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Abstract

For most of the second half of the 20th century the world’s political map was divided by the Cold War, a name given to the 40-year long standoff between the superpowers - the Unites States and the USSR - and their allies. Due to its geographical location and alliance with the United States, Britain was at the 'frontline' of the Cold War. As a response to increasing tensions, the British Government made arrangements by building hundreds of military sites and structures, which were often dismantled or abandoned as the technology on which they relied became rapidly ineffective. Nowadays, there is a growing (academic) recognition of Cold War sites and their new or contemporary uses, including as heritage attractions within a tourism context.

This study has brought forward a constructionist approach as to investigate how heritage works as a cultural and social practice that constructs and regulates a range of values and ideologies about what constitutes Cold War heritage (and) tourism in Britain. It has done this by, firstly, exploring the dominant and professional ‘authorised heritage discourse’, which aims to construct mutually, agreed and shared concepts about the phenomenon of ‘Cold War heritage’ within a tourism context. The study identified a network of actors, values, policies and discourses that centred on the concept of ‘Cold War heritage’ at selected sites through which a ‘material reality’ of the past is constructed. Although various opposing viewpoints were identified, the actors effectively seem to privilege and naturalise certain narratives of cultural and social meanings and values through tourism of what constitutes Cold War heritage and the ways it should be manifested through material and natural places, sites and objects within society. Differences were particularly noticeable in the values, uses and meanings of Cold
Cold War heritage within the contemporary context of heritage management in Britain. For some, the sites were connected with a personal ‘past’, a place to commemorate, celebrate or learn from the past. For others, the sites were a source of income, a tourism asset, or contrary, a financial burden as the sites were not ‘old enough’ or ‘aesthetically pleasing’ to be regarded as a monument to be preserved as heritage.

Subsequently, the study also explored the (disempowered) role of visitors to the sites as passive receivers, leaving little room for individual reflections on the wider social and cultural processes of Cold War heritage. Although, most visitors believed that the stewardship and professional view of the Cold War representations at the sites should not directly be contested, this study has illustrated the idea that what makes places valuable and gives them meaning as heritage sites is not solely based on contemporary practices by a dominant heritage discourse. Despite the visitors’ support for the sole ownership by site managers, and the selective representations of the Cold War and events, they did question or negotiate the idea of ‘heritage’ as a physical and sole subject of management practices. Despite having little prior knowledge about the Cold War era or events, by pressing the borders of the authorised parameters of ‘Cold War heritage’, visitors actively constructed their experiences as being, or becoming, part of their personal and collective moments of ‘heritage’. By inscribing (new) memories and meaning into their identity, and therefore also changing the nature of that identity, they reflected upon the past, present and future, (some more critically than others.

To conclude, understanding these discursive meanings of Cold War heritage (and) tourism, and the ways in which ideas about Cold War heritage are constructed, negotiated and contested within and between discourses also contributes to understandings about the philosophical, historical, conceptual and political barriers that exist in identifying and engaging with different forms of heritage.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

While I was waiting for my first interview with the site manager of a Cold War tourist attraction, a couple approached me and asked if I enjoyed the tour of the bunker. Because, after a three-hour journey, I needed to ‘recharge’ myself for my interview with the manager, I replied with a simple, “No”. Obliviously, the woman continued by saying that she only came along to the bunker because of her husband’s interest in military sites, but quickly added that she was astounded by what she had seen (and was not aware of before). The man seemed to agree, and started a rather long monologue directed at both of us on the government’s secret agenda and the clandestine activities by intelligence agencies, lasting up until this day. Then there was silence, as the three of us thought about what could have happened.

I have often thought about this first, unexpected, encounter with visitors and their understanding of the Cold War through their visits to Cold War sites. Not only, as it would turn out in latter stages of my data generation, is the visit by many regarded as ‘a nice day out’, it was also seen as an opportunity to make meaning of and share experiences with others about what was regarded to be a ‘mythical’ period in history. Notably, the latter aspect was often regarded to be a result of the visit, and not the initial incentive for visiting the site. Nonetheless, the visit for many was a ‘heritage practice’, as visitors, through the sharing of experiences with others, made sense of a place and constructed narratives and associations for present and future understandings. Heritage was not only something of the past, reserved for those who lived through the Cold War period (lasting roughly from 1946 until 1989) – though it was that too – it wasn’t solely about the tangible features of the sites – though that was often an important feature – heritage was above all a process of meaning making, in which the actual visit influenced a person’s identity and sense of self in and for the present.
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During the process of generating data (running from April until August 2011) about the nature and motivations for visiting Cold War sites and people’s understandings of the places they were in, I gained the understanding that perhaps all meanings were different in the way they were constructed. Moreover, they would remain to be altered through the stories that were told before and after we separated again. The narratives that were constructed during people’s visits were often attached to the material structure of the building, the layout of the interior and the artefacts that were on display, yet these ‘things’ were not heritage themselves. It was the stories associated with the Cold War period, ranging from long speeches to one-sentence accounts, that helped visitors to make sense of and understand who they ‘are’ and wanted to ‘be’ (and who not). In this regard, and inspired by Laurajane Smith’s (2009a) work *Uses of Heritage*, my academic venture was stirred by the idea that the actual notion of heritage lies in what Smith refers to as “the act of passing and receiving memories and knowledge” (2009a: 2). In this sense, it is the ‘signifying practices’ of discourses within, and that are part of, the constructive process of heritage through which meaning is transmitted, produced and reproduced (Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000: 3; see also, Hall, 1997: 1).

Considering this idea of heritage as a process of meaning making, visiting Cold War sites should be more than a mere leisure or touristic activity, as sometimes proclaimed in heritage studies (see, for example, Prentice, 1993; Cameron, 2012). However, following concerns expressed by Smith (2009a: 63), dominant influences from archaeological and historical disciplines make it difficult to define visitors’ experiences as a performance or act of identity and meaning making process. In this sense, the construction of visitors’ experiences is ‘authorised’ by traditional, elitist and Western approaches about conservation and preservation practices, which are carried out by heritage/attraction/site managers, as they manage what has been identified as Cold War ‘heritage’. This authorised discourse ascertains heritage as a tangible and immutable thing, rendering values and ideologies it represents through upholding the “‘old’, grand, monumental and aesthetically pleasing sites, buildings, places and artefacts” (Smith, 2009a: 11).
Contributing to the idea that heritage is a ‘thing’ that can be viewed from a distance is the convergence of heritage and tourism into ‘heritage tourism’ including, for example, (man-made) places such as the Eiffel tower, the Great Wall of China and natural scenes such as the Niagara falls, the Devon coastline and the Wadden Sea. Within this tourism context, heritage is embedded within an ‘industry’, by which practices of tourism marketing and interpretation, through the process of commodification and sanitisation, reduce heritage to ‘simple’ entertainment. In this regard, by privileging and naturalising certain narratives and cultural and social experiences cultural values through tourism of what constitutes heritage and the way it should be manifested within material and natural places, sites and objects become deeply embedded and accepted within society.

Consequently, this portrays visitors as passive receivers, leaving little room for individual reflections on the wider social and cultural processes of heritage that are going on during, and are stirred by, the visit. However, this work aims to highlight the idea that what makes these places valuable and gives them meaning as ‘official’ heritage sites are not solely present-day cultural processes that are undertaken at and around them by guardians and stewards of a self-referential, authorised (and professional) heritage discourse. In fact, it does not necessarily mean that it is impossible for visitors to (partly) disengage, oppose, query, or stray away from the economic and technical processes of heritage (Franklin, 2003). Instead, by visiting a Cold War site they have the possibility to construct, reconstruct and negotiate their own narratives of Cold war heritage as “a living component of present-day life” (Cleere, 1989: 5; see also, Clavir, 2002; Thomas, 2009). This perspective also emphasises the human agency of visitors, following Bruner (2001: 899), “as active selves that do not merely accept but interpret, and frequently question the messages” that are presented at heritage sites.

What happens at heritage sites is therefore not (solely) defined by the site itself or the interpretations of the objects or artefacts on display, or the manner in which visitors are organised and directed in and through the site (Franklin, 2003). However, although this implies that heritage is intangible, it does not terminate
the tangible and preceding existence and essence of places, sites and objects. It is merely a rather different approach from the perspective of the authorised discourse, in which the idea of what constitutes heritage, or a concern for the past, first and foremost comes from and revolves around all that is (literally) ‘set in stone’.

On the contrary, this study aligns itself with an emerging field of practice, often referred to as ‘critical heritage studies’ which emerged slowly after World War II, in which the idea, relationship to and practice of heritage is shifting from being a “taken-for-granted field of meanings and practices to becoming an area calling for investigation and analysis aiming to understand how heritage becomes constituted, what it is and does, and how different groups engage with it” (Carman and Stig Sørensen, 2009:17). To add to the categories of commentary and research within contemporary heritage literature, this work aims to demonstrate that heritage can also be a counter-hegemonic and collective process for groups or individuals to challenge and alter established values and identities. Heritage, in this sense, is about negotiation processes and bringing cultural change through reworking the meanings of the past. Heritage sites, objects, and artefacts involved in this process are not necessarily the focus of change, but may act merely as facilitating tools.

1.1 Cold War heritage (and) tourism

Informed by the discourse duality of what constitutes heritage, when placed within a tourism context, this study defines heritage as, on the one hand, a process of construction and negotiation (and contestations) of meanings that develop through tourism, whilst simultaneously acknowledging that it is a moment that also resides within tourism (often termed heritage tourism). Generally speaking, within both the authorised and dissenting discourses the entanglement of heritage (and) tourism has led to two sets of dominant practices. The first is concerned with the preservation and conservation management of sites, places and objects for future uses and generations to enjoy, whilst the second regards heritage as
something that can be used here and now as a tool for community development, social unity, or as an economic resource which, according to some, is part of and stirred by processes of commodification and touristification.

This study aims to identify and examine the order of discourses that surround Cold War heritage, including who engages in the dialogue of what should remain of the Cold War for tourism uses and audiences. From an historical perspective, over the last two decades the interest and concerns about Cold War remains, numerous in figures and categories, have been growing consistently in Britain and beyond (Strange and Walley, 2007). The most important catalyst for the debate, the collapse of the Soviet Union after 1989, resulted in large numbers of previously active military sites becoming obsolete almost overnight and, consequently, rousing concerns amongst government, ministries and policy makers of how to respond to increasing rates of market disposal and the need to catalogue what was actually there. The ‘new’ archaeological sites (Braasch, 2002) were outlined in preliminary governmental studies aiming to provide a framework and inventory of the Cold War sites. Most of the findings focused on the physical outline and nature of the sites, resulting in evaluative assessments to define the value and status for protective actions. Directed, and constituted by, authorised experts and institutions such as English Heritage and the National Trust, only a few sites were selected to become ‘accepted’ heritage tourism sites (see, for example, Cocroft, 2001, 2003). The selected sites qualified not because they simply ‘are’, but because they are subjected to conventional preservation and conservation processes and management practices. In this regard, Cold War sites are the tangible evidence of ever-changing discourses where multiple stakeholders have claimed authority over the management and conservation practices of tangible Cold War structures within a tourism context. This relative lack of interest by dominant institutions such as the National Trust (NT) and English Heritage (EH), has contributed to an impression of ‘accepted neglect’ of Cold War remains by the authorised discourses as the sites, objects and artefacts are regarded to be not aesthetic, grand, or old enough to be preserved for the public and future generations to enjoy as heritage tourism.
Additionally, the debate in Britain has been fuelled by archaeologists, historians and other (private) enthusiasts within and outside the authoritative discourse (Woodward, 2004). Resultantly, the findings of these academic, professional and lay endeavours have appeared in journals, blogs, reports, books and newspapers, have formed the basis of television and radio programmes, and have inspired courses, seminars and conferences. What’s more, the subaltern interests have resulted in Cold War remains being ‘collected’ and exploited by private owners and trusts for various and overlapping reasons and purposes, including storage spaces, commercial uses and tourism activities. For example, Hack Green Secret Nuclear Bunker is partly opened up as a tourism site, as it also serves as a facility for telecommunication purposes. Although the aesthetic and historical judgements may vary from the conventional authorised discourse, the emphasis and management practices of subaltern discourses likewise evolve around rather similar cultural and social practices, as opposed to a strong sense of political or moral critique, concerning the preservation and conservation of grand narratives through the objectification of the past through tourism.

The use of the concept of ‘discourse’ in this study does not solely refer to (neither excludes) the use and meanings of words and language, but also the social interactions that take place between people, as well as between people and Cold War materialities. In this sense, the process that constructs and is part of Cold War heritage should also be regarded as something that is ‘done’ by those visiting a Cold War site, as people construct, negotiate and adjust meanings through, and based on, the act of visiting, remembering and interpreting heritage sites, objects, structures, landscapes and artefacts that are constituted by the discourses. Ultimately, these experiences contribute to the construction of a sense of place, identity and belonging (see, for example, Edensor, 1998; Crouch, Aronsson and Wahlström, 2001).

Heritage, in this perspective, is something that is done perhaps more actively and consciously than acknowledged by heritage professionals and academics, and that is used to challenge existing authorised narratives about our ‘place’ in the world.
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(Smith, 2009a: 7). Since this study aims to explore heritage tourism from the perspective of those visiting Cold War sites, it also supports the idea that heritage as a process is closely tied to human action and agency that use the sites primarily as tools through which people make meaning of and engage with (memories of) the Cold War period and events. In this sense, Cold War sites enable and contain meaning making processes, yet simultaneously they do not make up for the very nature of heritage – their existence in essence is not valuable or meaningful.

1.2 Research aim and objectives

At the initial stages of the study, several questions arose concerning the conceptualisation of heritage as a process of meaning making, and ways in which the past is used and projected into an imagined future through practices. At the start of this investigation, it seemed unclear how constructions of Cold War heritage (and) tourism had developed, in particular from the perspective of social conflict and tension about their meanings. What are the dominant and alternative orders of discourse and how do they influence and conflict with each other? What are the meanings and nature of visits to visitors, and how are these constructs expressed through visitors’ performances and sense of place within Cold War sites? Do orders of authorised heritage discourse affect the heritage constructions of visitors to Cold War tourist sites, and/or is there a more physical sense of place and performance involved in the meaning making and identity process?

With this study, I aim to:

- Contribute to understandings about the nature, process and uses of Cold War heritage (and) tourism within heritage discourses in Britain.
- Contribute to understandings about the nature and meanings of visits to Cold War sites in Britain.
- Contribute to a theorisation of Cold War heritage (and) tourism discourses and visitors’ constructions at Cold War sites in Britain.
Because of the extent of the aims, five principal objectives have been formulated:

1. To develop an understanding of the phenomenon of Cold War heritage (and) tourism within the context of evolving and competing discourses of heritage in Britain.

2. To examine the nature and practices of different discourses of heritage, within the context of Cold War tourist attractions in Britain.

3. To explore the nature and experiences of visitors regarding Cold War heritage (and) tourism within selected sites in Britain.

4. To elicit the ways in which discourses of Cold War heritage (and) tourism are utilised, negotiated and reflected in the experiences of visitors at Cold War sites in Britain.

5. To contribute to understandings of the nature and power of heritage discourses at Cold War attractions in Britain in relation to the construction of meanings by the visitors.

1.3 Significance of the study

Critical understanding and engagement with and of Cold War heritage (and) tourism, especially within Britain, is still uncommon within the academic, professional and authorised discourses. The lack of capacity, expertise and a general bias towards Cold War remains regarding their aesthetics, age, and former uses, have prevented scholars and institutions in Britain from developing a commitment for their existence and possible contemporary uses. Although attention appears to be growing more swiftly, the development and impact of local and special interest groups, and private initiatives, have been too limited to move the debate forward towards real actions of recognition and acceptance. This work attempts to examine and identify Cold War heritage, and the arguments about heritage, its purpose and uses within the debate on 20th-century material culture. This study examines how this debate sits in and is stirred by wider authorised and subaltern/alternative discourses and practices. To some extent there is a growing awareness of Cold War heritage in these debates, but there is also a growing gap
between what is being discussed and developed (and neglected) at policy levels, and what is happening in particular places. This study also aims to reveal how existing heritage management strategies and practices provide specific and/or partial understandings about the nature of the remains visitors are faced with.

Thus, this study also focuses on the visitors’ experiences and construction of meanings, as these are created, shaped and altered during their visit to Cold War sites. Additionally, it aims to reveal that Cold War sites act merely as facilitating tools in the heritage process of understanding the past in the present (see, for example, Smith, 2009a: 44). Moving beyond dominant and framing discourses on what constitutes heritage, and exploring visitors’ constructions of heritage and the site they are visiting is still an under-theorised topic in the literature and, often, something that is overlooked in management practices (see, for example, Hollinshead, 2006: 50). By doing so, this study attempts to open up the conceptual space by not only examining heritage discourses, but also by exploring visitors’ constructions of heritage, for developing a more holistic understanding of the uses, nature and meanings of Cold War heritage in contemporary British society.

In addition, with the shift from categorisation of Cold War sites into practice, this work is well timed for sites have become accessible as touristic places that ‘need’ to be management and visited. This thesis calls for research that goes beyond static, archaeological and technical accounts of heritage (and) tourism, and instead addresses the need to examine the interplay between authorised heritage discourses and the idea of heritage as a process of human action and agency.

1.4 Context of personal meanings

The central focus of this study is to contribute to understandings of Cold War heritage (and) tourism through the conceptualisation of discourse(s), narratives, and practices that shape visitors’ constructions of meanings, values and identity at Cold War attractions. However, these concepts are ideas (or disciplines, where
tourism and geography are concerned) which are being increasingly loaded with a variety of different and contesting connotations, social ‘truths’ and ‘knowledge’, to such an extent that they are at risk of losing all meaning. To avoid further blurring of the debate, it is important to outline the study’s framework as a ‘carrier of meaning’ (Courtright, 2007; Cool, 2001) consisting of a dynamic environment in which interpretive processes unfold, become ratified, change, and solidify (Cool, 2001: 8). Based on subjectively constructed viewpoints, a personal ‘frame of references’ (Vakkari, Savolainen and Dervin, 1997: 8) developed throughout the course of this study, which recognises that everything, including the external context, is seen from my cognitive and affective viewpoint, and that the subsequent constraints and opportunities have influenced the paradigmatic perspectives within this study (Courtright, 2007). This section explains how a personal-centric view has influenced my personal frame of the Cold War period.

First, even though people who have lived through the Cold War might read this final work with their own memories and recollections of events in mind, I do not consider myself as a child of the conflict. Born in 1981, during the final act of the Cold War, my earliest memories go back to the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989. Whereas, the generations that were born after the fall will, in all probability, know the Cold War only from second-hand sources such as textbooks, songs, films, and stories. Nonetheless, prior to starting this academic endeavour, informal debates with friends and family had already provoked a variety of reactions. Firstly and above all, most seemed confused about the topic and my interest! Some remembered it as a superpower conflict between the Soviet Union and the USA. Some recalled a divided Europe and official accounts or personal stories about the ‘other side of the Curtain’. Finally, there were those who could only conjure up popular images of the Cold War, such as those portrayed in the James Bond movies, being too young to remember the events themselves. All the same, most people, young and old, do appear to have some personal sentiments about this period in human history.
Additionally, while acknowledging that all accounts, whether collective or personal, are selective and, in the end, newly released information will continue to add small pieces to the Cold War jigsaw, I have aimed to contribute a picture or interpretation of the Cold War that would, in ontological terms, contain and encapsulate the contemporary discourse(s) of the Cold War. In this regard, and in order to achieve a deeper conceptual determination within this study, it has been necessary to situate the era more precisely together with the opposition that was part of a framework of war and peace.

In essence, the Cold War presupposed and embodied a kind of peace at the end, illustrated in almost every text on the Cold War by the opening sentence: “Now that the war is over...” For many (including myself), the term often remains merely a catchphrase as it pronounces an epoch that was so blurry and inflated that it can include everything and anything at the same time. However, I also found that the Cold War is not at all a seamless, indivisible concept of a period in history; it can also be regarded as more of an essentialist principle according to which everything is a reflection or expression of an original essence, namely that of post-war relations between the US and USSR. Moreover, I noticed that the discursive histories of ‘the Cold War’ are actually written in retrospective, with the ‘end’ actually being the starting point of the trajectory of the ‘period’. This, I consider, is done to conceal or eliminate variations in the nature of the relationship between the two superpowers.

I have also noticed that those involved in the process felt uneasy about the flattening effect of the historical ‘real’, and have tend to focus on, and modify, the image by adding all kinds of ancillary aspects to make the period ‘richer’, more ‘realistic’, more ‘accurate’. In addition, even though more and more information will become available to fill in the ‘blanks’, the picture will continue to expand. In this sense, there is no set understanding of the ‘real’ Cold War, yet it is a produced concept through which other process, relations and antagonisms have evolved and revolved (and still do). For that reason, and in line with the study’s philosophical assumptions, the descriptions of the Cold War, especially in Chapter 3, are
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essayistic in nature, as opposed to 'definitional'. To conclude, although this study is analytically distinct from the debates of 'origins' or 'causes', an overview of a generally accepted timeline about the major events that took place during, and directed the course of, the Cold War period is included in Appendix 1.

To continue, and on a point of semantics, I have used 'America' interchangeably with 'USA' and 'US' to indicate the fifty federal states and a federal district that comprise the United States of America, and likewise with using the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (often abbreviated to 'USSR') 'Soviet Union' and 'Soviets' interchangeably with 'Russia' and 'Russians'. To elaborate, from a more factual description, however, the USSR was a sovereign country consisting of 15 countries. The USSR are commonly called the 'Soviet Union', and its government is often referred to as the 'Soviets', in a similar way that the 'United States of America is often referred to as 'the States'. However, the word 'Soviet' actually refers to its preceding political organisation, which was founded in 1924, and does not necessarily reflect the geographical structure or scope of the USSR. Within the USSR, the Russian Federation was the most populated and influential country, and this has led to the USSR sometimes being called 'Russia', and its population 'Russians', much in the same way as 'the Netherlands' is often referred to as 'Holland', or 'England' when talking about 'Britain'. However, to clarify the use of the latter term, the emphasis of this study is on Britain, rather than on England, but excluding Ireland.

In conclusion, within this study, the term 'Iron Curtain' refers to the ideological and physical boundaries that separated the Warsaw pact countries (USSR countries except for Yugoslavia and Albania) on the Eastern side from the NATO and military neutral countries in the Western part of Europe. Although this is a rather unpolished way to divide the conflict in geographical terms, it is necessary for the study's conciseness. Nevertheless, I would like to point out once more that differences in governance between allied countries were frequent and often tolerated by the superpowers. Furthermore, this study is biased towards events in
Europe and Britain, and references to conflicts in other parts of the world are
simplistically defined according to (parts of the) continents.

1.5 Reflecting on my positionality

As this study explores the discourses, practices and narratives that surround
heritage (and) tourism, it is of similar importance to identify and recognise how
these concepts have also contributed to a personal transformational process, at
times one that was characterised by anxiety and fear. To elaborate; the journey
has, to say the least, been transformational, and being exposed to a range of
academic construction(s) and discourses has contributed to concerns about the
significance of my own positionality and the understandings I construct.

Reflecting on my own ‘positionality’ (Jackson, 1993: 211) is an essential element
of this study’s process (and progress) and, from a social constructionist
perspective (Chapter 4), ties me, as the researcher, as an active and influential
social actor helping to understand and co-create the constructs of ‘social truths’ in
which the study is conducted, interpreted, analysed and presented (Denzin and
Lincoln, 1994; Berg and Mansvelt, 2000). In this sense, it is impossible to
separate myself from the scope and context that informs my (value-laden) study,
and my knowledge has privileged me with a social ‘position of authoring’ and
‘associated power’ to be able to voice what constitutes Cold War heritage (and)
tourism (Hannam and Ateljevic, 2008: 252). This knowledge is, as Chua, High
and Lau (2008: 17) argue, “the product of a historical, social, and personal
assemblage which includes not only the person [e.g. gender, age, ethnicity] but
also one’s intellectual background, institutional demands, conceptual genealogies,
and relation quirks within and beyond the field” (see also Angrosino, 2005). They
continue by stating that ‘how we know’ is deeply embedded in ‘who we are’, and
therefore researchers must acknowledge their role in creating - compared to
simply uncovering - evidence upon which knowledge is based. However, though I
attempt to reflect on my own positionality, I will never be able to fully understand
how it affects the research endeavour and its participants (Rose, 1997).
On the other hand, reflexive accounts help to reveal some of the silent moments that have informed my thinking process, practices, and eventually my writings. As Maykut and Morehouse (1994: 123) have pointed out:

... [a] researcher’s perspective is perhaps a paradoxical one: it is to be acutely tuned-in to the experiences and meaning systems of others – to indwell – and at the same time to be aware of how one’s own biases and preconceptions may be influencing what one is trying to understand.

Positionality in social science studies is often reflected in an ‘insider/outsider’ or ‘emic/etic’ distinction based on power differences along the axes of race and ethnicity (see, for example, Mohammad, 2001; Leib, 2002; Archer, 2003), gender (see, for example, Yeoh and Huang, 1998; Malam, 2004; and the edited work by Pritchard, Morgan, Ateljevic and Harris, 2007), and class categories (see, for example, Zukin, 1991; Sletto, 2005). However, when taking into account the fluidity of the power relations and politics of who ‘owns’ the research and who ‘impacts’ the multiple layers of the process, Naples (2003: 43) argues “the bipolar construction of insider/outsider ... sets up a false separation that neglects the interactive processes through which ‘insiderness’ and ‘outsiderness’ are constructed (see also, Kusow, 2003). In contrast, this study adopts Naples’ view that these taken-for-granted assumptions are not fixed or static positions; instead, they are “ever-shifting and permeable social locations that are differentially experienced and expressed by those involved in the study” (2003: 43).

When exploring the concept of multiple and fluid positions during the research process, I became increasingly aware of a) my own personality – a young, white, (Western) European, female, and b) my professional identity – a Postgraduate doctoral student aligned with a research institute for tourism research and registered at a university in the United Kingdom. Both aspects had significantly influenced my social inquiry and reflexive practices, even if this included not always acting ‘accordingly’ to academic procedures. Acknowledging that I was
reflexively aware of my own positionality, actions and values at times opened up more complex and nuanced understandings of power relations and politics during the research process (Feighery, 2006). However, admittedly, there were also moments when I forgot to monitor or reflect on, or simply felt too anxious to write about, the influences of my own subjectivity, resulting in reflexive, yet minimal, accounts in ‘safe spaces’, such as this section and the methodology chapter. In line with my personality, this reflexive approach seemed to be cautious about entrenching my own role and position in this study, informing the reader to be ‘aware’ that the findings may be influenced by my personality, before quickly continuing to the ‘results’ of the study. Despite Perriton’s (2010) comments that this form of calculated reflective reflexivity is actually a form of ‘textual guerrilla warfare’, I do wish to highlight a handful of insider/outsider issues that, although being side-lined in this study, have contributed to shaping my thoughts, practices and eventually the contents of this work.

During the study, there were several internal and external experiences that influenced, negotiated and repositioned my gender, class, and racial-ethnic positionalities in time and through space (Mullings, 1999). Strong personal feelings of exclusiveness were present at earlier stages in the study, as a lack of knowledge about the historical events of the Cold War and the role of Britain greatly disturbed me and affected me in my attempts to access certain types of information and approach possible informants. The perception of being an outsider was also stirred by a variety of external elements. Sometimes these were unexpected; for example, I was rather surprised by the fact that those informants who shared the same interests and professional background on several occasions considered me an ‘outsider’. In general, the academics was one group of informants that I expected would be willing to assist me in my research but often appeared hesitant, or sometimes even unwilling, to do so. This category predominantly consisted of academic researchers, consultants, or experts; generally middle-aged, male and aligned to a British university or research institute. It seemed that in this group’s perception there was a general doubt as to why I, a female, Dutch student, in her late twenties or early thirties, would be
interested in, or capable of, conducting a thorough investigation on a historical British subject. For example, questions such as, “How long have you been/are you staying in the UK?” and “Why are you studying in the UK?” arose. Additionally, some academics were noticeably suspicious of the underlying aims of this research, its embeddedness within the tourism field, and wondered whether it was intended to criticise their work.

During the fieldwork stages there were more ‘predictable’ informants, to whom I represented an ‘outsider’ based on my language accent and/or appearance, which immediately became obvious when approaching them either by e-mail, phone or in real-life situations. In this respect, there were the Cold War ‘fanatics’, as I would refer to them, consisting mostly of interest groups and former military employees, but also several site managers and visitors with a great interest in Cold War history, who participated during the fieldwork stages. Estimating my age and ethnic background, I was regarded as being too young and too estranged to understand the historical events of the Cold War and the importance of its legacy in Britain’s society. The suspicion of my competency and knowledge of British history and the military increased even further when revealing my educational background in leisure and tourism studies. In several cases, this resulted in a lively reciprocal conversation with numerous counter-questions relating to my knowledge, such as, “How many bunkers have you visited?” or “What do you know about the Cold War?” and patronising comments about my age and gender; for example, sentences starting with, “Young lady...” and “When I was your age...”

These experiences eventually led me to think, although based solely on my personal interpretations, that in terms of my personality I did not represent the right ‘type’ of researcher to whom these informants wanted to provide assistance and valuable insight. This is regrettable to some extent, because this group of informants has a comprehensive understanding of the historical events and the development of Cold War remains into heritage sites. Paradoxically, although certain feelings of ‘outsiderness’ remained noticeable in, mostly, earlier occasions
during the fieldwork stages, several of my most valuable insights came from interviews and informal discussions with site managers and visitors. Although perhaps not being ‘accepted’ from the beginning, my fieldwork experiences have challenged the belief of a fixed and detached ‘insider-outsider’ binary that is locked into the idea you are either in or out (Dwyer, 2009). For instance, it is important to stress the possibility that people may not be familiar with the Ph.D. research, the tourism discipline, or the topics discussed in this particular study. Therefore, the feelings of exclusion and alienation could have been mutual for everyone involved in the study. Additionally, it might have had a positive effect if this research was funded by a well-known research organisation or governmental organisation, or was conducted from a more familiar discipline in the area of heritage conservation and management, such as history or archaeology.

To return to internal experiences that have also influenced my insider/outsider positionality whilst conducting fieldwork activities, I would like to highlight some of my embodied experiences within the Cold War attractions. In many of these sites, I was generating data in concrete, relatively cold, and dim settings. Conducting fieldwork in these, largely, underground and enclosed places related with war and mass destruction was, at times, an apprehensive and embodied experience, and the impact of the relationship between my body, mind and spirit has been largely neglected in my work (and in leisure and tourism studies in general). When re-reading my personal notes I have noticed that I actually describe myself as a consummate rational actor, resistant to emotions of fear and agony. There are no accounts of my embodied experiences of walking around with a fast pace in search of other individuals, whilst feeling entrapped by the vastness and dimensions of the bunker. In addition, there are no stories of when I was cold after spending hours underground, nor of the damp smell that surrounded me for days after I had generated data at a site. Missing are also the talks I had with the participants (mostly visitors) about our mutual bodily experiences, and our fears and feelings of anxiety, which offered shared reference points upon which sympathy, trust and understandings could help to construct our relationship. This process of connecting with my participants overcame the
previously mentioned, (mutual) feelings of ‘outsiderness’, as my knowledge was co-constructed through engaging with the collective experiences of my participants.

During later stages of my fieldwork, I seem to have become more accustomed to and appreciative of the underground surroundings in which the fieldwork took place. Resultantly, this made it more difficult not to let my body or knowledge influence my demeanour towards the participants, and was something I often wondered about during my fieldwork weekends. However, I also began to realise that this was an impossible struggle, as the (bodily) experiences and emotions I encountered during my fieldwork undoubtedly influenced how I (inter)acted, perceived, interpreted and ascribed meanings to my participants’ narratives about their visit and experiences related to the Cold War events. Consequently, I started to notice a personal transformation as a Cold War ‘adviser’ – an insider – especially when I started to notice that I was answering questions from my participants about the Cold War site.

To conclude, the above situations have illustrated how reflexive approaches have helped to interweave voices of others without losing sight of the researcher’s positionality. Although Dupuis (1999: 59) argues for a reflexive approach in qualitative research that is characterised by a “continuous, intentional and systematic self-introspection ... continuing throughout the writing of our stories”, this seems to be an unattainable goal for social researchers – or at least for me. I suggest that this ‘narcissistic’ process (Maton, 2003) leads to navel-gazing, and denies moments when we turn our gaze outwards and engage with participants. Instead, although being constrained by personal abilities and external structures, engaging with issues of positionality through reflexive approaches is, in Dupuis’ words (1999), ‘good science’.
1.6 Structure of the thesis

The conceptualisation of discourse(s) through constructions of narratives, meanings and identities and demonstrated within practices that shape visitors’ constructions of meanings, values and identity at Cold War attractions is organised through three distinct subjects:

1. The debates and arguments on, and this study’s attempt to contribute to, the ethnographic approaches that aim to understand the nature of heritage (and) tourism and how the past is used and applied in present Cold War attractions in Britain – what are the ideas of Cold War heritage (and) tourism?

2. The authorised discourse(s) of Cold War heritage (and) tourism; and the hegemonic tensions and power conflicts that arise from this multiple construction – who decides what is heritage (and) tourism?

3. The visitors’ constructions of meanings, values and identity through narratives and practices when visiting Cold War attractions – in what ways is heritage (and) tourism a meaning making process?

The thesis itself is divided into five rather unequal parts, of which the first has been outlined in the above sections (see Figure 1).

The three consecutive chapters provide the conceptual introduction to the thesis and outline the issues, which are interrogated within a theoretical setting. Chapter 2 explains how, deriving from a historical origin, heritage is about a negotiation of how to use the past, and how objects and sites merely act as cultural tools or props to enable this process. It also demonstrates that the interventions are stirred by an authorised discourse, which embeds and reproduces social meanings, systems of knowledge and expertise, power relationships and ideologies about what constitutes heritage (and) tourism. Inspired by the underlying concept of authorised discourse, the chapter advances with a critical exploration of authorised heritage practices in Britain and their influence on expert and professional practices within Cold War sites. Chapter 3 aims to peel back the layers of deception and secrecy to reveal the myth-making processes of the Cold
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War. In doing so, this chapter examines many of the commonly held truths about this era in history, mostly from a Western perspective with a strong emphasis on the role and part Britain played. It discusses how this continuous historical period and its events have shaped, and are being utilised, in contested Cold War heritage debates and practices of conservation and management. The chapter also highlights the authorised and alternative discourses on Cold War heritage (and) tourism in Britain, and attempts to conceptualise them as a mechanism through which meanings are produced and reproduced. Chapter 4 deals with Cold War heritage and the ways in which visitors to heritage sites, such as Cold War sites, construct meanings relating to their values and identity and sense of place. It also examines the nature and intersections between passive reading and active involvement of visitors to heritage sites, to conceptualise the axes along which the meanings of Cold War heritage (and) tourism are defined.

Chapters 5 and 6 outline the context for this study by considering the philosophical assumptions and the methodology. The first chapter in this part of the study (Chapter 5) examines the ontological and epistemological possibilities and consequences that underpin the (empirical) study, as well as providing a description of the strategy by which the data will be ordered, interpreted and meanings will be constructed. Chapter 6 discusses the methods on a more practical level and outlines the methods that were employed for the generation and analysis of the data, as well as the ethical considerations that were involved in, and which affected, the empirical process.

Respectively, Chapters 7 and 8 summarise the findings that were generated from the survey and interview work with site managers and visitors at five selected Cold War sites. They aim to illustrate the management and conservation practices of site managers and the performative experiences of visitors within Cold War sites. In particular, the findings identify the meanings of heritage that are negotiated and constructed within these sites through discursive practices and narratives. Heritage in this sense ultimately affirms an identity and sense of belonging, which is nonetheless regulated by wider social forces and hierarchies.
Finally, to return to the study’s aim and objectives, Chapter 9 connects the study’s key themes of discourse(s), practices and narratives as mechanisms of meaning making processes to conceptualise constructs of Cold War heritage (and) tourism. In addition, this part includes a reflection on the significance of the research process and findings, their implications, consequences and limitations. It concludes by suggesting a number of areas for future research, regarding both the theorisation and understanding of heritage (and) tourism, but also in terms of understanding the practical implications for heritage practices and policy regarding Cold War sites in Britain.
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Chapter 2 - Heritage (and) tourism discourses: a theoretical exploration

The first chapter in Smith’s book *Uses of Heritage* (2009a: 11) starts with the opening sentence, “There is, really, no such thing as heritage”, and even though this is perhaps a rather blunt way of putting things (in perspective); this statement has deeply influenced the direction of this chapter. To elucidate, Smith (2009a: 11) explains that ‘heritage’ is still commonly identified as those things ‘old’, grand, monumental and aesthetically pleasing. However, as this chapter will illustrate, the concept is not so much a ‘thing’, but more a set of values and meanings, which ultimately make heritage a cultural or social practice (Smith, 2009a). These practices include management protocols, techniques and procedures that are undertaken by site managers, policy makers, cultural critics, archaeologists, architects, curators and others who claim to be scientific or aesthetic experts. These practices, as well as the meaning of the ‘material’ in heritage, are constituted by the discourses of those involved in the constructions of heritage, whilst at the same time the constructions influence the practices.

What is discussed in this chapter is, by no means, an easy ride on the ‘heritage bandwagon’, and emerging perspectives on the notion of ‘heritage’ have led to an entire fleet of definitions to choose from. Reflecting back on this study’s objectives 1, 2 and 3, before even considering ‘climbing aboard’ the study of heritage as a whole, first needs to be unpacked, with a central focus on the interpretations of the meanings of the concepts of ‘heritage’ itself. In this sense, following Smith’s (2009a: 6) perspective, a theoretical response to these concepts is almost a precondition of any study on heritage (and) tourism, and therefore included as a subsequent segment (section 2.1) in this study. These exercises seemed easy at first (before engaging with Smith’s understandings of ‘heritage’),
as the term heritage is widely used to describe those things, such as cultural places, traditions and artefacts that are inherited from our past. However, section 2.2 will illustrate that there is a need to accept that, as Naidoo (2005:48) notes, within Britain heritage has always been used as a value-loaded concept, constructed by the cultural and social process of embracing and contesting interpretations based on class, gender and locality. In addition, section 2.2 will demonstrate that heritage discourses can also be an instrument included into wider political agendas, and used to gather and proclaim knowledge about the past to articulate and legitimise ideologies of nationalism and national identity (Hammarlund-Larsson, 2004 quoted in Von Unge, 2008). These authorised discourses and their opposing movements and ideas can either strengthen or undermine existing patterns of power through the affected material places and objects, and the way they are perceived and valued as items of desire, status and prestige.

Whilst thinking about 'discourse' I quickly realised that, in order to avoid getting tangled up in a methodological discussion, there was an urgent need to clarify the use and consequences of the term for this particular study. Although this approach acknowledges that truth and knowledge are plural, contextual and historically produced through discourses, the emphasis differs from Foucault’s work (1991) and Foucauldian approaches (see, for example, Shackley, 2002). These notions of discourse attempt to ‘absorb too much’ into the idea of social (inter)actions and relations of power and knowledge, while neglecting the material, economic and structural factors in the way these knowledge constructions and practices are arranged (Hall, 2001: 73). Instead, although acknowledging the current discussion (on the relevance) of post-modern debates in which discourse is all that matters, this study is based on the epistemological assumptions of subtle realism (see Chapter 5), and therefore, is anchored in an understanding that social relations are connected to the materiality of heritage and have material consequences. If heritage is a process, in the sense that “people talk about, discuss and understand things, such as heritage” (Smith, 2009a: 15), when being in places of heritage, this makes the ability to control these places and defining the experience of being in
that particular place, and of remembering and meaning making, significantly important, as these are essential for individuals and communities in constructing a sense of being in the world and the social, political and cultural networks. Therefore, without losing sight of the materiality of heritage, this study aims to illuminate the (linkages between) discourses of Cold War heritage through practices of identity and meaning making within Cold War tourism attractions in Britain. As a foundation for the concept of discourse, I have used Hajer’s (1996: 44) idea of discourse, stating that:

... [discourse] as a specific ensemble of ideas, concepts and categorisations that are produced, reproduced, and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities.

This definition regards discourse to be a conceptualisation through which actors ‘give meaning to physical and social realities’, and by doing so they reduce the complexity of reality by ‘naming and framing’ it (Schön and Rein, 1994). Additionally, Hajer’s definition sees discourse as an ‘ensemble of concepts, ideas and categorisations’ which assumes a specific set of vocabulary but also suggests that there are ‘story line’ concepts or arguments which can provide a label for a new, alternative or subaltern frame to develop. This means that, in regard to heritage, there appear to be different ways of ‘seeing’ the social practices, as well as different ways of managing or ‘doing’ heritage according to the position of the social actors (Fairclough, 2001: 235). This also provides opportunities for shifts in and outside the discourse and breakthroughs in the heritage process. Finally, Hajer’s definition regards ‘discourse [as being] produced and reproduced in practices’, which means that they have an effect on the discourse, and vice versa, through routines, organisational make-up, procedures or any other regularities (Tennekes, 2007). These effects can come from within the frame, and therefore be regarded as ‘the normal way of acting’ in which actors are not aware of the fact that their acts are also ‘telling a story’, and therefore ‘reproducing a discourse’. Secondly, practices also set the ‘normal’ behaviour for actors in the arena through
which they can influence their chances, through access, position and decision-making processes, to put forward new frames and ensure that these become embedded in future practices. Ultimately, some frames are likely to become more dominant than others, and are therefore more likely to influence the discourse. Hajer’s concept of discourse and the relationship between the two kinds of effects, within the context of heritage, is illustrated in Figure 2:

**Figure 2** The sequential cultural and social processes of heritage
(adapted from Tennekes, 2007: 122)
As discourses in heritage reflect and constitute a range of social practices around nation, class, culture and ethnicity, this is also the case for practices in tourism. As opposed to being a product or destination, tourism also consists of fluid and embodied practices *in situ* through "feeling[s] of doing" (Crouch, 2002: 211), in which our bodies encounter a physical sense of performance and space through their materiality. In this regard, section 2.3 will focus on heritage within the ‘tourism’ discourse through which it is often portrayed as a tourism enterprise and catalyst for economic change, rejuvenation and commodification. In addition, this section will illustrate how this conventional discourse distances the visitor from any practice of ‘cultural ownership’, despite the fact that visiting a Cold War site could be described as a cultural practice grounded within British history. Ultimately, Section 2.5 provides a conclusion and implications of this theorisation regarding the contemporary process of heritage (and) tourism in Britain through the various discourses.

### 2.1 The authorised heritage discourse: processes and practices

At first, defining heritage seemed to be a relatively easy task, as Lowenthal (1996: 226) argues, heritage is "far from being fatally predetermined or God-given", and previous attempts to theorise the concept are "in large measure our own marvellously malleable creation". However, taking into account the concept’s lack of fixity and the present-centeredness of its creation (or attention), Lowenthal also foretold an inherent sense of dispute – or dissonance – within and regarding the concept. Acknowledging this view, it could mean that perhaps, as some have argued, we should not even pursue a tight definition at all, and settle with Larkham’s (1995: 85) proposition that heritage is simply “all things to all people” (see also, Johnson and Thomas, 1995: 170).

Although this offer seemed tempting, especially when taking into account, as Terry-Chandler (1999: 188) mentions, the current consternation of an “unsystematised” nature of heritage studies resulting in nothing more than a “…morass of case studies”, I felt the need to explore and consider the scope and
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Theorisation of the subject within heritage studies to establish a contextual and historical basis within which to place the ideas of Cold War heritage (and) tourism. Needless to say, it is not my intention to outline a comprehensive and narrowly-defined description of heritage, as I feel this will only lead to more debate about the already acknowledged complexity of the phenomenon and not the process or content of heritage and its discourses.

Though certainly understandable, it is perhaps because of the complexity of the concepts ‘under investigation’ that many commentators have left profound queries, including the process of ‘heritagisation’, its agency and the means by which it is constituted, largely unanswered. Despite a slow shift in understanding the heritage phenomenon, understandings are ever so concentrated on strong and often simplistic perspectives on the ‘contemporariness’ of heritage as a condition and product of post-modernity and the post-modern economy (Harvey, 2001: 5). To illustrate, De Cesari (2009: 14-15) notes that “the very notion of heritage in the modern sense was born in the context of modernity’s culture...”. In this sense, its ‘contemporariness’, as McCrone, Morris and Kiely (1995: 1, 12) argue, is rooted “in the restructuring of the world economy, a process which began in the 1970s...” making it a “thoroughly modern concept (as it) belongs to the final quarter of the twentieth century initiated to fulfil a ‘cultural need’ in modern times” (see also, Uriely, 1997; Hannabuss, 1999). These understandings, supposedly reflecting the ‘heterogeneous’ nature of many heritage studies and professional terrain, however, sell heritage short on three important suppositions, which be explained in more detail below: 1) heritage as a linear development; 2) heritage as a commercial practice; 3) heritage as a form and use of leisure time or recreation.

Firstly, to elaborate, there seems to a common assumption of a chronological or linear development of heritage, including the determination of a beginning, within many contemporary heritage studies (see, for example, Nuryanti’s work on heritage and postmodern tourism, 1996; and the collection of essays in Arnold, Davies and Ditchfield, 1998). Although one could say that it is possible to insert
various developments, such as the foundation of institutions and charters, along the timeline, outlining a consecutive history of heritage remains arbitrary. As already previously discussed in this work, and supported by an emerging school of critical scholars (see, for example, Lowenthal, 1985: 219; Harvey, 2008: 23; Smith 2009a: 11) heritage in itself is not a thing nor does it exist by itself and, in addition, it neither implies a movement or a project. In contrast, heritage is part of, and constitutes, the process by which people use the past - the discursive construction of heritage is itself part of the cultural and social processes that are heritage - and not because it simply 'is', nor do these practices just simply 'find' heritage. As a human construction, heritage is therefore ubiquitously intertwined with the power dynamics of a society and interwoven with both collective and individual processes of meaning making and identity constructions. In this sense, heritage is constructed, reconstructed and negotiated by discourses that are expressed and reflected by social and cultural practices, as those things and places that can be given meaning and value as 'heritage', depending on present-day values, debates and aspirations. In that sense, following Harvey’s (2008: 21) argument, the discursive process of heritage is perhaps more, but not exclusively, ‘a practice of’ historical narratives than ‘a history of’.

Nonetheless, as Smith (2009a: 16) argues, it seems possible to expand on the temporal aspect, the when, of heritage, as the contemporary discourses of ‘the past’ stem from late-nineteenth century European social experiences and hierarchies (Harvey, 2001: 320). To illustrate, Walsh argues (1992: 177) that the contemporary concepts of heritage, in this regard, can be regarded as “an intensification of those experiences of time-space compression and institutionalization which had originally emerged during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.” These values and cultural concerns permit heritage to remain subjected to a self-referential and hegemonic discourse in contemporary society. On the other hand, current heritage practices also originate from and are influenced by a much longer temporal framework than acknowledged in most heritage studies, especially in Britain (see section 2.2), and should therefore not only be viewed as a recent product or creation of post-modern and economic
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developments. In fact, although being influenced by historical movements, heritage as a present-day practice and instrument of cultural power actually resides and articulates discourses in the here and now, wherever and whenever that might be. In this sense, heritage ought to be regarded as a present-centred, continuous, sequential, and discursive process in which heritage through social and cultural practices is continuously made, interpreted, given meaning, classified and represented throughout time, to eventually be forgotten or adjusted all over again.

In this regard, to avoid becoming overwhelmed by listed objects, places and practices, heritage cannot be constructed from individual and collective memories and values, which are regulated to a certain degree, without also selecting some things and performances to forget. Within official forms of heritage, the processes of de-accessioning and disposal are partly instructed by authorised practices that privileges 'good' heritage for a wide range of economic, social, political, ecological and 'cultural' uses, whilst 'forgetting' about the 'bad' and 'ugly' of the past. Simultaneously, as Smith (2009a) argues, the process of heritage is similarly, to a certain extent, prevailing as a culturally directed personal and social act in which individuals also actively engage in the process of meaning making and negotiation of what constitutes heritage.

An example of collective and individual constructions of heritage, whilst at the same time 'forgetting' the past, is illustrated in Harrison’s work (2010; 2012). In his work he uses the term ‘absent heritage’ to refer to the ways in which the absences of partially or fully destroyed or neglected objects, sites and places, are conserved actively for social, political and economic revenues generated through tourism. Observations regarding individuals and collective memory, which illustrate that the process of forgetting is integral to the active process of remembering, include the place of the Bamiyan Buddhas which was destroyed by the Taliban but is now listed as a World Heritage Site; traces of the Berlin Wall which have been memorialised through a brick line running through the streets of Berlin, and; the ‘theme park’ Szobor Park situated on the outskirts of Budapest,
which randomly displays Communist memorials and statues that have been removed from their original context in an open air park setting.

Additionally, as Smith (2009a: 28) argues, the where of heritage can be found in the authorial voices of an elite upper class of European, white and educated professionals, experts that construct, reconstruct and negotiate a range of identities, values and meanings through heritage practices such as management and conservation protocols and techniques, and visitations to heritage sites, places and objects as a leisure or recreation activity. Heritage as a cultural and social process or a performance, or what Dicks (2000a) may call an ‘act of communication’, illustrates once more that the past is in a continual flux of alteration and renewal of heritage places, their management and conservation and their interpretation to visitors.

In addition, it constitutes, and is part of, processes within contemporary frameworks in which aspirations, values and meanings on a range of concepts such as ‘identity’, ‘memory’, ‘power’, ‘place’ and ‘performance’ are identified, considered, recreated, rejected or otherwise negotiated (Smith, 2009b). This is done at an international level by organisations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and at a national and local level by organisations such as EH and the NT (see section 2.4). On the contrary, this process is also done through the performance of visiting heritage sites; as visitors themselves participate in leisure and recreational activities compliant with meaning making based on social values and processes of collective and individual remembrance and commemorations (Smith, 2009b).

