


 Childhood

**'Remembrance isn't working': First World War battlefield tours and the militarisation of British youth during the centenary**

Journal:	<i>Childhood</i>
Manuscript ID	CHD-19-0068.R2
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue: Children, Childhoods, and Everyday Militarisms
Keywords:	First World War, centenary, youth, battlefields, remembrance, militarism
Abstract:	Between 2014 and 2019 secondary school pupils from every state school in England were given the opportunity to visit the battlefields of the Western Front as part of the UK government's flagship educational initiative to mark the centenary of the First World War. Based on empirical research conducted with pupil participants on the FWWCBTP, this paper explores the processes of militarisation present within these tours as well as the way young people participated in and made sense of these practices.

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## **‘Remembrance isn’t working’: First World War battlefield tours and the militarisation of British youth during the centenary**

### **Introduction**

When UK Prime Minister, David Cameron, unveiled the UK government’s long-awaited plans to mark the centenary of the First World War in October 2012 he underscored how it was an opportunity to ‘provide the foundations upon which to build an enduring cultural and educational legacy’ putting ‘young people front and centre in our commemoration’ in order ‘to ensure that the sacrifice and service of a hundred years ago is still remembered in a hundred years’ time’.<sup>1</sup> The cornerstone of this youth-focused commemorative activity, at a cost of £5.3 million, was the First World War Centenary Battlefield Tours Programme (FWWCBTP), delivered by UCL Institute of Education (UCL IoE) and Equity, a specialist provider of group tours for educational institutions, and designed to give the opportunity for at least two students, aged predominately 11 to 14 years old, and one teacher from every state-funded secondary school in England to visit the battlefields in a four-day tour of the major battlefields and memorial sites on the Western Front.<sup>2</sup>

The stated objectives of the FWWCBTP were to (1) enable young people to acquire a deeper understanding of the First World War based on the latest historiography and (2) create a generation who will carry the memory of the war forward (Pennell, 2018). Just over 4,500 students from 1,811 schools participated between September 2014 and March 2019 travelling in cohorts of between 80 and 120 participants per tour spread across two to three coaches.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/speech-at-imperial-war-museum-on-first-world-war-centenary-plans> (accessed 9 July 2019).

<sup>2</sup> It is worth noting that the FWWCBTP worked with schools from England only. This could be interpreted as being in contradiction to official government claims of a ‘truly national commemoration’ of the war. See Mycock (2014).

<sup>3</sup> Statistics provided by FWWCBTP Programme Director via email to author, 11 July 2019. For more information on the programme, see <https://www.centenarybattlefieldtours.org/about-us/> (accessed 9 July 2019).

1  
2  
3 Each coach was led by an accredited International Guild of Battlefield Guide (GBG)  
4  
5 accompanied by a serving soldier and a member of Equity staff. Each tour was supported by  
6  
7 a senior member of the FWFCBTP UCL IoE team as well as a mobile team of senior army  
8  
9 officers who were there, primarily, to support their junior personnel (Pennell, 2018). While  
10  
11 primarily funded by the Department for Education (DfE) and Department for Communities  
12  
13 and Local Government (DCLG)<sup>4</sup> it was supported by the Ministry of Defence (MoD) as part  
14  
15 of its broader mission to mark the centenary of the First World War and the British army's  
16  
17 participation in the conflict, Operation REFLECT (Foley, 2014).<sup>5</sup> The tours were deemed  
18  
19 highly successful winning various educational and youth travel awards and receiving  
20  
21 commendations from both participating teachers and key British politicians, including the  
22  
23 Chancellor of the Exchequer who, in the October 2018 budget, renewed funding until 2020.<sup>6</sup>  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 This article seeks to build on existing literature on war remembrance, national identity, and  
32  
33 militarisation to explore the processes of militarisation present within these tours and the way  
34  
35 the young participants participated in, understood and resisted these practices. It is based on  
36  
37 data gathered via survey, verbal, elicitation and observational approaches (Hopkins, 2010)  
38  
39 with 1,016 young people who travelled on the spring tours between 2015 and 2017.<sup>7</sup> The  
40  
41  
42  
43

---

44 <sup>4</sup> In January 2018, as part of a Cabinet reshuffle, it was announced that the DCLG would be renamed the  
45 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). See  
46 [https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-renews-focus-on-housing-with-ministry-of-housing-](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-renews-focus-on-housing-with-ministry-of-housing-communities-and-local-government)  
47 [communities-and-local-government](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-renews-focus-on-housing-with-ministry-of-housing-communities-and-local-government) (accessed 9 July 2019).

48 <sup>5</sup> Aside from (now broken) webpages (see [www.army.mod.uk/training\\_education/25813](http://www.army.mod.uk/training_education/25813)) accessed via Internet  
49 Archive Wayback Machine (<https://archive.org/web/>), little additional information about the MoD's 'First  
50 World War Support to Schools' scheme was available publicly. A Freedom of Information (FOI) request was  
51 largely refused under Section 12 (cost limits). In addition, the centenary in the UK was a cross-government  
52 initiative involving the DfE, DCLG and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) as well  
53 as the MoD, which resulted in questions about funding and delivery being obfuscated. Letter from Army  
54 Secretariat, Army Headquarters to author in response to a request for information under the Freedom of  
55 Information Act 2000, 18 June 2019 (Ref: FOI2019/05925).

56 <sup>6</sup> Letter on impact of the programme from FWFCBTP Programme Director to author, 7 March 2019. See also  
57 <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/budget-2018-philip-hammonds-speech> (accessed 17 July 2019).

58 <sup>7</sup> A mixed methods approach was adopted owing to its recognised benefits, particularly within education  
59 research, as a means to get deeper and broader insights, and to validate findings in research projects of this  
60 nature (Bernhard, 2019). For a detailed critical reflection on the methods employed in this project, in  
comparison to a similar study in New Zealand, see Pennell and Sheehan (2020).

