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ABSTRACT

Dark Tourism:

Understanding Visitor Motivation at

Sites of Death and Disaster. (December 2003)

Stephanie Marie Yuill, B.A., University of Waterloo

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Tazim Jamal

People are fascinated with death and disaster. One simply has to watch traffic slow to a crawl when passing a car accident to understand this. However, this fascination goes beyond the side of a highway and enters the realm of tourism. Today, numerous sites of death and disaster attract millions of visitors from all around the world: Auschwitz-Birkenau, Anne Frank’s House, Graceland, Oklahoma City, Gettysburg, Vimy Ridge, the Somme, Arlington National Cemetery. The list grows each year as exhibited by the recent creation of an apartheid museum in Johannesburg, South Africa.

Due to the increasing popularity of this tourism product, a small number of academics have begun studying the phenomenon. Leading the field are Lennon and Foley who labeled it Dark Tourism, Seaton who coined the term Thanatourism, and Rojek who developed the concept of Black Spots. However, despite ongoing study, there has been a paucity in understanding what actually motivates individuals to sites of dark tourism.

Yet understanding motivation is imperative, particularly given the subject and sensitivity of these sites. Some are slowly decaying, and visitors play a large role in
their preservation. Subsequently, without proper management, visitor influxes can further deteriorate sites or induce friction with the locals. Knowledge then, also provides administrators the necessary tools to properly manage the varying stakeholders. Although many feel an interest in death and disaster simply stems from morbidity, the range of factors involved extend from an interest in history and heritage to education to remembrance.

To begin this study, a list of possible motivations was compiled. Then, to get a better comprehension of these motivations, visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston were surveyed as a case study. As a commodified, synthetic site of death and atrocity, the museum fits the definitions of a dark tourism site as established by lead academics. Therefore, by asking visitors to the museum what motivated them to the site, the results will hopefully give some acumen into the wants and needs of certain stakeholders. Finally, this research sought to discover if motivation at the museum could shed light on motivation to other sites of dark tourism.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to Study

In 1998, the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam calculated that 822,700 people passed through the swinging bookshelf into the annex that once hid eight Jewish refugees during World War II (Sluis 2002). The following year, in 1999, the Alamo in San Antonio, the most visited tourist destination in Texas, saw 2.5 million visitors at the site where approximately 179 men died defending their vision of an independent Texas (Breuer 2002). In 2000, the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and Museum reported that 434,000 visitors (Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and Museum; 2002) entered the camp that exterminated approximately 1.5 million people during the duration of World War II (Beech 2000:32).

These sites, and many like them, are bound together by a shroud of darkness. They exemplify the darker aspects of the human experience: crime, war, death, murder, atrocity, and disaster. They also share an additional social phenomenon: tourism. Each year, visitors around the world flock to an ever-increasing number of sites associated with death and disaster. These sites range from actual locations of dark events (such as the previously illustrated examples) to off-site locales that are in someway connected to such an event (such as Holocaust museums). The latter often houses related artifacts and survivor stories that are directly connected to the event.

This thesis follows the style of Annals of Tourism Research.
Two off-site exhibits on the *Titanic* naval disaster provide good illustrations of the latter categorization of dark tourism sites. When the National Maritime Museum in Greenwich England opened an exhibit on the ship in 1994, it was the, “…most popular exhibition the museum has ever staged, helping to attract some 720,000 people…” (Deuchar 1996:212). Similarly, in 1998 The Maritime Museum of the Atlantic in Halifax, Nova Scotia opened a permanent exhibit on the *Titanic* that contained a vast array of artifacts from the ship itself, and from the town that played such a large part in the aftermath. The results were immediate and overwhelming. “Year-to-date visitation was exactly 2.5 times the same period the previous year and showed no signs of slowing down…Visitation in 1997 had been 112,600 – 1998 saw 244, 000 visitors” (Lunn 2000:26).

The Black American struggle for equal rights provides further illustration of off-site dark tourism destinations. Beginning with colonial enslavement to the lynching of the 19th and 20th centuries, blacks have endured much since their arrival in North America. This struggle has recently seen the creation of a number of museums around the world in the past decade dedicated to the movement (although it must be noted that not everyone considers such sites as dark tourism destinations). On September 28, 1991, the National Civil Rights Museum opened in Memphis, Tennessee, and averages 150, 000 visitors per year, with the number constantly increasing (Lauritzen-Wright 2002). The National Voting Rights Museum and Institute in Selma, Alabama opened in 1993, with over 480,000 visitors passing through its entrance since its inception. A more recent
addition to the movement for black recognition was the opening of the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg, South Africa in November 2001 (Thomas 2001).

The statistics enumerated above serve to highlight the popularity of tourism at sites of death and disaster. Although the eight destinations initially cited attract almost 4 million visitors each year, they are but a small segment of the tourism destinations offering evidence of atrocity. They represent but six countries in a world filled with death and disaster.

1.2 Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is not to recite instances of dark tourism; rather, it is an attempt to examine what motivates visitors to visit these places. From the figures above, we can discern that dark tourism sites are sought-after destinations. This statement is furthered by the works of Foley and Lennon (1996 and 1997) who discuss that, “…there has been significant growth in tourism associated with sites of death, disaster, and depravity” (Lennon and Foley 1999:46). Smith found in her research on war and tourism that, “…despite the horrors of death and destruction (and also because of them), the memorabilia of warfare and allied products…probably constitutes the largest single category of tourist attractions in the world” (1996:248). Due to the sheer volume of visitors and the nature of many of these sites, it is therefore vital to understand what motivates people to visit places of dark tourism.

However, visitor motivations to such sites remain yet undefined. The literature is fragmented and no composite understanding of why visitors visit these sites has been catalogued. Hence, the purpose of this research is three fold. First, it will peruse the
literature and compile a comprehensive list of definitions and potential visitor motivations to sites of dark tourism that will be detailed in Chapter II. Secondly, guided by five key research questions found in Figure 1, this research will examine these potential motivations to determine if visitor motivations to the Holocaust Museum Houston can shed light on tourist motivations to other sites of dark tourism. Thirdly, this study will attempt to equip site administrators with a useful tool for management by making recommendations based on its findings. For a more detailed breakdown of how the study’s purpose relates to the research questions, see Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0 What role do push factors play in visitor motivation to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What role, if any, does the presumed lack of death and dying rituals in some sectors of North American society play in regards to visitation at the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 What role does an interest in history play in visitation to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What role does heritage affiliation or cultural identity play in visitation to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 What role does survivors’ guilt play in motivating people to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 What roles do curiosity and novelty play in visitors coming to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Research Questions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0 What role does pull factors play in visitor motivation to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 What role does the media play in pulling people to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 What roles do education and remembrance play in attracting visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 What role does nostalgia play in pulling people to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 What roles do curios and artifacts play in attracting people to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 What role does site sacralization play in pulling people to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 What other motivations might bring people to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 What role does the location of the Holocaust Museum Houston play in the visitor motivation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 What are the management implications of visitor motivations at sites of death and disaster?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1. Research Questions continued.**

### 1.3 Importance of Study

The importance of this study is multifold. Death and disaster are undeniable components of the human experience, and for many, preserving such sites is a method of
heritage preservation. As Linenthal recognizes, there is a fear Holocaust sites in Europe will simply disappear. He feels that, “…someday every site [will] be like Belzec…Now the site is merely a field in the small Polish town with only a monument to mark the site…The evidence is disintegrating…everything is rotting away. Somehow or other these things have to be seized” (1995:163). Similarly, Pompeii risks further destruction because of, “…inadequate maintenance and conservation, and lack of tourism management” (World Monument Fund 2002).

Therefore, for some, interpreting death and disaster is a means of preserving and conserving not just history, but also heritage, and personal and collective identity. By understanding visitor motivations, curators and site administrators can provide what visitors desire. In turn, visitors have the opportunity to financially contribute to historic preservation and the sustainability of valuable cultural sites. Without tourism, and proper tourism management, some of these sites will deteriorate and simply fade away.

This is an important aspect as heritage tourism is a growing segment of international tourism. Swearingen uses Florida as a case in point. Although the state is considered a beach/amusement park destination, studies find that international visitors also frequent cultural and heritage sites. “In 1993, 21.4 percent of all international visitors to Florida visited an amusement park, and 12.7 percent went to Disney World. An impressive 8.9 percent of the international visitors also toured a historical site, and 5.5 percent went to a museum, or art gallery” (1994:504). These findings underscore the importance of paying greater attention to supply and demand factors associated with the effective management and provision of the visitor experience.
Rojek provides an illuminating example of why it is important to understand sites of dark tourism. When Pan Am Flight 103 crashed at Lockerbie Scotland in 1988, tourism impacts were immediate. The day after the crash, “…newspapers reported a six-to seven-mile traffic jam on the main road to Lockerbie; and the AA [Automobile Association] were quoted as estimating that they had received over 2,000 inquires from people asking for the best route to the crash site” (1993:137-138). Faced with such large-scale interest in death and disaster, it is important that managers are equipped with knowledge and understanding in order to administer such sensitive sites. Understanding visitor motivations is important to aid in site management.

This understanding and knowledge help managers properly administer these sites in a manner fitting to subjects that can be sensitive in nature. Although visitors are certainly stakeholders at these sites, they are not the sole ones. Locals, survivors and victims’ families are also important stakeholders whose opinions, feelings and emotions must be taken into consideration. In some instances, survivors and families feel that a site of death and disaster should not be memorialized let alone become a platform for tourism. This conflict where visitors want to know but locals want to forget, has been termed heritage dissonance (Light, 2000; Tunbridge, 1998; Tunbridge, 1994 and Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996).

The Johnstown, Pennsylvania flood of 1889 exemplifies this. After the flood (which took the lives of almost 1,800 people), surviving residents felt, “…it was now time for Johnstown to put the flood behind it and move forward with reconstruction, that further memorialization would only prolong painful memories” (Foote 1997:95). To
promote and encourage tourism would have been an affront to those who lived the experience.

Foley and Lennon warn that sites must be wary of exploitation and that taste must, “…prevail over economic considerations” (1996:198). When sites do become tourist destinations, they must continue to take into consideration the opinion of stakeholders. Therefore, there must be balance and understanding between stakeholders. Understanding tourist motivations will allow site managers to appropriately tailor sites that will interest visitors, be financially successful, and appease locals, survivors, and families.

In sum, this research is important to today’s society in the following ways:

1. Practically, sites of death and disaster act as archives for public memory and hence they should be properly understood;
2. Economically, these sites provide methods of increasing heritage sustainability and preservation through tourist dollars;
3. Dark tourism is a social and cultural phenomenon and understanding tourist motivation is necessary to better understand the concept in general;
4. In order to mitigate any physical and cultural impacts that dark tourism might have, it is necessary to develop proper management techniques.

1.4 Organization of Thesis

This paper follows a basic organizational layout. Chapter II details the literature review undertaken in order to comprehend the dark tourism phenomenon. Beginning with a series of definitions found in the literature, it then breaks down each potential visitor motivation. Concepts affiliated with this study are first discussed, including post-modernism and the influence of cultural values on dark tourism. Next, guided by Dann’s (1977) Push and Pull Theory, individual motives are then discussed. Finally, Chapter II
introduces a conceptual model developed to detail the relationship between the varying factors, the visitors, the destination and the media.

Chapter III expands upon the focus group and survey research methods used to obtain data for analysis, while Chapter IV analyzes the compiled information. Chapter V provides a discussion on the findings and finally, Chapter VI summarizes key findings, and details research conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Definitions

2.1.1 Dark Tourism

To understand the purpose and findings of this study, it is necessary to first understand the concept of dark tourism and its related terms. The term dark tourism was first coined by two researchers, Malcolm Foley and J. John Lennon, as a means of describing, “…the phenomenon which encompasses the presentation and consumption (by visitors) of real and commodified death and disaster sites” (1996:198).

In their book Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster, Lennon and Foley refine this definition even further by noting what actions do and do not constitute dark tourism. For instance, friends and family visiting sites of dark tourism is not categorized as dark tourism. Conversely, “It is those who visit due to serendipity, the itinerary of tourism companies or the merely curious who happen to be in the vicinity who are, for us, the basis of dark tourism” (2000:23). For the authors, it appears tourist motivations play an almost inconsequential role in dark tourism.

However, in the aforementioned article, they do concede that motivations may play some role in the dark tourism experience. They quote, “These visitors may have been motivated to undertake a visit by a desire to experience the reality behind the media images and/or personal association with inhumanity” (1996:198).
2.1.2 Thanatourism

Tony Seaton coined a similar label in his definitive article, *From Thanatopsis to Thanatourism: Guided by the Dark*. In it, he describes thanatourism as being, “…travel to a location wholly, or partially, motivated by the desire for actual or symbolic encounters with death, particularly, but not exclusively, violent death, which may, to a varying degree be activated by the person-specific features of those whose deaths are its focal objects” (1996:240).

Seaton furthers this definition by adding two factors. First, thanatourism is behavioral; the concept is defined by the traveler’s motives rather than attempting to specify the features of the destination. Unlike Lennon and Foley’s concept, Seaton recognizes that individual motivations do play a role in death and disaster tourism.

Secondly, thanatourism is not an absolute; rather it works on a continuum of intensity based on two elements. First, whether it is the single motivation or one of many and secondly, the extent to which the interest in death is person–centered or scale–of–death centered. Figure 2 illustrates Seaton’s (1996) thanatourism continuum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weak Thanatourism Element</th>
<th>Strong Thanatourism Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ The interest in death is person-centred and exists with other motivations.</td>
<td>+ Interest in death is generalised and exists as the sole motivator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ The dead are known to, and valued by, the visitor.</td>
<td>+ Fascination with death is irrespective of the person or persons involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ E.g. a visit to a war memorial commemorating a dead relative.</td>
<td>+ E.g. visits to graveyards, catacombs, scenes of disaster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Seaton’s (1996) Thanatourism Continuum*
Seaton (1999) subsequently developed five categories of activities related to death tourism based on motivation:

1. Travel to watch death, i.e. public hangings or executions;
2. Travel to sites after death has occurred, i.e. Auschwitz;
3. Travel to internment sites and memorials, i.e. graves and monuments;
4. Travel to re-enactments, i.e. Civil War re-enactors; and
5. Travel to synthetic sites at which evidence of the dead has been assembled, i.e. museums.

It is the latter category that pertains most to this research. Synthetic sites include, “…museums where weapons of death, the clothing of murder victims, and other artifacts are put on display” (199:131). Synthetic sites include museums such as the Holocaust Museum Houston that displays such articles as clothing, photographs, and diaries from the Holocaust.

In their work on heritage dissonance, Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) touch on atrocity as a tourist attraction. They enumerate six qualities that make atrocity usable:

1. Nature of cruelty favours unusual or spectacular;
2. Nature of the victims characterised by innocence, vulnerability, and non-complicit;
3. Numbers only because human imagination has difficulties extending sympathies to small groups;
4. Nature of perpetrators should be unambiguously identifiable and distinguishable from the victims;
5. High profile visibility of the original event; and

2.1.3 Black Spots

Finally, Rojek coined a third term affiliated with the concept of dark tourism. His expression, black spots, refers to the “…commercial developments of grave sites and sites in which celebrities or large numbers of peoples have met with sudden and violent deaths (1993:136). He cites such examples as the stretch of California highway where
hundreds congregate each year to remember actor James Dean’s 1955 death and Pere Le Chaise in Paris where thousands flock to see musician Jim Morrison’s grave, amongst others.

As this research seeks to understand visitor motivation at the Holocaust Museum Houston, it will follow Seaton’s 1996 model. For the purpose of this paper, the terms dark tourism and thanatourism will be used interchangeably and encompass a broad spectrum of sites. However, unlike Lennon and Foley’s dark tourism definition, both will refer to travel to sites of death and disaster based on visitor motivation. Such destinations may be on-site, where the actual event took place. For example, Mauthausen Concentration Camp, the Dallas Book Depository where John F. Kennedy was assassinated and Dakota in New York where John Lennon was shot.

In addition, thanatourism destinations may be off-site. These are representations of the event, which are located away from the actual site. Such examples include The Maritime Museum of the Atlantic which houses artifacts from the Titanic; Pere Le Chaise Cemetery which is the final resting spot for a number of notables including Jim Morrison; and finally and most significantly for the purpose of this study, the Holocaust Museum Houston which is home to both Holocaust survivors and artifacts.

2.1.4 History and Heritage

Two other cognate terms must be defined for the purpose of this study: history and heritage. This is especially important given the contention that often surrounds the two terms. Anne Faulkner defines history as an inheritance from the past and, “…carries a definite connotation of value, or importance, or fame” (Zuzanek 1998:52). Heritage on
the other hand, is something, “…inherited from our cultural past: no judgment of good or bad is made” (Zuzanek 1998:52).

However, not all scholars and practitioners share these definitions. Lord Charteris, late Chairman of Britain’s National Heritage Memorial Fund, believed the term history does not carry strong values, that it is analytical and factual. Conversely, heritage invokes emotional and psychological resonance, connected to values and a sense of obligation to one’s ancestors and descendents (Zuzanek 1998).

Zuzanek (1998) concurs with Charteris’ definition. History is defined as being a broad, chronological term, with non-personal connotations. On the other hand, heritage is associated with a subjective and emotional interpretation of the past. For the purpose of this study, the two terms will correspond with Zuzanek’s 1998 definition: history will constitute factual data while heritage engenders a familial, personal connection.

2.2 Introduction to Literature Review

The remaining literature review is divided into 16 different components. A number of the sections deal directly with the survey instrument and possible dark tourism motivations: push and pull factors, heritage, history, guilt, curiosity, death and dying, nostalgia, education, remembrance, artifacts, and site sacralization.

However, the concepts of memory, memorialization and dark tourism are complex issues and must be understood in the context of this study. Therefore, four additional sections were added to the review to assist in understanding the dark tourism phenomenon: post-modernism, cultural values, heritage dissonance, and Holocaust commemoration.
2.3 Post-modernism

Much of the literature on dark tourism invariably defines the phenomenon in the context of post-modernism. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the origins and chronology of post-modernism in order to fully comprehend the role dark tourism plays in today’s society. A starting point is modernism, the movement from which post-modernism emerged.

The beginning of the modern era is generally associated with the period of European Enlightenment, around the middle of the eighteenth century. At that time, societies were experiencing rapid transformations under the Industrial Revolution, and with it a transfer of power from the aristocracy and absolutist kings to the newly-emerging middle class. Impacted societies became more urbanized, industrialized, and regimented.

The Industrial Revolution and modernity spurred other significant changes in society. Firstly, with scientific and industrial advances, individuals were no longer dependent on the church. Modernity broke down barriers between sacred and profane. This also influenced tourism. To illustrate, Rojek (1993) notes that, where society once viewed cemeteries with respect and dignity, modernity opened them for mass tourism thereby transforming them into tourist sites.

MacCannell (1976) asserts modernity dislocated our attachment to work, neighbourhood, town and family. Where once the home was workplace, leisure space, and family hearth, our time and attachments were eventually dispersed across various
locations. Without these ties to the home, society became interested in the lives of others and began to simulate real life for tourists.

Modernity was also a time of rationality, progress, and personal improvement, hence, the many forms of educative tourism which emerged in that era (Lennon and Foley 2000). Beginning with the Grand Tours of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century through to Thomas Cook’s 18\textsuperscript{th} century excursions, individuals attempted to improve themselves and social conditions. Continued industrialization allowed for increased education through marketing, communications, and infrastructures (Burkart and Medlik 1981).

Modernity however, had consequences. Such strong beliefs in science, technology, and even humankind eventually led to disappointment on many fronts. Events once inconceivable in modern minds shook society to the core upon occurrence. Lennon and Foley (2000) site numerous instances of the breakdown of modernity; the sinking of the \textit{Titanic} brought into question the invincibility of technology; the deliberately–planned Final Solution brought into question the humanity of rationality; and presidential assassinations brought into question the effectiveness of liberal democracies.

Riding (2003) concurs, quoting, “…all technological progress implies risk…The victim of the Chernobyl accident was science, knowledge, even consciousness…” (Riding 2003:H7). These disastrous events resulted in anxiety and doubt about, “…the key tenets of…modernity such a progress, rationality, science, technology, industrialization and liberal democracy” (Lennon and Foley 2000:21).
These changes have led to an emerging shift in society. Around the mid-1980’s, a relatively new way of thinking arose as an area of academic study. It was termed post-modernism (Klages 2003). Much of post-modern thought comes from a reaction to modernity. Pre-1980, post–modernism was determined an irrational reaction to modernist rationality (Toynbee 1938). The 1990 Oxford Dictionary defines it as a movement in reaction against that designated modern (Fowler and Fowler 1990). More recently, it has been defined in part as a questioning of Victorian views (Foley and Lennon, 1997 and Klages, 2003).

Tourism literature reveals significant impacts that post-modernism has had, and is having, on tourism products. Society has seen a continuous move away from traditional mass tourism and package holidays to what has been termed by Munt (1994) as post-modern tourism. This genre of tourism is characterized by the pursuit of new destinations and experiences and by an increasing diversity of products ranging from ecotourism to heritage tourism.

Such tourists in general, “…place an emphasis on ‘other’, non-western destinations…authenticity, truthfulness, contact with indigenous cultures, environmental concerns and the desire to partake in sustainable travel experiences. They also show an increasing tendency to intellectualise holidays, with an emphasis on study and learning…” (Light 2000:153). These tourists are looking to increase their cultural capital.

Dark tourism is considered by some to be a product of post-modern society (Lennon and Foley, 2000 and Rojek, 1993) and a number of dark tourism sites illustrate
this. French philosopher and writer, Paul Virilio, is currently attempting to create a Museum of Accidents in Paris. He recognizes, “Accidents happen. In fact they have always happened, from the asteroid that presumably wiped out dinosaurs, to the great fire that razed central London in 1666…A good many…are unavoidable acts of nature. But many more are human accidents provoked by the very technology that we celebrate…” (Riding 2003:H7). Although the museum has not been actualized, as a pilot project, Virilio has developed a temporary exhibit where photographs and movies of every imaginable nature and human-made disaster are shown.

Foley and Lennon (2000) document the relationship between anxiety and dark tourism. In their research on the attraction of death and disaster, the authors stipulate sites beyond the memory of the living do not count as sites of dark tourism for they do not incite anxiety and doubt about modernity. They compare sites of the Scottish Wars of Independence and the United States’ Vietnam War Memorial. The Scottish sites, due to their chronological distance, do not induce questions on modernity and its consequences. However, artifacts and messages left behind at the Vietnam Memorial suggest elements of anxiety and doubt over a controversial war.

The rise of spectacle is another consequence of post-modernism found in tourism literature. As Rojek states, “Meaning has been replaced with spectacle and sensation dominates value” (1993:136). To illustrate, he points to private–sector initiatives like Robin Hood Country in Nottinghamshire, England and Catherine Cookson country in Tyneside, England, both of which are constructed around mythical and fictional themes.
Pretes found in post-modern society, objects become representations and are commodified, packaged, consumed and eventually obscure reality; hence, commodity becomes a spectacle. He cites as an example, the Santa Claus Village in Finland. He describes it as, “…a contrived tourism attraction…a city…built entirely on image” (1995:13).

The difficulty of spectacle is that it blurs the distinctions between the real and the imaginary (Debord 1967). Ignoring reality, “The spectacle presents itself as something enormously positive…It says nothing more than “that which appears is good, and that which is good appears”” (Debord 1967:145). Hence, visitors are satisfied with the spectacle and may assume the spectacle to be the truth and the whole story.

When television and other media outlets entered people’s living rooms, previously unknown worlds were revealed; consequently, a number of authors attribute the media as being responsible in part for the rise of dark tourism as spectacle (Foley and Lennon, 2000 and Rojek, 1993). Although Seaton notes that thanatourism has been a factor since the Middle Ages, he also recognizes the media’s role in fuelling public interest in death and disaster. He notes, “Murder coverage in the…press produced stampedes of visitors to death locations for sightseeing and souvenir hunting” (1996: 242).

Foley and Lennon also recognize the media’s early role in publicizing disaster tourism, particularly with the 1912 sinking of the Titanic. “Newsreel companies filmed survivors landing in the USA while reporters wired stories around the world” (2000:8). However, they too note media’s post-modern importance. As an example, they focus on
the assassination of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and its aftermath as a watershed moment in post-modernism. “Television broadcasts were interrupted across the globe to break the news. In the USA, coverage took precedence over scheduled programming and announcers… extemporized on camera as news changed and events unfolded” (Lennon and Foley 2000:16).

Lennon and Foley continue, “Central and notable in the media coverage was the death itself which offered a spectacle of televisual images defining the ‘reality’ of that weekend for many viewers. The viewing of the funeral itself constituted the heaviest day of TV viewing in the USA to date…” (2000:79). Furthermore, Neilsen report of 1963 reported that approximately 93 per cent of TV-equipped households watched the funeral procession to Arlington National Cemetery (Lennon and Foley 2000).

This rise in spectacle strongly impacts public commemoration and memorials. As a consequence, today’s architects and builders simply do not construct a memorial; they must also build to reach a generation, “…to which history has been spoon-fed as entertainment and spectacle” (Dunlop 2002:E48). This is evident not only with the sites of fictional representation that Pretes (1995) and Rojek (1993) describe. For some dark tourism sites that emphasize their educational and remembrance missions, interpretation veers closely to spectacle (Walsh 1992). Foley and Lennon (1997 and 2000) cite the Sixth Floor Museum, Dallas and the Arlington Cemetery, Virginia, as examples of sites that have difficulties delineating education, remembrance and spectacle. As Connally is quoted in Lennon and Foley (2000) as saying,

I don’t think the time has come when history will really look at the Kennedy administration with a realistic eye. And how could we? When you see a
beautiful little girl kneeling with her hand on her father’s coffin, when you see a handsome little boy standing with a military salute by his slain father, how can you feel anything but the utmost sympathy? (2000:80).

Rojek uses Jim Morrison’s grave in a Paris cemetery as an example, “…where the search for spectacle has replaced the respect for solemnity” (1993:141). Once a sacred site, Morrison’s tomb is now a, “…defaced, urine stained Mecca” (O’Hagan 1990:1.7).

The literature reveals additional inherent problems with such significant dependence on the media. Often, the time relationship causes problems. The past appears to visitors a planet different than the one they inhabit. Using Treblinka concentration camp, Steiner articulates this issue.

Precisely at the same hour in which Mehring or Langer (victims of the camps) were being done to death, the overwhelming plurality of human beings, two miles away on Polish farms, five thousand miles away in New York, were making love or worrying about the dentist. The two orders of simultaneous experiences are so different, so irreconcilable to any common norm of human values, their co-existence is so hideous a paradox… (1967:156-157).

Furthermore, constant repetition of the past through the media can cheapen, marginalize, or trivialize the magnitude of the events being interpreted (Foley and Lennon, 1997 and Foley and Lennon, 2000). Steven Spielberg’s production, Schindler’s List, is often singled out for its historical flaws. Foley and Lennon (1997) and Lanzmann (1995) describe how the movie operates within the confines of a traditional Hollywood narrative: there is a well-defined plot and an easy-to-follow chronology. Rather than offering an accurately- documented version of the events, the film renders a fictionalized account written for popular consumption.
Repetition is another key consequence of post-modernism occurring repeatedly in dark tourism literature. “As far as tourism is concerned, the emergence of simulations, replications, and virtual experiences as part of a tourism product has been a critical factor in the emergence of dark tourism” (Foley and Lennon 1999:46). In 2000, the authors elaborated, “The interpretation and re-telling of events surrounding…death have shaped perceptions of reality. In projecting visitors into the past, reality has been replaced with omnipresent simulation and commodification” (Foley and Lennon 2000:78). In his work on black spots, Rojek (1993) concurs, stating black spots contain signs of repetition and duplication, a sign of post-modernism. As a result, the real in the post-modern world is confined in pure repetition (Baudrillard 1983).

Repetition leads into other post-modern characteristics: simulation and duplication. As Foley and Lennon note, dark tourism, “…embodies the simulation of experiences, the importance of reproduction, and the significance of the media” (1997:154). Examples abound.

At the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), patrons are given an identity card that progresses with them as they tour the museum, “…imitating whether you have been arrested, imprisoned, transported to a concentration camp, gassed, etc.” (Lennon and Foley 2000:146). Similarly, when visitors enter the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg, they are arbitrarily assigned racial classification and experience part of the museum from that viewpoint (Swarns 2001).

At the Imperial War Museum in England, you can experience first-hand a replication of life in England during World War I. Their Trench Experience,
“...commodifies the life, sights, sounds and smells of life in the trenches...” while the Blitz Experience, “...includes the replication of an air raid while sitting in an Anderson shelter...” (Lennon and Foley 2000:115).

At the Sixth Floor Book Depository in Dallas, Texas, visitors can relive repeatedly, via the media, all aspects of the Kennedy’s assassination from the presidential entourage and the assassination to the funeral and Lee Harvey Oswald’s murder (Lennon and Foley 2000). Furthermore, the JFK Presidential Limousine Tour offers a replication assassination for visitors. “For $25.00 visitors retrace the route in a replica of the presidential limousine, with an audio commentary playing on the car tape deck that includes crowd cheers, gunshot sounds, comments of other passengers...and the news broadcasts covering the death of the president” (Lennon and Foley 2000:98). The tour ends at the Portland Hospital with confirmation of the President Kennedy’s death (Murray 1996).

Rojek notes how James Dean fans duplicate the actor’s death each year, on the same date, at the same time, at the exact location of the accident. They go so far as driving period vehicles. “Mile for mile, and moment for moment they try to repeat the sights, sounds and experiences that their hero experienced on the journey” (1993:142).

Museums and historic sites are not the only dark tourism spots to repeat the past. In Halifax, The Warehouse Restaurant has turned its dining room into a,

...culinary shrine to the Titanic...For $60.00 per person...patrons partake of six of the 11 courses offered to the first-class passengers on the night the ship went down-including poached salmon and Waldorf pudding. As a violinist and cellist play period pieces, an actor assuming the character of the Titanic...works the room, encouraging diners to take on the identity of some of the ship’s better-known passengers... (Bergman 1998:70).
There are undeniable consequences to the excessive use of replication, simulation and duplication. With a high dependence on virtual experiences in our post-modern society, “…reality is a matter for debate” (Lennon and Foley 2000:145). They continue, noting since interpretation confuses history and utilizes techniques to maintain interest, it, “…will remove the real that much farther from the simulation” (Lennon and Foley 2000:156).

Another aspect of post-modern society related to dark tourism is the de-differentiation of leisure (Lennon and Foley, 2000; Lash, 1990 and Rojek, 1993). Everything is now feasible as a leisure activity. As a consequence, all forms of leisure have become equal and all events and sites have become potential tourism destination. Two hundred years ago, cemeteries were sacred, yet the National Federation of Cemetery Friends in Britain promotes them as outdoor museums (Rojek 1993).

Lennon and Foley also note the commodification of the sacred, this time at Auschwitz where a number of private retail enterprises have developed. “Everything from hot dog stands, booksellers, postcard vendors, film stores and discount pottery warehouses are to be found. This, and the internal sale of concentration camp memorabilia, present the camp authorities with a clear dilemma” (2000:63).

De-differentiation can also be seen in the rise of museums and attractions that may be classified as dark tourism sites. Tourism to society’s back-regions has developed in areas traditionally off limits or obscured from view (MacCannell 1976). In Lothian, Scotland, two mining collieries have been repackaged as the Scottish Mining Museum.
(Rojek 1993). In his study on New York’s Little Italy, Conforti (1996) researched ghettos as tourist attractions.

Finally, “Under postmodernism, it might be said, everyone is a permanent émigré from the present” (Rojek 1993:168). Nostalgia is then seen to be a key paradigm of post-modernism, and Lennon and Foley (2000) cite numerous examples as testimony: the regeneration of urban centers; the creation of conservation: museum villages; the protection of landscapes; the boom in retro fashion; and the academic process of quoting and citing. History, time and space then become commodities for sale (Pretes 1995).

This sense of nostalgia appears to come from several sources. First, the doubt and anxiety modernity has produced surfaces in post-modern tourists who are searching for a simpler past. The tourists are, “…yearning for a past they can no longer find in their own social settings. Unable to tolerate their present alienated condition, and ever fearful of the future, they seek solace in days gone by—a world where it was once possible to distinguish right from wrong…pleasure from pain” (Dann and Potter 2001:72).

Similarly, individuals become nostalgic for a time they envision as more alive, more exciting, more romantic than present day society.

There was also an excitement in the streets of New York in 1882 that is gone…[people]…were…interested in their surrounding…[and]…carried with them a sense of purpose…they weren’t bored, for God sakes…Those men moved through their lives in unquestioned certainty that there was a reason for being…Faces don’t have that look now (Finney 1995:218-219).

The media has exacerbated romantic visions of the past. James Cameron’s movie, Titanic, is perhaps the most notorious example of disaster-turned-romance. The movie, which glossed over the deaths of over 1,500 people (Barnes 1998), chose instead
to focus on the love affair between two fictional characters, Jack Dawson and Rose DeWitt Bukater. The movie does recognize the enormity of the deaths when Rose reminisces, “Fifteen hundred people went into the sea when Titanic sank from under us. Six were saved from the water, myself included. Six out of 1,500” (Titanic 1997). However, the premise of the film is the true love between Jack and Rose.

Titanic is not the only entertainment source to turn disaster and war into romance. On November 23, 1987, Designing Women, a then-popular television show, aired an episode called I’ll Be Seeing You (Top That 2002). In it, one of the lead characters (Charlene) dreams of a soldier out of World War II for her birthday. She envisions the war as a romantic era of drama and unrequited love, and as the episode unfolds, Charlene actually meets her soldier and falls in love.

Nostalgia also surfaces under the guise of remembrance. “Like an individual approaching old age, Americans are increasingly looking backward, trying to extract from the past those things they want to preserve, those symbolic artifacts that reflect significant and proud moments in the development of their nation” (Conforti 1996:830).

Much of the literature conceptualizes dark tourism as being a post-modern phenomenon, a reaction to the doubt and anxiety imbued by modernity. With 17th century industrialization, came ongoing social change: rationalization, modernization, science, technology, and knowledge. This progress however, had its consequences.

Some authors cite the sinking of the Titanic as the embryo of post-modernism. An unsinkable wonder of man’s ingenuity, when the ship sank it shook society’s belief in technology. Soon after, the Holocaust instilled doubt about people’s humanity while
subsequent presidential assassinations produced anxiety about liberal democracies. As a result, society, including the tourism sector, began a transformation.

Several key points, which illustrated dark tourism’s correlation with post-modernism, were identified in the literature review. Firstly, was a move away from traditional, mass tourism as witnessed by the recent emergence of specialized tourism: green, heritage, adventure, dark and eco-tourism.

Post-modernity has also influenced a rise in spectacle, brought about in part by the increased dominance of the media. Such media as television, movies, and videos have blurred the distinction between reality and simulation. The repetition of dark tourism events makes it hard for visitors to differentiate between time and space. The past becomes another planet. With this distancing, comes a need for the past and a heightened sense of nostalgia.

In sum, for many authors, dark tourism provides the context for a post-modern experience. A society filled with doubt and anxiety looks to a variety of outlets to recoup the past. Generations dependent on the media have difficulty separating reality and therefore become satisfied with simulation and duplication.

### 2.4 Cultural Values

To grasp tourist motivation at sites of dark tourism, it is essential to understand the memorialization process of such sites, the how and why they were initially erected. Not all sites of death, disaster, and destruction are memorialized, nor do all sites evolve into tourist destinations. Much of this commemoration is shaped by cultural values. As
Foote reported, “…attitudes towards violence and tragedy are closely aligned with cultural values” (1997:6).

In his aptly named book, Shadowed Ground: America’s Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy, Foote (1997) discusses at length the impacts cultural values have on forging both a nation’s memory and its commemorative landscape. The memorializing sites seen today have all been shaped by political, social and/or economic factors, sometimes over a number of decades.

According to Foote (1997), when a site experiences a tragic or violent event, one of four outcomes results: sanctification, designation, rectification, or obliteration. Most relevant to this study are the former two, and they are discussed in detail below.

2.4.1 Sanctification

The most common motives for sanctification are to honor martyrs, fallen heroes, great leaders and community loss. The process involves the creation of a sacred place, often identified by a durable marker such as a statue, building, monument or memorial garden (Foote 1997). It also involves some form of formal consecration, a ceremony explaining the site’s history and significance.

However, this is not always an objective process as illustrated by the sanctification of Abraham Lincoln. Bodnar explains, “…the shaping of a past worthy of public commemoration in the present is contested and involves a struggle for supremacy between advocates of various political ideas and sentiments” (1992:13).

Although today Lincoln is regarded by many as one of the greatest American presidents, his memorial in Washington D.C. was not completed until 1922, fifty-seven
years after his death. Foote (1997) states that, “…the heart of the problem of building a larger memorial was that Americans did not agree on how Lincoln should be remembered” (50).

