Memorializing the Victims of Terrorism

Memorializing the Victims of Terrorism

Rina Egbo

Research and Statistics Division
Department of Justice Canada

rr09-6e

Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

The memorialization of victims of terrorism and terrorist-type events has recently been recognized as a critical component of the healing process for victims, their families and the general public. Identifying the issues associated with memorializing victims of terrorism is therefore vital towards the development of policy frameworks that effectively address their memorialization needs. This report presents a review of the international academic literature that has been produced regarding the memorialization of victims of terrorism and terrorist-type events. The literature shows that there are many practical and conceptual challenges involved in the memorialization processes. Some of these challenges include the meanings associated with memorials, the presence of multiple stakeholders in the memorialization process, and the location and maintenance of memorials. Hence, the successful memorialization of Canadian victims of terrorism relies in part, on the careful consideration of the various issues associated with memorializing and the memorialization process.

Executive Summary

The needs of victims of terrorism have now extended beyond the legal and health trajectories through which they have primarily been based. Today, the memorialization of the victims of terrorism is emerging as a necessary component in the general approach used to address the overall needs of those affected by terrorism. As a relatively recent area of focus, gauging the ways in which to address the memorialization related needs of Canadian victims of terrorism becomes a real challenge. Towards establishing a framework for addressing the memorialization needs of victims, this report presents a preliminary scan of the academic literature that addresses in some capacity, the various issues associated with devising an effective approach regarding the memorialization of victims of terrorism. Some of the questions guiding this report included:

- What kinds of physical memorials for acts of terrorism exist in Canada?
- What are the major types of memorials to recent acts of terrorism in other Western nations?
- What policy issues did governments consider when seeking to establish memorials for victims of terrorism?

The answers to these as well as other critical questions were obtained through a review of the Canadian and international academic literature in the area. The scholarly articles utilized in this report were drawn from academic journals accessed primarily through online academic databases. To compensate for the limited scholarship on memorializing the victims of terrorism, books, research reports, government documents and Internet searches were also utilized in the compilation of this review.

A vital step toward establishing the ways in which Canadian victims of terrorism can be memorialized is to first identify the definition and context of terrorism in Canada. In general, the academic literature shows that there is no particular definition that stands as the "correct" definition of terrorism. Rather, research points to the fact that scholars generally agree that the term is somewhat indefinable, and when it is definable it is also highly malleable (Staiger et al. 2008; Fletcher 2006; Weinberg et al. 2004). Although there is difficulty associated with establishing a sociological definition of terrorism, the legal field has witnessed some consistency in the way terrorism has been defined both within and between Western democratic states. Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Union all incorporate elements of fear, violence and intimidation in their definitions. In addition, each nation identifies politics, religion, and the need to influence governments as among the primary attributes of terrorist acts.

In terms of the Canadian context, some scholars have attempted to operationalize a typology of Canadian terrorism (Ross and Gurr 1989; Leman-Langlois and Brodeur 2005). According to Leman-Langlois and Brodeur (2005), there are four kinds of terrorism in operation in Canada – demand based terrorism, private justice terrorism, revolutionary terrorism and restorative terrorism. It should be noted however, that there are many Canadian examples of terrorism that may not fit into this particular typology. Nevertheless, this typology is one of several that have sought to explicate the historical and current context of terrorism in Canada.

Next, as an important aspect in understanding the ways in which Canadian victims of terrorism have been and are memorialized, "memorialization" becomes a central concept guiding the ways the issue is both framed and approached. Like the term "terrorism," the term "memorial" is open to many different interpretations and definitions that are dependent on the contexts in which they are used. However, there are some generalizable characteristics associated with the concept of a "memorial" – namely that it involves a space, site or form of action designed to honour, mourn and remember particular people and events that have significance in people's lives (Foot et al. 2006).

In general, memorializing is a complex process that involves the intersection of numerous issues. Research shows that the presence of multiple stakeholders in the process is a contributing factor to its overall complexity (Britton 2007; Couch et al. 2008). Common stakeholders in the process include victims and victims' families and friends; community and religious groups, organizations and associations; and city officials, city planners, government officials and public agents – each of which, according to Dee Britton (2007), seek to regulate and control the production of memorials.

Another significant issue to consider where memorialization is concerned is the ways in which narratives feature during and after the memorialization process. Research shows that narratives are an inherent component of memorials. Here, memorials provide the context through which implicit and explicit messages about terrorist events and the societies in which they are established can be made (Damphouse et al. 2003; Shay 2005). Common narratives include those regarding victimhood, politics, and war (Graham and Whelan 2007; Doss 2008; Hoskins 2007). Unfortunately, the distinction of whether or not the attack takes place in Canada or overseas and what proportion of the victims are Canadian is not addressed as a theme in the academic literature and, therefore, was not dealt with in a substantive manner in this report.

Next for consideration in the memorialization process are the various ways victims have been, and can be, memorialized. Through an examination of academic and non-academic literature produced regarding the memorialization of terrorist and non-terrorist events, this report presents a typology of some of the ways victims of terrorism can be memorialized. It should be noted that in addition to drawing from Canadian instances of terrorism and terrorist type events (i.e., Air India bombing, Montréal Massacre, September 11), this typology draws heavily from the international scholarship that has been produced regarding the ways victims in other nations have been memorialized.

Research indicates that physical memorials are among the most common ways victims of terrorism and terrorist-type events have been memorialized (Shipley 1987; Gough 2007). Given their public nature, they are prime sites where particular narratives and messages can be expressed, especially politically based narratives (Gough 2007; Nevin 2005). In addition to issues regarding narratives, logistical issues must also be considered where physical memorials are concerned. Design, location, costs and maintenance are all components that may create challenges for the memorialization process.