Secondly, there seems to be a general assumption within academic and professional debates that heritage is merely an economic and commercial practice. While some argue that heritage assets can yield multiple, distinct and incremental economic benefits and opportunities and therefore cannot be disassociated from the economy (see, for example, Rypkema, 2009), others claim that it will eventually lead to economic commodification and exploitation (discussed in more
detail in section 2.2). Despite these constricted perspectives on heritage, within both the academic and professional arena, the economic and management potential has dominated to the conceptualisation of heritage in terms of ‘(cultural) heritage management’, ‘cultural resource management’ or ‘archaeological heritage management’. The latter derives from the notion that it is the historians and archaeologists who “speak for the past that cannot represent itself...” (Blakey, 1994: 39).

Together these terms are commonly used amongst heritage professionals to indicate the manageable process and uses of heritage. In this sense, the process involves the responsibility of, or caring for, the heritage ‘resources’ - or in more economic terms ‘assets’ - for present or future generations, and managing “such assets to the best of our ability” (Du Cross and Lee, 2007: 1). Additionally, ‘good’ heritage management, as argued by the World Bank (2001: 45), can enhance “the economically ‘capturable’ values of cultural asset” that people assign to them. In this regard, the uses of the past are – and can increasingly become – a ‘value-adding industry’ in which its management can be prized, as Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998: 150) argues, as an ‘activity’:

... [adding] value to existing assets that have either ceased to be viable or that never were economically productive because their location is too hot, or too cold, or too wet, or too dry, or too remote, or because they are operated outside the realm of profit...

It is important to note that this strong connection between heritage and the market place is not without raison d'être, as its perspectives derive from the same business-oriented disciplinary lines as from where they originate. For example, despite the emerging and interdisciplinary character of the heritage concept and area, heritage studies and research frequently remain incorporate divisions or subject areas within university faculties oriented toward business management and industry-driven applied research (Jamal and Kim note (2005); see also, Jamal and Choi, 2003). Heritage studies, within the context of tourism, remain
philosophically and institutionally dominated by business and management approaches, which constrain these studies from developing new directions and understandings (Jamal and Choi, 2003; also see Jamal and Kim, 2005; Ren, Pritchard and Morgan, 2010; Tribe, 2010). These scientific-positivistic constraints continue to direct its scholarship, while being supported by neo-liberal values of "performativity, consumerism and profitability" (Tribe, 2009: 41) and often ignoring political, social and environmental issues.

To demonstrate, Table 1 displays a chronological spectrum of academic views of heritage inspired by, and critiquing, conventional and authorised discourses, yet all reflecting the tendencies towards industry-driven, supply-demand approaches, and underlining the consequence of consumerism and commodification. Although the emphasis between the definitions varies, they all confirm the general argument of heritage being perceived as an *industry*, and in most cases ultimately portrayed as a solution or a problem within contemporary culture. These market-driven perspectives, either positive or negative, seem to validate management or marketing practices and performances that promote financial progress, yet they slow down more profound cultural and social practices and understandings for both academics and professionals (Adams and Jeanrenaud, 2008; Weaver, 2011).

Thirdly, in line with its commercialisation, heritage is often understood as just "something people do in their free time" (Harvey, 2001: 6); by which people engage with artefacts, buildings, landscapes and local traditions as a form of leisure or recreation. This additional aspect is part of the varied and nuanced social and cultural practices characterising heritage; but it is more than only a pleasurable leisure experience. Instead, engaging with heritage as an act of leisure and recreation, for example visiting a historic site or monument, is more likely to have cultural and social meanings that go beyond the idea of simply 'a nice day out' (Smith, 2009a: 145). It is often in the activity of the visit, rather than in the simple knowledge that the object, place or monument exists, that people find and express a sense of who they are – and who they would want to be – in relation to and within the material environment.
### Table 1  Definitions of heritage tourism reflecting industry-driven, supply-demand approaches and practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Conceptualisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hewison (1987: 144)</td>
<td>It [heritage] is static, fossilising the past and distorting historical facts for the purpose of entertainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowes (1989: 36)</td>
<td>Heritage must be broadly defined to encompass not only major historic sites and institutions, but the entire landscape of the region with its geographic base... and of course, the people themselves and their traditions and economic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashworth (1994: 16)</td>
<td>Heritage is a contemporary commodity purposefully created to satisfy contemporary consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schouten (1995: 21)</td>
<td>Heritage is history processed through mythology, ideology, nationalism, local pride, romantic ideas or just plain marketing, into a commodity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutter and Rizzo (1997: 307)</td>
<td>It [heritage] stages its spectacles in a promiscuous variety of venues, turning maltings into concert halls, warehouses into studio flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock (1997: 195)</td>
<td>[Heritage is] ...an intangible service increasing the utility of consumers, in which historic buildings and artefacts are inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aitchison, Macleod and Shaw (2000: 96)</td>
<td>Heritage is the processed product of history – in effect heritage is history re-shaped and made palatable for contemporary consumption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This construction of identity and meaning making that emerges, and is central in the heritage experience, is “one in which ‘likeness’ is actively being sought and constructed” (Smith, 2009a: 301) as it defines who one is, and is not. The sense of inclusion and exclusion is by all means political, as the material forms of heritage are determined and constructed through discourses about them, providing a legitimising force for proclamations of collective, national and individual identities as well as sense of ethnic, spiritual and aspirational belonging.

To continue, the previous accounts have illustrated how various ‘heterogeneous’ concepts and perspectives of heritage have developed and changed according to the temporal cultural and social context in which they reside. Despite the emphasis or even ‘fetishisation’ of the tangible aspects of heritage, heritage in itself cannot be regarded as a ‘thing’, nor does it exist by itself and, in addition, it neither implies a movement or a project. Furthermore, heritage implies more than a focus oriented towards business management and industry-driven applied research. Instead, the above writings have demonstrated that heritage is part of, and constitutes, the processes by which people use the past. In fact, the discursive construction of heritage is itself part of the cultural and social processes that are heritage. In this sense, heritage is ubiquitously intertwined with the power dynamics of a society, in which the decision-making processes are interwoven with collective, national, and individual constructions of identity, aspirations and memory that are exemplified in objects and practices of remembering at heritage sites and places (see, for example, Smith, 2009a; Timothy and Boyd, 2003; Graham et al, 2000). In this sense, heritage is constructed, reconstructed, and negotiated by discourses that are influenced, expressed and reflected by social and cultural practices that occur at these sites, as those experiences of heritage can provide meaning and value depending on present-day values, debates and aspirations.

In conclusion, heritage should be regarded as a present-centred, continuous, sequential process in which heritage is not only a social and cultural practice, but also an instrument of cultural power, based on authorised and subaltern discourses.
in the _here_ and _now_, wherever and whenever that might be. This last comment illustrates that, although or because, heritage is a subjective and value-loaded concept that is filtered with references to the present and the future – whenever that 'present' actually is –, it is intrinsically reflective of a relationship with the past, – irrespective of how that 'past' is perceived and defined. The temporal process of 'heritagisation' in Britain, related to societal changes and power relations, is further explored in section 2.2. This section might merely scratch the surface of the historically contingent and embedded nature of heritage within Britain, but it will enable an engagement with the current debates about discourses around Cold War heritage, and subsequent practices of identity and meaning making within contemporary society.

2.2 Heritage discourses in Britain: temporal ways of 'seeing'

As already mentioned in the previous section, Harvey's (2008: 21) subjective historical analysis of heritage, with a particular focus on the developments in Britain, has revealed a much deeper history as acknowledged in most contemporary debates around the concept of heritage. To recap, although heritage is regarded by some authors as "a particular post-modern expression tied to a manifestation of economic commodification and hyper-relativism" (Smith, 2009a: 17), the origins of today's heritage debates derive largely from nineteenth-century developments of nationalism and liberal modernity and the sense of pastoral care of, or power over, the material past (see also, Foucault, 1988).

During this 'Age of Ideology', Europe witnessed significant cultural changes characterised by a loss of faith in traditional religious and political foundations of authority and a shift towards democracy and equality based on scientific principles. The thought of progress strengthened and legitimised Europe's yearning for colonial and imperial expansions through which new dialogues about race and identity were established and naturalised the inevitability of European cultural and technical advancement and achievement (Trigger, 1989). In this context, nationalism and territorial identity developed as meta-narratives to bind
geographically and culturally separated populations (Graham et al., 2000: 12) and the industrial revolution and related urbanisation gave way to the emergence of a middle class as feudalism gave way to capitalism. Overall, the nineteenth century can be regarded as a period that called for “new devices to ensure or express social cohesion and identity and to structure social relations” (Hobsbawn, 1983: 263). It is within this context of a new Modern Europe that the concern for, what we nowadays know as, ‘heritage’ emerged. Historic sites and monuments, mostly country houses and ‘exotic’ artefacts, were to be “protected and managed for the edification of the general public as physical representations of national identity and European taste and achievement” (Smith, 2009a: 18; Henson, 2012).

As Smith (2009a: 19) notes, particularly in England, and to a lesser degree the rest of the United Kingdom, a ‘conservation ethic’ became embedded in organisations such as the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB, established in 1877) and the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty (the ‘National Trust’, founded in 1985). These institutions aimed for greater conservation awareness and appreciation of the nation’s cultural heritage, as opposed to ordinary industrially produced objects (Pearce, 1989: 5), through lobbying and educating government and society in general about the ‘proper’ principles of conservation and the value and aesthetic significance of ancient buildings.

The sense of inheritance, and the ‘duty’ of the present to the past and its monuments, was heavily influenced by the work of the English art critic and social thinker John Ruskin (1819 - 1900), and eventually led to the English conservation ethos of ‘conserve as found’ in which “the responsibility of the present is to receive and revere that which has been passed on and in turn pass this inheritance on, untouched, to future generations” (Smith, 2009a: 19). She continues by stating that much of Ruskin’s conservation philosophy was based on the late nineteenth-century movement of Romanticism, which evolved around the notion that it was the professional responsibility to care for and pass on the aesthetical and untouched buildings of past time (2009a: 20). In addition, with the
establishment of the National Trust to address threats to the landscape of the Lake District (Jenkins, 1994), the conservation of 'natural' heritage was added to this sense of 'trusteeship' that led to the construction of a natural landscape which needed to be protected from the depredations of human interference (Head, 2000; Waterton, 2005).

The European conservation principles also became implemented in other places outside the 'old' world. In the United States the principles found synergy with the nineteenth century concept of 'secular pietism' that thrived within American preservation movements (Murtagh, 1997: 11). Likewise, the principles became embedded (or imposed) within colonial government legislations on heritage and its definition and categories, such as the Historical Monuments Acts, 1967 of Uganda. Most of these legislations generally equated heritage to build or material aspects, such as man-made structures, monuments, relics and artefacts with connections to historical events, whilst excluding the intangible, non-material or living aspects (ICCROM, 2009). These European conservation principles also became embedded in a range of ICOMOS charters, such as the Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments of 1931 and the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration (also referred to as the Venice Charter), of 1964, that carry on to structure and define the discussions about conservation and heritage management practices (Smith, 2009a).

Throughout the twentieth century, attention within organisations such as the National Trust shifted from the conservation of 'natural' heritage, such as open landscapes and medieval remains, to the acquirement of country houses and gardens which could no longer be maintained by the landed gentry and aristocrats (Smith, 2009a: 22). The National Trust, embedded within educated, privileged and influential circles of enlightened aristocrats and intensely connected with the state, became increasingly involved in the maintenance and preservation of these buildings and designed landscapes (Harvey, 2008). New legislation in 1937 and 1939 allowed owners to gift or bequeath their properties to the National Trust, while in most cases remaining tenants in their old home and benefitting from
generous tax concessions due to the property transfer. As part of their concern for popularising a purposively ‘national’ heritage agenda, the Trust would, in return, maintain, repair, modernise and transform the ancestral estates and country houses into public symbols of national pride (Mandler, 1997). As Lowenthal (1996: 65) illustrates, quoting The Times:

The great houses of England were brought into public ownership by confident delegation, by mild nepotism ... by leaning on the great and the good ... This was the old-boys network’s finest hour ... the noblest nationalisation. Trust officials were manifestly of the same class and stock ... [and] the aristocracy yielded up its finest possessions...into the care of like-minded guardians ... They shared assumptions, friends, even families.

In this sense, the campaigning elements of institutionalised bodies, such as the National Trust, resemble those of Ruskin and Morris, and are directed not at a social revolution, but at assembling and manipulating a public enthusiasm for the ‘olden-time’ (Harvey, 2008). Accordingly, the mediated past needed to be revered and conserved for the ‘good’ of the nation, in order to display an ideal (or appearance) of continuity – in physical form or in the presence of genetic lineage – which should be adhered to (Wright, 1985). In addition, these conservation ideas and ideologies, drawing on the desirability (and inevitability) of inheritance, grand narratives and the aesthetic taste of the upper class, advocated the preservation of elite heritage as a representative of Britain’s ‘national heritage’ and national identity (Smith, 2009a: 22). In the end, this has led to, as Lowenthal (1996: 66) argues, an ultimate heritage product in which “the British national legacy now embraces the entire countryside.”

Therefore, while patrimony elsewhere remained an exclusive practice of the elites, in Britain it became something that was openly accessible for the public to see, visit and enjoy. In this sense, in a more positive perspective, heritage denotes what belongs to and certifies all of its communal members, as “we are all its owners”
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(Lowenthal, 1996: 67). Hence, during the second half of the twentieth century, agencies of heritage such as the National Trust appeared to incorporate new consultation techniques that featured more ‘democratic’ and public consumption practices in their heritage agendas. As Harvey argues (2008: 30), this was partly due to a perception shift of heritage as a ‘social movement’ or revolution towards an ‘industry’, with particular attention on the growth of attractions and practices associated with communal and industrial heritage. In addition, he argues (2008: 23), it painted a democratic and open-view of a heritage that was ‘of the people’ instead of ‘for the people’ and a shift “towards the nation as the key axis through which heritage is replicated.”

Paradoxically, during the late 1960s and 1970s, this approach of ‘public heritage’ raised public concerns and criticism on the existing dominant environmental and heritage issues. The origins of this debate are still disputed (see section 2.2); some see it as a result of higher levels of education combined with an increase in income and leisure time (see, for example, Prentice, 1993; Light and Prentice, 1994; Stebbins, 1996), and therefore a greater public interest in historic surroundings, buildings and the environment, whilst others (see, for example, Richter, 2001) suggest it was a consequence of political and technological changes that occurred in the 1950s and 1960s with the development of jet aircrafts and travel information systems to meet the growing demand of global travel and tourism products.

All the same, the certainties of a bounded and singular heritage belonging to a white and upper-middle class became increasingly challenged in what Hall (2005: 28) has termed a “deep slow-motion revolution” that was embedded in a broader movement to dismantle the Enlightenment ideal of ‘universal knowledge’. This monumental shift in the meaning of heritage evidently influenced the development of two areas of heritage practices (Hewison, 1987; Boswell and Evans, 1999; Smith, 2009a). The first area involved an increase in heritage tourism as a sector of industry in Europe and America in the 1970s and 1980s, expanding the supply of heritage with heritage attractions through broadening
what counted as heritage in terms of class and aesthetics. These populist forms of ‘history from below’ were perceived as a platform from which industrial, domestic and ‘everyday’ heritage could be displayed and experienced through mass consumption (see, for example, Prentice, 1993, 2005; Hollinshead, 1997, Robertson, 2008).

Critique on the advent of mass tourism, leading to the emergence of a ‘heritage industry’, was led by historians such as Hewison (1981, 1987, and 1991) and Wright (1985, 1991). Especially in Britain, this criticism has been particularly vociferous, and was extensively adopted and articulated by various commentators in heritage studies (see, for example, Merriman, 1989; Walsh, 1992; McCrone et al, 1995). Centred on the advent of mass tourism, both Hewison and Wright argued that the mass interest in heritage, as a symptom of a backward-looking country, was based on a nostalgic yearning for better times and a loss of cultural confidence, which would ultimately lead to an overall cultural decline. Hewison (1987) particularly criticised the heritage industry as being nothing more than ‘bogus history’; a sanitised, false and inauthentic heritage that is purposively created, controlled, commodified and commercialised by a small intellectual group with a hegemonic interest in satisfying the contemporary consumption of a gullible audience of heritage tourists (see also, Ashworth, 1994). To illustrate, through their quasi-official roles in bodies such as the National Trust or other state-related organisations, the production of heritage products in practice remained firmly embedded through formal mediation amongst the privileged and educated experts, whilst at the same time enforcing the state’s role as its arbiter. As the former Head of Sustainability and Environmental Practices, Rob Jarman, illustrated in a telephone interview in 2002 (Fox and Johnston, 2009: 6):

We listen to our members, but they are not shareholders, in the sense that we don’t make decisions which are made by members, we make decisions which are made by Trustees on the basis of a lot of weighing up of the pros and cons.
The second movement of (authorised) heritage practices in the Western World can be traced to the degree by which national public heritage policies and legislations were introduced or amended around lists, registers or schedules of places (sometimes other entities) to which cultural significance could be ascribed (Lozny, 2006; Smith, 2009a). For example, deriving from the earlier *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act* of 1979, the *National Heritage Act* was established in 1980 (and amended in 1983 and 1997 and 2002), aiming to protect British national heritage assets through the governing by non-departmental public bodies and boards of trustees (Lozny, 2006).

Established by this act, and ‘godparent’ of the Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings in England list, is the “executive non-departmental body” English Heritage (EH) - formally known as the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England. Similar government agencies in Britain to that of EH include the Welsh heritage conservation body CADW which lists, conserves, protects and promotes the tangible patrimony of Wales, especially in cooperation with private property owners and other stakeholders, and Historic Scotland, which represents the interests of the built environment to the Scottish government through listing, conserving and interpreting the tangible past. The way in which the authorised heritage discourse is institutionalised by, and embedded within, these organisations is further explored in sections 2.3 and 2.4.

As a final point, on the surface, and in concurrence with the idea of “heritage of the nation” (see, for example, Smith, 2009a; Gillman, 2010), local communities and individuals actively seem to engage with, and be accepted and incorporated in, discussions of ‘the past’. The need, and sometimes even the desire, to work with community groups or individuals has, in many cases, grown from the campaigning efforts of these groups for greater inclusion and concerns for their needs, values and aspirations regarding ways in which their emotional and intangible past is used and presented through heritage practices (Smith, 2009a). Although, as a subject, ‘the past’ is often defined as something singular and concrete, whilst simultaneously being portrayed as vague, mysterious and difficult
to pin down, it is often felt that only those holding expert knowledge can identify
the innate value and significance of its current uses as heritage. This self-
referential and elitist discourse, in which archaeologists and conservation
architects claim expert authority over material culture (whether artefacts, sites or
structure), authorises its legitimate spokespersons’ ability to ‘speak to’, make
sense of and select aesthetically pleasing material objects, sites and places or
landscapes to be saved ‘for future generations’ (see, for example, Murray, 1989;
Trigger, 1989; Byrne, 1991; and Smith, 2004 for archaeology; and Lowenthal,

Although the when of the British ‘Authorised Heritage Discourse’ (AHD)
stretches back to the nineteenth century, the where can still be found in authorial
and institutionalised voices of the ruling classes and organisations through codes
of practices, legislations, charters, conventions and agreements regarding the
preservation and management of heritage sites and places (Smith, 2009a).
Nevertheless, the authorised discourse has not remained unchallenged, although
perhaps relatively lesser developed in Britain when compared to other countries.
Consequently, the present-day authorised discourses of institutionalised bodies in
Britain, such as the NT and EH, and their consequences, are discussed in more
detail in section 2.4, whilst simultaneously including the development of their
subaltern and opposing strands of critique from both academic and public stances.

2.3 Discourses in/of heritage tourism: reflections through ‘doing’

In the preceding sections, I have already, to some extent, introduced the concept of
discourses in/of tourism and, more specifically, its implications and linkages with the
concept of heritage in Britain. However, there has not been much debate between
discourse scholars or practitioners on the intense and complex relationship between
discourse, tourism and heritage, even though the question of ‘meaning’ in/of heritage
tourism has sparked the interest of many semioticians and anthropologists for a
considerable time (see, for example, Culler, 1981; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett and Bruner,
In recent years, and in response, some have expressed their frustration in the literature regarding the “lack of receptivity to intellectual currents in the ‘parent’ disciplines” (McNamee, 2000: 125), rendering understandings of discourses in/of heritage tourism ‘relatively unexplored’, but also ‘undertheorised’ (Meethan, 2001: 2), and ultimately ‘resolutely non-empirical’ (see, for example, Aitchison, 2000; Jaworski and Pritchard, 2005: 2). In spite of this lack of interest, international heritage tourism is definitely a leading industry, proven to be resilient and able to cope with present-day economic, political and natural shocks and crises. Furthermore, within many contemporary societies, travelling is regarded as a sine qua non of human existence, resulting in what Krippendorf has termed as “a feverish desire to move” (1997: xiii). In this sense, as Jaworski and Pritchard (2005: 8) state:

... it is impossible not to acknowledge, albeit in the sketchiest of ways, a large body of work on tourism, travel, mobility, etc. which has engaged with the nations of discourse, communication, interaction, representation, ideology and so on, although usually without the reference to discourse analysis as a method of close analysis of texts, be it spoken, written, visual or otherwise ...

Nonetheless, and only comparatively recently, especially since the 1990s, tourism is recognised as an important context for the study of discourse, and research of discourse in/of tourism was placed on the map of critical social scientific investigations. Most notable in this sense, amongst others, is the early sociological work of Urry (2002) and MacCannell (1999), the anthropological and ethnographical enquiries by scholars such as Clifford (1988, 1997), performance studies by, amongst others, Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998), and geographical and historical studies by Edensor (1998), Crouch and Lübren (2003) and Hannam (2002). Following Fox (2010), tourism started being treated as speech (Picard, 1993), as word and communication (Tresse cited in Dann, 1996), as semantics (Hollinshead, 1994) and as propaganda (Lash and Urry, 1994). In addition, these works, spanning several disciplines through cross- and post-disciplinary approaches, brought together different methodological perspectives and analytic attention for researcher positionality and reflectivity, among them Selwyn (1996),
Echtner and Jamal (1997) and Downward and Mearman (2004). Moreover, these attempts to overcome, or at least point out, powerful epistemological boundaries are encouraged by fractures in formerly stable divisions between academic disciplines. To elaborate, this study follows the suggestion by Morgan and Bischoff (2003: 295) that:

... by connecting more fully [sic] with the wider debates in the social sciences and embracing pluralist, multi-dimensional epistemologies already in evidence elsewhere, tourism studies has the opportunity to create a richer, more inclusive and more innovative research base.

Although there is still plenty that needs to be done (as research is ‘doing’), pluralist and multi-disciplinary epistemologies are gathering pace, as reflected in the emergence of new journals “that are orientated towards theoretical and critical works in the methodological issues in tourism studies” (Jamal and Hollinshead, 2001: 66). This development is rooted, and likely to accelerate ever more, in a shifting, and almost global, focus from a production/consumption economy to discursive world making/shaping processes (Hollinshead, 2004), broadening the traditional management focus towards more social and cultural arenas, including performances, reflections, active practices and feelings of belonging and exclusion. In such a climate of epistemological discussion and synthesis, I believe that, following Fox (2010: 303), to understand and be aware of multiple ‘realities’, we need to:

...consider the relationship between the complexity of the tourism industry and discourse, and within that relationship the many roles of discourses as a creator [and catalyst] of an array of social actions which constitute tourism.

Although most scholars acknowledge that heritage tourism is one of the most notable and widespread types of tourism, and amongst the very oldest forms of travel, a persistent string of critique on the uses of heritage argues that tourism reduces heritage to simple entertainment, and ultimately turns places and sites into ‘theme parks’. For example, Wright (1985), one of the initiators of the critique on the ‘heritage industry’,
already warned that Britain itself would become a gigantic theme park through tourism marketing, offering its visitors ‘Disneyfied’ interpretations which would simplify the historical messages of the past (see, for example, Smith, Clarke and Allcock, 1992; McCrone et al, 1995; Hollinshead, 1997; Brett, 1996; Burton, 2003). The advent of mass tourism, together with forces of economic rationalism and globalisation, in the 1980s and 1990s, has brought the lexis of ‘consumption’ as a practice of heritage interpretation into heritage debates (Dicks, 2003: 33, see also, Teo, 2002). Furthermore, resulting from the earlier conservation and preservation origins, Malcolm-Davies (2004: 279) describes a recent subsequent ‘heritage phase’ which is “one in which the resource is transformed into a product for consumption in the marketplace”. Evidently, in this sense, heritage sites are meant not only to respond to the expectations and desires of their visitors; they are, too, intended to create and produce these expectations and desires (Fox, 2010). The promotional discourse that sparks the consumption of heritage through tourism is more than a reflection of reality: it is, at the same time, the creator of that reality and an invitation for visitors to engage in the practices or performances of heritage.

In this regard, heritage is fused by mass tourism and the processes of engagement with heritage are reduced to simple consumption. Whether actively or unconsciously, by imposing (or at least proposing) an authorised heritage discourse and an obligation for visitors to partake in the experience, the practices of managers, conservationists, experts, and so on, also enforce a system of social values, meanings and identities upon the same visitors. This does not imply that heritage is solely an economic resource; rather, as Smith (2009a: 34) argues, it is also the reduction of heritage as only (or largely) a product of the marketplace, enforcing once more the idea of heritage as a ‘thing’, which is passively and unquestioningly consumed by mass consumers who are manipulated by tourism marketing.

Nonetheless, it is the same critique on the heritage industry that is reproducing some of the practices that authorised discourses in heritage tourism generate, in the sense that both authorised discourse practitioners and critics regard heritage visitors or users as passive consumers. In more detail, the critics often also label visitors as ‘tourists’,
which further detaches heritage users from actively and consciously engaging with heritage sites, objects and monuments. Within this concept, tourists are culturally oblivious or foreign to the heritage they visit or engage in, and they may even be regarded as those who are ‘simply passing through’. Consequently, as Smith (2009a: 123) notes, what this governing or regulating discourse does is distance the visitor from any sense of cultural ‘ownership’ in regard to heritage.

Within tourism literature this distancing is linked with the concept of (visiting) the ‘other’ or the (desire to) experience ‘otherness’, as people attempt to engender a divergent sense of ‘being’ and ‘place’ (see, for example, Peillon, 1984; Linnekin, 1997; Hollinshead, 1998). In its attempts, this requires the production and consumption of representations of ‘otherness’, such as signs or images, which are marketed and sold to tourists. Accordingly, ‘otherness’, represented as places, objects, artwork, food and other elements that are ‘exotic’, ‘sensuous’ or ‘different’, is discretely channelled into tourist, retail and media networks (Appadurai, 1990). Simultaneously, ‘otherness’ is also, and often vigorously, commodified, reproduced and displayed as a domestic space in a home-away-from-home context, reproducing familiarity and ‘feelings of home’, as seen in international hotels, retail outlets and holiday resorts. In Britain, especially the latter process of ‘othering’ is something that can be found in the concept of ‘family space’, a hidden trace against non-white, non-middle-class groups, as the idea that heritage speaks to – and is fundamentally about – the cultural symbols of a white British class system. In this regard, touristic heritage places become ideological spaces, and vice versa, with a leisure and family focus, offering domestic, conflict-free and sanitised experiences which are inherently ‘good’, educational and culturally fulfilling due to the constitution and construction by the authorised discourse (Waterton and Watson, 2010; Smith, 2012).

Returning to the scope of this study, I wonder if visiting a heritage site could really be defined as tourism in this passive sense. Could it not also be termed a cultural practice, with historical linkages and cultural currency for its visitors? What if these visitors participate in practices that are culturally close to themselves, as memories that are part of their identity; can they still be solely defined as tourists in the traditional sense?
In fact, as Samuel (1994) argues, it is impossible to lump all discourses of heritage tourism under the branch of the ‘heritage industry’, as heritage does much more than offering a sanitised experience to be consumed by its visitors. In response to the ‘otherness’ described in the previous paragraph, Adams (1991), for example, has noted that four out of five tourists to the Toraja highlands in Sulawesi, Indonesia, are in fact fellow Indonesians in search of their cultural identity. Although this form of domestic tourism is encouraged by state propaganda as a way of merging the cohesion and unity of a nation, engaging with an authorised discourse in tourism seems still likely to be much more than just the testimony of that place or an invitation to the ‘consumption’ of commodities.

In this regard, heritage tourism is more a sort of ‘Imaginarium’ (Boswell, 2011: 6), an entity that allows visitors to re-imagine aspects of one’s past or present, and to express or perform aspects of identity that are not offered under ‘normal’ circumstances, or even do not exist (Meethan, 2001). Although these experiences might perhaps take place in a circumscribed framework, they do allow ways of re-imagining the self, the ‘other’ and the ‘collective’; at least, temporarily. This alternative or individual production of heritage through identity construction suggests that knowledge production through tourism continues in new forms beyond the overarching discourses of dominant heritage management and institutions (Boswell, 2011). The proposition that I would suggest is that tourism is an (embodied) practice or expression of ontological knowledge, illustrated by Smith’s (2009a: 77) remark that “we encounter space in its materiality, and that materiality is itself constructed and understood through our engagements and encounters with it.”

This understanding also makes cultural meanings fluid and created through embodied “feeling[s] of doing” (Coleman and Crang, 2002: 211). Traditionally important as a marketing strategy in heritage tourism, and widely criticised for its commodified and Disneyfied character (see, for example, Hollinshead, 1999), the tourist experience (or ‘Western’ search for authentic experiences), nonetheless demonstrates the importance of ‘being’ at a ‘place’. To expand, the idea of ‘doing’ in a place helps to overcome the
perception of a passive, consuming audience, and helps to include these visitors as active agents in the discourses of identity construction and meaning making of heritage through tourism. In addition, it contributes to conceptual understandings of the multiple meanings which exist about Cold War heritage, and how these places are physically and emotionally encountered and constructed as realities and categories of thought (Escobar, 2001: 140).

2.4 Heritage (and) tourism in Britain: discourses in ‘practice’

This section will further explore the idea and possible power relationships that inform the discourses of heritage (and) tourism and ultimately structures society, processes of place-making, people-making and past-making. One strong set of views, which have been addressed in earlier sections, perceives heritage as an essentially conservative and nostalgic process and, when linked with tourism, leading to a ‘heritage industry’. From this perspective, practices are deployed to reinforce old certainties and identity constructions to be consumed by the masses. This sense of a fixed inheritance is inserted and strengthened with elite narratives that are centred on romanticised and idealised views of the past, which, in a British context, favour rural places and ‘golden age’ images.

In the geographical context of Britain, the established bodies that are assigned to listing and protecting, mostly tangible, heritage range from full governmental organisations to quasi-governmental agencies, representing both non-profit organisations and associations. Table 2 shows an overview of authorised organisations in charge of heritage protection in Britain.
### Table 2  Organisations in charge of heritage protection in Britain
(adapted from Timothy and Boyd, 2003: 113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intra-governmental level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning: Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)</td>
<td>Planning: Directorate for the Built Environment and the Directorate for Planning and Environmental Appeals</td>
<td>Planning: Planning Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture: Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS)</td>
<td>Culture: Directorate for Culture and Digital</td>
<td>Culture: Heritage Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)</td>
<td>Environment: Rural and Environment Directorate</td>
<td>Environment: Department of Environment, Sustainability and Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>England</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wales</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England - better known as English Heritage (EH)</td>
<td>Historic Scotland</td>
<td>Cadw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS)</td>
<td>The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historic Monuments of Wales (RCAHNMW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continues on next page)
## Non-governmental national level (non-inclusive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The Institute of Conservation (ICON)</td>
<td>- Association of Independent Museums</td>
<td>- SPAB: Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ancient Monuments Society Battlefield Trust</td>
<td>- Association of Industrial Archaeology</td>
<td>- SAVE Britain’s Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The National Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## National amenity societies and groups (non-inclusive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity societies:</td>
<td>Amenity societies:</td>
<td>Amenity societies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ancients Monuments Society</td>
<td>- Ancient Monuments Society</td>
<td>- Ancient Monuments Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Council for British Archaeology</td>
<td>- The Council for British Archaeology</td>
<td>- The Council for British Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Twentieth Century Society</td>
<td>- The Victorian Society</td>
<td>- The Twentieth Century Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Victorian Society</td>
<td>- Architectural Heritage Society of Scotland</td>
<td>- The Victorian Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National groups:</td>
<td>Scottish civic trust</td>
<td>National groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Garden History Society</td>
<td>National museums of Scotland</td>
<td>- Civic trust for Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Heritage Alliance</td>
<td>The Scottish Covenant Memorial Association</td>
<td>National groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wildlife and Countryside Link</td>
<td>ALGAO Scotland</td>
<td>- People’s Collection Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Civic Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td>- History Research Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Dehongli Cymru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this study, one of the primary agencies involved in the protection and conservation of (built) heritage, including Cold War remains, which is especially interesting to examine in more detail, is the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, more commonly known as English Heritage (EH). This agency is the government’s statutory advisor for heritage issues, and aims to conserve, broaden public access to, and increase understanding of ‘the environment’ (English Heritage, n.d.). Established under the National Heritage Act of 1983 and formalised in 1984, EH manages over 400 historic monuments and buildings, most of which were previously in the care of the former Department of National Heritage, which was replaced in 1997 by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). Although EH is funded by the government and under the sponsorship of the Department of Environment, it is an independent non-departmental public body (NDPB), which executes the identification and protection of heritage, aiming “to safeguard for the future the most significant physical remains of our national story” (English Heritage, 2011). Based on a personal inventory (May 2012) of the 385 sites advertised on their website, the uses of heritage remain connected to sites, monuments and buildings that represent only a particular section of England’s multicultural past.

English Heritage’s properties currently consist of about 13 natural or landscape sites, including gardens, ruins and scenic locations. An additional 103 sites can be termed as historical and archaeological heritage, including abbeys, medieval castles and burial chambers. A further 153 sites can be described as ‘built heritage’, composed of man-made structures created primarily to provide shelter for humans and for the practices of daily activities, including merchants’ houses, market halls, royal mansions and palaces. Roughly 90 sites in this latter category are ecclesiastical buildings or stately homes for royalty and the nobility (55), leaving only a small number for non-traditional heritage, such as the York Cold War bunker, three mills and three industrial estates, and one ‘row house’ (Smith, 2012). To conclude, roughly 116 sites were referred to as ‘monuments’, an adopted term defined in the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act (1797). English Heritage argues that this materialistic rendition of heritage is
made of a specific set of material things that are based on a specific collection of knowledge and values, which ensure the ‘proper’ care of heritage, as Lamb (2007: 38) has illustrated:

Surely all of us involved in the protection and explanation of the nation’s heritage believe the beauty, inspiration and education it provides can be enjoyed by everyone ... Crucially though, we need to remain confident about the value of the expert informing and educating people about the significance of the psychical remains of the past.

As EH also increasingly aims to attract new members and funding, the language it uses has inevitably been promotional. In addition, the government also encouraged capitalist thinking from the early 1980s as stated in a report from 1981, “the Government considers that a more imaginative approach to promoting monuments could lead to much more income being generated...” (Delafons, 1997: 136). In response, and copying the National Trust, English Heritage launched a membership scheme, with subscriptions rising from 12,764 in 1984 to 750,000 in 2011 (Gilmour, 2007; English Heritage, n.d.). However, it is debatable what it is that members sign up for in regard to (their) heritage. As illustrated above, it is perhaps feasible to say that the list of sites expresses a high level of commitment to the idea of heritage being classified as a distant past, and visible in tangible or monumental remains. Although the list includes fewer grand, old and aesthetically pleasing monuments, properties and sites, such as industrial estates, war sites and structures, and commonplace workhouses, the number of stately homes, ancient castles, monasteries and abbeys, and archaeological sites overruns these places. Overall, the list demonstrates, once more, the authorised self-referential discourse, through its construction of an unquestioned material reality and claims about itself. In this sense, the list contributes to the discourse, as Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004) argues, it tends to transform and reconstruct itself in its image and, in this case, that of its creator, English Heritage. Furthermore, English Heritage’s competitive strategy became further embedded throughout the
organisation by the appointment of commercially-orientated people such as Jennifer Page (appointed as Chief Executive in 1989); by adding commercial activities such as shops and events; and by rebranding staff from being “guards in prison warden uniforms” to custom oriented facilitators in “uniforms for custodians in soft, but welcoming tones” (Eastaugh and Weiss, 1989).

However, since the turn of the 21st century, the authorised heritage organisations, such as English Heritage, Cadw and Historic Scotland, have undertaken large-scale attempts to modernise and reform their heritage protection schemes. Driven by the hassle of competition and stirred by a need to react to what Gordon Brown and the New Labour government called “money for modernisation”; heritage agencies, organisations and institutions have made efforts to appear more modern, relevant and “fit for purpose” (DCMS, 2003; English Heritage, 2006; Waterton and Smith, 2008). The review of the heritage protection system – the Heritage Protection Review (HPR) – was initiated in 2001 with the publication of The Historic Environment: A force for our future (DCMS, 2001), after which a number of policy documents emerged. Prior to this review, attempts had been made by a government steering group to deliver an accumulative overview of what was meant by the terms ‘heritage’ and ‘historic environment’ (Waterton and Smith, 2008). Further steps in the review process were made by the publication of consultation and committee reports, which yielded hundreds of responses from key heritage organisations, professionals and individuals.

Accordingly, various strategies emerged to explore the issue of exclusion, including the ‘Taking Part’ survey by DCMS (2007a), the development of the Outreach Department within English Heritage (which closed in March 2011, due to spending cuts), and several other events to engage a new and wider audience. Eventually, the process resulted in the publication of the Heritage White Paper Heritage Protection for the 21st Century (DCMS, 2007b) – which culminated in the Draft Heritage Protection Bill in April 2008. The publication revealed that more than 500 responses, 70 written submissions and the results of two oral sessions from previous consultation and (pilot) projects revolved around
increasing a sense of “good practice” and were aimed at consultation with professionals (Waterton and Smith, 2008). Smith and Waterton (2012: 172) intensify their argument by stating that although there are commendable intentions to re-examine the concept of heritage through the inclusion of wider public perceptions:

...it is the tenacity of the AHD, however, that emerges most forcefully out of these recent debates ... For example, the review process, although ostensibly originating around desires to broaden the meaning of, and access to, heritage, became rather more an exercise in re-jigging and re-aligning the various planks of techniques of technical management, namely listing and scheduling.

In addition, they argue that the authorised heritage discourse was allowed to arise relatively unchanged from the review process and to act as a key framework, which informed the parameters of the Heritage Protection Draft Bill. As Smith and Waterton (2012: 173) noted, “despite significant efforts devoted to debating and critiquing the heritage management process... little attention was placed upon exploring the ways we think about, shape and give meaning to heritage.” By reducing the process of heritage to a merely technical issue, which can only be managed by experts and conservationists, it abolishes the social, political and cultural effects from the management process.

However, aside from the parameters of authorised managements, there has been an emerging range of significant and contested debates and practices concerning the role of communities in heritage management and conservation (Crooke, 2007; Watson, 2007, Waterton and Smith, 2009). Although this countervailing view is rare and often underrated, it is considerably more optimistic, as it draws predominantly on binary oppositions such as amateur/professional; insider/outsider; history/heritage, and emphasises the ‘little platoons’ rather than the ‘great society’ (Samuel, 1994: 158). Since the rise of heritage in Britain from the 1970s onwards as an ‘industry’ and ‘product’ for mass consumption, he
argues, there has also been a vast panoply of ‘other’ forms of history; revealing history to be a ‘social form of knowledge’ that is grounded in an ensemble of activities and practices’ (1994: 5-11).

Introduced in Chapter 1, this perspective opens the way for the recognition of possible expressions of alternative or subaltern forms of heritage that ‘work from below’ as well as within, conceived for, from and by local communities with little or no outside or ‘authorised’ help. This approach, leading to the concept of ‘counter-hegemony’ or ‘unofficial knowledge’ (Gramsci cited in Simms, 2003), has often been regarded as unfeasible or undesired within academic studies of heritage (and) tourism. To illustrate, Ashworth (1998: 113) notes that this approach is of limited value because:

Places rarely ... convey a simple master narrative of the imposition of a single coherent dominant ideology for the establishment of legitimacy by the hegemonic authority or social group.

Although having different consequences, the key task of both ‘alternative’ and ‘subalternative’ oppositions, is to act as forerunners (and influencers) of counter-hegemonic constructions of the past with opposing ideas to the hegemonic bodies (Robertson, 2008). Consequently, ‘heritage from below’, as Robertson (2008: 143-148) argues, leads to the realisation of a gap of meaning making and identity when determining and visiting heritage places in Britain. Heritage in this regard is a process of individual and local feelings, expressions, performances and narratives surrounding the construction of Cold War heritage sites in Britain.

Nevertheless, there is no such thing as ‘heritage from below’ without the manifestation of a discourse that sustains and shapes the parameters of social debates regarding heritage issues and representations of the past. Although this research aims to investigate what these hegemonic practices mean and do to visitors at Cold War sites, and to what extent the authorised discourse is taken up, expressed within and frames the heritage narratives of visitors at Cold War sites, it
is important to map out the various, and often overlapping, (un/non)authorised narratives that are manifested by heritage and tourism organisations concerned with (Cold War) heritage sites in Britain. This section will therefore set out with an overview of the authorised discourses that have determined the contemporary debate and practices on heritage (and) tourism.

There have been several observations (see, for example, the edited work by During, 2011) regarding the discursively constructed terrain of identity and meaning making through the seemingly unproblematic role of heritage bodies, such as the National Trust and English Heritage, as guardians of heritage in Britain. To this end, authorised mentalities of heritage conservation are established in agencies and (non-) governmental bodies, which legitimise and de-legitimise historical identities and narratives. The sites they select speak to, legitimise, and preserve the values that are collectively seen by these organisations as important in underpinning national, but also regional and individual, identities (Smith, 2009b). This process does not occur in a vacuum and it is itself regulated, informed and governed by primary authorised institutions of heritage, such as UNESCO and ICOMOS.

In Britain, with a great emphasis on England, heritage ‘from below’ is primarily pushed forward by the campaigning group Common Ground, founded in 1982 by Susan Clifford and Angela King, and the funding stream ‘Local Heritage Initiative’ (LHI), a joint body established by the Countryside Agency, the Heritage Lottery Fund, and the Nationwide Building Society. They have both (although in different degrees) explored and developed the concept of ‘local distinctiveness’, pointing up to, as Clifford and King (1993) describe “all those [authorised] attempts to understand the things around us by compartmentalising them, fragmenting, quantifying, reducing.” On the contrary, they argue (1993) that the concept is essentially about:
Chapter 2 - Heritage (and) tourism discourses: a theoretical exploration

...places and our relationship with them. It is as much about the commonplace as about the rare, about the everyday as much as the endangered, and about the ordinary as much as the spectacular.

In addition, Common Ground is concerned with ‘scale’ as the question of who defines it. In this sense, scale refers to “the area to which people feel they belong, and which belongs to them through familiarity, or which they have chosen and are claiming anew” (Common ground, 1993). The projects set up by Common Ground are, by all means, local and have the aim of producing resolutely local outcomes for, as Dick (2000b: 155) describes, “generations of insiders”. However, as Clifford and King argue (1993), this view is not similar to the concept of regional diversity, as this would speak of strategies for the ‘greater good’, prescribing the same approaches to subtly different circumstances and surroundings furthering convergence and homogeneity. Instead of defining locality from the outside by authorised bodies and experts, they argue that it needs to be defined from the inside, including its cultural and natural heritage. In practice, Common Ground has been offering support through facilitating and stimulating local projects of place making and maintenance. Noticeably inspired by the viewpoints of Heidegger, Ingold and more, the group attempts to conceptualise the relationship between people, place and identity as “a starting point for action to improve the quality of... everyday places” (Common Ground, n.d.). In this regard, Common Ground seeks to catalyse heritage as a process of heterogeneity by opposing authorised constructions of heritage as elitist, rural, grand, old and aesthetically pleasing (Smith, 2009a).

Common Ground’s founding philosophy of ‘local distinctiveness’, in combination with a government drive to encourage citizens to take action “to care for their local environment (Local Heritage Initiative, 2006: 9), have both played a key role in the establishment of a local heritage funding programme in the late 1990s - the Local Heritage Initiative (LHI). Administered by the Countryside Agency (then the Countryside Commission) in 1996 and funded through the Heritage Lottery Fund, with additional sponsorship from the Nationwide Building Society, the
grant and advice programme awarded over £22 million to more than 1,400 communities from 2000 onwards (applications closed in 2006). The LHI programme sought to “create a holistic programme that could add a new dimension to the understanding and appreciation of heritage at a local level” (Local Heritage Initiative, 2006: 8). Designed to encourage and foster expressions of heritage from below to be conserved for current and future generations, the founding principles of the LHI were grounded in the belief that ‘local people’ through “participatory heritage management ... are well qualified to identify heritage of their local area and determine what is of value to them” (Local Heritage Initiative, 2006: 7). Many of the LHI projects included leisure and recreation activities such as heritage walks or nature trails, often including direction signs and information panels, with the aim of attracting visitors, raising awareness and regenerating the local economy (Local Heritage Initiative, 2006).

Although promising in theory, a number of observations can be made about the practices of both Common Ground and the LHI that link these initiatives with authorised heritage discourses. First, it would be naïve to think that these alternative approaches produce unproblematic outcomes. For instance, almost two decades ago Wright (1993) already warned Common Ground against the tempting blandishments of the rural idyll by authorised experts and professionals, and as Robertson (2008) has shown, Common Ground’s efforts over the years have revealed the interference of external professional intervention within local rural projects. In chorus, LHI included a role for professionals within the process of heritage and established a network of expert advisors and project support workers, including a Grant Assessment Panel, which commissioned reports and conducted assessments of value (Robertson, 2008; Local Heritage Initiative, 2006: 10-12).

To elaborate, and drawing on the programme’s own reports, it seems that 62 per cent of the awards were made to groups in rural areas, with an original target of 75 per cent, aiming firmly at the rural environment and thereby aligning itself with the authorised discourse of rural conservatism. In addition, although the LHI has identified five broad areas of eligibility, including built; archaeological;
natural; industrial; and customs and traditions, there seems to be some hesitation
over the last area regarding what constitutes ‘cultural’, and there seems to be no
designated area specifically directed at customs and traditions. This focus of the
LHI on the tangible aspects of heritage could imply that the counter-hegemonic
style of the above initiatives is vanishing and instead is becoming a self-referential
discourse. This authorised claim was furthermore strengthened in their statements
on broadening both the social base, and the non-expert engagement in heritage
activity. In addition, according to the report’s statement (2006: 5) community
involvement is only favourable with the help of the LHI as:

Community groups have demonstrated that, with support, they can be
trusted to deliver all or more of their stated aims ... Through LHI,
forgotten or unknown elements of local heritage were reclaimed, local
distinctiveness valued and interest in heritage at the local level
intensified.

On the contrary, it is also impossible to neglect the respectable intentions and
positive outcomes of both Common Ground and the LHI. Active engagement with
Common Ground’s philosophy, principles and sometimes even personnel, has
opened up the debate and created possibilities for expressing individual views of
what constitutes heritage. However, because of the professional interference and
tangible and/or rural focus on specific areas, both Common Ground’s and LHI’s
programmes, though in various degrees, continue to operate from within the
dominant heritage discourse instead of from without. In this regard, following the
concerns expressed by Robertson, “official recognition of, and support for
heritage from below remains fleeting at best and oppositional at worst” (2012:
12). Additionally, it might seem difficult to escape from an easy reliance on the
questionable dualism of subaltern/authorised discourses in heritage (and) tourism.

To conclude, it has become evident that dominant discourses continue to narrow
individual perspectives on what constitutes the past in the present within everyday
lives and local surroundings, and from a tourism perspective, when visiting
heritage places. Consequently, this results in missing narratives, views and expressions of heritage, which influences processes of identity and meaning making.

2.5 Implications and conclusion

With this thought on exclusion, I would like to return to the point of departure for the discussion of what constitutes heritage (and) tourism, in terms of shaping particular (sets of) practices of meaning making and values and identity construction about what constitutes heritage. From a conservation and management perspective, these practices include management protocols, techniques and procedures that are undertaken by site managers, policy makers, cultural critics, archaeologists, architects, curators and others that claim to be scientific and aesthetic experts working by and from authorised heritage discourses.

What emerges foremost from the discussion is the understanding that these discourses ascertain heritage as a tangible and immutable thing, as opposed to a social and cultural process of which the discourse is also a part, rendering and legitimising the value-loaded concepts and ideologies it represents, through upholding the "old’, grand, monumental and aesthetically pleasing sites, buildings, places and artefacts” (Smith, 2009a: 11). Through often bolstering and privileging the elite, upper class, European, white and educated expert and professional judgements and stewardship over ‘the past’, Courtney (2012) argues that this self-referential discourse reflects and is reflected by grand narratives of the British nation based on class, gender and locality (see also, for example, Lyotard, [1979] 1984).

Although acknowledging the dominant discourses, this chapter has sought to bring forward, without losing sight of the materiality of heritage, the idea that heritage in itself is not a thing; nor does it exist by itself, and, in addition, it neither implies a movement nor a project. In contrast, heritage is part of, and constitutes, the process by which people use the past, and the discursive construction of heritage is itself part of the cultural and social processes that are heritage. Heritage is something vital and alive, not
because it simply ‘is’ or is ‘found’ through practices, but because it exists of a range of actions of power and agency by which meanings, values and identities are constructed, reconstructed and negotiated through present-day practices. Within this discursive process, heritage in the here-and-now is constantly made, interpreted, given meaning, classified, and represented throughout time, to eventually be forgotten (or adjusted) all over again, ubiquitously intertwining it with the power dynamics, present-day values, debates and aspirations of a society.

In this regard, within a tourism context, heritage is deliberately and actively used by and within heritage discourses for social, political and economic practices, including acts of forgetting or denial that occur and are instituted through visitations to heritage sites, places and objects as a leisure or recreation activity. In line with this notion that heritage is often understood just as something people do in their free time, although this is also an aspect of the nuanced and social process characterising heritage, it is more than the simple knowledge about a site, place, structure or object. Heritage is something through which people, during acts and performances of ‘doing’, find and express a sense of who they are – and what they would want to be – in relation to and in negotiation with the authorised discourse, other humans and the material environment.

Unfortunately, although attempts have been made to include individuals’ views within the professional and academic debate on what constitutes the past in present-day lives, local surroundings and when visiting heritage places, practises continue to focus from within the dominant and subaltern discourses instead of from without. Ultimately, this leads to tensions between human actions and agency and the material, static, representations that are nevertheless an important aspect of heritage.