1  
2  
3 tours are interpreted as a space where cultural elites (a government funded programme) have  
4  
5 determined the common narratives about Britain's engagement in the First World War and  
6  
7 the nation-state's identity as a security actor within a broader world order (Reeves, 2018).  
8  
9 Working with Enloe's core tenets of militarism, notably that war is necessary and purposeful,  
10  
11 with having enemies being a natural condition; violence is normal; the soldier is to be  
12  
13 glorified (Enloe, 2004: 219; see also Bernazzoli and Flint, 2009: 400-401), this article  
14  
15 explores the tensions within these tours between celebrating British armed service and  
16  
17 highlighting the tragic cost of war and, most importantly, considers the ways young people  
18  
19 involved made sense of this, as acting subjects in their own right rather than passive objects  
20  
21 or recipients of remembrance practices. Focus will concentrate on three primary sites of  
22  
23 interaction: on the battlefields of the Somme; with the artefacts of and memorials to violent  
24  
25 industrialised warfare; and with serving soldiers of the British army. In response to the  
26  
27 broader mission of Critical Military Studies to be 'sceptically curious' (Basham et al, 2015:  
28  
29 1) and in line with Hyde's (2016) illumination of the contradictions and confusion within the  
30  
31 everyday lived experience of militarisation, it will highlight the way that government  
32  
33 sponsored tours to the Western Front during the centenary of the First World War are far  
34  
35 from straightforward spaces of militarisation.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Militarism, Remembrance and Youth**

46  
47 Militarism and militarisation is understood in this article as a process through which military  
48  
49 objectives and priorities extend into civilian life (Enloe, 2000; Jenkins et al, 2012;  
50  
51 Woodward, 2004) as part of a Gramscian notion of hegemony whereby support, or at least  
52  
53 acquiescence, for a large standing army and its associated activities must be contrived from  
54  
55 those who do not necessarily have a stake in the well-being of this institution (Bernazzoli and  
56  
57 Flint, 2009). Those who study the process of militarisation note its social (involving people  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and their understandings and responses) and spatial (occurring in specific places)  
4  
5 characteristics. As militarisation is often seen as ‘an intentional, sustained and deliberate  
6  
7 practice on the part of state military institutions and wider actors supportive of state  
8  
9 objectives’ (Jenkins et al, 2012: 357) a number of scholars take the UK’s enthusiastic state-  
10  
11 led commemoration of past conflicts (particularly the First and Second World Wars) as  
12  
13 compelling evidence of the way ‘the military has invaded every part of our lives’ (Bourke,  
14  
15 2014: 2; Enloe, 1983, 2004, 2007). Acts of remembrance are one of the key ways  
16  
17 ‘populations come to understand and react to military institutions, practices, power and force’  
18  
19 (Basham, 2016: 884). It is within these ceremonies that the intersections of militarism with  
20  
21 patriotism, nationalism and religion (notably Anglican Christianity) are most clearly on  
22  
23 display, as are the ways national elites and everyday citizens engage in the glorification of the  
24  
25 soldier (Bernazzoli and Flint, 2009) accepting war as a regrettable but necessary sacrifice  
26  
27 (Basham, 2016). For societies to be mobilised into conflicts, they have to understand a certain  
28  
29 set of ideas about nation, identity, enemies and obligations (Stern, 1995) and there exists a  
30  
31 rich scholarship on the multifaceted ways sites of war remembrance circulate and reproduce  
32  
33 ideas about national identity (Ashplant et al, 2000; Gillis, 1994; Hutchinson, 2007; Reeves,  
34  
35 2018).

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 In answer to Enloe’s call to activate ‘critical curiosities about ideas, practices and sites that  
45  
46 might seem less obvious’ (Enloe, 2004; Beier, 2011: 3) increasing attention is being paid to  
47  
48 the subtle and indirect forms of militarisation that shape the everyday lives of children within  
49  
50 and beyond zones of conflict, particularly in the global north and so-called post-conflict or  
51  
52 peaceful societies (Solomon and Denov, 2010). Scholars have explored the ways militarism  
53  
54 might be experienced, felt or engaged with in childhood, such as in the school curricula,  
55  
56 museums, toys, films and video games (Carter et al, 2006; Doucet, 2005; Gor, 2003;  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Hörschelmann, 2016; MacDonald, 2008; Power, 2007; Reagan, 1994; Shaw, 2010) as well  
4  
5 as the relationship between militarism, childhood and recruitment to the armed forces (Rech,  
6  
7 2014, 2016; Wells, 2014). However, while debates about war remembrance and the spaces  
8  
9 they occupy, the performances they invoke, and the people they involve are central to  
10  
11 understanding processes of militarisation, the involvement of children and young people in  
12  
13 these commemorative practices, and their responses to them, has received less attention  
14  
15 (Benwell and Hopkins, 2016). This article seeks to address the dearth in the literature by  
16  
17 capturing children as acting subjects in this social space and, by extension, argue that  
18  
19 children, young people, the figure or imaginary of the child, and varied youthful engagements  
20  
21 are inherent to contemporary discourses and practices of remembrance, not simply incidental.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Britain's necessary war?**

28  
29 Martin Shaw (1991) defines militarism in contemporary British culture in relation to 'the  
30  
31 national military myth' founded upon 'an ideology and imagery of a totalitarian military  
32  
33 threat, the belief that 'appeasing' such threats is wrong, and that military strength is the  
34  
35 foundation of security' (Shaw, 1991: 119). The UK government's approach to the centenary  
36  
37 commemorations of the First World War were imbued by these ideas; in January 2014,  
38  
39 Michael Gove – then Secretary of State for Education – publicly argued that left-wing  
40  
41 historians and television programmes had denigrated 'patriotism and courage by depicting the  
42  
43 war as a "misbegotten shambles"' when, in fact, it was 'plainly a just war to combat  
44  
45 aggression by a German elite bent on domination' (Shipman, 2014).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 To some extent, the tour content fuelled ideas of the war's necessity (and by default an  
54  
55 uncritical acceptance of Germany's position as 'the enemy') because of the nature of its  
56  
57 conception in the broader centenary context; the very choice of designing and delivering an  
58  
59 educational and commemorative programme around a significant British military victory  
60

1  
2  
3 meant that issues of defeat, weakness, appeasement and opposition to war were largely  
4  
5 irrelevant. As such, in both 2015 and 2017, the students interpreted the purpose of the tours  
6  
7 primarily to (1) remember the dead and (2) learn about British history.<sup>8</sup> Owing to limits of  
8  
9 time, particular topics were chosen, to the exclusion of others, as focus for the daily enquiry  
10  
11 questions (Pennell, 2018).<sup>9</sup> As a result, discussions of why Britain entered the war (or  
12  
13 whether it should have) were largely absent in favour of focus on the everyday experience of  
14  
15 being at war (Enquiry Question 1) and the significance of remembrance in the modern era  
16  
17 (Enquiry Question 3).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 The second Enquiry Question was explored during a day's visit to the Somme battlefields in  
25  
26 France and invited students to consider whether the four-month offensive in 1916, which  
27  
28 resulted in over a million casualties, was a disaster (Bendry, 2017). Various pedagogical  
29  
30 tools, including map-reading, topography, and, in 2017, a role play exercise (where pupils re-  
31  
32 enacted the experiences at 'Sunken Lane' on 1 July 1916 of members of 29<sup>th</sup> Division 1<sup>st</sup>  
33  
34 Battalion Lancashire Fusiliers who were annihilated by oncoming machine-gun fire) were  
35  
36 employed to encourage reflection on the purpose, experience and implications of the battle.  
37  
38 The students' engagement with the question was framed by an introductory DVD, *The*  
39  
40 *Somme: From Defeat to Victory* (BBC, 2006), shown on the coach during the drive from the  
41  
42 hotel to the battlefield, and interjections from the GBG which combined to infer that the  
43  
44 British army learnt crucial lessons at the Somme that enabled them to 'defeat their German  
45  
46 enemy'<sup>10</sup> and win the overall war on the Western Front in 1918. Linguistic demarcations of  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

---

56  
57 <sup>8</sup> Survey results, 2015 and 2017.