At the time of his death in 1865, Lincoln was considered a polarizing leader who was responsible for dividing the nation. His name was synonymous with the American Civil War and any efforts to commemorate him were overshadowed by the after-effects of the war. However, these aftereffects began to fade with time.

Gradually, over several decades, the Civil War came to assume new meaning for Americans in both the North and the South. Whereas early assessments stressed only the issue of victory and defeat, by the late nineteenth century the war was being cast in heroic terms by both sides…both North and South could maintain that they had fought the good fight for causes each side held dear…Only a step separated this view from seeing the war as a struggle that tested-and strengthened-the nation (Foote 1997:51).

As American cultural values began to alter the status of the Civil War at the turn of the 19th century, they also began to transform Lincoln’s reputation. No longer vilified as the president who divided the nation, the Lincoln Memorial was dedicated in Washington, D.C., in 1922 to the *defender* of the nation.

### 2.4.2 Designation

Designated sites, “…arise from events that are viewed as important but somehow lacking the heroic or sacrificial qualities associated with sanctification” (Foote 1997:17-18). Due to a number of reasons, they omit the rituals of ceremony and consecration. For example, the designation of a site may be a transitional phase. The site could, over time, either be consecrated or eventually obliterated from memory.
The commemoration process of Martin Luther King Jr. illustrates this idea. After King’s assassination at the Lorraine Motel, Walter Bailey, building’s owner, marked the site to venerate the Black hero. However, the wider American population did not immediately accept King as a heroic symbol, and therefore sanctification was not forthcoming.

This is due in part because, “…commemoration is primarily enacted by former victims, survivors or relatives…Rarely does any state commemorate its own crimes…” (Foley and Lennon 1999:49). Young supports this idea. “Only rarely does a nation call upon itself to remember the victims of crimes it has perpetrated. Where are the national monuments to the genocide of American Indians, to the millions of Africans enslaved…? They barely exist” (1993:21).

For a group that has suffered such negative images and stereotypes, or who simply has not molded into American ideals, preservation has been limited. It took twenty years before the Black struggle was integrated into American cultural values and therefore King to reach national recognition. As Foote noted, the changing political climate finally allowed such black minority sites to be commemorated. Changes included, “…downsizing controversial divisive issues and instead stressing values and virtues held in common by parties on both sides… and canonizing heroes, and creating shared monuments…” (1997:324).

Foote (1997) is not the sole academic to recognize the influence of cultural values on the commemoration of dark places. Preservation is a selective process for Barthel (1989) and that which is selected often reflects the interests of those in power.
(Duncan and Duncan 1984). Similarly, Tunbridge and Ashworth found motives behind some interpretation, which, “…may include the manipulation of…essentially sensitive heritage so that it contributes to a variety of contemporary goals even though these may historically have had little relevance to the original atrocity events” (1996:104).

For Goodey, cultural influence does not lie solely in the hands of politicians: “There has always been those rich enough to create taste in landscape” (1986:87). Tunbridge and Ashworth reminded us that media is also highly selective in its choice of victims thereby influencing cultural values. For instance, the British Broadcasting Company (BBC) was not in Rwanda and, “…world interest in East Timor was stirred only after the broadcast of a 1990’s videotape, some 15 years after the violence had begun” (1996:105).

A number of additional academic works have looked at cultural values and commemoration. Also using the Black example, Crew (1996) noted that interest in Black History did not begin until the two decades after World War II. While initial commemoration took place with local, grass roots movements, it was not until the early 1970’s that mainstream America began to pay heed to Black History. Much of this change came with the political activism of the 1960’s. However, despite recent commemorations of Black History, certain parts of history remain vague, especially antebellum plantations and slavery: perhaps because this subservient part of history continues to diverge from overriding American values.

Compare this to modern slavery commemoration Britain. Until the last century, Unite Kingdom perceptions of Britain’s role in slavery were that of social reform
(Seaton 2002). With an absence of physical evidence, a smaller Black population, and no watershed mark to signify slavery as being important, Britons until recently have been removed from their role in the slavery triangle. It was easier to focus on the positive aspects of slavery that the historic sites postulated. For example, there is the abolition campaign led by William Wilberforce (Beech 2001).

The change came when a leading white, British philanthropist traveled to Barbados and discovered Britain’s ignorance about slavery. He funded a permanent exhibit at the Maritime Museum in Liverpool, England, and today, all aspects of slavery in Britain are interpreted.

Another illustrative example is to compare the sinking of the Titanic to that of the S.S. Atlantic, which sank in 1898, killing 562 persons. Until 1912, the Atlantic’s sinking had the distinction of being the worst single-vessel maritime disaster. Unlike the Titanic that carried a number of rich, influential individuals, the Atlantic was carrying mostly European immigrants to the United States. As a result, there is little commemoration to the victims except within the tiny Canadian fishing villages that played rescuers’ roles in the tragedy (Bergman 1998).

Another manifestation of conflicting cultural values is what Tunbridge and Ashworth define as heritage dissonance. As the authors noted, “All heritage is someone’s heritage and therefore logically not someone else’s” (1996:21). Hence, when individuals attempt to lay claim to a part of someone else’s heritage, conflict can arise. Furthermore, conflict is exacerbated when one party is comprised of tourists and tourism providers.
Lennon and Foley note,

Viewing the past – as opposed to history – as a set of discourses aimed at a particular group (in this case tourists) highlights the suggestion that history is for someone and that the contemporary dominant power élites are most likely to play a significant part in shaping that reality when the target group is ordinary citizens in the guise of tourists. Thus those with the responsibilities for tourism promotion and development may have a previously unrecognized ethical dilemma – that of adjudicating in debates over ‘whose history’ prevails in interpretation (2000:162).

This is well illustrated in a question posed by Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996). Is a British bomber pilot or German U-boat captain a hero, villain, or both simultaneously? For the allies during World War II, the British bomber pilot was a hero; however, the citizens of Dresden did not likely feel the same way after their city was bombed in 1945 by allied air raids.

The question becomes even more profound looking at contemporary interpretation of the events in Dresden. Although Britain and the United States devastated the city in 1945, the issue today is often skirted in the retelling of the war for, “…fear of offending the English-speaking tourism market” (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996:100). Consequently, tourism creates dissonance as people cater to the tourism dollar rather than adhering to authenticity.

The literature cites a number of additional relationships between tourism and heritage dissonance. Foote discusses the 1889 Johnstown flood that killed almost 1,800 of the town’s residents. Although a marker was erected in commemoration, little else was done. “Many residents felt that it was now time…to put the flood behind them and move forward with reconstruction, that further memorialization would only prolong painful memories” (1997:95). However, journalists and tourists continued to inundate
the region in attempt to keep the story alive. Over one hundred years later, cultural values have changed, and now the town is the site of a flood museum and a national memorial. Rather than wanting to turn away tourists, tourism is, “…seen as a way to turn a past catastrophe into a present-day asset” (Foot 1997:99).

Lennon and Foley (2000) discuss heritage dissonance regarding the Sixth Floor Depository in Dallas, Texas. Although a popular tourist site today, the Depository was not always seen in a positive light. “After the assassination, the building was clearly a difficult real estate proposition and state employees were understandably less than enthusiastic working on the sixth floor” (Lennon and Foley 2000:91-92). A former mayor of Dallas was quoted as saying, “For my part, I don’t want anything to remind me that a President was killed on the streets of Dallas. I want to forget” (Foote 1997:59).

However, tourists and other well-wishers flocked to the assassination site, leaving behind a collection of remembrances: flowers, madonnas, wreaths. Today a number of memorials commemorate the life of John F. Kennedy, including the Sixth Floor Book Depository, which is Dallas’ number one tourist attraction (Minutaglia 1993).

Dann and Potter noted that plantation and slavery tourism in Barbados often created dissonance by putting dollars first and people last. The island was, …quick to realize that it cannot portray its history as it really happened, since the presentation of centuries of overt racism…is hardly a recipe for touristic success. There has consequently been a selective rendition of the past…[resulting]…in a loss of identification for the provider, and indigenous culture becomes reduced…(2001:56).
This premise is supported by Tunbridge and Ashworth who quote, “This shaping of past oppression, perhaps as a reaction to the perceived contemporary problems of these groups, creates obvious dissonance possibilities in the interpretation of this historical period…” (1996:98). While tourists and tourism-providers may not want to confront the island’s history of suffering, for many islanders who endured slavery, telling their story may be vital.

The Jersey Islands off the coast of England also illustrate a history at odds with tourism. Today, “The ‘ill wind’ of the war years has been turned to the good. The relics and remains of Hitler’s British stronghold have now taken their place…Jersey’s German occupation is now big business, with more war museums per square mile than anywhere else in Europe” (Lennon and Foley 2000: 66).

However, any reminders tarnishing the island’s image during the war are sanitized or hidden: the collaborations, fraternization and compromises (Bunting 1995). Moreover, the whole issue of collaboration is dealt with in only one museum on Jersey in a minor display area (Lennon and Foley 2000). This is because collaboration brings into question the belief that Britain stood alone against Hitler during the dark days of World War II, thereby hurting national identity and the tourism dollar.

Light found dissonance to be alive and well in post-communist Romania. Like other Eastern and Central European nations, Romania has little desire to commemorate and interpret their communist past for, “…the physical legacy of Ceausescu’s rule is an unwelcome reminder of a period of history which Romania is attempting to forget”
(2000:148). As proof, after the 1998 revolution, statues of all communist leaders were torn down and streets were renamed.

However, there is considerable interest from tourists. In 1990, a year after the overthrow of communism in Romania, the country saw a 67% increase in tourism. “Independent travelers took the opportunity to see for themselves the site and sights of Eastern Europe’s most violent revolution, while travel companies hastily arranged packages for visitors wanting to see the locations associated with the collapse of communism” (Light 2000:148). In Romania then, the desire to forget the past conflicts with the desire to maximize the economic benefits of tourism.

Such heritage dissonance between survivors and tourism has possible ramifications aside from direct, human conflict. Firstly, as Henderson points out, “There is potential conflict between the functions of education and entertainment…” (2000:269). If hosts ignore the interpretation that is being offered to guests, the line between education and spectacle may easily be crossed.

Secondly, host sites may be missing opportunities to tell their stories. Using Light’s Romanian example, tourists are left uninformed about the meaning of communism to the country and why they are so unwilling to share their stories. Conversely, tourism may be rushing the country to confront a past they are not yet ready to face.

Cultural values dominate history, heritage, and the memorialization process. Frequently, those in power manipulate which stories are told for political, economic, and nationalistic purposes. This alone can create conflict between the prevailing forces and
victims and survivors as they battle for the ownership of the past. Survivors and victims
themselves do not always agree on the shaping of memory. However, the situation is
intensified when tourists and tourism dollars enter into the equation.

The literature was clear in outlining the conflict between hosts’ wants and guests’
demands. Unfortunately, the tourism dollar often triumphs over victims’ wishes and
historical fact. There are severe repercussions to this situation. As illustrated in Dresden,
Germany and Jersey, England, some historical facts were disregarded in order to satisfy
tourists. In Dallas, Texas, there was a division in the community. In Romania,
educational opportunities were lost due to the impatience of the tourism industry. Some
sites may even be threatened with spectacle as tourism operators’ rush to capitalize on
tragic events.

Dark tourism sites are particularly susceptible to heritage dissonance given the
gravity and sensitivity of their origins. For those who have undergone such traumatic
events, forgetting may be an instinctual reaction. Yet given the pervasiveness of the
media, touristic interest is often immediate. It follows that these sites must be managed
with heritage dissonance in mind in order to reduce conflict.

2.5 Cultural Values and the Holocaust

The commemoration of the Holocaust is no different from the previous examples
in that it, too, is impacted by prevailing cultural values. As Gourevitch notes, “In
America…we recast the story of the Holocaust to teach fundamental American
values…pluralism, democracy, restraint on government, the inalienable right of
individuals, the inability of government to enter into freedom of religion” (1993:55).
The USHMM in Washington, D.C. provides a highly illustrative example of this. In the years following World War II, the world tried to come to grips with a number of conflicting emotions, especially regarding the Holocaust. Veterans who liberated concentration camps endured, “…an almost unbearable mixture of empathy, disgust, guilt, anger and alienation” (Abzug 1985:44). Bystanders experienced guilt for not having taken a more active part, while perpetrators attempted to forget their actions. The implications of the events were simply too threatening for public examination (Linenthal 1995).

In America, reactions to the Holocaust were similar, and the reactions of survivors who had come to the country were equally as mixed. Some simply wanted to forget, while others did not want to identify with the victims (Linenthal 1995). Others starting a new life, “…were more concerned about acting as Americans than as Jews” (Lipstadt 1981:75).

The political climate of the decades following World War II proved conducive to sustaining these conflicting emotions. Post-war America had allied itself with Germany against Cold War communism. Holocaust perpetrators had suddenly become the allies, while some liberators such as the Soviet Union were now considered the enemy. “Active memory of the Nazi past was considered a needless complication in the struggle to win the Cold War” (Linenthal 1995:9).

A number of international and national events began to change American opinions towards the Holocaust in the 1960’s. May of 1967 saw the Six-Day War in Israel, with the ultimate Egyptian goal of annihilating Israel. For Jews in both the
United States and abroad, this awakened dormant memories of the Holocaust and brought about a ‘collapse of complacency’ (Herschel 1973). The Jewish struggle for ‘Never Again’ was born.

On another foreign shore, America was fighting a losing battle against North Vietnam. As the conflict began to erode the American belief in the, “…righteousness of the American fighting man…” the Holocaust provided a foundation for good versus evil after the, “…disorientation of Vietnam…” (Linenthal 1995:10). Americans were forced to reconsider their values.

On the home shores, the late 1960’s saw a rise in ethnic particularism as an accepted form of cultural expression (Linenthal 1995). It became acceptable to be different and to express those differences; therefore, many Jews became less reserved about demonstrating their Jewish identity in public.

In the late 1970’s, a number of additional events transpired. There were proposed anti-Semitic marches in Skokie, Illinois by American Nazis. The American Office of Special Investigations began prosecuting war criminals. The NBC aired a miniseries on the Holocaust, and in 1978 then-president Jimmy Carter commissioned a presidential report on the Holocaust (Linenthal 1995).

Finally, and pointedly, the changing political climate was in Washington, D.C. directly influenced the commemoration of the Holocaust in the capital. As Linenthal relates, “The motivation to build a Holocaust memorial was linked with a clear message of the administration’s support for the State of Israel” (1995:19). This was desperately needed as Carter wanted to appease the Jewish constituency after the sale of F-15 fighter
jets to Saudi Arabia (Foley and Lennon 1999). President Carter was using the, “…power of the government to do something many would perceive as good, and at the same time, reach out to an increasingly alienated ethnic constituency” (Linenthal 1995:17). In 1980, the Carter administration created a Campaign to Remember, a mail-out fundraising campaign targeting the American Jewish population (Lennon and Foley 2000).

Throughout the 1960’s and 70’s, the above factors combined with others to bring about the genesis of a Holocaust museum in Washington D.C. However, this museum would not only commemorate the Holocaust, it would be a, “…repository of American identity” (Linenthal 1995:68). The story, instead of focusing solely on the Jewish experience, would have to be told in a way that would be significant to an American audience: it needed to move beyond the limits of ethnic memory. To do so, the museum would reinforce, “…American identity by graphically revealing what America is not” (Linenthal 1995:107), “…through stark presentation of their antitheses in Nazi Germany” (Linenthal 1995:255).

Krauthammer (1993) reinforces this idea. Located in the Washington Mall, “…home of the monumental expressions of core national narratives” (Linenthal 1995:57), the museum provides excellent views of the Washington Monument and Jefferson Memorial. Here, “…juxtaposition is not just redemptive. It is reassuring. The angels of democracy stand watch on this temple of evil. It is as if only in the heart of the world’s most tolerant and powerful democracy can such terrible testimony be safely contained” (Linenthal 1995:58).
Outwardly, the commemoration process appears to be an easy practice. Americans flock in droves to the Sixth Floor Museum, the Lincoln Monument, and Gettysburg to venerate their heroes. However, these heroes and events, which we take for granted were likely once victims of debate and conflict over what accurately represented a national identity.

The enshrinement of disaster and tragedy is not accidental: it is shaped by prevailing cultural values that forge and maintain a national identity. ‘Remember the Alamo’, the ‘Maine’ and ‘Pearl Harbor’ have all served as rallying cries to rouse patriotic fervor in the pursuit of justice. These words conjure up visions of freedom, bravery and liberty. Rarely does one hear reminders of unpopular events such as ‘Remember Kent State’ or ‘Remember Saigon’. This is because shame and loss are not values governments want to instill in their constituency.

Therefore, the commemoration of dark tourism sites must be looked at under this light. Violence and tragedy are widespread in society; however, not all sites and events are memorialized. Social and political forces have moulded much of what is seen. Similarly, interpretation at sites of death and disaster must be viewed with skepticism. The truth may not be the ultimate ideal because it is more important to shape displays and exhibits into a marketable commodity.

### 2.5.1 Understanding the Holocaust

For many, the scope of the Holocaust is beyond belief: that one state sponsored regime could systematically annihilate mass populations is unfathomable. Beginning in 1933 with Hitler’s investiture as German chancellor, the Third Reich eventually
exterminated approximately eleven million individuals before the 1945 Nazi surrender (Laqueur and Tydor Baumel 2001). Those targeted included, but were not limited to, communists and other political prisoners, Gypsies, homosexuals, and the mentally disabled.

Of those eleven million, however, over half were of Jewish origin. In Poland alone, 90% of the Judaic population was wiped out. Pre-1933, there were 3.5 million Jews living in the country: approximately 300,000 survived (Young 1993). In Czechoslovakia, the ancient fortress city of Terezin was converted into a transit camp where 138,000 Jews died (Young 1993). Jewry in Austria, France, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg, Ukraine, Hungary and Lithuania suffered similar fates. All totaled, 6 million Jews lost their lives during the Holocaust, including 1.5 million children.

Whether termed Shoah or Holocaust, the remembrance and commemoration of such events are also overwhelming and are as varied as the individual experiences themselves. Much of the literature on memorializing the period emphasizes a deep divergence in commemoration, particularly between countries; for it is there cultural values dictate public memory. Furthermore, the stakes of remembrance are high for those involved. Holocaust commemoration not only involves veneration, but also perceived ownership of the events and subsequently the sculpting of a nation’s identity. To illustrate, two countries are examined: Israel, and most importantly for this study, the United States.
2.5.2 Israel and Shoah

Today, Israel is a nation indelibly tied to Shoah. For some, the events of 1933-1945 were precursors to the establishment of a Jewish state. The Israeli army’s Informational Guidelines to the Commander on Yom Hashoah goes as far as quoting, “By standing under these conditions and refusing to surrender to despair the Jews made it possible the continuation of the Jewish people even in the inferno of the Holocaust and thereby helped created the State of Israel” (Young 1993:214). This form of recognition however, was not always the case, for Israel, like all nations, remembers according to national myths and political will.

In the years immediately following the war, Israel had an ambiguous relationship with the destruction of the Shoah, particularly after statehood in 1948 (Young, 1993 and Cole, 1999). Native-born Israeli’s could not understand the mass extermination and did not care to commemorate the powerlessness of their people. Similarly, many of the 350,000 survivors that settled there after the war found the past too painful to confront. There was little desire to commemorate what was perceived to be victimization and as a result, remembrance was greeted with silence.

This silence was shattered with the 1961 trial of Adolph Eichmann. Hundreds of survivors stood to give testimony and emotion to their Holocaust experiences, and this soon opened dialogue between varying Israeli factions. “The trial created a climate of opinion in which the Holocaust…became the central topic of conversation…[it]…ceased to be a taboo, and instead assumed an increasingly central – if contested-position in Israeli society and politics” (Cole 1999:63).
The trial brought together the dueling reactions to the Holocaust, thus reconciling Israelis with their past. Furthermore, it brought about the genesis of modern remembrance in Israel: that of rebirth. Today in Israel, memory is devoted to heroism and yesterday’s victims have become modern martyrs. Where European museums focus on the annihilation of the Jews, at museums such as Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, the Holocaust links a, “…millennium of Jewish life in Europe before the war…to Jewish National Rebirth afterwards” (Young 1993:216).

2.5.3 The United States of America

Like Israel, both native-born Americans and immigrant survivors sought to put the past behind them immediately after the war. For Americans, Germany had become an ally in the Cold War; for survivors, the memories were too painful (Lipstadt, 1981 and Linenthal, 1995). For reasons detailed in Section 2.2, attitudes have changed dramatically in the past 60 years, and today the United States embraces the events. Now, what is, “…beyond dispute is that in the 1990’s the ‘Holocaust’ is being made in America” (Cole 1999:148). Holocaust history has become American history, justified by the country’s roles as bystander, liberator, and haven for survivors.

As a result, the Holocaust has become Americanized (Young, 1993; Cole, 1999 and Lopate, 1989) and the numerous Holocaust museums and memorials dotting the country exemplify this. From Dallas and Boston to Miami and Tucson, America remembers. Yet, America remembers through American ideals.

Perhaps no other museum illustrates this better than the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) in Washington, D.C. Where European sites focus on
victims and Israelis on rebirth, in the American focus in on what it means to be American. As the USHMM’s Memorial Council stated during the museum’s inception,

This museum belongs at the center of American life because as a democratic civilization America is the enemy of racism and its ultimate expression, genocide. An event of universal significance, the Holocaust has special importance for Americans: in act and word the Nazis denied the deepest tenets of the American people (Young 1993:337).

A number of other sources endorse this doctrine. Max Kampelman, Ronald Reagan’s chief arms negotiator felt that,

…Europeans probably should have built such museums in their capitals, but they haven’t and most probably won’t…But our building will demonstrate the tolerance of our culture, its ability to empathize with the suffering of all its people. Or decision to build such a museum says something about our commitment to human rights and to the kind of nation we want to be (Miller 1990:234).

Michael Berenbaum, director of the museum, commented that, “When people leave the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, the monuments to democracy that surround it – to Lincoln and Jefferson and Washington – will taken on new meaning” (Young 1993: 347). For Cole, this indicates the museum’s ability to affect all Americans. For him, “…the museum just off the Mall…gives an ‘Americanised’ telling of the ‘Holocaust’ to a target audience of non-Jewish mom, dad and kids from Iowa…[it]…talks of ‘victims’/‘survivors’ and ‘liberators’” (1999:150).

Ownership of the Holocaust, then, must be understood in the context of this research. The paper’s focus is an American Holocaust museum and its American visitors, hence, an Americanization of the events. Should someone initiate a similar study in Israel, Poland or Germany, the results will likely differ, for each country
comprehends the Holocaust differently. The events will be interpreted according to each country’s own unique cultural value systems.

For visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston, according to the literature, their experience will revolve around key American tenets. As bystander to many of the events, America will reach out through such museums to promise Nie Wider – Never Again. Exhibits will stand, “…as an explicit judgement on past inaction, and an implicit call to America (as self-styled ‘policeman of the world’) not to stand idly by in the future” (Cole 1999:151).

Via Holocaust museums such as in Houston, America may also overlay this inaction through her roles of liberator and haven for survivors. Once again, national cultural values such as pluralism, democracy, liberty and heroism are interwoven with other stories from the Holocaust. While Jewish death and destruction is commemorated, it is done so in an American context. Therefore, visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston are not just experiencing the Holocaust, they are experiencing an American version of the events.

2.6 Push/Pull Factors and Tourist Motivations

Researchers have long been commenting on the lack of research on tourist motivation (Cohen, 1974 and Lundberg, 1972), and much of this research to date on the subject identified the concept of equilibrium (McNeal 1973). In other words, research was focused on the theory that individuals travel to satisfy a need. Kim and Lee noted there are, “…psychological needs which play a significant role in causing a person to feel disequilibrium that can be corrected through a tourism experience” (2002:257). One
of the conceptual frameworks that consider this need is Dann’s (1977) push and pull theory where tourists are motivated by a push or pull to a destination.

Dann noted that past tourism research has indicated that the distinction between push and pull factors has been generally accepted practice. He then went on to define the two concepts. Push factors as a motivation, “…refer to the tourist as subject and deal with those factors predisposing him to travel” (1977:186). Pull factors are motivators, “…which attract the tourist to a given resort…and whose value is seen to reside in the object of travel” (1977:186).

Dann (1977) also noted that pull factors, to date, had taken precedence in tourism research and that there had been a lack of enthusiasm for push factors. This is supported by Crompton (1979) and Taylor (1974) who note the travel industry has also been conditioned to focus on pull factors. The industry’s, “…modus operandi is based on the assumption that people go on vacation to do and see things” (Crompton 1979:421). Visitors then, are attracted to destinations by the cultural offerings and/or special attributes the site might offer.

MacCannell (1989) supports this in his discussion on the language of tourism. For him, a tourist attraction is a sign; it represents (marks) something (a sight) to someone (the tourist). Hence, dark tourism sites use markers with language to pull tourists to the site. “The rhetoric of tourism is full of the manifestations of the importance of the authenticity of the relationship between tourists and what they see: this is a typical native house; this is the very place the leader fell; this is the actual pen used to sign the law; this is the original manuscript…” (MacCannell 1989:14).
To compensate for this lack of push focus, both Dann (1977) and Crompton (1979) sought to understand the push factor more thoroughly. In his study of tourists in Barbados, Dann suggested that anomie and ego-enhancement created a push factor within travellers. He argued, “…the presence of such factors is conducive to the creation of a fantasy world, one to which he plans a periodic escape” (1977:184).

Dann’s anomie refers to a society, “…whose norms governing interaction have lost their integrative force and where lawlessness and meaningless prevail” (1977:186). This lack of meaning has evolved into possible push factors, where the desire to, “…transcend the feeling of isolation obtained in everyday life…” (1977:187) pushes people to get away from it all.

The study of anomie as a motivator juxtaposes with the current studies of post-modern society. Today, where there is conflict in, “…wars, strikes, football hooliganism, muggings, highjacking and guerrilla violence” (Dann 1977:86), people continue to seek meaning in their world. Thus, anomie continues to push visitors almost 30 years after Dann’s initial study.

Dann also found ego-enhancement to be a push factor. He states that man needs to be recognized, to feel superior to those below him. One means of this advancement is via travel. “A tourist can go to a place where his social position is unknown and where he can feel superior by dine of this lack of knowledge. Additionally, on his return a further boost can be given to his ego in the recounting of his holiday experiences” (1977:87).
Crompton (1979) also deviated from traditional means of looking at push and pull. Previously, socio-psychological motives explained the initial decision to go on a vacation but the subsequent destination choice was a function of the pulling power of the destination. Crompton felt not only are socio-psychological motives useful in explaining the initial push or arousal to take a vacation, but “…they may have directive potential to direct the tourist towards a particular destination” (1979:412).

Crompton found nine motives for pleasure travel, including novelty and education, which were noted to be, “…at least partially aroused by the particular qualities that a destination offered” (1979:408). However, the other seven motives (escape from a perceived mundane environment, exploration and evaluation of self, relaxation, prestige, regression, enhancement of kinship relations and the facilitation of social interaction) were found to be unrelated to destination attributes. Indeed, Crompton (1979) found respondents in his study traveled for socio-psychological push factors unrelated to a specific destination.

More recent studies have had similar findings. Uzzell found, “Tourists are not motivated by specific qualities of a destination; rather, they match a destination’s attributed to their psychological needs (1984:80). Poria, Butler, and Airey also noted that, “…heritage tourism is a phenomenon based on tourists’ motivations and perceptions rather than specific site attributes” (2001:1047).

The literature review also revealed a wide variety of push factors. Kim and Lee (2002), in their research on visitation to National Parks in South Korea, found 12 motivational items (push factors) that pushed visitors to a destination. Factors included
escaping from everyday routine, adventure and building friendships, and family
togetherness. Meanwhile, Botha, Crompton and Kim (1999) noted intrinsic push factors
include escape, social recognition, socialization, self-esteem, learning, regression,
novelty, and distancing from crowds.

Finally, Dann (1996) notes the language of tourism, while pulling tourist with
good marketing, also pushes individuals to a destination. For the author, “…language of
tourism gently talks to them about possible places they can visit by introducing various
pull factors or attraction of competing destinations…By addressing them in terms of
their own culturally predicted needs and motives, it hopes to push them out of the
armchair and onto the plane…” (1996:2).

As a result, although not the sole motivators for travel, push-pull factors provide
a simple, concrete division that is easily understood. Therefore, for the purpose of this
study, the factors provide manageable categories of motivations. Furthermore, the
factors found in the literature review lend themselves to this natural, albeit porous,
division of internal push and destination pull factors.

It must be noted here that the literature and this study recognize that factors do
not always stand alone. For example, an individual might be pushed to visit Vimy Ridge
because a close relative was killed there during World War I. However, the site itself
may be commemorating a special anniversary and be offering conducted tours, which
pulls the individual to the site. This individual might experience both push and pull
factors simultaneously. Furthermore, an individual is not limited to experiencing just
one push factor, nor is a site limited to offering one pull factor. Many Holocaust museums affirm both education and remembrance in their mandate.

The literature indicates that a number of individuals visit sites of dark tourism for personal reasons. Some visit such sites as a socially feasible way of expressing interest in death and disaster. Some come to learn about the history behind an event, like those who visit Gettysburg because of an interest in military tactics. Some visit to commemorate family, friends or their own experience, such as war veterans and their families. Similarly, those affiliated with the site may also come to affirm their cultural identity. Some come because of feelings of guilt, and finally, some may come to simply out of morbid curiosity. These are being construed as push factors.

Conversely, dark tourism destinations can themselves pull visitors to their facilities, with the most common explanations being education and remembrance. Some sites feel a need to justify or rationalize their identity as a tourism attraction, while others incorporate education and remembrance into their public identity and mission statements. The Dallas Sixth Floor Book Depository Museum recognized this even before its inception. “It was created to meet the widespread visitor demand for information and understanding about a tragic but important event…” (Foley and Lennon 1996:203). However it is approached, sites of death and disaster do pull people in order to learn and to remember.

Two additional pull factors surfaced in the literature. Firstly, artifacts also supply a pull factor for visitors to visit sites of death and disaster. For instance, some individuals might be attracted to Holocaust museums to see remnants of the events such as boxcars,
human hair or Zyklon B gas canisters. Secondly, sight sacralization may pull tourists simply because the society has deemed that site to be of some touristic significance.

While the media was discussed at length in the dark tourism literature as both a push and pull factor, this study sees modern communication technologies as being a mediator between the varying dark tourism components. A model was developed and will be discussed at length in Section 2.17.4.

2.7 Heritage and Identity

It is not uncommon for individuals involved with death and disaster to return to the site of the event. Some individuals, such as war veterans or survivors, are directly related to the event; others are descendents and friends of victims and survivors, perhaps even relatives of perpetrators. Others are not related whatsoever, but rather identify with the event, such as movie star fans or those tied through race or religion.

It must be noted those motivated by heritage and identity do not solely visit the exact sites of death and disaster: they might visit representative sites such as museums and reconstructions. Paying homage to someone they identify with can help formulate their heritage. Numerous examples can be found in the dark tourism literature.

2.7.1 Victims and Survivors

Smith (1996) goes as far as attributing American mass tourism to the World War II experiences of American soldiers. She states, “Of those who returned home as victors, many were imbued with a desire to see the war-time sites under peaceful conditions” (1996:253). Today, veterans are still traveling to Europe to revisit the sites of their
nightmares. In November of 1998, 17 veterans of World War I traveled to France to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the armistice (Bobak 1998).

South Africa has recently seen a deluge of sites open to help locals acknowledge, understand and cope with their painful past (Swarns 2001). Sites include the recently opened Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg and the District 6 Museum in Cape Town. These sites are of particular importance given the recency of events. Apartheid did not end until 1994 and survivors of apartheid form a large majority of the population of South Africa.

Beech found in two separate dark tourism studies, a definitive division in people visiting the sites. In his study of Buchenwald concentration camp in Germany, he noted that was the division was in two parts, “…visitors with some connection with the camp, that is survivors…and general visitors with no direct or indirect connection” (2000:34-35). Although he adds relatives and those with a shared heritage to the former category, it is important to note he defines survivors as a body of visitors. Beech’s second study, which focuses on relatives not survivors, will be discussed later in this chapter.

There is a potential problem with victim and survivor visitation: it will likely fade with time. Beech (2000) compares the 1746 Battle of Culloden to the 1066 Battle of Hastings. He notes, “…there is still a residual group of Scots who feel drawn to the battlefield of Culloden with some sense of identity, whereas there are probably rather fewer English people drawn to Battle near Hastings with similar feelings of identity” (2000:38).
This visitor decline is a feasible concern for visitation at concentration camps. Although visitor numbers at Auschwitz-Birkenau fluctuate from year to year, there are some telltale trends. Table 1 illustrates visitation to the camp by country of origin. The four chosen represent countries heavily affected by World War II and could possibly constitute survivor visitation. In addition, the Nazis occupied Poland, France, Denmark and Holland and their Jewish populations were also severely impacted. With all four countries, visitation has been generally declining (Auschwitz-Birkenau, 2002).

Table 1. Visitation Statistics at Auschwitz-Birkenau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>282,675</td>
<td>266,570</td>
<td>285,026</td>
<td>224,996</td>
<td>160,737</td>
<td>142,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>19,456</td>
<td>18,350</td>
<td>18,881</td>
<td>15,493</td>
<td>16,289</td>
<td>15,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>10,929</td>
<td>8,416</td>
<td>8,650</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td>4,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>10,969</td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>11,004</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>7,566</td>
<td>5,107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7.2 Family and Relatives

The impacts of death and disaster reach much further than concentration camp survivors and others directly involved in death and disaster. In the aftermath, large numbers of people are affected by the repercussions of the event. For some, it is the tragic enslavement of a distance African ancestor. For others, it is a relative that fought and was killed on the beaches of Vimy Ridge. For others yet, they have a heritage kinship through religion, race or gender. Consequently, visitors are attracted to sites of
dark tourism because they have some personal affiliation with the event or someone who was involved in it.

The literature provides numerous studies and examples of sites where friends and relatives journey to actual or representative sites of death. However, it must be noted here that Foley and Lennon (2000) do not feel that friends and relatives visiting sites fulfill their definition of dark tourism. Nonetheless, for the purpose of this study, friends, relatives and descendants visiting sites of death and disaster will be considered dark tourism.

Holt’s Battlefield Tours organizes excursions to a myriad of 20th century European war sites, including the Menin Gate, Vimy Ridge, and Thièpval. Aware that some of their guests have family that fought in the wars, the organizers also attempt to, “…accommodate the possibility of visiting the graves of relatives for those on the coach” (Lennon and Foley 2000:123).

Lennon and Foley continue their discussion on war cemeteries. They note, “…transnational tourism, especially cultural tourism, in the postwar period was spearheaded in Europe…and the sights of Europe became attractive and…relatively inexpensive to those from North America…Many visitors to Europe…had either fought in these wars or had lost friends and relatives in it” (2000:103).

As in his Buchenwald study, Beech (2001) also found a division in tourist taxonomies at slavery sites in Britain, this time with a racial difference: White Britons and Black Britons. White visitors tend to be in unconscious denial and rarely identify
with slave traders. However, Black Britons, “…born and brought up in Britain…identify with the slaves and see them as part of their heritage” (2001:102).

In her study of Ghana and slavery, Essah (2001) found the country is turning the darker aspect of its past into a tourism commodity. Much of its marketing efforts are focussed on the United States and the Black diaspora. American tourists in particular are targeted because they are thought to be journeying to Ghana in search of their African roots (Essah, 2001 and Bruner, 1996). The focus on the Black diaspora can especially be seen in the festivities surrounding the PANAFEST (Pan-African Historical Theatre Festival). In 2001, PANAFEST saw a record number of African Americans who, “…combine attendance at the festivities with their thirst for knowledge about their heritage” (PANAFEST 2003).

In his study of a New York City Italian ghetto, Conforti found individuals visit such areas because of a sense of nostalgia created by the need to connect with their heritage. He notes, “…Italian-Americans who have never lived in or near such neighborhoods…visit…in an effort to underscore their identity, discover their ancestral roots, or at least come closer to them while in cities like Boston or New York” (1996: 837). He expands this discussion by citing other ethnic groups that have implemented cultural centers in order to educate such visitors. For instance, the historically Jewish section of New York contains a restored synagogue and a tenement museum.

Representations of death and disaster also provide those with heritage ties a place to affirm their cultural identity. Beth Hatefutsoth, the Jewish Diaspora Museum in Tel Aviv is an ideal example. For Goldmann (1983), the function of the museum is to forge
the identity of Jewish people around the world who are living in quite different, and at
times, antagonistic spheres. It provides a bridge for Jewish youth to comprehend the
meaning of their Jewish ancestry. Kovner concurs, adding the museum was to serve as a,
“…contribution to the covenant…of the modern Jew with himself, his own identity, the
covenant of the Israeli with the Jewish people” (1988:7).