Another way that victims may be memorialized is through government responses and statements regarding particular events. These provide the opportunity for governments to publicly acknowledge the experiences of victims – a need expressed by the family members of the victims of Air India Flight 182 (Air India Inquiry 2008). Commissions and inquiries also function in a similar manner during the memorialization process. In addition to fostering the public recognition of particular events, commissions and inquiries also illustrate to victims, their families and the general public a governments' commitment towards addressing the various needs of victims of terrorism.

Akin to government statements, the establishment of days of remembrance honouring the victims of terrorism promote both public and state based recognition of the experiences of victims. However, as research shows, the success of national days of remembrance lies in part on the extent to which victims are remembered in a capacity that reflects the severity of the event in question (Stone 2000). What is implied here is that the quality of the activities and events used to mark particular days of remembrance are just as significant as the existence of the day.

Next, research has shown that groups and organizations also play a significant role in the memorialization process (Couch et al. 2008). Areas of the memorialization process where groups and organizations have shown to have a real impact has been in the selection of memorial sites, funding for the development and maintenance of memorials, and most importantly, advocating for and expressing the various memorial related needs of victims and others affected by terrorist events (Shipley 1987; Couch et al. 2008). However, research also highlights that groups and organization can also pose a challenge to the memorial process, especially in the instances where multiple groups and organizations are working towards the same end but are guided by opposing objectives (Gough 2007).

Finally, victims of terrorism can also be memorialized through spontaneous memorials. Examples of spontaneous memorials include impromptu shrines, roadside memorials, and memorial walls (Thomas 2006). In addition to providing the public with opportunities to memorialize these victims, research shows that the unregulated and impromptu nature of spontaneous memorial sites also provides people with the opportunity to critique their governments (Santino 2006; Yocom 2006). As with physical memorials,

spontaneous memorials also require the careful consideration of logistical issues such as maintenance, public safety and the public response(s) towards unauthorized memorial schemes on public sites.

In conclusion, there are many issues to consider when examining the ways in which to memorialize victims of terrorism. To begin, in order to effectively gauge the policy considerations associated with memorializing Canadian victims of terrorism, further Canadian research is needed on the current ways victims of terrorism have been memorialized. Beyond this task, several implications can be drawn from the Canadian and international research that already exists. First, it is important to consider the implicit and explicit messages linked to particular memorial schemes. Since the presence of narratives will be a constant feature of memorial schemes, it is critical that these messages become deconstructed so as to prevent the revictimization of victims, their loved ones and the general public. Second, logistical issues such as the location, costs, maintenance and management of memorials are critical components of the memorialization process. As such, any effective memorial scheme must also consider both the short term and long term logistical needs pertinent to sustaining memorials. Finally, the research overwhelming stresses the need to address the presence of multiple voices in the memorialization process. Although victims may take precedence here, it is also important that the roles of various stakeholders be considered not only in terms of the ways they may impede on the memorial process but also for the ways in which they can effectively contribute towards the goal to establish memorials that *truly* memorialize the victims of terrorism.

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a trend in many countries towards giving more attention to understanding the specific needs of victims of crime. A particular focus may be given to victims' justice related needs, as well as their social and health needs of victims. Also, in many Western nations, there is a general understanding that the global reality of terrorist attacks can have an impact domestically by victimizing citizens through attacks that take place abroad or at home. One area of research that might help us better address the needs of victims of terrorism is to examine the current ways victims have been memorialized. This report is focused on outlining the various issues associated with memorializing the victims of terrorism. Based on a scan of Canadian and international academic literature on memorializing the victims of terrorism, this report presents a typology of the ways in which victims of terrorism have been memorialized, as well as some possible implications and considerations stemming from the research.

The first section of this report examines the definition of terrorism and the Canadian context of terrorism. In the section that follows, "memorialization" as a concept is examined. Next, this review discusses the various ways victims of terrorism have been and may be memorialized. The forms of memorialization addressed are physical memorials, government responses and statements, groups and organizations, days of remembrance and spontaneous memorials. Finally, this report concludes with a discussion of some relevant research and policy considerations.

Purpose

The purpose of this project is to examine the academic literature regarding the memorialization of victims of terrorist and terrorist-type events. A secondary objective is to examine the literature that addresses the ways Canadian victims of terrorism have been memorialized.

Canadians have recently been reminded of the devastating impact that terrorism can have in the life of our nation. Both the inquiry into the Air India attack (Air India Report 2008) and the annual remembrance of the September 11th World Trade Centre attacks in the United States raise many issues of national concern; both issues are of public concern and have profoundly personal impacts on citizens. Central to the rhetoric surrounding terrorism, and in healing from its aftermath, are the victims of terrorism. This research has been designed to provide information to consider when thinking about responding to the needs of victims of terrorism by addressing the following research questions:

- How is terrorism defined and understood in Canada?
- What kinds of physical memorials for acts of terrorism exist in Canada?
- What are the major types of memorials to recent acts of terrorism that exist in other Western nations?
- How are Canadian victims of terrorism memorialized in other nations?

- What policy issues did governments consider when seeking to establish memorials for victims of terrorism?