As part of exploring these tensions of historical and social constructions, Chapter 3 will illustrate in more detail, and from a historical basis, how authorised discourses have developed and influenced heritage practices, and are themselves sustaining, yet contested by subaltern discourses to negotiate and facilitate social and cultural change.
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Within contemporary warfare, there has probably never been a war more susceptible to mythmaking and storytelling than the Cold War. For more than forty years, two ‘Superpowers’, the Soviet Union (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics – USSR) and the United States of America (USA), together with their strategic allies, fought intangible and secret battles for, and of, the minds of people. Although they had emerged victoriously together from the Second War, the seeds of the conflict were germinating long before Hitler’s defeat (Thompson, 1981). As tension rose between the Communist and Capitalist sides during the final stages of the war against Nazi Germany, peace in Europe swiftly became an illusion and the world would be divided again by an even greater and more dangerous world conflict. Within months after the victory, the gap between the Soviet Union and America widened as fear of ‘the other’ swiftly increased and attitudes became more rigid and suspicious.

In the ideological conflict following, lasting roughly from 1946 until 1989, ‘winning’ not only entailed changing attitudes at home, but also persuading those on the ‘other side’ and the non-aligned states that one ideology or system (Communism or Capitalism) was preferable over the other (Gaddis, 1997). As an attempt to overrule the other, several tactics were used to encourage attitudes, initially at the home front, to win popularity and support for the contrasting dogmas. In this battle, perception and propaganda were probably the most effective weapons. The other reason for the conflict was the existence of nuclear weapons. The nuclear age of warfare meant that the existing conception of war was now completely out of date, and although nuclear weapons may not have
been there for actual use, they did deter, persuade, bargain, protect and pressure the period of heightened hostilities that is called the ‘Cold War’.

As with the origins of the conflict, there are many schools of thoughts, initially dominated by American historians, about the ideological origins and goals of the conflict (Westad, 2000). To begin with, according to the initial ‘orthodox’ beliefs that dominated the debate in the 1950s and most of the 1960s, the Cold War was seen as a Western reaction and struggle against Stalinist Expansionism. The ‘revisionists’, in their heydays in the late 1960s and early 1970s, followed with a counter-view of the conflict in terms of the USA’s determination to impose itself and its political system on the rest of the world. However, starting in the 1970s, the debate about the Cold War origins began to move beyond the simple claims of blame and responsibility. Although diplomatic and military aspects remained the prime focus, ‘post-revisionists’ started to view the conflict as the outcome of various complex interactions between all the parties involved, and in which ideology played an important role when dividing the world. The superpowers judged other countries and regional conflicts according to their ideological alliances and determined which of the smaller nations were camp followers, and therefore could be supported, and which were not. Effectively, the bipolar configuration during the Cold War can best be explained as, what Mackinder (cited in Sempa, 1989: 34) has termed, a process of “geographical quantities in the calculation [of balance and power]”, which contributed to the East-West tensions. In addition, the understandings of the Cold War, aided by a growing accessibility of primary sources and influence by emerging directions in the social sciences, made the study of the Cold War more diversified.

Particularly from the 1980s onwards, the economic, social and cultural history of the Cold War started to develop, meaning a growing interest in exploring the impact that the divided world had on those who were affected by it. However, it was not until the early 1990s, when the collapse of the Soviet Union provided an end to the narrative, that this on-going process known as the Cold War could be treated as history. In addition, this also meant that Cold War history had turned
from a ‘history of international relations’ into, in the broadest sense possible, an ‘international history’ (Gienow-Hecht and Schumacher, 2004). Due to the geographical extent and large time span, it has been necessary to select and simplify the complexity of historical events (see, for example, Saull, 2007).

Furthermore, the partial disclosure of documents, the numerous characteristics, geographical dispersions and the long period of the Cold War make writing concisely about its events a difficult task. Moreover, there was the struggle with moral doubts, when taking into account the fact that for those who lived through it, it was (or still is) a very real part of society. For many, the world was (and remains) divided along ideological lines and fear of nuclear annihilation was constantly present as a dark shadow over the everyday lives of ordinary people for more than forty years. However, with time passing by, the idea of the Cold War seems to become more and more amorphous. The sturdy beliefs of ideological politics appear to have blended into global streams of political thoughts and organisations and opposing politicians were replaced by managerial politicians with loose political agendas and principles (Thomas, 2009). It almost seems an imaginary story of a foregoing world that fought so hard and fiercely, for such a long time, and with such dangerous weapons, over what turned out to be merely philosophical ideals to create a ‘better society’.

To write about the Cold War within the context of this study, and taking my personal constructions of the events into account, this Chapter commences with a brief outline of the key characteristics of the period (Section 3.1) and, in more detail, the role Britain played in the conflict and the impacts and remains of the aftermath (Section 3.2). Furthermore, Sections 3.3 and 3.4 look at ways in which the (physical) remains of the Cold War in Britain are used in the discursive constructions of Cold War heritage through the socio-material processes taking place within Cold War attractions. More specifically, they identify and examine the orders of discourse that are involved in the contemporary use of Cold War remains as tourist attractions, how and when these discourses developed, and who is engaged in the dialogue. Likewise, these sections will illustrate that
mythmaking', even after the Cold War came to an end, remains a powerful tool and vehicle for a variety of power/knowledge practices of meaning making for heritage managers, archaeologists, site manager and curators, and other experts. Moreover, founded by the discourses that, at the same time, mirror and construct them (Smith, 2006), these myths have played (and still play) a crucial role in the processes of nation building and accounts that are accepted as some sort of 'truth'. In addition, Section 3.4 explores alternative views on Cold War heritage, and the values they represent, and how these clash with the authorised discourse. It will argue that this 'work' is essential to construct an idea of what Cold War heritage (and) tourism is - and is not. The chapter concludes with an overview of the implications of practices of heritage conservation, preservation and management in the construction and expression of certain social and cultural meanings and identities.

### 3.1 The Cold War: a story of ideological differences

Already briefly introduced in the previous section, and although still heavily debated by historians, politicians and many others, the Cold War can be defined as a sequence of actual or potential armed conflicts between the two superpowers and their strategic allies (Strange and Walley, 2007). These actual and potential conflicts took a number of forms, ranging from 'conventional' live confrontations in the Korean conflict, wars of de-colonialisation in Africa and South-East Asia, and spheres of influence within Southern parts of Africa and Southeast Asia. However, the uniqueness of the Cold War lies in its confrontation of ideologies, as Hanhimäki and Westad (2003: xii) argue, "ideas, values, and belief systems were at the heart of the struggle that defined the second half of the twentieth century." They continue by stating that acknowledging the role of ideologies does not imply that the aspects of geopolitical, economic and military assessments of the Cold War were irrelevant. Rather, it is impossible to understand the Cold War without incorporating the geopolitical interest of the dominant powers, the relative and real economic control and the advances in military technologies (specifically the advancement of nuclear weapons). However, underneath all the physical and
openly conversed aspects lies a deeply rooted and, what seemed to be, a contradictory, ideological conflict fought by proxy – the superpowers fought each other indirectly – stirring a psychological warfare, on a scale unseen before in warfare, for the minds of men through the art of influencing attitudes, and not only those of the enemy, but also of non-aligned and domestic audiences.

The warfare of this ideological conflict was mostly secret and, for the greater part, fought by the intelligence agencies of the main protagonists. What people knew (and perhaps still know) is only the tip of the iceberg. Following Aldrich's (2001) claim about the history of the Cold War, the only thing we can be certain of is that intelligence activity is “fundamental to any understanding of the Cold War … [it] was fought, above all, by the intelligence services.” Although intelligence services have always played (and still play) an important part in various types of warfare, the importance and variety of tools of intelligence agencies that were part of the Cold War conflict were unknown before. While prior conflicts throughout the centuries had always been largely determined by military operations, the Cold War was hardly fought with set piece battles in physical places and in traditional forms. In public statements Western governments communicated to their citizens that the role of intelligence agencies was merely defensive (Thomas, 2009).

However, it is now known that both sides were actively engaged in a whole range of more sinister activities. The tools and activities of intelligence agencies on both sides of the Iron Curtain were numerous and included, amongst many others, deception, sabotage, espionage, subversion, secret propaganda and, according to former MI5 and MI6 spy David Cornwell (Craig, 2010), every now and then a political assassination. In Britain, despite the fact that the Secret Intelligence Service (SIS, but commonly known as MI6) was established in 1909, its existence was not officially acknowledged until 1992. Nevertheless, its archives remain closed until this present day. The same counts for its sister organisation MI5, although it has released several hundred files to the National Archives covering the period up to the late 1950s. To ensure their secrecy during the Cold War, activities were kept low key, for example by using people – businessmen,
journalists, religious leaders, academics and even flight attendants – who had genuine reasons to travel to a particular country on the other side and could provide information and contacts. If any spy scandals were to be uncovered, governments commonly engaged in so-called ‘plausible deniability’, meaning that the government’s involvement and responsibility for any intelligence operation could be plausibly disclaimed to unauthorised persons (Thomas, 2009). In more diplomatic wording, Crossman (cited in Daugherty, 1958: 45) noted, “the way to carry out good propaganda is never appear to be carrying it out at all.” All the same, both organisations and their clandestine activities, due to their secrecy and deniability, are accountable for the present-day authorised discourse on Britain’s national history (Thomas, 2009).

Ironically, it was espionage, the most secret of all the intelligence occupations, that was perhaps most concrete and present in the public consciousness and imaginations of the Cold War. Even up till this day, espionage contributes significantly to the emotional and cognitive mechanism of mythmaking and storytelling regarding the Cold War. Especially in post-war Europe, where societies suffered economic collapse and struggled with state formations and power shifts, mythmaking was used by governments within propaganda efforts to bolster their grip on power and, to sustain popular support, as a way of representing its competency and efficiency. To illustrate, the Soviet Union adopted various strategies in order to appear more prepared than it actually was. It would fly, for example, the same Bison bombers repeatedly over a reviewing stand at international air shows, which in return bred US fear of a ‘bomber gap’ and later a ‘missile gap’ (Adams, 2001).

In addition, governments placed large demands on their citizens, both physically and emotionally, which required correspondingly large doses of mythmaking to ensure their acquiescence. Mythmaking during the Cold War period also grew with the increased receptivity of the audience: after two World Wars depriving many Europeans of their possessions and loved ones, people were more willing to believe the mythical propaganda of superpowers that would protect them against
‘the enemy’, whilst being rather indifferent to the idea that this aligned them with a communist or capitalist regime. What is more, the media played a vital role, as for most people their awareness of events derived from ‘formal’ channels, such as television broadcasts, government leaflets and brochures, newspaper articles, and ‘informal’ and unrestricted (yet often subjected to censorship) channels, such as magazine articles, films, computer and video games.

Lastly, and especially significant within the Soviet Union, education was used to purvey myths about the Cold War and the battles fought by the utopian world of communism against the evil of capitalism. Overall, the mythmaking and storytelling during and after the Cold War have contributed to the ‘justification’ of a divided world, a rearrangement of nations within the international context, and the reshaping of national identities based on the ideas, norms, values and beliefs on one of the two ideological structures.

Although on the level of military and intelligence the main protagonists during the Cold War were the Soviet Union and the USA, Britain played a role greater than most people know or acknowledge. This was partly due to its extensive relationship with, and exemplary role for, the intelligence agencies in the USA. In addition, British colonial history also provided a wealth of international covert networks and connections that were still regarded as extremely valuable. The next section will describe just how important Britain’s role was, and for whom, concerning the clandestine operations and military frictions of the superpowers. It also provides a backdrop for the discussion of the British Cold War defence assets and the social, cultural and psychological reminders they have left behind. In addition, the extent to which these reminders are part of the core beliefs of Britain’s national identity are critical in understanding the construction of heritage discourse(s) which contain, represent and communicate authorised and alternative narratives of values, meanings and identities (see also section 2.3). The processes, management and uses through which these selective historical ideas, based either on facts or on myths, are nowadays represented as Cold War (defence) heritage are further discussed in sections 3.2 and 3.3.
3.2 Britain’s Cold War: empirical prestige and popular protest

The role played by Britain in the development and duration of the East-West conflict has only recently begun to receive scholarly attention and remains underrated when compared to the principal protagonists, the United States and the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the ‘British’ absence from within the ‘Superpowers’ construction was the result of severe political, economic and technological struggles that Britain faced at the end of the Second World War as it tried to adapt to power shifts within a rapidly changing international environment. As Macleod (1997: 161) explains:

The rise of the two superpowers, the loss of empire, and the birth of a European Common Market, to which it was forced to apply three times before finally being admitted, were in themselves enough to shake that country’s self-confidence and international status.

The conversion from Empire to European country and shifts in the economic markets have traditionally been regarded as the major moments in the ‘decline’ story, a concept that has significantly dominated post-1945 writings of Britain’s Cold War history. It is true that, as with pretty much all European countries, post-1945 Britain was struggling with internal issues; in particular, its economy (gradually this would result in the country economically falling behind its major Western European rivals, France and Germany, until the 1990s).

Nevertheless, the symbolic story of Britain’s decline from an Empire to European nation was largely due to American propaganda, which influenced the crisis of national identity and status as Britain struggled to define its place in post-War Europe (Grant, 2009). An example of this American tactic can be found in what is probably the most often quoted public remark on Britain’s post-1945 position, the statement by Acheson, then President Kennedy’s Special Advisor on NATO Affairs, when he stated that: “Britain has lost an Empire, and has [had] not yet found a role” (cited in, for example, Sanders, 1990: 292; Holland, 1991: 311).
Controversially, Britain had a (somewhat selfish) role throughout the post-1945/Cold War period: to pursue ‘national interests’ wherever they might be found (Grant: 2009). This rather flexible concept comprised all interests, whether global politics and/or strategic and economic pursuits, with the desire to extend or maintain British influence and prestige around the globe. However, the difficulty for Britain, much more than other European countries, was the enormous range of obligations, commitments and ‘interests’ around the world, which greatly increased due to the political tensions and, at the same time, with decreasing financial means of meeting them. As Grant (2009: 2) argues, “the nation could not afford its active global role and everyone connected to the government knew it.” The intensifying financial pressure and, resultantly, ‘sense of powerlessness’ – of global prominence fading away – led to, as Grant (2009: 3) states, “British politicians placing prestige, the visible marks of influence, high on the list of national priorities.” Upholding British power and pursuing prestige was a way to fight the fear of decline, which was debated and experienced perhaps even more than the ‘objective’ historical accounts of the extent of decline (Tomlinson, 2001). This longing was one of the foundations in Britain’s attempt to play a mediating role in the Cold War.

Initially, in its quest for summit diplomacy, Britain believed it could accomplish breakthroughs with the Russians, independently of American policy concerns, of which the British government was often sceptical. However, the underlying pursuit of establishing diplomatic connections was overshadowed by the pursuit of representing the British influence to a variety of audiences: international, domestic, and the self. To illustrate, to maintain ‘key interests’ and gain influence within the corridors of Washington, Britain’s foreign policy (1979 – 1984), under the reign of Margaret Thatcher, became more assertive, more verbally anti-Soviet, and more insistent on Britain’s ‘special relationship’ with the United States. Despite the widespread belief that Britain suffered (in various degrees) a political, economic and technological decline since 1945, and that a return to the Empire under Margaret Thatcher was basically an illusion (Bulpitt, 1988; Sanders, 1990; Clarke, 1992), scholars seem to agree that she helped to restore a certain sense of
national reassurance and prestige within Britain (Tugendhat and Wallace, 1988). In addition, British foreign policy provided an effective vehicle to demonstrate the British influence, and perhaps for overstating the real power of the country, to the British-less ‘superpowers’. To illustrate; as divisions between East and West hardened, the United States realised that it would need a permanent stationing of large military forces in the country of one of its allied members. Britain had a stable government and a large clandestine network (Clarke 1992: 259) and perhaps most importantly, it had a geographically strategic location, which offered sufficient proximity to the USSR without the risk of quickly being overrun (Cocroft and Thomas, 2004).

For the Americans, this priceless geographical asset, already acknowledged during World War II, offered protected offshore sites for air force and logistics centres in case of war. At first, the country’s military bases were used as stopovers for training flights. However, after the Berlin crisis in 1948 (see Appendix 1) the National Security Council allowed the establishment of the first American Air Strategic Command (AASC) on British soil and the stationing of 60 bombers at three RAF stations in East Anglia. Swiftly after the agreement was formalised, more United Nations Air Force (USAF), communications and intelligence bases were established, including Mildenhall, Greenham Common and Upper Heyford (Ellis, 2009), and a treaty was signed for the seating of intermediate-range cruise missiles throughout Britain. Because of the secrecy surrounding the issue, and the fact that some are still operational today, the exact number of bases remains difficult to determine. In the mid-1980s it was estimated that there could be at least 135 American military bases in Britain; most of which were facilities that were used by U.S. armed forces; of these, 25 were major operational bases or military headquarters (Ellis, 2009). These self-contained and distinctive communities, often referred to as ‘little Americas’, included, amongst other things, an American dollar economy, cars, street names, fire hydrants, fast-food restaurants and supermarkets – something almost unheard of in Britain at that time – which sold American delicacies such as Hershey bars and Oreos (Cocroft and Thomas, 2004; Kennedy, 2010).
With the growing presence of U.S. military personnel and staff, concerns for the possibilities of Britain being attacked were used to justify an increasing focus on the British nuclear strategy. Because only an independent British deterrent would give the government any ability to influence Cold War diplomacy, the Cabinet agreed to the development of the hydrogen bomb (H-bomb) in 1954. This nuclear solution to defence policy offered a convenient and inexpensive way for the government to maintain a dignified presence. Ironically, in its attempts to keep up with the arms race of the superpowers, Britain placed more strain on the economy and its capacity to fund scientific research and development than any other Western country during the Cold War period, with the USA as an exception. Eventually, Britain did not have the economic or scientific base to sustain an effective rocket programme, and the H-Bomb was replaced by American missiles (Arnold and Pyne, 2001).

As the technology of the Cold War increased, Britain’s dependence upon the United States became extensive, yet half of the government expenditure on research and development between the 1960s and 1980s still went on defence (Bud and Gummett, 2002: 16). Although technology transfers from the defence research establishment was widespread and the British industry became a major component of the nation’s manufacturing output, it was almost exclusively confined to the defence sector. The gap between the unarmed population and the power of arms in control was unprecedented, as, according to Jones (2005: 31), “understandings of the technology of warfare lay in the hands of a privileged group of scientists, and control over its use was entrusted to a tiny group of ministers and civil servants.” This presented the state with a new authority as the guardian of civil safety, represented in heroic figures such as secret agent 007 James Bond, who, as a British agent, repeatedly saved Britain / humanity from devastation. As the ‘public face’ of the Cold War, James Bond also mirrors Britain’s pursuit to reaffirm her position as “a protagonist par excellence, a complex moral agent in the blunt geopolitical struggle between capitalism and communism” (Feeny, 2008). Other examples of British Cold War heroes include the science fiction television series ‘Thunderbirds’ (1965-1966) and even the book
series with boyhood hero ‘Biggles’ (1932-1968). Nevertheless, as the Cold War progressed, most cultural portrayals, for example BBC’s television dramas such as ‘Threads’ (1984), ‘The Edge of Darkness’ (1986), and films such as ‘Wargames’ (1983) presented grim concerns about the imminent apocalypse, annihilation and the end of ‘life as we know it’.

The perceived pointlessness of any kind of protection against a nuclear attack, communicated and represented in various forms, gave an air of the surreal and the absurd to civil defence planning throughout the Cold War. Yet, war planners still considered the potential for the deterrent to fail, and the unthinkable to happen, especially once the effects of the H-bomb were released. In response, in 1955 an inter-departmental committee reported that the only way to achieve any degree of protection from a nuclear attack was by mass evacuation of the population into deep underground bunkers. However, the costs of doing this in any possible way were unreasonable, and decisions were made to concentrate on the evacuation of a small number of officials into twelve regional shelters, from which a post-nuclear military government could operate. These harsh provisions were not publicly revealed until the 1990s, and were in sharp contrast to the civil defence approaches of other countries, such as ‘The People’s War’ in China, where networks of tunnels were dug for the civilian population. Nonetheless, by the early 1960s official policy began to emphasise the home as the unit of survival. This did not mean the construction of underground shelters but as civil defence booklets and leaflets such as ‘Protect and Survive’ (1980) stated, the creation of in-house shelters for different types of buildings and the advice to stay put until instructed otherwise.

The release of the ‘Protect and Survive’ leaflet particularly caused great disturbance to many people, contributing to feelings of nuclear paranoia that peaked during the mid-1980s. The real possibility of a nuclear threat, underlined by the government preparing leaflets for distribution in the event of nuclear warfare, inevitably influenced British everyday life and culture, including films, music and comedy. In this sense, as Shaw (2001: 196) argues, “the government
might not have shaped the details of the people’s thinking but they “helped to
define how many aspects of the Cold War – political, economic, ideological,
material, personal – were perceived by the millions who saw them.”

Furthermore, the Cold War contributed in its own way to changes in the practices
and location of memories. The blurring of former distinctions between war and
peace, the global scale and intangible character of the conflict, meant that for most
people it was very difficult to understand the beginnings or endings of events that
had previously been the focus of memory (Gillis, 1994). As a response, influenced
by American notions of ‘the home’ as a site of consumption, Britain experienced
an increasing domestication within society. In addition, traditional discourses
were also embodied in the ‘modern kitchen’, bolstering traditional women’s roles
in a time of challenge from feminism and global uncertainties. This made the
kitchen (and the domestic lifestyle it represents) a ‘mediation junction’ between
producers and consumers about consumer good; making them deeply social and
political (Oldenziel and Zachmann, 2009). Two decades earlier Crow (1989: 20)
already explained this domestication as follows:

It is ... in this period that the domestic ideal of an affluent nuclear
family living in a home of their own and enjoying the benefits of
leisurely home life took shape, with emphasis placed on the privacy of
the individual household rather than the wider community.

However, the moral consequences of the resolution to engage in nuclear warfare
(and the draconian provision for British civilians) did not only intensify a longing
for home, it also became a major driving force behind social conflicts. The
opposing discourse (especially notable in the Labour Party) to the importance of
strength and balancing power emphasised the negotiation component much more
as a point of departure for security (Larsen, 1997). In fact, as Larsen notes, the
opposing discourse argued that a ‘sweet’ approach was needed to fuel or restart
the international cooperation (1997: 75). Moreover, many peace movements that
‘mushroomed’ during the second stage of the Cold War (especially in the early
1980s) adhered to aspects of this discourse, leading to Britain’s peace movement being one of the strongest in the West. Initially, during the first wave of protest (late 1950s) against the development of thermonuclear weapons and the installation of inter-continental ballistic missiles, the movement consisted of locally established and operating branches throughout the country. Following a period of relative calm, a second wave of protest in the 1980s emerged as a response to increasing tension between the superpowers. As a result, the movements’ ideals, methods and peace logo(s) quickly spread around the world and, according to Larsen (1977: 77), the discourse was especially shared with “peace movements in Germany, Benelux, and Denmark, but not France!”

In the United Kingdom, initially starting out as several small organisations, the movement underwent a major revival and emerged into the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). Public support for unilateralism steadily grew and the numbers of CND members increased from 4,000 to 100,000 between 1979 and 1984 (Ceade, 1985). New sections and activities emerged within and outside of the CND, including Ex-services CND, Green CND, Student CND, Tories Against Cruise and Trident (TACT), Trade Union CND, and Youth CND. Due to the large number of women, the women’s movement soon had a strong influence and introduced all-women’s activities within the CND. Probably the most well-known example of the women’s movement is the mainly women’s march by the Welsh group ‘Women for Life on Earth’ from Cardiff to Greenham Common US Air Force base in Berkshire on September 5, 1981, where the first cruise missiles were to be based. Starting out as a temporary camp, the permanent Women’s Peace Camp (closed after 19 years of continuous presence in September 2000) quickly became a focus and symbol of women’s resistance to the traditional discourse and male-dominated world of nuclear weapons (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, 5 March 2012). Overall, the peace movement of the early 1980s was the largest in modern history, resulting in three million people simultaneously taking part in demonstrations across Europe; 300,000 of them in London, in October 1983 (Cortright, 2008).
Nevertheless, after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, public support for the CND fell rapidly. The peace movement had not succeeded in converting the British people to unilateral disarmament and nuclear weapons still had substantial support in Britain, from around one in four of the British population (Cortright, 2008). In addition, the end of the conflict also meant an end to the rationale that had underpinned and justified Britain’s continental strategy. Discussions arose about the consequent obsolescence (and future) of large numbers of previously active Cold War military sites (Strange and Walley, 2007). Even in Britain, where sophisticated and professional conservation and heritage management bodies were present, the dramatic change in the global political, economic and geographical relations presented an immediate and specific challenge to experts, heritage managers and policy makers. In addition, this was particularly felt in terms of responding to growing rates of market disposal, issues with cataloguing what was kept secret for many years, and the power to intervene when sites of recognised national historical significance were under threat (Strange and Walley, 2007).

Steps towards a change in direction were slow, and it wasn’t until the early 1990s that the Ministry of Defence (MoD), under the banner slogans of *Options for Change* and *Frontline First*, began a massive disposals programme which led to the redundancy of more than a hundred sites in Britain, the most notable example being the Royal Observer Corps (ROC) monitoring posts (DeCelles, 2008). Almost simultaneously, the United States drastically started scaling down its armed forces in Europe, leading to the closure of many large installations and military bases. In Britain, this resolution affected airbases such as Greenham Common, West Berkshire and Upper Heyford, and the bases at Bentwaters and Woodbridge, all of which had been modernised extensively during the 1970s and 1980s. Sites that were not decommissioned or disposed of directly during the early 1990s were often stripped of their furniture, fittings and equipment, leaving vacant spaces often devoid of meaning (Schofield and Cocroft, 2007).
3.3 The authorised heritage discourse: practices of stewardship

Underpinned by the concept of ‘heritage at risk’, the professional and academic fields of contemporary military archaeology and heritage management commenced an historical inquiry into Britain’s Cold War sites that could provide a framework of contemporary values and uses for the physical remains as part of the British landscape (Strange and Walley, 2007). However, due to the ‘30 year rule’, which prevented access to official documents relating to the construction, uses and inventory (information up to 1982 is currently accessible), and the reality that many sites were in a state of flux during the early 1990s, initially the most effective way of gathering information was based on extensive fieldwork and aerial recordings (see, for example, Saunders, 1989; Lowry, 1995; Dobinson, Lake and Schofield, 1997; Douet, 1998; English Heritage 1998).

In the 1990s, several research projects and assessments, initiated by the three Royal Commissions in England, Wales and Scotland and Historic Scotland, began documenting twentieth-century military remains, spanning from World War I (1914) until the end of the Cold War (1989). During a two-year period, (1994-95) two national initiatives were launched, representing the conclusion of studies that extended across a longer period. The first included the Defence of Britain Project, which ran from 1995 to 2002, under the co-auspices of the Council for British Archaeology (CBA) and the Fortress Study Group. Under the strategic direction of this consortium, and funded by the Department of National Heritage (now DCMS) and the Heritage Lottery Fund, over 600 volunteers recorded nearly 20,000 twentieth century military sites in the United Kingdom during this seven-year period (Council for British Archaeology, n.d.). The purpose of the project was to create, from field and documentary work, a record of the twentieth-century militarised landscape(s). The project results contributed, through revision and additions, to the original Defence of Britain database and are open to be searched via the Archaeology Data Service.

1 The phrase ‘30 year rule’ is commonly used to describe the point at which records created by government departments are transferred to The National Archives, and at which most of these records are released to the public.
Although valuable and initiated with the help of volunteers including amateur groups, local communities and individuals, the project was intended to inform heritage agencies at both local and national level with a view to the future preservation of surviving structure (Council for British Archaeology, n.d.). However, assessing the value of each individual site was left to the authorised agencies (Denison, 2002):

The next stage will be granting statutory protection to certain sites. Information is now available to enable heritage agencies to access the value of individual sites, and to select the most important for permanent preservation.

This purpose (and outcome) of the report supports the existing framework of privileged expert values and knowledge, and renders alternative accounts of military sites (or oral memories) to be included in future research and conservation programmes. However, a review of the Defence of Britain conference in 2001 showed that it was “evident that English Heritage had stolen a march (as it were) on the other agencies, with a series of Military Evaluation Programmes and several funding schemes” (Spencer, 2002: section 4). The involved research projects, mostly on particular site types, were used by English Heritage to assess the number and condition of surviving examples to recognise (and therefore justify) the ‘most’ important ones and recommend them for statutory protection as part of EHT’s Monument Protection Programme (MPP). Some of what English Heritage has assigned as the ‘most significant’ sites have already been protected as Scheduled Ancient Monuments, including the cruise missile shelters at Greenham Common.

In addition, by using the records that were generated, CBA carried out the Defence Area Project between 2002 and 2004 (with funding from English Heritage). Its overall aim was to build on the outcomes of the Defence of Britain project, by more closely examining anti-invasion defence works that form coherent and legible groupings which have survived ‘well’ in landscapes that are
largely unchanged since 1940/41 (Foot, 2006). Despite events during the previous century, the main purpose of the Project seemed to revolve around promoting people’s understanding and enjoyment of the selected defence landscapes and to encourage them to think of World War II archaeology as part of, and embedded within, the landscape. Not only were defence works from World War I and the Cold War excluded from gaining greater recognition, this discourse also reinforced a selected history, materialism and aesthetics. The initiative was followed by similar, but relatively minor, studies by, amongst others, CADW: Welsh Historic Monuments (2009, 2012).

A subsequent initiative by English Heritage included a series of internal projects commissioned and published in several volumes in Dobinson’s (2000) Twentieth Century Fortifications in England (later extended to include sites in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland). These research projects were primarily based on archive approaches, aimed at assessing England’s earlier twentieth-century defence heritage (see the outcomes published in, for example, Dobinson et al, 1997: 288-299; Schofield, 2002: 269-282). Profoundly based on archaeological and architectural fieldwork, English Heritage’s study of Cold War sites in England provided a foundation and justification for the criteria for (de-) selecting individual structures.

Built upon insights of this documentary research and information that was gathered during the Cold War Field Survey project, initiated by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME) and continued by English Heritage after the merger in 1999, a report on the Cold War was compiled as part of English Heritage’s Monuments Protection Programme (MPP). Soon after their primary purpose had ceased to exist, and under the tutelage of Wayne Cocroft, Cold War sites were assessed on their historical importance (Cocroft, 2001). For example, sites were included when they qualified as sites “that had been central to British defence or NATO policy’, sites that reflect the ‘changing nature’ of the Cold War, and sites “that characterise the British experience of the Cold War” (Cocroft, 2001: 42). However, it quickly became
evident that the initial description and widening choice of military sites to be designated exceeded the managing capacity of any heritage protection system or body, requiring a more detailed process of rationalisation, selection and prioritisation. Based on the work by Strange and Walley (2007: 159), Table 3 summarises the key selection and assessment criteria.

Table 3  The selection and assessment criteria for Cold War remains (adopted from Strange and Walley, 2007: 159)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Survival/ condition       | - Structural integrity and survival of original plant and fittings  
                            - Original uses are in evidence or multiple uses add interest  
                            - The group value of interrelated structures and landscape features |
| Period                    | - Representativeness of a particular phase of the Cold War  
                            - Centrality to British/NATO defence policy  
                            - Technological significance |
| Rarity                    | - One of the handful of surviving examples but must be supported by other features |
| Diversity                 | - Variety of structural features contributing to a common purpose |
| Cultural and amenity value| - Potential for promotion (e.g. as museum) |
The assessment provided a summary of Cold War sites and structures proposed for designation. The list, following the MPP division according to the *Category* and *Monument Classes*, was divided into nine *Categories*; which in turn were subdivided into 31 *Groups*, and then down into *Monument Classes* with *Type* variants. The "summary of the Cold War structures and sites identified as "nationally important and recommended for protection" (Cocroft, 2001) can be found in Appendix 2. Furthermore, the assessment illustrated that there were a number of factors, the most obvious of these being official secrecy, which inhibited the formation of a complete record of Cold War remains. The long timespan of the Cold War period, a time span greater than that of the World War I and II period (1914 to 1945), meant that structures and sites built for Cold War purposes are highly diverse in size and structure; ranging from small Royal Observer Corps to airfields covering hundreds of hectares, and no two structures or sites are alike. In addition, various Cold War sites and structures existed prior to the period and were modified for modern uses, making it difficult to uncover their original and additional function(s). Furthermore, the rapid turnover of personnel and technological developments during the Cold War period meant that a site could be used for multiple purposes, abandoned or relocated.

As a final point, English Heritage recognised that identifying the different structures of Cold War sites was extremely complicated due to the large time span, geographical scale and complexity of the structures, which consequently meant that a certain degree of flexibility was essential. Given the wide choice and state of flux of many Cold War sites that were available for designation, there was a basic issue as to what to recommend for preservation through scheduled listing. This Cold War monuments 'crusade' of English Heritage included an assessment of nearly all former and active Cold War military sites across the country, yet aimed at preserving only the most important ones. In addition, English Heritage's judgements have also had material consequences for community belonging and identity, as the past is more than merely archaeological data or historical texts - instead it is someone's heritage (see also Chapter 4). This also aligns with Harrison's (2012) argument that heritage, in addition to Smith's statement (2009a)
of heritage as a Western discourse or set of ideas, should be a combination of critical discourse analysis and a thorough consideration of its material effects. To go beyond the exploration of the discursive practice of heritage, Harrison’s (2012: 67) continues by stating that, we should explore the “corporeal influences and the ways in which heritage is caught up in the quotidian bodily practices of dwelling, travelling, working and ‘being’ in the world.” To illustrate, this idea of heritage as an more relational and dialogical process is extensively expressed through the various personal accounts on the BBC website ‘Your memories of the Cold War’ (2007); for example, the story by Sue Moore from Newcastle-upon-Tyne:

I still vividly remember walking home from school on a lovely summer’s afternoon in the very early ’80s when the sirens went off. I knew that this was the 4-minute warning and I knew I was about to die. It went through my mind that my mother would be at home on her own, my Dad was at work, and I didn't know where my sister was. I knew that I couldn't run home in time, nor was there anybody else, either friends or family, within a 4 minute running distance, so I just sat down on a nearby garden wall. I found myself watching the skies and wondering if I would see the explosion before being annihilated!

In addition, due to the complexity that surrounds the preservation, conservation and management of Cold War remains, English Heritage seems to claim that ‘proper’ care should lie with experts who have the resources, knowledge, and understandings to identify the value of historically important Cold War sites. A final aspect of the discourse lies in its attempts to create and provide a sense of national community, in which ‘qualified’ Cold War sites are a physical representation of ‘the past’ that speaks of a sense of self, place and community belonging.

The criteria that were drawn up in the MPP assessment were also based partly on the work by English Heritage authors Cocroft and Thomas (2004: 268) Cold War: Building for Nuclear Confrontation, 1946-1989, in which the authors argue that
“in Europe, English Heritage is at the forefront of assessing and developing strategies for the conservation of important Cold War sites”. They highlight the connections with previous assessments that have enabled sites to be assessed and national importance to be determined for each, as these sites are “secret and closed worlds” (2004: 2). This rhetorical device of ‘the past’, used as a shorthand or alternative to heritage and claiming that it is vague, mysterious and ‘hard to pin down’, hence is singular and concrete, and renders it subject to the judgements of experts such as English Heritage (Smith, 2009a).

This part of the authorised discourse also identifies that there is a ‘past’, which can best be looked after by experts, and that it has material reality as ‘heritage’. In this sense, the primary sources for the EH study are the sites themselves - the physical remains - which were thematically described according to particular aspects of the Cold War as well as their current remains. The preceding chapters in the work by Cocroft and Thomas are for the most part concerned with providing an overview of these physical remains, and even the different expressions of cultural expectations of US military employees, both military and personal, are explored through the physical fabric (such as graffiti and wall-art) of their bases. This links the idea of materiality of heritage to the concept of its ‘boundedness’, as the Cold War remains are labelled as fixed ‘monuments’ including sites, objects, buildings, and structures. As Cocroft and Thomas (2004: 2) describe:

‘Monuments’ of the Cold War we define as structures built, or adapted, to carry out nuclear war between the end of the Second World War and 1989.

In addition, their work, together with previous and future work on Cold War heritage, has attempted to set the boundaries through mapping, surveying, recording and archiving, between ‘valuable’ heritage and the rest. These attempts have reduced the concept of Cold War heritage to something that can easily be managed and helps to ease the social, cultural and historical conflicts about its
nature and meaning within contemporary uses. One problem with this process of meaning giving is that it also serves to camouflage the ‘bad’ or more unpleasant connotations that make it historically relevant in the first place. Even members of English Heritage staff, responsible for identifying military sites for preservation, such as John Schofield, head of Military Programmes, are aware of this irony, as he comments that it is “the places without funding or conservation [that] are often the most evocative (2005: 171).

Although Schofield is known as a forerunner in pressing the case for saving bunkers and other military remains, he also draws on a range of ‘aesthetic’ techniques to turn attention away from the implicit violence at the heart of all military installations. Instead, through surveys and procedures, which are put into practice by and embedded within English Heritage, the focus is on the shape, form and materials of military constructions, with an occasional assessment of the preservation and management of military wall art (Cocroft, Devlin, Gowing, Schofield and Thomas, 2004). Beck argues (2011: 95) that instead:

... it is violence that is evoked at the non-conserved sites in all its complex and affective forms; it may also be violence that is evoked at retrofitted tourist bunkers, but now it is violence mediated by the apparatus of recreation and heritage.

To conclude, it is commonly acknowledged that the Cold War has had an impact (in different degrees) on the lives of many (if not all) British citizens. However, recognition of the historical and social importance of buildings, sites and monuments associated with the Cold War was relatively new when fieldwork began two decades ago. In the assessment of Britain’s 20th century defence structures English Heritage has been at the forefront of assessing and developing criteria by which staff could either confirm or reject the historical and national importance of individual Cold War sites. Additionally, it has shown its authority and ability to demonstrate the way in which military secrets can be withdrawn and revealed with the power, knowledge and influence of heritage agencies and
experts such as English Heritage (Beck, 2011). In agreement with Beck’s argument (2011: 97), Cold War sites such as the York Cold War Bunker, become “spectacles of covert operations” whilst at the same time confronting the visitors with their previous ignorance of its existence. This furthermore emphasises English Heritage’s self-referential discourse, in which its authority rests on its ability to ‘speak to’ and ‘make sense’ of the aesthetic experiences and meanings of, and within, Cold War sites as part of a wider national identity and belonging. Nevertheless, the management, conservation, preservation and restoration of its properties, including York Cold War Bunker, are regarded as objective technical processes related to narratives of a British nation, national identity and Western (capitalist) superiority; while instead they are themselves part of a subjective heritage performance in which meanings are re/created and maintained (Smith, 2009a).

3.4 Challenges to the authorised heritage discourse

The political and cultural ‘work’ done by the authorised heritage discourse influences, and is influenced by, ‘lay’ knowledge and interests by communities, local historians, military collectors and ‘enthusiasts’ and amenity groups as they assert their own view of heritage and identity in the power struggles over resources. On a wide, and somewhat overlapping, scale this is exemplified in the work done by Subterranea Britannica (often simply referred to as ‘Sub Brit’), a UK-based society that aims:

...to advance education and science for the public benefit by the study, understanding, recording and (where practical) the preservation and protection of man-made and man-used underground structures, objects and spaces. (2011b: 1)

Initially the society started as a small and acquainted group of enthusiasts in 1974 that pursued a type of ‘counter-hegemony’ that challenged the secrecy and authorised approaches concerning underground structures. On the other hand, it is
also possible that in reality they were more likely perceived as a source of 'unofficial knowledge', hitherto still regarded as an unfeasible resource to become embedded and included in the authorised discourse.

Currently, the society has grown to over 1,000 members and its publications include the three times yearly magazine *Subterranea* and the online *UK Site Directory* which holds details of around 250 accessible underground sites. According to the Subterranea Britannica Trustees’ Report 2011, the society organised two full day conferences, two ‘study weekends’, and several arranged visits to underground sites. In addition, the society’s website www.subbrit.org attracted 700,000 unique visitors in 2011, while the additional ‘social networking channels, such as Facebook, now have almost 1,000 members (Subterranea Britannica, 2011a). While the society is still sometimes regarded merely as an ‘unofficial’ group of enthusiasts (see, for example Bell, 1997) that operates on the margins of the professional and academic domain in the production and practices of Cold War heritage constructions, it has recently (April, 2011a) become a registered charity, and therefore also a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee (Subterranea Britannica, 2011a).

Additionally, when reviewing the Sub Brit website and published documents it states that the society “enjoys good relationships with other UK groups such as the Council for British Archaeology and English Heritage” (Subterranea Britannica, 2012). Throughout this study, first-hand observations have also been made about the interference of external professional intervention and collaboration; for example, by inviting English Heritage executives to present at Sub Brit events such as the Sub Brit’s Friends Day at Hack Green Secret Nuclear Bunker on March 20, 2010.

Furthermore, Sub Brit members co-opted into the surveying of twentieth century relics of ‘the defence of Britain’ (Council of British Archaeology 2010). Sub Brit also has connections and collaborations with similar archaeological organisations and interest groups elsewhere in Western Europe, including the Netherlands,
Belgium, France and Italy. These statements and practices enforce the perspective, brought forward in sections 2.2 and 2.4, that subaltern or alternative forms of heritage do not merely ‘work from below’ but also that these forms often (unconsciously) support and operate within authorised discourses.

In more detail, based on the society’s memorandum and articles of association (2011b), Sub Brit is actively involved in establishing, legitimising and enforcing the discourse of processual or scientific rationality, and to a certain extent is governed by this process of knowledge and expertise. As stated in the society’s provisos, Sub Brit (2011b: 4) aims to encourage and promote:

...the highest achievable standards of surveying archaeological investigation and recording historical research interpretation and publication...

Although it is not clear from the document what is meant by ‘the highest achievable standards’, it does contribute to the rhetoric of archaeological science and the so-called professionalisation of the discipline since the 1960s and contributes to the ‘common sense’ view of the Cold War past as ‘merely’ being about geographical and geological issues. In addition, the society validates and facilitates the restrictive distribution of power and resources of archaeological knowledge deployed and maintained by English Heritage as the ‘godparent’ of the scheduling and listing policy, legislation and processes of a range of cultural objects and places, including those related to the Cold War period. In order to be recognised and to collaborate in the act of surveying and archaeological recording of underground objects, spaces and structures, in its provisos (2011b: 4) the society furthermore aims to promote and encourage:

...the scheduling where considered appropriate of underground sites and structures and objects as statutory Scheduled Ancient Monuments or Listing as Buildings of Architectural or Historical Interest...
...the scheduling where appropriate of underground sites as statutory Local Nature Reserves, Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Special Scientific Interest or National Nature Reserves... 

Through promoting and encouraging the scheduling of underground sites, including Cold War remains, the society appears to pursue a joint relationship that is based on the invocation of legitimate authority, as cooperation between English Heritage as the regulatory agency and Sub Brit working within and for the establishment of protocols and techniques. These attempts strengthen, and once again, reinforce, the extent to which the discourse is naturalised intentionally by, and within, the community of expertise through the sense of fellowship and commitment concerning a set of principles that represent ‘good sense’. To safeguard the values of ‘good’ heritage, and the ways in which sites should be conserved and managed, Sub Brit (2011b: 4) aims to contribute to the ‘heritage process’ of meaning making by promoting and encouraging:

...the assistance of and collaboration with persons or organisations conducting properly organised and authorised research into geological or natural history features of underground sites...

The intertextuality of the above texts highlights the attempts by Sub Brit to advance, redefine and propagate specific principles, such as those of ‘conservation’, ‘preservation’ and ‘stewardship’, that will protect, maintain and reveal the cultural and historical significance of the material nature of underground sites in a ‘clear’ and ‘seemly’ manner. Although the society’s efforts identify and stress their understanding of the symbolic importance of Cold War heritage in representing social and cultural values and identity, it also accepts the particular ethic and authority of the dominant discourse that has been put in place by, and constituted within, English Heritage. Despite a lack of interest for the Cold War past embedded within this ethic, Sub Brit has become a participant in the mainstream debate and has taken on, and been put under, the moral obligation
to care for, preserve and protect the underground places and sites so that they can be used in higher levels of policy making to educate the public about their 'common' past and identity and, ultimately, to ensure that this inheritance is passed on to future generations.

Additionally, while knowledge about the Cold War period is expanding through these archaeological practices, and more information and sites are being released and opened up for contemporary uses, this also means that Sub Brit will have to underline and reinforce its role as an advisory body and valuable source of information for policy makers in order to maintain and strengthen its position within the discourse of scientific rationality. In this regard, what is perhaps even more challenging to the nature of the knowledge that is deployed by bodies of expertise is to consider that heritage by (almost literally) 'inside' and 'outside' communities and individuals is not solely regarded as a place or thing, whose values are immutable.

Besides Sub Brit there are also other 'outside' bodies of interest and knowledge that thrive on the motivation to discuss (and reveal) Cold War sites, artefacts and 'official' documents that were concealed from the public for long periods in history. From the 1960s onwards, individuals and groups have made attempts to depict the (on-going) planned reactions to nuclear threat. Not all groups have increased in size, scale and involvement in the debate such as Sub Brit; local historians, amenity groups and other 'enthusiasts' have often taken on a more sympathetic, personal perspective based on feelings of nostalgia, curiosity or concern about the future of sites within their area.

One of these groups is The Oxford Trust of Contemporary History (OTCH), established in 1995 by Daniel Scharf, which serves the purpose of protecting and developing the potential heritage interest in the Cold War air base at RAF Upper Heyford (RAFUH). Although Scharf (2007: 2) claims that the site is regarded by English Heritage (EH) and the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) as the best-preserved Cold War remains in the country, it is also the focus of a battle over its contemporary uses after being declared surplus in 1994. The OCTH
has been fighting for the entire preservation of the military areas of the site, including retaining the fence, since 1995 with the local parish councils and English Heritage aiming to "present a more environmentally acceptable face" (Scharf, 2007).

During the early stages of the debate, English Heritage’s response to a request by OTCH to include Upper Heyford in the Register of Historic Battlefields was negative as nothing happened ‘on the ground’ (Scharf, 2007: 3). The councils went even further by proclaiming the military legacy of the site as a ‘scar’ within the local landscape, leading to the removal of the fencing and the construction of three hundred new residential buildings, and plans for seven hundred additional houses.

Over the years, however, English Heritage has become more aware of the site’s importance, and the public and academic attention, and has been instrumental in listing and scheduling several of the buildings on the site. Additionally, the Cherwell District Council (CDC) has been persuaded to preserve and ‘monumentalise’ some of the unlisted buildings accepted to be of ‘national interest’, but still this does not cover the entire site. In this regard, English Heritage, CDC and Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) have gradually shifted from their position of indifference and hostility to one of some modest support for the conservation of the heritage interest. The remains of the airfield are nowadays described by CDC as “a core area of historic importance”, while Andrew Brown, EH Regional Director, has even claimed Upper Heyford to be “the nation’s first Cold War heritage park” (Brown, 2007). However, Scharf argues that none of the above parties has yet adopted a position that reflects the importance that they all say is attached to the site.

It appears that this matter is two-fold; first, there appears to be a minimum level of trust between the OTCH versus the CDC and EH concerning the intentions of their actions and management practices. While the latter parties appear not to oppose or deny the symbolic importance of the site, including the replacement of
the air base with a 'heritage park', they also support the alternative options for the site (e.g. residential and commercial development). On the contrary, OTCH claims that it is the Cold War landscape that makes the site unique, and the establishment of a heritage park as a memorial site and museum should be ancillary to providing facilities and interpretation for visitors (Mair, 2009). Secondly, there seems to be some aggravation from members of the OTCH about the level and form of commitment from the other parties to preserve the entire site as a tangible aspect of Cold War heritage. The results of OTCH efforts are aimed at raising awareness of the existence and importance of the material aspects of the site, although they seem to be struggling to persuade authorised heritage bodies, local councils and the land managers of the 'intellectual' and 'scientific' value of the material remains to preserve the site as Cold War heritage. Although the attempts made by OTCH reveal that dominant ideas about the values of 'authentic material culture' and the 'built environment' are not completely abandoned, there is a sense of performativity of 'doing' and 'being' with opportunities for remembering and commemoration (Edensor, 2005).

Other minor 'outside' groups include urban exploration communities such as 28DaysLater, UK URBEX and TalkUrbex that operate and exist primarily through international Internet forums where members ('urban explorers') can read, discuss, review and exchange information and images regarding urban exploration and photography. Urban exploration is defined as the “exploration of abandoned [off-limits] buildings of which the public has forgotten or wish to forget...in order to document, photograph, film or just explore these places” (28DaysLater, 2008). As appealing, alternative forms of public space, in which, as Edensor (2005: 172) argues, people may play, linger and mix with non-humans, these places are regarded as spaces full of objects that are not (or no longer) commodities, whose function is open to new and dissident interpretations and meanings. As the landowners or managers of the site often prohibit access to derelict urban areas or industrial facilities, the forums operate according to strict guidelines to ensure that the exchange of information is only accessible to trustable forum members. Information about the location of the sites is also
something that in many cases is banned from the forums, not solely because of the risk of being prosecuted for trespassing, but, perhaps more importantly, to ensure that the sites remain something to be enjoyed exclusively by the 'happy few' that have “invested their time in it” (28DaysLater, 2008). Control over the location of the sites and the exclusivity of those visiting seems vital for most members, protecting them from the danger of becoming a commodity if the site were to be opened to the public to explore.

Nonetheless, from an ‘inside’ perspective, for many who lived through the Cold War period, worked in one of the Cold War buildings, or for those that are in any other way connected with the events of the past, it is what is done during visits at, and with, heritage sites, objects and places that constitutes the real moment of heritage. Contrary to the above ideas of exclusiveness and closure, heritage as a subaltern identity politics becomes a matter of public attention and involvement. Following Strange and Walley’s (2007) arguments, authorised and professional subaltern discourses in this sense also intersect with ‘inside’ interests and knowledge of individual scientists, technologists and military and civilian personnel who were employed at Cold War sites. These ‘lay’ discourses are concerned with, and stress, the actions undertaken by these men and women, with the main task being the protection of peace and prevention of nuclear warfare. Strange and Walley (2007) further demonstrate the discourses’ emphasis on the personal courage and potential sacrifices of those involved in the Cold War, reflecting the period and events as an achievement or success. Resultantly, they noted that from this perspective “its history should therefore be included within the historical narrative of progress, grandeur, modernisation, adaptation and even national decline” (2007: 160-161).