Weinberg (1988) reports the museum has succeeded in its goals. Many Jewish
visitors attend for very personal reasons: to fulfill a sense of identity with their cultural
past. “Beth Hatefutsoth is a warm museum: most of its Jewish visitors respond in a
strong emotional way…their sense of identification with the past is vigorously
awakened” (Weinberg 1988:11).

2.7.3 Identity Motivators

Finally, a number of people who have neither a direct nor an indirect connection
to the dark tourism event visit the site because of heritage motivations. They gain a sense
of identity from such visitation. Rojek refers to the James Dean fans that recreate the
actor’s 1959 fatal car crash. Their annual procession to the death site acts partly as, “…a
monument to the dead hero” (1993:142). Lennon and Foley extend this sense of
identification by noting, “…the erection of a memorial to Dean’s death by a Japanese
businessman, rather than a local touristic imperative” (2000:168).

A similar event is the annual vigil at Strawberry Fields each December 8th, the
anniversary of singer John Lennon’s death outside the Dakota apartment building in
New York City. Lennon’s fans lobbied to have a memorial garden erected, and today,
Strawberry Fields provides a shrine for all Beatles fans (Foote 1997).
In sum, the impacts of death and disaster leave lasting impressions, not just for those individuals involved but also for their family members. With such events come mixed feelings but an inevitable tie to the site and/or event. One consequence is dark tourism visitation, and as the literature articulates, this is a common phenomenon. Victims, survivors, and their loved ones often return to the scene of tragedy for a number of reasons.

Some individuals who directly experienced events return to see the destination under peaceful circumstances. Others yet go to confront a painful part of their past. By returning to the past, understanding and closure are possible. Visitation by this segment poses a challenge for dark tourism sites, however. As time passes, this population ages and eventually this segment will fade away.

Family members and friends also comprise a population that visits due to heritage affiliation. Some visit to honor and pay tribute to family members whose lives were lost. Others visit to help forge their identity, to discover their roots and where they came from. Visiting sites of death and disaster allow these visitors to understand their heritage. Others yet will visit due to nostalgic feelings of the past.

Finally, heritage motivated visitors may also visit due to an indirect affiliation with the events and/or the individuals involved. This is especially common in relation to celebrity deaths, where individuals formulated their identity in part around their hero. The works of musicians and actors often touch the lives of individuals who feel connected to it. The messages relayed in songs and movies connect viewers, listeners and readers to their visions of themselves.
2.8 Historical Motivations

As Smith (1996) notes, “Battlefields are of particular interest to two diverse groups: history buffs and military strategists, both real and armchair, who tramp over the area with books in hand, studying such details of the battle as it relates to terrain, to ground cover and to troop movements” (1996:257). Consequently, visitors do not need to be directly affiliated with a death or disaster site or event to be attracted to it: some are simply interested in history.

A number of academics have found cultural interest of some sort, including history, to be a motivation for general pleasure travel (Crompton, 1979; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983 and Anderton, 1995). Using unstructured interviews of 39 adults, Crompton (1979) found two-culturally oriented variables that motivated individuals to travel: novelty and education. Pearce and Caltabiano (1983), in their study of visitors to Florida, studies the benefits sought by visitors in their holiday. Included was attending cultural events and visiting historical sites. Taking part in educational programs was also on their list and, under certain circumstances, could be construed as being a cultural motivator. Anderton (1995) developed a nine-category taxonomy of tourists based on motivation. On this list were learning holidays and cultural tourism.

There is however, very little research on dark tourism motivators in general, let alone history as a motivator. One of the few authors to touch on the subject is Beech (2000). In his research on Buchenwald as a tourism product, he discusses the division in visitors at the German concentration camp. “Within a short time of arriving at Buchenwald as a tourist, one is immediately struck by a division among the
visitors with some connection to the camp...and general visitors with no direct or indirect connection” (2000:34-35). He continues his discussion by commenting both types may be on a learning holiday, although he does question whether that is the motivation.

This limited research is augmented by the number of dark tourism products discussed both in the literature and in marketing brochures. For instance, the Smithsonian Institute has sponsored excursions to battlefields for a number of years. Their 1994-1995 brochure offered a four-day, Civil War trip through Virginia, from Petersburg to Appomattox. The itinerary traced, “...the longest siege campaign in American military history...and features battlefields, private homes and museums associated with this decisive campaign…” (Smithsonian Museum 1994).

The year before, Holt’s Battlefield Tours offered lectures on Waterloo and the Zulu, Boer and Crimean wars (Smith 1996). For the 2002 season, Holt’s offered such tours as Eagles On The Danube, where participants visit sites of Napoleonic battles, and Battle Of Bosworth Field, where participants visit sites of the 1485 battle between Richard III and Henry VII (Holt’s 2002). It is important to note as Smith did, these battle years, “…preclude veteran attendees and the tours are historical commemorations” (1996:258).

Ghostwalks have recently risen in popularity and are now seen as being more than merely fun and entertainment. Says interpreter Kyle Upton of the storytelling behind ghostwalks, “…[it]...is well suited to the study of history because it brings
people and events to life for young people who might never see them as anything more than a collection of facts and dates” (Reeves 2001:260).

Cemeteries have also become more than just places of veneration and commemoration. Lennon and Foley note, “Now tourists rather than mourners visit and undertake cemetery tours” (2000:77). For some, these burial grounds are, …enigmatic histories of social patterns, settlement patterns, diseases like smallpox or influenza, childbirth mortality, storms and weather, ethnic bonds. Social distinctions-class, money and family-are re-enacted, families clustered together, the affluent in the choice spots, accident victims embracing mass graves and, in the past, suicides and atheists outside the sanctity of the enclosure (van Herk 1998:54).

Hamscher (2003) supports this idea of cemeteries’ being repositories of historical facts. As an educator at Kansas State University, he utilizes cemeteries as a research source for many of his courses, including one on death and dying in history. For Hamscher, the sites are a, “…valuable source for investigating a broad range of subjects concerning the collective values and attitudes of generations past…they…provide important insights into views of death, the relationships between the living and the dead, religious beliefs, and gender and class distinctions” (2003: 40).

The National Park Service also caters to the increasing demand in dark history tourism. In 1992, they published a brochure, *Visiting Civil War Battlefields: How to Have A Quality Experience* (Webb 1992). This was followed by a string of books to guide people through the battle sites and their histories. In 1993, National Geographic published their *Guide to the Civil War National Battlefield Parks* (Green, Gallagher, and Abell 1993). It includes maps showing troop movement and terrain type, statistics on the number of casualties, and summaries on each battle.
Despite the increasing interest in the historical aspects of dark tourism and the availability of dark tourism sites, there are inherent difficulties with history as a dark tourism motivator. The National Park Services claims, “We’ve learned, you don’t take sides, you don’t moralize, you tell what happened from a historical perspective. And we do that here...too...here’s the people involved, here’s what happened, when it happened, how it happened, why it happened. You can draw your own moral conclusion” (Lennon and Foley 2000: 107).

The literature illustrates that this is difficult to achieve. Sites can purposefully or inadvertently take sides, particularly when the negative aspects of history are being interpreted. As Lennon and Foley comment, “…to retain only the positive aspects of one’s past and to obliterate all trace of evil is to present a cultural and historical landscape that is, to say the least, incomplete” (2000:34). Yet, the literature abounds with sites that ignore the negative.

Early in 1995, the Smithsonian Institute in Washington cancelled a proposed exhibition entitled, ‘The Last Act: The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II’. In the exhibit, the museum questioned why the bomb had been dropped. Bowing to lobbying by veterans’ groups, the Smithsonian agreed to changes in the exhibition, “…resulting in criticism from historians that ‘known facts’ were being ignored and that the exhibition was being ‘historically cleansed’” (Lennon and Foley 2000:108).

The Jersey Islands off the coast of England were the only geographic part of England to be occupied during World War II and also ignore critical facts of the occupation. Today on the islands,
The ‘ill wind’ of the war years has been turned to the good. The relics and remains of Hitler’s British stronghold have now taken their place, both chronologically and commercially, alongside the older and more venerable attractions of the islands’ heritage. The sightseeing circuit of war curiosities is now well established. Jersey’s German occupation is now big business, with more war museums per square mile than anywhere else in Europe (Lennon and Foley 2000: 66).

The museums however, do not provide a full historical perspective. Images that could tarnish the islands’ during the war are sanitized or hidden: the collaborations, fraternization and compromises (Bunting 1995). In fact, the whole issue of collaboration is dealt with in only one museum on Jersey in a minor display area because collaboration brings into question the ideal that Britain stood alone against Hitler (Lennon and Foley 2000:68).

In his study of southern American plantation brochures, Butler comments on how the term plantation appears to be undergoing a ‘major revision’. In his textual analysis, the word slave occurred less frequently than all other keywords. Where once the term was automatically analogous with slavery, today the slavery aspect is being overlooked in marketing because, “By presenting slavery, too much of the ugly, historical reality of daily life in the past would be brought into the picture” (2001:171).

As a final example, Japan is notorious for ignoring some of the uglier moments of its past. At the Hiroshima Peace Memorial any, “…contextuality concerning Japan’s conduct during the war is noticeably absent” (Lennon and Foley 2000:110). Similarly, at the Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Museum, there is a strong nuclear deterrence message with little said on Japanese aggression towards China and Korea.
While ignoring aspects of dark history appears to be prevalent in the literature, so too is the changing nature of history. As society changes, so does history and so does the interpretation of that history. As discussed in section 2.4, changing cultural values of a society have tremendous impact on which histories are interpreted. Events such as the, “…Jewish Holocaust in Germany, Vietnam and Black Civil Rights in schools in the USA…and the Irish Question in Ulster and mainland UK have all been reappraised recently as elements of the students’ education about aspects of their national heritage which may have been suppressed, or represented differently in the ‘approved’ version” (Lennon and Foley 2000:163).

In sum, empirical studies on historical education as a dark tourism motivator are non-existent. However, by looking at the wide range of products available to visitors, it can be understood that history does incite visitation to sites of death and disaster. Furthermore, to paraphrase Smith (1996), the fact that many of these sites predate any chance of survivor visitation illustrates historical commemoration and learning.

One reason for the popularity of these products is that they provide experiential learning. Through first-hand experience, these events can be brought to life. To trace actual path of the underground railway has a much bigger impact than to simply read of it in a book.

The literature also reveals that sites of dark tourism can act as research sites. They act as archives for social conditions, political climates, and environmental hardships. One of the difficulties associated with this however, is the manipulation of history by prevailing cultural values and the powers that dictate them. Hence, dark
tourism sites provide learning experiences but visitors must be wary that the whole story is being communicated.

2.9 Survivors’ Guilt

The fact that survivors and victims’ families return to scenes of death and disaster are shown by one war veteran who, on a visit to France, stated, “…those of use who have been in combat share something very special…I simply had to be here to honor those men” (Smith 1996:261). For many who experienced the horrors of war, atrocity and disaster, returning to the scene is cathartic, a way to honor those who did not make it home. Alternatively, it may be a way to unburden a sense of guilt endured simply because they survived death and disaster.

It must be noted that this discussion focuses on guilt as opposed to shame and the literature defines the two concepts separately. Todd comments that guilt, “…connects the self to the social world…[and is]…concerned with how the self is perceived” (2001:600). Shame however, “…remains confined within the self’s parameters of self-idealisation…[it]…involves something that one cannot bring oneself to articulate to another” (2001:600-601).

Todd then studies the concept of guilt. In her research on the ways in which students confront the suffering of others, the author found three possible methods they identify with guilt. Some experience guilt because, “…they believe they have not done enough to help out those who suffer” (2001:599). Others compare and call into question their own lack of suffering. Finally, some claim they are made to feel guilty, focusing
on how they are not responsible for the past. The literature illustrates how the former two are often experienced today by people in relation to the Holocaust.

The literature supports a variety of definitions of survivors’ guilt, particularly in terms of Holocaust survivors. Carmelly (1975) distinguishes two types of survivors’ guilt: guilt about surviving and guilt about certain acts. Niederland (1981) partially concedes with Carmelly (1975). He suggests that survivors’ guilt is a reaction to simply having survived. Lifton (1979), in his study on Hiroshima survivors, coined the term death guilt.

Garwood has written perhaps the most detailed and decisive work on survivors’ guilt and the Holocaust. As both a psychoanalytic psychotherapist and a child survivor of the Holocaust, he offers a unique perspective of survivors’ guilt. He feels the aforementioned classic theories of guilt are unsatisfactory; they are too clinical. They, “…direct thinking away from the actual experience and towards the phantasies generated in the unconscious” (1996:245).

Although not all survivors experience guilt, its incidence, intensity and persistence is high. To explain, Garwood describes four essential components of Holocaust survivors’ trauma in light of a primal-development theory. The four elements are threat of annihilation, powerlessness, object loss, and torture: however, feelings of powerlessness in the face of annihilation are of greatest importance.

Garwood explains,

In the post-partum period the neonate is totally dependent on its carer for its survival…All significant discomforts…will be experienced as possible abandonment which will provoke instinctual fear of annihilation with attendant instinctually driven anxiety derived from the self-preservation
instinct...Powerlessness in later life evokes unconscious memories of this earliest vulnerable state...accompanied by overwhelming emotions...often self-blame and consequential guilt (1996:247).

The entire Final Solution proposed by Hitler to liquidate Jews and others, sought to make individuals, particularly those in concentration camps, feel powerless. Humiliation, enslavement, and ultimately annihilation were the goals of the Nazi Socialist regime. Leon, Butcher, Kleinman, Goldberg and Almagor (1981) comment that individuals who survived were made to feel they had more than their fair share of luck. As Garwood points out, “...the price of their survival was the death of their loved ones and fellow Jews (1996:246). It follows that self-blame and guilt surface.

A number of authors utilize the primal-development theory regarding guilt and the instinctive fight or flight response (Danieli, 1981 and Garwood, 1996). For Holocaust survivors, fight and flight were next to impossible: both would likely end in annihilation. As survivors, the anger towards this powerlessness could not be expressed; hence, the anger directed at one’s self resulted in self-blame and guilt.

Lack of grieving also contributes to the persistence of survivors’ guilt. Although often difficult, it is understood, “The effective mourning of loss has long been ... fundamental to mental health” (Garwood 1996:246). However, for many survivors, guilt persists because they are unable to grieve and mourn their losses. This is particularly true for Holocaust survivors. In addition to feelings of powerlessness and fears of annihilation, “Mourning at the time of the losses was impossible as survivors were in their own life and death struggle. On liberation the understandable priority was to
rebuild their lives; and they were encouraged to look forward and put the past behind them” (Garwood 1996:247),

Lipstadt (1981) and Linenthal (1995) both support this statement. In post-war America, survivor reactions to the Holocaust were similar. Some simply wanted to forget, while others did not want to identify with those victimized. Others who were starting a new life, “…were more concerned about acting as Americans than as Jews” (Lipstadt 1981:75). It was easier to ignore the memories and attempt to get on with life.

Other individuals may have experienced guilt for their inaction during the Holocaust. This may be particularly true for some Americans. In 1942 the SS St. Louis, a Jewish refugee ship landed on the shores of the United States. However, America, like other countries, did not grant passengers refuge. All 1106 individuals were sent back to Nazi dominated Europe. The Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC delineates the potential guilt Americans might have experienced. One of their aims is to provide an, “…encounter with American indifference to the plight of Nazi victims, would force museum visitors to weight the cost of being a bystander…one of the ‘lessons’ was that the indifference of the bystanders was critical to the success of the aggressors” (Linenthal 1995:112).

Marion Pritchard, despite saving approximately 150 Dutch Jews during World War II, articulates that she, too, feels guilt over her experience. “I never wanted to talk about the war, perhaps because I had some guilt that I didn’t do enough. There were times that I had to choose the safety of…the children over going to help someone else” (Monagle and Peart 1993:15).
Veterans who liberated concentration camps might also experience survivors’ guilt about the Holocaust. Abzug found liberators lived with, “…an almost unbearable mixture of empathy, disgust, guilt, anger and alienation” (1985:44). Many experience what Thomas calls, “…the tension of living in the present with the baggage of the past…” (1987:123). One liberator recalls, “I was not prepared for what I saw at Buchenwald. I think that made it more traumatic…I didn’t talk about it for years. I didn’t want to remember the ugliness of it” (Monagle and Peart 1993:13).

One of the ways for survivors to reconcile their feelings of guilt is through memorialization. As Garwood maintains, “Memorials are of the greatest importance…Memorialization and naming of perished families gives them a permanence that combats the fear that they will be forgotten and lost forever” (1996:253). For many survivors, carrying on the names of victims is one way to purge themselves of guilt. Museums such as the Holocaust Museum Houston provide an outlet for this healing.

Although not all survivors experience guilt after surviving an atrocity, its incidence and persistence is high, particularly with Holocaust survivors. Therefore, a great deal of literature has been written on the subject, much of it focusing on the reasoning behind the guilt. Academics cite two major reasons for this remorse. There is guilt for surviving, for a lack of suffering while others feel guilt over their actions, for not doing enough.

Concentration camps were breeding grounds for such perceptions. The feelings of powerlessness instilled in camp prisoners brought about helplessness and feelings of guilt for not being able to do anything. This was furthered by a lack of traditional fight
or flight options, both of which would result in death. There was also a lack of grieving opportunities in regards to the Holocaust. In the camps, people were caught up in their own life or death struggles, while in the post-war years people wanted to forget and put the past behind them.

Memorialization and interpretation are two ways of assuaging guilty feelings. Remembering the fallen keeps their memory alive, thereby giving survivors a purpose. Furthermore, as illustrated in previous pages, dark tourism visitation provides additional means of understanding and coping with the past. Returning to the site of the event allows people to put the past to rest.

2.10 Curiosity and Novelty Seeking

2.10.1 Curiosity

Academics and pop culture proponents alike have long realized humanity’s undeniable attraction to things morbid. Seaton (1996) reaches back in time to an 1827 essay by Thomas De Quincey, *On Murder Considered as One of the Fine Arts*. It, “…purported to be a paper which had been delivered to a wholly fictitious Society of Connoisseurs in Murder. It developed a premise that closely resembles…Dark Tourism – that an act or event which might be deplorable or repugnant from a moral point of view could have considerable attraction as a spectator sport” (Seaton 1996:234). In the paper, De Quincey himself wrote, “Murder…when tried by the principles of Taste, turns out to be a very meritorious performance” (Seaton 1996:234).

Thomas (1987) also reaches back in time to the American Civil War to describe how some individuals are simply motivated by a sense of curiosity. At the Battle of
Manassas, “There were even spectators that day in 1861. People had packed lunches and driven in their carriages from Washington to watch the battle…” (Thomas 1987:30). The author also recounts his own experience of seeing a photograph of a dead Civil War soldier, and subsequently visiting the site of the soldier’s death. “I like to think it was respect for the young man’s life and life itself that made me want to see where he died” (1987:125). He confesses however, that he is not completely sure this was his reasoning.

Previously, Steiner (1971) noted the attraction of Holocaust museums because many find the subject matter ‘darkly fascinating’ and ‘seductive’. He quotes, “Not only is the relevant material vast and intractable; it exercises a subtle, corrupting fascination. Bending too fixedly over hideousness, one feels queerly drawn. In some way the horror flatters attention…” (1971:30).

Uzzell (1989) also found people’s curiosity about atrocity is insatiable; they are motivated by empathy, excitement and other psychological stimuli of varying moral worth. Lennon and Foley add, “Horror and death have become established commodities, on sale to tourists who have an enduring appetite for the darkest elements of human history (2000:58). Rojek concurs, suggesting, “The interest in catastrophes and disasters might seem to be distasteful. However, it would be foolish to deny that it is widely shared” (1993:138).

In pop culture, hundreds are attracted to the Massachusetts’ town and house where Lizzie Borden is thought to have murdered her father and stepmother. Sullivan (1974) found this interest perplexing, “…that the American public, swimming as it is in a sea of contemporary violence, still finds the trial of Lizzie Borden in the early 1890’s
the most continually absorbing case in the annals of this nation’s homicides” (1974:1). When asked what brings these tourists, one bed and breakfast operator replied, “From the simply curious to the morbidly fascinated, the “Lizzie buffs” are legion. They are amateur sleuths, college professors and otherwise unremarkable folks who are – to a sometimes disturbing degree – fascinated with one of America’s most infamous murder cases” (Unknown 2001:2).

This last quote highlights the hazard of curiosity as a motivator: its potential transformation into spectacle. For, as Walsh (1992) comments, curiosity can be exacerbated by the idea of spectacle. Lennon and Foley agree, stating, despite other mandates such as education and remembrance, there is a, “…fundamental difficulty of delineating education and entertainment/spectacle and an uncritical approach to history” (2000:90). The work of Debord (1967) supports this relationship between spectacle and curiosity, noting both are staged and both are sensational. The literature abounds with examples of sites that walk the fine line between education and spectacle.

At the turn of the 20th century, Luna Park on Coney Island, New York, used spectacle to induce curiosity in visitors for touristic enjoyment: they provided simulations of the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius, the flooding of Johnstown Pennsylvania, and the 1900 destruction of Galveston. They even went as far as simulating a hurricane, citing education as a justification.

The city and harbor were recreated in miniature with model buildings. Then through a combination of real and fake water, large sheets of painted cotton fabric, intricate lighting and mechanical effects, the city was transformed into a state of utter destruction. A lecturer explained the sequence of events to the audience (Stanton 1997).
Sing Sing Prison in New York State, in the quest to build a museum in the still-active prison, often espouses education as one of its primary goals. However, as one author recognizes, there is no ignoring the fascination with the place itself, including the death chamber (Dunlop 2001).

In addition, as Lennon and Foley (2000) acknowledge, such sites often become both famous and notorious, thus inducing spectacle. On Sunday April 28, 1996, a gunman killed 35 people at a popular historical site in Tasmania, Australia (Hopkins 2002). Today, visitors at Port Arthur, “…include Port Arthur on their itinerary for two reasons. Overtly for all the traditional reasons of history but I suspect that many visitors want to see for themselves where those terrible events actually occurred. I think it’s normal human reaction” (Evans 1997:4).

Holocaust sites are particularly vulnerable to curiosity’s transformation into spectacle, given artifacts often displayed. At Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp, “…there are rooms full of clothes and suitcases, toothbrushes, dentures, glasses” (Lennon and Foley 2000:57). Yet, the authors comment on the lack of explanation, orientation, and historical documentation to back the display of such disturbing objects. Without proper interpretation, these exhibits may become spectacle.

When deciding on exhibits and displays at the National Holocaust Museum in Washington D.C., there was concern that the Zyklon-B cans used in concentration camp gas chambers would attract the ghoulish. Linenthal remarks on the debate surrounding their exhibit.

Was it impossible not to fall victim to some ghoulish desire to ‘see’ one of these cans? What was the purpose of seeing it? Of displaying it in a museum…Or
was it precisely because these canisters had been used to kill millions of people that they carried a power, a fascination that made it impossible not to include them…(1995:162).

2.10.2 Novelty Seeking

To understand curiosity as a motivator, it is necessary to look back to early research in the psychology and sociology fields. Montgomery (1952) was among the first to combine curiosity and the concept of novelty. In his experiments with laboratory rats, Montgomery found that novel stimuli evoked an exploratory drive, otherwise known as curiosity. The more novel the situation, the more curious the rat became.

Other studies found humans exhibited similar behaviour and correlated it to tourist movement. Berlyne (1950 and 1966) observed stimuli gradually loses power to raise arousal through repetition; however, novelty increased exploratory behavior. For tourists then, a change in environment may be a manifestation of a desire for novelty.

Similarly, Smock and Holt (1962) noted unusual or novel objects aroused curiosity, while monotonous and routine objects galvanized the individual to encounter new aspects of his or her environment. This premise is supported by Mayo and Jarvis (1981) who assert tourism is one of the most common means of alleviating or escaping boredom.

Novelty seeking as a tourist motivator subsequently emerged as an area of academic study, albeit not a well researched area (Bello and Etzel, 1985 and Pearce, 1987). As Lee notes, “As tourism research has evolved, it has moved from focusing on describing tourism behavior patterns, to identification and categorization of the
motivational and socio-psychological forces which explain these behavior patterns” (1991:1). One of these forces is novelty.

Jenkins (1969) defined novelty as a function of the degree of contrast between present perception and past experiences. For Judd (1988) novelty is simply the state or quality of being new. Something is considered novel if, relative to previous experiences, it is new or different. The novelty of an object or experience can be expressed on a continuum, varying from completely novel to very familiar (Judd 1988).

This directly corresponds to Cohen’s typology of tourists. Cohen (1972) found that novelty is an essential element of tourism experiences; however, he also noted that many tourists preferred a bubble of familiarity in order to appreciate the novelty of their experiences. From this study, he proposed a typology of tourists based on their need for novelty and familiarity (Appendix B).

Other studies have looked at the role novelty plays in motivating tourist behavior. Mehrabian and Russell (1974) found the degree of novelty sought is closely related to the individual’s preferred arousal level. An individual who is aroused by new environments often looks for novelty, complexity, variability, and other associated stimuli. Like Cohen, they report some tourists seek to satisfy high arousal levels by seeking the unfamiliar. Some researchers, however, attribute this desire for novelty to genetics. (Zuckerman, 1979; Jensen, 1980; Hirschman, 1984 and Wahlers and Etzel, 1985).

Overall, the literature review revealed five relevant novelty dimensions that tourists may use when evaluating the novelty potential of a destination (Kelly 1955).

**Change from Routine**

Change is defined as altered or different conditions of environment, psychological outcomes, and/or lifestyles (Mayo and Jarvis 1981). Travel provides the ideal opportunity for change (Urry 1990). Pearce (1991) accedes, stating a change from routine includes a search for new experience and the quest for adventure and excitement.

Crompton (1979) found pleasure-travelers to be motivated by seven socio-psychological motives. The first, escape from a perceived mundane environment, complements the idea that a vacation is an equilibrium-restoring break. For tourists, the overriding necessity was that, “…the pleasure vacation context should be physically and socially different from the environment in which one normally lives (Crompton 1979:416).

Crompton (1979) also cited novelty as a pull factor in cultural tourism, along with Smith and Turner (1973). The role of novelty recognized by these researchers in explaining the pull of a destination suggests the tourist’s desire for new and different experiences is a fundamental motivator in the destination-selection process (Lee, 1991 and Bello and Etzel, 1985).
Escape

Hornby (1974) defines escape as a temporary distraction from reality or dull routine, while McIntosh and Goeldner (1986) add that tourism provides opportunities to escape life’s problems. McIntosh (1977) suggested four categories of travel motivation, including interpersonal motivators. This category expressed a need for novel experiences in terms of escape from routine and meeting new people.

Thrill

Hornby (1974) defines thrill as an experience in which excitement is the essential element. Mayo and Jarvis (1981) found the concept of thrill in their study on arousal in tourists. They found people may try new things, even at some risk, and a novel environment may represent unpredictability for a tourist. This unpredictability is then viewed as a source of arousal from thrill that may attract novelty-seeking tourists.

Adventure

Adventure is defined as an exciting experience obtained through the medium of strange and unusual happenings (Mayo and Jarvis 1981). For some travelers in Crompton (1979), novelty was analogous with adventure. “Novelty was defined by respondents in a variety of ways. Synonyms included curiosity, adventure, new and different” (1979:419). A new destination should then possess large amounts of novelty, uncertainty, and complexity to have high adventure potential, hence high arousal (Wahlers and Etzel 1985).
**Boredom Alleviation**

Boredom alleviation is defined as the removal and/or reduction of the perception that experiences available in the home environment are not sufficient to satisfy the need for optimal arousal (Iso-Ahola and Weissinger 1990). In our urbanized and industrialized society, life is often reduced to an organized routine, thereby increasing boredom.

Escaping boredom is a basic human impulse, and researchers believe travel is an optimal way of relieving boredom. Nunnally and Leonard (1973) proposed boredom leads to exploration in order to increase arousal that in turn results in selecting novel experiences. Mayo and Jarvis (1981) asserted tourism is one of the most common means of alleviating or escaping boredom.

Academics unanimously agree tourists have a fascination with death, atrocity and horror. Furthermore, this is not a recent observation: historically, curiosity has played a significant role in travel and tourism. From early religious pilgrimages to 19th century examples, most notably the American Civil War, people have traveled to view sites of death and disaster. This curiosity continues today as illustrated by the variety of dark tourism products being offered.

Early research on curiosity took place under the auspices of sociology and psychology. In controlled laboratory experiments, rats were found to be attracted to novel situations. The newer the stimuli, the greater the rats’ exploratory behavior, otherwise known as curiosity. So too humans. Repetition increased boredom while novelty increased curiosity.
Travel is understood to be a manifestation of curiosity. As people grow bored of their home environment, the motivation to see something new and different increases. Yet, research reveals varying levels of curiosity and novelty in individual tourists. Some seek almost complete familiarity in a new environment while others envelop themselves in exotic environments, purposefully shunning anything familiar. Academics attribute these differences to the individual’s arousal level.

The literature highlighted five key elements tourists might use when evaluating the novelty potential of a destination: change from routine; escape; thrill; adventure; and boredom alleviation. Individuals looking for new experiences seek these elements and judge a destination accordingly; hence, the attraction of dark tourism sites. For people with high arousal levels, they offer any number of combinations of the five factors.

One danger of curiosity is its potential transformation into spectacle. A number of academics voiced this concern in the literature in addition to providing concrete examples of sites that vacillate between education and spectacle. There is the risk of people being attracted to a site because of gruesome details rather than visiting sites for other, more socially acceptable reasons. This is especially relevant to Holocaust sites whose mandates focus on education and remembrance. While such sites stress learning, curiosity may turn such artifacts as gas chambers, Zyklon B canisters, and human hair into spectacles.

### 2.11 Death and Dying

Death and dying are natural occurrences; however, the concepts themselves are socially constructed. “The fears, hopes, and orientations people have towards [them] are
not instinctive, but rather are learned from such public symbols as the languages, arts, and religious and funerary rituals of their culture. Every culture has a coherent mortality thesis whose explanations of death are so thoroughly ingrained that they are believed to be right by its members” (Kearl 2003:1).

Variances in cultural attitudes towards death and dying can be observed today. For many Western Christians, heaven, or the end of death, is the ultimate goal (Kearl 2003). Yet for Eastern Buddhists and Hindus, “…the arch-ordeal envisioned is not death but rather the pain of having to undergo another rebirth. It is the end of rebirths that is their goal…” (Kearl 2003:3).

In addition to variances between cultures, one culture may approach the concepts differently from generation to generation; time and cultural mores often influence individuals’ reactions during the death process (Kagawa-Singer, Martinson, and Munet-Vilaro 1998). Historically, reactions to death have changed dramatically over the past fifteen hundred years. O’Gorman’s (1998) *Stages in Development of Current Attitudes to Death and Dying*, and Aries’ (1991) *Five Models of Death* exemplify this change (Appendices C and D respectively).

Stage One begins in the Middle Ages, circa 500 AD. At this time, death was, “…regarded as the deliberate personal intervention of God” (O’Gorman 1998:1158). The church readily sanctioned this idea in its eagerness to maintain control over the masses. The, “…inculcation of the fear of death in general encouraged dependence on the consolations of religion and the church which -controlled it” (Seaton 1996:236). To encourage this dependence, the church ‘stage-managed’ representations of death in
paintings, monuments, morality plays, and sermons, thereby keeping death in the forefront of awareness.

Two incidents in the 14th century coincided to initiate change in social attitudes towards death and dying. In 1358, the Bubonic Plague struck Europe, killing up to two-thirds of the European population (Gottfried 1983). The disease brought changes in attitudes towards life, death, and religion. At the same time, the Renaissance developed a foothold in European society, also bringing dramatic changes in attitudes towards life, death, and religion. With a growing collective sense of the demise of the old feudal order, dying became the time when the true essence of oneself was assumed to be revealed (Aries 1991). Circa 1460, the treatise, Ars Moriendi, was published to instruct individuals on the art of dying.

During the 16th and 17th centuries, the Scientific Revolution once again shook belief systems previously guided and guarded by the church. Tentative and disturbing questions, “…about the theories of ancient authorities, whose views had been accepted for centuries…created a completely new way of looking at nature and a new way of thinking and arguing about physical problems” (Chambers, Grew, Herlihy, Rabb, and Woloch 1991:619). These questions included queries on death and mortality. Death became independent, a break from life rather than part of a continuum (Illich, 1990 and Aries, 1991).

This attitude paved the way for the rise of the ‘bourgeois’ death in late 1600’s. By the turn of the 17th century, the Industrial Revolution again changed social perceptions of death. The newly-created bourgeoisie sought health into old age, and
when death came to those not old and infirm, it was deemed untimely (Illich 1990). Those who could afford to were in some ways increasingly able to pay to keep death away.

The rise of the bourgeoisie and the ability to defy death brought a consciousness of scientifically-trained doctors, and subsequently, an elevation in the medical doctor’s status and role. Subsequently, doctors took center stage, “…struggling against the roaming phantoms of consumption and pestilence” (O’Gorman 1998:1129). Death in the 19th century became the outcome of diseases specified by the scientifically trained physician who now held life-giving powers.

The doctor’s role continued into the 20th century, this time with doctors themselves taking the initiative to prevent death. Health, death, and dying became commodities to be purchased. Many researchers see this era as the end of human ability to deal with death intimately (Seedhouse, 1992; Aries, 1991; Illich, 1990; Sacks, 1982 and Dubos, 1959). As O’Gorman sums, “By the middle of the 20th century…health [had] become a commodity undermining the unique spiritual and intellectual strength of the human race which enables them to rise to the challenges of dying and death” (1998:1130).

This commodification of death can be observed in the increase of businesses affiliated with death and dying. Sudnow (1967) and Walter (1996) point to the rise of such services as funeral parlors, headstone makers, counseling services, and flower shops. More recent additions include cryogenic services that aid in preservation of life for the future.
These sentiments reveal the death-defying attitudes of some segments of Western society (Toynbee 1979). American healthcare values mandate that life is sacred and must be preserved at all costs (Kagawa-Singer, 1996 and Silberfarb, 1988). The aged are institutionalized so that they are hidden from sight. Kearl comments, “Gauging from their increasing segregation from other age groups, the elderly are our culture's…lepers” (2003:3). All this brings about an increase in hospitalization, where in the United States, 70% of terminally ill patients die in institutional settings (Pietroni 1991).

There are serious ramifications for western society in regards to these attitudes. Barley (1995), Illich (1990) and Helgeland (1985) state that society has repressed any meaningful acceptance of, or preparation for, death because of our preoccupation with youth, good health and longer lives. Lennon and Foley (2000) note that death has become privatized and rituals have become increasingly less community-oriented. Kagawa-Singer et al. further this statement, “The United States lacks a richness of rituals to mark significant life transitions” (1998:1754).

Hamsher (2003) in her study of cemeteries found there have been significant changes in the meaning of death. Looking at modern ‘memorial parks’, the author observes, “…the dead themselves are the least intrusive element in the landscape. The dialogue between the worlds of life and death is muted” (2003:42). She concludes by noting how the living have disengaged themselves from the dead.

With this disengagement and reduced death rituals, some sectors of society may lack healthy outlets for expressions of death and dying. Few people know how to understand dying let alone deal with death directly. One implication of this may be an
interest in sites of dark tourism. As Seaton identified, 20th century Britain, “…has tended to conceal death and to regard any dwelling on it as morbid and pathological. Yet death continues to exert a fascination and motivates travel in ways which are rarely openly admitted” (1996:243).

Without valid outlets of expression, people may turn to death that is removed from them in order to express interest in the outcomes of death. Since they cannot get close to death via their own personal experience, perhaps understanding comes from substitution. Dark tourism destinations may provide these substitutes. They may offer socially viable ways of expressing an interest in death and may push visitors to a destination.

Kagawa-Singer (1998) suggests memorials can provide essential rituals to aid in the death processes for the living. Using the Vietnam War Memorial in Washington, DC as an example, she notes it is a symbol of death and continuity, allowing public acknowledgement of private grief, thereby initiating healing. To do so, the memorial helps people accept the reality of loss; allows them to experience the pain of grief; initiates adjustments to new roles; and draws the emotional energy form the dead and turns it to those who are left.

Attitudes towards death and dying have changed dramatically since the Middle Ages when church and God controlled the life course. Today, death has come under the auspices of institutions. Doctors fight to prevent death and life can actually be bought and sold. When death does appear on the horizon, the dying are shuffled into hospitals
and nursing homes. Individuals themselves attempt to defy aging and death, emphasized by our social obsession with youth.

All this affects how some sectors of contemporary society deals with death. The living have become separated from death and there has been a decrease in death rituals to aid in acceptance and healing. Few people have a comprehensive knowledge of death. One means of understanding is via dark tourism visitation.

As illustrated in previous sections (see 2.7, 2.8 and 2.10), memorials can play healing and coping roles. Visiting memorials can increase understanding for survivors, victims, and others. Perhaps then they can manage dealing with the tragedy. Similarly, by visiting dark tourism sites, perhaps people can understand and cope death and dying.