58 <sup>9</sup> Enquiry questions are an important pedagogical tool used to plan quality learning in history (Riley, 2000).  
59 Through using evidence to investigate historical questions, students are given the opportunity to see  
60 that history is not just a collection of facts, but rather a rigorously constructed set of arguments.

<sup>10</sup> Quotation taken from BBC documentary *The Somme: From Defeat to Victory* (2006).

1  
2  
3 'us' (the British) and 'them' (the Germans) were often part of the presentations employed to  
4  
5 explain military positions across the terrain.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Students were split over attempts to introduce them to recent historiography on the topic,  
11 encapsulated by Gary Sheffield's *Forgotten Victory: The First World War Myths and*  
12 *Realities* (2001; 2018). In both 2015 and 2017, over 50% of survey respondents either  
13  
14 remained indecisive or agreed/strongly agreed with the statement 'I now think the First  
15  
16 World War was pointless'. A 2017 elicitation task undertaken the evening after the morning's  
17  
18 role play at Sunken Lane resulted in equal numbers of responses being placed on the 'yes'  
19  
20 and 'no' sections of a 'judgement line' in response to the question 'Was the Somme really a  
21  
22 disaster?' One Year 10 pupil stated clearly that they felt 'the purpose of the trip is trying to  
23  
24 give a feeling of anti-war kind of thing' and that the tour had confirmed for them that the  
25  
26 First World War was pointless. However, another disagreed explaining that 'if we had never  
27  
28 did challenge Germany [sic], Germany would have had the confidence to...bully other  
29  
30 nations, of course you know a lot of men died but I think when you try to think about it, they  
31  
32 did die for a good reason.'<sup>11</sup> By 2017, in the context of Britain's vote to leave the European  
33  
34 Union in the referendum the previous year, one Year 10 student found the tour had  
35  
36 galvanised his belief in Britain's detachment from the continent and implored the government  
37  
38 to 'go for Brexit the fastest [sic] you can...It is our duty to keep the world safe and ensure  
39  
40 good morals are applied everywhere. We're the only ones that can'.<sup>12</sup>  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Explicitly nationalist perspectives, however, were rare as the nature of the tour, with its focus  
52  
53 on cemeteries and memorials to the missing, meant that the students largely framed their  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

---

59 <sup>11</sup> Focus group 1, 2015. Similar sentiments were also expressed in Focus group 3, 2017.

60 <sup>12</sup> Free-text comment in post-tour survey, 2017.



1  
2  
3 experiences within notions of loss and tragedy. Another introductory DVD, *A Debt of*  
4  
5 *Honour* on the history and work of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC),  
6  
7 was shown as the coaches departed Calais for Ypres on the first day overseas; it described the  
8  
9 horrors of trench warfare and the ‘appalling destruction to human life’ accompanied by a  
10  
11 haunting soundtrack composed by Peter Skellern, setting the tone for much of what the  
12  
13 students were about to see. In 2015, a Year 10 student was visibly moved after walking  
14  
15 around In Flanders Fields museum at the Cloth Hall in Ypres. She described how emotional  
16  
17 she felt after hearing the personal stories of those who survived; ‘with their mental scars and  
18  
19 aftershocks maybe it’s worse than being dead because at least when you’re dead the pain has  
20  
21 stopped’. At Lijssenthoek cemetery – the second largest CWGC cemetery in Belgium – a  
22  
23 Year 6 student commented: ‘I didn’t realise so many died’ before concluding that he would  
24  
25 not want to fight for his country because of the risk of being killed.<sup>13</sup> After witnessing the  
26  
27 Last Post ceremony at Menin Gate a number of students felt the need to voice their  
28  
29 frustration that Britain only commemorated its First World War dead once a year (in  
30  
31 November), rather than every evening as they did in Belgium. Inversely, the tour experience  
32  
33 had led them to be openly critical of British commemorative practices for not being  
34  
35 sufficiently patriotic.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Almost 79% of survey respondents in 2017 believed the tours had helped them ‘understand  
46  
47 why the First World War was called a world war’ enabled by visits to sites such as Neuve-  
48  
49 Chapelle Indian Memorial in France and/or the Indian Forces Memorial on the ramparts of  
50  
51 the south side of the Menin Gate. A full morning was spent at Langemark German cemetery,  
52  
53 north of Ypres, Belgium where more than 44,000 German soldiers are buried in multiple  
54  
55 occupancy and mass graves. This prompted some students to try and ‘see it from the other  
56  
57  
58  
59

---

60 <sup>13</sup> Interviews during observational tour, 2015.

1  
2  
3 side' and appreciate that all soldiers 'were fighting for the same reasons'.<sup>14</sup> Through a series  
4 of reflective activities prompted by 'profile cards' detailing the pre-war and wartime lives of  
5 individuals buried in the cemetery the students were able to contrast the more sombre and  
6 austere architecture at Langemark with the triumphant memorials and individualised  
7 headstones/name boards meticulously maintained by the CWGC. Students contrasted how  
8 victorious and defeated belligerents commemorate the First World War noting the freedom  
9 Britain had to 'glorify' its military dead.<sup>15</sup> A Year 12 pupil saw the significance of the Last  
10 Post ceremony at Menin Gate being its international nature bringing nations together.  
11 Conversely, a Year 10 and Year 12 pupil both thought the ceremony was 'maybe too  
12 British?' owing to the domineering lion (a symbol of both Britain and Flanders) lying on top  
13 of the gate and the presence of the British Ambassador, uniformed British soldiers and  
14 English-language engravings.<sup>16</sup> A Year 9 student thought the tour could have done more to  
15 place emphasis on 'the different countries involved and the different allies and things like  
16 that about the different countries.' The visit to Langemark, in her opinion, was excellent but  
17 insufficient.<sup>17</sup>

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Overall, the students responded ambiguously and in sometimes contradictory ways to aspects  
41 of the tour which confronted them with issues relating to the necessity of the war and  
42 Britain's position in a historic global conflict. As the 2017 elicitation task on the Battle of the  
43 Somme indicated, a large number of students were willing to consider the act of war as futile,  
44 even if those involved in its execution were heroes (as discussed below). Some even  
45 expressed internationalist ideals that exonerated individual nations or representatives of their  
46 armies. Yet despite an awareness that war is unpleasant and undesirable, there was little

---

57 <sup>14</sup> Overheard conversation between teacher and pupils, observational tour, 2017.

58 <sup>15</sup> Interviews during observational tour, 2016.

59 <sup>16</sup> Interviews during observational tour, 2015.