In this regard, veteran participants regard visits to Cold War sites as places to actively and openly celebrate, secure, negotiate and share the experiences of (that particular) place and action of which they were a part. On the other hand, although the visit reflects a sense of achievement and feelings of belonging, it also arouses disappointment over the redundancy of their role, the site and the equipment for
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c contemporary uses. Following Strange and Walley’s (2007: 161) cautious argument, these reactions of self-satisfaction and accomplishment mingled with dissatisfaction and frustrations may result in a sense of betrayal over the representation of their role in ‘preserving peace’. In this regard, it is also important to recognise the opponent to the heritage discourses that support and derive from military enthusiasms. The peace movements that were active during the Cold War period have also expressed an interest in the Cold War sites as places not only built to survive mass destruction but also to contest the war through significant peace actions.

3.5 Implications and conclusion

This chapter has illustrated three things. Firstly, it has provided an outline of the ideological lines and fear of nuclear annihilation that was constantly present during the period that is referred to as the Cold War. Although it might seem an imaginary or romanticised story of a foregoing world for some, for many it was a very real and threatening part of everyday life and society. The uniqueness of the Cold War was that it brought a different, intangible type of warfare and the objectives that became its main driving force and matter of concern for the ‘lay’ public. In comparison with previous wars, where battles were fought between opponents on tangible battlefields for religious or material causes, this confrontation was about the art of embedding and influencing ideas, values and belief systems in people’s minds, and not only those of the enemy.

After two World Wars, people were more than willing to believe the propaganda of their superpower, even though it consisted of myths and stories that were simply put in place to justify a divided world and reaffirm national identities based on one of the two ideological systems. Ironically, the secrecy surrounding the events, stirred by the ‘plausible deniability’ of the existence and activities of secret intelligence agencies, was perhaps the most concrete and present aspect in the public consciousness and imaginings of the Cold War. Even up until this day,
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Espionage remains significant for the emotional and cognitive constructions of myths and stories about the Cold War.

Additionally, the chapter has illustrated that the perceptions of the reasoning and role of Britain during the conflict were two-fold. From a British perspective, getting involved in the conflict reaffirmed some of the country’s self-confidence and international status after losing great parts of its empire, struggling with economic decline and its position within (the economic markets of) Europe. The pursuit of regaining some of the ‘national interest’, either in global politics and/or strategic and economic pursuits, was a difficult task as financial means to maintain the enormous range of commitments, obligations and ‘interests’ were steadily decreasing. In order to uphold British power, a visible approach to upholding prestige was placed high, even above the ‘objective’ accounts of the decline, on the list of priorities.

However, the struggles of national identity and status that were present throughout Britain’s post-war society were not solely the result of internal issues. Instead, the Americans through their propaganda tactics stirred the crisis and hardened relations between East and West in order to establish a permanent stationing of large military forces in Britain and Western Europe. From this perspective, they influenced the beliefs of the British government to uphold a diplomatic and moderating position that would provide the country with a sense of prestige and power as a player within the global political arena. With the appearance of U.S. military bases, equipment and personnel, concerns for the possibilities of Britain being attacked were used to justify the development of a national security strategy. However, in its attempts to keep up with the arms race, Britain placed more strain on its economy and the nation’s manufacturing output.

As a result, the gap between the unarmed population and the power of arms in control became unprecedented, and measures were put into place to evacuate a small number of officials into regional bunkers, whilst informing the public about alternative home-based shelters. The release of this information caused great
disturbance, leading to a nation-wide feeling of nuclear paranoia and annihilation that became synonymous with the Cold War. As a result, not only did Britain experience an increasing domestication within society, it also became a driving force behind social conflicts and calls for a recall of international negotiations.

Additionally, waves of protest emerged in response to the technological advantages of nuclear weapons and tension between the superpowers, the most well known in Britain being the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). Especially the women’s movement became a focus and symbol of women’s resistance to the traditional political discourse and male-dominated world of nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, public support for the peace discourse fell rapidly, partly because the end of the conflict also meant the end to a rationale that had underpinned and justified the dominant defence strategies.

Based on these understandings, the chapter has also illustrated the subsequent discussions that emerged regarding the rapid obsolescence of large numbers of previously active Cold War sites. Not only growing rates of market disposal were a concern for experts, heritage managers and policy makers, but there were also significant issues with cataloguing what was kept secret for so many years, and to obtain the power and knowledge to authorise the process of heritage preservation, conservation and management. In the assessment of Cold War sites and structures, as part of a wider evaluation of 20th century defence structures in Britain, English Heritage has been at the forefront of assisting and developing criteria by which the historical and national importance of individual sites and structures could be confirmed or rejected. In this regard, it has found another way of demonstrating its power, knowledge and influence as a heritage authority by ‘revealing’ military secrets and confronting the public with their previous ignorance of its tangible existence. In doing so, English Heritage reinforces the self-referential characteristics of the authorised discourse, as their authority is embedded within the ability to ‘speak to’ and ‘make sense’ of the aesthetic and monumental value of the Cold War remains and the meanings that are constructed through the
experiences of, and within, Cold War sites as a part of a wider national identity, collective memory and sense of belonging.

However, the political and cultural ‘work’ done by English Heritage influences, and is influenced by, ‘lay’ knowledge and interest from subaltern and alternative discourses as they assert their own view of Cold War heritage and identity in the power struggle over heritage. The most well known example is exemplified by the work done by the society Subterranea Britannica, which has developed itself from a group of enthusiasts into an ally and source of information for the dominant discourse that is controlled and implemented by English Heritage. Through promoting and encouraging the scheduling of underground sites, including Cold War sites and structures, the society aims to enhance the acknowledgment by, and relationship with, English Heritage. These attempts strengthen and reinforce the extent to which the authorised discourse and English Heritage as its regulatory agency are naturalised through the mutual commitment and fellowship that represent ‘good sense’. In addition, this also means that the society will have to reinforce and underline its role as an advisory body. The Oxford Trust for Contemporary Heritage is another active body that has emphasised its expertise through debates regarding the tangible remains of the Cold War, in particular, that of RAF Upper Heyford. Instead of offering its assistance and collaboration, the Trust’s perspectives on the potential heritage value conflict with those of the other parties involved, including local councils, the owner of the site and English Heritage. Despite a growing awareness and recognition of the tangible, heritage value of the site, there is still a minimum level of trust from the OTCH with regard to the intentions and expertise of the other parties involved in the contemporary designation of the site. Additionally, there are also alternative ‘inside’ discourses from those who lived through the Cold War period, worked in one of the Cold War sites, and/or protested against it as part of the peace movement.

Visiting Cold War sites, in this regard, could offer an opportunity to actively and openly celebrate, secure, negotiate and share the experiences of achievement but
also disappointment regarding their role, the obsolescence of the sites and the equipment that was used. However, it appears that currently their stories are not to be included in the historical narratives that are constructed and displayed by dominant discourses, and, in this sense, there is no glue that links the tangible and intangible aspects of heritage and that supports it as the physical sites through intangible experiences and practices that will lead to value and meaningful constructions of the Cold War period.
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The previous chapters have explored theories and practices concerned with authorised and alternative discourses concerning Cold War heritage (and) tourism. They examined the influence of the management and conservation practices and regulations by experts who are regarded as ‘those with knowledge’ and the ways in which the ‘past’, including Cold War sites and objects, was officially considered, assessed and identified as heritage (Groote and Haardsen: 182). The subsequent ‘tourism’ discourse that appeared to be used in the literature and management protocols and practices are essentially grounded in traditional concepts of ‘tourists’, in which ‘visits’ are understood as a marketing matter for conservation and management. The chapters have also illustrated that lay and popular discourses about what constitutes heritage (and) tourism are less prominent and that, although conventional practices are contested by alternative and ‘bottom up’ management approaches, they continue to narrow individual perspectives on what constitutes the past in the present within everyday lives and local surroundings. Consequently, what is going on, in terms of social and cultural consequences, by and within the visit remains largely unexplored. This results in a lack in temporal depths about visitors’ narratives, views and expressions of heritage when visiting Cold War attractions, ultimately affecting the meaning making process.

The aim of the chapter is, by moving beyond the authorised discourses, to explore what the experience of visiting a heritage site means, and how heritage is defined according to the messages, the impressions, and the social and cultural meanings that are constructed during and from the visit, and so on. To avoid getting tangled up, the various topics have, somewhat artificially, been separated from each other
in sections and sub-sections. Overall, all these concepts are connected and, when put together, heritage is a cultural practice comprising of processes of identity and acts of remembrance that work together to create ways to understand and engage with the present. Cold War sites, in this sense, are the cultural tools that facilitate this process.

4.1 Influencing elements within the meaning making process

Philosophical and theoretical explorations of meaning and meaning making processes are usually conducted within the discipline of structuralism, or succeeding paradigmatic assumptions such as constructionism (see Chapter 5). Originating from the earlier twentieth century work of the Swiss linguist Saussure, the discipline of structuralism, a philosophical exploration of meaning investigates how language accumulates meanings, and how these meanings are understood, gained increasing popularity in the 1950s and ‘60s. Stemming from linguistics, the approach, known as semiology and semiotics, expanded into several other disciplines such as philosophy, anthropology, sociology, geography, and a number of subfields such as biosemiotics, semiotic anthropology, and music semiology. In tourism studies, the structural approach resulted in studies that explored the subject of decoding myths and meanings, which producers and consumers sought to communicate through holiday texts and images (see, for example, Uzzell, 1984).

Structural approaches are concerned with the identification of mechanism through which things, words to objects in linguistics, and meanings to things in cultural studies, are related to each other (Abu-Khafajah, 2007). In line with Saussure’s concepts, these mechanisms consist of tangible (‘signifier’) words, materials or objects, and intangible (‘signifying’) meanings. The relationship between the signifier and signified produces signs and/or symbols (Figure 2).
For example, in Christian cultures, a ceremonial event such as a christening consists of tangible or visible ‘signifiers’ such as hymns, music, words and performances. To understand the ‘signified’, the meaning of the christening, we need to place them together in the structure of the christening and situate it within the larger context or system of representation of the Christian culture. In this sense, ‘culture’ is understood as a structure in which various elements, such as speeches, myths, traditions and social behaviour, exist in relation to each other. Only if we understand the elements and the rules governing the relationship between them, through deciphering the process of meaning making, the coming together of these elements results in meaning.

During the course of the century, Saussure’s work influenced many followers including Lévi-Strauss, who insisted that structures “emanate from the intellect,” and are *prior to* rather than *derived from* social order (Piaget, 1970: 112). However, and in line with this study’s constructionist approach, all social structures are ultimately the results of human actions at every level of culture and knowledge. This does not mean that there is no reality out there; it only implies that we cannot make sense of it, except in terms of our conceptual maps of meaning, which we create to help us gain meaning from what is around us. In this
sense, things do not mean: we construct meaning, using representational systems — concepts and signs (Hall, 2001: 25). To illustrate, Staples (2002: 200) states that:

... social structures do emanate from the human mind, but they do not actually become structures unless action has taken place. The prior existence of symbolic structures not only enables action to take place, but also constrains them to a certain extent.

This perspective supports the general concept of (subtle) realism (see Chapter 5.3), or as Lloyd states “there is no structure apart from construction, either abstract or genetic” (Lloyd: 1986: 240). Lloyd further distinguishes himself from Lévi-Strauss’ structural analyses, and begins to move to constructionism, for three reasons:

1. Structural analyses confine themselves to the cultural products of the human mind, and say little about the structures or relations of society, or about how they change (1986: 243);
2. Structural analyses attempt to condense the structures of culture to their atomistic elements to relocate them into rational and scientific forms (1986: 247);
3. Structural analyses do not approach social realities or human agency from the viewpoint of the actor’s understandings (1986: 264).

These insights provide a valuable framework to avoid losing sight of humans as social beings in the world when exploring the meaning making process of Cold War heritage (and) tourism. In this regard, and contrary to Saussure’s model of perceiving the process as the relationship between the signifier and signified, this study acknowledges ‘meaning’ as “organised structures of understanding and emotional attachments, by which grown people interpret and assimilate their environment” (Marris, 1986: 4). To exemplify, this approach allows for visitors’ practices, involving experiences, thoughts, feelings, and performances, to be
included as an inseparable part of the cultural practices through which Cold War sites are perceived, identified, and evaluated as heritage.

In social sciences, culture is often regarded as “a way of life,” consisting of a set practices through which meanings are produced and incorporated (Williams, 1988: 90; Hall, 2001: 2). To illustrate, Du Gay, Hall, James, Mackay and Negus (1997), while studying the Walkman cassette player, developed a ‘circuit of culture’ as a theory or framework to explore the production and circulation of meaning through language. They argue that language is the privileged medium in which we ‘make sense’ of things, in which meaning of cultural texts or artefacts is produced and exchanged. Furthermore, the ‘circuit of culture’ demonstrates that meanings are constructed through a dynamic process involving five aspects: representation, identity, production, consumption and regulation. These concepts are intricately linked in a dynamic and interchangeable network that enables texts and artefacts to acquire meanings, and become part of a cultural industry.

Based on Hall’s (1997) concept of language as a system of representation, it seems logical to link this view to the ideas of heritage (and) tourism (see Figure 4). As Ashworth and Graham (2005: 5) underwrite; “[heritage] like language...is one of the mechanisms by which meaning is selectively produced and consumed through processes of exchange and negotiation. The word ‘selectively’ in the previous sentence implies that not all of the past is heritage, nor is it all culture (Graham and Howard, 2008:2). Meanings are produced and consumed through social interactions and regulate and organise our practices through rules, norms and conventions. Taking into account the dominant authorised discourse indicating that there is no simple and static concept of heritage, it seems possible to view it as the cultural practice or network in which meaningful communication is (or can be) performed (Gregory, 2000).

Although tempting though, this study goes beyond (yet not completely abandoning) the ‘circuit of heritage’ as an analytical tool, by exploring heritage (and) tourism not as mere commodities to be consumed, but as an alternative,
regards them as part of an individual’s practices within and interpretation of a place and context. This perspective follows the concerns expressed by Smith (2009a: 45), as she argues that what people ‘do’ at heritage sites or with the concept of heritage itself is still an unexplored concept in the literature in heritage (and) tourism studies. The various themes and concepts below exemplify that heritage is a cultural process in which people actively engage and mediate cultural, political and social meanings.

**Figure 4** A circuit of heritage (and) tourism (adopted from Hall, 1997: 1)
4.2 Continuity, memory and remembering

The definition of meaning by Marris (1986: 4), in the previous section, as a “structure of understanding and emotional attachments” has demonstrated the importance of an individual’s interaction with things for the meaning making process. In this sense, material culture as heritage is assumed to provide a physical representation and reality of the meanings and ‘messages’ that it contains. However, this might falsely imply that the structure of understanding and attachments are solely based on internal feelings, following Williams’ (1977: 132-134) argument:

… [Feelings are] characteristic elements of impulse, restraint, and tone… with specific internal relations, at once interlocking and in tension… a social experience still in process, often indeed not yet recognized as social but taken to be private, idiosyncratic, and even isolating, but which in analysis (though rarely otherwise) has its emergent, connecting, and dominant characteristics.

These experiences of belonging and continuity are greatly fostered within heritage practices (Lowenthal, 1985: 214), while it is the physicality of heritage sites and objects, which gives these feelings an added sense of material reality (Smith, 2009a). A particular interest in the feelings of belonging and continuity is emphasised in the commemorative work of many scholars and Jewish communities on memory and the Holocaust (see, for example, Engelking and Paulsson, 2001; Ashworth, 2002). Following Marris (1986: 12), continuity - as an organising element - “represents for an individual his identity; for a society its cultures; and for mankind, perhaps, the half-hidden outline of a universal philosophy”. As Abu-Khafajah (2007: 177) argues, “meanings of things are contingent on their continuity in life, and in many cases, meanings of life are derived from continuity of certain people, things and conditions. In this regard, continuity is intricately linked to a sense of identity as it “[conveys] the ideas of timeless values and unbroken lineages that underpin identity” (Graham et al, 2000: 41; see also, Lowenthal, 1985: 62).
From a conservationist perspective, heritage in this regard acts as "a source and symbol of the collective identity and cultural continuity," which is employed as a shield against what is perceived as a dangerous assault by the culture industry (Anheier and Raj Isar, 2011). However, what is apparent is that this sense of belonging and emotional security is not static or definite, but may instead be a field of activities of rehearsing and sharing collective memories, experienced first-hand or retold and passed on (Said, 2000: 185; Smith, 2009a: 63). Heritage sites play an important role as ‘cultural spaces of memory’ (Macdonald and Fyfe, 1996) in which visitors use the past “to define and redefine who we [they] are, what we [they] believe, what we [they] like and dislike, and the values we [they] hold dear” (Archibald, 2004: 20). In this regard, the process of memories regulates the past, through distilling and selecting specific images, so it becomes possible to make sense and have meaning (Lowenthal, 1985: 204-205).

However, these images are merely a reflection of the ‘real’ events of the past. Instead, as an organic form of knowledge (Samuel, 1994) they are entwined with individual and collective perceptions, change and reproduction (Halbwachs, 1992: 47). This form of knowledge contrasts with the ‘official’ chronological pasts described in documentary records, and is instead related to local memories and personal stories (Lowenthal, 1985: 213). It also emphasises the idea that there is perhaps no collective memory, but that memory is diverse, allowing for popular and local versions of the past.

To make the dynamic process of memory even more complicated, Anderson (1991: 6) comments that feelings of continuity or belonging may develop from the sharing of ‘imagined memories’ for the construction of an ‘imagined community’ (see also, Mitchell, 2000, Tilly, 2006). She argues that this does not imply that either the sense of memory or the sense of continuity is therefore false or not real; rather, that the emotional effects in creating a sense of belonging are constantly reconstituted according to a presentist agenda. Wertsch (2002: 60) addresses this effect as he comments that, for members of a collective or nation, the memories and actions of remembering are important aspects of the socialising process.
Smith (2009a: 64) notes that the textual resources, identified by Wertsch (2002), are the narratives that are developed around specific tools, which are used in, and are stimulated through, acts of remembering. These narratives are put into collective memories, which make materials of the past meaningful (Archibald, 2004: 78-79; Lowenthal, 1985: 249). In this sense, Cold War sites can be identified as cultural tools in the process of remembering as they are inscribed with specific narratives.

This also moves attention from memories to the process of remembering as a public practice that is increasingly connected with heritage (and) tourism. By linking the concepts, Bajc argues (2007) we are able to “[direct] our analytical focus to the authority of experiencing the past in a specific touristic place in the present.” Memory, therefore, is not only reorganised in the minds of every generation; each act of communication or remembering, such as ceremonies and visits to places, also adds another “patina of meaning” (Young, 1989: 90). To add, Bajc (2007: 1) argues, “in the absence of, or complementary to, financial support for the historic preservation efforts, the entrepreneurial approach to collective pasts turns objects of memory into tourist attractions to keep them economically viable. These so-called ‘sites of remembrance’ are embedded with processes of remembering that enable physical sites and objects to become available for visitors to experience and remember the past.

This does not imply that individual or collective memories are incorrect or wrong, but simply that reminiscing, remembering, and even forgetting, are cultural processes of meaning making. New meanings are not only constructed and negotiated for the memories that are honoured and voiced or the places of remembrance that can be visited; the process also has significance for those who accept, celebrate or otherwise are involved in its social process (Smith, 2009a: 64). Hence, heritage as a cultural tool and as part of the process of creating and recreating meaning through memories and remembrances occurs through material realities of the past and embodied performances. The first emphasises that visiting and engaging with heritage sites is a cultural and political statement, whilst the
latter emphasises the active act of remembering through which we construct and negotiate 'legitimised' memories and meanings through remembering. This makes performances incorporating practices, which hold messages and meanings through gestures and actions, and at the same time inscribing practices as they record and store social memory and meaning (Connerton, 1991: 72-73 quoted in Smith, 2009a: 65).

To conclude, acknowledging the links between memories and remembering, and the way they are represented, constructed, negotiated and performed, it is possible to get a better understanding of the emotional features and power of the cultural processes of meaning making which occur at heritage sites. As mentioned earlier, memories, through sites and acts of remembrance, are linked with the possibility of forgetting, while practices of authorised discourses aim to achieve the opposite through heritage practices of conservation and management. The concept of 'forgetting' in the context of an authorised heritage discourse only exists for the sake of remembering the 'good' and forgetting the 'bad'. This ultimately leads to tensions about the concept of memory and history, in which memory is perceived as something unreliable, while the latter is based on facts derived from experts and authorised institutions. While accepting that within the process of meaning making, some people or groups may have emotional power to negotiate and impose meanings through processes of remembering and commemoration at heritage sites and objects; sharing memories through and as part of our heritage also allows us to actively engage with the construction and negotiation of personal memories and meanings. Interlinked with the concept of power is the active and continuous construction and negotiation of identity through the reinterpretation, remembering, and reassessment of the "meanings of the past in terms of the social, cultural, and political needs of the present" (Smith: 2009a: 83).

4.3 Identity and constructions of place

Subsequent to the closing argument in the previous section, heritage is less about the tangible artefacts and places or intangible forms of the past, but about the
meanings placed upon them and the constructions that are created from them (Graham, et al, 2000; Graham, 2002; Smith, 2004). This furthermore implies that heritage, instead of having intrinsic worth, is based on the meanings and symbolic values that are interwoven and reflected in the remains of the past.

In this regard, through stories, memories are believed to enrich meanings generated for places, and this is, amongst other examples, highly visible in religious tourism; where stories generated from religious memories transform ordinary places into sacred spaces that are infused with stories (Halbwachs, 1992; Archibald, 2004; Abu-Khafajah, 2007). To illustrate, Archibald (2004: 20) comments; “we make a place sacred by what we believe and how we act and the stories we weave around and into it.” He continues by stating that “without the stories... artefacts would be quaint and even valuable, but useless to a museum...Artefacts stimulate memory, make stories tangible, make the past palpable, but without stories they are devoid of meaning” (2004: 79). In this sense, stories provide a framework that enables people to project their identities and, in doing so, to identify themselves with places and stories related to the past, present and future. Identity is thus constructed through this context as part of a coherent story providing a sense of stability and continuity of the self and place through time and space (Dolón and Todoli, 2008).

This connection between the concepts of self and place has been recognised by various scholars in heritage (and) tourism studies. For example, when taking into account that heritage narratives convey the meaning of the heritage artefacts or sites and, as such, take part in the processes of place identity, Howard (2003: 147) argues that the “major outcome of conserving and interpreting heritage, whether intended or not, is to provide identity... to make some people feel better, more rooted and more secure”. Similarly, Hayden (1995: 9) acknowledges a strong connection between identity, memory and place, as he argues, “identity is intimately tied into memory; both our personal memories (where we have come from and where we have dwelt) and the collective or social memories interconnected with the histories of our families, neighbours, fellow workers, and
Chapter 4 - Cold War heritage and the process of meaning making

ethnic communities." He continues by stating that the urban landscapes [that] are storehouses for these social memories, because natural features such as hills or harbours, as well as streets, buildings, and patterns of settlements, frame the lives of many people and often outlast many lifetimes (1995: 9).

This analysis of the way heritage is used in constructing and giving material reality to ‘identity’ is often articulated in terms of national identity (Smith, 2009a). This focus on the ideologies of nationalism and national identities is a consequence of the way authorised heritage discourses remind people of their ‘homogenous’ national identity. In addition, as Crouch and Parker (2003: 405) have illustrated, heritage is used as a legitimising discourse in continuing and constructing a range of ‘identities’. In identifying the components of nation-state building, including ‘national heritage’, the emphasis is not only placed on reconstructing and preserving the past, but also on encouraging the present, to build and secure the future. In accordance with the concept of continuity, heritage provides temporal and material authority to experts and organisations to reinforce people’s identification with specific social values. This identification with a particular place is necessary for the cultivation of awareness, or what Osborne (2001: 3) has termed an ‘a-where-ness’ of national identity, in which nationalising-states occupy imagined terrains that act as supporting memory devices. In agreement, Rose (1995: 87-118) adds: “one way in which identity is connected to a particular place is by feeling that you belong to that place.”

The imaginative use of symbols, myths, monuments, commemorations and performances are all directed towards nurturing the construction of, as well as being influenced by, meaning-full places such as landscapes, monuments and sites. These ‘landmarks’ (Halbwachs, 1992) have no inherent identity; these are constructed by human behaviour in reaction to places (Osborne, 2001: 4). In addition, for Martin (1997: 1):

Identity is formed and continually reinforced via individual practice within culturally defined space...Sense of place, as a component of
identity and psychic interiority, is a lived embodied felt quality of place that informs practice and is productive of particular expression of place.

This statement also implies that people are not mere passive agents in the process; a society's diversity ensures that, however instructive the authorised practices of nationalism and national identity, they will always be 'polysemic' (Jensen, 1990; Rodman, 1992). Even though material heritage, such as artefacts, buildings, monuments, and prosaic practices, ritualised practices and institutionalised commemorations, are indented to reinforce and create collective feelings of 'state' and 'national' belonging and identity (Mann, 1994; Brueilly, 1993) through acts of remembering, these will always have multiple meanings, some of which will be different from the dominant discourse.

4.4 Engaging with the past and the present

Heritage does not only include acts of remembering through the (re-)making and sharing of oral histories, it includes embodied performances of remembering. Visiting a heritage site can be regarded as a nice day out - a break from the everyday – yet it also offers an opportunity to reflect and experience memories and acts of remembering through embodied practices, through 'doing'. In addition, it allows for novel memories to be created through the process of 'being' and for new meanings to be constructed and negotiated about what the heritage site means. In relation to this study, Cold War sites can be used as sites where memories of the Cold War are (re-) created and shared, and meanings about this period, but also about what it is to 'be' British, are constructed and negotiated. Traditional accounts regard this process of meaning making as a one-way form of communication, in which heritage visitors passively accept and adopt messages that are communicated by heritage experts and professionals.

However, as mentioned earlier, heritage is an experience that cannot be static or 'frozen in time' (Smith, 2009a), as the authorised discourse through conservation
and management protocols and techniques attempts to establish. Instead, it is an embodied process of experiences that is generally based on established values and meanings, yet also creates new ones (Smith, 2009a).

Nonetheless, the authorised discourse on heritage stirred and imposed by grand narratives of 'values', 'meanings', 'memory', 'place', 'identity' and 'performance' should not be overlooked. As observed previously, alternative and personal conceptualisations of heritage can only exist to contradict a dominant discourse. As Fish (1990: 186) argues, it is the conventional and social means by which physical context is constructed, that compose the cultural institutions that "precede us" and in which "we are already embedded" and "it is only by inhabiting them, or being inhabited by them, that we have access to the public and conventional sense they make." Concerns about the authority of interactions are also expressed by Geertz (1973: 49) as he states that interactions are by no means the outcome of human thoughts and behaviour, but instead are "a set of control mechanisms – plans, recipes, rules, instructions – for the governing of behaviour" (Geertz, 1973: 44). Thus, from this perspective, individuals may be regarded as buoyant agents that actively engage with their world and make sense of it, yet such statements are actually misleading as they deny historical or sociocultural influences. It is impossible for individuals to encounter phenomena in the world and interpret them independently and unconnectedly; instead, we enter a social environment in which a 'system of intelligibility' prevails (Fish, 1980).

On the contrary, and more in line with this study's assumptions, individual interactions between individuals and their context, and the role of this interaction in constructing personal meanings for materials of the past, Dicks (2000a: 74-75) argues that materials of the past hardly have a meaning in and of themselves. Without abandoning the existence of a 'world out there', meanings are constructed through the continuous personal encounters between individuals and their environment. Due to this process in which place, meaning and identity are actively created and recreated by visitors, constructions of heritage will keep changing and developing through time and place, as well as between and within
individuals. In this sense, Smith (2009b: 35) observes that “the identification of heritage places, their management and conservation and their interpretation to visitors is itself a process and performance of meaning making in which certain heritage sites, and the social and cultural values and meanings they are considered to represent, are continually reinforced and recreated.”

This reinforces the idea that engagement with heritage through visiting sites is not only ‘done’ at national level and by authorised discourse, but also occurs at more personal levels, as visitors themselves make meaning through the performance of visiting. It also emphasises that meanings at heritage sites are mediated through, as Smith (2009a: 70) argues, “constructing and engaging with a plausible experience”, which implies more than just merely presenting or reading interpretive panels, through which visitors become personally concerned with decoding the meanings of the experience. In this sense, sites and objects also act as tools within culturally defined practices of ‘doing’ in which the past is encoded and decoded according to both influences from contemporary contexts and control mechanism and individuals’ experiences and perceptions (Dicks, 2000a, 2000b, Abu-Khafajah, 2007). To illustrate, heritage sites such as Stonehenge, the holy sites of Jerusalem (if not the entire city), and commemorative sites of the political and religious conflicts in Northern Ireland are notable examples of apportioning diverse, and often conflicting, meanings to the same artefacts, places and events (Graham, 1996: 12).

Because of this essential relationship between human experiences and objects, no object can be adequately constructed in isolation from the conscious mind experiencing it, nor can an experience be described in isolation from its object. Following Smith’s (2009a: 71) argument, this makes heritage performances not only physical experiences of ‘doing’, but also emotional experiences of ‘being’. Recalling Heidegger’s study, ‘being human’ (discussed in, for example, Kaelin, 1988; Blattner, 2006) means, with mind and body, ‘being-in-the-world’. In this regard, the meaning making process is not governed by subjectivism or objectivism. Instead, it mirrors the concept of intentionality, in which all mental
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phenomena are described as having “reference to a content, direction toward an object” (Brentano, 1973: 88). Embracing this notion allows for the interaction between subject and object, of humans engaging with things and activities, out of which meaning is constructed (Crotty, 2003).

In tourism studies, this duality is explored in writings such as Obrador Pons’ (2003) findings on the relevance of tourist dwelling and embodiment metaphors and Pernecky’s (2010) theoretical paper in which he explores the multitude of meanings that inform our understandings in and of tourism. He concludes by stating that the construction and interpretation of these meanings is not based on ‘correct’, ‘reliable’ and ‘valid’ accounts (2010: 11) of Cold War heritage but should be regarded as something that consists of a multitude of meanings by different discourses, including the authorised perspectives, management interpretation and visitors’ experiences. Most importantly, and in line with this study’s notion on the concept of heritage, the phenomenon of Cold War heritage can be conceived as a result of, and a starting point for, making meaning and sense of our lives (and that of others and the world). Visiting Cold War attractions as places of the past helps visitors to construct the ways in which they ‘are’ in the world; to conceptualise the events of the Cold War; to express and commemorate their memories; and to experience the driving forces behind the conflict.

4.5 Implications and conclusion

If heritage is something that is experienced through ‘doing’ and ‘being’, just what do we mean by this? What this chapter has once again revealed is that heritage is foremost about action, power and agency. It is vital and alive, and not a thing only experts and professionals are involved in, but something with which everyone is actively, consciously, and often, critically engaged in. On the contrary, authorised perspectives often focus on maintaining the realities, ideas and meanings of the past, as part of a fixed continuity through processes of representations and interpretations of, places of heritage.
Acknowledging this tension between the emphasis on the materiality of a place and personal interactions has led to the understanding that heritage experiences are fluid and personal. To elaborate, heritage can be perceived as part of a range of internal processes such as feelings, memories and images, which come into existence through practices of communicating and acts of passing on knowledge and stories, through which cultural and social values, meanings and notions of identity are constructed, shaped and negotiated. In this regard, it is the use of sites, objects and artefacts; the experience that makes them part of heritage, but more importantly, a sense of heritage is the experience (Smith, Morgan and Van der Meer, 2003). Simultaneously, through social and cultural performances at heritage sites, people interact with the objects, systems, structures, artefacts and things in order to define and construct their meaning. The outcomes or product of these practices are the emotions and memories of the Cold War that help to construct and, ultimately, contribute to senses of belonging and identity.

In addition, what is apparent in the processes of binding and creating these senses is that they are not simply personal, but are part of and facilitated by networks of social relations. These networks are constantly created and recreated by social and cultural activities of rehearsing and sharing collective memories, values, meanings and understandings of the past. Heritage is those activities of ‘doing’ that enable visitors to engage with processes of thinking about the past and where we come from, which define our actions in the present and, ultimately, mediate the future.
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To understand what a visit to a Cold War site means for visitors, and how the experience influences and contributes to valuable constructions of meanings and identity, this chapter originates from a personal endeavour about the development of social inquiry applied within heritage (and) tourism studies (section 5.1). Subsequently, the discussion turns to the choice of social constructionism in relation to other philosophies, as the paradigmatical foundation of the study, including its ontological, epistemological assumptions (section 5.2). Subsequently, section 5.3 describes the strategy that has been utilised in the pursuit of the aim of this research. Finally, this chapter provides a methodological framework - based on the implications of the interconnected elements - ontology, epistemology (and methodology) – that illustrates the methodological approach (section 5.4).

5.1 The development of social inquiry

The academic world can be regarded as an ‘enterprise’ based on the knowledge circuits that come into existence at universities, research institutes, governmental bodies and commercial enterprises. Merriam (1991, p. 43) defines this activity of production, which is generally (and in a rather positivistic manner) referred to as research, as a “systematic or disciplined inquiry”. However, the development of social research or inquiry has been historically developed from coinciding and overlapping phases, also referred to as the five ‘moments of qualitative research’ (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004; Denzin and Lincoln, 2011: 3; see also, Riley and Love, 2000). These moments are each located within a specific historical period in time; however, succeeding moments do not eliminate the previous ones, as moments overlap and simultaneously operate in the present. The initial moment in qualitative research, also referred to by Denzin and Lincoln (2011) as the
'traditional period' (1900-1950), is predominantly informed by a positivistic, natural science paradigm in which the researcher was seen as an objective expert who judged the validity of findings that derived from quantitative research. Over time other moments developed, including the modernist or golden age (1950-1970), blurred genres (1970-1986), the crisis of representation (1986-1990) and the postmodern, a period of experimental and new ethnographies (1990-1995). All of these moments question former standpoints with regard to knowledge production and the extent to which research findings are factual and determined solely by the 'qualified' researcher. From the blurred genres onwards, stances embraced a constructionist or subjectivist approach towards research connected with qualitative or quantitative methods, or a combination of both (Crotty, 2003).

The swift expansion of these moments, and corresponding paradigmatic approaches, has developed further, although they are yet to be well-defined, with Denzin and Lincoln (2011) proposing the post-experiment inquiry (1995-2000), the methodologically contested present (2000-2010) and the future moment (2010-). These moments are concerned “with moral discourse, the development of sacred textualities,” and make an appeal to social sciences and humanities to “become sites for critical conversation about democracy, race, gender, class, nation states, globalisation, freedom, and community” (2011: 3). The relationship between the moments and traits in social inquiry, based on Riley and Love’s (2000) post-1996 review framework within tourism research and Denzin and Lincoln’s five historically defined moments of qualitative research (2011) is illustrated in Appendix 3. Inspired by Phillimore and Goodwin’s work (2004), examples were added to elucidate evidence concerning the paradigmatic influences and consequent use of methods within tourism studies.

Despite concerns expressed by Phillimore and Goodwin (2004) that using Denzin and Lincoln’s outline in order to classify research within moments is not without difficulties due to the complexities of categorising research within the chronological development of moments, it also offers a means to an end; a snapshot of the development of thinking about and researching the social world.
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and the field of tourism. Moreover, the idea of moments and the ways in which Denzin and Lincoln have constructed the history of qualitative research has also been critiqued elsewhere (see the collaborative work by Atkinson, Coffey and Delamont, 1999; Delamont, Coffey and Atkinson, 2000; Atkinson, Coffey and Delamont, 2003), as it assumes that the self in text is a relatively recent phenomenon. This is partly due to the acknowledgment of innovative methods and mechanisms in social sciences for (re)writing the self into text, yet these are by no means new, or necessarily innovative. For example, Malinowski (1967), Van Maanen (1988) and Clifford (1983) already described personal accounts of fieldwork in their autobiographical work, including the use of field notes, research diaries and personal narratives of the research process.

Nevertheless, amongst other indicators, Denzin and Lincoln’s overview has revealed, to date, the rise and variety of qualitative methods in tourism research, along with the emergence of the mixing of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Furthermore, it has shown that, especially in research situated within the blurred genres and onwards, it is possible at the level of methods for either qualitative or quantitative methods, or both, to serve the research purposes, without this being in any way problematic. Additionally, I would argue that what seems to be the issue lies at a deeper theoretical level of inquiry; few people would probably feel comfortable claiming to be an objectivist and subjectivist at the same time. Moreover, the historical framework has served to illustrate that tourism researchers started to question the limitations of the traditional, quantitative positivist paradigm and began a quest for in-depth understanding through innovative research practices and engagement based around detailed and contemporary debates informed by the researcher’s paradigm which constitutes what is included and excluded in the researcher’s legitimate inquiry (Guba and Lincoln, 1998).

As ‘moments’ emerged, simultaneously the suite of paradigms from which tourism studies researchers may draw (and have drawn) developed from merely positivism/post-positivism stances to assumptions of critical realism, pragmatism,
chaos and complexity theory orientations, constructivism/interpretivism/constructivism, postmodernism, and participatory paradigms (Jamal and Robinson, 2010). Despite various approaches to the positioning of each paradigm, it remains a brittle topic within tourism studies (and other social sciences), leading to as many definitions and clusters as those writing about them. Masterman (1970), for example, already identified twenty-one different interpretations of what constitutes a paradigm in Kuhn’s founding work on the subject ([1962] 1996). To illustrate the risk of misinterpretation in more detail, Kuhn’s concept of paradigms was developed “at a time when there was greater rigidity and structure in academic subject areas” (Ryan, cited in Cooper, 2003: 2). Assumedly, Kuhn’s most prominent realm lies in his idea that ‘facts do not speak for themselves’, and in this sense a paradigm is considered to be “an underlying assumption and structure upon which research and development were based.” Despite the passing of time, within tourism studies and other social sciences the debate, initiated by Kuhn’s intended ‘meaning(s)’ of what a ‘paradigm’ is and means (Ritzer, 1981), continues as vividly as fifty years ago (see, for example, Dann, 1997; Echtner and Jamal, 1997; Wearing, McDonald and Ponting, 2005).

Although I recognise the valuable contribution the debate has made to the development in the social sciences; it is, however, not the aim of this study to re-open, or even add to, the discussion on what constitutes a paradigm. Neither does this study seek to get involved in the dispute, vividly described by Tribe (2009), as to whether tourism studies are in fact pre-paradigmatic, or whether each field of tourism constitutes in itself a loose paradigm that is gradually establishing its own norms and rules. Instead, in this study, what is meant by a research paradigm is adopted from Johnson and Onwuegbuzie’s (2004: 24) depiction of a ‘research culture’, which is based on “a set of beliefs, values, and assumptions that a community of researchers has in common regarding the nature and conduct of the research”. These beliefs, they reason (2004: 24), “include, but are not limited to ontological beliefs, epistemological beliefs, axiological beliefs, aesthetic beliefs, and methodological beliefs.”
Furthermore, the proposed meaning of a paradigm as a particular view of the way the world operates, or ‘guides action’ (Guba, 1990: 17), is associated with three frames: ontology, epistemology, methodology (and axiology) as described in the following sections (5.3 and 5.4). This study also acknowledges that progress is also influenced by axiological and rhetorical assumptions, as all research is value laden by value systems of the inquirer, the theory, the paradigm used, and the social and cultural norms of either the inquirer or the respondents (Cresswell, 2003; Guba and Lincoln, 1988). The value judgements and ethical implications within this study are described in section 5.6.

5.2 Paradigmatic assumptions: social constructionism

Already introduced in the previous chapters, this study is influenced by the concept of ‘discourse analysis’ (DA); a term best understood as an umbrella designated for a quickly growing field of research covering a vast range of various theoretical approaches and analytic emphasis. The common factor of these discursive viewpoints in different disciplinary locations is a strong social constructionist epistemology in which discourse is of central importance in constructing the ideas, social processes, and phenomena that make up our social world (Nikander, 2008).

In line with the theoretical platform and methodological approaches of discourse analysis, a social constructionism paradigm is pursued in this study. Developed out of a combination of Foucauldian criticism, poststructuralism and feminism, this relatively new and alternative approach to the study of human beings within a social setting has appeared under a variety of rubrics in a number of disciplines, making it multidisciplinary in nature. In tourism studies, the emergence of ‘social constructionism’ is seen through various approaches, including ‘critical studies’ (see, for example, Pernecky, 2009; Hannam and Knox, 2010), ‘discursive studies (see, for example, Coupland, Garrett and Bishop, 2005), ‘discourse analysis’ (see, for example, Jaworski and Pritchard, 2005; Hallett and Kaplan-Weinger, 2010), ‘deconstruction’ (see, for example, Fesenmaier and MacKay, 1996; Payne, 2002).
and 'poststructuralism' (see, for example, Aitchison, 2001). These different styles and analytic dimensions in discursive research, including social constructionism, can be conveyed by the model designed by Philips and Hardy (2002: 62), as illustrated in Figure 5.

The studies that pursue discourse analysis can be located within this model that represents different analytic importance. Critical discourse analysis (CDA), for example, aims at explaining the processes of power from the onset. As Nikander (2008: 414) explains, it is a method that helps to look at "how power is legitimated, reproduced and enacted in the talk and texts of dominant groups and institutions". However, a social constructionist approach to discourse also includes methodological features that participants themselves focus on, and power also refers to notions of alternative, subaltern and counter-hegemonic forms that are analysable and used in (social) interactions. Aside from the heterogeneity of the field of discursive research which holds the field together, as Nikander (2008) notes, is the focus on the nature of social actions and how actions and/or meanings of social life and various institutionalised practices are accomplished, constructed and reproduced in the process. They emphasise that all qualitative research is a co-constituted account based on the dialogues between researcher-researched, as well as the social context (as illustrated extensively in section 1.5).

Figure 5 The field of discourse analysis (adopted from Philips and Hardy, 2002: 62)
Focus on the microdynamic of discourse in its own right

Although there is no one school of social constructionism, neither do all contributors to this approach or field wish to be labelled as ‘social constructionists’; the foundation of their writing is based on “things you would absolutely have to believe in order to be a social constructionist” (Burr, 2011: 2). However, Lock and Strong (2010: 7), in their attempt to provide an historical overview of the different theorists and schools of thought, have provided some general tenets that hold the church of social constructionism together:

- Meaning and understanding are the central feature of human activities;
- Meaning and understanding have their beginnings in social interaction;
- Ways of meaning making, being inherently embedded in socio-cultural processes, are specific to particular times and places.

Social constructionism, as Lock and Strong (2010: 6) emphasise, does not include an authoritative coherent framework; it is very much a work in progress. This absence should not, by any means, be regarded as a limitation, as it provides flexible guidelines, which connect theory and method and ultimately contribute to the structure and shape of this inquiry. Although this section intends to generate and maintain a basically sympathetic stance on social construction, it is also necessary to point out, before going into more detailed accounts, some of the limitations of and difficulties with the adopted form of social constructionism within this study. However, it might be wise to add that the critique includes only those aspects that affect the current study, and therefore does not necessarily address other issues, which different constructionists might regard as being of prime importance. Following Burr’s (2011: 178) arguments, social constructionism collides with:

- Tensions in the field around the extent to which social constructionist theory and research is able to generate its own theoretical and research programmes.
Chapter 5 - Methodological considerations

- Absence of the 'self', in terms of personality characteristics, attitudes, and motivations and so on. Social constructionism claims that this 'self' just cannot be reconciled with social constructionism. The self has become an effect of language, fragmented and distributed across discourse and interactions;
- The difficulty of how to explain the desires, hopes, wants and fantasies of a person and their role in the choices that person makes in their lives. Instead it relegates them as a kind of side effect of discourse.
- Lack of attention to embodiment, as social constructionism is based on the concept of the person-as-text that can be read for the operation of discourses.

I have attempted to overcome some of these difficulties by inserting forms of reflexivity, aiming to avoid imposing, patronising, paternalising and refusing the social stances within the research. Nevertheless, following Marcus’ (1998) warnings, I have also tried to keep in mind that reflexivity is about relativizing, and should not become a ‘my study is holier than thou’ contest. In an attempt to overcome the risk of homogenising the potential diversity and plurality of constructions, I have frequently questioned the focus of the study and the findings from the data, and attempted to explore other possible ways in which the focus and data could also be approached and represented. Another attempt to increase reflexivity consisted of considerations on my ‘positioning’ in relationship to the research(ed). What identities did I adopted, what historical, cultural and social ‘baggage’ did I bring to the research moment, such as gender, race, status, and so forth? These issues have been described, although in different degrees, in the thesis, but most explicitly in sections 1.4 and 1.5.

In addition, to limit the impact of tensions in the field, a clear overview has been included concerning the origin and development of social constructionism, the contributors to the field and within tourism studies and, ultimately, how these accounts provide the foundation and justification for the theoretical approach of this study.
Preceding the conception of constructionism, the founding fathers of psychology, Mead (1932, 1936), Vygotsky (1978, [1925] 1999) and Piaget ([1926] 1970) already saw clearly that psychology should not confine itself to the study of the isolated individual, but instead could only be understood by connecting it to its social impulses. Proclaimed as an early advocate of this view, Mead (1932: 276) remarked that “any self is a social self ... restricted to the group whose roles it assumes, and will never abandon this self until it finds itself entering into the larger society and maintaining itself there.” Following this concept of a ‘social self’, both Piaget and Vygotsky introduced the term in educational psychology to emphasise the role of social interaction as a means to overcome the unhelpful separation of the discipline and sociology since the early 20th century. Especially, Piaget’s theory of constructivism (1995), or gaining knowledge, provided a widely accepted and solid framework of gaining an understanding of children’s ways of doing and thinking at different levels of their development.

The concept of constructionism was introduced a few decades later in the 1980s by Piaget’s student Seymour Papert, who expanded on this earlier social movement to define the concept of constructionism (1980), or constructing knowledge, by illustrating how students produce constructions of knowledge through interactions with others. In his words (Papert, 1991: 1), constructionism:

... shares [Piaget’s] constructivism’s view of learning as ‘building knowledge structures’ through progressive internationalization of actions ... It then adds the idea that this happens especially felicitously in a context where the learner is consciously engaged in constructing a public entity, whether it’s a sand castle on the beach or a theory of the universe.

Despite essential differences and multiple descriptions of both constructivism and constructionism, both views brought a radical change, in the sense that, in search of a psychological explanation of behaviour, scholars moved away from the
positivist sense that the world is objectively knowable through scientific and systematic inquiry. The obvious point of agreement between the two stances, which some writers have tried to bring together in synthesis (see, for example, Botella, 1995; Burr and Butt, 2000), relies on the belief that each of us develops an interpersonal system of dimensions of meanings, notions or connotations. Kelly (1955) groups these discursive processes together as ‘constructs’ through which we perceive the world and our actions. In this, as everyone construes the world differently, we each inhabit different worlds and there is no one true reality; on the contrary, ‘reality’ is most likely to be multiple. Regardless of these shared beliefs, being either a constructionist or constructivist (or both) has crucial implications for many dimensions of the research; the way it is conducted, how to view data, and many other aspects. As Crotty (2003: 64) states:

It has become something of a shibboleth for qualitative researchers to claim to be constructionist or constructivist, or both. We need to ensure that this is not just a glib claim, a matter of rhetoric only. If we make such a claim, we should reflect deeply on its significance.

In this sense, using the ‘N word’ – constructionism - instead of the ‘V word’ – constructivism – within this study cannot be acknowledged without a rich explanation of both stances. Constructivism (based on the work of Piaget) views the human being as actively engaged in the creation of their phenomenal world. Each person perceives the world differently and actively creates his or her own meanings, notions or connotations from objects and events. Based on this emphasis on the individual, it would appear useful to reserve the term ‘constructivism’, as Schwandt (1994: 125) describes, for epistemological thoughts concerning the “meaning making activity of the individual mind.” Effectively, this Piagetian or relativist theory assumes the merging of ontological and epistemological stances, and consequently an emphasis on phenomenology approaches concerning an individual’s cognitive processes, viewpoints, values, beliefs and so forth. In this sense, a constructivist view of knowledge recognises the unique experience of each of us as a valid and worthy way of making sense of
the world, thereby respecting all other ways and "tending to scotch any hint of a critical spirit" (Crotty, 2003: 58).

Contrary to constructivist views, constructionism (founded in the work of Papert) claims that the shaping of the human mind limits and liberates human beings at the same time, and while welcome, the 'critical spirit' is continuously questioned and challenged by power structures. In this sense, social constructionism focuses on "the collective generation [and transmission] of meaning" as it shapes our concepts, theories and meanings though interaction, language and other social processes (Schwandt, 1994: 125). From this point of view, meanings, knowledge and truth, are not discovered by the human mind but are constructed and created within and by social settings. Additionally, constructionism puts emphasis on the grip culture has on individuals; it shapes ways of seeing and feeling and ultimately provides the basis for a rather fixed view of the world. In conclusion, and adding to Papert's initial understanding, this study adopts Crotty's (2003: 42) definition of social constructionism as:

... the view that all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context.

The 'critical spirit' in constructionism towards power structures, for example expressed by and through heritage discourses surrounding Cold War remains, has also contributed to my awareness of the restrictive, inherited and prevailing characteristic of cultural understandings, to the extent that they are regarded as continuously active but "closed systems in which thought imprisons us" (Marcel, 1955: 191) or, even worse, our "imprisonment in a world of our own construction" (Wild, 1955: 191). Constructionists in social science have emphasised that "particular sets of meanings, because they have come into being in and out of the give-and-take of social existence, exist to serve hegemonic interests" (Crotty, 2003: 59). Crotty continues, as he argues that:
Each set of meanings supports particular power structures, resists moves towards greater equity, and harbours oppression, manipulation and other modes of injustice and unfreedom.