2.12 Nostalgia

2.12.1 Nostalgia Defined

Nostalgia was originally conceptualized as a painful yearning to return home (Holak and Havlena 1998). In recent decades, it has been viewed as a normal human reaction (Davis 1979). However, there is little consensus on a unanimous definition. Davis defined it as, “…a positively toned evocation of a lived past” (1979:18). Belk suggested it is, “…a wistful mood that may be prompted by an object, a scene, a smell, or a strain of music” (1990:670).

Holbrook and Schindler expanded the definition to entail, “…a preference (general liking, positive attitude, or favorable affect) towards objects (people, places, or things) that were more common (popular, fashionable, or wider circulated) when one was younger (in early childhood, in adolescence, in childhood, or even before birth)”
For the purpose of this paper, nostalgia will imply a wistful mood that results in a preference or fantasy for something from the past.

### 2.12.2 Nostalgia and Post-modernism

For many authors, nostalgia is a key characteristic of post-modernism. Pretes sees post-modern society as being filled with uncertainty and stress, with escape and illusion strategies for coping. He furthers this idea by stating, “Society takes on the characteristics of a perpetual present, leading to nostalgia for ideas of the past…History, time and space become commodities” (1995:2).

Lennon and Foley (2000) concur, citing nostalgia and society’s commemorative environment as being key to post-modern culture. They acknowledge the importance of monuments as evidence of post-modern nostalgia.

A central element for retention of a museum/monument as opposed to its replacement with the television/media image is the centrality and primacy of the object. Museum objects…take on a key role in a culture that is dominated by moving images and fleeting visions in modern technology. Permanency of monuments, ruins, preserved spaces, can serve to attract a public dissatisfied with constant simulation and media culture of the modern age (2000:147).

Other academics, however, attribute modernity as being responsible for the ‘cult of nostalgia’. For Rojek (1993), modernity helped shape nostalgia as people yearned to go back to simpler times. “The constant revolutionizing of the instruments and relations of production” (Marx and Engels 1848:38), which the 19th century established as normal, made the, “…flight into the calmer, resplendent, pre-modern past seem like a magnetic attraction for large numbers of the Victorian intelligentsia” (Rojek 1993:144).

MacCannell (1989) also sees modernity lending itself to nostalgia. He writes, “The progress of modernity (“modernization”) depends on its very sense of instability
and inauthenticity. For moderns, reality and authenticity are thought to be elsewhere: in other historical periods and other cultures, in purer, simpler lifestyles. In other words, the concern for modern...are components of the conquering spirit of modernity...” (1989:3).

Finally, Golden also sees modernity as being key to nostalgia. He notes, “...some museums reveal nostalgic yearning for what is seen to be the simple life of other times and other places...In this view, museum, as a facet of tourism, manifests a response to and an attempt to assuage the fragmentary disconcerting quality of modernity” (1996:223).

2.12.3 Nostalgia Studies

Several studies have delved into the concept of nostalgia as a tourism motivator. Conforti (1996) cites nostalgia as one of the keys to the regeneration of Italian ghettos for tourists. These areas serve, “...Italian-Americans who have never lived in or near such neighborhoods, but visit them in an effort to underscore their identity, discover their ancestral roots, or at least come a little closer to them...” (1996:837). On any given weekend afternoon, probably half the tourists in New York’s Little Italy are Italian-Americans: suburbanites coming into the city for the nostalgic ethnic experience.

In her study of war tourism, Smith (1996) recognizes, “Old soldiers do go back to the battlefields, to revisit and to remember the days of their youth...one graying veteran summed it up well, “those of us who have been in combat share something very special...I simply had to be here, to honor those men”” (1996: 260-261).
This sense of nostalgia is underscored by Smith’s vernacular when describing war tourism. Such terms as, “the heroic past…remember the fallen…lest we forget…when we were young…reliving the past…” (Smith 1996:205) all denote a romantic yearning for the past. Lowenthal adds, “…age lends romance to times gone by” (1982:78) and the more time passes, the more mystical it appears.

This illusion of romance to instil nostalgia is also seen in Barbados, where tourism authorities, rather than looking at scholarly data, have chosen instead, “…to caricature both host and guest within the romantic feudal framework of the 17th century Great House” (Dann and Potter 2001:75). Instead of interpreting the dark side of ante-bellum plantation life, marketers focus on the romantic side. Hence, people yearn to experience a more gracious, genteel past.

Dann and Potter (2001) continue this discussion. The success of Bajan plantation tourism is dependent on four things: the post-modern ethos of Bajan visitors; the related appeal of dark tourism attractions; the effectiveness of promotion; and nostalgia pervading their motivation. The authors describe this nostalgia as a quest for an absent order, a, “…playful hankering after a differentiated premodern world by tourists from a post-modern de-differentiated home environment” (2001:70).

They further develop this description. The tourists are, “…yearning for a past they can no longer find in their own social settings. Unable to tolerate their present alienated condition, and ever fearful of the future, they seek solace in days gone by-a world where it was once possible to distinguish right from wrong…pleasure from pain”
(Dann and Potter 2001:72). Therefore, the visitors’ need for nostalgia must be satisfied in countries they assume retain a natural system of justice.

Ioannides and Ioannides (2002) is one of the few studies directly looking at nostalgia and travel in the Jewish context, albeit Jewish-American specific. Although the Jewish religion has no mass pilgrimage destination similar to Mecca or Lourdes, the authors point out Jews travel for reasons of history. By visiting such places as old Jewish neighborhoods, synagogues and homes of famous Jewish personalities, “…Jews can discover the Judaism of their ancestors” (Ioannides and Ioannides 2002:18). Eisen (1998) calls this the “mitzvah of nostalgia” (184).

This visitation also includes graveyards and Holocaust death camps, for it is here that Jews can reconnect with their past and reassess their religious identities. Ioannides and Ioannides maintain, “These nostalgic tours also allow the visitor a chance to see the ‘graves’ of their forebears and perform, with others who have the same need, the required acts of public mourning for martyrs who are not necessarily family members” (2002:19).

As a result of their study, the above authors identified 22 separate categories of Jewish attractions (Appendix E). Of particular interest for this study are five attraction categories: shrines of Jewish history; monuments and memorials to Jews; places of general historic importance having some Jewish connection; historic places and buildings preserved for or donated to the public by Jews; and interfaith shrines. As a public building donated by Jews, commemorating Jewish history, the Holocaust
Museum Houston falls under Ioannides’ and Ioannides’ (2002) conceptualization of an attraction that Jews visit because of nostalgia.

### 2.12.4 Nostalgia and Marketing

Marketers have long been in tune with the power of nostalgia. “Consumers are encouraged by marketers to experience nostalgic feelings through the use of nostalgic themes and images in advertising, the marketing of nostalgic products, and the utilization of consumer products to capture or create nostalgia through fantasies and memories” (Holak and Havlena 1998:217).

Dann (1996) found war sites also employ nostalgia to promote their attraction, mainly through the glorification of battle. This however, is dependent on whether, “…the country in question emerged victorious…” (Dann 1996:226). He cites a 1992 British Imperial Museum advertisement that stated, “Visit Britain’s war museums and you’ll see, feel and even smell what life was really like in the two world wars…After all, the experience of war was shared by everyone. And now we’d like to share it with you…” (Imperial War Museum 1992:114).

Similarly, Britain at War Experience plays on people’s feelings of nostalgia. One of their promotional brochures reads,

Britain is at War…and YOU can be in the midst of it. Come back with us on an unforgettable journey back in time to wartime London and the Blitz…its [sic] the experience of a lifetime…Britain at War is more than just a tourist attraction…its [sic] a unique trip down memory lane for those who lived through these bitter-sweet days and is an educational must for all those too young to remember (Lennon and Foley 2000: 116).
This notion is underscored by an endorsement by famed singer Dame Vera Lynn, who believes, “…all children should visit this nostalgic and moving experience” (Lennon and Foley 2000: 118).

Marketing nostalgia, however, is not always an easy task given the complexity of the concept, with both positive and negative emotions feeding into the reaction (Holak and Havlena 1998). While the positive components of nostalgia are easy to market (joy, happiness, pleasure, love), products with negative connotations can also be marketed (those feelings of desire stemming from loss). Therefore, to assist in marketing nostalgia, yearning should be coupled with attempts to minimize that loss. One way to accomplish this is to explicitly, “…portray the product as a means of recapturing enough of the past to avoid an overwhelming feeling of loss” (Holak and Havlena 1998:223).

The consumer is more likely to, “…limit the sense of loss when the purchase can actually allow him or her to recapture much of the original feeling …The present experience is likely to be perceived as a reflection of the past, not as a true recreation of it” (Holak and Havlena 1998:223). For Dann (1996), this sense of nostalgia is accomplished by, “…screening out unpleasant vistas while retaining colorful places and people in the memory forever” (1996: 223).

While the lineage of nostalgia remains unresolved, the literature is clear that it is a condition of yearning for the past: notably, a purer, simpler time when life was not so complicated, unstable and fragmented. Contemporary society seems to have evolved into the latter state, and many look back to the past as a magic time. Some of this yearning is a result of marketing, as illustrated previous.
The literature also recognizes nostalgia is a complex concept, especially given the gravity of some parts of history. While love, joy and happiness are easier to market, nostalgia is also a powerful tool at sites of death and disaster. The literature reveals a number of reasons for this.

Firstly, dark tourism sites often provide answers in a search for heritage. They provide a place of identity for those nostalgic for their family’s history. Secondly, dark tourism sites may romanticize and glorify the past thereby attracting visitors; conversely, individuals may romanticize and glorify the past, seeking out sites of death and disaster. As time passes, this becomes easier to do as negative memory fades and nostalgia for the positive grows.

Thirdly, education may be used in conjunction with nostalgia. As it is important to remember the past, so too it is important to teach the next generation. Finally, sites of dark tourism may influence nostalgia by minimizing the loss and/or screening-out the negative. By emphasizing the positive side of history and ignoring or minimizing the negative, individuals may in turn be more attracted to the site.

2.13 Education

In the aftermath of death or disaster, the need to understand why the event occurred manifests itself in many ways. Some individuals turn to higher religious or spiritual forms, seeking answers to why loved ones were killed. Others take legal action in order to place responsibility for the event’s occurrence. Dark tourism sites can offer understanding through education and knowledge.
Tourism as a form of educative enterprise is strongly associated with the key principles of modernity and has age-old roots (Burkart and Medlik 1981). With 17th century industrialization came advancement and increases in education, marketing, communications, and infrastructures, all of which in turn lead to educational travel. Witness the 18th century Grand Tour undertaken by wealthy aristocrats and the 19th century temperance tours organized by Thomas Cook.

At the turn of the 20th century, dark tourism exhibits were being promoted and justified with an educational component. At Luna Park on Coney Island, exhibits included such simulations as the eruption of Mount Vesuvius, the destruction of Martinique and the 1900 Galveston flood (Rojek 1993). One exhibit even featured the fabrication of a hurricane, accompanied with simulated lightning and water and a lecturer explaining the sequence of events to visitors (Stanton 1997).

Today, individuals continue to travel for knowledge, understanding and educational opportunities, and dark tourism sites continue to promote their educational mission. Most notable is the Smithsonian Institute. The Smithsonian Associates, the educational arm of Washington D.C.’s museums, offered a number of educational tours for the 2002-2003 season. These ranged from The Civil War at Chancellorville to the Philadelphia Campaign and Valley Forge. One of the more interesting tours, Booth’s Escape Route, traces John Wilkes Booth’s escape route and reveals the, “…personalities, intrigues, and dramas surrounding the assassination” of President Abraham Lincoln (Resident Associates 2003).
A number of sites emphasize their educational mandate in order for people to learn from past mistakes. The Brown Foundation, which administers the Brown VS. Board of Education National Historic Site in Topeka, Kansas, also considers education as part of their mission. They strive, “…to improve the quality of life for individuals and strengthen our overall sense of community by furthering educational equity and multicultural understanding” (Brown Foundation, N.D.). By learning from the past, it is hoped future generations of Blacks will live improved lives.

Similarly, at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, there is the feeling that education will aid in producing a more secure tomorrow, that future generations will learn from past mistakes. In speaking of the Japanese attack and its aftermath, one visitor acknowledged, “If a visit to this memorial leaves visitors with a better understanding of why the attack took place and with the strong feeling that we must not let this happen again, then surely those entombed will not have died in vain” (Unknown 1987).

The Oklahoma City National Memorial also seeks to educate the public against future events, this time terrorist attacks (Linenthal 1995). In addition to the 168 chairs erected to remember each victim of the 1997 bombing, the memorial is also comprised of a museum and a terrorism institute (Sixth Floor Museum 2002a). Here people can understand the events in hopes of preventing further terrorism.

Other sites have used an educational focus to cope with an increase in their popularity. To meet public demand and as an education service, in 1992, the United States National Park Service published a brochure, Visiting Civil War Battlefields: How to Have A Quality Experience (Webb 1992). In Fall River, Massachusetts, where visitors
flock to see Lizzie Borden paraphernalia, city officials have reacted in a similar way. “If
your claim to fame is a murder case, you want to (teach) about it in the most educational
way possible” (Unknown 2001:2).

Finally, the literature reveals education can offer a form of catharsis. Seaton (1996), in his study of thanatourism, related that the study of death for catharsis is not a
new concept. Thanatopsis (the Aristotelian contemplation of death) provided relief from
death for early Christian societies. The author noted, “…by experiencing the pity and
terror of representations of Death, a person could be inoculated against, or purged of its
terrors in real life” (Seaton 1996:237).

Seaton (1996) uses the example of pilgrims traveling to sites of martyrdom and
interment as early forms of thanatopsis. Here enters the tourism component. Pilgrims
ventured to sites of death and disaster to pay homage and more importantly, to learn and
understand death.

More recently, Lennon and Foley (2000), in their discussion on the renovation of
Dachau, Germany concentration camp, noted, “…when the renovation…of the camp
began…the level of local resistance was considerable. It was part of a past that many
wanted to leave behind yet, for the victims, their relatives and others, understanding
“Forgetting the extermination is part of the extermination itself” (Baudrillard 1988:23).

Foote observes similar occurrences with the memorialization of sites of death and
disaster. The process of erecting memorials and monuments, many of which include
some element of education, “…is…a way for communities to come to terms with a
disaster” (1997:80). And like Holocaust sites, these memorials help, “…to assure survivors that victims did not suffer alone, that their deaths meant something more…” (Foote 1997:81).

2.13.1 Difficulties with Education

While the majority of researchers recognize that sites of dark tourism incorporate education into their mandates and missions, many academics also recognize the issues and dangers surrounding such incorporation. One of the more controversial dark tourism sites promoting education in their mandate is the Sixth Floor Museum in Dallas, Texas. “It was created to meet the widespread visitor demand for information and understanding about a tragic but important event…documentary films and interpretive displays help…[to]…educate younger audiences about the meaning of an unforgettable chapter in American history” (Lennon and Foley 2000: 82).

Curators, managers, and project directors have iterated this educational justification often since the museum’s inception. As far back as 1970, the educational mission has been stressed. When Nashvillian, Aubrey Mayhew, bought the building, he sought to develop it as a historically significant museum as opposed to a tourist trap (Kleiwer and Martin 1971).

Much of this was done to, “…capitalize on the ‘dark’ interest evidenced at a site of assassination…and in… public defense of the development” (Lennon and Foley 2000:95). Other justifications included the absolution of communal guilt and coming to terms with history (Lennon and Foley 2000). Then-mayor, J.M. Shea Jr., stated that
Dallas could not carry on into the future until it confronted its past (Foote 1997). Conover Hunt, then-project manager for the museum, clarified this by stating,

Dallas is joining other cities that have had to confront the problem of stewardship of a tragic part of history…and like Washington DC, Pearl Harbor, Gettysburg and Manassas, Dallas has dealt with the demands for information by creating a prominent educational display for the public (Collins 1989:1B).

There are several reasons for controversy over this mandate. Firstly, there has been significant commercial development at the site. A retail outlet operates from within the Sixth Floor while a corporate facility is open to rent. Lennon and Foley (2000) report the debate over catering facilities at the site. The museum bookshop sells a child’s cutout book where the reader can dress and undress the entire John F. Kennedy family (Bull 1995). One vendor defends these actions by observing that when individuals visit a historic site, they want a memento or something to remember the trip by (Martin 1988).

Education at the Sixth Floor is also made controversial by the expressed opposition of the Kennedy family who see Boston’s John F. Kennedy Library as the primary education and research center (John F. Kennedy Library 1994). Further distancing themselves from the Sixth Floor Museum, the family went as far as issuing the following statement. “The family has taken the position that the only memorial should be the Kennedy Library…with its outreach capabilities in terms of inspiring people to service” (Aguirre 1988:33).

Henderson (2000) recognizes that visitors at sites of dark tourism may have such motivations as a search for knowledge or novelty. However, for some sites, the educational mission veers closely to spectacle (Walsh 1992). This is another difficulty of
an educational mandate. Mestrovic (1996) attributes this to the fact that museums are obliged to win and reward the attention of visitors and often do so via entertainment. For Lennon and Foley (2000), a heavy dependence on media reveals a, “…fundamental difficulty of delineating education and entertainment slash spectacle and an uncritical approach to history” (90).

Interpretation on the Channel Islands in Britain illustrates an additional dilemma regarding dark tourism and education: education can be selective, and biased history is therefore reinforced through interpretation. There were significant anti-Jewish measures and sentiments on the islands before and during the German occupation during World War II; however, this is neglected in interpretation and these omissions are significant. Visitors are not being told the whole story, perhaps even misguided in their information.

Additionally, “…no public memorial has ever been erected on either island (Guernsey and Alderney) in commemoration of the deaths of slave labourers…This is even more disturbing since Alderney was the site of the UK’s largest mass murder” (Lennon and Foley 2000:70). The brutality exhibited by the German occupiers left a death-toll in the thousands (Bunting 1995). The dark side of occupation is ignored; rather, the focus is on liberation and the ensuing celebrations, leaving an incomplete history.

2.13.2 Education and the Holocaust

Despite the aforementioned educational dilemmas, education at Holocaust sites is regarded as being especially important. As Levi (1986) reminds, Holocaust sites are not, “…mistakes to efface. With the passing of years and decades, their remains do not lose
any of their significance as a warning monument; rather, they gain in meaning” (1986:185). Society has an obligation to commemorate those who lost their lives in the Holocaust, “…not just to ensure their continued existence ‘lest we forget’ but to ensure they occur ‘Nie Wieder’” (Beech 2000:40). One way to ensure that it never happens ‘Never Again’ is through education.

At the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) in Washington D.C., education is a primary component for a number of reasons. For Weinberg, “…it was to make visitors understand how attempts to annihilate an entire people came to be and how this was executed” (1993:118). Linenthal comments on the museum’s mandate. “People would need to be convinced that the museum would be more than a horror story before they could be persuaded to visit. Each of these impulses-commemorative sensibility and educational imperative, appropriate institutional civility, and public reassurance-became part of the interpretive mix in exhibit planning” (1995:193).

For the USHMM, education centers on ensuring such horrific events are never repeated. Much of the education is aimed at the general public so they understand and learn from the past; however, some education is also geared towards heads of state so that they too can prevent these kinds of atrocities from happening again. “The Holocaust museum not only was a crucial memory for survivors or members of the public; but also might help those entrusted with affairs of state to navigate through troubled waters” (Linenthal 1995:2). As Riding supports, “…recalling…is the best way to avoid…” (2003:H7).
Educating against future events is a common theme found in the literature on the USHMM. Linenthal observed that the museum would, “…stand as warning against hatred and dehumanization whoever the victim is” (1995:67). Discussing the exhibit on ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, Lennon and Foley commented, “Such exhibitions clearly reaffirm…Museum’s mission to relate the history of the Holocaust to world events” (2000:158).

To underscore this education, the museum is a reminder to the dangers of the outside world (Will 1983). Eskenazi, museum’s Director of Public Information concurs. The museum acts as,

…a counterpoint to all of these other museums and memorials that you see, they all celebrate humans-their technology and art and creativity and we’re saying watch out there is another side to humankind and to what humans are also capable of doing…I think people are interested in seeing things and learning things they feel they should see and that’s part of it, this is actually something people feel they should see or learn something about or have a responsibility to learn about (Lennon and Foley 2000:153).

The Beth Hatefutsoth Museum of the Jewish Diaspora in Tel Aviv also states that education is an integral part of their site, and this importance is emphasized in the programs offered. For adult visitors, their education department runs, “… a variety of study days, workshops and seminars” (Golden 1996:225). The museum’s educational component for youth is detailed programs that cater to, “… approximately 50,000 schoolchildren per year between the ages of 12 and 18” (225). Furthermore, these visits are usually, “… structured around a particular topic designed to coincide with the history being taught at school” (225).
The history of the death-education/tourism relationship spans hundreds of years. Beginning in the Middle Ages and still prevalent in today’s society, education has provided interpretation of death and disaster for over 700 years. Much of this understanding necessitates travel. This is one of the key themes that emerged from a perusal of dark tourism literature: travel to try to understand death is not new.

A second theme is that education seeks to prevent similar events from occurring. If present and future generations can experience past tragedies, they will hopefully learn from their forebears’ mistakes. As one interpreter at Washita Battlefield National Historic Site explained, “…we become keepers of the stories. It is up to us to make the intangible connections. We can help them form a deep connection to the story and the place so that future generations do not forget what happened at these tragic sites, ever” (Black 2001:1).

A third observable theme is that education may be a reaction to popularity, and may be introduced to offset such notoriety. Some sites of death and disaster draw attention from other sources much as media exposure, hence attracting hordes of visitors. However, without some form of interpretation, visitors may not understand the event. As a result, the dangers discussed previously might eventuate.

Catharsis is a fourth theme that emerged from the literature. Education is often a means for a community to come to terms with the tragedy that touched them; it provides a means of understanding an event and subsequently provides relief. Keeping the past alive helps some survivors and victims keep the memories of other victims alive.
This is not to say that education as a pull factor lacks inherent dangers. Some sites use education as a justification for their existence. Other sites focus on their educational mandate while providing what some consider unsuitable products and services. This in turn can lead to controversy and conflict, particularly when heritage dissonance arises, as exemplified by the Kennedy families’ experiences in Dallas.

With education also comes the danger of spectacle. Most sites attempt to provide education in an interesting, entertaining way. However, spectacle can overshadow meaningful interpretation. Much of this is attributed to an overdependence on the media where constant repetition collapses reality.

Finally, an additional dilemma with education found in the literature is that telling the whole story is difficult. Sites of dark tourism may omit pertinent information due to shifting cultural values as discussed in Section 2.4. Community leaders, popular opinion or touristic demand on what is wanted may dictate exhibits and interpretation.

Despite these dangers, education at Holocaust sites is revealed to be critical, correlating with many of the aforementioned themes. Key to Holocaust education is the hope of prevention of a repeat of past atrocities. Sites focus displays, programs and outreach on teaching present and future generations the horrors of the Holocaust in hopes they learn not to let it happen again. Humankind has a dark side and by revealing it, individuals may be taught to heed it.

2.14 Remembrance

Remembrance is a vital human activity that connects us to our past and our future, and the ways we remember define us in the present (Young, 1993 and Foley and
Lennon, 1999). Remembrance helps cement our identities through an understanding of what has shaped us thus far. It allows us to learn from past mistakes and go forward with clear vision of the future. “As individuals and societies, we need the past to construct and anchor our identities and to nurture a vision of the future...” (Young 1993:9).

Given many sites of dark tourism are warehouses for memories, it is not surprising they also mandate remembrance, in addition to education, as a factor in their planning. The literature review revealed a number of sites that cited commemoration and remembrance as their raison d’être. This is especially true for, but not limited to, sites of the Holocaust.

When the Beth Hatefutsoth Museum of the Jewish Diaspora was proposed in 1959, its primary purpose was commemoration. The museum’s originator felt that, “Following the...Nazis...and the establishment of the State of Israel, the 2,500 year old chapter of the history of the Diaspora is, in a certain sense drawing to a close. Thus the museum was to ‘create a living memorial to the Jewish Diaspora’” (Golden 1996:227). Today, one of the main themes in the permanent exhibit is a commemorative section simply called, Remember (Golden 1996).

Similarly, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum also works on an educational-remembrance doctrine. Museum creators believed that a failure to remember those who died would, “…mean to become accomplices to their murders” (Linenthal 1995:35). The museum then would, “…stand in commemoration of the destroyed Euro-Jews and their civilisation...” (Linenthal 1995:59). Hence, the inclusion
of a Hall of Remembrance, “…where people can reflect on what they have seen” (Lennon and Foley 2000:151).

A visit to the Holocaust Museum Houston emphasizes their commitment to remembrance. One of the first things one encounters is their permanent exhibit entitled, Bearing Witness: A Community Remembers. Elsewhere in the museum, in the Lack Family Memorial Room visitors can reflect on their experience at the Wall of Remembrance or Wall of Hope. Outside is the Eric Alexander Garden of Hope, memorializing the 1.5 million children that perished in the Holocaust.

Sites other than those related to the Holocaust also espouse remembrance as a mandate. At the Oklahoma City National Memorial, the inscription on the Gates of Time reads, “We come here to remember those who were killed, those who survived and those changed forever. May all who leave here know the impact of violence. May this memorial offer comfort, strength, peace, hope and serenity” (National Parks Service 2003). The Menin Gate in Ypres, Belgium does not simply stand in commemoration to the war dead. It trumpets its remembrance loudly, every day stopping traffic. The Gate is located on one of the busiest roads in town and acts as a constant reminder of sacrifice (Evans 1992). At 8 p.m.each night, buglers from the local fire brigade sound the last post as a living tribute from the people of Ypres

The literature also revealed reverence is a key feature at many of these sites of remembrance. At Pearl Harbor, a number of steps are taken to ensure respect. Visitors must first view an interpretive film before they are able to board the skiffs to the memorial. Once there, “…reverence is encouraged by staff present upon the Memorial
structure. Beach-style clothing is not permitted upon the memorial...Visitors...are required to lave aboard the next-arriving small craft from the shoreside” (Lennon and Foley 2000:104). This is done so visitors approach the structure as a memorial rather than simply a tourist attraction.

Lennon and Foley also found reverential contemplation to be desirous in interpretation at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

The interpretation assumes a knowledge of the camps and their purpose. Explanation, orientation and historical documentation are limited. In the larger barracks entitled ‘Jews’, the displays are reverential as opposed to historical or sequential...The aim of interpretation is to stimulate reflection and contemplation rather than an historical/literal interpretation to catalyse an understanding and appreciation of the past (2000:57-58).

Some of Holt’s Battlefield Tours also attempt to adopt an atmosphere of reverence. One of their key tours encompasses World War I battle sites, including affiliated cemeteries of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission. Here, “The tone is, not unexpectedly, reverential with customers encouraged to bring items of remembrance and, where this is feasible, to lay flowers at the graves of family members, etc.” (Lennon and Foley 2000:26).

The review of the literature also suggested remembrance is done in a large part to educate society so that such events are never repeated. As Beech (2000) warns, society has an ethical obligation to educate visitors. Lennon and Foley concur, noting,

From Honolulu to Hiroshima and from Saigon to Singapore conflicts of the twentieth century are offered as part of touristic fare, most often as...a salutary warning from whatever is being represented should never happen again. It is not unusual for parties of schoolchildren from home and abroad to be seen at sites of infamy, degradation and death alongside the elderly on coach tours, historians on theme vacations and the merely curious on a day trip on extended tour (2000:111).
Butler, in his discussion on whitewashing slavery in contemporary plantation tourism, recognized the dangers of not remembering slavery. Without such remembrance, “…the result is a lost opportunity for a nation to learn from its past mistakes…so that when confronted with similar evil in the present or future, they can challenge it before it becomes…” (2001:173).

The erection of the U.S. National Holocaust Memorial Museum fulfilled similar beliefs. Through, “…this act of remembrance, Americans would not only memorialize Holocaust victims, but would instil caution, fortify restraint, and protect against future evil or indifference” (Linenthal 1995:37). Without such remembrance, survivors would be accomplices in murder and prevent the lessons from being disseminated.

This is not to say remembrance is devoid of controversy. As discussed in Section 2.4, cultural values often dictate what is and is not commemorated. As Henderson observed, “Truth is the first casualty of war” (2000:270). What is offered under the guise of remembrance may not be the full story.

Smith noted, “Victory reinforces group identity and national pride, self-worth, belonging to a winning team, knowing you’ve done something right” (1996:254). Inevitably, the victors create monuments and memorials to commemorate their success. However, some governments may control such messages to suit their own agendas rather than attempting to reach any level of authenticity. Barthel (1989) supports this idea, noting heritage often lies in the hands of governments who present their own versions of the past that corresponds with their own interest.
In some instances, this manipulation becomes outright propaganda. In Vietnam, current governments have promoted war tourism using message of solidarity, a heroic struggle against outside aggressors (Henderson 2000). At the Cu Chi Tunnel complex where Vietcong ran supplies to forces in South Vietnam, certain interpretations appear geared specifically towards locals. Although some film footage at the visitors centre is original, certain sections depict, “…the rustic atmosphere and local heroes who were honored as ‘Number One American Killers’” (Henderson 2000:277).

Remembering defeat is also difficult. Yet as Mayo recognized, “…defeat…cannot be forgotten and a nation’s people must find ways to redeem those who died for their country to make defeat honorable. This must be done by honoring the individuals who fought rather than the country’s lost cause” (1988:63). This is not an easy task. The Vietnam War Memorial is black granite and below street level. Some veterans have labeled it the Ditch of Shame while Smith (1996) identified it as a monument of defeat.

Foote found defeat is not the only event difficult to commemorate and remember. “Shame can be a powerful motive to obliterate all reminders of tragedy and violence” (1997:174). He cites such instances as places of mass murder, events caused by human negligence, and accidental tragedies that reflect badly on a group or community. Under such circumstances, the shame and grief may be too hard to bear and as a result, no public remembrance takes place.

Holocaust remembrance brings with it its own difficulties, especially given the urgency of remembrance. However, here too controversy exists in regards to
interpretation of such sites. Some believe the scope of the Holocaust is too big for interpretation. Steiner argued that it is best, “…not to add the trivia of literacy…to the unspeakable” (1967:163).

Conversely, others have argued, “…silence brings with it the problem of displacement and may encourage further generations to forget or ignore the incidence of this terrible period of human history” (Lennon and Foley 2000:32). Survivors fear they again will be victimized through the murder of memory and there is a need, to fulfill, “…victims’ wishes to defeat the conspiracy of silence” (Linenthal 1995:35). For Baudrillard (1988), “Forgetting the extermination is part of the exterminating itself” (23).

A common cliché states that to know where you are going you must know where you have been. In other words to move forward, the past must be remembered and understood. Therefore, as places of commemoration and remembrance, dark tourism sites can play a significant role in this understanding. They allow for the forging of identities, the mapping of the future, and the reading of contemporary society.

For many such sites, their primary purpose is remembrance, particularly remembrance for education. By venerating the past, individuals and society can learn from previous mistakes. Holocaust museums in particular operate under this agenda. In order to prevent further genocides, they offer places of learning and reflection through remembrance.

There are dangers, however, to remembrance. As iterated throughout this paper, prevailing cultural values often dictate what is remembered and commemorated.
Therefore, important and relevant stories may be ignored for political, economic or social gain. This applies also to sources of shame. Significant events and stories may be obliterated because of the shame and grief they cause.

The Holocaust provides a unique set of dilemmas, particularly in how the remembrance is undertaken. While some feel monuments and memorials can stand on their own, others appeal for accompanying interpretation. What is clear, is that the Holocaust is an extraordinary event that demands remembrance: for survivors, relatives, and a strong tomorrow.

2.15 Artifacts

The literature is not inundated with empirical studies on the ability of dark tourism objects to pull visitors to specific sites. However, there are a number of ancillary studies that must be noted. In his categorization of thanatourism, Seaton recognized one relevant classification: travel to view material evidence or symbolic representations of death in locations unconnected with their occurrence. These include, “…museums where weapons of death, the clothing of murder victims and other artefacts are put on display” (1999:131). He cites such examples as the Museum of the Revolution in Cuba, which exhibits blood-splattered, bullet-riddled clothing of heroes of the Revolution and instruments of torture used by the Battista regime; and Madame Tussaud’s in London where wax effigies of famous murderers are displayed.

Tunbridge and Ashworth also cite Madame Tussaud’s exhibits as an attraction. They note the wax museum where, “…the tourists’ appetite for…artefacts relating to tragedy is substantial” (1996:94). Opening in London England in 1846 to house
gruesome relics of the French Revolution, today the museum boasts 2.5 million visitors a year (Katz 2003).

Smith (1996) in her research on war and tourism, found military victory may lead to tourism, and she acknowledges the pull of artifacts found at some sites. She notes, especially, the British Museum with its, “…countless…valuable curios that were incidental to colonial expansion…and many gold altars of Spain, and the gold chalices and jewelled cross that are booty from the conquest of Peru” (Smith 1996:256). However, she does recognize, “Tangible elements of war can be described in tourist brochures and serve as incentives for tourism…but that alone is not sufficient motivation to attract large numbers of pleasure-seekers to sites of carnage” (1996:250).

Uzzell however, makes a case for the presentation of the display of certain controversial artifacts. He emphasizes that museums and interpretive sites should relate all aspects of human history, including that of atrocity because, “We are deceiving ourselves if we think that when we stand in front of a case of…photographs of mutilated bodies we are looking at the past. We are also looking at the present and the future” (1989:46).

Hence, Uzzell (1989) promotes hot interpretation. By displaying such artifacts as glasses and identity cards, museologists and interpreters provoke reactions. Without such reactions, people may adopt a cool and detached attitude to history.

Aside from the above studies, there is little empirical research in this area. To supplement this dearth of academic work, heritage industry publications and popular culture literature were also considered. It was revealed in a number of articles and
marketing brochures that artifacts are often employed to attract visitors. Artifacts from the Titanic, particularly, have been used to pull visitors to sites; and these efforts have been extraordinarily successful. Up until 1997, the Maritime Museum of the Atlantic had, as part of its collection, a deck chair from the Titanic along with a few other pieces of wood from the ship. “Each year, even this modest display [drew] visitors from around the world” (Lunn 2000:22). However, with the 1997 introduction of an entire exhibit about the Titanic, including additional artifacts, the museum saw its visitation increase 2.5 times from the previous year.

Similarly, when the National Maritime Museum in Greenwich England opened an exhibit about the ship in 1994, it was the, “…most popular exhibition the museum has ever staged, helping to attract some 720,000 people…” (Deuchar 1996:212). Central to its exhibit were some 150 artifacts salvaged by RMS Titanic Incorporated, the team that located the wreck in 1985. Pieces ranged from parts of the ship to passengers’ belongings.

In Kansas, remnants of the 1931 plane crash that killed Notre Dame’s legendary football coach, Knute Rockne, continue to attract visitors. As one state publication advertises, “Up the road at Cottonwood Falls, the Chase County Historical Museum houses pieces of the plane and other items related to the crash” (Plumlee 2001:2).

Meanwhile, other sites import relics of dark tourism to emphasize their message and draw additional visitation. The New York Battery Park City Authority has as its centrepiece an actual stone cottage from potato-famine-era-Ireland in order to provide the city’s large Irish population, “…something tangible to connect us with the past”
The author notes similar relics found throughout New York City. These include a tablet cast from metal from the USS Maine sunk in Havana Harbor in 1898; a tablet containing nine coins from an eleven-year-old victim of United Airlines Flight 1049 1960 air crash; and a 15-foot statue brought from Hiroshima, one of the few surviving structures after the 1945 bombing.

Numerous brochures of dark tourism sites offer artifacts in their marketing campaigns. At the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, you can walk into a Montgomery city bus or a Greyhound bus similar to those used in the 1961 Freedom Rides (National Civil Rights Museum 2002). You can see the salvaged mast of the USS Maine, sunk in 1898, at Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia, (Arlington National Cemetery 2002). At The Second World War Experience Centre in Leeds, England, you can see wartime letters, diaries, photographs, and official papers (The Second World War Experience Centre 2000).

In the context of the Holocaust, artifacts bring with them their own controversial dilemmas, particularly in the kinds of artifacts displayed. Foley and Lennon (2000) detail the debate surrounding almost two tons of human hair on exhibit as Auschwitz. While some argue preservation is vital for remembrance, others argue this type of remembrance is ineffectual. Young argues, “These artefacts…force us to recall the victims as the Germans have remembered them to us: in the collected debris of a destroyed civilization…In great loose piles, these remnants remind us not of the lives that once animated them, so much as of the brokenness of lives” (1993:132).
Linenthal (1995) concurs, stating hair is, “…not a commodity to be shipped, transported…and crafted for dramatic displays” (212). However, he does note the location of such artifacts plays a role in its display. While hair, bones, and ashes do not belong in an American museum where no concentration camp stood, if their appearance was in a museum such as Treblinka or Auschwitz, it would be acceptable.