Method

This project is the result of a literature review that took place during the summer of 2008. The research was undertaken through the standard practices associated with composing a literature review. Research articles were drawn primarily from academic journals acquired through online academic databases and Internet searches. Given the limited Canadian scholarship documenting the ways victims of terrorism have been memorialized, media sources were also utilized to obtain information. Overall, more than fifty academic sources were consulted for this project. A significant proportion of this literature was drawn from social science journals; the majority of which were based on cultural studies and anthropological research. Other journal areas included social science research on victims' issues, as well as some legal scholarship regarding terrorism.

The first component of this project was a general reading of the sources followed by a critical reading of specific components of the literature, especially those that directly addressed memorializing the victims of terrorism. However, given that most of the sources did not or only vaguely addressed the topic of memorializing the victims of terrorism, the scope of the research explored in this report was broadened to incorporate other similar research areas that may be of relevance to the topic of memorializing victims of terrorism. These areas of research included but were not limited to war remembrance memorials, extreme instances of violence, and terrorist-type events.

Definitions of Terrorism and the Canadian Context

The past few decades have witnessed an increase in the scholarship produced regarding terrorism. Critical to this body of literature has been the definition of terrorism. Although defining terrorism has proven to be a highly contentious issue, there is some agreement among academics that the term is highly malleable and is hence, open to many different definitions and interpretations (Staiger et al. 2008; Weinberg et al. 2004; Fletcher 2006).

Many factors have been identified as contributing to the complexity involved in determining the definition of "terrorism." According to Weinberg et al. (2004), the primary factors that impede any attempt to provide a formal definition of terrorism include the use of the term for political purposes; problems associated with the scope of the term (i.e. identifying where terrorism begins and ends); and issues associated with the analytical characteristics of terrorism. Others argue that much of the difficulty surrounding the definition of terrorism stems from the need to develop a concrete meaning of the term (Grob-Fitzgibbon 2005; Fletcher 2006). For example, Grob-Fitzgibbon (2005) argues that the term remains ambiguous as a result of governments and scholars seeking to define the term too broadly so as to classify any form of unconventional violence as terrorism. Rather, the author suggests that governments and academics avoid "general" definitions of terrorism and instead acknowledge the various meanings the term may occupy. Despite this call to utilize the numerous and varied definitions of terrorism, legal

definitions continue to serve as the primary and formally recognized definitions utilized by many governments and people. Given the scope of this project, it is critical that such terms subsequently serve as the foundation on which this report is based.

In Canada, section 83.01 of the *Criminal Code*[1] defines terrorism as an act committed "in whole or in part for a political, religious or ideological purpose, objective or cause" with the intention of intimidating the public "…with regard to its security, including its economic security, or compelling a person, a government or a domestic or an international organization to do or to refrain from doing any act." Activities recognized as criminal within this context include death and bodily harm with the use of violence; endangering a person's life; risks posed to the health and safety of the public; significant property damage; and interference or disruption of essential services, facilities or systems. It is useful to briefly contrast this definition with those adopted by other nations operating under law systems similar to that of Canada. According to the *British Terrorism Act* (2006), terrorism refers to the use and threat of action "designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public or a section of the public" and "made for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause." Similar to the legal definition of terrorism in Canada, violence against people; damage to property; endangerment of life; and risks to the health or safety of the public are the key actions addressed within the Act. In the United States, terrorism is defined as consisting of activities that "involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State….intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; influence the policy of a government by intimidation; or…affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping." Finally, the legal definition of terrorism in the European Union can be found in the *EU Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism* (2002) which identifies terrorism as activities with the aim of "seriously intimidating a population, or; unduly compelling a government or international organisation to perform or abstain from performing any act, or; seriously destabilising or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organisation." Activities that may be deemed terrorist under this framework include attacks on people resulting in death, kidnapping or hostage taking and extensive destruction to a government or public facility. Although it is widely acknowledged that attempts to establish a definition of terrorism that transcends various national borders have been largely unsuccessful (Staiger et al. 2008), the definitions presented clearly show that some consistency can be found in the various definitions employed by the governments of many Western democracies. Given these similarities, the approaches adopted by these governments toward the issue of victims of terrorism may provide some key insights on the various ways other governments can address the multiple issues that affect victims of terrorism.

In addition, the definitions described above also provide some support to the claim made by scholars that there are also consistencies in the terms used to characterize terrorism. In their empirical study on the definitions of terrorism utilized in three prominent terrorism journals, Weinberg et al. (2004) found that "violence," "threat(s)," and "politically motivated tactics" were among the key descriptors used to define terrorism. Marsella and Moghaddam (2004) note similar findings in their own research but include "influence/coercion" and "fear" as critical characteristics of terrorism.

---

[1] *Criminal Code,* R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, s. 83.01.

Like the definition of terrorism, significant attention has also been given towards explicating the different kinds and types of terrorism. In general, research shows that there are three basic forms of terrorism – international terrorism, domestic terrorism and transnational terrorism (Staiger et al. 2008; Hough 2007). However, each basic form is also comprised of other sub-types that largely inform their basis. According to Grob-Fitzgerald (2005), terrorism can be broken down into four broad forms: national terrorism – terrorist activities involving national borders; revolutionary terrorism – activities aimed at the philosophical and political nature of government; reactionary terrorism – activities concerned with preventing societal and governmental changes; and religious terrorism whereby violence is used to further religious objectives. Staiger et al. (2008) also include vigilante terrorism and single-issue terrorism as among the important forms of terrorism.