Moreover, it seems important to elucidate on the 'social' label that is added to the constructionism paradigm, which has informed this study. Through social constructionism I have aimed to closely observe, explore and engage with the ways in which The Cold War phenomena is socially constructed as heritage (and) tourism, within Britain’s society and through diverse needs, values, or interests. By utilising a multi-sited ethnographic approach in a manner that Geertz (1973) has described as 'thick description', has helped to grasp and render the multiplicity of complex conceptual structures, details, conceptual structures and meanings. Thick descriptions are opposed to 'thin descriptions', which is a factual account without any interpretation (Packer, 2011). Essential to this ethnographic perspective of the social paradigm is that should aim to be reflective; that is, it is aware that the 'reality' that is 'out there' does not exist separately, nor truly or perfectly separately, from one’s presence, own assumptions and reactions to the 'inscribed' situations and the way they are turned into 'accounts' (Packer, 2011). Additionally, in line with Rosaldo’s (1993: 98) argument of culture as a system in continuous motion, my reflective efforts were constantly stretched and shaped (along with my perceptions of it) by forces of power and hegemony to react to or fit with purposeful acts of human agents such as the site managers. Consequently, to speak of something that it is socially constructed, produced and maintained is to emphasise that meaning and power are all that we really can claim to know about the contingent aspects of our social selves.

In addition, this study builds on the debate of whether naturally existing objects exist independently of us and should be regarded as things that cannot be influenced in their shaping. Within tourism studies there are certainly many things, and facts about them; take for example the tourism destination, the beach or natural attraction itself, which have contributed to or are in themselves social
constructs in the notion of the core idea. It is argued by some (see, for example, Dwyer and Bressey, 2008) that none of these things could have existed without society; and each will be constructed differently according to meanings and hegemonic interests that prevail in a specific society. In contrast and inspired by, among other stances, such as Thrift’s (2008) non-representational theory within cultural geography, a so-called ‘performance turn’ within tourism studies has emerged since the mid 1990s (see Chapter 4), illustrating that “tourists experience places in more multi-sensuous ways, touching, tasting, smelling, hearing and so on, as well as the materiality of objects and places and not just objects and places viewed as signs” (Urry, 2011: 14).

Thus, not all constructionists are ‘abolitionist’ in their approaches and, in tackling one of the proclaimed weaknesses of social constructionism, the current inquiry considers knowledge and knowing as being inextricably tied to the material and social circumstances in which they are acquired (Gherardi and Nicolini, 2000). The material and social constructions of reality are considered to be inextricably related, following Orlikowski’s comments that “there is no social that is not also material, and no material that is not also social” (2007: 1437). Consequently, there is no intention of choosing between a representational or performance stance as the perspective on Cold War tourism within this study. On the contrary, in striving for a holistic account of Cold War tourism - how meanings are constructed through human encounters, embodied practices and material objects, spaces and technologies – at the end of the day this thesis is more aligned with the writing of scholars such as Lorimer (2003, 2005) who advocate a ‘more than representational’ approach which may inform understandings of and into past tourism practices, based on the intention to work with materials and physical places such as Cold War bunkers and radar stations (see Chapter 3).

Furthermore, previous accounts regarding social constructionism derive from, and are informed by, a detailed review of the interpretivism paradigm. Consequently, it appears that an interpretivist framework is unsuitable for the purpose of this study as interpretivism is overwhelmingly dominated by an uncritical exploration
of cultural meanings (Schwandt, 2000). In opposition to social constructionists, interpretivists argue that it is possible to understand subjective meanings of actors (referred to as Verstehen), including their desires, beliefs and so forth, in an objective manner (Lincoln, 1997, 1998a, 1998b). Ultimately, interpretivists will claim that these meanings can then be reproduced and reconstructed by the distanced and disinterested interpreter (researcher) and, from an interpretivism viewpoint, be considered to be the original meaning of the action (Schwandt, 2000).

Engaging with the social constructionism paradigm requires the inclusion of three interconnected elements of generic activities within social inquiry: ontology, epistemology and methodology (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). As Hosking and Green (1999: 117) state, “social inquiry is in on-going (re)construction in activities such as research, writing, teaching and consulting, and conference paper.” All of these practices produce certain ‘taken-for-granteds’ about what exists; this is the question of ontology. More specifically, Denzin and Lincoln (2011: 11) have defined ontology as “the study of being (what is real), raising questions about the nature of reality while referring to claims or approaches that a specific inquiry makes with regard to the nature of social reality”.

In practice, for example, in the field of tourism humans construct the concept of what a ‘tourist’ consists of (by means of their characteristics, motives and cognitive maps), tourism organisations (by means of their structures, mission statement and ethics) and tourism environments (complex, turbulent, (under)developed). These constructions of existence are entwined with concepts of what can be known of these things; this is the question of epistemology. To give more detail, Denzin and Lincoln (2001: 11) state that epistemology is concerned with “the theory of knowledge (how do we know what we know)”, and deals with the origin and nature of knowing and how this knowledge is constructed, and the claims or approaches that are made about what the nature of knowledge is (Longino, 1990; Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). Finally, methodology is concerned with how such knowledge about the world might be produced,
whereas within this, methods are merely the tools that take on meaning according to the methodology in which they are used (Silverman, 2000).

5.2.1 Ontological assumptions

Ontology, as previously stated, is concerned with (the study of) matters of being and becoming. In a general sense, ontological and epistemological issues usually tend to merge together to inform the theoretical perspective, as each perspective consists of a certain ontological way of understanding 'what is' and a certain epistemological way of understanding 'what it means to know'. As already illustrated, the interpersonal system of dimensions of meanings, notions or connotations can be regarded as 'constructs' through which we all differently perceive the world and our actions. In this sense, although there are multiple realities, in all probability, I follow Crotty's (2003) supposition that the world will still be there regardless of whether or not human beings are conscious of it. In accordance, Macquarie (cited in Crotty 2003: 10) describes this ontological viewpoint in more detail:

If there were no human beings, there might still be galaxies, trees, rocks, and so on – and doubtless there were, in those long stretches of time before the evolution of homo sapiens or any other human species that may have existed on earth.

I have also noted that, this ontological viewpoint is the cause of an academic game of ping-pong between realists and relativists within social constructionism. On the one hand, the realism doctrine, widely embedded within natural sciences and originally based on positivism, embraces the concept that an external world exists independently of our representations of it (Searle, 1995). On the other hand, anti-realism or relativism, generally rooted in constructivist or poststructuralist interpretations of the world, claims that there are no grounds for necessary postulating or investigating a reality independent of the knower (e.g. Potter, 1998). However, as with the range of definitions on (social) constructionism, there
are as many positions within the debate on the possibility of proposing and fully theorising a world independent of our representations of it: unreserved defences of relativism (Davies, 1998); stances defending realism (Collier, 1998, Galloway, 2000; Nightingale and Cromby, 1999); anti-realism critiques of realism (Gergen, 1994, 1999), and several others.

In tourism, claims that defend versions of realism in social constructionism are limited and can be found in the works of Gale (2005), Gale and Botteril (2005), and conversely, counter-claims are articulated in the work of Kachel and Gayle (2010) amongst other contributors. Many researchers concerned with social science research (see, for example, Blaikie, 1993; Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Potter, 1996; Crotty, 2003) support the anti-realist or relativist orientation and will argue that whatever the underlying reality of nature is, there is no direct access to it. Resultantly, both language and knowledge are therefore seen as socially constructed rather than as mediated reflections or ‘mirrors’ of reality (Rorty, 1979). In this sense, although the existence of a world without a mind might seem plausible, it only becomes a world of meaning when meaning making by conscious human beings takes place.

An illustration of the sceptical standpoint of many constructionists when it comes to offering any ontological statements or positions at all is provided in Gergen’s earlier work on social constructionism (1994: 72). Gergen’s forceful critique advocates the belief that there are no grounds for necessarily investigating an ontological rooting in social constructionism, as he argues:

> Whatever is, simply is. There is no foundational description to be made about a world ‘out there’ as opposed to ‘in here’, about experience or material. Once we attempt to articulate ‘what there is’, however, we enter the world of discourse. At that moment the processes of construction commence, and this effort is inextricably woven into processes of social interchange and into history and culture.
However, I found that there is something misleading about Gergen's and Macquarie's anti-realist or relativist claims of ontology, amongst others, in the sense that there is a certain affirmative tendency of faith in the remark 'whatever is, simply is', and the belief that only when the 'what there is' is articulated do we enter the world of discourse. Nevertheless, it raises curiosity about how such insights fit with the work of articulation and re-articulation as the world or 'what is there' is not simply what it is, but rather open to interpretation (Burkitt, 2003).

Another general assumption made by many anti-realists and relativists, largely influenced by Gergen's theory, is to guard against foundationalism. This assumption is, as Gergen states (2001: 425), to ensure that we do not "find doors shut and voices silenced" because of "claims to the real". In this sense, all forms of realism, such as perceptions, thoughts, language, beliefs and desires, as well as artefacts such as pictures and maps, and all other ways in which we could or do know and experience the world and ourselves of it (Searle, 1995) are regarded to be based on privileged access to the world of which accounts stand as objective representations. However, on the contrary, far from all realists naively claim to have privileged access to the world or their views to be objective representation. As Sayer notes (2000: 41):

To say certain propositions are true is not to say that they are beyond improvement. It is not only that they may later be shown to be false but that, even if they are not, they may be shown to be partial rather than complete, or integrated within a wider conceptual scheme that is flawed.

I have not brought this study 'to life' to solve the ontological debate between the two opposing assertions about what sort of things exist, in this respect; nor is this study trying to answer the ontological question of whether or not the Cold War existed. The focus of this study is upon the way people construct descriptions as factual, and how others (including the researcher) undermine, modify, or even ignore those constructions as being irrelevant. Such an approach does not require
an answer to philosophical questions on factuality, referentiality or objectivity when making ontological claims within this study.

On the contrary, as Hammersley (1992, 2005) advocates, this study embraces a ‘subtle realism’ stance, to steer a path through and beyond the ambivalent counter-poising of ontology caused by the realism/anti-realism debate within social constructionism. He (1992: 50) aims to build a bridge between the opposites by arguing that:

We can maintain a belief in the existence of phenomena independent of our claims about them, and in their knowability, without assuming that we can have unmediated contact with them and therefore that we can know with certainty whether our knowledge of them is valid or invalid. The most promising strategy for resolving the problem ... is to adopt a more subtle form of realism.

In tourism studies, perhaps one of the strongest examples to illustrate Hammersley’s appeal for a ‘subtle realist’ stance in constructionism is Butler’s (1980) Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC) model, which postulates that tourism destinations, whether it be a hotel, attraction, city or so forth, follow a generally similar pattern of development to that of most other products; namely, that of a ‘life cycle’. The basic idea of Butler’s model became the basis for subsequent developments and research within the tourism industry, especially within the area of tourism development and planning, not least because it successfully explained the rise and decline or rejuvenation of tourism destinations throughout sequential phases. The key point, with regard to Sayer’s argument, is that Butler did not provide us with a simple explanation of the basic principles of tourism, but provided us with a model that corresponded with ‘something’ in the nature of tourism reality. Nevertheless, this was not a foundationalist claim of Butler’s privileged access to the tourism world. In fact, in order for the model to be adequate within specific situations and conditions, his concept was already scrutinised in many early settings and critical suggestions, both conceptual (see,
for example, Haywood 1986) and in case study applications (see, for example, Bianchi 1994; Russell and Faulkner 1998, 1999).

More than two decades later, Butler’s understanding of the importance of the diffusion of ideas regarding his model even resulted in the editing of a two-volume edition (2006), titled The Tourism Area Life Cycle: Applications and Modifications, which included suggestions and reforms to the initial model not only within disciplines but also between and across disciplines. To return to the debate on the ontology of social constructionism, the example illustrated that Butler’s model is not untrue, in the sense that it has ‘practical adequacy’ with respect to the question of the development of tourism destinations. However, the initial model has offered only a ‘partial’ explanation of the overall tourism phenomenon. To assess the issues relating to Butler’s model in terms of (absolute) truth or falsity does little justice to the complexity of the relations of practical knowledge of the tourism destinations to which it refers.

Although highly debatable, but with the previous examples in mind, social constructionism is not at all ontologically mute as Gergen initially claimed (1994: 74), but has the potential to function as an explanatory framework in which the actual ‘nature’ of the world can be examined, rather than just our knowledge or understanding of such a world. In addition, it can contribute to theorising the “ways in which discursive practices and human experiences [in tourism] are already historically grounded in, and structured by, aspects of external reality such as subjectivity, embodiment, materiality, aesthetics and power (Nightingale and Cromby, 2002: 704). Through their work they illustrate that the experienced reality is not simply based around language, but actually co-constitutes meaning through processes of construction involving the researcher, participants, other humans and the world.
5.2.2 Epistemological assumptions

In contrast to a positivist epistemology, which assumes that knowledge progression leads to an absolute truth; social constructionism regards knowledge to be conscious of something, which then becomes a constructed meaning. While humans are engaging with the world and trying to construct meaningful realities, we do not unconsciously make sense of the phenomena we encounter. Instead, we are all born into a world of meaning constructed within the historical and social setting of our society. As Greenwood (1994: 85) argues:

...social phenomena do not exist independently of our knowledge of them...Social realities, therefore, are constructed and sustained by the observation of the social rules which obtain in any social situation by all the social interactors involved ... .Social reality is, therefore, a function of shares meanings; it is constructed and reproduced through social life.

Greenwood's argument suggests that, at the epistemological level, the main purpose of constructionism is based upon understanding the multiple social constructions of meaning and knowledge. Hence, I have accepted that knowledge is regarded to be complex and multi-faceted, to the extent that there is no 'one true knowledge' about the things, humans and places that are part of an inquiry. Each individual has a specific knowledge, and therefore meaningful construction of reality; although this can be shared with others, it can only lead to interpretations of what others see and hear in their own way.

Furthermore, given that social constructionists consider reality to be constructed out of our given encounters with the physical world and other humans, knowledge and understanding of reality is highly contextual and situation dependent, in the sense that it is local, provisional and fleeting, as opposed to atemporal and universal claims and models. As Marshall, Kelder and Perry (2005) state, "all knowledge claims, then, are a product of and contingent on a particular cultural and historical situation." Thus, unlike logical empiricists or positivists, social
constructionists aim not to privilege a particular view of reality, and, in this sense, knowledge is not a cold, static concept but, instead, is layered with meaning.

Therefore, this study is based on a 'non-foundationalist belief' that knowledge is not equal to essential and timeless truth, yet it is merely a starting point for how knowledge of the Cold War (and therefore meaningful realities) are shaped and altered through human practices at Cold War attractions; whether these are socially constructed in and out of interaction between human beings or the material and technologies that are presented. However, as with all knowledge, the observations and interpretations will be influenced by, and reflect, my personal upbringing, standpoints, beliefs, opinions, philosophies, predispositions, and therefore become value-laden so that they cannot be regarded as 'true' (section 4.6).

5.3 Process of inquiry: abductive research strategy

Based on the epistemological impulses and direction, the next step consisted of establishing a starting point and set of steps by means of which the study's aim and objectives could be answered. Each research strategy, or logic of inquiry, has connections with particular philosophical and theoretical paradigms (Blaikie, 2007), and consequently leads to different findings. Following Blaikie's concerns (2007: 108) about making informed choices based on a sound understanding of the ontological and epistemological assumptions, which are described in the previous sections (5.2.1 and 5.2.2), an abductive research strategy was employed as the starting point for the empirical part of the study. This strategy enables the incorporation of meanings, interpretations, motives and intentions that will enable this study to answer both the 'what' objectives (inductive) and 'why' objectives (deductive/reproductive). As stated in a report issued by the World Health Organisation (2005: 23), "the abductive strategy leans heavily on inductive reasoning (moving from the particular to the general) as well as on retrospective [and deductive] reasoning (moving from a description of empirical data to an explanation that draws attention to not only regularities in the data but also why
the regularities occur...). Although the above statement emphasises the scientific aspects of abductive reasoning, in practice it is inherently messy and uncertain in nature (O’Reilly, 2009). This has affected the perspective of analysing the mass of generated data, as I was educated with the notion that the overt process of logic prevails over personal experiences and feelings. Data generation and analysis in this sense means that data must be sorted, coded, labelled and that explanations have to be tested for robustness. Although these internal struggles, as well as external factors such as the University’s predefined set of steps and fieldwork methods, I have made attempts to break away from traditional theories and perspectives and to engage with an recursive, iterative and abductive reasoning process, a logic-in-use (Kaplan, 1998).

The difference between inductive and retroductive (and deductive) versus the abductive research strategy lies in the understanding that the latter provides reasons instead of causes and generates understandings rather than explanations. Blaikie augments (2000: 24) that:

The starting-point for abductive strategy is the social world of the social actors being investigated, their construction of reality, their way of conceptualizing and giving meaning to their social world, their tacit knowledge. This can only be discovered from the accounts which social actors provide... Hence, the researcher has to enter their world in order to discover the motives and reasons that accompany social activities. The task is then to describe the motives and reasons that accompany social activities, and the situations in which they occur, in the technical language of social scientific discourse. Individual motives and actions have to be abstracted into typical motives for typical actions in typical situations... These social scientific typifications provide an understanding of the activities, and may then become the ingredients in more systematic explanatory accounts.
Eventually, this systematic and cyclical form of logic helps to inductively develop theories, consisting of categories and concepts, and deductively elaborate them iteratively (Giddens, 1976; Hoffman, 1998; Blaikie, 2007). Figure 6 illustrates the process of abduction reasoning applied within this study, based on the abductive research process model from Kovács and Spens (2005: 136).

In practice, although abduction responds to a reasoning of scientific discovery (Hoffmann, 1998), there are weaknesses with this interference that lay with the formulation of an abduction. The literature is not especially clear on this point, and even Pierce (cited in Ruiz Ruiz, 2009), one of the founding fathers of the term, has limited his argument by stating that abduction is concerned with making relevant, clever guesses, between questions, theories, and observations through a “flash of understanding.” However, this would make the formulation of abductive reasoning depend solely on human instincts and would exclude the very nature of logical interference. Even now, following remarks made by Ruiz Ruiz (2009), attempts to formalise abduction have not obtained many promising results, as the formalisation of scientific creativity appear not only to be difficult but sometimes also counter-productive.

**Figure 6**  The process of abductive reasoning (adopted from Kovács and Spens, 2002: 62)
Although there are no set procedures to formulate abductions, Pierce (cited in Ruiz Ruiz, 2009) does set down criteria to distinguish between the formulation of 'good' and 'bad' abductions. In detail, and adapted from Pierce's work, Ruiz Ruiz (2009) distinguishes three main criteria:

1. The need for abduction to propose truly 'new' ideas or explanations;
2. The need to derive empirically contrastable predictions from the theories and observations and;
3. The need for theoretical suggestions to fit in with or give an adequate account of the social and historical context in which they emerge.

These conditions will prevent this study from reasoning false abductions, meaning those that are, in a strict sense, veiled deductions based on an analogy of properties (Debrock, 1998). In addition, it helps this study to focus on the role of abduction within the process of scientific research (Debrock, 1998) and alludes to scientific intersubjectivity as a criterion that permits a set of possible abductions for this study to be established (Hoffmann, 1998). Within this study the interpretations of Cold War heritage (and) tourism discourses, as an application of abductive logic, provide tools to understand the meanings of the authorised and personal constructions of Cold War heritage (and) tourism.

5.4 Methodological framework

This chapter has drawn on the paradigmatic assumptions of social constructionism that influence the current study. Based on the implications of the interconnected elements - ontology, epistemology (and methodology) - a framework is constructed (Table 4). This framework is based on distinguishing the authorised heritage discourse that interacts with a range of subaltern professional and 'lay' discourses and the ways in which they have constructed the concept of heritage as a distinct 'site', object, building or other structure that exists within identifiable boundaries that can be mapped, surveyed, recorded, and placed on national and international maps, brochures, and registers. In addition, the social constructionist
framework also recognises visitors to Cold War sites as people that interact with, frame and negotiate authorised heritage discourses of Britain’s Cold War past within and based on their interpersonal systems (constructs) of values, memories, experiences and identity. To conclude, this framework illustrates the methodological approach that social constructionism is also influenced by whoever has the 'power' or 'responsibility' to speak for and define the past. However, the process also allows for active interactions with the visitors to Cold War sites to create and recreate memories, experiences, values, meanings and identity about both the past and the present through performances and embodied experiences that contribute to a sense of place and connections with the material.

The subsequent chapter (Chapter 6) will draw on the methodology (highlighted in grey within the framework) in more detail and the methods that were employed during the data generation phase. The employed methods focus on site managers and visitors and their constructions of Cold War heritage (and) tourism regarding Cold War sites within their context. They not only provide data but also enrich understandings as they bring professional and 'lay' discourses of Cold War heritage (and) tourism into the foreground. As the data generated through the various methods derives from site managers and visitors within a specific context, they constitute an essential part of the case study methodology that has been adopted within this study.
### Table 4  Methodological framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What can be known</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Relationship between) the knower and what can be known</strong></td>
<td><strong>How to find things out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtle Realism</strong></td>
<td><strong>Non-foundational, abductive strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Case study methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge as beliefs about whose validity we are reasonably confident, acknowledging that we can never be absolutely certain about knowledge claims.</td>
<td>Knowledge of reality as highly contextual and situation dependent, based on local, provisional and fleeting interactions and actions between humans and non-humans.</td>
<td>Empirical inquiry that investigates contemporary phenomena in tourism within a real-life context and aims to understand how humans construct their experiences of the social world, through and based on their interpretations and actions with humans and non-humans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What can be known</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Relationship between) the knower and what can be known</strong></td>
<td><strong>How to find things out</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cold War heritage (and) tourism study</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cold War heritage (and) tourism study</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cold War heritage (and) tourism study</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study offers 'practical adequacy' with respect to understandings of Cold War tourism, and 'partial' explanations of the overall tourism phenomenon.</td>
<td>This study is a starting point for how knowledge of the Cold War, and therefore meaningful realities as such, are shaped and altered through interactions and actions between humans and non-humans at Cold War attractions.</td>
<td>This study aims to construct the realities of Cold War tourism through various data collection processes at selected sites while acknowledging that such a representation will always be from a particular perspective, making some features relevant and others irrelevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6 - Methods of inquiry

This chapter outlines the empirical stance and exemplifies the methods that were used in the study, the precedent and justification for these, and the reason why they were selected for this study in relation to other methods. In doing so, it sets out with an overview of the phases of inquiry, based on an embedded research design (section 6.1) and stages of data generation, analysis and interpretation. Subsequently, the sites of data collection, and how and why empirical access was achieved, are described in section 6.1.1. Furthermore, details of the quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry and applied sampling type and methods are described in sections 6.1.2 and 6.1.3. Section 6.3. covers the practices of inquiry, including the data analysis and interpretation, and indicates the status of the generated data by describing the extent to which the data captured or mirrored the 'reality' of the phenomenon of Cold War heritage (and) tourism. The issues of power and ethics consequences with regard to the methods of inquiry are discussed in detail in sections 6.4. and 6.5.

6.1 Phases of inquiry: research design and stages

To determine the order or sequence of the design elements, and the priority given to them, various typologies were investigated whilst taking into account the concerns expressed by Maxwell and Loomis (2002) that a typology does not capture the actual diversity and interrelationship of the quantitative and qualitative parts of the design that is used. Instead, they advocate an interactive design approach, in which the research questions are at the heart of the study, and the typology is used to decide the type of study; making broad decisions about how to proceed, the sequencing and ordering of approaches, and their relative dominance (Robson, 2011). Although many design variants exist within the social sciences, Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) have clustered them into four major research designs that are currently being used by researchers (see Appendix 4). These four
design types include the triangulation design, the embedded design, the exploratory design, and the explanatory design.

After a careful consideration of the different design types, especially with regard to the weighting, timing and mixing of the data, the study was left with two possible options: triangulation or embedded design. The early use of triangulation in social science, deriving from navigation and surveying practices in order to arrive at a precise physical location, was taken to determine “how different methods check, validate or corroborate one another” (Brannen, 2005: 12). The employed design aims at understanding a social phenomenon from various vantage points, such as theories, methods, investigators and data, which ultimately would lead to the same conclusion (Denzin, 1970).

However, as many researchers (see, for example, Brannen, 2005; Moran-Ellis, Alexander, Cronin, Dickinson, Fielding, Slaney, Thomas, 2006) have pointed out, data generated from different quantitative and qualitative methods cannot be simply put together, and ultimately, generate a claimed or universal reality or truth. Following Hammersley (2005) in his concerns, researchers need to move away from the assumptions that we will reach a single reality; instead, an understanding is needed on how various accounts arrive and which purpose they serve in the current study. The embedded design offers a number of advantages to cover these issues. Unlike the triangulation design, which tends to mix at the level of data analysis and data interpretation, the embedded design mixes at the design level with one type of data being embedded within a methodology framed by the other data type. As shown in Appendix 4, most applications of this design use qualitative data as support for predominantly quantitative studies such as experiments. However, this study has embedded quantitative data within a largely qualitative case study. In tourism studies, Hyde’s (2008) work on independent traveller decision-making processes for choices of elements of the vacation itinerary is a distinctive example of using an embedded design, which is qualitative in nature, whilst being assisted by quantitative measures and pattern matching.
The embedded design used within this study is based on the assumption that one type of data provides a supportive, secondary role based primarily on the other type of data (Cresswell and Plano Clark, 2003) in order to answer both the ‘why’ and ‘how’ related objectives. The primary data and secondary data were simultaneously generated at each of the selected sites. The primary data generated consisted of in-depth interviews with individuals after visiting the site. To enhance the study additional secondary data was generated with both observations and questionnaires. Thus, the qualitative and quantitative data types were mixed in different ways; observations were embedded before the other methods to gain an initial understanding of the characteristics, actions and interactions of visitors, within the context of the observed area in Cold War tourist attractions. This informed the approach and generation for the remaining two methods; in-depth interviews and questionnaires. In addition, both the observations and questionnaires were used to enhance the interpretation of the in-depth interviews.

In addition to the embedded design and the stages of data collection, analysis and interpretation for Symbolic Interactionism (a theoretical perspective established within Social Constructionism) adapted from Charon’s (2007: 194), this study involved an “exploration” and “inspection” stage. The first theoretical stage of “exploration” focused on the Cold War tourist attractions, to gain a general understanding of the Cold War tourism phenomenon. Unannounced visits were made to Kelvedon Hatch Secret Nuclear bunker and Hack Green Secret Nuclear bunker prior to the data generation stage. This stage further involved an examination of historical documents pertaining to the initially designated sites as it put me “in more direct touch with the very object [case] that he or she is investigating” (Peräkylä, 2005: 869). The documents included personal blogs of visitors, research articles, official correspondence and reports, media releases, financial statements, information on the attraction’s website, printed leaflets and brochures and other research-related material. Additionally, I attended an extensive ten-week course on Cold War history at Oxford University. Contacts were established with fellow students who were invited to become part of an informal “response panel” to provide input and feedback regarding the selected
design, methods and sites. Further, the panel was also involved in the design and piloting of the observation, in-depth interview and questionnaire.

The second empirical stage of ‘inspection’ involved a reflective inquiry of the social constructions and the phenomenon of Cold War tourism by means of generating data with the use of the main methods. Data was generated during a three-month period in 2011 and took place during school holidays to ensure a wide range of participants. At each site similar methods were used to generate data to ensure consistency between the cases. In addition, due to limited opening hours or data generated during the first visit, additional data generation took place at Hack Green Secret Nuclear Bunker and York Cold War Bunker in August 2011. For each of the sites, the period of data generation and quantity of data per method are illustrated in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5  
**Timeline of data generated during the exploration stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period/Site</th>
<th>April 2010</th>
<th>May 2010</th>
<th>August 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hack Green</td>
<td>8-9-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvedon Hatch</td>
<td>13-14-15-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York bunker</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF bunker</td>
<td>19-20-21-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland bunker</td>
<td></td>
<td>26-27-28-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6  Quantity of data generated during the exploration stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>In-depth interviews</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hack Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvedon Hatch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York bunker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF bunker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland bunker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>251</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


During these stages, I also kept an informal journal (and took pictures), which provided a valuable resource when I was analysing and interpreting the data (section 4.6). Although not an official part of the empirical material, the journal and images illustrate a record of insights, ideas, comments and possible connections that guided the data generation methods and the generation of codes and themes during the interpretation process. Additionally, the frequent discussions with the internal and external supervisors (Neuman, 2006) and my written, personal reflections contributed to the interpretation process and understandings of social constructions of the Cold War tourism phenomenon.

6.2 Objects of inquiry: case study approach

Through its objectives this study aimed to obtain an understanding through a rich description of the multiple understandings and social constructions of Cold War tourism, recognising they are multidisciplinary in nature and embedded within a multi-faceted social context. To appropriately consider the different dimensions of
this context, various research methodologies and their uses within tourism studies were considered as relevant methodologies including the ‘experiment’, ‘survey’, ‘archival analysis’, ‘history’ and ‘case study’. The latter methodology has long been taken for granted in social sciences and, whilst there is still “some lingering uncertainty about the nature and appropriate usage” (Merriam, 1998: 27) of the term case study, it is evident that “the single and most defining characteristic of case study lies in delimitating the object of the study, the case” (1998: 37).

In this sense a case study is limited or restricted to a particular area of study. As such, it is a “bounded system” (Stake, 2000: 444) and the case under consideration effectively becomes the study’s scope of analysis. From this perspective, case studies support the investigation of real life situations in their specific contexts and offer opportunities to connect with the actors’ or agents’ meanings, through real-life research procedures. This aligns with Merriam’s (1998: 41) description of case study as a research methodology:

> The case study approach offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon. Because it is anchored in real-life situations, a case study results in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon. It offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand the readers’ experiences. These insights can be construed as tentative hypotheses that help structure feature research; hence, case study plays an important role in advancing the field’s knowledge base.

Accordingly, case study, as a methodology, allowed me to gain insight into the social constructions of the Cold War based on people’s actions and interactions at Cold War tourist attractions. Further, this methodology allowed me to provide a full and deep description of the object of the study and confirmed what Stake (2000: 25) notes a “direct and satisfying way of adding to experience and improving understanding”. Consequently, case study research is intentionally particularistic and contextual, yet the ‘limitations’ of these conditions are
debateable, as Hancock (1998: 7) notes, "generalisation is not normally an issue for
the researcher who is involved in studying a specific situation, it is an issue for the
readers who want to know whether the findings can be applied elsewhere. It is the
reader who must decide whether or not the case being described is sufficiently
representative to their own local situation". The current study represents a
particular case study research that was limited to the social constructions of the
Cold War that took place at five selected Cold War tourist attractions from April
until August 2010. The three components of the case study involved in this study
were the selection of the sites to be studied, the approach of the data generated
and the data design or procedure. Each of these components is discussed in
sections 6.4.1 and 6.4.2.

6.2.1 Sites of inquiry: Cold War tourist attractions

Today, the remains of the Cold War in Britain together with, and originating from,
World War I and II are estimated at more than 10,000 grid references. A number
of factors, the most obvious of these being official secrecy, inhibit the formation
of a complete record of Cold War remains. Claims have been made that official
records do exist but, due to the '30 year rule', these will remain inaccessible for
some considerable time. Another limitation is the difficulty of establishing the
original and additional function(s) of the various Cold War structures, complexes
and other remains. The rapid turnover of personnel and technological
developments meant that a site could be used for multiple purposes, abandoned or
relocated. As part of the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of
England (RCHME) recording programmes, English Heritage (2003) categorised
the wide variety of Cold War monuments into one or more of eight functional
classifications consisting of:

- Air Defence
- Nuclear Deterrent
- USAF Air Bases and Depots
- Ballistic Missile Early Warning
Recognising and identifying these different structures can be extremely difficult due to the large time span, geographical scale and complexity of the structures. In addition, because of the close interrelationships between the above classifications, it is not always possible to use them in a definitive manner, and a certain degree of flexibility is essential. Moreover, within a tourism context, Cold War attractions occupy an odd position in the niche of war tourism; they qualify on grounds of composition, structure and purpose (Laws, 1998), but are not yet fully regarded as aesthetically 'qualified' as essential forms of war heritage within the rural-historic landscape and, ultimately, the English national identity. Hence, as many sites in the United Kingdom moved rapidly from active military use to sites of historic, archaeological and commercial interest once the Cold War ended (Cocroft and Thomas, 2004); only a limited number of sites are transformed, predominantly by private and local initiatives, into tourist attractions. Yet, in recent years, public and ‘official’ attitudes from agencies and governmental institutions such as English Heritage and the National Trust have gradually shifted. Over the last decade various, though mostly archaeological, studies have been undertaken regarding the recording and conservation of modern military heritage and its contemporary uses, values and meanings, as well as its neglect and destruction (see, for example, Cocroft, 2000; Dobinson, 2000).

Based on the research objectives an extensive investigation was undertaken, resulting in the establishment of the location of several Cold War tourist attractions within Britain, as visualised in Figure 7. While the selection reveals a certain degree of geographical variability, this was not a primary factor during the selection procedures. In addition, the sites were selected based on the following criteria (adapted from Tourism Western Australia, 2006), illustrated in Table 7:
Table 7  Criteria for the selection of Cold War tourist attractions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>They must be located within Great Britain, and previously have functioned as a Cold War site or structure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>They must provide a substantive tourist experience in addition to, or as part of, the attraction’s normal activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>They must have all relevant State and Local Government licenses and approvals to operate as a tourist attraction including health, planning, parking and disabled access facilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>They must be open to the public on weekends and three other days of the week, including public holidays, and for at least 6 months per year;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>They should be sufficiently similar to each other to generate meaningful data on a broad range of activities and operating conditions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>They should offer a similar types of resource according to the nature and quality of the tourist attraction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>They should have similarities in the extent to which the sites are represented as and within tourist attractions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the physical location of the selected sites, it appeared that almost all sites were located underground and in remote rural areas. Often harmless looking buildings that function as the entrance to the underground complex disguise the sites.

Additionally, participation was another important factor during the selection process. Inquiries were initiated, based on the above criteria, and seven Cold War tourist attractions were invited to participate in the study: Hack Green Secret Nuclear Bunker (HG), Kelvedon Hatch Secret Nuclear Bunker (KHSNB), York Cold War Bunker (YCWB), the Royal Air Force Defence Radar Museum Neatishead (RAFN), Royal Air Force Holmpton (RAFH), Bentwaters Cold War...
Museum (BC) and Scotland’s Secret Bunker (SSB). In due course, five sites agreed to participate; unfortunately, Bentwaters Cold War Museum did not participate as they felt that their own survey was adequate and that additional research would overburden their staff. As one of the Trustees replied in an e-mail on March 18, 2011:

I do not want our visitors to be subjected to twice the amount as it may put them off from returning in the future...I am not keen to burden my already overworked staff with additional tasks...I cannot see how your research will benefit us in any way?

During the data generation, however, many visitors found the interview or the questionnaire unproblematic, and rejection rates were dismissible. Many visitors did reply that questions led to more profound thoughts about their visit, as these were taken for granted, although this was not a problem for most participants, as many rather enjoyed reflecting on the experience. The other site, Royal Air Force Holmpton, was closed due to health and safety issues and was therefore excluded from the study (although the site re-opened a few months later). A description of the participating sites in this study is included in Appendix 5.

After an introductory telephone conversation to introduce myself and the study, to generate interest and to verify contact details, the sites’ managers were invited by e-mail and letter to participate in the study (Appendix 6). The site managers also received the preliminary version, both digital and hard copy, of the data generation documents, including questionnaires, interview questions and observations forms. Although all participating managers were given the right to keep their identities and that of the site private within the outcomes of the study, none opted for complete anonymity.
Figure 7  Geographical locations of selected Cold War sites
6.2.2 Methods of inquiry: quantitative and qualitative

Guided by a social constructionist perspective, this study aimed to gain an insight into the social construction of the phenomenon of Cold War tourism. Nevertheless, following Denzin (1994), in each and every social science investigation nothing will speak for itself, whatever the driving paradigm might be. In this sense, even the very choice of methods is, in many cases, in itself an act of the so-called, ever-present and highly ‘political’ serviceability between the researcher, supervisors, commissioning clients, community, and the research project in question (Quantz, 1992: 471). To illustrate the end of an era of an allegedly value-free social world, Hollinshead (2009: 76) states:

... in making choices at the twinned levels of methodology and methods, the researcher must remain alive to the fact that power always plays an important (if, often, a below the surface) role in the existence, creation, and/or development of receptive audiences for research projects.

Beyond these discourses and political aspects in research lies a fervent dispute that has lingered for more than a century between the followers of quantitative research paradigms who argue for an objective hypothetic-deductive framework for methods, closely linked to positivism, and their qualitative opponents who argue for a holistic-inductive approach including alternative methods and an inclusion of the researcher as an essential part of the research ‘reality’. Supporters of both arguments claim that their research design and analysis are the best for research and cannot be combined due to fact that the “...paradigms do not study the same phenomena...” (Sale, Lohfeld and Brazil, 2002: 43).

This ‘incompatibility thesis’ suggests that quantitative and qualitative paradigms and, perhaps more importantly, their methods cannot and should not be mixed (Howe, 1988). In reflecting further on the debate, there are many tourism researchers who articulate the incommensurability of paradigmatic framing – ontology, epistemology, methodology, and axiology (Jennings, 2004) - and tend
to draw on the works of Guba and Lincoln (1994, 2005), Lincoln and Guba (2000) and Denzin and Lincoln ([1994], 2011). To illustrate their view, Guba (1990: 81), regarded to be amongst the early campaigners for qualitative research, offers a colourful account when contending that “accommodation between paradigms is impossible ... we are led to vastly diverse, disparate, and totally antithetical ends.” This ‘paradigm war’ or ‘paradigm debate’ has led to a disturbing outcome in the relentless focus and treatment of research cultures, as foretold by Sieber (1973: 1335); “one professing the superiority of ‘deep, rich observational data’ and the other the virtues of ‘hard, generalizable’ ... data.”

From the smoking ashes of the continuing debate, ‘mixed methods’ or ‘mixed methods research’ has arisen phoenix-like as a third research paradigm in social science research over the last 20 years. Within this short time span, mixed methods has developed into a separate research approach with its own philosophical foundations, terminology, research designs and specific procedures (Pierce, 2001; Davies, 2003). Accordingly, it was not until the late 1990s and early 2000s that qualitative and quantitative agendas in tourism studies were challenged by the use of mixed methods, especially by supporters of pragmatism (Pansiri, 2005, 2006) and (critical) realism (Botterill, 2000, 2001; Gale and Botterill, 2005). The concept of ‘mixed methods’ has become a popular term and rationale for mixing qualitative and quantitative data in a single study (Bryman, 2006; Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner, 2007) and is also the label that will be used in this study. Based on an analysis of the main scholars in the field of mixed methods, the following definition by Johnson et al (2007: 123) will be used in this study:

Mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g. use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purpose of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration.
Furthermore, citing Robson (2011: 164), a mixed methods approach is typically characterised as:

- Quantitative and qualitative methods within the same research project;
- A research design that clearly specifies the sequencing and priority that is given to the quantitative and qualitative elements of data generation and analysis, and;
- An explicit account of the manner in which the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the research relate to each other.

Although mixed methods have strong implications for the philosophical foundations of research, the mixed methods approach in this study was primarily method-based, combining quantitative and qualitative methods that encouraged or even required an integration of different ways of collecting, analysing, interpreting and reporting the multi-layered meanings and assumptions about the nature and 'truth' of Cold War tourism (Nagy Hesse-Biber, 2008). Applying mixed methods together may result in a better understanding of Cold War tourism being studied, as multiple perspectives of the phenomenon represent different, yet complementary, views. Within this current study, three empirical methods – observations, in-depth interviews and questionnaires – were included within the mixed methods approach. The outline of these methods is illustrated in Table 8 and discussed in the following sections.
Table 8  Overview of selected methods – purposes, difficulties and weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Purpose of the method</th>
<th>Common difficulties / weaknesses in/of the method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>To generate an initial and tactical understanding of the characteristics, actions and interactions of visitors, within the context of the observed area in Cold War tourist attractions.</td>
<td>Limited experiences with observation techniques and knowledge of participating sites. Not possible to discover the causes behind the Cold War tourism phenomenon; only possible to describe and report the observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>To gain an understanding of how constructs are created, stretched and shaped within and by the social actions and interactions with other humans and non-humans, and how forces of power and hegemony of human agents influence the experience.</td>
<td>Time consuming activity, with an uncertain result based on the interviewees’ willingness to share information with the interviewer. Bias caused by appearance, gender, age and ethnic background of interviewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>To enhance the understanding of how constructs are created, stretched and shaped within and by the social actions and interactions between humans and non-humans when visiting Cold War tourist attractions.</td>
<td>Lack of time and attention to explain the questions in a form that participants might not misinterpret. In some cases the open-ended questions generated superficial answers. Time consuming activity to insert the large amounts of data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2.1 Observations

The data generation at each participating site started with informal, direct observations of the activities of visitors themselves, using an observation pro-forma form and a priori checklist (see Appendix 7). The observations were carried out to grasp the phenomenon and observe the diverse practices of tourists and their interactions with the physical setting and each other within real-world settings (Feldman, 1974; Merriman, 1989; Corbetta, 2003). The observations were intended to be responsive ‘snapshots’ in relation to information obtained by other data sources and techniques - ‘saying’ is one thing, ‘doing’ another. They provide first-hand information that other sources cannot easily obtain or which the observed may not wish to discuss; for example, the routes taken in the observed areas and physical behaviour and interactions of those observed.

However, observations are not a simple method without their own troubles. Following Robson’s (2011: 319) perspective that “the social world involves subjective meanings and experiences constructed by participants in social situations ...[and] the task of interpreting can only be achieved through participation with those involved.” As observations involve “intensive fieldwork in which the investigator is immersed in the culture under study” (Patton, 2002: 81), the observer ultimately becomes some kind of member of the observed group. This involvement can range from insider to outsider roles, which may also vary throughout the research, as shown in section 1.5 (see also, Lewins, 1992; Zeisel, 2006). Especially within this study, significant ethical issues can arise regarding the extent to which the observer influences the situation under observation, and, perhaps more importantly, the misconstruction of the observed interaction or phenomena.

The first issue concerned informing participants about my outsider or etic role of ‘observer-as-participant’, which I took on within the observation. Participants were informed beforehand by a sign at the entrance of the area under observation or by the tour guide who informed the participants at the beginning of the tour of my presence. Nevertheless, as this study acknowledges, to some extent the
observation was 'reactive', as it is impossible to "be a fly on the wall" when
directly observing others (Wimmer and Domenick, 2011: 122). When participants
are aware of the presence of an observer, this can cause distortions in their
behaviour. These 'misrepresentations' can be expressed by, for example, behaving
differently in order to present themselves in a more favourable light (Robson,
2011), and will eventually change what is being observed. In an attempt to
minimise such 'observer effects', minimal interaction with the group was sought
through expressing 'natural' behaviour, whilst adopting strategies of minimising
contact, simple behavioural techniques, and standing 'out of the way' of those
observed. The blurring of roles during the observations and other aspects of the
process are discussed in section 4.6.

The second matter concerns the misconstruction of the observed interaction or
phenomena within this setting. As the observation was subject to 'selective
attention', all perceptual processes involved in the taking in of the information
and the following internal process of constructing meanings were subject to bias.
Furthermore, expectations, based on prior knowledge obtained through secondary
data sources and social and physical interactions, have inevitably coloured my
perceptions and views, and in turn led to 'selective coding' of the observation, and
eventually this will impact the construction of meaning. Tackling these issues, as
Robson (2011: 329) advocates when stating, "the general strategy is to seek to
recognize and discount all biases" was not a simple task.

Instead, in order to recognise and reduce biases, the observations were carried out
with a relative degree of structure, based on a prior exploration and pilot study at
two of the selected sites (Hack Green Secret Nuclear Bunker and Kelvedon Hatch
Secret Nuclear bunker, in February/March 2011). Informed by this exploratory
phase, the need for a pro-forma form and a coding scheme arose to capture the
setting and processes that were observed in observational categories. Informed by
Barton, Baltes and Orzech (1980) and Watson (2007), a pro-forma form (Table 9)
and observational recording form (Table 10) were developed, consisting of
several categories. The outlines of the final documents used during the site visits can be found in Appendices 7 and 8.

A specific room or space at each site was selected upon arrival and described and visualised in detail with the help of the pro forma form. At set times, observations took place, focusing on the activities, movements, interactions, and reactions of tourists, attempting to make an interpretation of the actions and behaviour of the tourists. This approach to guiding the observations was favoured due to the few prior experiences with observations, whilst taking into account that templates and forms can deflect attention from unnamed categories, and unimagined and unanticipated activities that could also be of importance to understanding the phenomenon and setting. The observations provided valuable present and atemporal descriptions about visitor characteristics, time spent in the observed room or space, points of interest, movements and routing, and interactions with other human and non-humans.

The descriptive observations complemented information obtained by the two other methods (in-depth interviews and questionnaires) to limit the discrepancies between what people say that they have done or will do, and what they actually did or will do. This initial story or narrative account based on these descriptions provided a framework that helped to understand, and explain to the reader, what was going on at the Cold War sites.

Overall, the primary data were the interpretations of the observer about what was going on, which required great sensitivity and personal skills. In this sense, observations within this study were conducted with a lower or no degree of participation. This was done by adopting the role of a (largely) passive, though completely accepted, marginal participant. Furthermore, assumptions were limited due to informing participants about the observations before entering the room by a clear note on the door. Nevertheless, this study acknowledges that it is never logically possible to be completely sure that the observer’s presence has not in some way changed what is being observed.
### Table 9  General outline observation pro-forma form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations pro-forma form</th>
<th>Observations at site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General description of the area: features and layout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary of objects and artefacts displayed in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leaflets, guides and other printed material (quality, condition and layering).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Directional signage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Special facilities for visitors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10  General outline observation recording form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations recording form</th>
<th>Observations at site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Visitor characteristics: gender, clothing, group size, estimated age group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Verbal behaviour and interactions: who speaks to whom and for how long, who initiates interaction, languages or dialects spoken; tone of voice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical behaviour and gesture: What people do, who does what; who interacts with whom and what, who is not interacting with other people or objects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal space: How close do people stand to one another.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Human traffic: routing of people, people who enter and leave; and the time spent at the observation site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Human traffic: routing of people, people who enter and leave; and the time spend at the observation site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People who stand out: Identification of people who receive a lot of attention from others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2.2 In-depth interviews

Within this study, participants were chosen for in-depth interviews that took place at the selected sites. Given the study's aim and objectives, the participants included both site managers and visitors. In this context, I was interested in understanding the construction of the Cold War from those who are responsible for the creation of Cold War constructs within Cold War tourist attractions and those visiting the sites.

Based on the degree of structure or standardisation, a general typology used in social research divides interviews into structured, semi-structured and unstructured, depending on the 'depth' sought by the researcher (Robson, 2011). According to this division, the study adopted 'semi-structured interviews', whereby the interview was guided by a checklist of topics to get a rich account of the tourist's experiences and construction of realities. Furthermore, the interview was 'focused', which allowed participants' understandings, meanings and values to emerge, but still gives the researcher some 'control' over the development of the conversation (Merton, Fiske and Kendall, 1990). This provided guidance, yet simultaneously, allowed for questions and wording to be modified based on the flow of the interview; on various occasions, unplanned prompts and probes could be included to go more in-depth on specific topics, based on what the interviewee said.

Prior to the interview, each participant was given an 'Interview Information and Consent Form' in which the study and the purpose of the interview were explained (Appendix 8). At the bottom of the form the participant could indicate that he/she had read and understood the information, was willing to participate in an interview of approximately 30 minutes and whether an audio recording device could be used during the interview. Each interview followed an interview guide, informed by *a priori* knowledge, including questions of facts, knowledge, experiences and (the process of) generating meanings and reality construction. Demographic questions were relatively easy to get, and generally made the participant feel more comfortable; however, errors such as response bias were
taken into account. As a result, participants were given options; for example, to state their age or age group if they felt uncomfortable with the first. This was followed by the main body of the interview, covering questions regarding the main purpose of the study, and the opportunity for closing comments, to give the participant the opportunity to add information that he or she felt could be of importance. The interview guide for both site managers and tourists at Cold War tourist attractions is included in Appendix 9.

Interviewing as a research method typically involves interaction between the interviewer and interviewee, even to the extent that they are seen as conversations – they are “merely one of the many ways in which two people talk to each other” (Benny and Hughes, 1970: 176). However, this comment is perhaps an overly simplistic view of the practice of interviewing. As Oakley (1981: 32) notes, interviews are pseudo-conversations, which are guided by pre-determined procedures. For her, interviews have to be grounded in a “relationship of mutual trust”, or else the findings will be “particularly dismal” (1981: 50). Furthermore, Oakley highlights the need for ‘non-hierarchical’ interviews, although this is, from my personal perspective, almost impossible based on unequal relationships of power and politics between people. However, this issue can be addressed when taking into account my own identity and personal relationship with the interviewees (see paragraph 4.7). I do, however, agree with Oakley’s notion that there is ‘no intimacy without reciprocity’, as notions of exchange and intersubjective interactions cannot be excluded from the activity.

To acknowledge the transactional and active nature of the interview process, Robson (2011: 171) advocates the replacement of ‘interviewer’ and ‘interviewee’ with ‘researcher(s)’ and participant(s)/co-researcher(s)’ (in this study referred to as ‘participants’). Although there will always be forces of power and politics influencing the process; for example, to participate or not, it stimulates the engagement of all parties in the debate.
Furthermore, especially within this study, the interview is regarded as a reflective process for all involved, as Patton (2002: 405) states:

The process of being taken through a directed, reflective process affects the persons being interviewed and leaves them knowing things about themselves that they didn’t know – or at least were not aware of – before the interview.

To ensure that the interviews were conducted in a comfortable atmosphere for the participants, all interviews took place at the participating sites. Where possible a cafeteria or rest room was selected as the most appropriate space within the facility for the person-to-person interviews.

6.2.2.3 Questionnaires

The final method within the study was the use of questionnaires. As this study is based on a mixed method approach, I prefer to think of quantitative or qualitative data as two discrete categories, but as a range of options with purely quantitative and qualitative data at the opposites ends. The questionnaires within this study were carried out for descriptive and interpretive purposes, to provide an understanding of social constructions of the Cold War within the context of the five tourist attractions. Some of the questions were based on predetermined sets of items and involved categorical data or rating scales, and therefore leaned toward the quantitative end of the spectrum. Opposite, there were also questions that offered open-ended responses in writing and which were suitable for both statistical analysis and discourse analyses.