The Imperial War Museum in London described its own dilemmas when assigning artifacts to be displayed in their recently opened Holocaust Exhibit. Museum staff wanted objects that would, “…bring the reality of the subject home…give some tangible sense of the…conditions of those imprisoned…and…offer visitors the special interaction which only fabric genuinely of the period can offer” (Bardgett 2000:19).

However, consensus over these objects was difficult to achieve. While some felt not displaying such items as a marble dissecting-table would sanitize the subject, others felt it would upset survivors and encourage ‘prurient’ interest. In other words, people might be attracted to the horrible and obscene as opposed to the subject itself.

The exhibition of such controversial items has additional consequences. Lanzmann (1995) feels such displays have the capability to harden the visitor, to make them less sensitive to the topic. Meanwhile, Lennon and Foley (2000) already believe society may be hardened, “…that the artefacts and attitudes of modernity have reached a stage of ambivalence and ambiguity which continues to be present in some public consciousness” (2000:22). The latter authors highlight this idea with an example from Auschwitz-Birkenau where, “Groups of schoolchildren were taking photographs of each other, parents were photographing their children at the gate of Birkenau and, indeed,
school parties were sitting on the ruins of the crematorium eating sandwiches” (Lennon and Foley 2000:61).

A further, indirect consequence of exhibiting artifacts to attract visitors, is the ensuing emergence of souvenirs. Lennon and Foley continue their discussion on Auschwitz.

In the vicinity (just outside of the main entrance to Auschwitz I), a range of private retail units have developed. Everything from hot dog stands, booksellers, postcard vendors, film stores and discount pottery warehouses are to be found. These, and the internal sale of concentration camp memorabilia, present the camp authorities with a clear dilemma (2000:63).

Similarly, the Imperial War Museum operates a number of commercial ventures at their many sites, including a retail shop and franchised café at their main branch. At the Duxford branch, “…income generation is to the fore with cafés and a large shop offering a range of possible purchases consistent with a day out in the countryside” (Lennon and Foley 2000:116).

This author entered the Imperial War Museum website to view the array of souvenirs offered. All memorabilia is said to be associated with any current special exhibits while each branch specializes in products connected to its particular theme. Such mementos include replica war posters for children with suggestions how they could help with the war effort; replica certificates issued to children by King George VI for the Victory Celebrations; and model aircraft sets. All are reproduced from artifacts found within the museums.

Empirical research on artifacts as motivators is limited. However, popular culture and ancillary academic studies illustrate the attraction of such objects. Some
authors goes as far as propagating the use of artifacts to provoke reactions and emotions from visitors. Controversy can force individuals to take a stance.

The review of related dark tourism literature enumerates a number of sites that actually use artifacts to promote visitation. Much of this was found in site brochures and other marketing materials. Therefore, sites appear to use concrete evidence of dark events as attractors. Furthermore, the literature revealed the success of such promotion. Two sites in particular found a significant increase in visitation after the introduction of tangible objects from the Titanic.

The display of artifacts at Holocaust sites proved to be a controversial undertaking. Some academics and museum professionals strongly advocate the display of such things as hair, bones, and spectacles. They cite the need for tangible objects to bring home the scope of the Holocaust. Other professionals disagree, claiming such exhibitions are useless, that they are improper remembrances for the dead.

A final note on the attraction of artifacts is their commodification through souvenirs. Although some items serve as appropriate reminders of the trip, the resulting retail commercialization is troublesome. While books and replica posters may be pertinent to the history of the site, the ensuing cafes, postcard vendors, and hotdog stands can deteriorate the sites and take away from their gravity.

2.16 Sight Sacralization

As mentioned previously in this study, cultural values often dictate what sites and events are commemorated, including incidents of death and disaster. However, MacCannell (1976 and 1989) continues this discussion in terms of tourist attractions and
the processes of sacralizing sights for tourism. As Seaton quotes, “It is not that tourism creates more things to see - although it does that too - but that is constructs new meaning structures by which existing things can be seen and revalued” (2002:76).

MacCannell (1976 and 1989) likens tourist travel to religious pilgrimages. When tourists travel, they are searching for the authentic, and this search becomes like a sacred journey or religious pilgrimage. In this search for authenticity, some objects (and sights and sites) go through a process of sacralisation where they are marked, making them separate and different from other sights, and so branding them meaningful.

The first stage of sight sacralization involves the naming of an object, where attractions are marked worthy of preservation (MacCannell, 1976 and MacCannell, 1989). This involves some form of authentication testifying to an object’s aesthetic, historical, monetary, recreational, and social value. Such authentication might include restoration of a period home (Fine and Speer 1985) or the photographing and x-raying of an object (MacCannell 1989).

The second stage is the framing and elevation phase, where an object/sight/site is put on display and official boundaries are set around the object/sight/site (MacCannell, 1976 and MacCannell, 1989). Official boundaries include markers that make the sight recognizable as an attraction: plaques, interpretive displays, spotlights, additional protection, and hanging silk cords. All can confer importance upon a site. As Dann (1996) noted, “Markers speak. They convey messages to tourists, and…in turn relay messages to other tourists and potential tourists” (1996:10). Without markers, the site would be meaningless (Pretes 1995).
MacCannell’s third stage of sacralization enshrinement takes place when, “…the framing material that is used has itself entered into the first stage of sacralization” (1989:45). As an example, the author chose the Sainte Chappelle church in Paris, originally built to house/frame/elevate Christ’s Crown of Thorns. Today, while the object is still a major tourist attraction, the church (frame) has become an attraction in its own right.

Next, a sight enters the mechanical reproduction stage where the sacred object, or one associated with a sight or site, is reproduced. Reproductions include souvenirs, prints, or photographs. As MacCannell notes, this phase, “…is most responsible for setting the tourist in motion on his journey to find the true object” (1989:45).

The final stage of sight sacralization is social reproduction. This occurs when such entities as groups, cities, and regions begin to name themselves after the famous attraction. For example, while in Memphis, one can drive down Elvis Presley Boulevard, camp at KOA Graceland, or eat at Elvis Presley’s Memphis.

2.16.1 Sight Sacralization and Dark Tourism

There are limited studies on sight sacralization within the context of dark tourism. Foley and Lennon (1996 and 1997) state the way a dark tourism sight develops as a tourism attraction is systematically and socially organized, designed to be different from everyday. However, Seaton’s (1999) definitive work on the sacralization of the 1815 Battle of Waterloo is perhaps the only one of its kind.

Waterloo’s historical significance is achieved by its ranking as one of the 15 most decisive battles in the world (Creasey 1962). Its importance however, does not
account for its success as an attraction, for modern tourism is unconcerned with other battlefields examined in Creasey’s book. Marathon, Blenheim, Chalons, and Pultowa, once pivotal battles, remain relatively obscure today.

For Seaton, “The answer lies, rather, not just in the historic importance of the battle, but in the nature of the tourism process itself—how it is constructed, influenced, and sustained” (1999:140). By studying Waterloo under the umbrella of MacCannell’s five-step sanctification process, Seaton is able to explain the rise of the battlefield as a major tourism destination.

Naming

The actual battle of Waterloo was fought by six different armies and took place over four continuous battlefields; thus, its geographical space had no precise name marked on a map. However, it was the English general, Wellington, who chose to name the battle ‘Waterloo’ after the hamlet and inn at which he stayed the night previous. In doing so, Wellington venerated his own role, and England’s, in the battle.

This socially-constructed name has had a direct impact on tourism at Waterloo.

In the first action at Ligny the Prussians fought an important if unsuccessful…operation…while Wellington was…fighting at Quatre Bras. At Wavre two days later…the Prussians fought another diversionary action…However, by being categorized individually…as minor skirmishes preceding the great battle, Ligny and Wavre became marginalized as “warm-ups” to the main show… (Seaton 1999:143).

This marginalization continues today. Ligny, Quatre Bras and Wavre are visited much less than Waterloo because of the pre-eminence of the name Waterloo.
Framing and Elevation

MacCannell defined framing and elevation as, “The putting on display of an object – placement in a case, on a pedestal or opened up for visitation. Framing is the place of an official boundary around an object” (1976:44). Yet Seaton (1999) noted that battles are ephemeral and that it is not possible to put them in cases or on pedestals. Seaton did note, however, that it is possible to elevate and frame a battle through monumental markers. Witness what occurred at Waterloo.

Eight years after the battle, the Belgian people constructed the Butte de Lion, a massive bronze statue to the allied forces at Waterloo. It touristic impact was enormous. “Once the monument was built, it was inevitable that it would become a tourism spectacle…and that restaurants, museums and hotels would spring up as they did and still do (along with a panorama, housed in a rotunda and built just before the First World War; a modern visitor centre built in the last 20 years; and numerous gift shops)” (Seaton 1999:144). Today over 135 monuments and markers stand in remembrance of the Battle of Waterloo (Speechaert and Baecker 1990).

Enshrinement

Enshrinement, refers to the point at which, “…the framing material that is used has itself entered the first stage of sacralization” (MacCannell 1989:45). As one example of enshrinement, Seaton cites the Waterloo Church, “…where the British deposited battle standards, military pendants…and placed memorial plaques to the dead” (1999:145). Prior to the battle, the building was relatively unimportant; however, it was subsequently rebuilt on a grander scale.
Mechanical Reproduction

According to MacCannell (1976 and 1989), mechanically reproducing tourism sights or objects elevates them as significant touristic attractions. The media played, and still plays, an important role in these reproductions, ranging from Hollywood blockbusters to comic strips. Seaton concurs, “The sustained reproduction of Waterloo through the printed word and graphic image was one of the reasons it achieved a unique place in public imagination” (1999:146).

The litany of mechanical reproductions that surfaced about Waterloo is wide-ranging and Seaton attributes this to the coinciding advances of technology; poems, books, and ballads were written and distributed; caricatures, lithographs, and photos were developed; and equally as important, guidebooks were enhanced. These reproductions served to secure Waterloo’s importance in culture and tourism.

Social Reproduction

MacCannell’s (1989 and 1976) final step in sight sacralization is social reproduction: the representation of cultural objects in everyday life, away from their places of origin. Notable examples include the naming of roads, pubs, streets, bridges, and monuments. According to Seaton the name Waterloo,

…was disseminated in an astonishing variety of manifestations…Virtually every town had its Waterloo or Wellington street, road, or terrace…Furthermore, as the Empire expanded there were towns called Wellington in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia…In summary, Waterloo entered the popular psyche of the British at home and overseas…” (1999:149-150).

Although Seaton’s (1999) Waterloo example correlates with MacCannell’s sight sacralization process, the author recognizes the original concept was developed for
objects as tourism attractions rather than destinations. He cites as examples di Vinci’s Mona Lisa, Napoleon’s hat, and the Moon rock. Therefore, due to MacCannell’s (1976 and 1989) object-oriented focus, Seaton (1999) offers a number of modifications to the original concept.

Firstly, Seaton believes the sacralization process can be abbreviated to just two phases: naming and mechanical reproduction. To illustrate, he details the sudden rush of visitation to the site immediately after the battle, “…before any significant framing and elevations, enshrinement or social reproduction had taken place” (1999:152). He attributes this to the media onslaught to report the victory. Furthermore, the guidebooks and other reproductions that took place before sight elevation indicate the predominance of mechanical reproduction.

This leads to Seaton’s second modification: there is no evidence the marking stages occur in any particular order, except for the initial naming phase. He states sacralization is not a linear process with a final end point nor does the process uniformly affect everyone. The process is influenced heavily by the powers that place the sight on offering and those who gaze at it. Sights may be rethought or redrawn by those, “…presiding over the process” (Seaton 1999:154). As an example, he cites the erection of new markers at the site, particularly the more recent additions occurring over 150 years after the battle. These include a plaque installed by the French at Hougomount as late as 1990.

Seaton also believes framing, elevation, and enshrinement are less important for tourism generation than naming and mechanical and social reproduction since it is the
latter three that propel visitors in the first place. Both reproductions may, “…well be the key sacralization factors in the success of major international attractions” (1999:153).

Finally, Seaton observes that what was once seen as remarkable can mutate, thereby dimming demands for the sight, a process he calls sight secularization or sight desacralization. While Waterloo is still considered a major tourist attraction, “…it rarely provokes the kind of euphoric triumphalism that it did a hundred years ago—even among the British” (1999:154).

In sum, not all sites of death and disaster develop as tourist attractions. One reason for this as previously discussed, is the influence of prevailing cultural values. If those in authority do not deem an event or site important, then it is largely ignored. Sociologist Dean MacCannell (1976 and 1989) formulated another possible cause for the development of tourist attractions: sight sacralization. While tourism physically develops new attractions, so too it develops destinations through the construction of new meaning structures.

Using MacCannell’s 5-step process, Seaton (1999) demonstrated the sacralization of the site of the Battle of Waterloo. The naming of the battle Waterloo, gave that specific site preeminence and therefore a recognition factor to the public at large. Since the name sounded familiar, it must therefore be important. The framing and elevation of Waterloo followed with the erection of monuments and markers to the fallen. With something concrete to now gaze at, tourists began to arrive. Phase three, enshrinement, came with an unimportant church rebuilt after the battle. While the artifacts inside the church are still important attractions, people now come to see the
building itself. Finally, *mechanical and social reproductions* of Waterloo are still prevalent in society. Guidebooks continue to direct tourists to the site while pubs, streets, and cities can be found across the British Commonwealth. Seaton (1999) does note however, that MacCannell’s original concept was object based rather than destination based. Therefore, he offers a number of modifications to the process, which in turn influence the sacralization of dark tourism sites.

Feasibly, dark tourism sites can be sacralized in just two stages: naming and mechanical reproduction. Given the prominence of the media in contemporary society, naming will attract visitors with or without any markers being erected. For instance the hordes of visitors travelling to Lockerbie, Scotland after the crash of Pan Am Flight 103. There are no social reproductions of Lockerbie. One does not find a Lockerbie Street or Lockerbie Park named after the tragedy.

Seaton (1999) also comments that the process can occur in any order (except the initial naming phase), citing the continuing erection of monuments at Waterloo as an example. Conversely, there may be a reversal of sacralization as time passes and memory fades. In the same article, the author notes the declining popularity of the Battle of Hastings.

### 2.17 Role of the Media

Contemporary media has an undeniable influence over public consciousness. Individuals regularly turn on their televisions and radios for weather, news and entertainment. In turn, public opinion and behavior are informed by these sources. From what to wear on any given day to who to vote for, society depends on the media for
information and answers. Furthermore, this influence has expanded as communications have become a global commodity.

The media also has undeniable influence over public interpretation of the landscape (Goodey 1986) including sites of dark tourism. According to Lennon and Foley, “…global communication technologies are inherent in both the events which are associated with a dark tourism product and are present in the representation of the events for visitors at the site itself” (2000:16). Hence, the relationship between dark tourism and the media is thoroughly interconnected.

The authors further this statement by noting the development of mass media, “…has changed the relationship between the public and world events. Thus, an event represented as ‘dark tourism’ is likely to have taken place in the last hundred years and been brought to the public via modern mass media. The scale and scope of the tourism product are likely to be driven by the media” (Lennon and Foley 2000:119).

The 1912 sinking of the Titanic is considered to be the genesis of global media. Although television did not exist and communications were slower than today, newspapers and newsreels were quick to report on the tragedy. Forty-six years later, the media again brought the Titanic to the forefront of public consciousness with the release of the film, A Night to Remember. The film, “…effectively turned the relatively impersonal and largely forgotten sinking into a series of individuals ‘stories’ of fictional characters upon the vessel (Lennon and Foley 2000:18). In 1998, the Titanic once again rose onto the big screen with the release James Cameron’s Titanic.
While the *Titanic* represents the advent of global communication, the life and death of John F. Kennedy perhaps represents the watershed. Even before his assassination he was referred to as the ‘television president’. “From the initial ‘great debate’ with Nixon through the regular live televised news conferences to his ultimatum on US television demanding that Russian missiles be removed from Cuba, he showed an early mastery of TV” (Lennon and Foley 2000:78).

It was after his assassination however, that the media influence began to dominate his life and death. White (1982) noted, “Television was at the centre of the shock. With its indelible images, information, immediacy, repetition and close-ups, it served to define the tragedy for the public” (174).

Connally furthered this. Not only did the media define the tragedy, it characterized Kennedy’s entire administration.

I don’t think the time has come when history will really look at the Kennedy administration with a realistic eye. And how could we? When you see a beautiful little girl kneeling with her hand on her father’s coffin, when you see a handsome little boy standing with a military salute by his slain father, how can you feel anything but the utmost sympathy? It’s a scene of pathos, of remorse, of tragedy, and that’s the way we now view President Kennedy (Zelizer 1992:186).

### 2.17.1 Media as a Push and Pull Factor

The media has a unique place in dark tourism in the fact it acts both as a push factor and a pull factor. Through its mass appeal to audiences, it has the ability to bring dark tourism sites to public consciousness (and conversely, keep other sites out of public perception). What the public reads and hears through the media is brought to the forefront of the awareness thereby creating destination awareness and an aware set for potential visitors (Woodside and Lysonski 1989).
Furthermore, through its extensive use in the actual interpretation at dark tourism sites, the media can pull people to a site. People who want to hear and see specific information may be attracted to the tools used at such sites. As Lennon and Foley note, “Technology and particularly multimedia have been used to relate the visitor experience to the individual” (2000:152). As will be illustrated further in the paper, dark tourism destinations often rely heavily on technology to convey their messages.

2.17.2 Media as Push

Even before the advent of electronic communications, the media has played an integral role in relaying information to the public. Such mediums as, “…broadsheets, poems, songs and political speeches were essential instruments in stimulating popular indignations…” (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996:105). For instance, when Abraham Lincoln was assassinated in 1865 it was, “Newspaper headlines and telegrams [that] spread the news of Lincoln’s death” (Sixth Floor Museum 2003b). However, modern communication technologies have extended the range, immediacy and impact of such events.

This increase has also resulted in an increase in the popularity of dark tourism sites. Media coverage appears to have the ability to both push and pull visitors as illustrated in the literature review. In Fall’s River, Massachusetts, there is an undeniable interest in all things Lizzie Borden, but as one local tourist operator noted, travel “…seemed to pick up in recent years after a string of television documentaries” (Unknown 2001:2).
The Sixth Floor Museum in Dallas also reports visitation increases after media focus. “Recording approximately 0.5 million paying visitors a year this remains Dallas’ premier paid attraction with an average annual increase of visitors in excess of 15 per cent. Attendance fluctuations are noted during times of media focus on any aspect of the Kennedy story” (Lennon and Foley 2000:91). According to the Dallas County Historical Foundation, visitor numbers increased significantly upon the release of Oliver Stone’s movie JFK while anniversaries also lead to increased media and increased visitor numbers (Sixth Floor Museum 2002c).

Other media have served to tantalize visitor interest in all things Kennedy. For Foley and Lennon, “…novels and film treatments such as the *Parallax View, Executive Action* and *JFK* have all contrived to feed the growing interest in the events of the Kennedy death” (1996:201).

In 1992, the National Parks Service in the United States reported every national battlefield and cemetery reported a, “… significant increase in attendance, as much as 75% in the last ten years for the Fredericksburg, Virginia Memorial” (Smith 1996:259). Park staff attributed some of this to the influence of the media.

Two years earlier, the Public Broadcast System aired the Ken Burns miniseries, *Civil War*. This coverage was accompanied by a, “…surge of Civil War tourism interest …supported by numerous travel articles in the leading magazines, Travel Holiday, National Geographic Traveler…as well as travel sections in newspapers such as the Boston Globe, New York Time etc.” (Smith 1996:259).
Since the release of James Cameron’s, *Titanic*, Halifax has also been basking in surreal popularity (Bergman 1998). Hard Copy, People Magazine, The Boston Globe, Bangkok Post and the Sunday Times of London have all featured Halifax and the *Titanic* in their publications. As a result, affiliated sites saw a tremendous increase in popularity. Countless mementos were, and continue to be, left at J. Dawson’s grave at Fairview Cemetery by movie fans believing he was Jack Dawson of the movie fame.

The Maritime Museum of the Atlantic saw an increase of triple the visitors (Bergman, 1998 and Lunn, 2000). Ironically, at the time of the movie’s release, the museum was about to open a permanent exhibit on the *Titanic*. The response was immediate.

As it turned out, as we were putting the final touches on our exhibit, we learned that Cameron’s move, which, by this time, had received an extraordinary amount of worldwide media attention …was to be released on Dec. 18, 1997. Taking advantage of this fact, on Dec. 17 we put a release out on the newswire which began “Coincident with the release of James Cameron’s movie Titanic, the Maritime Museum of the Atlantic is please to announce the opening of its new permanent exhibit…”. Within 24 hours, we began fielding calls from local, then regional, then national, then American and then other international media (Lunn 2000:25).

Holocaust sites are not immune to the power of the media. Dachau was not a major extermination camp yet ironically, it remains one of the most visited, stemming in part from media influence. Much of this is because it is often featured in media portrayals of liberation and the reporting of the on-site war crime trials of camp guards and other Nazi party members (Young 1993).
Lennon and Foley cite Krakow, Poland as another dark tourism site impacted by media exposure, this time after the release of Steven Spielberg’s movie, *Schindler’s List*. The popularization of Thomas Keneally’s book *Schindler’s Ark* [sic] by the production of...[the]...film...caused tourism to increase significantly in the 1993-4 period. In effect, ‘Schindler tourism’ developed, focusing on the remaining cluster of synagogues, cemeteries, and strongest of all, the disused film sets for the...production. The film sets located near to Krakow became a Schindler tour in the years 1994-5 (2000:64).

2.17.3 Media as Pull

Modern media not only plays a role in disseminating information to the public off-site (thereby pushing visitors to the destination); it also plays an important role in the development of on-site interpretation (hence pulling visitors). Sites associated with the Kennedy assassination and the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C. all exemplify this reliance on media for their interpretation.

Lennon and Foley note that central to interpretation at the Sixth Floor Museum are pictorial images including, “Upwards of four hundred photographs, [and] six documentary films (heavily based on contemporary TV coverage) (Lennon and Foley 2000:82). As a result, since its opening in 1989 the museum has been presented with numerous awards for its use of video (Zelizer 1992).

Other communication mediums are used extensively in and around the Sixth Floor. Inside the museum, visitor can hire audio tours (Hoppe 1982) to heighten their experience. While outside, limousine tours retrace Kennedy’s last steps accompanied by an, “...audio commentary playing on the car tape deck that includes crowd cheers,
gunshot sounds, comments of other passengers…and the news broadcast covering the death of the President” (Lennon and Foley 2000:98).

The New Museum at the JFK Library in Boston also utilizes media in its interpretation at the site. “In each of the White House rooms and other locations there are screens located as a primarily element of exhibition space…[along with]…TV screens…used to show television clips in an attempt to give the visitor the ‘impression’ that someone at the time would have had when watching their own TV” (Lennon and Foley 2000:81). Interestingly, the authors also noted that displayed artifacts are not authenticated, signifying the secondary role they play to the media tools offered.

At the US Holocaust Museum, technology also defines the visitor experience. “Central to the interpretation is the use of newsreels, radios broadcasts, and papers. The reality of the 1930’s and 1940’s is recreated in the way US citizens were actually informed of the rise of Nazi Germany and the progress of the war” (Lennon and Foley, 2000:152). This includes interviews with witnesses and film footage of camp liberations.

Also central to the interpretation is a passport given to each individual on entering the permanent exhibit in the museum. Visitors are asked to,

…type their age, gender, and profession into a computer, after which they will be issued an identity card of someone like themselves who was caught up in the Holocaust. At three stages of the exhibit, visitors will have their cards updated, so that with every passing year in exhibit-time, the personal history of what might be called our phantom-guide will be revealed. At the end of the permanent exhibition, visitors will insert their cards into a television monitors and meet the companion face-to-fact through oral history – or if the phantom-companion died, the memory of the deceased will be conveyed by surviving family and friends (Young 1993:342).
This use of passports attempts to link visitors directly to the Holocaust. The museum goes as far as allowing visitors to print their updated passports as they progress through the exhibit thereby allowing them to take their experience outside of the museum.

In addition to the permanent exhibit, the museum also houses a learning center where people can learn more about the Holocaust. Here visitors can access the 24 computer terminals from which they can, “…call up articles about Holocaust-related topics; watch film clips of or hear taped interviews with survivors of the Holocaust; look at maps or photographs; and listed to related music” (Lennon and Foley 1999:48).

2.17.4 A Conceptual Model

The literature clearly illustrates the influence the media has on dark tourism. It has the ability to inform and therefore attract people to dark destinations. By placing such events and destinations in the forefront of communications, visitors are made aware of these kinds of travel options. Whether they are pushed because of heritage, history, guilt, curiosity, death, dying or nostalgia will vary with each individual tourist; however, the media offers the information to satisfy these factors. In other words, it acts as a mediator between push factors, visitors and the destinations.

Furthermore, on-site interpretation relies heavily on media and therefore is able to use such technology as a pull factor. People can ‘hear’ tapes of survivors or the commentary of news correspondents; they can ‘see’ the liberation of concentration camps or even the death of a president. By offering such sensory and provoking experiences, museums are able to pull people to their exhibits. Whether they are pulled
because of education, remembrance or artifacts again vary with each individual; however, the media at dark tourism sites offers ways to satisfy these pull factors. In other words, the media can also act as mediator between pull factors, visitors and the destinations. Figure 3 details this model.

Figure 3. The Media as a Mediator for Visitation to Dark Tourism Sites
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Due to the limited research on visitor motivations to Holocaust museums, this study takes an exploratory approach. Two separate methods were chosen; a qualitative focus group and a questionnaire administered to a sample of tourists and resident visitors. The principal method used in this study was a survey administered to museum visitors; however, it was determined that a preliminary focus group with museum staff would enhance the survey content. It was believed staff might provide first-hand insights on visitor trends and related observations given their front-line work with the public. It is museum staff that encounter dark tourism visitors on a daily basis; therefore, they are the most likely individuals to hear comments and observe reactions to the museum. Although the literature is largely based on empirical study, researchers may miss some experiences that front-line employees may notice. Furthermore, the public may be more relaxed and unguarded in front of staff as opposed to academics.

The second method of study was a mixed questionnaire. Due to the potentially sensitive nature of the Holocaust Museum Houston, a mail-out survey was selected as the means of obtaining information, as opposed to administering the survey on-site in person. This was done out of respect for visitors who might have experienced trauma or distress immediately after visiting the site. Approaching individuals leaving such an emotional experience could be construed as insensitive. Furthermore, the magnitude of the experience may have biased survey responses.
3.2 Focus Group Design and Administration

A focus group was utilized as a first step to the survey design. The literature on thanatourism and dark tourism gives limited understanding of why individuals attend such sites; therefore, it was important to gain a broader perspective on visitor motivation. Krueger (1988) comments how focus groups are useful under such circumstances. A focus groups is a,

...carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, nonthreatening environment. It is conducted with approximately seven to ten people by a skilled interviewer. The discussion is relaxed, comfortable, and often enjoyable for participants as they share their ideas and perceptions. Group members influence each other by responding to ideas and comments in the discussion (1988:18).

Management at the museum organized for six staff members to participate voluntarily in an informal focus group to discuss visitor motivations to the museum. As museum staff encounter visitors on a daily basis in an intimate manner, it was believed they would provide additional insights into why visitors come to the Holocaust Museum Houston specifically and sites of dark tourism in general. It was presumed the ideas generated in the focus group would provide useful insight for the survey. A meeting was arranged and a series of questions were then developed with the theoretical framework and research questions in mind (see Appendix F).

On February 22, 2002 the six staff members participated in a group discussion focusing on why they believe visitors visit the Holocaust Museum Houston and other sites of dark tourism. Staff make-up was comprised of one weekend docent, one weekday docent, one volunteer, the museum’s executive director, the museum’s visitor service coordinator, and the museum’s education coordinator. This composition was
arranged to capture the maximum range of visitor encounters. Each member of the group was given a cover letter explaining the purpose of the meeting (Appendix G).

To encourage Krueger’s relaxed and comfortable atmosphere, a general interview guide approach was used whereby a set of topics were outlined although the order and wording were not predetermined (Patton 1990). A series of structured questions were asked, augmented with open-form probing questions to obtain additional information (Patton 1990). Appendix F details the initial focus group questions, and during the interview probing questions where applicable followed.

Focus group results were transcribed into a Microsoft Word document and then transferred into Atlas Ti for qualitative analysis. Section 4.1 analyzes the final results.

3.3 Survey Design and Administration

Upon entering the Holocaust Museum Houston, one member from each visitor group is asked to fill out an information card for the museum’s visitor database. Over a four-week period during March and April 2002, a sign was posted above the information card drop-off box in the museum, indicating that when visitors filled out that card, they might receive an off-site, detailed survey. Respondents were broken down into voluntary and non-voluntary. If visitors chose not to accept the detailed survey, their information cards went into one response box. If visitors did choose to participate in the detailed survey, their information cards went into a separate response box. These voluntary response cards were set aside from non-voluntary response cards, thereby providing the database from which the sample was randomly chosen.
A database of 1,318 visitors to the museum during the four-week period was accumulated. From this, a sample of 500 individuals was chosen by systematic sampling, where every nth person in the population is selected for the sample. To calculate n, the population number is divided by the desired sample number. Hence, for this study, the population (1,318) was divided by the sample (500) to get 2.636. From there, every third person in the population database was chosen for the study sample.

As this is exploratory research, the survey consisted of both of open-ended and closed-ended questions (Appendix H). Closed-ended questions were asked in relation to possible motivations to the site to establish if their motivations reflect the literature. Open-ended questions were asked about motivations in order to establish motivations that might not be included in the survey. Close-ended demographic questions were also asked in order to differentiate between local residents who visit and tourists from out of town, and to establish a profile of visitors to the site.

This design of the survey was drawn from a number of sources. First, questions reflect motivations found in the literature review. Secondly, information garnered from the focus group was incorporated into survey questions. Finally, questions and design were adapted from two previous surveys at dark tourism sites: The National Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, D.C., and a National Park Service survey at the USS Arizona Memorial.

3.4 Survey Instrument

Five broad research questions were formed in order to guide this study, and provide direction for both the focus group and survey questions. Under the umbrella of
these questions, ten specific questions were developed to further the broad categories (see Appendix A). These questions were based on personal experience and extensive reading, therefore drawing upon major factors identified in the literature review on dark tourism. The questions also sought factors and motivations specific to the Holocaust Museum Houston.

The theoretical framework behind the research questions was Dann’s (1977) Push and Pull Theory. The author recognized two different types of traveler motivations: push factors, or internal motivations that come from within the visitor; and pull factors, or motivations that emit from external sources such as the site itself. It was believed the Holocaust Museum Houston, as a destination for visitors, created both visitor push motivations and site pull factors. Chapter II discusses the theory in detail in addition to site-specific push and pull factors.

The media figured prominently in the literature on dark tourism; however, as a factor, it did not fit under either push or pull. A model was then developed to understand how the media acted as a mediator between push and pull: it is what moves people from push to pull. Section 2.17.4 details the correlation between the factors.

A series of 26 questions were finally developed for the survey instrument based on the above model and any additional motivators to the Holocaust Museum Houston or dark tourism sites in general. Five basic demographic questions were added to the survey in order to get a profile of visitors at the Holocaust Museum Houston. Appendix A lists the research questions and illustrates how each fits into the study in general, and
the survey specifically. In turn, Appendix J details each survey question and how they relate to the research questions and the literature review.

Before the survey could be administered however, ethical consent was sought from Texas A&M University’s Internal Review Board (IRB). An IRB application was filled out, asking for approval to do research on human subjects. Appendix K details the memorandum and approval number.

3.5 Survey Methods

Upon completion of the survey instrument, steps were then taken to distribute the survey to the sample. Respondents had two options for responding to the survey: they could mail back their survey or respond on-line at the author’s website specifically created for this research. Located on the Recreation, Parks and Tourism Department server at Texas A&M University, the web address was http://www.survey.tamu/holocaust/. At the beginning of the study, the Holocaust Museum Houston confirmed there was room on the card for email addresses on the initial information card they handed out. Therefore, the sample was divided into two: those with a postal address alone and those with both postal and email addresses.

With the website operational, postcards were developed in order to pre-contact individuals, informing them of upcoming contact from the researcher (Appendix L). A pre-contact was undertaken, as it has been found contacting respondents before sending a questionnaire increases response rates (Linsky 1975). The postcard informed individuals they would be receiving either an email or a mail survey within the next two weeks. Postcards were sent out June 13, 2002.
Although further discussed in the limitation section of the paper, one shortcoming of this research is that emails and survey were not sent out until seven months later. Two hundred and eighty-three (283) surveys were mailed out January 21st 2003 to those with only postal addresses. The following week, from January 27th-29th, two hundred and seventeen (217) emails were sent to the remaining sample with email addresses. Attached to all surveys was a cover letter informing visitors of the purpose of the survey, their rights in regards to responding, and any contact information should they have questions (Appendix M).

Postal service respondents were given three weeks and email respondents were given two before postcard reminders were sent out on February 11, 2003 (Appendix N). An identical postcard was sent out to both sets of respondents for two reasons. Firstly, it gave postal service individuals the opportunity to respond via the Internet should they have lost the initial survey. Secondly, I felt that repetitive emails might be harassing to respondents.

In the end, participants completed a total of 188 surveys; however, two responses were almost identical using the same respondent number. From the answers, it appears a husband and wife each filled a survey out. Because of this, both responses were deemed inadmissible, bringing the total number of usable surveys down to 186 out of a possible 500. Specifically, there were 88 email respondents and 98 mail-back respondents. This represents an overall response rate of 37.2 %.

The survey itself consisted of a combination of both open and closed-ended questions; therefore, analysis was carried out in three parts. Firstly, data was inputted
into a Microsoft Access database. Those surveys answered on-line went directly into the database, while mailed back surveys were inputted manually. From there, descriptive statistics were formed using Atlas Ti. The software was utilized to evaluate the qualitative data procured from the fourteen open-ended questions. Data from each question was inputted into the software package in order to ascertain any commonalties. A number of significant themes emerged and are described in a chronological basis further in the paper. Additionally, some qualitative data is supplemented with basic quantitative statistics. For instance, where visitors were asked to list other Holocaust destinations they have recently attended, percentages were added for additional insight.

3.6 Research Limitations

Before any analysis or discussion can take place, it must be understood certain limitations exist in this research, thereby influencing any observations and conclusions. Firstly, dark tourism is an emerging field and there is limited prior research on the topic, particularly in the area of motivation. Therefore, there are no precedents by which to compare. Findings are exploratory and stepping-stones for much needed additional research.

Secondly, there are limitations in the methodology of the study. The sample was taken from a specific population: it was collected over a one-week period in March 2002, during spring break. Therefore, given it was a holiday period, the incidence of vacationers, students and other specialized populations may be higher than during other times of the year.
During the compilation of the sample database, datum was taken from handwritten information cards. Given the use of handwriting, mistakes in addresses (particularly email addresses) were possible and some therefore may have not received surveys. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, there was a significant time gap between the initial pre-contact postcard mail out and the mailing/emailing of the actual surveys. During the interim, potential respondents may have moved, lost interest or forgotten information.

Email surveying is also a relatively new method. While almost half the sample reported email addresses, not everyone is comfortable using computers and may have been too intimidated to use technology. Furthermore, given potential fears of computer viruses, some respondents may not have opened the email although pre-contact postcards were sent.

Thirdly, author bias may exist. Having a personal interest in dark tourism lead to this study, and although an extensive literature review was undertaken, some of the initial motivators came from the author’s own assumptions. Hence, additional motivations may exist that the author is unaware of.

Fourthly, although this research attempted to understand visitor motivation, it is recognized that the survey was administered post-visit and responses are likely influenced by the museum experience. As a result, there may be mixing of the concepts of motivation and experience, and while this research is exploratory this overlap is seen as a limitation.
Finally, this study looks only at the Holocaust Museum Houston as a case study and therefore results may not necessarily apply to other sites of dark tourism. One of the initial aims of this paper was to see if motivations at the museum reflect overall dark tourism sites. Yet it must be kept in mind, the study did only look at one site and results must be seen in that light.

The above limitations must then be taken into consideration when reviewing the following chapters. While information is based on an extensive literature review, a museum focus group and a detailed survey analysis, conclusions and inferences are influenced by study limitations and the author’s own biases. To assist in substantiating this work, further research is needed in the area of dark tourism.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction to Data Analysis and Results

Research for the study occurred in two interrelated steps. First, a focus group took place where six museum staff members were interviewed regarding their thoughts on visitor motivation. Information garnered from the meeting was then applied to a survey mailed out to the sample. Subsequently, analysis of the data took place in two separate steps: of the focus group and the survey.

In this chapter, results from the focus group and survey are discussed on a basic level. Observations are made simply on the findings: Chapters V and VI however, do go into more detail. Chapter V provides a discussion of the results while Chapter VI summarizes the conclusions of this study, the implications for further research and the implications for dark tourism managers and administrators.