Given the social, political and cultural environment in which terrorism is often based, efforts have also been made to contextualize the problem as it features for various states. In Canada, this research has been scarce; however, two notable studies in this area are those conducted by Ross and Gurr (1989), and Leman-Langlois and Brodeur (2005). In their 1989 comparative analysis of political terrorism in Canada and the United States, Ross and Gurr established that there were roughly 500 politically motivated terrorist events that occurred in Canada between 1960 and 1985 (85 percent of which were domestic). Concerned with identifying the reasons behind the decrease in oppositional terrorism in Canada, the authors cite pre-emption, deterrence, backlash and burnout as the primary reasons behind the drop in domestic political terrorism in Canada. The second study presents a contemporary analysis of terrorism in Canada. Utilizing more than 400 terrorist "situations" that occurred in Canada between 1973 and 2003, the authors developed an operational typology of terrorism (Leman-Langlois and Brodeur 2005). Some of the "situations" utilized by the authors to develop their typology include acts of vandalism by particular rights-based groups, acts of arson such as those committed by the members of the Doukhobor "Sons of Freedom," and acts of intimidation such as a 1986 incident in which a bomb was placed in a Canadian Immigration Centre. Based on the authors' typology, terrorism in Canada has been governed by four underlying rationales: demand based terror – activities geared towards a perceived problem; private justice terror – activities with the intent of attaining retribution; revolutionary terror – terror aimed at changes at the state level; and restoration terror – activities aimed at re-establishing a historical condition. Regarding the current face of terrorism in Canada, the authors stipulate that the Canadian context of terrorism is now more than ever, marked by transnational terrorism, ambiguous ownership of terrorist activities, and the link between religiously- and politically-motivated terrorist activities. It should be noted, however, that although this typology attempts to cover the Canadian experience of terrorism, it cannot be construed as exhaustive. As Staiger et al. (2008) note, the presence of multiple forms of terrorism makes it inherently difficult to make claims regarding the identification of *all* types of terrorism within a given context. Nonetheless, there are certain violent events that have been recognized and cited as Canadian terrorist events because they occurred in Canada and/or Canadian citizens were victimized as a result of the events.

One event that has received extensive attention from the media, the federal government and the general Canadian public is the 1985 bombing of Air India Flight 182. Described as the one of the worst cases of Canadian terrorism, the bombing took the lives of 389 people – 280 of whom were Canadian citizens. Other recent Canadian examples of terrorism include the Bali nightclub bombings, the World Trade Center attacks of September 11, and the criminal acts of the Front de libération du Québec (FLQ). These

events and others situate the context of this report and provide some of the background behind the impetus to memorialize the victims of terrorism.

Any endeavour to explain the context of terrorism in Canada must also consider the ways extreme acts of violence and terrorist-type events have featured in Canada. Examining these instances of violence and terror can contribute towards a more comprehensive analysis of victims' issues related to terrorism, especially where Canadian literature on particular issues related to victims and terrorism may be scarce. This juxtaposition is based primarily on the fact that both types of events share several similar characteristics. For example, research shows that terrorist acts and extreme acts of non-terrorist violence are at many times, motivated by hate (Sternberg 2003). According to Sternberg (2003), hatred functions as a critical premise of acts of violence such as terrorism, genocide and massacres. For Jagger (2005), acts of violence can be rendered terrorist in the instances where personal prejudices about particular groups of individuals are used to fuel violence against those groups. A second characteristic shared by acts of terrorism and non-terrorist acts of violence is that both types of events are at times, motivated by particular ideologies. Scholars have long recognized the influential role ideology plays in terrorist motivation (Drake 1998; Hoffman 1995). Whether religiously or politically based, ideologies are central components of terrorism that can be used to encourage peoples' participation in terrorist activities (Hudson 1999). This critical assessment can also be applied to "non-terrorist" acts of violence. Racist and sexist ideologies are, but a few examples of particular ideologies that may function in non-terrorist acts of violence. The 1989 Montreal Massacre is exemplary of this form of violence. In light of these and other justifications, the discussions to follow in this report incorporate various Canadian and international instances of non-terrorist violence in an attempt establish a framework for addressing the memorialization needs of victims.

When we think of victims of terrorism, we need to consider the issues that relate to the different levels of victimization experienced by victims (Hill 2004). According to Hill (2004, 83), victimization through terrorism may be experienced at direct, secondary, and community levels, all of which may vary in terms of the extent and kind of victimization. Staiger et al. (2008) present a similar classification of victims of terrorism. The authors note that although the term "victim" may be used to refer to all individuals that experience some form of direct injury, emotional harm and or suffering as a result of an act of terrorism, vicarious or indirect victims are individuals that were not direct targets of terrorists, but nonetheless experienced fear, anxiety and other related stressors following a terrorist attack (i.e. the general public). This notion of direct and indirect victimization is significant because it highlights the importance of considering the needs of the general public alongside the needs of victims and their families.

As we see, what motivates an attack or who is attacked is part of what may determine the form memorialization of victims may take. A further distinction is whether or not the attack takes place in Canada or overseas, and how what proportion of the victims are Canadians.[2] Unfortunately, this important area of inquiry does not appear to have been addressed yet as a theme in the academic literature and, therefore, cannot be dealt with in a substantive manner in this report.

---

[2] For instance, the Air India bombings took place near Ireland and about 90% of the 307 killed were Canadian, the World Trade Centre attack took place in New York and about 1% of the 2,750 killed were Canadian, and in the Bali night club bombings about 1% of the 202 killed were Canadian. Yet how nationality was highlighted and impacted upon the memorialization of victims was very different in all three cases.