Another important aspect for the selection of questionnaires concerned the authorisation of the site managers regarding the generation of data at the selected sites. As Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006) state, “agencies, private and governmental, may prefer that researchers use traditional “tied and true” research methods.” Several site managers expressed their doubts and concerns regarding observations and in-depth interviews as “acceptable methods” (Gouldner, 1971).
In addition, as background information about visitors is absent at many sites, the site managers used their position and 'power' to extent the research methods with the inclusion of a questionnaire, and several specific question regarding demographic characteristics and the actual visit.

In practice, simultaneously to the conduction of in-depth interviews, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire consisting of four sections (see Appendix 10). The first section sought data relating to the actual visit; group composition, general reasons for visiting, expectations and prior knowledge. The following section consisted of a series of four closed and four open questions to collect accounts about the experiences, actions and interactions between humans and non-humans within the attraction. Third, a series of three open-ended questions sought data about how tourists develop interpersonal systems or dimensions of meanings, notions or connotations of the Cold War based on their visit. This quantitative method is thus created according to a post-positivistic paradigm that assumes that the researcher is unbiased towards the data that are generated, although as noted earlier (section 6.2.2.2) the act of asking a question is in essence not neutral and sets an agenda. The use of open-ended questions reveals an attempt to obtain a certain amount of qualitative data from a larger sample than those obtained from the interviews.

Based on the assumption that the case study methodology was not concerned with statistical generalisation but with analytical or theoretical generalisation, convenience sampling was employed for both methods; in-depth interviews and questionnaires, as the sampling approach. Although highly contested and referred to as "a cheap and dirty way of doing a sample survey" (Robson, 2011: 275), commentators such as Bryman (1989) and Schwab (1985) have pointed out the deficiencies in research. As Schwab (1985: 173) ironically notes:

Of course we all know that almost all of the empirical studies published ... use convenience, not probability samples ...
6.3 Practices of inquiry: data analysis and interpretation

Within this study, the practices of data analysis and interpretation involved the generation of understandings from data that had been generated at the various sites. The purpose of this process of 'how can I understand what is going on here' is based on the subtle realism thread which has been described in an earlier section of this chapter (see section 4.3.1). Based on this stance, theoretical propositions of Cold War tourism constructions can be revealed due to the design of the study and looking closely at the data, identifying emerging themes and issues, and interpreting the material in the light of the previous outline theoretical consideration. Based on the abductive reasoning of this study, it was possible to analyse and interpret the generated data in a systematic and cyclical way. Due to the considerable amount, and to ensure that the experiences and opinions of all those involved in the study were included and understood, the data first needed to be categorised. To realise this task through continual comparisons with themes that emerged from the data, significant or coherent meanings needed to be assigned to the data (Neuman, 2006: 159).

To make sense of the data generated in the exploration and inspection stage, Neuman's (2006) 'iterative process of data analysis' was adopted to be used in this study. According to Neuman's model, the analysis and interpretation of data consists of three stages. First, to gain an understanding about the meanings of participants regarding Cold War tourism the generated data was categorised into themes. This “first-order interpretation” (p. 160) helped to develop an understanding of the site managers' and tourists' meanings, experiences, and ultimately constructions of Cold War tourism at the participating sites. In this case, this also included official documents, records, observations and personal notes, preliminary results from questionnaires and interview transcripts.

The “second-order interpretation” consisted of the researcher's interpretation of what the data had in common, through which “an underlying coherence or sense of meaning in the data” emerged (Neuman, 2006: 160). Simply put, the first-order interpretation was re-discovered and reconstructed through a process of putting
the data into categories. Within an interpretive approach the analysis would stop at this point. However, based on the theoretical base and reasoning of this study, a third-order of interpretation was included to give room for a discussion of the theoretical significance of understandings that emerged from the data.

A combination of the previously described 'iterative process of data analysis' by Neuman (2006), the adopted stages of data generation, analysis and interpretation by Charon (2007: 194) and the embedded design adopted from Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) lay the foundation of a modified iterative process of data generation, analysis and interpretation used within this study (Figure 8). Although the models have overlapping features, within this figure the influential features of the models have been illustrated with superscript numbers: (¹) for aspects from Neuman’s model, (²) for aspects from Charon’s stages of data generation, and (³) for features from Creswell and Plano’s design.
Chapter 6 - Methods of inquiry

Figure 8  Process of data generation, analysis and interpretation (combined from Neuman, 2006, Charon, 2007: 194; and Cresswell and Plano Clark, 2007)
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6.3.1 In-depth interviews: thematic analysis

The recorded interviews were transcribed and partly (or simultaneously) coded manually or through the proprietary software package NVivo-9 (QRS International). To understand the constructions of Cold War tourism of both the site managers and tourists at Cold War tourist attractions thematic analysis was applied. Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that thematic analysis is widely used as a qualitative analytic method, yet at the same time it is “a poorly branded method, in that it does not appear to exist as a named analysis in the same way as other methods” [for example; narrative analysis, grounded theory, content analysis] (see also, Boyatzis, 1998; Roulston, 2001). In regard to thematic analysis, the literature shows a variety of labels for related methods of analysis, or no label at all (Macht, Meininger and Roth, 2005); hence, they all share the stepwise and iterative approach of thematic analysis (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Miles and Hubermann, 1994; Elo and Kyngas, 2007; Hsieh and Shannon, 2005), including familiarisation with the data, defining, collating and renaming themes. Braun and Clarke (2006: 5) even argue that “it is the first qualitative method of analysis that researchers should learn”, as ‘thematised meanings’ are one of the few shared generic skills across qualitative analysis (Holloway and Todres, 2003: 347).

Although there might not seem to be a clear agreement about what thematic analysis is and how researchers should go about it (see, for example, discussions raised by Boyatzis, 1998; Attirde-Stirling, 2001; Tuckett, 2005), Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that many analyses are essentially thematic. To illustrate, the method of analysis is claimed to be something else (such as discourse analysis or content analysis) or not labelled as a particular method at all. In this regard, clarity around the process and practice of thematic analysis is important. Although thematic analysis provides a flexible and useful tool for rich and thick accounts of the data, it does not imply the absence of clear and concise guidelines or an ‘anything goes’ approach (Antaki, Billig, Edwards and Potter, 2002). There are many examples within the literature which state that themes ‘emerged’ from the data (also noticeable with other forms of interpretation and analysis). For example, in
Haven-Tang and Jones’ (2008) work on sense(s) of place, thematic analysis of the data was used to raise awareness amongst tourism providers about the value opportunities and sustainable focus of tourism. However, providing an overview of themes ‘emerging’ or being ‘discovered’ is a passive or positivistic account of the process of analysis and, as Braun and Clarke (2006: 7) argue, “it denies the active role the researcher always plays in identifying patterns/themes, selecting which are of interest, and reporting them to the readers” (see also, Taylor and Ussher, 2001). Themes do not merge, nor do we simply ‘give voice to them’; they already reside in our heads and are constructed, shaped and altered by our personal and theoretical position and values in relation to the research (see also, Ely, Vinz, Downing and Anzul, 1997; Fine 2002).

Within the current study, the thematic analysis was based on a constructionist approach, as it examined the ways in which events, realities, meanings, experiences and more were the effects of a range of discourses operating within society and individual visitors at Cold War sites. Furthermore, influenced by subtle realism theories, thematic analysis within this study also focused on ways in which visitors “make meaning of their experience, and, in turn, the ways the broader social context impinges on those meaning, while retaining focus on the material and other limits of ‘reality’” (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 8).

Furthermore, thematic analysis is concerned with a number of additional choices and phases, which explicitly need to be considered and discussed. First of all, it needs to be clear within this study what counts as a theme. Following Braun and Clarke’s (2006: 10) view, a theme “captures something important about the data” in relation to the study’s aim and objectives, and “represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set.” Large numbers of instances do not necessarily mean that the theme itself is more crucial. The theme may also only be appearing in one set of the data, and might not appear or be given space in others. Furthermore, Braun and Clarke (2006: 10) argue that “the ‘keyness’ of a theme is not necessarily dependent on quantifiable measures”, but depends on whether something is important for the overall aim. In this study, to maintain a
certain depth and complexity, a more detailed and nuanced account of particular (groups of) themes is provided based on the present aim and objectives. This more theoretical and latent approach influenced by the constructionist paradigm (Burr, 1995) goes beyond the semantic content of the data, as it tries to examine and understand “the underlying ideas, assumptions and conceptualisation – and ideologies – that are theorised as shaping or informing the content of the data” (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 14).

The thematic analysis was conducted through several phases (Figure 9). Although not explicitly mentioned in the figure, the process had already started during the data generation period when I began to notice, and look for, patterns of meaning and personal interest in particular aspects of the data. Writing down initial ideas and potential coding schemes in my personal diary, this activity (writing) became an integral part of the analysis of the data that was produced. In later phases of the data I sometimes re-read my early notes for inspiration and the rearrangement of (existing) coding schemes and analysis process, and, in this sense, it was more a recursive process, as I was constantly moving back and forth between the data set.

Familiarisation with the data goes beyond the re-reading of personal notes and reading the transcripts of the interviews; it also meant immersing myself with the data “to the extent that you are familiar with the depth and breadth of the content” (Braun and Clarke: 2006: 17). This involved ‘repeated reading’ of the recorded data, and doing so in an active (yet relatively informal) way through scribbling down ideas, meanings and patterns. This process also continued during the transcription process, although at times it was time-consuming, frustrating and boring. Hence, this activity can be seen as an act of constructionism, as meanings are constructed rather than simply mechanically produced as spoken sounds that are put on paper as texts (Lapadat and Lindsay, 1999). The transcripts were created as ‘verbatim’ accounts of all verbal (and sporadically nonverbal or external sounds, e.g. sighs or phone ringing) expressions. Transcriptions were also checked against the original audio recordings for ‘accuracy’ to the extent that the
accounts stayed ‘true’ to the original nature (for example; exclamation marks were added when respondents raised their voice or sounded upset).

The subsequent phase was concerned with the construction of initial codes from the data to identify a feature of the data that seemed interesting and related to the study’s aim and objectives. The coding process was part of the analysis as data was organised into meaningful groups that would eventually be clustered in units that formed the themes from which arguments regarding Cold War heritage (and) tourism were made. By working through the entire data set, full and ‘equal’ attention was given to each data item and interesting aspects relating to the aim and objectives were identified which formed the basis of patterns (themes) across the data sets. The manual coding process included the analysis of hard copy transcripts and writing notes and highlighting patterns or repetitive phrases on the documents while analysing the texts. The coding through the software programme Nvivo-9 was mainly used for coding the transcripts from the interviews with visitors by tagging and naming selections of text within each data item. Separate sets of text remained uncoded; others were coded once, twice, or multiple times, depending on their relevancy. Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that it is important to keep in mind that no data set is without contradiction, as the outcome of the coding process - a thematic ‘map’ – will provide an overall conceptualisation of the patterns within the data and their relationship, yet also illustrates the tensions and conflicts within and across data items.

The following phases involved the analysis of the codes to a broader level of themes. With the help of visual mind maps different codes or units were combined to form overarching themes inspired by the aim and objectives of the study. Also the relationship between the codes, themes, and different levels of themes (for example, head and sub-themes) were examined. In some cases codes were discarded or grouped under ‘other’, and in some cases, re-assessed at a later stage. Subsequently, a refinement of the themes took place, as some themes might not always be ‘real’ themes due to the lack of support from the text, or two or more themes might collapse into one theme.
The final phase included the defining and naming of themes, as well as identifying the ‘story’ that each theme was telling and how it connected with the overall aims and objectives of the study. Braun and Clarke (2006) also add an additional phase in the original model, called ‘producing the report’. It states that the complicated story should be told “in a way that convinces the reader of the merit and validity of your analysis” (2006: 24).

Finally, themes were developed from the data sets of the site managers (Chapter 7) and the visitors (Chapter 8), which in this sense were thought to be the outcome of coding, and not something that was, in itself, coded. As a form of pattern recognition within the data, thematic ‘maps’ were developed in order to formalise the ‘fitting together’ of different themes into one or more networks or relationships (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Finally, to ensure the trustworthiness of the analysis the analytical narratives aim to go beyond merely a description of the data, and instead try to make an argument in relation to the research objectives (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Occasionally, the findings displayed in the subsequent chapters include personal information derived from notes, reflections and images taken during the visits. Where needed, edits had been made to the original transcripts to remove personal details that could compromise the anonymity of the participants or others mentioned during the interview, such as comments about personal lives and the lives of others. As a systematic convention for dealing with this information real names of individuals and organisations, including other sites, were replaced with the statement “<sensitive information>”. Accompanying the text are extracts from the transcripts to provide clarity and a degree of analysis, whilst also illustrating the often complex and convoluted nature of the responses. In accordance with the embedded design, quantitative data has been added in chapter 8 to support and back up the qualitative responses from visitors.
Figure 9  Description of the phases of thematic analyses, adopted from Braun and Clarke (2006)

- **Familiarising with the data**: Transcription, reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.

- **Generating initial codes**: Coding features relevant to the research question in a systematic fashion across the entire data set until saturation is reached (Strauss and Corbin 1998).

- **Searching for themes**: Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.

- **Reviewing themes**: Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts and the entire data set, generating a ‘thematic map’ of the analysis.

- **Defining and naming themes**: On-going analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.
6.3.2 Questionnaires: statistical analyses

The completed questionnaires were inserted in a data file, according to a codebook, in the proprietary software package SPSS 17 (IBM). The data file was partly constructed prior to generating the data at the selected sites; hence, the variables for the open-ended questions were constructed afterwards through a rather similar thematic analysis to that applied within the interview analysis. Prior to constructing the various themes for each of the open-ended questions, these were inserted in an Excel file and respectively read and re-read to generate an overview of groups and units based on the study's aim and objectives, as well as being informed by the themes from the interview analysis. In the codebook the major themes were listed under the variable and assigned a separate label; in some cases, participants' responses were assigned to multiple items under the same variable. The questionnaire also involved a combination of closed and open questions. This involved providing participants with a number of defined responses, and also an additional category (other) that they could tick if the response they wished to give was not listed. In all cases an additional numerical code (other=99) was added to the codebook and used within the data set for responses that did not fall into any of the listed categories.

Once all the variables were defined and the data was inserted, the set was checked for errors and scores that were out of range or incomplete. By inspecting the frequencies for each of the variables, and, perhaps due to the large dataset, small errors were detected and corrected; in most cases, this included the presence of missing or non-existent codes. Additionally, one of the most striking data errors was the initial inclusion of 19 participants under the age of eighteen at the time of data generation. Although participants were asked whether they were over eighteen before filling in the questionnaire, it seemed that in some cases this did not provide sufficient guarantee. Explanations for this can be found in either participants providing incorrect information about their age; or I might not have consequently asked participants about their age; or the fact that in some cases the personnel on site assisted me by handing out questionnaires to visitors in the
lunchroom area while I was conducting interviews. Consequently, these nineteen participants were excluded during the analyses of the data.

Subsequently, preliminary analyses were conducted to provide a quick summary of the cases in the data file. Based on the type of variable, categorical or continuous, mainly ‘frequencies’, ‘descriptives’ or ‘explore’ procedures will be used. Especially the ‘descriptives’ procedure provides useful insights as it illustrates the percentage of the data that was missing for each of the variables. This could be happening randomly, but could also be an indication for a systematic pattern, as some participants for example might have felt uncomfortable answering a particular question.

Following the preliminary analyses, reliability was another important aspect of measuring the same underlying construct. To ensure internal consistency, Devillis (2003) and Briggs and Cheek (1986) recommend the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient to be above .7 and the inter-item correlation range of .2 to .4. Testing the reliability of the scale was especially important with the open-ended questions, as several items all tap into or reflected an underlying concept (either hidden or latent). The collections of items for a scale were not identical, but were related in that they measured different facets of an underlying concept.

The next step in the analysis process was defining the statistical techniques to analyse the data. Based on the aim and objectives of the study several statistical techniques were employed. As this study is not based on strictly defined questions and hypotheses, the decision-making process was largely influenced by the aims and objectives; these are already explored in the literature review and the thematic analysis from the primary data set, the in-depth interviews with the visitors. The initial issues in this process are concerned with the (demographics) characteristics of the participants, including:

- **Age and gender** were regarded as important factors to consider because personal constructions of the past are likely to be influenced by gender and
age as they change as individuals grow older. Although little is known about the effect of gender on the visit, the literature review has already illustrated that memories are dependent on a person’s birth cohort and change throughout an individual’s life cycle. For example, those who have lived through the Cold War period are likely to have significantly dissimilar memories from those who were born after 1989.

- **Education levels** figured into the socio-economic status of the visitors. As McKercher and Du Cros (2002) argue, there appears to be a positive relation between education level and interest in activities related to cultural and heritage tourism; a better-educated population is more motivated to visit places for cultural enrichment and self-enlightenment. Although no questions about income (or economic status) were included in the questionnaire, there is a general recognition of the positive relation between higher levels of education and higher incomes for all racial/ethnic groups and for both men and women, although there are differences in income between groups and geographical locations (see, for example, the extensive study by De Gregorio and Lee, 2002). In Britain, as Smith (2009a) argues, visits to heritage sites (mainly country houses) were also traditionally confined to the elites and upper middle class (based on income and/or education), though in the post-war period it has been firmly established as a general class pastime (see also, Tinniswood, 1989: 1; Markwell, Bennett and Ravenscroft, 1997).

- **Location** was also included as an important characteristic as visitors were asked to provide their postcode and the name of their village or town. The information provided was used to reason the idea that people connect to meaningful spaces, while simultaneously constructing a sense of place in reaction to the visit. These constructions can contribute to understandings of the local or counter-culture, and the way in which visitors situate themselves imaginatively within or outside the Cold War site.
Other indicators included the group composition (Question 1), the number of times a participant has visited the site (Question 3), the duration of the visit (Question 4), the decision-making process to visit the site (Questions 4, 5 and 6), and the participant’s knowledge prior to the visit (Question 7).

The subsequent analyses were concerned with the construction of the Cold War through the performances and embodied experiences during the visit to the Cold War site. To put the process into a temporal context, participants were asked about their motivations (Question 8) and prior understandings (Question 9) of the site. The following section (section B) was concerned with the participants’ experiences at the site; the interaction with the materialities of the site, such as the structure, the items on display, and the layout of the room (Questions 10 and 11). In addition, the section included questions about what ‘being’ at the site means, how they would describe the experience (Question 12), and what feelings were elicited from the visit (Question 13). Also related to this process of sense and meaning making was the question about what the participant would remember the most from the visit (Question 14).

The embodied practices of ‘getting in touch’ with the site were further explored by asking participants about specific items that were brought along for the visit (Question 15) and by asking participants for a general description of the type of visitors they have seen during their visit (Question 16). The performances, or acts of ‘doing’ the Cold War site, also contribute to the process of Cold War heritage. How, and in which way, the experiences within the sites construct and express memories, meanings and feelings of belonging to the (national) community were explored by asking participants about their personal connections with the Cold War (Question 18). In addition, to understand how the site as a cultural tool is able to invoke, signify, and connect with participants’ experiences, understandings and meanings of what Cold War heritage is and does, participants were asked to express their feelings about how and to what extent the Cold War was represented at the particular site (Question 19). Ultimately, participants were asked about the process of heritage making, and about feelings and memories it engendered. The
questionnaire also investigated how such elements contributed to or changed their feelings about the Cold War (Question 20). Due to a request from the site managers, Question 17, asking participants about what would have improved their experiences, and Question 20, asking about other comments or suggestions, were excluded from the analysis and communicated to the managers separately outside the study.

The analyses were largely based on exploring the relationship between two or multiple variables from the general characteristics and the detailed questions, although comparisons between groups of participants are also examined. Chapter 8 will illustrate the statistical analyses and will visually and textually summarise the key points in a diagram.

6.4 Power relations and ethical consequences

The methodology that underpinned this study’s strategic direction also influenced the approach that was taken towards the research ethics. Although all research adheres to the basic ethical principles of ‘doing good’ and ‘doing no harm’, this does not imply that all approaches to research ethics are similar. Furthermore, the modern or mainstream theories regarding ethics in research (see, for example, Thompson and McHugh, 1995) largely emphasise how not to intervene in the lives and understandings of those who are being included within the study; for instance, by guaranteeing the anonymity of the participants, by excluding inappropriate questions, and by the voluntary consent and withdrawal options.

However, generating data implies that empirical inquiries are interventions in the everyday lives of participants as Gergen (1994), for example, argues; “the eminence of scientific inquiry contributes to the daily life formations of participants”. Shotter (1993: 19) adds that it is a public assumption that “the best way to make sense of our lives and to act for the best is in terms of theoretical formulations provided us by experts (rather than in terms of more practical, everyday forms of knowledge)”. Constructionist premises consider that
participating in research inevitably influences and (re)constructs people's meanings in some degree (McNamee, 1994) and suggests that all participants, including the researcher, construct and reconstruct their knowledge, position, identity and relations with others and the material. Shifting reflexive attention to the research process itself allows for accounts of responsibility and the kinds of people and worlds it (re)produces.

In research practices based on constructionism, Gergen (1994) has outlined three important "overtures to innovation". The first includes 'deconstruction' – "wherein all presumptions of the true, the rational, and the good are open to suspicion" (Gergen, 1994: 62). The second is 'democratisation' consisting of "relational responsibility" and the third includes 'reconstruction' 'wherein new realities and practices are fashioned for cultural transformation' (Gergen, 1994: 63). To put these overtures into practice, dialogues through reflections and dialogues took place between myself, as 'the researcher' and other academics including my director of studies, supervisor and external adviser. In addition, informal, yet reflexive, dialogues took place with the Cold War study group prior to and during the data generation phase. Nonetheless, reflection was not persistent throughout the research process and there could be feelings of exclusiveness from the participants. To address these issues of reflection it is important to consider the research identities, who participated and the stories that were shared, and finally, how these understandings were interpreted and reported.

As mentioned in Section 1.5, my positionality as a researcher, as well as my personal opinion about the participants, was regularly and openly (as well as unconsciously) re- and deconstructed during the research. However, as it is in most studies, it was my voice that dominated the what, the how, and the why – influenced by the scientific values, norms and expectations deriving from the scientific form of life. Although I attempted to become part of the process, instead of directing it, and to be one expert among many, it remained a struggle throughout the research. This also influenced the issue of whose voices were (not) included, who was ignored, and who was muted (see also, Section 6.3.1).
Although I was in control of which questions were included, I did not have exclusive power over who was included and excluded and over the responses from participants. I used my contacts from the Cold War study group at the University of Oxford to gain an overview of possible sources of information and to get an insight into which Cold War sites were open for the public, and who was managing them (see also, Section 6.1). The Cold War study group was comprised of individual persons, many of whom had not been in contact with each other before, and who could provide me with separate insights into Cold War heritage (and) tourism. Being rather unfamiliar with some aspects, such as Cold War history or heritage protocols, within the context of the study, some participants during the data generation phase tried to promote their story and constructions of its truth-value by portraying their identity as reliable and trustworthy, whilst others, for example, relied heavily on my input during the in-depth interviews.

### 6.5 Implications and conclusion

This chapter has discussed and summarised how the empirical part of the study was executed. The empirical part, based on a case-study methodology, used an embedded design to address the complexity of the study’s aim and objectives. For the objects of inquiry, a case study approach was adopted, including the selection of five objects (Cold War sites) in Britain and qualitative and quantitative methods of inquiry.

Despite a thorough outline of the methods that would be employed during the generation phase, the cleaned sample was smaller due to limited human and financial resources. This resulted in a situation where certain (statistical) analyses, such as multilevel analyses, were difficult to perform through the SPPS statistical programme. Also, the initial coding revealed that in some cases insufficient or contradicting data was available to underpin constructs that arose from ideas and potential coding schemes in my personal diary during (and prior to) the data generation phase. Due to time constraints additional data was only generated at one site (York Cold War Bunker) during a second visit in August 2011; this
activity was regarded as necessary to ensure an equal distribution within each of the data sets.

Furthermore, although I had a reasonable amount of experience with both methods, quantitative and qualitative, the expertise in mixed methods research was limited and challenges the realisation of concurrent data generation at the selected sites. Furthermore, the consequences of having different samples and different data sample sizes, and merging the two sets of different data, was more challenging than initially anticipated.

Moreover, the sample included participants who had visited the sites during the school holidays. By the inclusion of families the maximum variation of the sample was enlarged; however, it is possible that this resulted in an inaccurate reflection of the variety of participants. As this research was constructive in nature, this constraint may, however, be an artificial one, since the aim was to understand the process of Cold War heritage of site managers and visitors through the constructions that were influenced, shaped and negotiated at Cold War sites. Although the sample aimed to include all Cold War sites that are currently open to visitors (based on this study’s criteria), only those sites that agreed to participate are included. Generalisation for all sites is therefore not possible.

Finally, to ensure the quality of the mixed methods design, separate criteria through which both the qualitative and quantitative data can be validated are required. Although both data sets attempted to answer the study’s aim and objectives, they were not measured equally (qualitative is dominant over quantitative) and the approach to both data sets was slightly different. Moreover, validations in mixed methods based on constructionist paradigmatic assumptions required more than simply applying the traditional, ‘positivistic’ terms of reliability and validity. Although the ‘mix’ in mixed methods, until recently, was underpinned by positivist assumptions as a way to ensure rigour, it left merely descriptive accounts. Instead, I attempted to come to some understanding of the process of Cold War heritage and the construction of meanings and sense of place.
and belonging. Throughout the process of data generation, analysis and interpretation illustrated in the model proposed in section 6.3, I was also dealing with concepts of power and knowledge within a heavily debated concept such as heritage. As a result, the meaning of trustworthiness within this study shifted considerably from traditional conceptions. Within this political context, trustworthiness also required that I, as a researcher, must have a sharp awareness of my own standpoint - particularly in relation to heritage discourses, Cold War history and British culture.
Chapter 7 - Professional discourses of Cold War heritage (and) tourism

In displaying the data generated within this study on the uses and constructions of Cold War heritage (and) tourism by the site managers and visitors at five selected Cold War sites, consideration was given to whether they should be reported within separate chapters for managers and visitors, or within chapters based upon emergent themes deriving from the data. The second option would allow for an immediate comparison between responses around the themes, but would exclude a clear insight into the processes and practices of both groups. As detailed in Chapter 6, the data generation methods and emphasis employed for the managers and visitors also varied in range and scope. Resultantly, the data generated from site managers were less abundant, consisting solely of in-depth interviews, and their responses could be overshadowed if merged with the data generation from visitors. It was decided, therefore, to devote one chapter to reporting the data on site managers (this chapter) followed by one chapter on the uses and constructions by visitors of the selected Cold War sites (Chapter 8). In this way, opinions and meanings of both groups could be clearly built into a wider picture that enabled theoretical propositions to be established.

The chapter commences with specific background information regarding the selected sites. The subsequent sections display the key themes and subthemes that were constructed from the site managers’ responses regarding their role and influence in the construction of Cold War tourism, and specifically their particular attraction. In addition, the themes and subthemes are discussed in more detail within the sections and subsections in this chapter. Finally, the chapter concludes by presenting a theoretical proposition that illumines the meanings of site mangers regarding constructions of Cold War heritage (and) tourism.
7.1 Background perspectives

The analysis of the interview transcripts initially generated overall insights about the background, design and alterations of the physical site. In addition, basic information was obtained about the past and present uses of the site, its current ownership and management structures. Features of the participating sites are described in more detail in Appendix 5.

In regard to the physical location of the site, it appears that almost all sites are located underground and in remote rural areas. Often the sites are disguised by harmless looking buildings that function as the entrance to the underground complex, such as the bungalow entrance of the Kelvedon Hatch Secret Nuclear Bunker (Figure 10). The exceptions are the RAF Air Defence Radar Museum, which is located above ground in the Military of Defence buildings after a fire destroyed the underground bunker; and the York Cold War Bunker, which is located within the residential area of Holgate, York.

Figure 10  Kelvedon Hatch Secret Nuclear Bunker, front view of the bungalow entrance (Author’s collection, January 15, 2010)
The fact that most sites were located underground evoked feelings of continuity, clandestineness and hiding. As two site managers expressed:

"They can’t list things underground... [but] I don’t want that generally known, because if it’s generally known, they may change the rules or something."

(Site manager 428)

"...this is 24,000 square feet of accommodation a hundred feet underground."

(Site manager 305)

Initial analyses showed that the participating Cold War tourist attractions are based on three types of ownership, including privately owned or sole proprietorships, (non-profit) trusts and executive, non-departmental public bodies. In addition, the daily operations of the sites are largely based on a hierarchical structure, consisting of one site manager and a relatively small number of employees and/or volunteers. As illustrated by two managers:

"Yeah. It’s run by a trust. The trust maintains the collection and runs the museum, and the site is owned by a communications company that run the communications tower and they take the centre that’s here."

(Site manager 131)

"We have a trust, which is management, guidance, structure of that, governments, generally speaking. Then below that, you have a management committee, shared by the museum manager...The composition of this management committee is volunteers, up to six of them, and they make the decisions around the committee."

(Site manager 701)
The transcripts showed that all sites were open during what the participants called the ‘season’, which roughly appeared to run from April till October. In addition, four sites also continued to be open on selected times during the ‘off-season’ months, approximately from late October till the end of March. Two site managers responded:

We’re open all year, but in the winter, we’re closed Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays.

(Site manager 428)

We have a seven-month season, April to October. During that period, we’re open Tuesday and Thursday, the second Saturday of every month, and non-holiday Mondays. Then out-of-season, the five months of winter, we just open it once a month, the second Saturday.

(Site manager 701)

The number of visitors per season seemed to vary significantly, according to the site managers’ responses; the managers of privately owned sites claimed to attract the highest number of visitors, followed by the trust and public body owned sites. Three responses are included to illustrate the gradual shift in visitor numbers, based on ownership:

Around 60,000. But it’s – I can’t give you – it’s an honesty box system so I can’t give you an exact figure that we have. But obviously now we’ve got the right numbers; we’ve got more people coming in, so yeah, about 50,000 is where we are. 60 – 65,000 is where we are.

(Site manager 428)

Between five and six thousand [on average, per year]

(Site manager 701)
Yes, I mean, it’s not linear from the point of view of when they come, but from the point of view of totals, I would say that it’s around anything between – it varies year on year, but it’s about 35 – 40,000 up to about 55 – 60,000.

(Site manager 131)

We get about 45 – 50,000 in a season, so we are open usually the first of April to the end of October.

(Site manager 305)

From the first year right to the second, then it’s pretty much averaged at 3,000 a year. [When asked about rises in visitor numbers the following years:] Very steady but not huge. Around 3,000. So we might have had I think, 200 extra people last year over the year before.

(Site manager 987)

It was surprising that almost none of the managers could, or were willing to, provide more detailed and specific information about the number of people that visited the site per year. Moreover, when looking at the numbers there appears to be a rather large difference between the privately owned sites (highest), trusts (intermediate) and the public body (lowest). Although sometimes visitors use an honesty box as a method of paying for their visit, the numbers vary significantly.

### 7.2 Constructing discourse themes

As the study progressed through the iterative process of data generation, analysis and interpretation, based on the objectives of the study, a number of cultural and social themes and sub-themes were developed regarding the managers’ discourses – namely the governing, materiality and meaning making – of Cold War heritage (and) tourism (Table 11).
Table 11 Display of site managers’ discourses of Cold War heritage (and) tourism according to themes and sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governing Cold War heritage</td>
<td>Accepted neglect vs. subaltern discourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(and) tourism</td>
<td>Organic connections and politics of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastoral stewardship and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialising Cold War heritage</td>
<td>Material(ising) practices and engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(and) tourism</td>
<td>Stewardship over material sites and items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antagonism over ignorance of material resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making meaning of Cold War</td>
<td>Uncomplicated leisurely experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heritage (and) tourism</td>
<td>Multiple motivations for visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing memories of, and responses to, heritage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.1 Governing Cold War heritage

Governing heritage is an important resource of power in the process of constructing and legitimising heritage and is often put into practice through legislative, policy and management practices at Cold War sites. Currently, the way of governing Cold War heritage by governmental institutions, cultural agencies and amenity societies such as English Heritage and the National Trust relies heavily on placing it within the category of 'accepted neglect' (see also Chapter 2.2). Simultaneously, to promote the power of ignoring, beliefs of 'benign neglect' and 'natural decay' are put into place to justify the lack of scheduling and active conservation legislations. In addition to Cold War sites, buildings, places and artefacts not being identified as 'old', grand, monumental or aesthetically pleasing, the authorised institutions also face another considerable challenge as the broad choice and geographical scale of remains to be designated far exceeds the managing capacity of the heritage protection system (Strange and Walley, 2007). Furthermore, due to the swift ending of the Cold War and the incessant levels of secrecy and concealment, responding to the increasing rates of
material remains and cataloguing what was being released as the Cold War ‘past’ proves to be highly problematic even for the judgements of experts such as archaeologists and historians. As one of the site managers notes:

If you are interested in WWII, either artefacts or history or political, there are literally hundreds of museums and sites that you can go to throughout the United Kingdom. When the Cold War ended, there was nothing to reflect the sterling service by the thousands of people who contributed to the Cold War, because by its nature, most of it was secret. So that’s why we did this... The bunker and its collection are safeguarded for future generations. So that was the original intention.

(Site manager 131)

The current difficulties and levels of bureaucracy and neglect by, and within, the authorised discourse also has implications for active governance of specific Cold War sites, places, buildings and artefacts. The absence of authorised discourses has a significant impact on the already complicated political and ethical debate over the recognition and acknowledgement of the existence of Cold War heritage. Resultantly, due to authorised deficiencies, Cold War remains, such as buildings and equipment, have largely been ‘collected’ by new owners, enthusiasts and specialist groups, introducing “the danger of objectification prevailing in any sense of political or moral critique” (Woodward, quoted in Strange and Walley, 2004: 159). As illustrated by the site managers:

So I went to the House of Parliament, they read all about me or whatever, and I said: “Well, I really wanted the bunker.” I don’t know why, I just really wanted it. It was an interesting place. They spent five millions on this place: they spent five million on it before they decided to sell it ... and then we went into some of these places [nuclear bunkers] that were really secret and then there were tons of equipment, all the telephone equipment, and then we just took it all
out, tons and tons of equipment, and then there was brand-new stainless steel kitchens; we just dismantled them and took it all out...

(Site manager 305)

So when we first brought it back, it had nothing in it to speak of, so we went round other bunkers collecting the little bits that had been left in those bunkers to fill it up... We tried to replace the things that were in here with the things that were in here. So for example the radio, the home office radio down the end of the tunnel we found in a scrap yard in Scotland, and it actually had Kelvedon Hatch still stuck on the label. The BBC equipment went back to the BBC, but when they closed their stores when we were about five years old and so well... and we were able to get that back here. Going round other bunkers, we had been able to collect the correct teleprinters, the correct things, so we tried to put in here what was here, again as I said teleprinters, those – four or five ages of those.

(Site manager 428)

Although as Pendlebury, Townshend and Gilroy (2004: 26) argue, 'partnership building' has been a significant and desirable policy feature for various forms of regeneration, conservation and management, the site managers seemed to be reluctant to align their practices with the prescribed values about the nature, meanings and values of (Cold War) heritage defined by the authorised heritage discourse. Resultantly, when asked about previous and present relations that exist between the 'authorised' experts and the site managers, external relationships seemed to be minor amongst site managers, particularly those of privately and trust-owned sites:

No, not really [when asked about external relationships]. I mean, you have to jump through so many hoops to try and get any grants or anything, and by taking it, you get your architects involved and your
accountants involved – it’s actually far too expensive to try and ask somebody for help...

(Site manager 305)

... I would resist all attempts by any do-gooding heritage people to try and list us or whatever, because I know they would just lose it. I’m not about their bureaucracy for something that I’m doing very well, thank you.

(Site manager 428)

We were offered assistance at one point by <sensitive information>, and they wanted to substantially get involved with us. A number of meetings took place, and we would have become a sub site of them as it were. But again, I made a decision to pull away from that because – too many people in suits...

(Site manager 131)

On the contrary, observing the data, the Cold War heritage that most of the managers attempt to construct appears to be more organically linked to, and evolving from, their personal connections with, for example, the site (e.g. previous landowners), the Cold War events (e.g. former employer at the site), or an interest in (military) history (e.g. having an educational background):

And then they came up for sale in Scotland, and I saw one, I am a – I like guns and missiles and handcuffs and things. I mean it is just – I am a boy...

(Site manager 305)

They [Ministry of Defence] took the site from my grandfather, 25 acres of it, bulldozed the hill away. Built the bunker and then we farmed over the top of it.

(Site manager 428)
Resultantly, the process of Cold War heritage is dominated by, and influences, separate management approaches at separate, independently operated, sites. Hence, heritage becomes more than a tool for governance for the managers, it becomes a tool of for the opposition and subversion of their identities, personal experiences, meanings and socio-cultural standing opposed to other groups and the authorised discourse. Findings illustrate that these subversive and oppositional opinions have resulted in a variety of management and conservation practices and processes, yet there seems to be little or no (need for) interference or response from authorised heritage institutions or between the site managers. This 'island approach' was especially noticeable in analyses of transcripts with managers of privately owned Cold War sites; hence, managers responsible for the daily operations of sites owned by a trust or public body also expressed a great desire to maintain control over the daily operations and heritage constructions:

Normally, of course, it’s just running the business, running the museum... when you become independent and you own the building and all the rest. But up to now it’s been pretty well a benevolent dictatorship. You’ve got to have structure. You’ve got to have somebody to say no or yes.

(Site manager 701)

So <sensitive information> and I take on the roles that the site manager would do and share them between us so cataloguing and ordering stuff and any repairs that need doing to the building to log that and interpret emails for the health and safety database... just have to be on top of any problems that need attending and – so we do that.

(Site manager 987)

No [when asked about help from other organisations]. I mean obviously, help from the trustees is there, and help from various people, by all means, but we don’t – I also made a political decision
not to seek assistance from any other quarter from the point of view of grants and things like that.

(Site manager 131)

Oh no, I consider it to be heritage [the site], but I do not need a government to tell me how to look after it.

(Site manager 428)

However, observations deriving from the analyses have also suggested that this governance of 'mentalities' is top-down in nature and still excludes local communities, groups and visitors from the process by which heritage is defined and managed.

We have a trust, which is management, guidance, structure of that, governments, generally speaking. Then below that, you have a management committee, shared by the museum managers. They meet once a month and discuss the way ahead for the museum. The composition of this management committee are volunteers, up to six of them, and they make the decisions around the committee. Anything contentious, of course, is passed up to the board of trustees who will make the ultimate decision.

(Site manager 701)

I did [when asked who made the decision what to represent of the Cold War].

(Site manager 131)

As I have argued earlier in this section, subaltern discourses that exist without the inclusion and active sense of negotiation and involvement of local communities and others involved in the process could simply be termed as gestural politics of control. In this sense, it is a counter-hegemony of site manager, trustees boards and experts through which a, perhaps unconscious, political agenda is put into
practice that defines which meanings and material, groups, and interest are supported and challenged (Schadla-Hall, 2004).

It is just that we brought the bunker back to how it had been before, so it is all the equipment that used to be here came back here... I know where it all goes [the equipment]. It is all proper equipment that is here. It is all original, there’s nothing we have made up. Everything is original equipment, all the computers, everything is the same equipment. It is come straight back in; the same plotting boards, everything.

(Site manager 305)

Following Urry’s (1996: 52) observations about dominant trends in British heritage, to make history “safe, sterile and shorn of danger, subversion and seduction”, a similar management and conservation process seems to be occurring within the selected sites. Managers from the trusts and governmental bodies especially appear to prefer representing the threats and (possible) terrors of the Cold War events within a safe and ordered setting with the instalment of interpretive panels, exhibition windows, signing posts or even by allowing access to the site only with guided tours.

We represent the development of detection radar and air defence from 1935 pretty much up-to-date. We have presentations in there that show [inaudible 00:31:05], places like that, so we cover the whole aspect as best we can within the limitations of security of course... They [visitors] are taking what we tell them... [When asked about the guided tours:] There is a transcript. Every volunteer is equipped with a script for all the rooms... the reason for the script is so we are passing on common information... [Additionally,] ...we introduced a couple of bits to help visitors, like more chairs and a slide projector to show what the Russian aircraft looked like... Oh yeah, there are text panels everywhere.

(Site manager 701)
... we turn up half an hour before the site is open to you know, turn all
the lights on, turn the film and videos on, do any cleaning that is
necessary and just organise everything so it's tidy and again, a half an
hour after the last tourist has left, to collect all the signs in, turn it all
down...

(Site manager 987)

Additionally, the management and conservation practices of Cold War sites
appear not always to be based on the more conventional authorised stewardship,
that is, to preserve the 'past' for the nation and future generations, but also seems
to be somewhat based on a sense of stewardship for their own descendants and
(future) personal usage (see also, Mandler 1997: 377; Lowenthal, 2003: 427). As
one manager mentioned:

I mean, you had the First World War, you had the Second World War,
and then there was the Cold War, and that is what this bunker was for,
and we were still technically in the Cold War, and it is still like live
history. It is not old history, it is ongoing. And so I was looking at the
bunker for a cottage, and I was planning on buying it and converting it
into a cottage...

(Site manager 305)

Furthermore, the upkeep of the relatively large and mostly underground structures
involves substantial financial investments. The managers from privately owned
sites particularly expressed that they have little or no access to public money or
government funding schemes. Sometimes they even felt discriminated against,
and therefore believed it was necessary to open their sites for visitors to generate
income for maintenance, repairs and the preservation of objects and artefacts.

And then I thought well, maybe I should turn it into a museum
because it costs so much. All the equipment was already down here.
All the beds were here, all the filing cabinets, millions of ashtrays, I mean really, it was unused to the point it was just ready to be used.

(Site manager 305)

We had a little help from the tourist board, but foot and mouth was going around so everybody had to close, which was ridiculous, if that is what you mean by financial help, but, on the whole, because we are privately owned we find we are discriminated against.

(Site manager 428)

From a guardian perspective, the discourses deployed by the site managers seem to be stirred by 'sense[s] of pastoral care' (Smith, 2009a: 18) or pastoral power (Foucault, 1988) about their role as kindly 'shepherds' of the material culture of the Cold War (physical remains). It reinforces and establishes the subaltern viewpoint of, and ways of dealing with, the protection of physical remains that make up Cold War heritage, and ensuring that the meanings and values are safeguarded, communicated, understood and propagated as consensual history and heritage for the 'nation' (or for personal exploitation). This guardianship was expressed in the following comments:

I'm looking after it very well [the site], and it's in my interest because I aim to look after it very well, thank you, and it will be here in 300 years' time without their interference [English Heritage] as to how I can do what.

(Site manager 428)

The bunker and collection are safeguarded for future generations... that was the original intention... it is important that our future generations know what power can do. They are our future prime ministers.

(Site manager 131)
Once this place is gone, that is it, gone. There is not another – there is not a lot of places open in Scotland to the public. We are the only one... I mean, it would be absolutely tragic if we lost it... and if it wasn’t for my passion, it would be closed.

(Site manager 305)

These responses about the moral responsibility to care for, and facilitate the understandings of, the site also influence beliefs about the importance of educating the ‘unaware’ public about the social, technical and military aspects of the Cold War to contribute to the construction of meanings, values and identity. This renders the visitor to a ‘passive’ subject, for which, according to Malviya (2005: 144) “interpretation is required to communicate the significance of an area”, leaving it to the management to decide what to present, to archive and to demolish (Waterton and Watson, 2010: 144). What is being displayed through well-designed, implemented, or sometimes ad-hoc interpretation and education agendas, aims to justify and validate a specific version of history (while ignoring other versions):

But I remember it well, because I am that old, and a lot of people do not. But those that do remember it just remember old snippets. They might remember the Cuban missile crisis, for example. Saber rattling in the press, with the various Soviet Premiers over the years, but really we missed it. Too busy shopping, working, earning a living, to bother about that. It’s only when you come up here that they are like: “a whole lot was going on and I did not know about it.”

(Site manager 701)

The decision was made initially, having looked at all of the various situations, that because of the history of the site to represent the Cold War with a broad brush, because in addition to it being a Cold War site, which of course it was, it was a radar site, a civilian role as well, so there was a considerable history dating back to 1940...a broad Cold
War museum as opposed to a focused RGHQ... So as I say, we wanted to paint a broad picture.

(Site manager 131)

The final quote particularly highlights the idea that although there are different aspects to the Cold War past, the management decided to broad-brush history as a planned effort to create a general understanding for the visitors of its history and the significance of events, people, and objects. Another possible factor for this marketing and managerial approach is, as Waterton and Watson (2010: 221) have argued, the issue of not being ‘prestigious’ enough to be acknowledged and examined by ‘real’ scholars, experts and institutions, and with that the lack of research and funding. Heritage sites are faced with increasing competition with each other and other tourist attractions, and therefore are ‘forced’ to make their own sites, objects or buildings more appealing and attractive for a wide audience. In line with Woodward’s arguments, this process of interpretation from the presenter’s or supplier’s perspective is interlinked with various aims, including the need for recognition and (financial) support by institutionalised experts and bodies; facilitating understanding of the importance of preservation and conservation for future generations (and descendants), and educating visitors to increase public understanding, appreciation and, ultimately, protection (Tilden, 1977: 38).

7.2.2 Materialising Cold War heritage

Although heritage is foremost a cultural practice that engages with acts of remembering to understand and engage with the present (Smith, 2009a: 44), it uses sites as cultural tools to facilitate the process. In this sense, heritage is also a materialising practice, in the ways by which physical products are produced, created, listed or labelled as heritage. In the case of Cold War sites, however, material practices are hardly concerned with the (un)conscious cultural and political work that the authorised discourse does; yet it illustrates the dialectical relationship between the material practices, such as the production of displays and
interpretive panels, captions and guidebooks, and the symbolic meanings the managers attach to their site. (Richardson and Jensen, 2003: 8; Lucas, 2001: 204; Smith, 2009a).

The Cold War atmosphere is obviously the jewel in the crown if you like, because it is almost 100% original, and you know when you walk in there if you are going on a tour, there is people talking in the rooms, and the controlling aircraft... the atmosphere is very good. People appreciate that.

(Site manager 701)

...they [visitors] will get the impression that here is a bunker that was self-contained. It has got its own water, electricity, everything else. There were teleprinters and there were telephones. That is what they need to know... Bits and pieces from an earlier time because if I am trying to portray the history of the bunker, I need to have the little plotting floor...

(Site manager 428)

This productivity of interpretation and representation, both at moments of production and consumption, also implies an on-going performative engagement, rather than constituting a relationship between images and texts. The material practices undertaken by the site managers appear to result in exclusive constructions of meaning making, with their own commentaries being communicated through interpretative panels, texts, guide books, et cetera (Bolt, 2004). The practices of engaging with the construction of a material reality of Cold War heritage are illustrated here:

I think if they for sure watch our films, anybody that would even consider pressing the button for a nuclear war, you are talking the end of the world... Once an actual nuclear bomb goes off, and when they see these pictures, like the films that show there, it shocks people. It is
an eye-opener for them to come here and see what actually happened in the event of a nuclear war.

(Site manager 305)

... some of the signs could be construed as being much better if they were on plastic. The reason that we have some things that are amateurish, the reason behind that is that it just adds to the charm of the nature of the exhibition.

(Site manager 131)

So when we first brought it back, it had nothing in it to speak of, so we went round other bunkers collecting the little bits that had been left in those bunkers to fill it up... As it was, we employed one of the guards, we just took him over, and who had been down here for 28 years. So we had a pretty good idea of what we were missing and what we needed, so the way it has improved is obvious... and so what I think we have now is a fairly comprehensive history of what it did and what it was going to do.

(Site manager 428)

As a discursive construction, struggles for recognition and ownership over Cold War material also have material consequences in facilitating the redistribution and renegotiation of power, wealth and identity constructions, both on a public and personal level (Fraser, 2000: 2). The ‘neglect’ of Cold War heritage within the authorised heritage discourse has led to claims by site managers to have ‘discovered’ Cold War remains and to have ‘saved’ them as heritage ‘for future generations’, a rhetoric adopted from the authorised discourse, with the help and professional guidance of the site managers. Disengaging visitors from an active use of Cold War heritage, they ultimately aim to reaffirm their sense of ownership of the objects and sites. This has, in some cases, led to a competition over resources, as some of the site managers noted:
So <sensitive information> still have our meat cutter and our dough maker and I think that we are in here and they refuse to give it back to us, and they have not got it on display, and I know they are thinking that they might get around to doing this, but I think it is quite wrong that <sensitive information> should keep an artefact from a bunker when they are not displaying it themselves. It should go back into the place where it was.

(Site manager 428)

Outside of the atomic weapon authority’s private museum, we have the largest and most varied collection of nuclear weapons in Europe... The bunker and its collection are safeguarded for future generations. So that was the original intention.

(Site manager 131)

They [Ministry of Defence] did not leave anything, they took all the equipment, but we got that all back, once we realised we were going to make it into a museum. They left things like the bunk beds, they left filing cabinets, they left a lot of trash, and a lot of bits and pieces, but they took the main equipment away, but it all came back... we brought equipment back to what they were before.

(Site manager 428)

Underlying these tensions with the official bodies and former employers of Cold War structures, places and objects is a struggle, perhaps even an antagonism, over resources and the loss of control of the Cold War landscapes, structures and objects. These items, in return, become important objects in challenging marginalisation by the authorised discourse and stressing the legitimacy and significance through material practices that assert the values and meanings of Cold War heritage to an array of audiences. Nevertheless, the material practices by the site managers both subvert and reproduce conventional conceptualisations of what constitutes heritage, through defining their own version of the history of
the process of heritage and ensuring that their own role in ensuring the materialities is recognised.

7.2.3 Making meaning of Cold War heritage

The site managers all appear to construct experiences by the process of meaning-making for the visitors. What was identified from the interviews is that many site managers were critical about the visitors' levels of understandings about the Cold War and what was presented within the site. The responses illustrated that site managers assumed that the most frequent reasons for visiting were 'recreational' and based on feelings of 'curiosity'. For instance, initial comments about the experience often started with:

The main reason why people visit the site is because it's a day out...
The main core of the visitors here is Mr. and Mrs. Smith with Johnny and Lindsay who have just come for a day out. It is as simple as that.