60 <sup>17</sup> Focus group 5, 2017.

1  
2  
3 empirical evidence to suggest that these young people were being encouraged, within the  
4  
5 confines of the tour, to ask questions about whether the British military *should* serve the  
6  
7 nation or ‘police’ the world for the common good. The narratives within the tour assumed  
8  
9 ‘that above all we live in a world of threat and risk, of enemies and allies, and of nation and  
10  
11 state rather than global and human interests as operative values’ (Lutz, 2009: 25). As Lutz  
12  
13 (2009) and McSorley (2014) observe, people rarely articulate militarism explicitly or in a  
14  
15 nationalistic way but that does not mean that their practices do not facilitate nationalistic and  
16  
17 geopolitical ideas such that war is inevitable and having enemies is a natural position.  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **Violence made visible?**

23  
24 In many ways there was a strong disjuncture between the violence that characterised the First  
25  
26 World War and the educational content of the FWWCBTP. One regular soldier, participating  
27  
28 in a tour as a coach chaperone in 2015, felt torn between the realities of his job and the  
29  
30 audience he had enlisted to support on the tours: ‘the kids are asking me “what does the army  
31  
32 do?” and I want to say “violence, killing people. In the event politics fails, we go in to kill,  
33  
34 protect Britain and its interests. Sometimes we build schools, wells, but we also blow things  
35  
36 up.”<sup>18</sup> For another regular, in 2016, the number one question the young people asked him  
37  
38 was ‘how many people have you killed?’<sup>19</sup> His response was to draw their attention to the  
39  
40 multiple roles played by the British army including disaster relief and supporting the police.  
41  
42 Some teachers, particularly those accompanying younger pupils, also faced difficulties  
43  
44 explaining the ramifications of mass industrialised warfare in an age-appropriate manner. In  
45  
46 2015, at Thiepval Memorial to the more than 72,300 missing British and South African  
47  
48 soldiers of the Somme, a Year 6 pupil seemed confused about where their bodies were. His  
49  
50 teacher explained that they were ‘lost in the fields’ around where they were standing and  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

---

59 <sup>18</sup> Interview during observational tour, 2015.

60 <sup>19</sup> Interview during observational tour, 2016.

1  
2  
3 'couldn't be brought home' without detailing the pulverising effect of artillery bombardment.  
4  
5 The beautiful and neatly kept cemeteries of the CWGC had obscured the harsh realities of  
6  
7 one of the bloodiest moments in twentieth century history.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 One of the main roles of the serving army personnel was to help run the object handling  
13  
14 sessions that featured twice in the tour, alongside the GBG, many of whom had themselves  
15  
16 served in the armed forces. On the first night of the tour, a selection of predominately  
17  
18 military items relating to the First World War were explored. Unsurprisingly, with its  
19  
20 emphasis on tactile learning, free discussion and independent thinking, this was one of the  
21  
22 most popular aspects of the tour for the students. The larger items (rifle and wire cutters)  
23  
24 were particularly popular (described by one GBG in 2017 as 'the big tourist attraction'), as  
25  
26 was the helmet, which the young people tried on and captured as 'selfies' on their  
27  
28 smartphones. As one Year 9 pupil exclaimed, in 2017, as he pointed a First World War era  
29  
30 Lewis gun at the classmate taking his photo: 'I love the way we learn about such a sad thing  
31  
32 in such a cheery way – it's great!'<sup>20</sup> There were attempts to alert the students to the purpose  
33  
34 of these items (to kill others/protect yourself from being killed) supported by the serving  
35  
36 army personnel who shared stories of shrapnel injuries and leading bayonet charges during  
37  
38 the 2003 invasion of Iraq.<sup>21</sup> But the light-hearted atmosphere was quickly restored when the  
39  
40 session leaders returned to encouraging photos or joked about bayonets being good tin-  
41  
42 openers.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 As Rech (2019) has demonstrated in his work on material cultures of British military  
52  
53 recruitment, the 'static', in situ stuff in these object handling sessions highlight 'the  
54  
55  
56  
57

58  
59 <sup>20</sup> Overheard during observation, 2017.

60 <sup>21</sup> Observed during object handling sessions, 2016 and 2017.

1  
2  
3 determinacy of immediate space' which acts 'to decontextualize objects – to remove them  
4  
5 from spaces of battle – in order that a range of ethical questions about their use might be  
6  
7 avoided' while simultaneously '*re-plac[ing]* objects in the imagined landscapes of Western  
8  
9 military endeavour' (Rech, 2019: 12). On the third night of the tour, the GBG and army  
10  
11 personnel, supported by UCL IoE staff, ran a session contrasting First World War era and  
12  
13 present-day equipment utilised by the British army. While this helped students understand  
14  
15 historical change and continuities it also had a tendency, during the observations undertaken,  
16  
17 to descend into play with students and teachers trying on uniform, painting their faces with  
18  
19 camouflage cream (2015), undertaking a 'gas mask' relay race (2016) and the distribution of  
20  
21 army branded 'goodies' like pencils and glow sticks (2017)<sup>22</sup>, which bear a troubling  
22  
23 similarity to the 'thing-ness' of contemporary recruiting and remembrance. Here objects –  
24  
25 such as Help for Heroes bracelets, poppies and free pens, lanyards and keyrings distributed at  
26  
27 outdoor military recruitment events – fold militarism and geopolitical power into everyday  
28  
29 habits and routines animating certain narratives about warfare that obscure violence and  
30  
31 bloodshed (Basham, 2016; Rech, 2019).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 The circumnavigation of violence within some aspects of the tour risked its effects being  
41  
42 normalized and morally neutralized (Bourke, 2014: 6). However, the sheer scale of the  
43  
44 cemeteries and memorials visited, as well as the tour's emphasis on every headstone telling  
45  
46 the story of an individual and their family impacted by war (Bendry, 2017), ensured that the  
47  
48 students could not interpret war as something 'fun' and without consequence, even if they did  
49  
50 not go into the precise, and gory, details of how combatants were injured and killed. The  
51  
52 cemeteries depict, in stark and sombre detail, the human cost of war (Miley and Read, 2017).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

---

58  
59 <sup>22</sup> The latter three were described by the UCL IoE team as inappropriate anomalies, rather than regular fixtures,  
60 that were stopped each tour season. Email correspondence between FWFCBTP Programme Director and  
author, 19 October 2017.