Although there many issues associated with victimization following terrorist events, trauma has been identified as among the most critical issues victims may face (Miller 2003; Updegraff et al. 2008). Issues particular to victims of terrorism under the broad spectrum of trauma include post-traumatic stress disorder, grief, and survivors' guilt (Hill 2004). In addition to issues related to trauma, Shichor (2007) distinguishes the public response to victims of terrorism as an important area in victimological studies of victimization through terrorism. According to the author, victims of terrorism are more likely than other victims of crime to receive sympathy from the public. In addition, Shichor (2007, 277) stipulates that victims of terrorism are also less likely to be stigmatized and labelled "weak" as a result of their victimization and are thereby free of the negative psychological effects associated with such a label. Overall, there are many issues to consider when addressing the needs of victims of terrorism. Memorializing these victims may be one way to address the issues related to their victimization; however, some consideration of the ways memorialization can be used to assist in the healing process is necessary, as well as the ways in which it may contribute to further traumatization and revictimization of victims. The discussions that follow shed some light on many of these issues.

Memorialization

Today, memorials occupy a permanent place in the landscape of many nations. By definition, memorials have been described as spaces "invested with meaning" that are set aside to remember (Doka 2003, 186). In devising a definition of the term "memorial," researchers have been keen on noting that care must be taken to avoid incorrectly using the term "memorial" in place of the term "monument" (Gough 2002). According to Gough (2002), what differentiates the two terms is the intent of preserving and remembering that is accompanied with memorializing; while monuments usually project celebratory sentiments.

As a process, memorializing is marked by activities and actions done to mourn and remember people, places and things of importance in society. As Foot et al. (2006, 72) note, these practices provide the opportunity for people to "celebrate the lives of those who died, to mourn their passing, and to inscribe memories of the deceased in the public consciousness."

In terms of research, it should be noted that most of the academic literature on memorialization and remembrance largely focuses on the positive impact of memorializing events for individuals that have been victimized. For the most part, the academic literature does not empirically examine the wider social effect that memorializing can have on social attitudes or on public policy. However, there is some evidence that memorialization can also have negative social consequences. For instance, as social psychologists have demonstrated, remembering the historical victimization of one's own social group makes an individual less concerned by the harmful actions their own group may inflict on others (Wohl and Branscombe 2008). This is particularly true for those social groups identified as being responsible for the victimization.

Irrespective of the extent of research focused specifically on the negative and positive effects of memorializing, a significant proportion of the general literature on memorials and memorialization has been sociologically and psychologically based. From the psychological perspective, memorials have been examined in relation to peoples' memories and as mechanisms for coping with trauma. For example, one body of research casts memorialization as a method used by people to cope with the feelings of guilt and responsibility that is sometimes associated with surviving traumatic events (Oliner 2006). Described as

externalization, this necessary process uses memorials to facilitate the use of "objects in external reality" to overcome internal conflicts that plague peoples' conscious after traumatic events (Oliner 2006, 884). From the sociological perspective, research on memorials is varied and covers a wide range of topics such as the meanings attached to memorials, and the basic functions of memorials (Zitoun 2004; Low 2004). For example Zitoun (2004), who deconstructs the meaning of memorials, asserts that memorials have four primary functions in society. First, they are used to reinforce notions of trust in the nation-state; second, memorials establish avenues through which people can interact with others; third, they function as sites of mourning; and lastly, they provide opportunities of learning. In general, it is important to note that although the scope of research on memorials and memorializing is wide and diverse, research in the area has only recently begun to incorporate the experiences of the victims of terrorism into this particular discourse.

As a relatively recent research endeavour, there is little doubt that memorializing the victims of terrorism is a complex process. The scarce research that does exist in the area depicts the process of memorialization as highly contentious. First, research highlights that a contributing factor to the complexity of the memorialization process is the presence of numerous stakeholders (Britton 2007; Couch et al. 2008). Some of the stakeholders involved in one way or another in the memorialization process are victims, victims' families, victims' associations, the public, religious organizations and community groups/associations. In addition, city officials, politicians and various governmental units at many levels of government, such as the federal, provincial and municipal governments also serve as critical stakeholders involved in the memorialization process. Amid the extensive presence of numerous stakeholders in the memorialization process, the literature overwhelmingly stresses the critical role victims and victims' families *can* and *should* play regarding the development of memorials honouring the lives lost to acts of terrorism (Britton 2007; Berman 2002; Hoffman and Kasupski 2007). However, research shows that victims and victims' families are often faced with competing influences from other groups involved in the memorialization process (Britton 2007). In her analysis of commemorative activities in the United States, Britton highlights the various roles stakeholders may play in the commemorative process. According to Britton (2007), stakeholders have various levels of influence and control over the memorialization process. Of note are the "gatekeepers," whom the author asserts are the public agents and government officials focused on regulating the "production and reception" of memorials (Britton 2007). In many instances, the outcomes of these forms of control over the memorialization process are evident in the various narratives that become associated with particular memorial events. As such, deconstructing the ways narratives feature in the memorial process may provide an opportunity to identify how and for what purposes control is exercised and may also signify the role, or lack thereof, victims and victims' families play in the memorialization process.