(Site manager 131)

...families now and probably middle-aged couples who just want to see something different as opposed to – because they remember if they tend to see castles that is, then they come to you, they come out to see the bunker, because it's just a little bit different... Yeah. It is curiosity.

(Site manager 987)

They come here mainly out of either nostalgia or curiosity... I would say about 65% curiosity, and the other 35% as sort of nostalgia from WWII, all the way through. You know about national service in this country, which did not finish until 1960 or thereabouts. A lot of people have fond memories of those two years in their life or regretted not signing on.

(Site manager 701)
I think it is more than that: it is the secret of a bunker. It is a fairly universal cause that actually makes people interested, which you will find out with your questions...

(Site manager 428)

It is a secret, you are not meant to see this... People seem to be finding it really fascinating and really interesting.

(Site manager 305)

From the managers’ perspectives, the process and nature of meaning making that was shared with and between visitors varied between those who actually ‘lived through’ the Cold War or were directly connected to the Cold War events, and those who were ‘born after’ the Cold War or were ‘too young to remember’. Smith (2009a: 215) argues that, because the Cold War period is not deep in the past, it could be “more personal and personally relevant than authorised heritage tends to be”. Additionally, the sites display a period and events that are largely neglected within the authorised heritage discourse and conventional authorised accounts of British history and heritage, leaving more room for personal memories to surface and be revived. In this regard, site managers assumed that the first group visited the site for the sense of importance of memory and remembering, while the latter groups are believed to visit the site for entertainment and educational purposes, as the memories are no longer first-hand. Additionally, it was also thought that the educational aspect of the experience was stirred by the inclusion of the Cold War period in the National Curriculum:

We have lots of schools here. Every year, we are starting to get more and more schools here, because they make it part of their curriculum.

(Site manager 305)

They are increasing stage two, three and four, but they cannot afford - we have got a fair share of schools... [although] it seems that only the
private schools can afford it, so there is an element of economics that is affecting that as well.

(Site manager 428)

...it is the four-generation visit, they are quite important, because the older one, normally a woman, worked on the system during the war, will not talk about it. The family is keen to get her memories; because that is the way the world’s going at the moment. We do not like what is happening now; we will hark back to a better time. Hey, we will ask Granny. They come here, they have the tour, and suddenly she feels she can talk about it. In the tearoom there, you see the expression on the children’s faces when they are looking at Granny. “Did you really do this?”... Well, the younger people, because they are getting it at school now, and it is part of Key Stage III in the national curriculum, they are always keen to learn more... I can certainly detect a massive increase in interest from young people in their past who came to learn more, helped, of course, by the usual television programmes, you know, “Who do you think you are?” and all the ancestry movies and stats on the website from the government, I mean, that is constant.

(Site manager 701)

In the older people, maybe it sort of re-awakens the feelings that they had in the 1960s so they share lots of their personal experiences with you... In the younger generation, without – you know people of our age they might have lived through the Berlin Wall coming down but they were most interested in other 9 year olds and playing with their toys.

(Site manager 987)

While the site managers expressed different understandings of visitors prior to, during and resulting from their visit to the Cold War sites, they often forgot to identify and acknowledge the representative role and functions of the site that influence the construction of multiple meanings or readings of different audiences
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of the materialities represented at the site (Leopold, 2007). The Cold War sites themselves were regarded as encoded and static places ‘frozen in time’, discarding the idea that heritage is a process stirred by established management and conservation values and meanings, and that these remains, by passing on, also can (re-) construct and establish values and meanings for the visitors (Smith, 2009a).

It is a bunker as it would have been. It is a regional government headquarters, somewhere where some central government would have come to govern this region. This was the <sensitive information> bunker and so that is what we try to portray... So what I have tried to do is show how really basic it would have been here and it would have been... We tried to replace the things that were in here with the things that were in here...

(Site manager 428)

I have been in hundreds of bunkers. I have seen all of them. I have seen – I still see the ones that are secret just now. I have seen all the equipment that has been in them. I know where it goes. It is all the proper equipment that is here. It is all original, there’s nothing we’ve made up. Everything is original equipment, all the computers, everything is the same equipment. It has come straight back in. The same plotting boards, everything...

(Site manager 305)

However, a closer look at the transcripts also disclosed a certain degree of awareness of more nuanced and complex emotional processes that appear to be going on during the visit. The managers considered that the visit could provoke feelings of anxiety and apprehension when visitors were confronted with the impact and scale of the Cold War (and the site itself) and the destructive forces of nuclear warfare. In their responses, site managers referred to the visitors’ experiences as a valid opportunity to enter a world of concealment that was kept secret from the public for over 40 years. By doing so, the experience is believed to commemorate, rekindle and shape the personal and wider social meanings of the
Cold War past for constructing an understanding of today’s geographical boundaries and political forces:

It is a secret. You are not meant to see this site. We are peasants. If anything were to happen, we are to be fried; we are not important. It is all the ministers and important people in the world. We are cannon fodder... They [visitors] are really shocked, and they really cannot believe that this is 24,000 square feet of accommodation a hundred feet underground. They just find it fascinating that this was all here, and that they were above ground, and nobody knew about it. It was a secret... there’s so much here underground. It is so mind-blowing. Who could – the average peasant like me – afford something like this? ... So yes, it is an eye-opener for people to come down here and actually see what happened.

(Site manager 305)

The primary comment that is mostly made is “I did not know anything of this size was here and I need to come back because I cannot take it all in... So they need to come back and take it all in. That’s the primary feedback, is that obviously it is fascinating, it is very interesting, spooky...

(Site manager 131)

In line with the above comments, another important observation is that, although most managers at first assumed that visits to the site were based on merely recreational reasons, a stronger understanding surfaced that, although visitors were perhaps unaware of the history of the Cold War and the sites themselves, they did engage in a process of meaning making and remembrance. The memories and understandings that were constructed and negotiated during the visit were part of a process of forming ties and links to the past – either through personal experiences or collectively through the stories of family members who were part of the group. This also contributed to the notion of the site as a place of living
history with first-hand or family memories being shared and reconstructed by the visitors, instead of being regarded as a merely ‘static’ museum. However, the site managers did not always share this perception as they mentioned the site to be a representation of a specific and accurate setting in time, through which most visitors wander around as passive spectators with no direct or personal connections to their own pasts.

Instead, they regarded the site to be a place that would awaken values and meanings to help visitors critically evaluate, reflect and engage with a period in history that was deliberately kept away from public awareness and interference on various levels in society. In order to provide an ‘optimal’ experience, in many cases, objects and artefacts have been moved to the site rather than being ‘in situ’, although managers argue that this was legitimate to the visitors’ experiences. Based on their knowledge or enduring involvement with the site, most managers argued that it was foremost their expertise and knowledge that ensured the accuracy, validity and legitimacy of the material culture of the site that facilitated the active and creative process of heritage.

7.3 Implications and conclusions

Cold War heritage can be regarded as a complex cultural and social process within, and between, authorised institutions and experts, site managers and visitors. The site managers expressed their concerns regarding the apparent sense of ‘accepted neglect’ of Cold War history and heritage within the authorised heritage discourse, and which, they argued, was reflected by and constituted in practices of official bodies and institutions. This conscious perspective, sometimes stirred by a great deal of prior frustrations about ownership and regulations, reinforces the idea of Western and elite inherent cultural values that are tied to time depth, monumentality, expert knowledge and aesthetics. In this regard, from an authorised narrative and approach, all these criteria are believed to be absent from Cold War sites, making them less significant for conventional preservation, conservation, interpretation and management protocols and
guidelines. Although these practices define and empower the experiences and worldviews of dominant narratives about Cold War history, British society and culture, they are not exclusive in defining, and being part, of heritage.

On the contrary, in neglecting the Cold War period as heritage, a subaltern process stimulated by private and local initiatives has emerged. This professional discourse of ‘stewardship’ is not contesting the already existing narratives, values and cultural and social meanings of the Cold War; it is foremost promoting, implementing and affirming particular meaning, values and identities that justify and legitimise Cold War heritage, and, simultaneously, its own practices as part of the social and cultural processes that are heritage.

Nonetheless, despite the current absence of visible authorised practices, such as preservation and conservation protocols, guidelines and regulations, values and meanings are constructed based on the assertion that heritage is ‘physical’ and represented in the site, structures, objects and sometimes even the events that constitute Cold War history. Additionally, the values and ideologies that are constructed and affirmed by the site managers also render the cultural and social processes of heritage, as well as its mediation, to be tangible and self-evident.

The findings from the data illustrate that the processes in which site managers engage facilitates the assertion of more organically and individually motivated connections and expressions of identity that are intertwined with constructions of Cold War history and heritage. This active and personal interlinking of the Cold War past and the present with the process of identity formation has often become the basis of critical versions regarding the manager’s social, economic or political positions and experiences as opposed to conventional authorised powers. Heritage in this regard also becomes a personal discourse about how, and through which, meanings about human and material identities are constructed and legitimised, in order to become collective memories that can be ‘passed on’ to the wider public and future generations. Although this is a personal, and what some would call a ‘moral’, drive to preserve and manage these sites as tourist attractions for people
to visit, it is also a necessity to generate financial resources to maintain the sites for personal uses and to be passed on to family descendants.

Memory and remembering are important themes in the managers’ understandings of the process and concept of heritage. The sites are believed to offer a safe environment where visitors wander around to create an understanding and construct meanings about the Cold War and its events (see also Chapter 4.2). As a way of moral responsibility, the idea is that by offering a static and symbolic account of the site and displayed Cold War items, visitors are given the opportunity to step back in time and ‘observe’ the events and uses of the site in a particular time in history. This also implies that the site managers believe they have the ability to control how experiences are remembered and the meanings that are constructed from these remembrances. This approach also privileged and authorised the managers’ material practices, manifestations and consequences. As self-referential and self-evident discourses, the managers expressed the need to construct a material reality within the bunker, as in most cases the bunkers were emptied of their contents before, or just after, they were purchased and converted into heritage sites. Claims about the material practices, consisting of bringing back and replacing items ‘as it would have been’, were made to legitimise and construct the discourse, as well as to establish the way in which visitors would talk about, discuss and understand the things that constitute Cold War heritage.

People visiting the Cold War sites, despite at first being regarded by many of the managers as enjoying a leisurely activity of a ‘nice day out’, seem to be engaging with acts of meaning making and remembrance. The experiences vary amongst the age groups and are multi-layered, as the sites provoke both a sense of anxiety and reverence about the scale and possibly destructive impact of the Cold War events and the site itself. It could also be that the visit roused feelings of exclusion, as ‘ordinary’ people would not have been able to access, and were kept unaware of the existence of, these underground bunkers. Therefore, most site managers regarded the site as being a place that would awaken values and meanings to help visitors critically evaluate, reflect and engage with a period in
history that was deliberately kept away from public awareness and interference. Nevertheless, due to their knowledge or enduring involvement with the site, many of the managers seemed to show modest concerns about the active role and engagement of visitors in the construction and negotiation of meanings, rendering it solely a subject of management practices.
Chapter 8 - Visitor constructions of Cold War heritage (and) tourism

In addition to displaying the data generated within this study on the constructions of Cold War heritage (and) tourism by the site managers at five selected Cold War sites, this chapter now discusses the data, both quantitative and qualitative, that was generated from the visitors. As detailed in Chapter 6, the data generation methods and emphasis employed for the visitors varied in range and scope. Resultantly, the data generated from the visitors is analysed and displayed within an embedded design (see Chapter 6, section 6.2), giving primary attention to the qualitative in-depth interviews.

The chapter begins with an overview of background information regarding the sites, including ownership, opening hours and organisational structure. To avoid confusion, the subsequent sections are structured using the key themes and sub themes that were constructed from the visitors’ responses regarding the process of Cold War heritage through the (re-)construction of knowledge, position, identity and relations with others and the material during their visit. The aim of this chapter is to move beyond the authorised discourses put in place by the site managers and to explore what the experiences of heritage through visiting a Cold War site mean, and how these meanings are constructed during the visit. In addition, the themes and sub themes are discussed in more detail within the sections and subsections in this chapter. Finally, the chapter concludes by presenting a theoretical proposition that illumes the meanings of visitors regarding Cold War heritage (and) tourism.
8.1 Demographic characteristics

To ensure the comprehensiveness of the data file for the demographic analysis only the data from questionnaires was analysed and included. Although the interview transcripts also include data about general characteristics such as age and gender, this data was derived from a different method and had too many errors and missing data. Based on the information generated from the questionnaires completed by 251 questionnaire participants (with the exclusion of those under 18), the data indicated that 141 males and 109 females participated in the study, and that there was one participant who did not indicate his/her gender. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 70 years and older, divided into six groups (group 1: 18-29 years; group 2: 30-39 years; group 3: 40-49 years; group 4: 50-59 years; group 5: 60-69 years; group 6: 70 and >70). Scores were reasonable normally distributed for both gender variables, with most scores occurring in the centre, tapering outwards to extremes (Table 12).
### Table 12  Demographic characteristics of participants, by age and education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (per group)</th>
<th>Frequency Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency Males</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency Females</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-29 (group 1)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 (group 2)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 (group 3)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 (group 4)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 (group 5)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+ (group 6)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency Males</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency Females</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth form</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical / vocational college</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University undergraduate level</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University postgraduate level</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From interrogation into the level of education, it appeared there was a significant
difference between males and females in terms of age groups and education.
Therefore, a two-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to
explore the impact of sex and age on the level of education. It was not possible to
determine the effect for an exact age in years, as this variable was divided into
groups (see Table 12). The output showed that the interaction effect between sex
and age group was not statistically significant (1.23). When reviewing the effects
independently for sex and age on education, there was no statistically significant
main effect for age (.620), but there was a significant main effect for sex (.033).
This means that there is no difference in age groups, but there appears to be a
difference in scores for males and females in terms of levels of education. These
results suggest that male participants were more highly educated than female
participants in the study.

When analysing the data related to the visit to the Cold War site, the majority of
the participants were first-time visitors (84 per cent), leaving only 16 per cent of
those included in the survey identifying themselves as repeat visitors at the site at
which they were surveyed. Of the 251 respondents, only 188 specified whether
they were part of a heritage or military organisation related to the Cold War
bunker. Of those that answered the question, 58 per cent indicated that they were
not a member of any organisation, and only 19 per cent were members of English
Heritage, and 7 per cent were members of a military related organisation (such as
veterans’ association, military association or armed forces association).
Surprisingly, 11 per cent of those responding to the question filled in ‘other’, and
identified themselves mainly as members of the National Trust. Based on a cross
tabulation it appears that there is no significant relationship between membership
of an association and how many times individuals undertake repeat visits.

8.2 Constructing discourse themes
As the study progressed, a number of cultural and social themes and sub-themes
were constructed (also see Chapter 7, section 7.2). In contrast to the previous
chapter, this chapter will discuss the themes relating to the visitor discourses of Cold War heritage (and) tourism (Table 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governing Cold War heritage (and) tourism</td>
<td>Disconnectedness and unfamiliarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastoral stewardship and negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings of privilege and humbleness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialising Cold War heritage (and) tourism</td>
<td>Geographical connectedness and sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical representation and reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings of discomfort and exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making meaning of Cold War heritage (and) tourism</td>
<td>Experiencing the ‘Cold War’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive reflections, meanings and memories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alterations of ‘being’ and the nature of identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.2.1 Governing Cold War heritage**

Although the participants were not specifically asked about the meaning of the word ‘heritage’, they were asked about their motivations for visiting, and the meanings and accuracy of the site they had visited. It is surprising, at first, to see that interviewees, similar to the managers’ responses, identified the most important reasons for visiting as recreational, including responses such as “a day out” (PT157, male, 48 years, visiting with son), “seemed to be a nice place” (PT165, male, 76 years, visiting with friend). Of the 244 respondents that provided their reasons for visiting in the survey, the most frequent (and overlapping) reasons for visiting a Cold War site were an interest in history (40 per cent), curiosity (12 per cent) and educational purposes (11 per cent). These reasons were also frequently expressed during the in-depth interviews, as illustrated:
Well, more for my husband really. He’s interested in the military.

(PT148, female, 71 years, visiting with husband)

It’s kind of a day out but you know, learning, it’s just a kind of education about the bunker and its past.

(PT142, male, 50 years, with girlfriend)

I don’t know, really. A day out, education for the kids, I think that’s all really.

(PT148, male, 55 years, visiting with wife and sons)

Curiosity I suppose, you know.

(PT160, male, 54 years, visiting with relatives)

Yeah, so explore, eh, because, I heard there was a bunker here but not actually what was inside it, I don’t think.

(PT156, male, 22 years, visiting with girlfriend)

Curiosity really, I think I should say, yes...

(PT144, female, 67 years, visiting with a friend)

Although 68 per cent of the participants claimed to be aware of the site, 41 per cent simultaneously stated their knowledge about the site was limited, and restricted to minimal general knowledge (28 per cent) and awareness of the site’s existence or location (17 per cent). These self-proclaimed non-expert uses of Cold War heritage reinforce the top-down relationship of the site managers, the Cold War site and the visitors, in which the managers ‘translates’ the site and its meanings to the ‘passive’ and ‘unaware’ visitor. These reasons could also explain the use of information sources prior to the visit, including the Internet (22 per cent), visitor centres or tourist information centres (18 per cent) and, on a more personal level, friends and relatives (15 per cent).
These social meanings of the visit as primarily a 'nice day out' do not necessarily indicate a 'passive' act of recreation and leisure without cultural and social meaning, or solely the work of the site managers to disengage 'the past' from the visitors; it can also symbolise an person's disconnectedness with the Cold War past as such (see Chapter 3). This disengagement, illustrated by 42 per cent of the survey participants who stated that they had no personal connection with the Cold War, however, indirectly contributes to the public and professional view that expert judgements and stewardship over the Cold War past should not be contested, and that the management and interpretation of its remains are 'safe' in the custody of the site managers. This also aligns, as Chapter 7 illustrated, with the idea of heritage being taken on by the site managers as an act of managing and constructing the nature of visitors' 'Cold War heritage experience' with the help of management and conservation practices. Through this heritage process, people as passive receptors (Smith, 2009a) are initially directed in their constructions of the Cold War with the 'help' of sources, items and objects prior to and during the visit to a Cold War site.

Furthermore, it appeared that for many, especially the older participants who were born, grew up, or lived through the era (24 per cent of the survey participants), the Cold War was often reminisced as something that just 'happened' to them, as the events were too intangible to grasp, influence or understand in the past and present. This in turn resulted in the visit to the Cold War site often being (one of) the first tangible encounters to explore the militarised aspects of the conflict and to 'actively' rewrite cultural and social meanings into their personal or family memories. As one participant observed, “this isn't an [tourist] escape: this is a shock, a nuclear reality” (PT147, male, 75 years). Interwoven with this, many considered the visit to the Cold War site as a rare opportunity to enter a 'concealed domain' and to consume the material items (from which many felt they were deliberately kept away) to help them jog their memories, or to use as props to tell the story about their own or their parents' lives and experiences. These senses of 'clandestineness' of the site remained a pervasive and emotional theme that underlined the importance of the Cold War heritage constructions during the visit to the Cold War sites. The rareness and mysteriousness of this opportunity, even
though the sites are now open to the public, significantly influenced feelings of humbleness in relation to the site, (the role it played during the) Cold War events, and the people that worked there. For instance:

I was surprised at how big it was. I was surprised at how many people actually worked here. I was surprised I’ve never seen anything about it on TV or anything… The fact that all this was here without anybody knowing it was here… I didn’t realise the government was really taking it that seriously that they would build nuclear bunkers all over the country for something that hasn’t happened.

(PT167, female, age mid-forties)

I was just overcome by the sheer size of it, of the capacity of information, everything that had to be thought of, in fact, because people had to survive here… It does bring home the reality of the age and the things that possibly could have taken place…

(PT147, male, 29 years)

Well it was – showed people having to live in these conditions, you know, just to sort of monitor what was going on with maybe no chance of ever coming out of it...

(PT151, male, 66 years)

As part of the processes of remembering from first-hand memories and second-hand reactionary responses, for some the act of visiting a Cold War site was already in itself a statement or way of contributing to the process of conservation and depicting social history. In practice this contribution takes place in terms of paying admissions fees, membership contributions and by considering the visit as legitimate proof that the Cold War remains ‘matter’:
For something that’s got to be kept out, it’s important for the people to know what went on in the past. Everybody knows castles, art galleries, whatever, it’s important to see it, whatever.

(PT155, male, 64 years)

It is in a way that all heritage sites are, you know, museums and things, yeah it is [a heritage site]

(PT169, male, 67 years)

... I think it should be on a map, because it’s a really unique location...

(PT157, male, 48 years)

You know, it’s something that I feel a lot of people would like to see and know about.

(PT162, Male, 55 years)

And it isn’t in the guidebooks that I am aware of. And I think that’s a shame.

(PT163, male, 63 years)

Although first-hand memories were limited in both the interviews and the surveys, implying that authorised heritage becomes a form of social control instructed and governed by the site managers (Hollinshead, 1997: 186) and used for the “promotion of selective memory or nostalgia” (Walsh, 1992: 98), this does not acknowledge the influence of the actual visit in the construction of meanings, values and identities, either actively or passively within or opposed to the professional heritage discourses. Furthermore, this perception underestimates the influence of already existing memories, experiences and expectations, whether unconsciously or actively present, in relation to the visit. The appeal of conserving the Cold War sites, expressed through the act of visiting, already suggests that there is a sense of participation from visitors in negotiating meanings and adding values to the Cold War remains as part of a personal, military or British history.
Analysis of the transcripts indicated that the interviewees extended their ideas of heritage beyond those things that were ‘old’, grand, monumental and aesthetically pleasing. Although the authorised discourse was still present in providing the physical parameters of previous events, the concept of heritage was pressed to include aspects of intangible heritage alongside material elements of the site, such as values, memories, traditions, ways of life and identity constructions. As participant PT168 (male, 39 years, visiting with parents, wife and son) expressed: “Well, for my family to all see what my background was [interviewee worked at the site]. I mean, I did this since I was eighteen years old, up until 2005. This really is a bit of a step back in time for myself, really.”

Both the emphasis on the intangible heritage and the acceptance of authorised accounts of heritage placed upon visitors by the site managers are noteworthy elements in the responses made by the interviewees about their visit. Although the majority of participants found it difficult to express deeper motivations for visiting the site, or initially identify strong links between their personal connections and the Cold War or the site, the visit did evoke memories, meanings and a sense of place.

8.2.2 Materialising Cold War heritage

As mentioned in the previous section, heritage for many visitors is more than a physical thing or place; it is a cultural process including aspects of memory, meaning making and remaking. However, heritage does more than simply construct or represent sets of identities and memories; it also helps to define one’s ‘place’ or ‘sense of belonging’ (Smith, 2009a) and helps with positioning one’s self in a cultural, social and physical world. Within this study participants indicated that intangible acts and performances were connected to a sense of place about the site. Not only did the site contribute to a geographical sense of space or a ‘constructed reality’, it also contributed to a ‘category of thought’ through the negotiation and alteration of visitors’ thoughts about the Cold War events (Escobar, 2001: 140). In a geographical sense, visitors placed the physical reality
of the site not solely within a local or national context: “it was close to where we live” (PT154, male, 54 years, visiting with sons) and “I live only a mile away” (PT163, male, 63 years, sole visitor), but also internationally, as one participant noted: “looking around here today, you realise we were really heavily involved, and the threat was as real for us as it was for America” (PT145, male, 19 years, visiting with friend).

This study recognises the current debate (see, for example, Kjeldstadli, 2008: 181) about the dominant assumption that heritage is connected to the geographical closeness of visitors, and that geographical distance implies lower levels of cultural connections (see also Chapter 4, section 4.3). Although the assumptions within this study exclude diasporas, movement of displacement by (groups of) people and influences of globalised means of transportation, participants in the survey were asked to provide details of their address of residence for geographical mapping (see Appendix 12). Although cultural or emotional links might not necessarily be determined by geographical proximity, the maps illustrate that the majority of the participants live relatively close to the Cold War site. Furthermore, observations of the maps illustrate that those participants that did come from abroad were all ‘Western’ tourists, such as those from America, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands, France and Spain. Although no definitive claims can be made within this study, findings suggest that visits to the sites could be encouraged by, and as part of, an authorised heritage discourse that promotes Western values and ideologies. Or, alternatively, and more likely within the context of this study, the diversity of links and associations with the Cold War sites are connected to the visitors’ emotional or cultural values and meanings, such as personal memories about the Cold War events or growing up or working at a (similar) Cold War site.

The idea of geographical proximity also links to the argument in heritage studies about the rather restrictive term ‘site’; an indication of location and locales that complies with archaeological, aesthetic and monumental values imposed on them by the authorised institutions and experts. Within this study I have (deliberately)
adopted the term 'site', and included the term throughout my data generation phase to learn how participants associated themselves with a sense of place constructed within and by the Cold War site. This idea of place invoked a sense of belonging about where participants lived, came from, and where they felt they belonged, allowing for the construction of shared experiences of the Cold War events, or at least the visit, and an anchor of continuity about the physicality of the Cold War place. For instance:

I came here when I was a wee boy so I had forgotten the place existed until, you know, the place was opened up some [time ago].

(PT147, male, 29 years, visiting with girlfriend)

An unusual place you wouldn't normally go to so it, yeah, it's a quite interesting place. I wouldn't like to live here though…

(PT154, male, 54 years, visiting with sons)

I lived here from 1969 and I remember when they were just government buildings and it was hidden away. You didn't know it was there.

(PT163, male, 63 years, sole visitor)

Furthermore, the materiality of the Cold War site is also assumed to provide a physical representation and reality of the meanings and 'messages' that are placed upon it. The construction of categories of thoughts was initially explored by asking participants in the survey to indicate their feelings elicited by the visit; what 'being' in the Cold War site meant to them and how the physical environment guided, assisted or affected them during their visit. Out of 247 responses, guided panels (35 per cent), signs (24 per cent) and audio guides (17 per cent) were most frequently mentioned by the participants. For instance, during the interview participants noted:
I would say it was very informative [guides and information panels]. It was in-depth enough for visitors I think, obviously it was kept simplistic.

(PT168, male, 39 years, visiting with parents, wife and child)

The boards are very good and I think the audio guide could have been included in the admission pricing... It’s lovely to look around, but the audio guide is quite necessary to piece together to see why they were there instead of [just] looking at a formal state room...

(PT147, male, 29 years)

Well, just seeing that and seeing the photographs of the different rooms et cetera is sort of, you know, it looks right I would say.

(PT151, male, 66 years)

...every room we went into, [had] a proper display board. I thought it was good... I think they ought to put only limited things on display, we were only seeing a part of it.

(PT159, male, 60 years)

Although the initial responses for visiting Cold War sites revealed the more apparent internal connections, a further analysis of the data sets resulted in a more complex social set of experiences connected to a sense of place that were constructed through acts of ‘being’ during the visit. When asked about the experience of ‘being’ at the Cold War site, through questions related to feelings and what they would remember most about the visit, a strong awareness of the Cold War site as an unknown, secret and concealed place arose. Initially, the survey participants were asked to tick a list of aspects that had affected their experiences during their visit. Based on a multiple response analysis, sounds (23 per cent), exterior (16 per cent) and smells (15 per cent) were most frequently mentioned. When linked to responses from those who participated in the interviews, these aspects could be linked to a sense of unfamiliarity with the
place, although this does not necessarily indicate that personal memories are not activated through the visit:

...the things that you hear coming over the speakers [sounds], it can sort of bring – take you back in time, if you like, to you know, to what it might have been like in some respects.

(PT162, male, 55 years, visiting with wife and children)

...even if you’re blindfolded, you know you’re in one [bunker] because there’s a certain temperature that your body recognises and there’s certain smells that are quite evocative...

(PT161, male, 56 years, visiting with friends)

When you are in those rooms...with an audio guide and everything, it [being there] takes you back and you feel like you’re actually there, and that smell is – the smell of old things, and things that we didn’t know about makes it more interesting...

(PT146, female, 56 years, visiting with son and grandson)

The smell – yeah the smell, smelled musty sort of.

(PT154, male, 54 years, visiting with sons)

...so if someone were to ask me about it [the visit], you know, [I would tell them], it was dark, tell them about the depth and the thickness of the concrete and all those kind of things.

(PT147, male, 29 years, visiting with girlfriend)

Just the physical aspect – I can’t even image, what, say 600 people in it, imagine it be pretty cramped.

(PT156, male, 22 years, visiting with girlfriend)
Not only did people feel confronted with the physical discomforts, such as the constant temperature, particular smells and closed setting of the place, there were also social discomforts, and instead of experiencing senses of nostalgia towards a past that was ‘better’ people often felt confronted with their ‘outsider’ position and ‘powerlessness’ against the dominant policies of war. These more-than-representational experiences do not imply that all those that expressed ‘senses of discomfort’ were emotionally disengaged with the Cold War site; on the contrary, on numerous occasions participants responded passionately about their rejection of, and segregation from, the Cold War symbolism at the site because “if you’re not important, you didn’t deserve it, pretty much...and we paid all the taxes” (PT156, male, 22 years). More likely, this discomfort was about being confronted with the inequality and unlikelihood of ‘common people’ surviving an actual nuclear attack, which created important effects of the visit – aspects shared both in the survey and interviews. As participants noted: “…what we’ve seen today is that the wimpy survivors would be government officials, while the rest of society was obliterated…” (PT169, male, 67 years), and “…only a very small portion of the whole population would survive and that would only be the politically elite. So yes, that was quite, quite scary in a way when you think about it like that” (PT154, male, 54 years). In some responses participants even expressed feelings of sympathy for those who were permitted access into the bunkers in case of an attack; for example:

But so even if it actually happened, I wouldn’t like to be the hiding prime minister here. It would be a woeful slow death.

(PT160, male, 54 years)

…it was a working environment and not – they must have been scared to death sometimes.

(PT169, male, 67 years)

It must have been mundane but when the [bomb] – you know, yeah, it must have been under bare pressure.

(PT143, male, 49 years)
...you would survive down here which is something, [but] what you’d come up to is another thing.

(PT154, male, 54 years)

Even though a few participants did not positively respond to the Cold War site, as PT158 (female, 71 years) noted: “I really think it is quite sad that humankind has to have a place like this in the middle of a beautiful countryside”. Conversely, interview participants did frequently express the importance of the site for other visitors as a way of understanding and learning from the past, in a more educational sense, as participants noted:

I admire those people that are keeping it open. They do really well. And it should stay open, shouldn’t it, for people to see, for the younger generations?

(PT143, male, 49 years)

...most children should be allowed to come to places like this just to give them an idea of what it is like in the not-too-distant past so it’s more – I see it more as public information rather than a tourist attraction, actually.

(PT147, male, 29 years)

Intertwined with feelings of discomfort and dissonance was a strong, yet somewhat opposing, ‘sense of astonishment’, as people expressed their amazement about the magnitude and size, and perhaps most important of all, the actual existence of the place. The Cold War site was regarded to be a place that could tell its visitors how ‘the secret world’ operated, and what happened outside of the scope of ‘ordinary’ life; for instance:

I found it fascinating. It was a bit of an eye-opener in certain areas. It really is pretty big, but I am surprised at how small it is as well and
how few people they expected to maintain the country and things like that.

(PT157, male, 48 years)

The above stances, one more critical than the other, illustrate the affect of the Cold War site, their (underground) setting and atmosphere, to facilitate an active engagement of visitors with the messages about the British nation and society. Although understandings of the Cold War or the sites they were visiting were perceived to be limited, when asked what the visit had contributed, 30 per cent of the responses included increased knowledge about the Cold War events and period that was passed on through the visit. In this regard, despite being governed by an authorised discourse, this process of passing on and receiving memories and knowledge within, and through, the physical reality of the place helped visitors to arrange, shape and negotiate a range of links and associations about who they 'are' and their 'place' in this world, both within a geographical and social context. The next section goes beyond examining visitors' experiences of place, and identifies how experiences are furthermore created by and expressed through acts of remembrance and feelings of belonging that are related to processes of meaning making and identity construction.

8.2.3 Making meaning of Cold War heritage

The sense of place constructed within, and by, the Cold War sites enforces the idea of experiencing the Cold War, of being 'granted permission' to enter, and of being part of, or include, a previously closed part of everyday life into one's memories - whether or not the experience of Cold War symbolism was regulated by the site manager. The idea of heritage as an act of meaning making, instead of being a one-way communication, is something that is not often recognised by the site managers. Visitors' experiences with Cold War heritage, as discussed in Chapter 7, section 7.2.3, are defined by the managers as passive outcomes of arranged values, meanings and understandings. However, despite a limited level of knowledge about the Cold War or the specific site prior to the visit, people did
seem to construct and negotiate their own sense of being in place as experiencing the moment of 'heritage' (Smith, 2009a). By referring to the place in past and present tenses, visitors were actively inscribing the experiences during the visit into their identities, and vice versa; which in turn became the starting point for, or critical observations about, their personal social, economic or political position within a constructed, contemporary reality.

I would say it's told me a lot about the Cold War and probably made me realise how recent it was and how involved we were as a nation.

(PT145, male, 19 years, visiting with friend)

I thought “My God. In so many minutes —” and you just think you know, we were going about our lives, and all this was going on, and we hadn't got a clue, you know?

(PT146, female 56, visiting with son and grandson)

We didn’t realise how much actually went on here, which you don’t really know because there are people doing this sort of job. You don’t know how much involved – what actually went on, naturally to see some of the kit now and yes it’s really – you don’t realise how much went on just to do one job, you know what I mean?

(PT143 male 49, visiting with girlfriend)

The linking of the past with present experiences contributed to active performances of identity creation. Through the process of meaning making, constructions of place and identity are formed, and influenced by, the process of negotiation, although there was a sense that many participants seemed to agree with the current regulation and governing of the sites and the way they were managed and interpreted for visitors. This also aligns with the argument by Fish (1990: 186), as he states that this is to some extent also inevitable, as visitors encounter and enter a place in which already a ‘system of intelligibility’, based on historical and socio-cultural influences, is in place.
As Chapter 4 illustrated, memory and the process of remembering are important concepts in understanding the process of heritage. In this, visits to Cold War sites appear to be less about the rehearsal of collective memories or experiences, as the majority of participants indicated having no direct connections or memories about this era of the past, with the exception of specific events directly related to the Cold War. For instance, participant PT163 (male, sole visitor) noted: “No, nothing really. I can [only] remember living through the Cuban Crisis, I suppose.” The sense of historical realism and humbleness was more connected to the construction of ‘new’ memories with the Cold War past, as ties and links to the past – either related to family or collective memories, were not always (actively) present or recognised during the interview:

- and the [inaudible 00:02:18] and things and also it didn’t really – it didn’t really touch our lives, it honestly didn’t.

  (PT169, male, 67 years, visiting with friend)

Well it always was, as I said when we were kids, we grew up with that, that sort of cloud, you know. But that stuff was going on unnoticeable through our daily lives, all living in London.

  (PT160, male, 54 years, visiting with relatives)

As a child, I think probably I was better off not knowing about it, to be quite honest with you, because when you listen to what some of the gentlemen have to say and how quickly something could have happened, then I think I was probably better off not knowing, to be quite honest.

  (PT166, female, 51 years, visiting with partner)

Where first-hand experiences of family memories were absent, reflections of the visit were made in a present context by drawing on other personal experiences. Meanings and values that visitors constructed, negotiated and engaged with during their visit were (part of) an active process through which they critically
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reflected upon the present and future, especially in terms of social and political insecurities, global shifts in power and their own ‘being’:

You suddenly realise that probably we are living in a false paradise. It [a nuclear war] is still possible.

(PT165, male, 76 years, visiting with friend)

It doesn’t anger me and I’m not going to feel frightened about it now, because things change, technology changes; there’s probably another threat that I don’t know about...

(PT166, female, 51 years, visiting with partner)

...it might possibly be used [nuclear bombs] again in the future which is best now doubtful.

(PT160, male, 54 years, visiting with relatives)

The legitimacy, validity or significance of the site as a ‘place of memory’ where visitors could negotiate and engage with the material culture, even though materials had come from other places instead of being in situ, were important in exploring and experiencing Cold War history. The ‘doing’ of the visit, and the ‘being’ at the site, entwined with the process of memory making or remembrances, are the emotional experiences or (subtle) performances through which visitors emotionally, cognitively or imaginably engaged with the site. As Bagnall (2003: 88) noted, visitors at museums “required that the sites generated emotionally authentic responses”, which ensured that the meanings, values, memories and identities that are (re)constructed are ‘real’ and ‘authentic’ and engendered for many real feelings and emotions that helped to legitimise and embed the experiences in the lives of visitors.

For the majority of the participants (61 per cent) in the questionnaire, the symbolic accounts of the Cold War at the site were perceived to be accurate and genuine. This does not mean that the visit was authenticated through a notion of
time or expert concerns for ‘accuracy’ (Smith, 2009a), but rather the visit was reviewed on the legitimacy and relevance of the constructed meanings on people’s lives. For instance, when asked about whether or not they believed the site to be an accurate, or authentic, representation of the Cold War past, respondents gave the following comments on their experiences and memories:

I’ve seen what I seen and I want to see that’s what happened and that’s what went on. I don’t know because I have nothing to compare it with. So I’m going to assume that it is, yes. It could be a lot of garbage couldn’t it, really? But I think it highly unlikely.

(PT144, female, 67 years, visiting with friend)

Obviously all the models are here and, but everything that’s especially in the plan room, everything looks original; it’s not plucked from obscurities. You’re so used to seeing museums or places that are made up, but this place is actually real. It’s not just been built to show people what it might have been like. This would have been a canteen; it’s not fake.

(TP147, male 29 years, visiting with girlfriend)

Yes, I do, yeah, yeah. From what I already know about it and what I’ve read, yes, I would say so.

(PT148, male, 55 years, visiting with wife and sons)

Oh yeah, definitely, I mean it would certainly be accurate. Yeah, there’s no question of that.

(PT153, female, 27 years, visiting with parent)

8.3 Implications and conclusion

Although participants were not directly asked about their understanding of the word ‘heritage’, they were asked about their motivations behind the visit. Similar
to the initial responses of the site managers, the majority of respondents, both in the questionnaire and the in-depth interviews, regarded the visit as a recreational or leisure activity, 'as a nice day out'. The sites were visited for overlapping reasons, such as an interest in history, curiosity and educational purposes, especially as many participants noted having no first-hand memories, not even among those who indicated they were born, grew up, or had lived through the Cold War era. This was stirred up by, or influenced by, overall feelings of disengagement and they therefore believed that the stewardship and professional view of the Cold War representations at the sites should not directly be contested. For older participants, the Cold War was in many cases perceived as something that happened 'to' them, as the events were too intangible to grasp, influence or understand, in the past and the present. As this was (one of) the first encounters with the militarised aspects of the Cold War, many regarded this as a unique opportunity to enter a previously 'concealed world'. This privilege, often expressed in feelings of humbleness, also prompted the support for the role of, and efforts made by, the site managers as stewards of the Cold War past.

Although visitors supported the sole ownership by site managers and the selective representations of the Cold War and events, this does not mean that visitors did not, actively or passively, engage with or negotiate the idea of 'heritage' as a physical and passive subject of management practices. On the contrary, the appeal to conserve the site and to promote it to other people already suggests a sense of participation from the visitors in negotiating meanings and adding values to the Cold War history as part of a broader, collective, military or British history. Although the traditional parameters of 'heritage' were still defined by the site managers, its borders were pressed to include the visit within people’s existing meanings, memories, values, ways of life and identity constructions.

One way of engaging with the site was through connecting it to the concept of space and place-making practices (see also Chapter 2, section 2.3). Within a geographical context, the majority of the visitors lived relatively close to the Cold War sites, indicating the Cold War site to be one of the 'last' spaces to be
anchored within visitors’ sense of place and belonging. Furthermore, when asked about what ‘being’ at the site meant, a strong awareness of the secrecy of, and resultantly an unfamiliarity with, the site from everyday life arose. This, once again, does not necessarily indicate that personal or collective meanings and memories were not (re-)activated through the experiences at the site. On the contrary; not only did people experience physical discomforts, such as being in a cold, damp and underground environment, they also noted feelings of social discomfort when confronted with the inequality and unlikelihood of ‘common people’ surviving a nuclear attack. The site managers also express this division between the government and the public, yet their approach varies from the fact that they are more frustrated about the current neglect of the physical buildings as part of British ‘heritage’. Intertwined with this sense of discomfort was a strong, yet somewhat opposing, sense of astonishment from visitors who expressed their amazement over its actual existence, size and magnitude.

Despite having little knowledge about the Cold War era or events prior to the visit, visitors did appear to construct and negotiate the experience as being or becoming part of their personal and collective memories and identities. By negotiating and legitimising their own sense of being at a Cold War site, visitors experience the moments of ‘heritage’ as inscribing (new) memories and meaning into their identity, and therefore also changing the nature of that identity. In doing so they (some more critically than others) reflected upon the past, present and future, especially in terms of their own place, and that of others in the world.
Chapter 9 - Conclusion

This work was inspired by Smith’s (2009a) idea that there is an ‘authorised heritage discourse’ in Britain that takes its cue from the grand narratives of Western-orientated, national and elite class experiences. Informed by Ruskin’s philosophy and the English conservation ethos of ‘conserve as found’, this self-referential discourse reinforces the idea that historic sites, buildings, objects and monuments ought to be protected and managed for education and understanding of the general public as physical representations of national identity and ‘proper’ taste and achievement. Governed and controlled by bodies of ‘experts’, state-sanctioned agencies and international institutions, such as English Heritage, the National Trust, ICOMOS and UNESCO, the heritage discourse carries power, and legitimises, over what is ‘old’, grand, monumental or aesthetically pleasing enough to be termed ‘heritage’. Through often bolstering and privileging the elite, upper class, European, white and educated expert and professional judgements and stewardship over ‘the past’, this self-referential discourse reflects and is reflected by grand narratives of the British nation based on class, gender, and locality.

9.1 Revisiting the study’s aim and objectives

I acknowledge that the above passage can be regarded as a provocative summary of the authorised discourse, and might overlook the various intensities of authorisation, and that the discourse is more nuanced and changeable over time and space. Nevertheless, the subjectivity of the discourse, as illustrated throughout this work, remains contested. To capture the idea of heritage, Chapter 2 sought to demonstrate how heritage is utilised, mutated and challenged as a political negotiation of identity, values, meanings, memories and ideologies, which aims to underpin people’s sense of, and belonging to, a certain place or events of ‘heritage’. However, during the process the links are often lost and obscured by
the very nature of the authorised discourse. This is not only because of its focus on objective expert knowledge and the characterisation of heritage as a ‘thing’ that must be treasured for future generations, but also because it continues to constitute and mediate individual perspectives on who is ‘capable’ enough to assert, negotiate and affirm the past that we adopt in the present, within everyday lives and local surroundings. Surprisingly, however, Chapter 3 illustrated that within the context of Cold War heritage, it appeared that the way of governing Cold War heritage by bodies of ‘experts’, such as English Heritage, relies heavily on placing it within the category of ‘accepted neglect’. Cold War sites, buildings, places and artefacts within the authorised discourse are not identified as ‘old’, grand, monumental or aesthetically pleasing, and therefore the power of ignoring is promoted; putting in place beliefs of ‘benign neglect’ and ‘natural decay’ to justify the lack of scheduling and active conservation legislations. However, placing complete blame on the authorised institutions would be denying the practical challenges that are involved in the heritage process, as the broad choice and geographical scale of remains to be designated exceeds the managing capacity of the authorised institutions. Due to the swift ending of the Cold War and the incessant levels of secrecy and concealment, responding to the increasing rates of material remains and cataloguing what was being released as the Cold War ‘past’ has proved to be highly problematic even for the judgements of experts.

As a reaction to the authorised discourse, Chapters 2 and 3 also illustrated the existence and efforts of several subaltern heritage initiatives in Britain, such as Common Ground and the funding stream ‘Local Heritage Initiative’ (LHI). These groups ‘work from below’ as well as within the authorised discourse and both (although in different degrees) explore and develop the concept of ‘local distinctiveness’ in heritage. These external participants in the heritage process, and forerunners of counter hegemonic constructions of the past, as well as some experts operating within the authorised discourse, can obtain the facilitative power to alter and broaden the definitions about the nature and meaning of ‘heritage’. In this regard, it is impossible to overlook the respectable intentions and positive outcomes of both external and internal active engagement, as it has opened up the
debate and created possibilities to express individual views of what constitutes heritage. However, because of the professional interference and tangible focus on specific aspects, though in various degrees, the intentions by individual practitioners, communities and non-experts is to continue to work from within the dominant heritage discourse instead of from without. This makes it even more necessary to escape from an easy reliance on the (questionable) dualism of subaltern/authorised discourses in heritage (and) tourism. The literature has showed that the various definitions of heritage and the language that is used to structure and justify the management practices of conservation, preservation and interpretation all have similar consequences in terms of promoting the power of the authorised discourse.

In this regard, the authorised discourse of ‘accepted neglect’ is also shaped and altered, but most of all confirmed, by subaltern cultural values tied to time depth, monumentality, expert knowledge, and aesthetics among different groups, communities, and individuals. The literature review has demonstrated the ways in which the political and cultural ‘work’ done by authorised bodies influences, and is influenced by, ‘lay’ knowledge and interest from subaltern and alternative discourses as they assert their own view of Cold War heritage and identity in the power struggle over heritage. A prominent example is provided by the society Subterranea Britannica (Sub Brit), which has developed itself from a group of enthusiasts into an ally and source of information for the dominant discourse that is controlled and implemented by English Heritage. Through promoting and encouraging the scheduling of underground sites, including Cold War sites and structures, the society aims to enhance the acknowledgment of the advisory body by, and relationship with, English Heritage. Although the nature of the aspirations differ from those of English Heritage, the attempts by Sub Brit strengthen and reinforce the extent to which the authorised discourse and English Heritage as its regulatory agency are naturalised through the mutual commitment and fellowship that represent ‘good sense’. The Oxford Trust for Contemporary Heritage (OTCH) is another active body that has emphasised its expertise through debates regarding the tangible remains of the Cold War, in particular that of RAF Upper
Heyford. Instead of offering its assistance and collaboration, the Trust’s perspectives on the potential heritage value conflict with those of the other parties involved, including local councils, the owner of the site and English Heritage.

Despite a growing awareness and recognition of the tangible, heritage value of the site, there is still a minimum level of trust from the OTCH in regard to the intentions and expertise of the other parties involved in the contemporary designation of the site. Additionally, there are also alternative ‘inside’ discourses from those who lived through the Cold War period, worked in one of the Cold War sites, and/or protested against it as part of the peace movement. Visiting Cold War sites, in this regard, could offer an opportunity to actively and openly celebrate, secure, negotiate, and share the experiences of achievement, but also disappointment regarding their role, the obsolescence of the sites and the equipment that was used. Unfortunately, even though attempts have been made to include people’s views within the professional and academic debate on what constitutes the past in present-day lives, local surroundings and when visiting heritage places, management practices continue to derive from, and are based on, the guidelines and protocols of the dominant discourses to which it is subject.

Ultimately, this leads to tensions between human actions and agency and the material, static representations that are nevertheless an important aspect of heritage. As this thesis has illustrated, it appears that currently these ‘inside’ stories are not included in the historical narratives that are constructed by the authorised discourses, and, in this sense, there is no glue that links the tangible and intangible aspects of heritage that will lead to value and meaningful constructions of the Cold War period. In this regard, this thesis has sought to bring forward, without losing sight of the materiality of heritage, the idea that heritage in itself is not a tangible and immutable thing, nor does it exist by itself or imply a movement or a project. What emerged foremost is the understanding that the heritage discourse, whatever its particular nuances or variations across time and space, should be regarded as part of the social and cultural process of heritage, which renders and legitimises the value-laden concepts and ideologies it represents. However, heritage is also part of, and
constitutes, the process by which people use the past, and these constructions of heritage are equally part of the cultural and social processes that are heritage. Heritage in this sense is something vital and alive, not because it simply 'is' or is 'found' through practices, but because it exists of a range of actions of power and agency by which meanings, values and identities are constructed, reconstructed and negotiated through present-day practices. Within this discursive process, heritage in the here-and-now is constantly made, interpreted, given meaning, classified, and represented throughout time, to eventually be forgotten (or adjusted) all over again, ubiquitously intertwining it with the power dynamics, present-day values, debates and aspirations of a society.

Within a tourism context, heritage is deliberately and actively used by and within heritage discourses for social, political, and economic practices, including acts of forgetting or denial that occur and are instituted through visitations to heritage sites, places, and objects as a leisure or recreation activity. Consequently, as the authorised discourse legitimises particular cultural changes, values, and ideologies, it results in neglected narratives, narrowed meanings and fixed constructions that are part of heritage experiences at heritage sites. To link this knowledge to the current study, one of my first experiences, described in Chapter 1, was the conversation with two people visiting one of the Cold War sites used in this study (p. 16). It was perhaps the first conscious moment that I grasped that heritage is more than just something people do in their free time, although this is also an aspect of the nuanced and social process characterising heritage, and that it is more than the simple knowledge about a Cold War site, place, structure, or object. Instead, heritage is something through which people, during acts and performances of 'doing', find and express a sense of who they are – and what they would want to be – in relation to, and in negotiation with, the authorised discourse, other humans and the material environment.

However, before exploring the experiences when visiting a Cold War site, Chapter 7 demonstrated the various professional discourses about these material forms of heritage. As the nature and meaning of heritage sites derive from the creation and maintenance of heritage practices by the site managers, it was also important to illustrate the various struggles and negotiations with the authorised discourse.
Exploring the establishment and persuasiveness of the professional discourse has contributed to understanding why the site managers are passionate about their pastoral stewardship and the quest for expert recognition. Often being stirred by a great sense of frustration and concern over the sense of ‘accepted neglect’ and unequal deployment of resources of power, the perspective of the site managers reinforced a subaltern process stimulated by private and commercial initiatives. This subaltern discourse of ‘stewardship’ is not contesting the already existing narratives, values and cultural and social meanings of the Cold War; it is foremost promoting, implementing and affirming particular meanings, values and identities that justify and legitimise Cold War heritage, and, simultaneously, its own practices, as part of the social and cultural processes that are heritage. By doing so, and despite the current absence of visible authorised practices such as preservation and conservation protocols, guidelines and regulations, values and meanings are constructed based on the assertion that heritage is ‘physical’ and represented in the site, structures, objects and sometimes even events, that constitute Cold War history.