1  
2  
3 Both the 2015 and 2017 survey results indicated that ‘scale of loss’ was the second key piece  
4 of information learnt about the First World War after ‘major battles’. Students described  
5 feeling predominately ‘surprised’ and ‘sad’ when they saw the cemeteries for the first time.<sup>23</sup>  
6  
7 As one Year 9 student commented after visiting Tyne Cot cemetery: ‘Wow. It’s one thing  
8 seeing 12,000 written in a book, but it’s another thing seeing 12,000 headstones’.<sup>24</sup> In an  
9 effort to make the unimaginable number of losses intelligible, students were assigned a  
10 soldier, with some association to their locality, killed during the First World War and  
11 buried/listed at Tyne Cot or Thiepval memorial. They researched his story using internet  
12 resources before being encouraged to lay a wooden cross – provided by the tour in exchange  
13 for a small donation to the Royal British Legion (RBL) – when they found ‘their’ soldier’s  
14 headstone/engraved name. Two Year 12 pupils were visibly overwhelmed at finding the  
15 headstone of the soldier they had researched: ‘It’s really tough actually. I feel a huge sense of  
16 closure’; ‘It’s just really sad. We’ve heard about his name...and now we’re here and it says  
17 he’s 19...his brother isn’t here, he’s in Thiepval.’<sup>25</sup> Arguably, in comparison to other state-  
18 managed sites of memorialisation on sacred land, such as Ground Zero in New York City, the  
19 bodies – at least in the form of their names – are visible, thwarting any attempt by the state to  
20 conceal the link between its security needs and the cost to human life (Auchter, 2015).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

### 44 **Fallen soldiers**

45 While the FWWCBTP enabled student participants to critically reflect on whether the First  
46 World War was ‘just’, primarily by confronting them with the human cost of war, the tours  
47 must be understood on a continuum of British ritualised remembrance that emerged during  
48 the war itself. Such practices ‘elevated the war to a sacred event through its concentration on  
49 the sacrifice of the fallen’ and thus denied people any opportunity to criticise the war  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

---

58 <sup>23</sup> Survey results, 2015 and 2017.

59 <sup>24</sup> Interview during observational tour, 2015.

60 <sup>25</sup> Interview during observational tour, 2017.

1  
2  
3 (Bushaway, 1992: 137; Lloyd, 1998: 173). As Basham (2016) has explored in relation to  
4 recent iterations of the RBL's Annual Poppy Appeal, mourning and remembrance of past  
5 wars has been separated from military violence, particularly linguistically, with the emphasis  
6 on 'fallen' soldiers. The tours are weaved together by a series of acts of remembrance  
7 interpreting war deaths as noble sacrifices and burial sites and memorials as sacred places  
8 worthy of respect and veneration. While many of the students were familiar with  
9 remembrance practices from Remembrance Day services at their schools every November,  
10 the tours confirmed key behaviours associated with contemporary remembrance over an  
11 intense four-day period.<sup>26</sup> Students were encouraged to lay wooden poppies at the  
12 name/headstone of the local soldier they were assigned to research; selected to lay a wreath at  
13 the Last Post ceremony at the Menin Gate; encouraged to donate to RBL collection boxes  
14 that were passed around the coach at the end of the tour; and, across all observations,  
15 increasing numbers of students were observed purchasing and wearing red poppy pin badges.  
16 The students described their behaviour and responses to such acts of remembrance in  
17 language that drew heavily on traditional tropes of sacrifice, respect, pride and gratitude. For  
18 two Year 12 and 13 pupils, the ceremony at Menin Gate was significant because it was 'an  
19 opportunity to remember the sacrifice and the lives lost so we could be free'.<sup>27</sup> A Year 10  
20 pupil who was selected to lay a wreath during the ceremony understood the ritual in terms of  
21 an unquestionable duty to atone for a past debt: 'Hundreds of thousands of people died for us  
22 so we could live our way of life. We've got to remember because if we forget then it's like  
23 we don't care. We owe them everything.' A Year 11 student wore a red poppy 'as a badge of  
24 respect' to the 'numbers who died fighting for democracy'. One Year 10 pupil, moved by the  
25 number of headstones in a single cemetery, was consciously avoiding feeling 'too sad'

---

26 In 2015, 57.8% of survey respondents had participated in a remembrance ceremony in the UK before the tour. In 2017 this figure decreased slightly to 54.6%.

27 Interview during observational tour, 2016.

1  
2  
3 because 'we're here to remember and ...be grateful'. Another pupil, also Year 10, felt proud  
4  
5 laying a wreath at the Menin Gate because it was a way of saying thank you to those who had  
6  
7 served.<sup>28</sup>  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Each tour ended with a final whole-group ceremony at Tyne Cot cemetery where students  
13  
14 were invited to reflect on the final enquiry question (should we still remember 100 years on?)  
15  
16 before listening, often with heads bowed, to the 'Ode of Remembrance' from Laurence  
17  
18 Binyon's poem 'For the Fallen'. It was an experience that a number of students found very  
19  
20 emotional and some were moved to tears.<sup>29</sup> In 2015, explicit links were made between the  
21  
22 sacrifice of soldiers in the First World Wars and those serving in current conflicts through a  
23  
24 deeply personal reflection by one of the UCL IoE team on the death of a Royal Marine in  
25  
26 Afghanistan in June 2010 who had studied at their former school. Students stood silently  
27  
28 around the Cross of Sacrifice, serving soldiers in their midst, as they were told: 'soldiers are  
29  
30 still today going off and ... making the same sacrifices' before being asked 'time has passed  
31  
32 and now it's for you to decide are they still important'.<sup>30</sup> The 'past' became affirmation of the  
33  
34 'present' (Basham, 2016) potentially legitimising armed conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan  
35  
36 that bear little resemblance to the conflict of 1914 to 1918 (Danilova, 2015; Jenkins et al,  
37  
38 2012) and closing down the opportunity to query whether remembrance deserves the  
39  
40 attention it receives in contemporary British society (Pennell, 2018).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 As well as accompanying students in the formal wreath-laying ceremony at the Menin Gate  
50  
51 ceremony, serving soldiers were called upon throughout the tours to offer their insights into  
52  
53 strategy, tactics and equipment, often leading activities, answering questions and engaging  
54  
55  
56  
57

---

58 <sup>28</sup> Interviews during observational tour, 2015.

59 <sup>29</sup> Focus group 1, 2017.

60 <sup>30</sup> Observed during tour, 2015.



1  
2  
3 the students in conversation thus assuming a position of authority. Their presence was a  
4 highlight for the majority of participating students, providing, in their opinion, a unique  
5 insight into what being a soldier involves. In 2017, ‘meeting and talking with army  
6 personnel’ was the second most popular aspect of the tour for survey respondents. For a Year  
7 10 pupil this was because they helped bridge 100 years of history: ‘I like the modern-day  
8 soldiers being there in general because I thought that’s really cool because they’re telling  
9 their experiences now and they can relate it back there [the First World War].’<sup>31</sup> For others,  
10 their presence helped to break-down civil-military barriers, allowing the students to  
11 understand that soldiers were also human too.<sup>32</sup> Some students thought the soldiers added an  
12 element of fun to the programme, particularly the equipment handling sessions which were  
13 ‘so interactive and we got lots of free stuff like the glow sticks’.<sup>33</sup> Focus group discussions  
14 and free-text comments in the surveys suggested some students wanted the soldiers to have  
15 been more involved in the tours.<sup>34</sup>

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 As with other soldier-centred remembrance practices, these interactions with serving army  
36 personnel manifested feelings of ‘hero-ification’ (Kelly, 2012). A number of students  
37 referenced how they had a new-found respect for the bravery and heroism of present-day  
38 soldiers as a result of the tour.<sup>35</sup> First World War soldiers were characterised by the students  
39 as duped ‘innocents’, a tendency evident across broader British society (McCartney, 2014).<sup>36</sup>  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

<sup>31</sup> Focus groups 1 and 4, 2017.