Citing Schwartz (1998) and Langer (1998), Damphouse et al. (2003, 6) identify narratives as stories that are used to (in)directly influence the collective support needed to successfully establish memorials for tragic events. More precisely, the authors assert that such narratives normally convey major or minor messages regarding the event in question. Major narratives include progressive and redemptive themes, while minor narratives are those represented primarily through dogmatic, toxic (narratives focused on the pain associated with remembering) and patriotic themes (Damphouse et al. 2003). Other research has focused on the ways in which politics feature in the production and presentation of narratives. According to some scholars, memorials related to terrorism and other hostile activities are often reflective of nation and state based narratives regarding war and security (Shay 2005; Doss 2008). For example, Doss (2008)

stipulates that American memorials developed to preserve memory following a terrorist event primarily function by transforming the lives lost through acts of terrorism into symbols of American patriotism and heroism. For Doss, painting an image of American courage and heroism with the experiences of victims of terrorist events actually undermines authentic acts of individual heroism while simultaneously projecting an image of the US as blameless, and victims of terrorism as highly patriotic citizens. What is being called into consideration here is the fact that particular state narratives regarding terrorist memorials are open to interpretation at both the local and international levels. As such, care must be taken to address the underlying implications of memorial narratives from particular, as well as global contexts.

Doss' (2008) ideas are also reflected in the debates that emerged immediately following an early proposal to develop a museum - The International Freedom Center (IFC) - to commemorate the events and victims of 9/11. According to the Center's developers, the forthcoming centre would serve as a place to celebrate American ideals and visions of freedom (Hoskins 2007). However, the proposal was met with opposition from victims' families who argued that the museum was in actuality, an avenue to further American political ideologies while indirectly displacing the memory of the victims. This sentiment speaks to the argument that too often, the varied narratives of victims, victims' families and groups are often obscured by more dominant memorial discourses, namely government and media dominated narratives (Low 2004).

Another issue associated with memorial narratives are the multiple meanings regarding terrorism that emerge in their production. For example, research shows that meanings about "victim" and "victimhood" sometimes become critical areas where memorialization is concerned. In their research on the commemoration of the Northern Ireland Troubles,[3] Graham and Whelan (2007) argue that contested meanings of victimhood can often emerge as people struggle to differentiate amongst the various kinds of victims (i.e. victims of state violence versus victims of terrorist actions). The authors stipulate that as a result of this, a "hierarchy of victimhood" becomes prevalent in the memorialization process thereby perpetuating the fragmentation of consensus regarding the establishment of memorials, especially where diverse groups are involved (2007, 483). Hite (2007) presents a similar case regarding the memorialization of victims of terrorism in Peru. In this example, some individuals were calling for a national terrorism memorial to also acknowledge the supposed and suspected perpetrators of terrorist events in Peru. For the opponents of this position, such forms of recognition at the memorial site undermined the experiences of the victims and their loved ones and hence, should not have been suggested in the first place. Overall, the studies discussed above illustrate the significance in deconstructing the ways narratives feature within memorial processes, and stress the need to address such issues in the planning process of prospective memorials for the victims of terrorism.

Classifying Memorials

Memorializing those killed through acts of terrorism can be accomplished in a variety of ways. Memorials honouring these victims consist primarily but not exclusively of physical memorials,

---

[3] "The Troubles" refers to a period of violent conflict between various political organizations and groups in Northern Ireland from approximately 1960 to 1996.

spontaneous memorials, and formally recognized days of remembrance. Other secondary forms of memorialization include the creation of victims' groups and organizations, government statements and responses regarding the victims of terrorism, and commissions and inquiries regarding terrorist events. Overall, identifying and specifying the ways in which the victims of terrorism are memorialized is a somewhat challenging task given the malleability of the terms associated with terrorism, and the various forms and types of memorials that exist.

The section below presents a typology of some of the various kinds of memorials that have been and may be used to honour the victims of terrorism.

Physical Memorials

Physical memorials are among the most common forms of memorialization. As they relate to terrorism, research indicates that there are many issues to address when physical memorials are being considered as a viable option for memorializing victims. Many of these issues are addressed in the works of human and social geographers. For example, Rankin (2003) notes that geographers generally view space as situated places guided and highly influenced by social processes. Under such processes, locations and places become susceptible to imposed meanings and in turn generate social meaning. What this implies for the memorialization victims of terrorism is that prospective locations of physical memorials require significant consideration in the memorialization process. In the United States, the Arlington Cairn memorial for the victims of Pan Am Flight 103 is an example of the ways in which the location of a monument can pose significant challenges in the establishment of a memorial. Dispute over the Cairn was fuelled by a request from the members of victims' families who were seeking to erect the monument at Arlington National Cemetery – a cemetery for American war veterans (Britton 2007). Based on the emotional appeal of family members and despite initial refusals to the request, U.S congress later agreed to construct the memorial in the military cemetery. Shay (2005) presents a similar situation regarding the memorialization of victims of "hostile activities" in Israel.[4] According to Shay (2005), efforts to construct a memorial for the victims of hostile activities within close proximity to a military cemetery drew much debate. At issue was whether the chosen location for the monument connoted the idea that the deaths of the victims of hostile activities were similar to those of soldiers. Despite this debate, the monument still remains at the Israeli military site on which it was initially erected.

The design of an impending memorial can also be a source of dispute among the various stakeholders involved in the memorialization process. An example is evident from the dispute that has erupted regarding the World Trade Center (WTC) site upon which the 9/11 memorial is to be erected and the business centre developed. At issue here are the competing visions regarding the outcome of the site between the WTC United Family Group and the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC). The LMDC's proposal to build a commercial centre over the area of the site where a significant proportion of victims' remains were recovered was a major problem during the memorialization process (Couch et al. 2008). For the victims' families, the area from which human remains were retrieved (and may still be buried) should be a site reserved for the sacred act of memorialization rather than profane commercial enterprise. To protect the area from being built upon, the WTC United Family Group, with

---

[4] 'Hostile activities' is the formal name given to the monument erected in honour of victims of violence in Israel (i.e. The Memorial for the Victims of Hostile Acts and Terrorism).

the assistance of politicians, drafted legislation to protect the site. As a result, the plans proposed by the LMDC were subsequently discarded. This case illustrates the importance of recognizing and acknowledging the various and competing objectives surrounding the selection of a memorial site.