This belief of tangibility, constructed and affirmed by the site managers, also renders the cultural and social processes of heritage, as well as its mediation, to be fixed and self-evident. The professional discourse played out by the site managers differentiates itself by the understanding that the process facilitates the assertion of more organically and individually motivated connections and expressions of identity that are intertwined with constructions of Cold War history and heritage. Contrary to a detached approach, this active and personal interlinking of the Cold War past with the present as a process of identity formation has formed the basis of multiple versions of the manager’s social, economic or political positions and experiences, as opposed to conventional authorised powers. This individual and subaltern approach, used to narrate and define meanings about human and material identities, is constructed and legitimised for collective memories to be ‘passed on’ to the wider public and future generations, or perhaps merely to generate financial resources to maintain the site for personal uses, and ultimately, to be passed on to descendants.
Memory and remembering are important themes in the managers’ understandings of the process and nature of heritage. In many cases, the sites are believed to offer a safe environment for visitors to wander around in order to construct meanings about the Cold War and its events. As a way of moral responsibility, the idea is that by offering a static and symbolic account of the site and by displaying Cold War items, visitors are given the opportunity to step back in time and ‘observe’ the events and uses of the site in a particular (set) time in history (see Chapter 7). This belief about the ability to control how the visit is remembered through the meanings that are constructed also privileges the managers’ material practices, manifestations and consequences. As most sites were emptied of their contents before, or just after, they were purchased and transformed into heritage sites, the managers’ self-referential understandings of the Cold War past ‘legitimises’ the construction of a material reality within the bunker. In this regard, claims about the material practices, consisting of bringing back and replacing items ‘as it would have been’ reinforced the discourse, and the way visitors would talk about, discuss and understand the things that constitute Cold War heritage.

From the managers’ perspectives, despite foremost being regarded as a leisurely activity, visits to Cold War sites are considered activities through which people engage with acts of meaning making and remembrance. Varying amongst age groups, the visit is believed to provoke a sense of anxiety and reverence, not only because of the scale, but also due to the confronting reality and impact of the Cold War events. In this regard, they argue that visitors are moved by feelings of exclusion, as ‘ordinary’ people would not have been able to access, and were kept unaware on various levels in society of, the existence of these underground bunkers. As a place that awakens values and meanings to help visitors critically evaluate, reflect and engage with a period in history that was deliberately kept away from public awareness and interference, the subaltern approach reinforces its legitimacy against further ‘authorised neglect’. Despite their opposing position, the managers seemed to show little concern about the active role and engagement of visitors in the construction and negotiation of meanings, rendering it a passive subject of management practices. In order to provide an ‘optimal’ experience,
most managers argued that it was foremost their expertise that ensured the accuracy, validity and legitimacy of the material culture of the site that facilitated the active and creative process of heritage.

What Chapter 8 illustrates, particularly in comparison to Chapter 7, however, is that the idea of heritage is engaged with the construction and negotiation of meaning, in the case of Cold War sites, through personal and social acts of remembering and identifying to make sense of, and understanding, the past and the present. This makes the visit part of a process of forming ties that create a collective present, based on messages from site managers, personal experiences and collective memories that are shared with other group members. Initially, and similar to motivations perceived by the site manager, participants regarded the visit as a recreational or leisure activity, as ‘a nice day out’, with overlapping motives such as an interest in history, curiosity and educational purposes. Stirred up by, or influenced by, overall feelings of disengagement, most visitors believed that the stewardship and professional view of the Cold War representations at the sites should not directly be contested. Combined with feelings of humbleness, these (often) first encounters with the militarised aspects of the Cold War were regarded by many as a privilege or opportunity to enter a previously ‘concealed world’.

Despite the visitors’ support for the sole ownership by site managers, and the selective representations of the Cold War and events, they did actively or passively engage or negotiate the idea of ‘heritage’ as a physical and passive subject of management practices. Although the managers still largely define traditional parameters of ‘heritage’; its borders are pressed to include people’s prevailing meanings, memories, values, and ways of life and identity constructions. Engagement with the site occurred through the concept of space and place-making practices as the majority of the visitors lived relatively close to the Cold War sites, indicating the Cold War site to be one of the ‘last’ spaces to be anchored within visitors’ sense of place and belonging. Furthermore, when asked about what ‘being’ at the site meant, a strong sense of ‘strangeness’, and
resultantly, unfamiliarity with the site, almost as a ‘blind spot’ in everyday life, arouse. This, once again, does not necessarily indicate that personal or collective meanings and memories were not (re-)activated through the experiences at the site. To the contrary, not only did people experience physical discomforts, they also noted feelings of social discomfort when confronted with the inequality and unlikelihood for ‘common people’ to survive a nuclear attack. Intertwined with this sense of discomfort was a strong, yet somewhat opposing, sense of astonishment from visitors who expressed their amazement over its actual existence, size and magnitude. This inequality between the government and the public, expressed through senses of admiration or shock, is also voiced by the site managers, yet their approach varies from the fact that they are more frustrated about the current neglect noticeable in the current authorised discourse towards the preservation and conservation of the physical Cold War remains as part of British ‘heritage’.

Despite having little prior knowledge about the Cold War era or events, visitors seem to construct and negotiate their experiences as being, or becoming, part of their personal and collective memories and identities. Negotiating and legitimising their own sense of being at a Cold War site, visitors see the moments of ‘heritage’ as inscribing (new) memories and meaning into their identity, and therefore also changing the nature of that identity. In doing so, they reflected upon the past, present and future, (some more critically than others), especially in terms of their own place, and that of others in the world.

To conclude, understanding these discursive meanings of Cold War heritage (and) tourism, and the ways in which ideas about Cold War heritage are constructed, negotiated and contested within and between discourses and visitors’ experiences also contributes to understandings about the philosophical, historical, conceptual and political barriers that exist in identifying and engaging with different forms of heritage.
9.2 Limitations of the study and avenues for future research

It is important to critically evaluate the contributions of the study and findings by taking into account the current limitations. Although the consequences of methodological choices and their ethical implications have already been discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, these decisions and the theoretical bases explored in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 can be seen as food for thought for future research regarding the themes of heritage, tourism and the Cold War period and events.

One of the major methodological limitations concerns the disciplinary nature of the present study. The Cold War remains were studied within the discursive field of heritage and the context of tourism, with a scope that was limited to Britain. There is an apparent risk involved when combining the concepts of heritage (and) tourism, especially as they are also extensively studied in, amongst other disciplines, geography, history, archaeology, anthropology and sociology, and applying them to relatively new ‘heritage sites’ and geographical scope. Although I do not have a degree in the aforementioned disciplines, nor do I have a degree in (Cold War) history, I did have several discussions with scholars, researchers, fellow students and other enthusiasts specialising in Cold War history and heritage (and) tourism phenomena. As I do not represent a specific school of thought in more common approaches to uses of heritage, such as history or archaeological studies, this ‘outsider’ position also freed me to use, connect and make bridges between various views in a novel way. This, for example, resulted in the exploratory paper on more-than-representational stances in tourism, in which I investigated different viewpoints used in tourism studies for studying and representing social relationships and practices.

Furthermore, this study has focused on phenomena that are extensive and complex in nature and understandings. Clearly, this embodied a challenging task for research, irrespective of the more narrow focus and empirical perspective of this study. The limited number and selection of sites as case studies naturally brings forth several limitations concerning the generalisation of the findings. Thus, the empirical setting can only be seen as a small proportion of the use and nature of
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Cold War heritage, and only in the British context. However, this also aligns with the concept of case study research, by contributing to understandings about the use of Cold War remains as heritage within a tourism context; this eventually adds to our understandings of the general phenomena. To study the dominant, authorised, dissenting and subaltern discourses and their understandings about the nature and meaning of the Cold War period and events and its material uses through heritage sites in a wider European context is clearly one of the future research challenges in this topic. A European context would also contribute to wider understandings of the heritage process and the privileging and exclusion of judgements and stewardship over the Cold War ‘past’. However, as various related studies about Cold War heritage have already been conducted within the Eastern European context, there appeared to be a greater need for a Western retrospective.

The British scope of the study can be seen to include certain other limitations in the sense that the recorded Cold War sites are still in an evolving and uncertain stage. Although the sites included encompassed almost the entire range of Cold War tourist attractions in Britain, excluding only two sites, it could be argued that for future research, an empirical setting where more sites have been transformed into heritage sites for tourism purposes would reveal more, especially as far as the dynamism between the authorised and professional discourses is concerned. Particularly, in future research the current understandings of Cold War heritage could be criticised in terms of the explorative stages of constructing and negotiating certain social and cultural values. However, the present study has provided an essential starting point in order to identify the complexity of historically, institutionally and politically situated discourses and the ways in which relatively recent events are excluded or included in heritage practices, and the consequences this has for the expression of the cultural and social construction of meaning, place and identity.

A final limitation of this study is the perspective adopted. Instead of trying to understand the authorised or dominant discourses of Cold War heritage against a
range of counter-hegemony or subaltern discourses to understand the nature of Cold War heritage as a social process, this study has also included visitors’ constructions of social relations, values and meanings about the past and the present. By doing so, the study has taken on the challenge of analysing the (interaction between) current discourses, while also attempting to develop the idea of Cold War heritage beyond these conceptual understandings towards an understanding of its contemporary meaning in people’s lives. To gain a better understanding future research should, on the one hand, focus more on the development of dominant discourses, either from authorised or subaltern practices, whilst also focusing more on the social and cultural processes and performances that take place during the visit and that contribute to a range of contemporary meanings that are ‘heritage’. This approach could ultimately add to theoretical and managerial understandings of dissonance between discourses and people, especially in the context of an increasing discussion about the nature of Britain’s multicultural past and present and emerging debates about global citizenship and cosmopolitanism.

The conclusion, as well as the limitations of this study, also revealed several interesting possible avenues for future research that could also be noteworthy in relation to the themes discussed in this current study. The most important avenue for future research clearly lies in continuing the exploration of the nature and understandings of Cold War heritage (and) tourism. A thicker understanding of the discursive field of Cold War heritage and its discourses could be achieved by considering the various historical, institutional and political relationships, hierarchies and interactions that constitute the heritage process in a more global context. However, in this study the decision was made to explicitly examine the field within a British context so that these insights could contribute to already existing knowledge and to develop a model for understanding the various sets of cultural and social practices throughout Europe. In addition, the ways in which people visiting Cold War sites view and engage with these fixed constructions of value, meanings and identity are equally important. As discussed in Chapters 4 and 7, visiting heritage sites also includes a process in which meanings, whether
through messages, impressions or memories, are created, negotiated and treasured. Future research investigating the ability of challenging the historical and social narratives imposed by a dominant discourse during a visit to a Cold War site would be interesting, for example. In this study I aimed to reveal the surface of these experiences and the possibility of negotiating the interpretations of the Cold War sites, as the study's concepts were all relatively novel.

9.3 A final reflection on the process

Since my PhD journey and research process at the Institute of Tourism Research (INTOUR) started in September 2009, it has been nothing short of amazing. Initially, the whole experience of being a researcher all felt quite surreal; as the focus of my research was still fluid and I still needed to find my place of belonging within the research community at the University of Bedfordshire. Now, more than three years later, it feels that I have found my place, although the journey has seen periods of euphoria and excitement where I felt that I was mastering my project, being on top of the world, yet also darker moments filled with doubt and uncertainty about the value and academic quality of my writings. However, looking back, I think this is all part of the journey of obtaining a PhD, as it also teaches you to be flexible, persistent and to accept, or sometimes ignore, commentary by others. It all provided me with an insight into what it takes to develop into a successful academic.

Looking back, I have to admit that I have developed a strong affection towards my research topic and scope. Although I am not sure that I will pursue a future career solely in the field of Cold War heritage (and) tourism, it has provided me with a more critical stance towards historical events and their implications for contemporary understandings of and within society. Most importantly, I have had the opportunity to map out various insights and analysis for understanding the nature and power of heritage in a Western context, and also the consequences of the uses of heritage as social, cultural and political processes through which meaningful constructions about the past are created and negotiated.
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Appendices
Appendix 1  Timeline of events during the Cold War

This timeline is based on the work by Borade (2012) Summary of the Cold War.

1945 to 1950:

- In 1945 the Allies agree in Potsdam to the fundamental conditions of the occupation of Germany. American nuclear bombs destroy Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
- The US offers assistance to countries threatened by communism and in 1947 US Secretary of State George C. Marshall announces a massive aid programme for the reconstruction of World War II-torn Europe, known as the Marshall Plan.
- The first major Berlin crisis during the Cold War occurs when the Soviet blockade of West Berlin begins on June 24, 1948.
- On April 4, 1949 the NATO Treaty is signed in Washington and on May 23rd the Federal Republic of Germany is established. Later that year on October 7th the communist German Democratic Republic (GDR) comes into existence. On the other side of the world, the People's Republic of China is established by the Communist Party under Mao Zedong.
- On 25th June 1950, North Korea attacks South Korea; subsequently, UN troops, led by the United States, invade the country. China and the Soviet Union back North Korea.

1951 to 1955:

- In 1952, Soviet leader Joseph Stalin offers to hold negotiations on the reunification of Germany with the condition that the unified Germany remains neutral. However, the Western allied powers in conjunction with the West German parliament reject the offer.
- In 1953, a cease-fire is declared halting the Korean War. The two countries are forced to maintain their pre-war status.
- On June 17, 1953, a workers' strike in East Germany quickly turns into an uprising that is violently suppressed by Russian tanks.
The first German army to exist after Hitler's fall, the Bundeswehr, is formed as the Federal Republic of Germany joins NATO on 9th May, 1955.

A mutual defence treaty between eight communist nations of Eastern Europe is signed on 14th May 1955. Commonly referred to as the Warsaw Pact, it was a strategic counter to the NATO treaty signed by the US and its allies.

1956 to 1960:

- On October 23rd 1956, a nation-wide revolt against the Communist government of Hungary begins in Budapest. After 17 days of protests, the Hungarian uprising is brutally crushed as Soviet tanks roll into the capital, leading to 2,500 deaths.
- In July 1956, Egypt announces its plans to nationalise the Suez Canal. This leads to military action by the forces of Britain, France and Israel with the objective of occupying the Suez Canal. The US and Soviet Union, along with the UN, put pressure of the three nations to withdraw and avert a major escalation of conflict.
- In 1959, Cuba is taken over by Fidel Castro who promptly allies himself with the Soviet Union and its policies.

1961 to 1965:

- In April 1961 the Bay of Pigs invasion, an exercise planned by the CIA to support rebels against Castro in Cuba, fails horribly, causing embarrassment to the US.
- Fearing a brain drain of professionals and damage to the political and economic credibility of East Germany, the construction of the Berlin wall, dividing the Soviet section of Berlin, begins on August 13, 1961.
- In 1962 the world is on the verge of nuclear war for 14 long days, after the Soviets position nuclear war heads in Cuba and the US threatens war.
- In 1963, the US, Great Britain and the Soviet Union mutually agree to suspend surface and underwater tests of nuclear weapons.
• The first combat forces of the US land in South Vietnam in March 1965 signifying the direct involvement of the US in the Vietnam War.

1966 to 1970:
• On January 23, 1968 an American research ship, USS Pueblo, is captured by the North Koreans along with its 82 crew members. The crew are released after 11 months, but the ship remains with the North Koreans even today.
• Soviet troops, along with other Warsaw Pact members, enter Prague on August 21, 1968 to halt reforms and liberalisation policies, followed by the Czechoslovakian government popularly known as the Prague Spring.
• On September 1, 1969 Muammar al-Gaddafi overthrows the monarchy in Libya and aligns with the Soviet Union, expelling US and British personnel.

1971 to 1975:
• The signing of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks - I (SALT - I) agreement on May 26, 1972 signals the easing of strained relations between the United States and Soviet Union.
• The signing of the Paris Peace Accords on January 27 signals the end of American involvement in Vietnam.

1976 to 1980:
• On June 18, 1979 U.S. President Jimmy Carter and Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev, sign the SALT-II agreement, outlining guidelines and limitations for nuclear weapons.
• The USSR invades Afghanistan to save the crumbling government there. The occupation lasts almost 10 years and results in one of the costliest wars for the Soviet Union.
• Following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the US imposes sanctions on the Russians and boycotts the Moscow Olympic Games of 1980.
1981 to 1985:

- A Korean Airlines flight carrying 239 civilians is shot down by Soviet interceptor aircraft on 1st September, 1983.
- On 21st November 1985, Geneva, Switzerland, host a summit between Reagan and Gorbachev for the first time, where they agree to hold two more summits.

1986 to 1991:

- In October 1986, Reagan and Gorbachev hold successful talks and agree to remove all intermediate nuclear missiles from Europe.
- U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev sign the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty in Washington, D.C on 8th December 1987, and also agree on the START - I treaty.
- Mounting losses and little significant gain leads the Soviet Union to admit defeat in Afghanistan and announce withdrawal of the troops in early 1989.
- In the latter half of 1989, a spate of revolutions across Eastern Europe see governments in Poland, Romania and Hungary fall to democratic and liberal forces led by its people.
- In December 1989 at the Malta summit, US President George Bush and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev announce the beginning of a long-lasting era of peace. This summit is regarded by many observers to be the start of the end of the Cold War.
- On December 25th 1991 Mikhail Gorbachev resigns as the President of the Soviet Union; the Soviet flag is lowered over the Kremlin for the last time.
- The Council of Republics of Supreme Socialist of USSR recognises the dissolution of the USSR.
- On 31st December 1991, all Soviet institutions are disbanded and cease operations, officially marking the end of the Cold War.
The introduction of reform programmes by the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev laid the basis for the opening up of the Soviet Union and its satellite states to pro-democratic and liberal styles of governance. This gradual and peaceful revolution led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. The Cold War lasted for four decades and left a significant legacy wherein the world experienced the horrors of a nuclear arms race and deep divisions and animosity amongst the nations of the world.
Appendix 2  Summary of Cold War structures and sites

Summary of Cold War structures and sites identified as nationally important and recommended for protection as part of English Heritage’s Monuments Protection Programme (MPP).

The list derives from the work by Cocroft (2001) *Cold War monument: an assessment of the Monuments Protection Programme*. This list provides a summary by category, group, and class of the sites and structures proposed for designation. The sites are identified by name and county, or Unitary Authority (UA); in the third column the proposed form of protection is indicated.

Abbreviations used: SM – Scheduled Monument; LB – Listed Building; GR – Gardens Register; MA – Management Agreement.

**Air Defence**

1. Radar

*Rotor 1950s*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>SM or LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawdsey</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bempton</td>
<td>E Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmy Down</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenies</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvedon Hatch</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langtoft</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM and GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neatishead</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>SM and GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treleaver</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimingham</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventnor</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Linesman 1960s-1990s*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>SM, LB, and/or MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawdsey</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neatishead</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventnor</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2 Royal Observer Corps**

Visual Reporting Posts * = associated Underground Monitoring Post

A = Orlit A, B = Orlit B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soham*</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmdon*</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring*B</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burghill*</td>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookland*B</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamstreet*</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epworth*</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narborough*A</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reepham*A</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wymondham*B</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton Constable*A</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Creake*</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watton*B</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway*A</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowle*</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunstall*A</td>
<td>E Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipsea*</td>
<td>N Yorkshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Visual Reporting Posts – within existing scheduled area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Redoubt*B</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester*</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Hill* A</td>
<td>N Yorkshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgh on Bain* A</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underground Monitoring Posts* * = associated visual reporting post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soham*</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faddiley</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penryn</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veryan</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greystoke</td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threlkeld</td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmdon*</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendring*</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Point</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burghill*</td>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookland*</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knockholt</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamstreet*</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baumber</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epworth*</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxton</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dersingham</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gressenhall</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narborough*</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reepham*</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wymondham*</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton Constable*</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Creake*</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watton*</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Deeping</td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushton Spencer</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuckfield</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avebury  Wiltshire  SM
Wroughton  Wiltshire  SM
Broadway*  Worcestershire  SM
Crowle*  Worcestershire  SM
Out Newton  E Riding of Yorkshire  SM
Tunstall*  E Riding of Yorkshire  SM
Skipsea*  North Yorkshire  SM

*Underground Monitoring Posts – within existing scheduled area*

Raddon Hill  Devon  Scheduled
Cornwall Redoubt*  Cornwall  Scheduled
Tich Barrows  Cornwall  Scheduled
Dorchester*  Dorset  Scheduled
Ashwell  Hertfordshire  Scheduled
Beacon Hill*  N Yorkshire  Scheduled
Farningham  Kent  Scheduled
Burgh on Bain*  Lincolnshire  Scheduled
Hinderswell  North Yorkshire  Scheduled
Berry Head Fort  Torbay  Scheduled
Radstock  Somerset  Scheduled
Scarborough Castle  North Yorkshire  Scheduled

*Group Headquarters*

York  North Yorkshire  Scheduled
Yeovil  Somerset  SM or LB
Watford  Hertfordshire  LB
Horsham  West Sussex  SM or LB
Winchester  Hampshire  SM or LB

*3 Anti Aircraft Guns*

*Anti Aircraft Operations Rooms*

Mistley  Essex  SM or LB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lippitts Hill</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frodsham</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-war Heavy Anti Aircraft gun sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norley</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatts Green</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandpit Hill</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowaters Farm</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Extend Scheduled area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmshaws Farm</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stondon Massey</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searson’s farm</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddlestead</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. Surface to Air Missiles**

**Bloodhound missile sites Mark I — including Tactical Control Centres**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Coates</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolfox Lodge</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breighton</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD North Luffenham Leicestershire</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SB (TCC), CA, and MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindholme</td>
<td>South Yorkshire</td>
<td>LB (TCC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bloodhound missiles Mark II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bawdsey</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Raynham</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF Barkston Heath</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. Military Airfields**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biggin Hill</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>LB (Control Tower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binbrook</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM (QRA shelter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coltishall</td>
<td>Norfolk SM</td>
<td>(Blast Walls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coningsby</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM or MA (HAS Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duxford</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire Inc.</td>
<td>Armory in CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control Tower in CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemble</td>
<td>Gloucester Inc.</td>
<td>Control Tower in CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF Lakenheath</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>LB (Control Tower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Weald</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>LB (Control Tower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Raynham</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>LB (Control Tower)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nuclear Deterrent**

**6. V-Bomber airfields**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thurleigh</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruntingthorpe</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scampton</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>LB or MA, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesmore</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittering</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>UA SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeovilton</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7. Nuclear weapons stores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wethersfield</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faldingworth</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM, LB, CA, and GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelveston</td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF Marham</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnham</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>SM, LB, CA, and GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds Grove</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8. Thor missiles sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoD North Luffenham</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caistor</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breighton</td>
<td>E Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
United States Air Force

9. Airfields
   - Greenham Common, Berkshire, LB (one hangar)
   - Alconbury, Cambridgeshire, SM
   - Upper Heyford, Oxfordshire, SM and LB
   - RAF Lakenheath, Suffolk LB, (Tower & monument)

10. Cruise Missile sites
    - Greenham Common, Berkshire, SM and LB, MA

Defence Research Establishments

11. Aviation
    - RAE Bedford Thurleigh, Bedfordshire, Further assessment required
    - NGTE Farnborough, Hampshire, Further assessment required
    - Boscombe Down, Wiltshire, Further assessment Required

12. Naval

13. Rockets, Guided weapons
    - Cranfield, Bedfordshire, SM
    - Westcott, Buckinghamshire, SM, secure artefacts
    - Spadeadam, Cumbria, SM, LB and MA
    - West Down, Isle of Wight, SM

14. Nuclear
    - Aldermaston, Berkshire, Further assessment required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burghfield</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>Further assessment required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingham</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>Further assessment required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennridding</td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>Further assessment Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foulness</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>SM and LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Halstead</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Further assessment required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orfordness</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>SM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Miscellaneous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porton Down</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>Further assessment required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>Further assessment required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defence Manufacturing Sites**

16. **Stevenage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emergency Civil Government**

17. **Early 1950s War Rooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>UA SM or LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>SM or LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill</td>
<td>Greater London</td>
<td>SM or LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>see next page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Regional Seats of Government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nottinghamshire

19. Sub Regional Head Quarters
Swynnerton
Staffordshire
SM

20. Regional Government Head Quarters
Chilmark
Wiltshire
SM or LB
Hack Green
Cheshire
SM or LB

21. Local Authority Emergency Head Quarters
None identified at present for designation

22. Civil Defence Structures
Gravesend
Kent
SM
Dagenham
Gtr London
SM

23. The utilities
None identified at present for designation

24. Private nuclear shelters
None identified at present for designation

Emergency Provisions Stores

25. Grain silos
None identified at present for designation

26. Cold stores
None identified at present for designation

27. Dry stores
None identified at present for designation
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28. Fuel depots
   None identified at present for designation

Communications

29. Underground telephone exchanges
   Manchester  Gtr Manchester  SM

30. Microwave tower network
   Over  Cambridgeshire  LB
   Swaffham  Norfolk  LB
   Henham  Essex  LB
   BT Tower  London  Listed
   Pye Green  Staffordshire  LB
   Purdown  Bristol  LB

Miscellaneous

31. The Peace Movement
   Manchester  Gtr Manchester  LB or CA
Appendix 3  Five ‘moments’ of qualitative research

Five ‘moments’ of qualitative research in social research and their paradigmatic influences within tourism studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description and influences in tourism studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Traditional Period (1900s – 1914) | Empirical research informed by a positivistic, natural science approach. The researcher is regarded to be a depersonalised expert of objective colonising accounts of experiences in the field. Findings are presented as facts.  
  • Cohen’s research (1982) about holidaymakers and their location by the sea, coined as a ‘marginal paradise’ is an inclusive example of a positivistic account of ownership structure and the tourist facilities on the islands of Southern Thailand. |
| Modernist Phase (Post War – 1970s) | Move away from natural science, with its notion that ‘reality is out there’, whilst attempting to maintain positivistic rigour in qualitative research. Researchers interested in ways people categorise the world and how they place meaning on events. Introduction of phenomenology, ethnomethodology, grounded theory.  
  • Jutla’s (2000) study explores people’s images of Simla by using interviews, mapping techniques, photographs and questionnaires, all designed according to Lynch’s legibility method, provides a good example of maintaining positivistic rules into a qualitative inductive research.  
  • Snepenger, O’Connell and Snepenger’s (2001) study, using data from a probability sample of residents of Bozeman, Montana, reports on the development and measurement of an embrace- |
withdraw scale of responses towards tourism development by community residents. This comprehensive ‘modernist’ phase study focuses primarily on ways to incorporate empirically reliable and valid measurements to the continuum.

| Blurred Genres (1970s – 1986) | Recognition and availability of various paradigms and multiple methods, strategies and theories. Boundaries between disciplines are becoming blurred and ‘mixing and matching’ of conventional and unconventional approaches, such as semiotics, accepted. Author’s presence in the interpretive text and the construction of ‘the self’ become important aspects of the research.  
• Aitchison’s (1999) study on the theoretical developments within geography, which have contributed to the analysis and understanding of spatiality of leisure, gender and sexuality in the 1980s and 1990s, and ultimately of a new cultural geography and its impact upon leisure studies. This study recognises the multiple, creative and artistic approaches, in this case feminist, to research.  
• Jamal and Hollinshead’s work (2001) addresses the neglected power of qualitative inquiry in tourism studies. This study called for a dialogue in travel and tourism research, which includes multiple approaches, theories, practices and an understanding of ‘the self’ as a researcher. |

| Crisis of Representation (Mid-1980s – 1990s) | Researchers’ ‘objective’ knowledge is challenged, and validity, rigor and generalisability in social research questioned. Research and writing becomes more reflexive, embodied and personal. Interpretive theories and multiple interpretations become recognised. Fieldwork and writing blur into one another. |
Dyer, Aberdeen and Schuler’s (2003) study on tourism impacts on the indigenous Australian Djabugay community, emphasis was placed on the importance of narrative, as storytelling is an important aspect of knowledge transfer within these communities. Furthermore, they discussed and incorporated the impact of the researchers as being ‘Anglo-Australian descendants of colonisers’ on the community’s legacy and history and how these identities affect the research process. This study, by adopting a critical ethnography and participatory approach, is a good example of the profound rupture in thinking about research and the role of the researcher in tourism studies by incorporating a greater degree of reflexivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Postmodern Stage</strong></th>
<th>End of the grand narrative. Focus on other local, small scale, context specific theories and local research – seen as ‘snapshots’. Researcher as ‘objective expert’ rejected, and voice becomes one among many.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1990 – 1995)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Doorne, Ateljevic and Zhai’s (2003) work on cultural tourism in Dali (China) elaborates on new grounds through which processes of identity formation are being articulated, and emphasises the extent to which cultural identities are appropriated, constructed and traded through and around material objects of tourism exchange.
Appendix 4  Mixed methods design types

The four major mixed methods design types presented by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007).

The triangulation design is a one-phase mixed methods design in which the quantitative and qualitative data are collected and analysed during the same phase of the research process and are merged into one interpretation (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007). Both the quantitative and qualitative methods are complementary types of data and are usually given equal weighting with the aim of developing a better understanding of a topic (Morse, 1991). This design is used when comparing and contrasting quantitative and qualitative data or to validate one type of data with the help of the other.
The embedded design is used when one type of data, either quantitative or qualitative, takes on a supportive, secondary role in a study based primarily on the other type of data (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann and Hanson, 2003). In comparison to the triangulation design, which tends to mix at the level of data analysis and data interpretation, this design tends to mix at the design level, with one type of data embedded within a methodology framed by the other type of data. The embedded design is used when there are different research questions or objectives that require qualitative and quantitative data.
The explanatory design is a two-phased mixed methods design in which the quantitative and qualitative methods are implemented in a sequence. The design starts with the generation and analysis of quantitative data. This quantitative phase is followed by the subsequent generation and analysis of qualitative data in a second phase. This latter phase of the study is designed so that it follows from, or is connected to, the results of the initial quantitative phase. Due to the fact that this design begins quantitatively, researchers generally put greater importance on the quantitative methods when addressing the study’s research questions or objectives. The qualitative data is used to further explain, elaborate, or redefine the initial quantitative results.
Similar to the explanatory design, the exploratory design is a two-phased mixed methods design. This design starts with the collection and analysis of qualitative data to explore a topic and then continues to a second phase in which quantitative data is collected and analysed. The subsequent quantitative phase of the study is designed so it builds on, or is connected to, the results of the initial qualitative phase. Because the design sets out qualitatively, the researcher places greater importance on the qualitative methods to explore a topic. The quantitative data is used to measure, generalise, or test the qualitative results.
Appendix 5  Description of participating sites

Kelvedon Hatch Secret Nuclear Bunker
The three-storey bunker was designed in the 1960s to house 600 military and civil personnel (and possibly the prime minister too) and over 120 tonnes of equipment in the event of a Soviet attack. Throughout the Cold War period, up till 1992, the site had three lives – as an RAF Rotor Station, a civil defence centre, then a regional government HQ.

Ironically, as the intensity of the Cold War died out, the bunker and its ancillary systems were no longer needed by the Government, and were costing up to 3 million pounds a year to keep on standby. Upon decommissioning in 1992, the bunker was bought back from the government by the Parrish family at a closed bid public auction, and hence is now privately owned.

Nowadays the site is open for self-guided tours using a handset that visitors can pick up from the entrance, and its succession of eerie rooms peopled by costumed mannequins tells the story of life deep below ground level and how the survival of the population would have been organised should nuclear war have happened. Right at the end of the tour, visitors end up in the retro café.

Sources:


Hack Green Secret Nuclear Bunker

Declassified in 1993, the 35,000 square feet underground bunker would have been the centre of Regional Government had nuclear war broken out. It was built in the 1950s as part of a vast secret radar network codenamed 'ROTOR'. Previously, the military use of the site was in World War II, when a starfish site, and later a ground-controlled interception (GCI) radar station, was established to confuse Luftwaffe bombers looking for the fundamental railway junction at Crewe. In the 1950s, the site was modernised as part of the Rotor project. This included the provision of a substantial semi-sunk reinforced concrete bunker or blockhouse (type R6). The station, officially titled RAF Hack Green, provided an air traffic control service to military aircraft crossing civil airspace. The site was abandoned and remained derelict for many years until the Home Office took it over. They rebuilt the R6 bunker as a Regional Government Headquarters (RGHQs) - one of a network of 17 such sites throughout the UK - designed to enable government to continue in the aftermath of a major nuclear attack on the UK.

In 1992, following the end of the Cold War, the Home Office abandoned its network of RGHQs and sold many of the sites. This one was bought by a private company and subsequently opened to the public in 1998 as a museum with a Cold War theme. Entering through massive blast doors, visitors are guided into the underground bunker. The bunker contains a substantial collection of military and Cold War memorabilia, including one of the largest collections of decommissioned nuclear weapons in the world. Furthermore, the bunker represents the potential Government headquarters during nuclear war, including minister of state’s offices, life support systems, a communication centre, decontamination facilities and telephone exchange rooms. With the use of (authentic) equipment and audio-visual presentations, including two cinemas showing previously secret films, visitors are given an insight into what living conditions were like. Younger children can ‘become’ secret agents by following the Soviet Spy mouse trail. Before ending the self-guided tour, visitors can stop at the Bunker Bistro or visit the shop.
York Cold War Bunker

The York Cold War Bunker, built in 1961, is a two-storey semi-subterranean Cold War bunker situated in the grounds of a large Edwardian property, used over the years by several Government agencies, in the Holgate area of York, England. The bunker, with the formal description ‘Royal Observer Corps 20 Group Headquarters’, was built as a reporting centre for a cluster of smaller bunkers to monitor and generate data about nuclear explosions and radioactive fallout in Yorkshire in the event of nuclear war. As part of about 30 similar buildings in Britain and Northern Ireland, the bunker was used throughout its operational existence as the regional headquarters and control centre for the Royal Observer Corps' No. 20 Group YORK between 1961 and 1991. The bunker could accommodate 60 local volunteer members of the Royal Observer Corps, inclusive of a ten man United Kingdom Warning and Monitoring Organisation scientific warning team. This example of an ROC control building is currently the only one that is preserved in its operational condition. Other sites have been demolished, are derelict or are used for other contemporary uses such as a veterinary clinic or recording studio.

The bunker was put on top alert only once, in 1962, during the Cuban Missile crisis, but was eventually abandoned in 1991 after the signing of a non-aggression treaty with the Warsaw Pact countries. In 2006 the bunker was listed as an English Heritage Scheduled Monument by English Heritage and opened for the public to visit on guided tours. The tour starts with a ten-minute informative video about nuclear war, after which visitors are shown the air filtration and generating
plant, kitchen and canteen, dormitories, and fully equipped operations room containing radio and landline communication equipment, specialist computers and vertical illuminated perspex maps. Visitors can purchase souvenirs from the guide at the end of the tour.

Sources:

Royal Air Force Neatishead
Royal Air Force Neatishead is a military radar station near Norfolk, East Anglia. Established during the Second World War, the site consists of a main technical place, and a number of remote and sometimes unmanned locations. The main function of Neatishead was as a Control and Reporting Centre (CRC) for the south of the United Kingdom; it forms a part of the UK's air defences - namely the UK "Air Surveillance And Control System" (ASACS), and is part of the larger NATO air defence. It uses radar, ground-to-air radio and digitally encrypted data links. In April 2004 the decision was taken to substantially reduce activities at Neatishead, and by 2006, the base had been downgraded to Remote Radar Head (RRH) status, but the museum remains open.

Whilst visitors are free to explore the museum on their own, a guided tour starts every 30 minutes. The museum traces the history of radar from early experiments, like the sound mirrors still standing on the Kent coast, to today's more sophisticated systems. RAF Neatishead is significant for radar enthusiasts because it was home to the first secret defence system, built in 1941. It continued as a Sector Operations centre until 1993, protecting Britain throughout the nuclear threat of the Cold War.
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As part of the museum’s collection there is a reconstructed Royal Observer Corps Nuclear Reporting Post complete with red telephone for conveying a 3 Minute Warning. Additionally, there is a Cold War payload – a huge operations room left exactly as it was during 1954. There is also a replica operations room from the Battle of Britain and an updated operations room from 1942.

Sources:


**Scotland’s Secret Bunker**
The bunker, located just outside of Anstruther, was built in 1951, beneath what looked like an ordinary domestic dwelling. The bunker was a subsidiary Regional Seat of Government during the Cold War and would have been occupied by UK Armed Forces, UK Warning and Monitoring Organisation, Royal Observer Corps and other Civil Service personnel. The site served a variety of purposes over its operational life, and visitors today get to see a mixture of recreated interiors from different periods (yet most of its is from the 1970s).

The bunker is dug 40 metres in the ground, and is accessible through a 150 metre long tunnel which start from within an innocent looking bungalow. The bunker could accommodate up to 300 people, and the site includes dormitories, a mess (now used a the bunker’s cafeteria) and a chapel.

The most important room in the building is the Nuclear command Control Centre, a large area from which what was left of the country would have been controlled. The bunker remained in operation until 1992, and was opened for the public in 1994 by the current (private) owners.
Sources:
Appendix 6  Invitation to site managers

The invitation letter and suggestion form were sent to the site managers after a telephone conversation to inform them about the study, generate interest and to verify the contact details.

[Date]

[Address details]
[Address details]
[Address details]
[Address details]

Ref. Cold War Tourism: Practices, Performances and Representations

Dear [Name],

It was a pleasure speaking with you regarding your possible participation in my doctoral research project, funded by the University of Bedfordshire and undertaken through the Institute for Tourism Research (INTOUR) at the University of Bedfordshire.

The purpose of this research is to study performances, practices and representations at Cold War attractions in the United Kingdom. In other words, this research looks at ways in which individuals encounter Cold War experiences, events and spaces and how these are connected with people’s everyday lives.
The research objectives are:

1. To develop insights into the representations of Cold War tourism attractions;
2. To develop insights into the encounters of visitors to Cold War tourism attractions;
3. To develop understandings of how Cold War tourism experiences, events and spaces are connected with everyday life.

In order to allow for different practices, performances and representations to become known, rather than merely providing an overview of existing literature, and to develop new insights and understandings in this niche market of tourism, Cold War sites have been invited to participate as case studies in this research project. For data gathering purposes this research will include:

- In-depth interviews with site managers
- In-depth interviews with visitors
- Participant observations
- Visitor questionnaires

At the end of their visit I will ask visitors in an appropriate way to participate in an interview or to fill in a questionnaire. Before participating, visitors will be informed about the intent and purpose of the interview or questionnaire and its future use in this research project. Participation is voluntary, meaning that each participant is entitled to withdraw from the interview, or not complete or hand in the questionnaire. If there are any questions you think could be relevant to be included in the above data gathering methods, please write them down on the enclosed form. Furthermore, I have enclosed a form to ask your permission to take photographs as part of the participant observations.

I would like to gather the data from the [Cold War site] on [Date] 2011. If another time would be more appropriate or successful please let me know and I will try and re-arrange my visit.
If you have any additional documentation that could be useful for this research project, such as annual visitor reports, brochures or newspaper articles, please include these in the enclosed pre-paid envelope.

Thank you for your help with this research. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone (+44 (0)1234 793 450) or e-mail (inge.hermann@beds.ac.uk). You may also want to contact Dr Sally Everett, Head of Tourism and Leisure (sally.everett@beds.ac.uk).

I will call you within the next week to confirm whether you are willing to participate.

Sincerely,

Inge Hermann
Suggestions

Cold War Tourism: Practices, Performances and Representations

I would recommend including the following questions in any of the data gathering methods:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

***Please return this form in the pre-paid envelope***
Appendix 7  Observation priori checklist and pro-forma form

Site: ..........................  Area of observation: ..........................
Date: ..........................
Time: ..........................

Description and setting of observation area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General description of the area features and lay-out</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of objects and artefacts displayed in the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets, guides and other printed material (quality, condition and layering)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special facilities for visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Photographed observation area?  Yes / No
Appendix 8  In-depth interview guide – Site managers

Interview Questions

_Cold War Tourism: Practices, Performances and Representations_

Respondent number #  ..................................... Date .................................................. .

Location .................................................................................................................... .

Questions about the site

Can you describe the history of this Cold War site? Before and after the Cold War ended?

Could you give a description of the owner or management team and the organisational structure of this site?

How long has this site been open to visitors?

What are the operating dates and hours of this site?
Could you give an estimation of number of visitors per year/ season?

Questions about (re-)presentations of the site

What aspect of the Cold War is being (re-)presented at this site?

*Probe (if necessary): What were the motivations behind this decision?*

What kind of objects, items or artefacts have been chosen for the (re)presentation, and with what criteria? *Probe (if necessary): Which objects, items or artefacts have been put on display?*

What or who has influenced the selection of objects, items or artefacts (re-) presented at this site?
Have you worked, or do you still work, with other organisations to develop this site? *Probe (if necessary): Which organisation and for what purpose?*

Do you consider this site to be a heritage site? And could you explain your answer and thoughts?

What about this site makes it potentially attractive to tourists and the tourist industry?

Did you bring any specific items with you for your visit to this Cold War site? *Prompt if necessary: clothing, equipment, items.*

For what purposes do you think people visit this site?
Could you describe the reactions you get from people after their visit?

Do you think a visit to this site impacts on visitors' understanding(s) of the Cold War?

Is there anything you would like to add?

Thank you very much for your time.

Management characteristics (complete after close of interview)

Gender  □ Male  □ Female
Appendix 9  In-depth interview information form and consent form – Participants

Interview Information and Consent Form

_Cold War Tourism: Practices, Performances and Representations_

Dear Participant,

This interview is being undertaken as part of a Cold War Tourism doctoral research project, funded by the University of Bedfordshire, undertaken through the Institute for Tourism Research (INTOUR). The purpose of this research is to look at ways in which visitors encounter Cold War experiences, events and spaces and how these are connected with people’s everyday lives.

I would like to interview you to learn more about your Cold War experiences, and of places and events related to the Cold War. During this interview I will ask you how you experience this particular site and its representation of the Cold War. Also, I will ask you questions about how your experiences at this site are connected with your everyday life. If there are any questions that I ask that you would prefer not to answer, please tell me and we will move on to another question. If you would like to stop the interview at any time, please tell me and we will end the interview immediately.

It is expected that this interview will take no longer than 30 minutes. During this interview I will make notes and use audio recording for further analysis of our discussion. Your answers may be included in the research outcomes or subsequent research publications and reports; however, no personal background information will be used without your permission. The information is confidential, and no one else except me will have access to the data. You may refuse to answer certain questions, withdraw from the interview at any time, or request material not to be used.
This research project operates under the research ethics protocols of the University, and any questions or complaints can be sent to:

INTOUR Ethics Committee
University of Bedfordshire
Polhill Avenue, Bedford
MK41 9EA United Kingdom
sally.everett@beds.ac.uk

If you have any further questions, please contact me by phone (+44 (0)1234 793 450) or e-mail (inge.herrmann@beds.ac.uk).

Thank you for your help with this research!

- I have read and understood the information in this form.
- I hereby agree to be interviewed under the conditions set out above.
- I hereby agree that an audio recording of this interview can be taken.

Name: ...................................................... Signature: .................
Location: ..............................................Date:.................................

I would like to receive a summary of the research once it is completed. My e-mail address is:

............................................................................................................
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Appendix 10 In-depth interview guide – Participants

Interview Questions

Cold War Tourism: Practices, Performances and Representations

Respondent number # ............................................ Date.................................................................

Location..............................................................................................................................................

Questions about your characteristics

Where are you from?
......................................................................................................................................................

What is your age? What age group are you in?
......................................................................................................................................................

Who are you visiting this site with today?
......................................................................................................................................................

Questions about your visit

Do you have a connection to the Cold War, and, or specifically, to this site?

......................................................................................................................................................
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How would you describe your experience at this site?

*Probe (if necessary): what are your feelings about your visit?*

What will you most remember about your visit to this Cold War site?

*Prompt (if necessary): the building, the setting, the people etc.*

How would you describe the information presented about the Cold War at this site? *Probe (if necessary): In what ways do you think it provides an accurate representation of the Cold War?*

Did you bring any specific items with you for your visit to this Cold War site?

*Prompt if necessary: clothing, equipment, items.*

Has your visit to this site changed your feelings about the Cold War? If yes, could you tell me in what ways? If no, could you explain why not?
Is there anything else that you would want to add?

Thank you very much for your time.

Visitor characteristics (complete after close of interview)

Gender  □ Male  □ Female
Appendix 11 Questionnaire

Background Information

Cold War Tourism: Practices, Performances and Representations

This research is being undertaken as part of the Cold War Tourism: Practices, Performances and Representations doctoral research project, funded by the University of Bedfordshire, undertaken through the Institute for Tourism Research (INTOUR) at the University of Bedfordshire.

The purpose of this research is to study performances, practices and representations at Cold War tourism attractions in Britain. In other words, this research looks at ways in which individuals encounter Cold War tourism experiences, events and spaces and how these potential connections relate to people’s lives.

You are invited to answer a series of questions about your Cold War experiences, and of places and events relating to the Cold War. These questions relate to your general experiences with the Cold War, and your experiences at this particular tourism attraction; whether your experiences are positive or negative. Furthermore, there will be questions about your attitude towards the representations of the Cold War at this site; and how these experiences, events and spaces relate to your own life.

It is expected that this questionnaire will take no longer than 15 minutes to complete. All questionnaires will be coded by number only, not by name, so that anonymity and confidentiality is assured. The results may be used in subsequent research publications and reports but they will only refer to the total set of data. Individual results will not be described.
Participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the research project at any stage, without further consequences.

This research operates under the research ethics protocols of the University, and any questions or complaints can be forwarded by e-mail to:
INTOUR Ethics Committee
University of Bedfordshire
Polhill Avenue, Bedford
MK41 9EA United Kingdom
Email: sally.everett@beds.ac.uk

Thank you for your help with this research. If you have any further questions or require any further information about the research project, please contact me by phone (+44 (0) 1234 793 450) or e-mail (inge.hermann@beds.ac.uk).

Kind regards,

Inge Hermann
QUESTIONNAIRE

Please tick the box that denotes the answer you want to give or circle the number that most applies to you. Please answer the open questions in as much detail as possible, if needed more paper will be provided.

A. Your visit to this Cold War attraction

1. How many people are in your group? Adults........ Children ........
   -> Please fill in the numbers, including yourself as a member

2. How many times have you visited this site?
   □ First time  □ 2-5 times  □ 5 times or more

3. How long have you spent looking at the exhibits in this attraction?
   □ Less than 1 hour  □ 1 hour to 2 hours
   □ Up to 4 hours  □ 4 hours or more

4. When did you decide to visit this attraction? Please tick all that apply
   □ Before my trip to this area  □ During my stay in this area
   □ On the way to / from somewhere else  □ Happen to drive past
   □ Other (please specify) ............

5. Were you aware of this Cold War attraction before you visited the area?
   -> If not, please go to question 9  □ yes  □ no

6. What were your three most important sources of information?
   □ Family and relatives  □ Visitor centre / Tourist information centre
   □ Other visitors  □ Television / radio programme
   □ Travel agents  □ Books, newspapers and magazines
   □ Travel guidebooks  □ Internet
   □ Accommodation providers  □ Transport providers
   □ Friends  □ Others (please specify) ............
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7. How would you rate your knowledge of this attraction before your visit?

Minimal 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

8. What did you know about the attraction before your visit?

B. Your experiences at this Cold War attraction

10. What items or objects have guided or assisted you during your visit?

Please tick all that apply

- Information panels
- Tour guide
- Signage
- Handout provided by attraction
- Audioguide
- Handout brought by respondent
- Other group members
- Other (please specify) 

11. Which of the following aspects have affected your experiences?

Please tick all that apply

- Exterior of the building
- Textures and materials
- Colours and contours
- Temperatures
- Smells
- Sounds
- Gradients and pathways
- Other (please specify) 
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12. How would you describe your experience at this attraction?

..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................

13. What are your main feelings about your visit to this Cold War attraction?
Please tick all that apply

☐ Entertaining and fun

☐ Adventurous and exciting

☐ Educational and learning

☐ Relaxing and calm

☐ Sharing experiences

☐ Commemorative and memorial

☐ Anxious and unease

☐ Other (please specify) ..............

14. What will you remember most about your visit to this attraction?

..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................................................................

15. What specific items did you bring for your visit to this attraction?
Please tick all that apply

☐ Camera / camcorder

☐ Travel or guidebook

☐ Specific clothing / footwear

☐ Flashlight / pocket torch

☐ Notebook

☐ Other (please specify) ........
16. Can you give a general description of the type of visitors that you have seen at this attraction?

17. What would have improved your experiences at this attraction?

C. Your connections with the Cold War

18. What are your personal connections with the Cold War?

19. How do you feel this attraction represents the Cold War?
20. How has this visit contributed to or changed your feelings about the Cold War?

D. Your information


22. Your gender
□ Male □ Female

23. Which age group are you in?
□ <18 □ 19-29 □ 30-39
□ 40-49 □ 50-59 □ 60-69 □ >70

24. What is the highest level of formal education you have completed?
□ Primary school □ Secondary school
□ Sixth form □ Technical/Vocational college
□ University undergraduate level □ University postgraduate level
□ Other (please specify) ...........

25. Are you currently a member of any association listed below?
□ Veterans Associations □ Armed Forces Association
□ Military Association □ Other related organisations
□ English Heritage □ Subterranea Britannica
□ None of these? □ Other (please specify) ............
26. Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!

If you would be willing to contribute further to the project by sharing your experiences, stories, memories and views on Cold War heritage and tourism attractions in more detail please provide a name and telephone number for me to contact you.

Name: Phone number:

Email:

*** Please return your completed questionnaire to me or leave it in the box ***
Appendix 12 Geographical location of the visitors per site

Map to show the addresses of visitors to the Hack Green bunker by their home postcode areas
Map to show the addresses of visitors to the Kelvedon Hatch bunker by their home postcode areas
Map to show the addresses of visitors to the Neatishead bunker by their home postcode areas
Map to show the addresses of visitors to Scotland's Secret bunker by their home postcode areas.
Map to show the addresses of visitors to the York bunker by their home postcode areas

- Home addresses of visitors
- Site location

Visitor numbers in postcode areas:
- 5 visitors
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1 visitor
- No visitors

Members of non-UK visitors:
- Australia: 1
- USA: 1

Total respondents: 35