4.2 Focus Group Analysis and Results

A focus group was utilized in this study as an integral step in the survey design. The literature on thanatourism and dark tourism gives limited understanding of why individuals attend such sites; therefore, it is important to gain a broader perspective on visitor motivation. Museum staff, docents, and volunteers encounter visitors on a daily basis in an intimate manner. Hence, it was believed that they could provide additional insights into why visitors come to the Holocaust Museum Houston specifically and sites of dark tourism in general. These insights were then woven into the survey questions.
From the focus group discussion, sixteen themes emerged. These themes were recurrent topics discussed by focus group participants. Given their repetition by a variety of individuals, they were considered to be important concepts and therefore analyzed.

Much of what was discovered correlated to what was found in academic and popular writings. Of the sixteen major themes, ten were found in the literature review: death and dying, education, exhibits, media, personal connection, morbid curiosity, remembrance, history, survivors’ guilt and catharsis. This reinforced the original variables intended for the survey and therefore they were included as questions. Furthermore, motivation, an eleventh and separate theme, was found during analysis; however, participant discussion in that area focused on previously mentioned themes.

Three of the remaining themes were considered site specific and were not included in this survey. These included visitor types, visitation dates and visitation duration. While each theme could provide insight into motivation, in themselves they were not actual motivators.

Finally, two additional themes surfaced during analysis: hope and change. Change was expressed as a post-visit response versus a motivation to come to the museum, and was therefore not included in the survey. However, hope was expressed as a motivation during the focus group. Meeting survivors and witnessing others in a worse predicament could provide individuals with hope that they could survive their own, personal ordeals. Due to this potential motivation for visitation, hope was included in the survey.
The following paragraphs individually recount the results observed in the focus group analysis. Again, any discussion or final conclusions on these results take place in Chapters V and VI.

4.2.1 Visitor Types

The results were unanimous that the Holocaust Museum Houston attracts a diverse composition of visitors. As one docent commented, the museum attracts, “All kinds of people” (Focus Transcripts 2002). From gang members and sociology students, to nurses and quilters, visitors from all walks of life visit the museum.

4.2.2 Visitation Dates

Although the museum’s clientele varies widely, spring is reported to be the busiest time of year for visitation to the museum. This is in part because Holocaust education takes place in the spring. Elementary school groups visit the museum on field trips while older students make use of the museum’s library as term papers come due. Spring is also reported to be the busiest time of year due to spring break. The 2002 break saw 2,500 visitors come to the museum (Focus Transcripts 2002).

In addition to spring break, museum staff also report other holidays as being busy periods. Memorial Day and July 4th report high visitation, as does Mother’s Day. In the amazed words of one staff member, “And another funny thing, odd thing, is that on holidays, for instance. Well not real holidays, but Mother's Day for instance. It's packed. And who would think you would come to take your mother to the Holocaust Museum. But there are” (Focus Transcripts 2002).
4.2.3 Visitation Duration

Although some visitors stay three hours, the majority of people at the museum visit for two to two and half-hours.

4.2.4 Death and Dying

Although the literature on visitor motivation does not directly maintain that death and dying influence visitation to sites of death and disaster, the author theorizes that it does play a role in people’s interest in the subject. Furthermore, the literature on death and dying supports the notion that some sectors of North American society may not have a deep understanding of either process. Some segments of contemporary society have placed dying individuals into hospitals and nursing homes, away from friends and family. Pietroni (1991), reported that 70% of the terminally ill die in institutions. As a result, some individuals may feel separated from death and lack understanding.

Insights from the focus group discussion further supported the idea that visitors may be interested in sites of death and disaster because of a lack of understanding. One participant stated that, “…in our culture we're so separated from death and most destruction that there's a fascination with seeing that” (Focus Transcripts 2002). This opinion was seconded by another participant, who felt that,

…in the United State people don't like to talk about death. Europeans they're more used to it and if you start thinking on the way you should think, I think, the minute you're born you start dying. So it's, it's a, no way out. Can't do nothing about it. You have ten thousand dollars, you can be frozen and wait two hundred years. But the United States is bad about it. They just don’t like to talk about it (Focus Transcripts 2002).

With this additional insight, it was decided to include a question on death and dying on the survey. Rather than ask outright if they thought sites of dark tourism
provided an outlet for understanding death, respondents were asked to report what mechanisms contemporary society has to deal with death and dying. Included on this list were Museums and Other. From this question, we can garner an understanding how society copes with death and disaster and if museums play a role.

Interestingly, the discussion revealed one group who currently uses the museum as an education center for death and dying: student nurses. With a number of hospitals located in close proximity to the museum, it is reported that, “Nurse groups and groups of student nurses who are studying death and dying” often come into the Holocaust Museum Houston (Focus Transcripts 2002). The museum then, does provide a forum for understanding death and dying. Although these specific visitors come to the museum for the specific purpose, they are still motivated by a want to understand death and dying.

4.2.5 Education

Within the broad spectrum of education, two major subthemes emerged. First, is the use of interactive, sensory programs to stimulate visitors and make the exhibits more relevant to the lives of the visitors. The museum takes a highly sensory approach to their education programs and activities. Staff gave one instance of an artist who constructed a large butterfly out of six million plus soda tabs, one to represent each of the six million Jews who lost their lives in the Holocaust. This artwork subsequently came to the Holocaust Museum Houston as a temporary exhibit. For visiting students, it was a useful illustration using something they could relate to. A child may not comprehend six million deaths, but he or she can grasp six million pop tabs. One focus group participant
recounted when a child dropped a soda tab and the other children chastised him for dropping a real person.

Another illustrative example of a sensory, relevant program that the museum offers is the gang program the Executive Director developed. She developed a three-day program for gangs with the Holocaust as a backdrop for teaching as some gang members might see the parallels with the Holocaust and their lives. One participant noted these parallels. “I just think because they, they can relate to a lot of this cause you know. But we have kids that've had their heads split open, some much worse than that, they have gun shot wounds. In the beginning, we had hard-core gang members in here and they brought everybody back because they could relate to this” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002). Even with gangs, sensory, relevant programs can make a difference.

The second subtheme to emerge was the types of students that make use of the programs. Although they receive a variety of students, they predominantly see school groups, “…who have in some way been touched by the Holocaust in their education, their curriculum” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

From the discussion with museum staff, it is evident their programs pull in visitors with interesting, interactive, and relevant activities. Furthermore, these programs are integrated with the school curriculum to attract large numbers of school groups. Education appears to a key motivator to individuals coming to the museum.

4.2.6 Hope

Hope emerged as an unexpected topic of discussion. As a visitor motivation, it did not appear in the literature, yet it was discussed by a number of participants.
However, it must be noted that the museum’s proximity to a large number of hospitals may be an influencing factor. Focus group participants noted that a number of patients from nearby hospitals come into the museum. One volunteer expressed her admiration,

And it's amazing that they would come because I've had people who have their little marks where they're going to radiation and here there. You know I can't give a tour when I am feeling bad, when I'm sick because it's just too much. But here they're in a horrible place in their lives and they choose to come here (Focus Group Transcripts 2002).

This visitation was explained by the fact that perhaps people felt better after a visit, that they felt hope.

The fact that people have the opportunity to meet Holocaust survivors also provides a forum for hope. For those in less fortunate circumstances, “Perhaps, you know they meet a survivor…and …that…gives them hope that they can be, grow up to be a normal being, laugh at jokes that are personal” (Focus Transcripts 2002). Therefore, although the museum’s proximity to numerous hospitals may influence hope being a motivator, it was included in the survey. A number of key points were raised as to the survivors themselves providing hope, and this could induce visitation.

### 4.2.7 Museum Exhibits and Displays

The museum houses a permanent exhibit that functions as the core attraction; however, it also features a number of temporary exhibits that serve to promote repeat visitation among other things. As with the education component, experiential exhibits are reported to be the most successful. Furthermore, visitors often sight the people behind the voices as some of these individuals can also be found working in the museum on any given day.
The temporary exhibits appear to have even more pull for the visitors. Museum staff report that people come in and ask what exhibit is being featured. “And the changing exhibits believe it or not bring repeats back to an exhibit. People who have been here before, they just want come into to see what we have in our changing exhibit” (Focus Transcripts 2002). Therefore, in accordance with the literature, exhibits do have the ability to pull visitors to the museum.

4.2.8 Media

During the discussion with the focus group, the media emerged as a tremendous influence on people’s knowledge of the Holocaust, although it was recognized that this influence is both positive and negative. This knowledge in turn has the capacity to both positively and negatively impact visitation.

For many school children, The Diary of Anne Frank is their first encounter with the Holocaust. Today however, the influence of the media has expanded as more mediums become available. The movie Schindler’s List provides a useful example. One participant revealed that, “…they used to say that Anne Frank has made, I think it was fifty million copies made of Anne Frank, I can get the fact number. But on one night alone, 64 million people sat down and watched Schindler's List uninterrupted…” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

This exposure impacts museum visitation, for awareness brings in visitors. Yet exposure does not necessarily have to be good. One staff member recognized the old adage that bad press is better than no press. “It's like movie stars and they say no press is bad press because it keeps your name up there. Even during the whole Enron thing,
people kept say it's not bad that y'all are so closely related to the Lay's and Enron. Your name is splashed in the *New York Times* and *Newsweek* and *Time Magazine*” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

Another illustration of good media exposure occurred when the museum was exhibiting quilts and giving quilts to school classes to give to a needy child. Quilters from the Houston Quilt Convention caught wind of this and immediately responded. “It's the biggest convention we have, and they heard about this, and so they gave us hundreds and hundreds of quilts so that we'd have a stack of quilts all day” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

Another positive media influence to emerge from the discussion was the rise in popularity of the History Channel. The participants felt that the History Channel has opened the doors to history that were previously shut. Through its entertaining yet informative formatting, the channel has given individuals a unique perspective to the past. “You just read the words and it doesn't mean anything and you make it come alive and people are interested. The history channel cinched the deal. You start to see history from a different point of view than just the names and dates you got in school” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

Discussion however, also centered on the negative effects of the media as an influencing factor for museum visitation. Although media can increase visitation, some feel that too much exposure creates the opposite effect; people are inundated with information and lose interest.

I guess from the other side there, I know for a while there, there were a lot of Holocaust movies were coming out. Right around when Schindler's List came
out. That was before I had been to the museum and I remember thinking that's that last Holocaust film. I know about it, I've heard about it, and I understand about, and that's all [222]. I don't want to see anymore. So it can have the opposite effect (Focus Transcripts 2002).

Another participant went as far as to say that this over exposure in effect turned the Holocaust into a cliché.

Insensitivity may also be another negative side effect of increasing media exposure. The more people see of the horrors and grim reality of the Holocaust, the less sensitive they become to it. One participant felt that, “Living in the information age and people are just bombarded with more information than I know I can hold. And it's easy to be insensitive you almost have to be (Focus Transcripts 2002).

This was seconded by another participant who explained that, “I think our world, our world is, I mean, communications, the media, you know everything has made us a little more, you know insensitive. Just watch television and they've made that would have never been made twenty or thirty years ago. Five years ago. I think the media plays a large role (Focus Transcripts 2002).

4.2.9 Motivation

Although museum staff can only surmise what visitor motives are, three potential motives were discussed during the focus group. First, as has been hypothesised with a personal connection, visitors come because they want to understand their connection to the Holocaust. Descendants of survivors come in looking for information because their parents will not tell them. Secondly, as presumed from the education standpoint, people come in because they want to know more, to understand. As one participant stated, “I think a lot of time history has dark endings and you, and your education, you're teased a
little bit with the history and you become inquisitive and you just want. You know the results, you already know what's going to happen but it's just going through that process of getting it down I think. I think a lot of history is dark” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002). Thirdly, as also surmised from the literature, people are interested in exhibits, particularly the changing exhibits.

4.2.10 Personal Connection

Establishing a personal connection plays a large role in the operations of the museum and a number of instances were revealed during the focus group where a personal connection to the Holocaust was a motivator. One participant found that, “Second-generation survivors, you know kids of survivors, which come to the survivors' organizations to ask about where their parents were because the parents won't tell them” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002). Many of these adult children are seeking answers to their family’s history.

However, it is not just a personal connection to Holocaust survivors that motivate people to come to the museum. Some come because they had husbands, fathers or grandfathers that fought in the Second World War. The museum even receives war veterans as visitors. One focus group participant noted, “And a lot of veterans that come in here [176] army veterans. They come in here just to see, and probably most of them have never been here before. They say, I'll just look in here and they want to see how they present it” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002).

Focus group participants revealed that the personal connection is key in getting their message across. By offering experiences with a personal connection they are able
to make it personal and immediate. One individual felt that the stories in the *Voices* video are the most powerful messages they have. They recounted a time when a group of children actually met one of the people behind the voice.

And then it's really neat when one of the survivors is out there like Walter was out there today, he was walking around waiting for me, he's a survivor from the video, and the kids that came out of the movie, and there's Walter, and they were just. They thought he was their long lost brother. So emotional. Walter came in crying (Focus Group Transcripts 2002).

The gang program that was implemented in the museum also works on the premise of personal connection. Many of these children and teenagers come from violent backgrounds and able to identify with the pain of the Holocaust. More importantly, the connection is made how dangerous gangs can be. The Nazis represent a gang with ideals that almost destroyed a culture.

4.2.11 Catharsis

Catharsis was not a common topic in the visitor motivation literature, nor was it a common topic in the focus group. However, the literature dealing with survivors directly discussed how different people coped with their experiences. Some World War I veterans returned to battle scenes to commemorate fallen comrades and to confront their own experiences. The focus group touched on this idea. One Holocaust survivor quoted, “Everybody gets it out from the system different ways, you know, it doesn't bother me. It bothered my brother so he start writing books so he got it out of his system. Everybody, some of them still won't talk about it” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

Consequently, a question was included in the survey on catharsis. Should the museum get a high number of people visiting because they have personal connections to
the Holocaust or related events, perhaps then a question on catharsis may be relevant to their experience.

### 4.2.12 Morbid Curiosity

There was little consensus from the focus group on the topic of morbid curiosity, although all agreed people visit because of it. Visitors at the Holocaust Museum Houston have expressed morbid curiosity. Individuals in the Memorial Room where victims’ ashes are displayed often wish to see the ashes, but are embarrassed for fear of appearing morbid. Similarly, some individuals want to meet survivors and occasionally request to see their tattoos from the concentration camp. Although one of the volunteers was offended by the seeming insensitivity of individuals looking to see the tattoos, the survivor in the focus group did not find this morbid or disturbing.

There was a divergence in the group on what causes morbid curiosity. One camp feels that morbid curiosity stems from a lack of exposure, particularly visual exposure. One participant felt that, “…there is an attraction to just to the, the morbid aspects. Because that's not something we usually see. And to read about these kinds of things, and know that these things happened. It's a totally different thing to see a picture of it than” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

Conversely, other participants believe that morbid attraction occurs because we are over exposed to the morbid. One woman thought, “… there's a lot of morbidity around. September 11 and television and I'm just amazed at the things that you know, that five children drowned. I think that children hear that from the television over and over and over. To me the morbidity is around everywhere” (Focus Transcripts 2002).
This was furthered by another participants who stated that, “I think it's around everywhere, but I think that part of it too, that there's so much gratuitous violence, in the movies, and in your head…” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002).

Although there is little agreement as to what morbid curiosity is and where it may come from, participants agree that it does indeed motivate individuals to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston. Hence, it was included as a survey question.

### 4.2.13 Remembrance

The idea of remembrance at sites of dark tourism appears to be especially poignant when discussed in the context of the Holocaust. Contemporary society has innumerable ways of remembering victims of tragedy: family members; oral history; photographs; cemeteries; videotapes; audio tape recordings; television footage; newspaper clippings. However, for many Holocaust victims, there is little if anything to remember them by. One focus group participant recognized,

…we have photographs of a tenth of the people who were related to Houston's survivors that died in the Holocaust. There's nothing to remember those people. No cemetery and no photographs. That would be ninety percent of them. It's as though they never existed. And to think in sixty years it would be as though you never existed. Coming here, at least I have grandchildren someday that will pass this museum and say that place a lot to her. And so, it's something about being remembered that people go to (Focus Transcripts 2002).

Abraham, a Holocaust survivor and a focus group participant supported this idea, testifying, “I tell people sometime go to the memorial room it's my grandparents' cemetery. Two flags over there for my mother, my sister, my father. And my two pairs of grandparents” (Focus Transcripts 2002). Therefore, from the focus group, a
consensus appears that people need a place of remembrance, a concrete symbol of what was lost, a place to pay respects and to remember.

The idea of remembrance at the Holocaust museum was also highlighted by the importance of living witnesses. It is vital that these survivors are given a voice in order to keep the memories alive, and sites such as the museum provide these voices. Museums such as the Holocaust Museum Houston are repositories for people who help keep the memory alive. This will become increasingly important in the next twenty years as one participant noted.

I think as survivors are getting on in the twilight of their years, I think you have a lot of people who come in just because they realize a lot of these witnesses and survivors won't be here thirty years from now...And then it's up to institutions like this to keep the memory alive because we won't have these great eyewitnesses, the Bob Dole's, the Abraham's of this world (Focus Group Transcripts, 2002).

From the focus group discussion it becomes clear that remembrance plays an important role in Holocaust Museum Houston. It provides not only a place of remembrance for the generations directly affected by the Holocaust, but equally as important, it provides a place of remembrance for generations to come. And with remembrance comes understanding and learning and the hope that such events will never happen again.

4.2.14 History

Contrary to the literature, little was said in regards to if visitors come to the museum because of an interest in history. However, participants recognized unanimously that a good teacher can spur an interest in history. Teachers that stimulate and encourage students provoke learning. One participant noted that, “...they'll
remember something they really enjoyed learning about in school and they'll come back just because of the teacher” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

More recently, the history channel has provided that stimulation to learn. One participant recognized that, “There are lots of people that are just more interested in history. They have the History Channel. You start to see history from a different point of view than just the names and dates you got in school” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002). Another participant furthered this idea, stating, “You just read the words and it doesn't mean anything and you make it come alive and people are interested. The History Channel cinched the deal” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002).

**4.2.15 Change**

One of the surprising themes that emerged from the focus group discussion was that of change. Neither the literature nor the author supposed that change would be a factor in the visitor’s experience. However, a number of participants made note of how people change from when they enter the museum to when they leave. As one individual simply stated, “They change. From beginning to end” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002). Some felt that people were more sombre when they left and this was because, “…the museum makes it all so real. Living in the information age and people are just bombarded with more information than I know I can hold. And it's easy to be insensitive you almost have to be” (Focus Group Transcripts 2002).

This change, however, is difficult to judge subjectively. Some visitors may experience a change in attitude yet not recognize it immediately or at all. Therefore, since people may not recognize change, it was not included on the survey.
4.2.16 Survivors’ Guilt

Survivors’ guilt is another topic that is not directly discussed in the literature and is one that the focus group also felt that was not an overriding factor. This was explained by one participant who stated,

I’ve never met a person over here who's talked about it, if they came in here, we certainly didn't notice because you can't see it in their faces, it's just going to be old people. Like you don't know what they did in their past. I don't know if people, like feel guilt for it. And I think that most young people would, not all young people, but most of them would realize that there's, there's no need for a young person to feel guilty because. A young person who's apologizing to a survivor doesn't mean anything because they weren't here (Focus Group Transcripts, 2002).

Although neither the literature nor the focus group considered survivors’ guilt a motivator, it was included on the survey due to the potential of high survivor visitation. Due to the recency of the events, a high number of survivors are still alive and able to visit the museum. Furthermore, survivors’ guilt is a personal issue that may not be easily expressed by individuals nor recognized by staff or volunteers. People may therefore be experiencing guilt despite the lack of evidence.

However, one respondent did envision some instances where visitors might express guilt in regards to the Holocaust. “I do think there are some religious groups that come in that will tell you they're in here because their religion didn't step up to the plate and try to prevent what went on” (Focus Transcripts 2002).

4.3 Survey Analysis

After incorporating information from the focus group into the questionnaire, the survey was administered to the sample. Of the original 500 surveys sent out, 186 were found to be admissible for final analysis. In the following pages, survey results are
merely noted in sequential order. Results are set to stand out by themselves. Observations and any significant findings and conclusions are elaborated in Chapters V and VI.

4.3.1 Survey Questions

**Question 1A: Are you a resident of Houston?**

Question 1A asked if people were residents of Houston. Of the total sample, over half were *not* from the Houston area (104 respondents or 55.9%) while 69 individuals (37.1%) reported being residents; however, 13 respondents (7%) left it blank.

**Question 1B: If not a resident, do you live within 100 miles of Houston?**

This question examined those who are not residents of Houston and asked if they lived within 100 miles. This was asked as people within this distance could easily make their trip to Houston a day trip. Further afar than that, some people might stay longer and have differing motivations. As observed above, a total of 104 participants answered no they were not residents of Houston. Of those, 87 respondents (46.8% of the total sample) stated they did *not* live within 100 miles of the city while 17 individuals (9.1% of the total sample) did.

In sum, the residency of visitors is relatively evenly divided. Almost half of the respondents (87 individuals or 46.8%) reported they are *not* residents of Houston and live over 100 miles away. Conversely, almost half of the respondents (86 individuals or 46.2%) stated they do live in Houston or within 100 miles.
Question 2A: If you are not a resident, what brought/attracted you to Houston?

Question 2A was a closed-ended question that asked respondents not from Houston to check the variables that brought/attracted them to the city. A slight majority of the visitors (49 or 26.3%) chose the Holocaust Museum Houston itself as being what attracted them to the city. Visiting friends and family was second (39 or 21%), followed by visiting the city for vacation (34 or 18.3%). Shopping and business (at 10 or 5.4% each) were cited as reasons visitors came to the city. Other was a final option for respondents and represents 13.4% (or 25) of the total sample.

Those who replied Other were given space to expand their answers and during analysis, four main themes emerged. Some respondents reported being in Houston to visit the Veterans Affairs Hospital but did not elaborate on the reasons for their visit. The second major theme found was respondents coming to the city for school related activities but few specified further other than to mention research purposes. Thirdly, the attraction of other Houston destinations surfaced, particularly visiting other museums (non-specified) and Moody Gardens. Finally, a supportive role emerged with some respondents replying they were accompanying friends with Jewish roots who wanted to go.

Question 2B: What was your primary reason for visiting Houston?

Although non-resident respondents reported the Holocaust Museum Houston as being their main reason for being attracted to the city, it was not their primary reason for visiting. The majority of these individuals were primarily attracted to the city to visit friends and relatives (29 or 15.6% of the sample). This was followed by vacation (24 or
12.9%) and then the museum (20 or 10.8%) The Other category was next (15 or 8.1%) while only five people (2.7%) came to Houston primarily to shop. No one reported business as being his or her primary reason for coming to Houston.

No qualitative analysis was done as respondents did not elaborate on their Other response.

**Question 3: Have you been to the Museum previously? If yes, how many times?**

Question 3 sought to uncover repeat visitation to the museum. Part A asked if respondents had been to the site previously. A large majority of the sample (132 or 70.9%) reported they had never been to the Holocaust Museum Houston before. Only 18.3% (or 34 respondents) replied they this was as a repeat visit. However, it must be observed that 20 respondents did not reply to this question (10.8%).

Part B asked repeat visitors to specify how many times they had previously been to the museum. Twenty-five respondents (or 13.4%) reported having been once before, while nine (or 4.8%) had been twice. No one reported as to have visited the museum more than two times.

**Question 4: Have you previously visited any other museum and/or site directly related to the Holocaust? If yes, which one(s)?**

Question 4 sought to uncover visitation to other Holocaust sites for it was believed frequent visitation to other sites might indicate a relationship with other push and pull factors. For instance, if a person visited a number of related sites, they might be pushed to experience heritage or history or pulled by education and remembrance. This question had a 98.9% response rate (or 184 respondents). A vast majority reported to
have *never* been to similar sites (147 or 79%) while only 37 individuals (or 19.9%) stated they had attended other such places.

Part B asked respondents to specify what Holocaust sites they have previously attended. Two themes emerged from the qualitative analysis. Firstly, respondents have visited a limited number of additional museums throughout the United States. With over one hundred Holocaust museums, memorials and research centers in the US (Cole 1999), survey respondents have visited only three sites: Washington, Boston, and Miami.

Secondly, respondents have even less international experience. Of literally thousands of Holocaust remembrance sites outside of the United States, only one was specified by respondents: the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam with ten respondents noting it (or 5.4%). The same ten individuals also reported visiting concentration camps in Europe; however, none could remember the names, while four noted they were in located somewhere in Germany. It must be noted that one individual later reported having visited Yad Vashem in Jerusalem but did not do so in this question.

**Question 5: Are you or anyone you’re closely related to, connected to any of the following events associated with the Holocaust?**

Question 5 attempted to establish an overall heritage connection for visitors to the museum, although not strictly in a Jewish context. It asked respondents if they or anyone they are closely related to are or were connected to World War II, the Jewish Diaspora or other events related to the Holocaust. Respondents however, do not appear to have noteworthy connections to events surrounding the Holocaust. Only 37.1% (or 69 respondents) reported to somehow being connected to World War II. Furthermore, only
4.8% (or 9 respondents) reported being connected to the Jewish Diaspora. Another 5.4% (or 10 respondents) noted they were connected to the events through Other means.

Of the ten respondents that reported Other, three themes emerged during qualitative analysis. Firstly, there was an indirect family connection, but not enough to be considered close connections for respondents. These individuals (2) reported their in-laws were survivors while some (2) noted their grandparents were involved in the war.

A second surprising theme was some respondents (5) felt simply being human connected them to the Holocaust in particular. One respondent poignantly responded he or she was connected to the events associated with the Holocaust simply because he or she was, “…part of the human race” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Finally, a very minor educational theme was found to connect a single respondent to the events surrounding the Holocaust. One individual replied that, “My High School AP program required a senior thesis. The writing of Elie Wiesel was my topic” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

**Question 6: Are you personally related to or connected to anyone affected by the Holocaust? If yes, please check all that apply.**

Question 6 also sought to establish a specific Holocaust heritage connection for visitors to the museum. It asked whether they knew anyone affected by the Holocaust directly and what that exact connection was. The vast majority said no, they are not personally connected to nor do they know anyone affected by the Holocaust (84.4% or 157 respondents). Twenty-five (13.4%) individuals responded positively to this question. Only four respondents failed to respond (2.2%).

For those who do feel personally connected to the Holocaust, the second part of the question gave nine specific variables for respondents to chose from in order to
establish the relationship. Of those that replied, distant relatives, spouse, grandparents, friends and faith were the five reported connections. No one answered they themselves were connected to the Holocaust, nor did any report parents or siblings.

Fourteen respondents (7.5%) stated they had distant relatives connected to the Holocaust, while another ten each reported having grandparents (5.4%) and spouses (5.4%) connected. Five respondents (2.7%) were connected to the Holocaust via faith, while another five (2.7%) noted they were connected through friends.

Ten people responded Other; of those, nine reported having friends who had family and distant relatives affected by the Holocaust, but they themselves were not directly related. However, none of these respondents answered as such in the closed-ended portion of the question. The final respondent was the individual doing research on Elie Wiesel.

**Question 7A: If you feel personally connected to the Holocaust, what is that connection?**

Question 7 attempted to establish what precisely the individual personal connection was: survivor, victim, liberator, descendent or other. A vast majority continued to report *no* connection whatsoever (68.3% or 127 respondents), yet 31.7% (49) do feel personally connected. No one reported being a survivor or victim; however, five respondents each reported being a liberator (2.3%) and a descendent (2.3%). Of those who answered this question positively, most reported being connected via Other (26.3% or 49).

Using Atlas Ti to analyze the qualitative portion of this question, two major themes and one lesser ones emerged. Firstly, a large portion of the respondents who
chose Other, reported empathy, compassion and sadness over the Holocaust as being their connectors. One individual felt, “All humankind should feel sadness and anger that it happened and deep empathy and compassion for victims and survivors of this atrocity” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another was, “Simply a person interested in humanity towards one another” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another felt he or she has, “…fully inherited the history of the Holocaust, and its logical ramifications for the future” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Similarly, one respondent was, “Just someone who believes we should not forget” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

A second major theme that emerged was based on shared experiences. Some respondents reported feeling empathetic connections due to their own ethnic background, specifically, African and Native American. One individual reported because of such ancestry, they belonged to, “…other populations that suffered from similar horrible events in history” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another responded that he or she could relate to the hate of one group towards another because of, “…the past struggle and genocide of my people” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

The third theme to emerge was again a non-familial connection. In-laws were reported as being the connector to the Holocaust while others personally knew people who have survived the Holocaust but did not expand on the relationship.

Finally, somewhat of an anomaly was found in this question. Although Descendent was listed as a category, one respondent who chose Other elaborated that he or she was a, “…descendent of German immigrants/ Related to former Nazis” (Survey
Transcripts 2003). Furthermore, this individual did not indicate a connection as Descendent in the closed-ended portion of the question.

**Question 7B: If you are connected to anyone you feel is affected by the Holocaust, what is their connection?**

This question sought to establish the precise relationship of the 26.3% (49) that reported being personally connected to the Holocaust. Again, being a descendant was the most reported category (18.8% or 35). Fourteen (7.5%) respondents noted they were connected to survivors, while five individuals each (2.7%) stated they were connected to victims and Other. Finally, four respondents (2.2%) noted they were connected to liberators.

Qualitative analysis revealed one common theme: all five individuals who responded Other reported they are connected to people who were witness to the Holocaust. However, none elaborated further.

**Question 8: Have you attended any educational events related to the Holocaust in the past six months? If yes, what kinds of educational events were they?**

This question attempted to uncover if people were interested in any educational events related to the Holocaust, including World War II and the Jewish Diaspora. The vast majority of respondents reported they did not attend any educational activities (84.4% or 157 respondents). However, 19 individuals (10.2%) did not respond to this question. Of the ten (5.4%) that answered yes they attended educational events, five had seen documentaries and five respondents said Other, citing attendance at teacher workshops on the Holocaust. No one elaborated on specific documentaries.
**Question 9A: What attracted you to the Holocaust Museum Houston?**

This question inquired specifically what attracted respondents (push factors) to the Holocaust Museum Houston. A majority of individuals reported education attracted them to the site (71% or 132). This was followed by remembrance (53% or 98), curiosity (45.2% or 84), artifacts/exhibits (44.6% or 83), hope (13.4% or 25), Other (12.9% or 24), and finally nostalgia (7.5% or 14).

**Question 9B: For any of the above reasons you checked, please explain how they influenced your decision to visit the Museum.**

Respondents were subsequently given a chance to expand on their answers for question 9B. Each variable was analysed separately using Atlas Ti and are discussed below.

**Education**

The most evident theme by far that emerged was education as a means of preventing similar events from happening in the future. For many, it is as simple as noting, “We should all remain educated to ensure that it doesn't happen again” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Other respondents concurred, stating they, “Believe that if we do not learn from such things we are doomed to repeat them” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another felt, “I just think the holocaust is an important chapter in the history of humanity, a lesson about how horrible one person can be to another and it should not be forgotten” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Secondly, other respondents emphasized the importance of educating future generations, particularly their own children. One individual visited because he or she, “…wanted to visit the museum to now [sic] more about the holocaust [sic] and, in this
way, to have information to tell...[his or her]...sons and teach them what racism can do” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another, “…wanted [her] children (16 and 13 at the time) to understand the significance, scope, and horror of the Holocaust” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Finally, one teacher felt the need to reach his or her students about understanding the Holocaust. “I am a US History Teacher and believe that students need to be aware of the Holocaust. By visiting the exhibit I could better relate these events to my classes” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

A third theme that emerged from education was a simple need to understand the Holocaust. Respondents wrote they, “…wanted to see what the museum was like and to see how it affected so many lives” (Survey Transcripts 2003) or “…just wanted to know the facts about the Holocaust” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Others simply wanted to know more. Finally, one respondent thought, “…the holocaust [sic] is an important chapter in the history of humanity, a lesson about how horrible one person can be to another and it should not be forgotten. I wanted to know as much about is as possible” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

**Remembrance**

Two themes emerged from the remembrance segment of the question. Firstly, there is a feeling that remembrance is affiliated with prevention through education. Respondents expressed the opinion that society should remember so that, “…nothing like that ever happens again” (Survey Transcripts 2003). One individual elaborated, stating, “I feel that all people have a duty to their fellow man to study and to remember acts of genocide. The terrible awareness is required in order to prevent repetition”
(Survey Transcripts 2003). Another concurred, saying, “In remembering, I hope that we will know enough in the future to stop dictators from such undertakings before it reaches such epic proportions” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

The second theme was remembrance of the people who suffered in the Holocaust. For some it was a personal. One respondent stated he or she came in, “Honor and remembrance of Steve's family” (Survey Transcripts 2003). For others, remembrance was broader, encompassing all Holocaust victims and survivors. “The people who suffered and the extraordinary episodes of heroism and survival should never be forgotten…” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Others agreed, noting, “I feel that all people have a duty to their fellow man to study and to remember acts of genocide” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

**Artifacts/Exhibits**

One theme surfaced from artifacts/exhibits analysis: individuals appear drawn to the museum to artifacts by a combination of both curiosity and education. One respondent noted, “I have not been exposed to many artifacts from that time period and I am a World War II history buff of some sort” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another individual disclosed that artifacts and exhibits influenced his or her decisions, “…to visit the Museum in that I just wanted to know the facts about the Holocaust” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Finally, another reported, “My boyfriend and I wanted to visit the museum to learn more about the Holocaust, see the museum, and look at the artifacts/exhibits because the Holocaust was such a shocking part of our recent past” (Survey Transcripts 2003).
Nostalgia

No one responded directly into the qualitative section of this question. Any conclusions stemming from this are discussed in Chapters V and VI.

Curiosity

From the analysis of curiosity, one theme was found: individuals were drawn to visit the museum by a combination of curiosity and education. Respondents reported being curious to see what the museum and its contents were like. Some were curious about the museum itself, some were curious about its artifacts and exhibits, while others, “…wanted to know the facts about the Holocaust” (Survey Transcripts 2003). There appeared to be an overall curiosity, but often justified by an educational/historical interest in the subject.

History

History was not a well-represented category; only one individual noted he or she has, “…read a few books about Jewish history” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Other

A number of individuals reported being attracted to the Holocaust Museum Houston for reasons other than listed above. From analysis of this category, three themes emerged. Firstly, respondents reported being personally connected to the Holocaust in some indirect way. Some feel this connection through personal relationships with individuals who experienced the events. One, “…had a friend in high school whose mother was a survivor and had come to talk to us” (Survey Transcript 2003). Another reported being, “…a retired teacher of history and government…As a student and
teacher I had several friends, colleagues, and students who had relatives who were either victims or survivors of the Holocaust, and I lived in what had once been a predominantly Jewish neighborhood where I came in contact with others” (Survey Transcript 2003).

One individual found that although they may not have been initially attracted because of personal connections, after the experience they were prompted to learn more about their family. “Ever since it opened, I have wanted to go…And after I went I was interested in the connection my loved ones (alive at the time) had to it. I found that my pawpaw was a pilot and that my pawpaw helped to liberate Auschwitz” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Secondly, other personal, non-specific Holocaust connections were found to be an attraction to the museum. One individual has, “…a friend who is a docent at the museum and I wanted to hear his tour” (Survey Transcript 2003). The retired teach quoted above also noted having been, “…interested in World War II since the age of four. I have very distinct memories of the news of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Moreover, I have many relatives who served in the armed forces of the USA, and I have lived with veterans of the war when I served the in the U.S. Navy, enlisting when I was seventeen years of age” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another respondent, “…lived on a kibbutz in Israel for a year…” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

A third theme to surface was somewhat related to education, although respondents reported their answers in the Other category as opposed to the education category. Some individuals stated they were attracted to the museum for further understanding of the Holocaust. One person mentioned the influence of Anne Frank’s
diary, which incited him or her to, “...know more” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another respondent noted, “I have always been fascinated by what went on, I wanted to get a realer [sic] sense of what it was about. Make it become more personal for me” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

**Question 10: Does this guilt play any part in your coming to the Museum today? Please explain.**

This question attempted to establish what role, if any, does guilt play in influencing people to come to the museum. The majority of respondents (73.7% or 137) stated no, they do not experience guilt in relation to the Holocaust; however, 25 individuals (13.4%) did acknowledge experiencing some guilt. Yet when asked if this guilt was related to being a survivor, not a single respondent answered yes.

The question also asked if guilt played a part in that day’s visit. Five (2.7%) individuals answered yes. The one theme to emerge from guilt was its association with family. While others simply stated family, one individual detailed, “My feelings of guilt are related to a branch of my family and my ethnicity perpetuating the Holocaust” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Although he or she did not elaborate further, this individual had replied previous that his or her family were German immigrants related to former Nazis.

Another individual replied, “I'm not so sure that I would exactly call it guilt, maybe I'd call it sorrow at the atrocities [sic] done to Jewish men, women and children. You see, I found out from my grandmother shortly before she died that her mother was Jewish, so maybe I feel like I have something in common with the Jewish people” (Survey Transcripts 2003).
Question 11: What do you think are the most effective aids in coping with death or dying in today’s society?