The memorialization process regarding the Northern Irish Troubles is another case that illustrates the importance in acknowledging the meanings conveyed to the public via physical memorials. At the request of the Northern Ireland Office, a commission was established to identify the issues associated with implementing various memorial schemes for the victims of The Troubles. Of note in the resulting report is a brief discussion of issues to be taken into consideration where physical monuments are concerned. These critical issues are captured in the following statement:

> What should be the tone and message of such a monument? How could it take a form which would recognize the suffering of victims from diverse backgrounds in a way which would seem both acceptable and fitting to them… the understandable concern of relatives, friends and colleagues is not merely that the life and death of a victim should be remembered, but that it should be reflected in a memorial which can be treated with due respect by those who encounter it (Bloomfield 1998, 46).

Again, this case highlights the significance that the potential meanings memorials may have for the victims, their families and the general public. It also draws attention to another concern that bears some consideration in the memorial planning process: the general public's reactions to the memorial(s). As many academics have noted, memorializing is a highly political issue (Hite 2007; Graham and Whelan 2008). As such, public responses to memorials, and in this case physical monuments, may be subject to reactions as diverse as the communities in which they exist. The events following the creation of a monument for Peruvian victims of terrorism are exemplary of this situation.

A Peruvian memorial to victims of terrorism - "The Eye that Cries" - was initially controversial because the inscription of the names of both victims and supposed perpetrators of terrorist activities were made on the same monument. However, this issue was heightened with the arrest and charge of a key political figure involved in many terrorist-related conflicts in the region (Hite 2007). In protest of the arrest and charge, the monument was vandalized and many of the names doused in paint. What may be gathered from this case is that "simple acts of memorialization" such as inscribing names to monuments (or other attributes common to physical memorials) have significant social and political implications that must be addressed when considering memorializing the victims of terrorism.

Similar concerns were also addressed during the commemoration process for the victims of the March 11, 2004 terrorist attack in Madrid, Spain. Many people were of the viewpoint that the national memorial should honour *all* the people who had been victimized over the past 30 years by the Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA), the group responsible for many of the terrorist attacks in Spain (Abend and Pingree 2004).[5] Despite this request, the monument that was eventually erected was dedicated only to the victims of the March 11 bombings. One way to address these issues of inclusion and exclusion regarding memorializing victims may be to consider Bloomfield's (1998) suggestion that physical memorials avoid presenting certain victims as more deserving over others; rather, they should seek to incorporate key words and statements than can transcend differences and promote change and remembrance.

---

[5] Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA) in Basque translates as "Basque Homeland and Freedom."

These examples all highlight the ways in which "meaning" features in attempts to memorialize victims of terrorism. As the literature has stressed, implicit and explicit messages that emerge from monuments and or memorials have a real effect on the people that come into contact with them. Therefore, there may be some benefit gained from utilizing policies that examine the narratives attached to proposed memorial and monument schemes.

The paper has thus far focused on approaches that could be used to address prospective memorials, especially physical memorials. However, one can also look towards the current landscape of physical memorials in Canada for an understanding of the ways to address some of the issues involved where considerations are being made to memorialize Canadian victims of terrorism. The monuments erected to honour the victims of Air India Flight 182 illustrate some examples of physical memorials that have been developed to memorialize Canadian victims of terrorism. According to the Air India Report, the first formally recognized physical memorial for the victims of Air India Flight 182 was erected on June 23, 1986, at Ahakista on Dunmanus Bay, Ireland (Air India Report 2008). In terms of recent monuments, the June 23, 2008, dedication of an Ottawa memorial for the Air India victims on the National Day of Remembrance for Victims of Terrorism (June 23, 2008) serves as the most recent memorial erected for the victims of the bombing. Comprised of a walkway and a bronze plaque on which the names of the victims are inscribed, the memorial site was donated and designed by the National Capital Commission and the $70,000 cost of the renovation was covered by Public Safety Canada (Public Safety Canada 2008). Other recent memorials for the victims of the Air India bombing include a sundial and wall etched with the names of the victims that was unveiled in Toronto on June 23, 2007, and a similar wall along with a playground that was unveiled in Vancouver in July 2007. Public Safety Canada notes that the cost of this memorial is shared by the federal government and the government of British Columbia, while the land for the site was donated by the Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation (Public Safety Canada 2007a). Similarly, the $625,000 cost for the Toronto memorial is also shared between the federal and provincial government, with land for the site donated by the City of Toronto (Public Safety Canada 2007b). Overall, these recent monuments reflect partnerships between the federal, provincial and municipal governments (Air India Report 2008).