<sup>32</sup> Focus group 2, 2017.

<sup>33</sup> Interview during observational tour, 2017.

<sup>34</sup> Focus group 4, 2017.

<sup>35</sup> Focus groups 1 and 2, 2017.

<sup>36</sup> Focus group 2, 2017.

1  
2  
3 someone else's'.<sup>37</sup> In 2015, a Year 11 pupil felt the presence of military personnel restricted  
4 their ability to ask questions. For them, no one was going to respond to the enquiry question  
5 'should we remember' in the negative if a serving soldier was within earshot.<sup>38</sup> But these  
6 critical interjections were limited. The majority of students agreed that raising an objection to  
7 remembrance or criticising the soldier-dead was inappropriate and disrespectful. The analogy  
8 used by one Year 12 student was: 'walking into a church and you know saying that you love  
9 the devil and you hate god and everything.'<sup>39</sup> Overall, the tours dissuaded students from  
10 questioning 'the violence done to and perpetrated by' soldiers (Basham, 2016: 892).

## 22 **Conclusion**

23  
24 The FWWCBTTP was the most significant youth-centred activity funded by the UK  
25 government during the centenary of the First World War. Influenced by scholars in Critical  
26 Military Studies and Military Geography, this article has taken a moment of intense focus on  
27 young people and war remembrance to see what it reveals about processes of militarisation in  
28 the global north. Focusing on Enloe's core tenets of militarism subtly present within the  
29 tour content – war is necessary and purposeful, with having enemies being a natural  
30 condition; violence is normal; the soldier is to be glorified – it has revealed that student  
31 understandings of these ideas are complex and fluid. As studies into youth responses to  
32 Anzac Day in Australia and New Zealand have shown, the young participants of the  
33 FWWCBTTP were capable of holding a range of views simultaneously that were not confined  
34 by the restrictive binaries of militaristic/anti-militaristic, pro/anti-war,  
35 nationalist/internationalist, patriotic/unpatriotic (Davison, 2003; McKay, 2013; Scates, 2006;  
36 Sheehan and Davison, 2017). While students came away from the tours with a largely British  
37 understanding of the First World War and the major battles fought by the British army, this

---

58 <sup>37</sup> Focus group 2, 2017.

59 <sup>38</sup> Focus group 1, 2015.

60 <sup>39</sup> Focus group 2, 2015.

1  
2  
3 was framed within a strong awareness of the tragic cost of the war leading many students to  
4 question whether the war was worth fighting. During the tours, the students were confronted  
5 with both the implements and implications of violence. Certainly, the tours raise broader  
6 questions about the ethics of ‘discomforting pedagogies’ whereby educators and students  
7 alike move outside their ‘comfort zones’ and confront the unsettling feelings that may emerge  
8 (Zembylas and McGlynn, 2010). But it would be false to claim that the students were not  
9 being exposed to what violence in war means, even if this was sometimes achieved through  
10 playful techniques such as object handling. While not denying the tours were in large part a  
11 series of acts of remembrance, which in themselves are both deeply political and militarised,  
12 the fact that they took place against the backdrop of cemeteries and memorials enabled the  
13 students to return home more aware of the destructive consequences of war for all  
14 nationalities involved.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 However, the involvement of serving army personnel in the tours did serve to project the  
34 armed forces as legitimate and worthy of respect (Wells, 2014). Students struggled to  
35 contemplate not taking ‘their expected place in the ceremonial order’ or even challenging ‘the  
36 order itself’ through fear that they would be dismissed and derided by their peers (Kelly,  
37 2012: 735). In light of research by Gee (2007) and Sangster (2013), the engagement of the  
38 armed forces with young people via the FWWCBTP could be understood as part of a wider  
39 recruitment strategy present before the centenary. The UCL IoE team were attuned to this  
40 risk and explicit in their oversight of the MoD that ‘there was to be no recruitment element  
41 ...no literature handed out ...nothing there that could be deemed as the Army looking to  
42 recruit young people’.<sup>40</sup> Instead, this aspect of the tours should be understood as part of a  
43 trend of the rehabilitation of the military in the aftermath of the Iraq War (Jenkins et al,  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

<sup>40</sup> Interview with FWWCBTP Programme Director, 23 May 2019.

1  
2  
3 2012). As an exercise in promoting positive civilian-military relations, the tours were very  
4  
5 successful. They also raise difficult questions about how young people can be encouraged to  
6  
7 critique the ‘figure of the soldier’ without demeaning the value of the individual human being  
8  
9 (Jenkins et al, 2012: 361).  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 Perhaps most troublingly, the tours did little to challenge young people’s assumptions that  
15  
16 war is inevitable. Students frequently attested to the tours’ value being in keeping the  
17  
18 memory of the First World War alive to ensure ‘lessons are learned’ and societies ‘never  
19  
20 forget’. However, the presence of serving army personnel who had seen action in recent  
21  
22 conflicts was evidence that these phrases were inane. With remembrance the pivot axis of the  
23  
24 tours, in a context of a diminution of peace education more generally (Cook, 2008), the  
25  
26 students’ focus remained on their individual responses *to* violence rather than the structural  
27  
28 causes *of* violence (Bourke, 2014); politics was separated from remembrance (Danilova,  
29  
30 2015). One Year 12 student said she ‘felt really sad because wars just keep going and will  
31  
32 never end.’ Her classmate interjected: ‘if I ruled the world I’d make sure everyone was  
33  
34 friends [laughs] but I know that will never happen.’<sup>41</sup> A Year 10 pupil admitted:  
35  
36 ‘Remembrance isn’t working ... we have all the evidence there and we know that it’s tragic  
37  
38 and futile but we still do it’.<sup>42</sup>  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Finally, this article has highlighted the ways in which children and young people are inherent  
48  
49 to discourses and practices of remembrance, and not simply standing on the periphery of a  
50  
51 cultural and political practice that would continue regardless of their participation. This is  
52  
53 particularly evident in the context of the First World War centenary; the absence of living  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

---

59 <sup>41</sup> Interviews during observational tour, 2016.

60 <sup>42</sup> Focus group 1, 2017.