This question attempted to discover if understanding death and dying was a motivator for museum visitation. Individuals were asked to check a number of different methods they used in coping with death and dying, including museums. Friends and family were both by far are the most common means of dealing with death. Almost three-quarters of the sample felt friends (74% or 137) and family (74% or 137) were effective coping aids. Others found spirituality (63.4% or 118), church (50% or 93), and personal mediation (37.1% or 69) to be helpful. Medical institutions offered solace through counselling (23.7% or 44) and the medical profession (18.3% or 34). Finally, museums were reported by 21% (39) of the sample to be an effective aid in coping with death and dying in today’s society.

Fifteen individuals (8.1%) stated that they used Other coping mechanisms, and two themes emerged during quantitative analysis. Firstly, although church and spirituality were offered as closed-ended options, several respondents reiterated similar concepts. One individual stated, “For those that are so inclined church may also be a good outlet for them as well” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another felt, “A personal relationship with Jesus Christ”(Survey Transcripts 2003) was an effective aid in coping with death and dying.

Education surfaced as a second theme for coping with death in today’s society. Some felt that education leads to understanding which leads to healing. This was particularly so for events of the magnitude of the Holocaust. As one respondent suggested, “In the case of such massive deaths, education” (Survey Transcripts 2003).
Question 12: How did you find out about the Museum?

To understand media’s influence over visitation, this question attempted to establish how visitors found out about the museum. Friends/family was by far the most common category for obtaining information, reported by 47.3% of the sample (88). Respondents also stated they obtained knowledge of the museum via newspapers (12.9% or 24), travel guides (8.1% or 15), and road signs (8.1% or 15). The museum’s website was noted by 14 visitors (7.5%) as a method of obtaining information. Finally, respondents also found out about the museum through radio programs (5.4% or 10), travel brochures (4.8% or 9), and magazines (2.7% or 5). No one stated they discovered the museum through television programs.

Thirty-four (18.3%) of the respondents cited Other methods of obtaining information about the museum. Two themes emerged from the qualitative information analysis. Firstly, of the 34 individuals that responded Other, 20 cited some form of school or educational means. While most did not specify other than to say school and/or teachers, five visitors reported they attend The Institute for Hebraic Christian Studies. Five more added they visited the Clayton Library located across the street from the museum.

Ten visitors reported awareness because of additional, non-offered media outlets. Four found the museum in the Yellow Pages while six others had previous knowledge of the museum from media coverage during its construction. For example, one respondent observed, “As it was built, it was international news” (Survey Transcripts 2003).
Question 13: Did any of the following influence your decision to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?

This question attempted to further identify the influence of the media, asking respondents what mediums influenced their decision to visit the museum. Friends and family was again the most often cited influence, being reported by 47.3% (84) of the respondents. Documentaries (23.7% or 44) and non-fiction books (23.7% 44) were also influential over the decision making process. Written material was next in importance, with newspaper (13.4% or 25) and magazine (12.9% or 24) articles being reported as influences. Television (8.1% or 15) and movies (8.1% or 15) also held sway over some respondents’ decisions to attend the museum. Finally, five (2.7% or 5) individuals reported non-fictions books as being a reason for their visit.

Nineteen respondents stated Other reasons as being influential in their decision to come to the museum. The most notable theme that arose from qualitative analysis was that none of the additional reasons listed were related to the media. Some individuals cited personal interest while family influenced others in that they brought their children so they could get a better understanding of their history and heritage. Finally, a single individual was influenced via education in that he or she was doing a research paper on Elie Wiesel.

Question 14: Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience at the Holocaust Museum Houston?

Respondents were asked to describe their experience at the Holocaust Museum Houston. This was posed in the belief that additional insight might be gained from understanding the visitor experience. For instance, perhaps subconscious motivations
might surface. This was by large the most detailed qualitative section responded to. A number of themes arose during analysis.

The first theme to surface was the emotional impact the experience had on visitors. Most reported how touched and moved they were by their experience, albeit in a number of differing ways. Many wrote they were moved in a positive way. One respondent, “…felt full of hope to now that There's [sic] an organization that is teaching people about these events so they can not be repeated” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another mentioned how he or she, “…appreciated how the Museum conveyed history in a more personal sense, by focusing on the tales of specific survivors and victims…because mourning for a human being is more impactful [sic] than mourning for a statistic” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

A number of people were also moved, but on a less positive note: many reported feeling deeply saddened. For one respondent, “It was sad to see what humans can do in name of patriotism and racial superiority” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another was, “…sadden [ed] to visit a memorial of such brave and innocent lives” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Still yet, another actually wept, “…for the people who had suffered through and died in this horrendous period of our history” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Education was the second major theme to emerge. As one respondent explained, “I loved it! It enlightened me about the past…” (Survey Transcripts 2003). While many other individuals stated they found the museum very educational, one respondent went as far as stating,

It made me remember that this disaster must never be repeated and that we must effectively teach every generation the lessons to be learned. The Houston
Holocaust Museum should be at least a once in a lifetime mandatory visit for every citizen in the area as should such visits by citizens to other Holocaust museums in metro and rural areas across the nation (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Numerous respondents who felt it was important to remember in order to avoid a repeat of history reiterated this role of preventative education. One respondent felt, “The material displayed enhanced my understanding of the suffering that a specific group of human beings had to endure at the hands of other human beings who somehow forgot their humanity. It made me remember that this disaster must never be repeated…” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another noted, “Some of the images and topics are disturbing but they must be faced by anyone with a conscious” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Respondents themselves were not the only ones to benefit from their educational experience; many were able to take their encounter and transfer it to others. For example, one respondent reported, “I have taught the Holocaust for twenty nine years, however, this visit will enable me to add several different aspects to my teaching of it” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Others spoke of being able to relate the history better to their children. Finally, a number of respondents stated they, “…recommended the Museum to others” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

A third theme that surfaced was the effectiveness of the exhibits. A number of respondents noted how much they enjoyed and learned from the displays. Furthermore, the exhibits seemed to have the most impact on the visitor experience. For one individual, what stuck with him or her most was, “…the images of stacks of dead bodies” (Survey Transcripts 2003). To reiterate a previous respondent, “Some of the
images and topics are disturbing but they must be faced by anyone with a conscious” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

While most individuals commented on photographs and pictures, someone added, “We were very impressed with the exhibits and particularly were interested in the movies, pictures [sic], and bolded quotes” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Another included, “…the artifacts and diaries…” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Others yet spoke of the, “…heart wrenching testimony of the survivors video” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Not all had positive comments in regards to the exhibits, however. Some felt, “…there was too much information to digest at one time” (Survey Transcripts 2003). This is supported by another visitor who was told by the receptionist, “…it would take 1 1/2 hours to go through the exhibit. Three hours later I had to leave without completing my tour” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Others yet, “…expected more artifacts and more of an overview of Holocaust information and statistics” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Some of these comments have to do with a fourth theme: time. A number of respondents felt they did not have enough time to see the museum. For one visitor, he or she, “Wished we had had more time to spend. I don't feel like we got the full benefit with the time restraints we had” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Others yet recognized the time issue and realized they, “…could have spent more time if I had been alone” (Survey Transcripts 2003).

As a smaller theme, some used this question to vocalize any complaints they had about the museum. In addition to the time issue, others felt “…the crowded nature of the
rooms made it impossible to read everything” (Survey Transcripts 2003). One individual felt somewhat affronted by museum’s failure to include certain groups.

There was one thing that made me annoyed however. Except for one small clip in the audio tour, the persecution of Catholics is never mentioned. All other candidates for persecution were mentioned in someway in either pictures or lists, etc. However, Catholics were completely left out. This hurt me. I am a Catholic and we are taught to love all religions. My home church is next to a synagogue and we have such a wonderful relationship with them. I would really like to see a plaque on Saint Maximillian Kolbe who died in Auschwitz. I feel that we need to get rid of the feelings of what the Catholic Church did back then and start the healing process. I was just very disappointed that it seemed so obvious that we were left out (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Finally, one respondent eloquently summed up two of the main themes that emerged from this question: being moved by overwhelming emotions and the museum’s ability to educate.

Visiting the Museum, like watching a movie or TV program about the Holocaust, always generates the question: "How could this have happened?" There is no answer to that. History into the rise to power of Hitler's Nazi Party gives an answer to the political inquiries, but there still remains that underlying disbelief that so many unspeakable horrors could have been carried out, man against man. A visit to the Museum, doesn't give an answer to the question. It does, however, offer more examples of this particular situation and puts yet more faces to the evils perpetrated, but there are still no answers. One walks out into the sunlight after such a visit, takes a deep breath for life and hope, and silently prays that he or she will have the courage to stand up against similar otrocities [sic] in the future. The Holocaust is only the most notorious; similar actions take place all over the world every day but without our notice. Even those directly effected [sic] by the horrors of WWII will not be counted amoung [sic] the protestors of these injustices, as the American Jews were not in the 1930's and 1940's. It seems that we, as caring humans, cannot fathom such things, either. To recognize them is more than we can comprehend. So, we visit the Holocaust Museum and sadly wonder how it can happen (Survey Transcripts 2003).
**Question 15: Is there anything else you would like to share about your reasons for visiting the Holocaust Museum Houston?**

Question 15 was an open-ended question that sought to uncover additional visitor motivations not addressed in the survey. While some respondents used this section to critique the museum (i.e. one individual noted the, “Main exhibit should be changed by 20% each year” (Survey Transcripts 2003)), others detailed reasons for their visit.

From that, one main theme emerged, albeit for varying reasons. Respondents spoke of remembering the Holocaust but for reasons not discussed previously in the survey. Firstly, some came to remember and honor survivors specifically. One respondent eloquently summed,

> I admire and greatly respect all of the survivors of the Holocaust and especially the ones that have faced their trials enough to be able to speak and write about their experiences. They are the ones that will insure [sic] that the past is not forgotten and the true heros [sic] of the Holocaust. That people submitted to such atrocities can go on to live productive lives is amazing (Survey Transcripts 2003).

Secondly, remembering was discussed in the context of laziness. Some mentioned that because of an over abundance of Holocaust information, they felt saturated by data. Conversely, too much information made it easy to let someone else do the remembering. One respondent noted, “I have read many books, saw much film footage, listened to guest speakers, and talked to survivors of the Holocaust. Even so, the mind becomes lazy about remembering, either out of saturation or neglect. The Museum visit served to remind me that I must never allow my mind to become lazy in this regard” (Survey Transcripts 2003).
Question 16: What age group do you fall into?

Visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston are diverse group, with most age cohorts represented. Furthermore, exactly 50% of the respondents reported being between the ages 18-39 and 50% being between the ages of 40-69. Notably, the mean age of respondents is 39.9 years of age.

No one reported being over 69 years of age. However, looking at the statistics overall, the bulk of the visitors fall under the age of 54. The majority (71% or 133 respondents) falls between the ages of 18-49, while 63.4% are between the ages 30-54 (or 118 respondents). Table 2 details the precise breakdown of visitor ages.

Table 2. Age Distribution of Visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 17: What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston appear to be a well-educated group, although 10.6% of the sample did not answer question 17. No one responded as having
an eighth grade education or less, while only four (2.2%) people reported to having some high school. The vast majority have at least some college or university (87.1% or 162 respondents). Furthermore, over half have graduated from a college or university (50.5% or 94 respondents) while 26.9% (50 respondents) have gone onto post-graduate work. Table 3 breaks down exact educational levels.

Table 3. Education Distribution of Visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight Or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Some College/University</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 18: Are you Male or Female?

The gender of visitors is relatively evenly split; however, four (2.2%) individuals did not answer question 18. Of those that did respond, females make up a slight majority with 55.4% of the sample compared to 42.4% for males.

Question 19: What is your faith?

When asked their faith, the majority of respondents (73% or 142) answered they considered themselves Christian. This was followed by 18.3% (or 34) that responded Other. Only 2.7% (5) of the individuals surveyed stated they were Jewish.

Analysis of the Other category revealed two major themes. Firstly, there a lack of belief in some respondents as they answered they were either agnostic or atheists. There
was no elaboration of either of these concepts. Others explained that they were spiritual but not religious, but did not expand further.

The second theme was that of involvement in religions outside of the boundaries of Christianity. One individual stated he or she was raised, “…Christian but now appreciates the religions of the world” (Survey Transcripts 2003). Others noted they were members of the Church of Jesus but again did not elaborate further.

**Question 20: What is your income?**

Although there was a 12.9% (24 respondents) non-response rate, those that responded revealed a large disparity in the incomes of visitors to the museum. Exactly half the respondents reported having an income above $35,000 (50% or 93 respondents) while within that group, the largest percentage was those at more than $65,000 (31.7% or 59 respondents). It would appear that visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston are an affluent group.

However, a large percentage of the respondents earn under $24,999 (24.2% or 45 respondents). Furthermore, within that group a large percent earn under $14,999 (21.5% or 40 respondents). Table 4 details income breakdown.
Table 4. Income Distribution for Visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income ($)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Income ($)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14,999</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45,000-54,999</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55,000-64,999</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-34,999</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65,000+</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000-44,999</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.1 Discussion Introduction

A review of the literature suggested a number of variables that could push and/or pull visitors to sites of dark tourism. As Dann (1977) noted, internal factors can push individuals to destinations while pull factors are those at a destinations that can attract the tourist. At the onset of this study, five research questions were formulated to guide research; two of which centered on the push and pull theory. Individuals may be pushed to such sites through a desire to connect with their heritage, an interest in historical facts, feelings of guilt, nostalgic yearnings, simple curiosity, or an understanding of death and disaster. Additionally, sites of death and disaster have the ability to pull or attract visitors with education, remembrance, curios and artifacts, or site sacralization through the mediation of the media. While the media was originally included under the research questions as a push factor, it evolved to be a mediator between push and pull factors rather than a push factor in itself.

Guided by additional research questions, this study sought to uncover other facets of visitor motivation. Firstly, what other factors influenced visitation as disclosed by the focus group and the visitors themselves; secondly, to discover the role of location in visitor motivation to the HMH; and thirdly, what the management implications are of visitor motivations at sites of death and disaster.

This research then sought to understand what role these dark tourism factors played in visitation at the Holocaust Museum Houston. Congruent with pioneering
researchers in the dark tourism field, the museum constituted a site of dark tourism. In line with Seaton (1999), visitation to the HMH could be considered travel to a synthetic site at which evidence of the dead has been assembled. For Foley and Lennon (2000), travel to the HMH could be consumption of a commodified site of death and disaster. For Rojek (1993), visitation to the HMH could be a visit to a black spot, a commodified site where large number of people met their death (albeit a synthetic site). Hence, at the onset of this study, it was believed that visitors would be motivated by the same or similar variables as found in the dark tourism literature.

A survey of 186 visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston revealed a number of commonalities with the dark tourism push and pull factors. However, it also uncovered a set of circumstances unique to American Holocaust sites touched on briefly in the overall literature review, particularly the location of the museums. Elaboration on each factor follows in the ensuing paragraphs.

5.2 Heritage

Research question 1.3 asked what does heritage affiliation or cultural identity play in visitation to the Holocaust Museum Houston. Survey analysis revealed a lack of motivation based on heritage affiliation. Although the literature detailed personal visitor connections to many sites of death and disaster, it is not a strong factor in visitation to the HMH. Most tellingly, when asked directly what, if any, associations they had with the events, the vast majority replied none. Of those respondents who replied yes, most reported having ties to World War II more so than the Holocaust or the Jewish Diaspora specifically.
When asked about the Holocaust in particular, again the vast majority of respondents stated no, they themselves were not involved nor was anyone they are connected to. Only ten individuals stated they were directly involved with the Holocaust: five as liberators and five as descendants. Others reported having grandparents, distant relatives and spouses connected to the events. A few felt affiliated through faith and friends.

Furthermore, as seen in the analysis, the sample is relatively divided in residency. Given that almost half the population lives within 100 miles of the museum, a high rate of repeat visitation would be expected. Qualitative analysis revealed a number of respondents wished they had more time to experience the museum. Again, indicating the likelihood of repeat visitors. However, the vast majority of individuals reported this visit was their first.

This may mean most visitors are satisfied with the information they receive during their visit; it could also mean they do not feel a close, personal connection with the Holocaust or its ancillary events. Without such connections, visitors may find a cursory understanding sufficient for their needs.

Overall, the majority of respondents do not experience heritage ties to the Holocaust. Most of the connections discussed were distant and not likely to have serious impacts on respondents. Individuals noted that in-laws and distant relatives were somehow involved in the war and the Holocaust. Due to the passing of time and space, those visitors with any connection appear to be removed from people and the events and therefore their visits are not based on heritage.
While heritage bonds may be lacking, emotional bonds to the Holocaust cannot be ignored. Most respondents are not directly nor personally tied to the actual events of 1933-1945, however, they feel tied simply by being human. A large number of individuals discussed how their compassion, anger, and sadness over the Holocaust connected them to the victims and survivors. That such atrocities can befall fellow humans entails action on our part to ensure similar events never occur. Such visitors, despite perceived affiliations, are not motivated by heritage. However, they may constitute a special category of visitors motivated by factors not discussed in the literature: sympathy and compassion.

5.3 History

Research question 1.2 asked what role does an interest in history play in visitation to the HMH. Similar to heritage affiliation, it appears that few visitors are pushed because due to an interest in history. Although a majority answered they were attracted to Houston because of the museum, when asked their primary reason for visiting, the vast majority came to visit friends or family and for a vacation. Only a few responded that the museum was their primary reason for coming to the city. From this, there appears to be a lack of general interest in the museum as a stand-alone destination. For most, it appears the museum was an attraction once in the city. As believed there is a lack of heritage push, history also appears not to be a strong motivator.

This is supported by the accompanying lack of experience with additional historical events and destinations. When asked if they had attended any educational events related to the Holocaust in the past six months, the vast majority replied no. No
one reported having attended lectures, seminars, guest speakers, or organized tours. Of the ten that responded positively, five events appeared to be work related teaching workshops while the other five were unspecified documentaries.

Furthermore, visitors have a lack of experience at other Holocaust sites. When asked if they had attended other sites related to the Holocaust, again the vast majority responded no. Only four sites were identified by name, three of them within the United States. A small number of respondents detailed that they had visited Holocaust Museums in Miami, Boston, and Washington. Outside the US, only ten had been to the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam. The same ten cited visits to German concentration camps but none identified by name. Ironically, one individual later stated he or she had visited Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, but did not discuss it in this question (Q4).

In sum, learning about history does not appear to be a strong push factor for visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston. While some respondents noted they have read books on the Holocaust, are writing papers associated with the Holocaust, or are history buffs, the majority of individuals do not appear to be motivated by an interest in Holocaust history. Most discussion on history centers on learning and understanding so that it does not repeat itself.

Any focus on prevention may stem from the image Americans have of themselves and the Holocaust. As discussed previous, the last thirty years have seen an ‘Americanization’ of the event. The context of the story is now reshaped into a, “…tale of pluralism, tolerance, democracy, and human rights that American tells about itself” (Berenbaum 1993:40-41). Visitors may then be drawn to the museum as a way of
expressing their national identity. At such a place they are able to reinforce the messages around them that the United States is the policeman of the world, the keeper of democracy.

5.4 Survivors’ Guilt

Research question asked what role does survivors’ guilt play in motivating people to visit the HMH. Guilt, including survivors’ guilt, does not appear to be a strong motivator for visitors at the museum. When asked directly if they experienced guilt over the Holocaust, the majority of respondents replied no. Furthermore, no one reported feeling guilt over being a survivor. Similarly, most individuals replied that guilt did not play a part in their visit.

However, a small number of individuals did note they felt guilt, particularly through family connections. One lone individual remarked that his or her family was German descendants, related to Nazis. Additional discussion of guilt found in the survey centered on an overall sadness that the events occurred.

Despite the prevalence of guilt over the Holocaust found in the literature, given the demographics of the sample it is not surprising that guilt plays an almost non-existent role. Much of the literature focused on survivors’, liberators’, and bystanders’ guilt. Given the young age, American nationality, and Christian faith of the majority of respondents, they would not fit in to the three categories most likely to experience guilt.

Guilt over the Holocaust may also be suppressed in the American belief system. As seen through media representations, contemporary renditions of the Holocaust “…shy away from the prospect of having to face total despair without the hope of
Even in the movie, *Anne Frank*, “…we go to Auschwitz still believing – ‘in spite of everything’ – ‘people are really good at heart’” (Cole 1999:40). With the media imparting feel good messages and museums highlighting America’s roles as liberator and haven for survivors, it is not surprising guilt plays a minimal part.

### 5.5 Curiosity

Research question asked what roles do curiosity and novelty play in visitor motivation to the HMH. While 45.2% of the respondents expressed curiosity was part of their attraction to the museum, there was little to support this in the qualitative answers. Much of the discussion of curiosity centered on an educational or historical interest. Individuals stated that they wanted to know about the museum, its exhibits, or facts about the Holocaust. It is as if respondents need to justify their curiosity.

Furthermore, there appears to be a lack of curiosity about the Holocaust in the dearth of additional Holocaust experiences respondents reported. Few individuals expressed an interest in educational activities, have read little historical material, or have traveled to few additional Holocaust sites despite a desire for preventative education.

It must be noted there is not a vacuum in interest. There were a few respondents that may have been curious and therefore viewed documentaries read books and traveled to other such sites. For instance, a number of participants reported having visited other Holocaust museums, concentration camps, Anne Frank’s House and Yad Vashem. However, none of this was expressed explicitly as curiosity in qualitative answers.

None of this assumed curiosity correlates with the literature, which details that curiosity is a result of exploratory behavior induced by novelty seeking. The five main
elements of novelty seeking include change from routine, escape, thrill, adventure, and boredom alleviation. These do not appear in, nor are they implied, anywhere in the survey analysis as attractions to the museum. Therefore, there appears to be a weak link between curiosity and motivation at the Holocaust Museum Houston. If visitors do feel curious, it is on a subconscious level or is justified by other motivators.

This apparent lack of curiosity may be seen as an assuredness in national identity rather than a lack of interest in the Holocaust, particularly since 100% of the sample was American. A number of academics and researchers have commented on the role of Holocaust museums as repositories for American values. Therefore, perhaps individuals visiting the HMH do so to reaffirm their American identity as opposed to being curious about the Holocaust. This then, may explain the lack of curiosity in the topic as supported by the respondents’ lack of experiences at additional Holocaust destinations.

5.6 Death and Dying

Guided by research question 1.1, research sought to understand the apparent lack of death and dying rituals in some segments of North American society and what part that plays in regards to visitation at the HMH. It was initially hypothesized that because of society’s decreasing understanding of death and dying, dark tourism sites would act as venues for comprehension. This was supported by the focus group, where it surfaced that the museum welcomed nurses in training who were there to learn about death. It was also noted that they receive visitors from the nearby hospitals, perhaps to deal with their own impending death.
Some respondents agreed with this conjecture, reporting they do believe museums are one way of coping with death and dying. However, the number was not significant with only 39 individuals responding yes. Furthermore, no additional insight on this topic surfaced in the qualitative answers. The vast majority spoke of friends, family, spirituality and church as ways of dealing with death. The later two are not surprising given that over 75% of the respondents noted some form of religion affiliation.

Confronting death once inside the museum appears to have an impact on the visitor experience. A number of respondents noted how the images of the dead moved them, touched them or saddened them. Once again, much of this centered on remembrance as prevention. However, despite the initial hypothesis, it appears that death and dying is a small factor in actually pushing visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston.

5.7 Nostalgia

Research question 2.3 asked what role nostalgia plays in pulling people to the HMH. Despite its prevalence in the literature, nostalgia played an almost non-existent role in motivating individuals to the museum. While 14 individuals checked that nostalgia attracted them to the museum, no one went into further detail in the open-ended portion of the question. Additionally, no one discussed the concept in any of the additional qualitative sections.

This is not surprising on a number of fronts. Firstly, given the mean age of visitors is 39.9, few could have been directly involved with either the war or the Holocaust. Secondly, a very small number of individuals reported being of the Jewish
faith, hence a lack of yearning for the Diaspora or other pre-war Jewish events. Thirdly, 100% of the sample was American and likely sees the Holocaust as a European event. Any visitor outside of the United States was not included in the overall database following the museum’s lead of separating foreign visitors. Again, given the demographics, non-Jewish Americans under the age of 40 are not likely to be wistful over the Holocaust.

Finally, given the nature of the Holocaust Museum, it is understandable few have nostalgic feelings towards the events it embodies. The magnitude of suffering leaves little to miss. While the literature illustrated how Holocaust sites might induce a yearning for the past for some World War II partisans and even some survivors (Hass 1995), the Holocaust itself leaves little room for American nostalgia.

This is particularly true given the role of victimhood in American history. Previous to the development of an interest in Holocaust history, immigrants to the United States assimilated in silence. Yet during the 1970’s, the Holocaust became central to the Jewish consciousness and victimhood helped shape an ethnic distinctiveness in America (Cole, 1999 and Berenbaum, 1993). While the majority of Americans shunned the victim role and assumed the liberator one, for immigrants, victimization was a way to shape their distinctiveness.

5.8 Education

Another pull factor, research question 2.2 attempted to discover what role education played in pulling visitors to the HMH. Correspondent to the literature, education, in conjunction with remembrance, was the biggest factor in visitation at the
Holocaust Museum Houston. Throughout the survey, respondents referred to education, most notably preventative education. Although there was little heritage or personal affiliation to the events surrounding the Holocaust, most visitors felt connected simply by being part of the human race. They expressed sorrow, compassion, and anger that something like the Holocaust could occur, and that alone connected people. They felt overwhelmed that humankind could be capable of such atrocities. From that, came the reiterated point that education is imperative to ensure the Holocaust is never repeated.

When asked directly what attracted them to the museum, 71% replied education; and when asked to elaborate, prevention rose to the surface. Time and time again, individuals expressed the opinion we should understand so it happens ‘Nie Weider’-Never Again. One individual went so far as to state visits to Holocaust museums be mandatory for all citizens across America, reaffirming their status as international policeman.

Respondent answers to additional questions emphasized this desire for prevention through education. When discussing death and dying, one respondent voice the opinion that the only way to understand death on such a large scale was through education. Individuals stated they were attracted to artifacts/exhibits because by being exposed to them, they would learn more. Curiosity was often accompanied by education as a factor in that they wanted to learn and understand the events. Finally, someone expressed hope for the prevention of future genocide because there is now an organization to teach people about the Holocaust.
Ironically, given this fixation on preventative education, few individuals have taken steps outside the museum to become learned. As discussed previously, few respondents have been to other Holocaust sites, have participated in additional educational opportunities, or read Holocaust related materials.

Perhaps this is indicative of the Americanization of the Holocaust as discussed previously. As recalled from the literature review, Holocaust sites in the United States function as nation builders, a compass to point the direction the country is to follow. In order to serve as a democratic, pluralistic, and compassionate society, all genocide must be eradicated. In order to act as the world’s ‘self-styled policeman’, the citizenry must be education on past wrong doings so they never happen again (Young, 1993 and Cole, 1999). Not surprisingly then, this is the message of the museum and what visitors reported the most.

Furthermore, it is not surprising that many individuals reported seeking education in order to teach the next generation. To prevent similar occurrences, not only is it important for the present generations to understand, but as time passes, it is more important that future generations do not forget. Should the Holocaust fade from memory, the likelihood of it happening again increases. Therefore, teaching children is an important tool. Similarly, teaching children of the Holocaust is another way of instilling appropriate national values so that they are maintained in the future.

5.9 Remembrance

Research question 2.2 also asked what role remembrance plays in pulling visitors to the Houston museum. Remembrance turned out to be the second most powerful factor
in visitation to the Holocaust Museum Houston. When visitors were asked directly what attracted them to the museum, over half responded remembrance. However, when asked to elaborate, a strong connection to education surfaced. Remembrance was often undertaken as a preventative measure. If society remembers they learn and understand the Holocaust; therefore, it is unlikely history will repeat itself.

This correlates with the literature, as many authors emphasized the importance of remembrance to prevent future mistakes. To paraphrase an old adage, those who forget the past are doomed to repeat it. It is not surprising then, the focus of many visitors was remembrance. However, as the literature also reveals, memory can be manipulated by prevailing cultural values. Those in power and authority often dictate what is remembered.

This is revealed by what visitors are remembering at the Houston museum. Rather than discussing Jewish losses, many feel it is important to remember all genocide. The emphasis was on ‘specific groups’, ‘innocent people’, and ‘the people who suffered’. Rarely does anyone specifically mention the magnitude of Jewish destruction. From respondent comments, they are remembering overall American cultural values as opposed to Jewish suffering.

This diminution of the Jewishness of the Holocaust in American conscience is not a new phenomenon. In the 1955 play, *Anne Frank*, American novelist and journalist Meyer Levin commented on the downplaying of Anne’s Judaism.

Perhaps the clearest example of this is the editing for Broadway consumption of Anne’s diary comments to Peter. In response to his despairing ‘Look at us, hiding out for two years! … Caught here, like rabbits…Because we’re Jews. Because we’re Jews!, Anne- in her diary – responds that ‘we’re not the only Jew that’ve
had to suffer…However, the Broadway Anne replies in far more universal terms: ‘We’re not the only people that’ve had to suffer. There’ve always been people that’ve had to…Sometimes one race…Sometimes another…’(Cole 1999:31).

Even from the beginning of Holocaust consciousness, American values have prevailed in American memory: universal tolerance and empathy were to be the messages disseminated. The United States was a liberating force and a haven for Holocaust survivors in the 1940’s and today the country still stands as the world’s policeman.

The HMH is not the first Holocaust museum to be instilled with national values. During construction of the USHMM, Max Kampelman, Ronald Reagan’s chief arms negotiator, justified its creation. He noted,

…the Europeans probably should have built such museums in their capitals, but they haven’t and most probably won’t…But our building will demonstrate the tolerance of our culture, its ability to empathise with the suffering of all its people. Our decision to build such a museum says something about our commitment to human rights and to the kind of nation we want to be (Cole 1999:149).

It is not suprising then that similar messages are being read and sought at the HMH. Through remembrance, the country is able prevent similar events from occurring and therefore, to assume its role of protector and police. For individuals visiting, they are looking to reaffirm their country’s stance on tolerance and human rights and therefore their own.

5.10 Artifacts/Exhibits

Research question 2.4 asked what roles do artifacts play in pulling people to the HMH. From the analysis, some respondents are drawn to the museum for the artifacts and exhibits on display. It is however, a smaller percentage than anticipated at the onset
of this study. The literature revealed that visitors are indeed pulled to dark tourism sites because of what is on display. Furthermore, during the focus group, artifacts surfaced as an attraction to that museum in particular. It was noted the museum changes their temporary exhibit in order to attract visitors and two very successful ones were discussed (a quilt exhibit and a butterfly made out of pop can tabs are discussed in Section 4.2.8).

Surprisingly little was said about the attraction of artifacts despite the fact 44.6% of the respondents reported they were drawn to the museum for that reason. Given a chance to expand, visitors noted they were attracted to artifacts and exhibits because of their educational value. Many wanted to be exposed and learn about the Holocaust and the artifacts were useful means.

Yet the education they received for the exhibits and displays was in part an education in American identity. Visitors can listen to the stories of survivors who came to America, or they can view the liberation of Dachau by American forces. Lectures are on Holocaust topics, but often include American speakers or guests. For instance, a series on the 1936 Olympics includes as a guest, American runner Jesse Owens’ daughter.

5.11 Sight Sacralization

Research question 2.5 looked at the role of sight sacralization in pulling visitors, and although information on sight sacralization was not explored in the survey, the subject merits some discussion. Adapting MacCannell’s original five-step sacralization process to a tourism destination, Seaton (1999) whittles the process down to just two
phases: naming and mechanical reproduction. In order to pull tourists, a dark tourism site simply needs to be named and mechanically reproduced.

Certainly, the HMH has undergone both phases. During research and construction it was marked a Holocaust site, thereby attracting the attention of those interested in the events for a their own personal reasons. Named a Holocaust museum, it was deemed to contain information and material important to education and remembrance. Given the emerging interest in the Holocaust, it would not be surprising visitors came to the site simply because it was labeled Holocaust Museum Houston.

Secondly, the museum has been mechanically reproduced in a variety of ways such as in Houston tourism promotions, Holocaust literature, newspaper articles and quilting magazines. Similar to naming, with mechanical reproduction comes promotion and visitor awareness of the museum, thereby inciting tourism.

5.12 Media

Research question 2.1 asked what role the media played as a pull factor for visitors to the HMH. During the literature review, the media surfaced repeatedly as a motivating factor; and although not a direct motivation, it has the ability to transfer information. By broadcasting via modern technology, the media advertises the museum and its offerings. It puts the museum in the forefront of peoples’ awareness. Therefore, when individuals experience a push factor, they have the means to satisfy it because communication technology has mediated the push of the visitor and the pull of the site.

Survey analysis however, revealed the secondary role the media plays at the HMH. When asked how they found out about the museum, friends and family were the
most commonly reported means. Visitors appear to know of the museum via word of
mouth more than any other communication means. This surfaced throughout the
analysis where respondents noted they came to the museum to show their children, out-
of-town visitors, or other friends.

The second most common means of obtaining information on the museum was
via education. A number of respondents noted they came for educational reasons; either
for research purposes or for class trips. It must be noted the timing of the data collection,
which took place over spring break, 2002, may influence the high incidence of scholastic
related answers. Yet, when asked what actually influenced their decision to visit the
museum, only one respondent reported education. Therefore, it appears school creates
awareness, but does not actually influence visitation.

What respondents did report influencing their decision to visit was again friends
and family. Almost half the individuals stated they came because of friends and family.
As touched upon previous, many said they visited to show their children, out of town
guests or other friends. Again, word of mouth is an important communication tool for
the museum, more so than traditional media outlets.

Traditional media outlets did play a role in creating knowledge of the museum
and influencing visitation. Checked by respondents less often, newspapers, travel guides,
road signs, the museum’s website, radio programs, travel brochure, and magazines still
helped create awareness of the museum. Although television is thought to be one of the
most powerful communication tools, no one stated they discovered the museum through
television programs. Additionally, respondents not discuss television anywhere in the qualitative sections.

Television was found to be an influencing factor in visitation, however. Television, along with documentaries, non-fiction books, newspaper, magazine articles, movies and non-fiction books, influenced peoples’ decisions to come to the museum. Respondents then, are impacted by modern communication. Yet it is a surprisingly small number compared to friends and family. In sum, the museum differs dramatically from what the literature purports.

Yet it must be reiterated that the media acts as a mediator rather than a direct motivator. Cole commented that, “…the Holocaust has emerged – in the Western World – as probably the most talked about and oft-represented event of the twentieth century” (1999:3). This prevalence has certainly created awareness if not motivation.

5.13 Hope

Research question 3.0 asked what other factors might motivate visitors to come to the HMH and during the focus group, hope surfaced as a possible factor. For that reason, it was included in the survey. However, hope appeared to be more of a factor in the focus session where visitors were thought to come to the museum to feel better about their situation.

Twenty-five survey respondents did check they were attracted to the museum because of hope; yet none elaborated further in the qualitative section of that question. There was some discussion however, throughout other qualitative answers in the survey and much of this centered on hope that such events never occur again. Again, the idea of
preventative education and remembrance surfaces. Individuals hope that education and remembrance will prevent other Holocausts.

This corresponds with the Americanization of the Holocaust. Visitors feel hope that such events will never be repeated because their country has taken it upon itself to educate people of the past. As a country of democracy and freedom, America has a duty to remember and therefore prevent. Visitors wanting hope for the future may seek affirmation at Holocaust museums. They are therefore safe and hopeful in the knowledge that their country is educating others to prevent a repeat of the past.

5.14 Location

When research question 4.0 asked what does the role of location play in visitor motivation to the HMH, it originally sought to understand the museum’s location within Houston or Texas. However, what has surfaced from this study is on a much larger scale. The importance of visitor motivation to the Houston museum lies in its global location as opposed to its national location. In other words, the fact the museum is in the United States may be of the utmost importance in visitor motivation.

A great deal has been written about the Americanization of the Holocaust, both in this paper and other academic writings. Young noted that,

As the shape Holocaust memory takes in Europe and Israel is constrained by political, aesthetic, and religious coordinated, that is America is no less guided by both American ideals and experiences of this time…In this sense, American memorials seem not to be anchored in history so much as in the ideals that generated them in the first place (1993:283-4).

This adoption and shaping of events can be seen at Holocaust memorials across the country. At the memorial in Denver, Colorado, the inscription reads, “A holocaust
[sic] for the Jews of Europe, A tragedy for all humanity…” (Young 1993:295). The Tucson, Arizona memorial is described as a combination of, “…Israel’s sense of continuing Jewish life after the Holocaust with America’s ever-sanguine view of the future” (Young 1993:300). The Museum for Tolerance in Los Angeles adopts an all-inclusive mission because as the curator pointed out,

…what is the point of having a museum which is of relevance to maybe five scholars in the whole wide world, when we live in Los Angeles, where urban violence and ethnic hatred are part of our cultural landscape. We address the issues which affect us, in this city, where we live (Cole 1999:151).