1  
2  
3 veterans meant it was young people who had ‘to bear the burden of memory in order to pass  
4 it onto subsequent generations’ (Pennell, 2016: 38). Complementing work by Basham (2016)  
5 and others – who have demonstrated that particular imaginaries of the family, and  
6 masculinities and femininities, undergird practices of remembrance – this article demands a  
7 more ambitious rendering of the figure of the child, one that acknowledges the political utility  
8 of conceptions of ‘youthfulness’ and ‘innocence’ in contemporary remembrance discourse  
9 and that understands contemporary remembrance practices as an attempt to re-cast ‘aged’,  
10 historic and temporally distant memorial spaces as multi-generational in order to retain their  
11 meaning and relevance. Thus commemorative initiatives, such as the FWWCBTP, are not  
12 only part of a portfolio of ‘mundane embodied practices and idioms’ that enable ‘a broad and  
13 subtle form of militarism’ to become ‘something not explicitly thought but simply felt to be  
14 habitually right...from an early age’ (McSorley, 2014: 119), but they are inherently  
15 dependent on children and young people – and what they are imagined to represent.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

Auchter J (2015) *The Politics of Haunting and Memory in International Relations*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Ashplant TG, Dawson G and Roper M (2000) *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration*. London: Routledge.

Basham VM, Belkin A and Gifkins J (2015) What is Critical Military Studies? *Critical Military Studies* 1(1): 1 – 2.

Basham VM (2016) Gender, race, militarism and remembrance: the everyday geopolitics of the poppy. *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 23(6): 883 – 96.

Beaumont J (2015) The politics of memory: Commemorating the centenary of the First World War. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 50(3): 529 – 35.

Beier JM (2011) Introduction. In: *The Militarization of Childhood: Thinking Beyond the Global South*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.1 – 15.

Bendry S (February 2017) Learning beyond the battlefield. *Leader: The Magazine for School and College Leaders*. Available at [http://www.leadermagazine.co.uk/articles/learning\\_beyond\\_the\\_battlefield/](http://www.leadermagazine.co.uk/articles/learning_beyond_the_battlefield/) (accessed 12 July 2019).

Benwell MC and Hopkins P (2016) Introducing Children's and Young People's Critical Geopolitics. In: Benwell MC and Hopkins P (eds) *Children, Young People and Critical Geopolitics*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.1 – 27.

Bernazzoli RM and Flint C (2009) Power, Place and Militarism: Toward a Comparative Geographic Analysis of Militarization. *Geography Compass* 3(1): 393 – 411.

Bernhard R (2019) Using mixed methods to capture complexity in an empirical

- 1  
2  
3 project about teachers' beliefs and history education in Austria. *History Education*  
4  
5  
6 *Research Journal* 16(1): 63–73.  
7  
8  
9 Bourke J (2014) *Wounding the World: How Military Violence and War-Play Invade Our*  
10  
11 *Lives*. London: Virago Press.  
12  
13  
14 Bushaway B (1992) Name Upon Name: The Great War and Remembrance. In: Porter R (ed)  
15  
16 *The Myths of the English*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp.136 – 67.  
17  
18  
19 Carter S, Kirby P and Woodyer T (2016) Lucic – or Playful – Geopolitics. In Benwell MC  
20  
21 and Hopkins P (eds) *Children, Young People and Critical Geopolitics*. Abingdon: Routledge,  
22  
23 pp.61 – 89.  
24  
25  
26 Cook SA (2008) Give Peace a Chance: The Diminution of Peace Education in Global  
27  
28 Education in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. *Canadian Journal of*  
29  
30 *Education* 31(4): 889 – 913.  
31  
32  
33  
34 Danilova N (2015) *The Politics of War Commemoration in the UK and Russia*. Basingstoke:  
35  
36 Palgrave Macmillan.  
37  
38  
39 Davison G (2003) The Habits of Commemoration and the Revival of Anzac Day. *Australian*  
40  
41 *Cultural History* 22: 73 – 82.  
42  
43  
44 Doucet MG (2005) Child's play: The political imaginary of international relations and  
45  
46 contemporary popular children's films. *Global Society* 19(3): 289 – 306.  
47  
48  
49 Edkins J (2003) The Rush to Memory and the Rhetoric of War. *Journal of Political and*  
50  
51 *Military Sociology* 31(2): 231 – 51.  
52  
53  
54 Enloe C (1983) *Does khaki become you? The militarisation of women's lives*. London: Pluto  
55  
56 Press.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Enloe C (2000) *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*.  
4  
5 Berkley CA: University of California Press.  
6  
7  
8 Enloe C (2004) *The Curious Feminist: searching for women in a new age of empire*.  
9  
10 Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.  
11  
12  
13 Enloe C (2007) *Globalization & militarism: feminists make the link*. Lanham, MD: Rowman  
14 & Littlefield.  
15  
16  
17  
18 Foley RT (2014) Op REFLECT: What Can We Learn from the First World War? Available  
19 at [https://defenceindepth.co/2014/11/10/op-reflect-what-can-we-learn-from-the-first-world-](https://defenceindepth.co/2014/11/10/op-reflect-what-can-we-learn-from-the-first-world-war/)  
20 [war/](https://defenceindepth.co/2014/11/10/op-reflect-what-can-we-learn-from-the-first-world-war/) (accessed 9 July 2019).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 Gee D (2007) *Informed Choice? Armed forces recruitment practice in the United Kingdom*.  
27 York: Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust.  
28  
29  
30  
31 Gillis JR (ed) (1994) *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton, NJ:  
32 Princeton University Press.  
33  
34  
35  
36 Hopkins PE (2010) *Young People, Place and Identity*. Routledge: London.  
37  
38  
39 Hörschelmann K (2016) Crossing Points: Contesting Militarism in the Spaces of Children's  
40 Everyday Lives in Britain and Germany. In: Benwell MC and Hopkins P (eds) *Children,*  
41 *Young People and Critical Geopolitics*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.29 – 44.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Hyde A (2016) The present tense of Afghanistan: accounting for space, time and gender in  
47 processes of militarisation. *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*  
48 23(6): 857 – 68.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 Gor H (2003) Education for war in Israel: preparing children to accept war as a natural factor  
55 of life. In: Saltman KJ and Gabbard DA (eds) *Education as Enforcement: The Militarisation*  
56 *and Corporatization of Schools*. New York NY: Routledge Falmer, pp.177 – 88.  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Hutchinson J (2007) Warfare, Remembrance and National Identity. In Leoussi AS and  
4  
5  
6 Grosby S (eds) *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the*  
7  
8 *Formation of Nations*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp.42 – 52.  
9  
10  
11 Jenkins KN, Megoran N, Woodward R and Bos D (2012) Wootton Bassett and the political  
12  
13 spaces of remembrance and mourning. *Area* 44(3): 356 – 63.  
14  
15  
16 Kelly J (2012) Popular Culture, Sport and the ‘Hero’-fication of British Militarism. *Sociology*  
17  
18 47(4): 722 – 38.  
19  
20  
21 Lloyd DW (1998) *Battlefield Tourism: Pilgrimage and the Commemoration of the Great War*  
22  
23 *in Britain, Australia and Canada, 1919-1939*. Oxford: Berg.  
24  
25  
26 Lutz C (2009) The military normal. In: Network of Concerned Anthropologists (eds) *The*  
27  
28 *Counter-Counterinsurgency Manual*. Chicago IL: Prickly Paradigm Press, pp.23 – 37.  
29  
30  
31 McCartney H (2014) The First World War soldier and his contemporary image in Britain.  
32  
33 *International Affairs* 90(2): 299 – 315.  
34  
35  
36 McSorley, K (2014) Towards an embodied sociology of war. *The Sociological Review* 62:S2:  
37  
38 107 – 28.  
39  
40  
41 Macdonald F (2008) Space and the Atom: On the Popular Geopolitics of Cold War Rocketry.  
42  
43 *Geopolitics* 13(4): 611 – 34.  
44  
45  
46 McKay J (2013) A Critique of the Militarisation of Australian History and Culture Thesis:  
47  
48 The Case of Anzac Battlefield Tourism. *Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*  
49  
50 10(1): 1 – 25.  
51  
52  
53  
54 Miley F and Read A (2017) Their name liveth for evermore: Accounting for the human cost  
55  
56 of war. In: *9<sup>th</sup> Accounting History International Conference*, Verona, Italy, 6 – 8 September  
57  
58 2017. Available at  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323836116\\_Their\\_name\\_liveth\\_for\\_evermore\\_Accounting\\_for\\_the\\_human\\_cost\\_of\\_war](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323836116_Their_name_liveth_for_evermore_Accounting_for_the_human_cost_of_war) (accessed 14 July 2019).

4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Mosse GL (1990) *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*. Oxford:  
9 Oxford University Press.

10  
11  
12  
13 Mycock A (2014) The First World War Centenary in the UK: “A Truly National  
14 Commemoration”? *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*  
15  
16 103(2): 153 – 62.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Pennell C (2016) Learning Lessons from War? Inclusions and Exclusions in Teaching First  
22 World War History in English Secondary Schools. *History and Memory* 28(1): 36 – 71.

23  
24  
25  
26 Pennell C (2018) Taught to Remember? British Youth and First World War Centenary  
27 Battlefield Tours. *Cultural Trends* 27(2): 83 – 98.

28  
29  
30  
31 Pennell C and Sheehan M (2020) But what do they really think? Methodological challenges  
32 of investigating young people’s perspectives of war remembrance. *History Education*  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Power M (2007) Digitized Virtuosity: Video War Games and Post 9/11 Cyber-Deterrence.  
*Security Dialogue* 38(2): 271 – 88.

Reagan PM (1994) War toys, war movies and the militarization of the United States, 1900 –  
1985. *Journal of Peace Research* 31(1): 45 – 58.

Rech MF (2014) Be Part of the Story: A popular geopolitics of war comics aesthetics and  
Royal Air Force recruitment. *Political Geography* 39: 36 – 47.

Rech MF (2016) Children, Young People and the Everyday Geopolitics of British Military  
Recruitment. In: Benwell MC and Hopkins P (eds) *Children, Young People and Critical*  
*Geopolitics*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.45 – 60.

- 1  
2  
3 Rech MF (2019) Ephemera(l) Geopolitics: The Material Cultures of British Military  
4 Recruitment. *Geopolitics* (published online 11 February 2019): 1 – 24.  
5  
6  
7  
8 Reeves A (2018) Auto-ethnography and the Study of Affect and Emotion in World Politics:  
9 Investigating Security Discourses at London’s Imperial War Museum. In: Clément M and  
10 Sangar E (eds) *Researching Emotions in International Relations: Methodological*  
11 *Perspectives on the Emotional Turn*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.103 – 27.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Riley M (2000) Into the Key Stage 3 history garden: choosing and planting your enquiry  
19 questions. *Teaching History* 99: 8 – 13.  
20  
21  
22  
23 Sangster E (2013) The military’s influence in UK education. In: Everett O (ed) *Sowing*  
24 *Seeds: The Militarisation of Youth and How to Counter It*. London: War Resisters’  
25 International, pp.86 – 93.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 Scates B (2006) *Return to Gallipoli: Walking the Battlefields of the Great War*. Cambridge:  
31 Melbourne University Press.  
32  
33  
34  
35 Shaw IGR (2010) Playing war. *Social & Cultural Geography* 11(8): 789 – 803.  
36  
37  
38  
39 Shaw M (1991) *Post-Military Society: Militarism, Demilitarization and War at the End of the*  
40 *Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Polity Press.  
41  
42  
43  
44 Sheehan M and Davison M (2017) ‘We need to remember they died for us’: How young  
45 people in New Zealand make meaning of war remembrance and commemoration of the First  
46 World War. *London Review of Education* 15(20), 259 – 71.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Sheffield G (2001; 2018) *Forgotten Victory: The First World War Myths and Realities*.  
52 London: Headline (1<sup>st</sup> edition).  
53  
54  
55  
56 Shipman T (2 January 2014). Michael Gove blasts ‘Blackadder myths’ about the First World  
57 War spread by television sit-coms and left-wing academics’. *Daily Mail*. Available  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 at [http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2532923/Michael-Gove-blasts-Blackadder-](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2532923/Michael-Gove-blasts-Blackadder-myths-First-World-War-spread-television-sit-coms-left-wing-academics.html)  
4 [myths-First-World-War-spread-television-sit-coms-left-wing-academics.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2532923/Michael-Gove-blasts-Blackadder-myths-First-World-War-spread-television-sit-coms-left-wing-academics.html) (accessed 12  
5  
6  
7  
8 July 2019).

9  
10 Solomon I and Denov M (2010) Militarised Bodies: The Global Militarisation of Children's  
11 Lives. In: Hörschelmann K and Colls R (eds) *Contested Bodies of Childhood and Youth*.  
12  
13 Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.163 – 77.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Stern P (1995) Why do people sacrifice for their nations? *Political Psychology* 16(2): 217 –  
19  
20 35.

21  
22  
23 Wells K (2014) Marching to be somebody: a governmentality analysis of online cadet  
24  
25 recruitment. *Children's Geographies* 12(3): 339 – 53.

26  
27  
28 Winter J (2006) *Remembering the Great War: The Great War between Memory and History*  
29  
30 *in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.

31  
32  
33 Woodward R (2004) *Military Geographies*. Oxford: Blackwell.

34  
35  
36 Zembylas M and McGlynn C (2010) Discomforting pedagogies: emotional tensions, ethical  
37  
38 dilemmas and transformative possibilities. *British Educational Research Journal* 38(1): 1 –  
39  
40 19.