It is not surprising then, that American Holocaust museums are warehouses for national values. They are not simply repositories of the past; they can be political entities used to shape national identity. Visitors come to discover a country’s history and this history may be manipulated by those in power in order to promote a specified value system. Visitors leave then, with a predetermined idea of what the appropriate national values are. At many Holocaust museums in the United States, pluralism, democracy, tolerance, empathy and freedom are the messages being promoted.

It is not surprising that the motivations detailed by visitors to the HMH reflect these national values. Preventative education and remembrance underscore a hope that such an event never happens again. By taking ownership of this hope and knowledge, visitors are assuming a role of protector, someone who will assist in the prevention of repetition. This is strikingly similar to the stance of the American government and their self-styled role of global policeman.

This phenomenon does not occur solely in the United States, hence the importance of the global location of the museum. Israel promulgates the Holocaust in
part as a necessity for the creation of the state of Israel; the dead are seen as martyrs who
died for the state (Cole, 1999 and Young, 1993). In Poland, national values help to create
a contested memory of the Holocaust: a Polish tragedy versus a Jewish one (Cole, 1999
and Young, 1993). In Holland, the Dutch canonize Anne Frank in order to elevate their
experience in the war: the Dutch are good while the Germans are evil (Miller 1990).

Therefore, the role of location is of critical importance in visitor motivation to
the HMH. American visitors may be seeking affirmation of their American beliefs and
values. Furthermore, this may explain the lack of visitation to Holocaust sites outside of
the United States. They may visit the museum to help establish their identity as an
American.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Conclusions Introduction

The initial purpose of this study was three fold. Firstly, it endeavored to examine relevant, dark tourism literature and compile a comprehensive list of potential visitor motivations, which to date, had been lacking. Secondly, it applied these motivations to visitors at the Holocaust Museum Houston in order to discern if they could shed light on motivation at other sites of dark tourism. Thirdly, due to dark tourism’s increasing popularity, it sought to identify potential implications for administrators at sites of dark tourism.

It must be reiterated that any findings must be taken in context. As dark tourism is an emerging field, there are few precedents to compare to. It is difficult to say what are characteristic or expected motivations as none have been established. This work, in the end, can only say what motivates visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston. It can postulate other dark tourism motivations found in the literature review, and compare them with the museum; but it cannot be certain this is what indeed pushes or pulls individuals to other sites of death, disaster, and darkness.

6.2 Key Findings

The literature review revealed and compiled ten possible factors in dark tourism visitation that have been discussed at length in Chapter II. However, during this research, only two emerged to be of any importance in regards to the HMH: remembrance and education. Survey respondents wrote at length of education and
remembering for prevention. They stressed the imperativeness that current and future generations learn and memorialize the lessons so that such events never occur again.

Other factors, when discussed, also reflected education and remembrance for prevention. Visitors noted they were interested in artifacts and exhibits in order to teach children. Likewise, interest expressed in history and heritage echoed the theme of prevention through education and commemoration.

This is not to say visitors were not motivated by other factors. Some indeed felt the push of guilt and curiosity. Other responded that museums were feasible means of coping with death and dying. Yet given the sparcity of these answers, they remain secondary reasons. Compared to the outpouring of discussion on education and remembering, all other factors fade.

The museum itself has a strong focus on remembrance and education and promotes itself as such in its literature. As noted previously, Bearing Witness: A Community Remembers, is the name of the museum’s permanent exhibit. Special exhibits such as, Private Writings, Public Records: Diaries of Young People in the Holocaust serve to educate the public while at the same time commemorate the victims. Indeed the museum’s mission stipulates Holocaust remembrance, understanding and education.

Yet as discussed previously, museums are not merely buildings housing artifacts: they are sites of meaning. What is housed in a museum represents what a nation holds to be true, and more importantly, what a nation’s leaders hold to be true. Museums are the
means of promoting, reaffirming and shaping the national identity prescribed by those in power.

Due to this, we see the Americanization of the Holocaust in museums (Cole, 1999; Young, 1993; Appignanesi, 1999 and Hass, 1995). The overriding belief is Holocaust sites in the United States have a tendency to place the events in the context of American values). The focus, rather than being on the attempted liquidation of the entire Jewish population, concentrates on such national ideals as liberty, equality, and pluralism.

Perhaps then, it is not surprising that education and remembrance are key in visitation to the Holocaust Museum Houston. While the museum pulls individuals with their educative and commemorative offerings, visitors are also pushed by a need to honor, observe, and fulfil American values.

With this knowledge, it is difficult to comment whether or not the motivators to the HMH can shed light on other sites of dark tourism. Certainly, other Holocaust museums in the United States attract visitors with similar messages. It has been well documented even in this paper the role of the USHMM as site for national identity. Holocaust sites in other countries also manipulate events to suit their national identity. In Holland, the Dutch canonized Anne Frank, “…enabling them ‘to alleviate their guilt, and blame the Nazis for having decimated their Jewish population…The Anne Frank lore says to the world: Look, we Dutch hid her; the terrible Germans killed her. They were evil and we were virtuous” (Cole 1999:43).
Perhaps then, visitor motivation to sites of dark tourism is related to the messages the site is trying to promote. As sites of national identity, museums represent what citizens strive to be. When immigrants want to gain insight into their new country, they visit museums. Similarly, when citizens want to understand their country’s past and their present, they visit museums (whose messages are manipulated by those in power). As this study shows, American visitors to American Holocaust museums are attracted to the nationalistic messages put forth by the museums, such as pluralism, tolerance and freedom.

If visitors are attracted by the messages being promoted at dark tourism sites, then the location of these sites is paramount in motivation. This study shows that American visitors to the HMH come to the museum for preventative education and remembrance; such motivations are highly reflective of the values America upholds and how the country perceives itself. By seeking to personally prevent further Holocausts, visitors exemplify their country’s role of global policeman and watchdog.

The above paragraphs highlight a number of things. Firstly, the usefulness of Dann’s (1977) Push and Pull Model. In this study, there was a definite relationship between what internally pushes the visitor and what the museums use to pull individuals. As seen at the HMH, visitors came to be educated and remember the past so that such events are not repeated, correlating with the American identity as liberator and global policeman. Similarly, the museum, as a warehouse for national values, promotes these values as underscored by the museum’s mission. Should visitor motivation be related to
the messages that sites of dark tourism are promoting, then Dann’s model would be practical for further research.

The above paragraphs also reveal the continuing uncertainty of dark tourism visitation. The specificity of American Holocaust site motivations makes it difficult to say with certainty, that any light can be shed on other dark tourism destinations. What can be said however, is that location may be an important variable for visitor motivation and is one that must be considered for further research.

To summarize, key findings from this research are:

- Visitors to the HMH visit for preventative education and remembrance;
- Holocaust museums in the United States, including the HMH, are warehouses for national identity. They are used in part by the governing powers to promote and instil national values into the citizenry;
- The motivations divulged by visitors to the HMH are reflective of America’s national identity; therefore, they may visit the museum to fulfil their own identity as an American;
- The location of the HMH is of paramount importance on a global scale. It is more significant that the museum is located in the United States as opposed to being located in Texas or Houston. Should an identical study take place in Germany, Poland or Israel, the results would likely be different;
- Similarly, should foreign visitors to the HMH be included in an identical study, the results may also vary;
• It remains uncertain whether these same factors influence visitor motivation at other sites of dark tourism; however, location must be included in any further research on the topic;

• Similarly, prevailing cultural values must also be included in any further research on this topic; and

• Finally, there is a definite need for further research if visitor motivation to sites of death and disaster is to be understood.

6.3 Implications for Further Research

There are literally thousands of dark tourism sites that can be examined, studied, and surveyed in order to gain a better comprehension of visitor motivation to sites of dark tourism. Academics have boundless room to compare motivation at other sites with this study and with each other. Such research would provide a good starting point. While a comprehensive list of motivations would prove useful, what attracts visitors to Auschwitz may be entirely different from those at the Alamo.

Perhaps the most pressing area for further research is to establish visitor motivation to Holocaust sites before comparisons can be made with other dark tourism destinations. This study found preventative education and remembrance motivated visitors; a message promoted by those in power that see American identity as being that of global policeman and protector. Yet this study looked strictly at American visitors at an American museum.

This necessitates more wide-ranging research. Studies can be done looking at international visitors to American Holocaust sites; German visitors to German sites;
international visitors to German sites; Polish visitors to Polish sites; international visitors to Polish sites; and so on. Once motivations to Holocaust sites are established through extensive study, only then can they be compared to other dark tourism destinations.

Certainly, there is further research needed in understanding visitor motivation to other sites of death and disaster beyond the Holocaust. While this study highlighted the importance of location and cultural values, the original list of motivations should not be discarded. Non-Holocaust specific destinations could serve as potential survey sites for motivation research. Future researchers could apply the same motivations as this study but at different sites. For example, surveying visitors at Alcatraz or any of the Titanic exhibits could reveal the importance of history motivations.

Given the sensitivity and ethical considerations of this subject, perhaps other research methods could be utilized. Focus groups provide useful insight into visitor emotions, actions and reactions and therefore potential motivations. In-depth interviews with visitors could provide richer and more detailed understanding of their motives.

Furthermore, some dark tourism sites may lend themselves to a post-visit survey or interview. While the subject of the Holocaust was deemed too sensitive for post-visit research, sites such as the Frank Slide in Alberta, Canada or the Melbourne Gaol in Victoria, Australia may be less controversial. Perhaps visitors to such places would willingly fill out surveys before they enter the site, therefore eliminating the motivation-experience limitation.

Hope, as a motivator, is a specific area of further research. Although not found in the literature review, it surfaced in both the focus group and survey responses as a
variable. One focus group participant observed some visitors experienced hope for the future, particularly after meeting survivors. Some survey respondents also wrote they felt hope after their visit, hope for a better future by learning from the past. Therefore, hope may play an important role in pushing or pulling visitors to sites.

Education and remembrance as factors bring up additional questions. While respondents in this study noted prevention was key to visitation, this may be questioned. While education and remembrance are honorable intentions, some may ask if these act as justifications rather than motivations. Therefore, continued research solely in the area of curiosity would be beneficial.

The role of the media leaves room for additional study. As a mediator, it provides the link for visitors to satisfy their push factors and for dark tourism sites to promote their offerings. While it played a secondary role at the Holocaust Museum Houston, the media is becoming increasingly important in our lives and in its influence in the future. Its romanticization and glorification of the past certainly changes our perceptions of history.

Similarly, the role of marketing must be understood in dark tourism visitation and provides room for further research. Marketers, using the media as a tool, have the ability to significantly influence site visitation. By promoting education and remembrance in site literature, marketers may be providing justification for visitation. A potential research project then, would be to look at visitor motivation to a specific site and compare it to site literature. Perhaps the pull of the site takes precedence in dark tourism motivation.
This brings forth another area of further research: marketing and potential trivialization of the site and subject. While sites may promote education and remembrance, the literature review revealed the commercialization of some dark tourism destinations. Again, a chronological case study would be useful, where researchers could observed any changes over time and provide insight into the role of marketing.

Furthermore, role of sight sacralization must be understood better. Although the literature review touched on the concept, it was not explored further in the survey due to its esoteric nature. Following Seaton’s (1996) example, chronological examination of sites would useful in determining if they too experienced any phases of sacralization. Asking visitors about the concept would be difficult, but such in-depth information if obtained would also be helpful. If individuals attend sites simply because they have been named and reproduced, then the role of the media (and marketing) would increase in significance.

Not surprisingly, the relationship between cultural values and dark tourism leaves innumerable opportunities for further research. Many instances of dark tourism are of a nationalistic nature, where the entire country mourns: for example the Oklahoma City bombing at the Alfred P. Murrah building. However, other sites of death and disaster are of a more universal nature. For example, the Swiss Air crash over Nova Scotia where citizens from 16 different national were killed. One might ask what role does cultural values play in a more global event? Furthermore, whose cultural values will prevail?
In regards to cultural values, two specific research avenues emerge. Firstly, while Seaton (1996) undertook a chronological examination of thanatourism, a more detailed study would prove beneficial. Future researchers could do a chronological comparison study, looking at the role of thanatourism throughout the centuries while also examining the corresponding cultural values. For instance, one could research 19th century thanatourism in conjunction with prevailing value systems to determine if there is a relationship.

Secondly, further case studies would be beneficial in understanding the role of cultural values. Researchers could choose a particular site then research the interpretive offerings and the prevailing cultural values to determine any relationship and any change over time. This would be particularly useful if chosen sites have long-standing histories as tourist attractions, thereby providing a chronological and more detailed study.

The definition of dark tourism can also be revisited for further research. Academics studying the phenomenon have yet to agree on a singular definition, largely because they do not agree on the role of motivation. For Seaton (1996), thanatourism exists because of visitor motivation to see sites of death and disaster. Yet visitors to the HMH are not motivated to see death; they came in order to prevent further death. For Foley and Lennon (1996), dark tourism is about the presentation and consumption of death: visitor motivation plays only a minor role. Yet clearly preventative education and remembrance motivate visitors to the HMH. Perhaps then, dark tourism is a combination of the two definitions.
6.4 Implications for Management

Despite the obvious need for further research, lessons can be learned from this exploration into visitor motivation to sites of death and disaster. For site administrators, these lessons can be translated into implications for management. And as discussed earlier in the paper, the growing popularity of dark tourism necessitates managerial understanding of visitor motivation.

Given their role as archives for memory and identity, it is vital that museums stay aware of current political situations. Changes in government could mean changes in national values. Economically, this could mean simple funding changes from one government to another. On a larger scale, this could mean changes in displays as those in power change messages. Simply being aware of what messages are being manipulated and by whom can help balance interpretation.

No matter what the message the museum is representing, or for whom, balance is key to a historical whole. While it is reasonable that American Holocaust museums embody the tolerance, pluralism and democracy of their country, it is vital that the negative aspects are covered to get a complete picture. For instance, displaying the anti-Semitism of the government exhibited by its refusal to allow a boat of Jewish refugees to dock before the war (as the HMH did). History and heritage are complex and political issues, and this means that management has to pay close attention to identifying and involving relevant stakeholders.

On a practical level, understanding visitor motivation is good for marketing. Knowledge of such motives can assist in the promotion of the site. Should a site receive
a high number of survivors, it would then be beneficial to be promoted as a place for remembrance, a place to pay respect or a place to assuage one’s guilt. Similarly, should education be the key motivator, then the site should focus on the teaching aspects. This could be as simple as interpretive design or as complex as offering and promoting additional services such as lectures, seminars, or workshops.

Furthermore, as witnessed in this study, the media plays a mediator role: it creates an awareness of both the Holocaust and the museum itself. However, it was friends and family that served as the major influencer for visitation. Perhaps sites can tailor their marketing to that group in order to raise their profiles rather than focusing on expensive advertising campaigns.

Site interpretation may also be better designed through understanding visitor motivation. Understanding what your guests want makes it easier to cater to their needs. Should visitors be motivated by remembrance, then it would be advantageous to offer a place for quiet contemplation. Should nostalgia be a key motivation, then highly sensory exhibits would be best suited to these visitors.

This then leads to higher guest satisfaction as visitors are better able to meet their wants and needs. Higher satisfaction can lead to a higher profile for the site via word of mouth promotion. A higher profile may mean increased visitation and this in turn increases revenues for the site. More money leads to increased heritage preservation. Therefore, understanding visitor motivation has the ability to contribute to heritage preservation and sustainability.
Understanding visitor motivation may also assist in stopping the trivialization and commodification of a site. Economic pressures and decreasing heritage budgets make it all too easy to fall into the trap of commercialization. Ticket sales can at times become the driving force in interpretation and dark tourism sites are susceptible to ghoulish voyeurism (Strange and Kempa 2003). By being aware of what visitors want, sites may be able to provide a quality product that stays true to its history. Administrators would be able to work around guest needs and decrease trivialization.

Heritage dissonance is another issues that may be mitigated by understanding visitor motivation. Such knowledge may give site administrators the rational for certain actions. In turn, the may take this rational to relevant stakeholders (such as locals and survivors) so that everyone understands the meanings behind the actions. This then also leaves room for site managers to exhibit the other side of the story to visitors so that they understand the locals or the survivors’ positions.

It is only with continuing research can the field of dark tourism be managed or even understood. It is a difficult and delicate field but one that is increasingly growing in popularity. By understanding the motives of visitors, sites can be better managed for all stakeholders and preserved for the future. The importance of this cannot be understated. For as the literature constantly reminds us, human history if fraught with violence and tragedy, death and disaster. If we ignore that, we are left with a sanitized and incomplete past.
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## APPENDIX A

### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
<th>Survey Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 What role do push factors play in visitor motivation to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>Section 2.6 Push and Pull Factors</td>
<td>See specific factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What role, if any, does the apparent lack of death and dying rituals in North American society play in regards to visitation at the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>Section 2.11 Death and Dying</td>
<td>Question 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 What role does an interest in history play in visitation to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>Section 2.8 History</td>
<td>Questions 8 a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What role does heritage affiliation or cultural identity play in visitation to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>Section 2.7 Heritage and Identity</td>
<td>Questions 5 6 a,b 7 a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 What role does survivors’ guilt play in motivating people to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>Section 2.9 Survivors’ Guilt</td>
<td>Questions 10 a,b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 What roles do curiosity and novelty play in visitors coming to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>Section 2.10 Novelty and Curiosity</td>
<td>Questions 4 a,b 5 6 a,b 7 a,b 9 a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 What role does pull factors play in visitor motivation to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>Section 2.6 Push and Pull Factors</td>
<td>See specific factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Media</td>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Education</td>
<td>8 a,b, 9 a,b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Nostalgia</td>
<td>9 a,b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Artifacts</td>
<td>9 a,b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Site Sacralization</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Other</td>
<td>14, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Cultural</td>
<td>1 a,b, 2 a,b, 3 a,b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Chapter II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### COHEN’S TYPOLOGY OF TOURISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourist Type</th>
<th>Familiarly-Novelty Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organized Mass Tourist</td>
<td>Familiarity is at a maximum while novelty at a minimum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individual Mass Tourist</td>
<td>Seeks familiarity but also a greater degree of novelty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Explorer</td>
<td>Novelty dominates but likes to retain some basic remnants of his or her native way of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Drifter</td>
<td>Novelty is at its highest while familiarity is non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

STAGES IN DEVELOPMENT OF CURRENT ATTITUDES TO DEATH AND DYING

Stage I: ‘Dance of the Dead’
15th century, death becomes autonomous

Stage II: ‘Dance of Death’
16-17th century, death becomes independent

Stage III: ‘Bourgeois Death’
17-18th century, death avoidance by paying for health

Stage IV: ‘Clinical Death’
19th century, the emergence of the clinical doctor

Stage V: ‘Health as a Commodity’
20th century, health is seen as a civil right

Stage VI: ‘Death in Intensive Care’
Contemporary society unable to cope with death and dying

Late 20th
Changes in Attitudes

Stage VII: ‘Social Death’
Professionalization of death rituals

Stage VIII: ‘Return to Holistic Concepts’
Contemporary education endorses understanding of death as a right of passage
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APPENDIX D

WESTERN ATTITUDES TOWARDS DEATH
FROM THE MIDDLES AGES TO THE PRESENT

Tamed Death: 10-13\textsuperscript{th} Centuries
Death familiar, evoking no great fear

One’s Own Death: 13-15\textsuperscript{th} Centuries
Death always present, but now a judging of souls

Thy Death: 15\textsuperscript{th}-18\textsuperscript{th} Centuries
Death now a rupture, acceptance more difficult

Forbidden Death: 19-20\textsuperscript{th} Centuries
Death shameful, avoidance necessary for society’s sake
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JEWSH ATTRACTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

1. Shrines of Jewish history.
2. Monuments and memorials to Jews and portraits or bas-reliefs.
3. Geographical places named for, found by, or discovered by Jews.
4. Sites of early Jewish agricultural colonies.
5. Monuments and statuary donated by Jews of having some Jewish connection.
6. Historic residences and other historic buildings or sites erected by, owned by, or named for Jews.
7. Places of general historic importance having some Jewish connection.
8. Monuments and memorials to non-Jews who were philo-semites.
9. Graves of Jewish personalities celebrated in American or Jewish history.
10. Historic places and buildings preserved for or donated to the public by Jews.
11. Interfaith shrines.
12. Works of art depicting Jewish themes or characters on display in public places.
13. Jewish religious objects on non-Jewish places.
15. Public buildings or institutions donated by, named for or dedicated to Jews.
16. Major public works designed by or named for Jews.
17. Major library and art collections established by Jews for public use.
18. Important statuary, murals and public buildings which are the work of Jewish artists and architects.
19. National Jewish institutions housed in their own buildings.
20. Local Jewish institutions housed in their own buildings.
22. Kosher restaurants.

Ioannides, D., and M.W. Ioannides
APPENDIX F

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Holocaust Museum Houston Visitor Survey
Focus Group Questions

1. Who visits your museum? Do any similar characteristics stand out, for example a specific age cohort? Does one gender appear to frequent more than the other does? Does any group composition stand out?

2. Where do you find most of your visitors come from?

3. When do they visit? Are there peak visitation times? Week/month/year/holidays?

4. How long do visitors usually stay?

5. Do you notice if they stay at any exhibit(s) in particular?

6. Have visitors, either directly or indirectly, spoken to you about the reasons why they are visiting the museum?

7. If so, what kind of reasons do they give?

8. Have you any ideas, suggestions, or knowledge of why visitors visit other such sites?

9. Do you feel that some people are drawn to the museum because of a personal connection to Holocaust?

10. Do you feel that some people visit out of an interest in history?

11. Do you believe that some visitors are there because they experience survivors’ guilt?

12. Do you feel that visitors come out of simple curiosity?

13. How do you feel the media has impacted on visitation to the museum?

14. What roles do education and remembrance play in attracting people to the museum?

15. Do you feel that some are attracted to certain exhibits? If so, which one?
APPENDIX G

FOCUS GROUP COVER LETTER

Holocaust Museum Houston Visitor Survey
IRB Approval: 2002-122E

Texas A&M University
Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences
College Station, TX 77843-2261

Dear __________________________:

Thank you for your participation in this focus group, which is a component of my graduate studies research at Texas A&M. Our goal is to better understand the motivations of visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston. Given the nature of the museum, it is vital that we understand what motivates people to visit the site. With this understanding, it is hoped that this site, and others like it, can better administer their exhibits and collections.

The focus group should take approximately two hours of your time. Its primary goal is to obtain additional insight into visitor motivation to both the Holocaust Museum and similar sites. For the duration of the two hours, a series of discussion questions will be asked, and your answers tape-recorded. Your answers may be adapted to formulate questions for a survey that will be applied to museum visitors. You may withdraw from participation at any time or refuse to answer questions that make you uncomfortable. The tape recording will be used to aid in data collection. During focus groups, valuable answers are often missed as the researcher is too busy taking notes instead of listening.

Your responses are confidential and your names will never appear in the research: pseudonyms will be used as identification. The tape recording, written notes and official transcripts will be kept for two years at the university with my advisor, Dr. Tazim Jamal. At the end of the two years, all materials will be destroyed.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects’ rights, you can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services, Office of Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067.

If you have any other questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Stephanie Yuill at (979) 693-3334 or via email, syuill@rpts.tamu.edu.

Thank you. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Stephanie Yuill, Master’s Candidate
Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences
Texas A&M University, 2261 TAMU
College Station, TX, 77843-2261
1a. Are you a resident of Houston?
   Yes___ (Please skip to Question 3)
   No ___

1b. If not a resident, do you live within 100 miles of Houston?
   Yes____ No ___

2a. If you are not a resident, what brought/attracted you to Houston?
   (Check all that apply)
   To Visit the Museum___
   Shopping___
   Visiting family or friends___
   Business trip___
   Vacation trip___
   Other (Please Describe) _____________________________________________
   _____________________________________________

2b. What was your primary reason for visiting Houston?
   (Check just one)
   To Visit the Museum___
   Shopping___
   Visiting Family or Friends___
   Business Trip___
   Vacation Trip___
   Other ____________________________________________________________
3a. Have you been to the Museum previously?  
  Yes___ No ___ (Please skip to Question 4)

3b. If yes, how many times? ___________________________

4a. Have you previously visited any other museum and/or site directly related to the Holocaust (e.g. Auschwitz, Anne Frank’s House)  
  Yes___ No ___

4b. If yes, which one(s)?________________________________________________  
  ________________________________________________________________

5. Are you or anyone you’re closely related to, connected to any of the following events associated with the Holocaust?  
   World War II  Yes___ No___  
   The Jewish Diaspora  Yes___ No___  
   Other  Yes___ No___

   Please specify Other________________________________________________  
   ________________________________________________________________

6a. Are you personally related to or connected to anyone affected by the Holocaust?  
   Yes___ No___ (If no, please skip to Question 7)

6b. If yes, please check all that apply.  
   Yourself___  
   Spouse ___  
   Parent(s) ___  
   Grandparent(s) ___  
   Brothers or Sisters ___  
   Distant Family Members___  
   Friend(s) ___  
   Faith___  
   Other (Please specify)_______________________________________________  
   ________________________________________________________________
7a. If you feel personally connected to the Holocaust, what is that connection?  
(Check all that apply)

I am a(n):  
Survivor___  
Victim___  
Liberator___  
Descendent___  
Other (Please specify)_____________________________

7b. If you are connected to anyone you feel is affected by the Holocaust, what is their connection?  
(Check all that apply)

They are a(n):  
Survivor___  
Victim___  
Liberator___  
Descendent___  
Other (Please specify) _____________________________

8a. Have you attended any educational events related to the Holocaust in the past six months?  
This also includes educational events related to World War II, the Jewish Diaspora, and Other answered in Question 5.

Yes___  No ___ (Please skip to Question 9)

8b. If yes, what kinds of educational events were they?  
(Check all that apply)

Lectures___  
Seminars___  
Guest Speakers___  
Documentaries___  
Organized Tours___  
Other____________________________________________________________

9a. What attracted you to the Holocaust Museum Houston?  
(Check all that apply)

Education___  
Remembrance___  
Artifacts/Exhibits___  
Nostalgia___  
Hope___  
Curiosity___  
Other (Please expand below)___
9b. For any of the above reasons you checked, please explain how they influenced your decision to visit the Museum.

Education

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Remembrance

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Artifacts/Exhibits

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Nostalgia

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Hope

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Curiosity

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Other

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

10a. Do you ever experience feelings of guilt in relation to the Holocaust?
Yes___ No___ (Please skip to Question 11)

10b. Are these feelings of guilt related to being a Holocaust survivor in some manner?
Yes___ No___
10c. Does this guilt play any part in your coming to the Museum today?
Yes___ No___

10d. Please explain:
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

11. What do you think are the most effective aids in coping with death or dying in today's society? (Check all that apply)
Friends___ Family Members___ Medical Profession___
Counselors___ Church___ Spirituality___
Media___ Museums___ Personal Meditation___
Other (Please specify)_____________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

12. How did you find out about the Museum?
(Check all that apply)
Friends/Family___ Newspapers ___
Magazines___ Travel Guides___
Travel Brochures___ Holocaust Museum Houston Website___
TV Programs___ Radio Programs___
Road Sign___ Other (please specify)________________________________________
13. **Did any of the following influence your decision to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?**  
   (Check all that apply)  
   Family/Friends  
   Television  
   Movies  
   Documentaries  
   Newspaper Articles  
   Magazine Articles  
   Fiction Novel  
   Non-Fiction Book  
   Other  

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

14. **Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience at the Holocaust Museum Houston?**

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

15. **Is there anything else you would like to share about your reasons for visiting the Holocaust Museum Houston?**

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Please tell us something about yourself.

16. **What age group do you fall into?**

   18-24  
   25-29  
   30-34  
   35-39  
   65-69  
   45-49  

   50-54  
   55-59  
   60-64  
   40-44  
   70-74  
   75 +  

17. **What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

   Eighth Grade or less  
   Some High School  
   High School  

   Some College/University  
   College Graduate  
   Post Graduate  
18. Are you?

Female ___  Male ___

19. What is your faith?

Jewish ___  Christian ___
Other ____________________________________________

20. What is your income?

$0-14,999 ___  $45,000-54,999 ___
$15,000-24,999 ___  $55,000-64,999 ___
$25,000-34,999 ___  $65,000+ ___
$35,000-44,999 ___

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.
## APPENDIX J

### SURVEY QUESTIONS EXPLAINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you a resident of Houston?</td>
<td>This question seeks to understand where museum visitors come from. It is believed local visitors may be attracted to the museum as an entity itself where long distance visitors may be attracted to the Museum as another site on the itinerary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not a resident, do you live within 100 miles of Houston?</td>
<td>Again, this questions seeks to establish visitor residency and hence a clue to their motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are not a resident, what brought/attracted you to Houston?</td>
<td>Visitors come to the city for numerous reasons, and this question seeks to establish if visitors came specifically for the Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was your primary reason for visiting Houston?</td>
<td>Visitors may be attracted to the city for a number of reasons, and this question seeks to establish if the Museum was the primary reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been to the Museum previously?</td>
<td>Repeat visitation may indicate the influence of certain push and pull factors such as heritage, guilt, education, or remembrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, how many times?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you previously visited any other museum and/or site directly related to the Holocaust (e.g. Auschwitz, Anne Frank’s House)?</td>
<td>Visiting additional Holocaust sites could indicate certain push and pull factors such as history, heritage, guilt, education, remembrance, nostalgia, and curiosity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, which one (s)?</td>
<td>This question gives a sense of what additional sites people are interested in and perhaps insight to any relationships between sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you or anyone you’re closely related to, connected to any of the following events associated with the Holocaust? World War II The Jewish Diaspora Other</td>
<td>This question seeks to reveal if people visit due to heritage connections, and more specifically what that heritage might be (i.e. faith based or experience based).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you personally related to or connected to anyone affected by the Holocaust?</td>
<td>This seeks to understand if people are motivated by heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is yes, check all that apply. Yourself Spouse Parent (s) Grandparent (s) Brothers or Sisters Distant Family Members Friend (s) Faith Other</td>
<td>This question seeks to understand exactly what the heritage connection is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you feel personally connected to the Holocaust, what is that connection? Survivor Victim Liberator Descendent</td>
<td>This question seeks who precisely comes to the museum based on heritage. This question also may give insight into guilt (i.e. perpetrator), remembrance (survivor), or education (descendent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are personally connected to anyone you feel is affected by the Holocaust, what is their connection? Survivor Victim Liberator Descendent</td>
<td>This question seeks to understand visitor relationships based on heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you attended any educational events related to the Holocaust in the past six months?</td>
<td>As the literature indicates people are motivated by an interest in history, this question seeks to establish is this is true for visitors to the Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what kinds of educational events were they? Lectures Seminars Guest Speakers Documentaries Organized Tours Other</td>
<td>This question intends to discover what kinds of educational events may motivate people to visit because of an interest in history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What attracted you to the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>A simple question intended to discover if people are pulled to the site by what was found in the literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For any of the above reasons you checked, please explain how they influenced your decision to visit the museum.</td>
<td>This is an opportunity for individuals to articulate exactly what they see attracted them to the museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ever experience feelings of guilt in relation to the Holocaust?</td>
<td>This question seeks to establish if guilt plays a factor in visitor motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are these feelings of guilt related to being a Holocaust survivor in some manner?</td>
<td>This question again seeks to establish if survivors’ guilt is a factor in visitor motivations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this guilt play any part in your coming to the Museum today? Please explain.</td>
<td>This question seeks to establish if survivors’ guilt motivated individuals to visit the Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think are the most effective aids in coping with death or dying in today’s society? Friends Family Members Medical Profession Counselors Church Spirituality Media Museums Personal Meditation Other</td>
<td>This question attempts to understand if the Museum plays a role in helping people cope with death and dying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you find out about the Museum? Friends Family Newspapers Magazines Travel Guides Travel Brochures Holocaust Museum Website TV Programs Radio Programs Road Sign Other</td>
<td>This question attempts to understand if and what media sources might influence visitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any of the following influence your decision to visit the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>This question also seeks to understand media sources that directly influenced visitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine Articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction Novel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Fiction Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to share about your experience at the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>This allows respondents to include other unconscious motivations that brought them to the Museum. This allows for potential factors not found in the literature and a deeper understanding of motivations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to share about your reasons for visiting the Holocaust Museum Houston?</td>
<td>This allows respondents to include other conscious motivations that brought them to the Museum. This again allows for potential factors not found in the literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What age group do you fall into?</td>
<td>Basic demographic information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the highest level of education you have completed?</td>
<td>Basic demographic information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male or Female?</td>
<td>Basic demographic information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your faith?</td>
<td>Basic demographic information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your income?</td>
<td>Basic demographic information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

INTERNAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

March 29, 2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: Stephanie Marie Yuill
Department of Recreation, Parks and Tourism Sciences
MS 2261


Approval Date: March 29, 2002 – March 28, 2003

The Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University has reviewed and approved the above referenced protocol. Your study has been approved for one year. As the principal investigator of this study, you assume the following responsibilities:

Renewal: Your protocol must be re-approved each year in order to continue the research. You must also complete the proper renewal forms in order to continue the study after the initial approval period.

Adverse events: Any adverse events or reactions must be reported to the IRB immediately.

Amendments: Any changes to the protocol, such as procedures, consent/assent forms, addition of subjects, or study design must be reported to and approved by the IRB.

Informed Consent/Assent: All subjects should be given a copy of the consent document approved by the IRB for use in your study.

Completion: When the study is complete, you must notify the IRB office and complete the required forms.

Dr. E. Murl Bailey, Chair
Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects in Research
APPENDIX L

PRE-CONTACT POSTCARD

Dear Holocaust Museum Visitor:

My name is Stephanie Yuill and I am a graduate student doing research on visitor motivation at the Holocaust Museum Houston. Within ten days, you will be receiving either a questionnaire or an email entitled Holocaust Museum Houston Visitor Survey. Should you receive an email, I ask that you please do not delete the message as it further details the study and provides you with a website so that the questionnaire can be completed on-line. If you prefer to be mailed a questionnaire, feel free to contact me either by email or by post at the university. Alternatively, if you prefer to respond on-line, please contact me by email and I can forward you the information. All information is completely confidential. Your respondent number is:

Your help is greatly appreciated. I would be more than happy to answer any questions you might have. Feel free to email me at syuill@rpts.tamu.edu. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Yuill, Master’s Candidate
Texas A&M University
APPENDIX M

SURVEY COVER LETTER

Texas A&M University
Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences
College Station, TX
77843-2261

Dear _____________:

Thank you for your participation in this important study, which is part of my graduate research at Texas A&M University. Our goal is to better understand the motivations of visitors to the Holocaust Museum Houston. Given the nature of the museum, it is vital that we understand what motivates people to visit the site. With this understanding, it is hoped that this site, and others like it, can better administer their exhibits and collections.

This questionnaire is only being given to five hundred visitors, so your participation is important. You have three options for completing the survey. You may place it in the self-addressed, pre-stamped envelope and simply drop it in any United States post box. If you prefer to answer online, you may visit the survey site at http://www.darktourismsurvey.html. However, you may withdraw your participation at any time or refuse to answer questions that make you uncomfortable.

Your responses are confidential. The survey has an identification number that is used for mailing purposes only. Your name will never be placed on the survey or linked with your answer in any way. All surveys and resulting data will be kept secure for two years with my advisor, Dr. Tazim Jamal. After two years, the information will be destroyed.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research related questions regarding subjects’ rights, you can contacts the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Support Services, Office of Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067.

If you have any other questions or concerns, do not hesitate to contact Stephanie Yuill at (979) 842-3069 or via email, syuill@rpts.tamu.edu.

Thank you. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated,

Stephanie Yuill
Master’s Candidate
Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences
Texas A&M University 2261 TAMU
College Station, TX 77843-2261
Dear Holocaust Museum Visitor:

My name is Stephanie Yuill and I am a graduate student doing research on visitor motivation at the Holocaust Museum Houston. Last spring, you visited the Museum and your name was obtained with permission to be used as a survey participant.

For your ease, the survey has been placed on-line. It should take 10-20 minutes to complete, and will provide an important contribution to understanding visitation at the Museum. With this understanding, it is hoped that this site, and others like it, can better administer their exhibits and collections.

All responses are confidential and you can withdraw participation at any time. This research has bee approved by Texas A&M University’s Ethics Panel, 2002-I22E.

To proceed, simply access the website at http://survey.tamu.edu/holocaust/
Your respondent number is: ______.

Your help is greatly appreciated. I would be more than happy to answer any questions you might have. Feel free to email me at yuilltide@yahoo.ca. Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely, Stephanie Yuill,
Master’s Candidate, Texas A&M University
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Ontario, Canada
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Texas A&M University
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Heritage Interpreter/Program Design
Muskoka Heritage Place
Ontario, Canada
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Heritage Interpreter/Researcher
Woodside National Historic Site
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