Another important dimension of physical memorials in Canada can be found in war memorials. Though not particularly related to terrorism, war monuments and memorials constitute a significant proportion of the physical memorials that occupy the Canadian memorial landscape and as such, should be acknowledged in any discussion regarding the role physical memorials play in commemorating lives lost to violence. War memorials commemorating the lives of soldiers can be found in most Canadian cities and towns. In his genealogy of Canadian war memorials, Shipley (1987) shows that the process of memorializing Canadian victims of war is one that involves many of the logistical issues associated with establishing physical memorials for other types of events. According to Shipley, many war memorials are the result of insistence from various stakeholder groups such as veterans' associations, governments and politicians, and community associations such as women's and social groups. In terms of costs, Shipley (1987) notes that funding for memorials erected during the 1920s and 1930s came from organizational donations, fundraisers and individual contributions. It might be assumed that these funding sources still serve as the primary sources of funding for memorials erected today. Finally, the upkeep of many war memorials and monuments is an important facet of the war memorialization process. According to Shipley, war monuments and memorials are maintained primarily because some people see value in their

preservation; however, their on-going care continues to be an issue for many municipalities, to whom responsibility for their upkeep often falls.

Today, Canadian war monuments and memorials are maintained through a variety of means. Apart from individual donations made towards the preservation of these sites, Veterans Affairs Canada has also taken an active role in the conservation process. For example, the department operates a *Cenotaph/Monument Restoration Program* which provides financial assistance to municipal governments, non-profit organizations, educational institutions, historical organizations, and charitable organizations and associations seeking to preserve war monuments (Veterans Affairs Canada). A similar approach is taken in the United Kingdom where war monuments and memorials are maintained primarily by the War Memorials Trust, a charity that works to preserve all war memorials in the nation (Department of Constitutional Affairs 2007). The Trust also provides grants to public and private groups and organizations, and people seeking to maintain memorials in their communities and jurisdictions. The maintenance of physical memorials, such as monuments, can benefit from the contributions made by government or state-based initiatives geared toward preserving such forms of memory.

Given their extensive presence in Canadian society, war memorials and monuments indeed provide key opportunities for policy makers and researchers to gauge some of the technical issues associated with establishing physical memorials. In addition, some recent research also suggests that these forms of memorials also provide exemplars of the complex ways meaning and narratives feature for the logistical components regarding physical memorials. For example, Gordon and Osborne (2004) assert that war memorials are often laden with symbolic meanings regarding national identity. In their research on Confederation Square and the National War Memorial, Gordon and Osborne (2004) chart the history of Canadian war memorials of the last century and the impact that these memorials have had on Canadian national identity. According to the authors, early instances of identity shaping through memorials can be found with the efforts taken in the 1920s to establish a war memorial in Ottawa. As the authors note, the key premise that governed many of the proposed ideas regarding a future monument was the idea that the monument to be erected must convey notions of heroism and patriotism while simultaneously enhancing the national image of the nation's capital. The memorial of choice, the National War Memorial, was thought to convey all of these sentiments; however, its erection at Confederation Square in 1938 was received with discontent by some Canadians. According to Gough (2004), Canadians were displeased with the monument's title ("The Response") which was viewed as an implicit affirmation of Britain's control over Canada, and by the fact that the monument was designed by a non-Canadian. Another example of a Canadian case where a war memorial was met with conflict is the Beaumont Hamel Newfoundland Memorial battleground. This case is especially interesting because it was created to honour the memory of Canadian, Scottish and British soldiers. A primary issue that has plagued the memorial has been the ownership of the memorial (Gough 2007). Given the presence of the various nationalities being commemorated at and through the site, the issue as to whom the memorial truly belongs and represents has been a critical point of contention. Issues regarding the inaccurate presentation and lack of facts and information regarding the events commemorated at the battlegrounds have also resulted in contention for many. According to Gough (2004), the accuracy of dates, times and actions represent critical moments of truth for the various social groups that come in contact with the memorial. As such, any deviation from what may be considered "truth" by a particular group may indirectly undermine the memorialization of victims of terrorist and terrorist like events.

Finally, one can also learn from the 1989 Montréal Massacre in which fourteen women were murdered at l'Ècole polytechnique at the University of Montréal in Québec. Though the classification (or declassification) of this event as terrorist may be open for debate, it is nonetheless recognized as a historic Canadian example of a mass killing involving Canadian citizens. In particular, this case is also exemplary of a non-terrorist act of violence that bears some characteristic features of acts of terrorism, namely the presence of hate and stimulating fear amongst a class of people. The assailant's hatred towards "feminists" was one of several key factors that led to the massacre (Weston and Aubry 2007). In short, there are some insights that can be gained from the ways this event has been and continues to be memorialized through the use of physical monuments.

Over the past eighteen years since its occurrence, the victims of the Montréal Massacre have been memorialized primarily through memorial services and the development of various memorial monuments. Monuments commemorating the event can be found in major Canadian cities such as Montréal, Vancouver, and Toronto, as well as in smaller cities and towns. In addition, monuments have been further localized to include areas such as college and university campuses and local community parks. The funding for these physical monuments may come from a wide array of sources depending on the context in which they are being erected. For example, memorials built on college and university campuses may be funded by these institutions, while different levels of government may provide funding for monuments at public sites such as parks. In the context of this particular massacre, funding for memorials also came from various advocacy groups (Burk 2006).

The preceding pages have noted some of the key issues associated with utilizing physical memorials to memorialize the victims of terrorism. Based on the case of the Air India tragedy, one key factor that must be addressed when attempting to memorialize is timing. The earliest, formal, physical memorial was erected in Ireland the year immediately following the tragedy, while the earliest Canadian memorials were erected decades later. Overall, the literature indicates that the timeframe of particular memorial projects following a terrorist event is critical not only for the victims, but for society as a whole. Logistical issues such as costs, location and the upkeep of physical memorials are also important factors to consider in the memorialization process. As evidenced in the conflicts regarding the Beaumont Hamel Memorial, efficient upkeep of the site, accessibility to the site and accuracy of information depicted in and around the site are all factors that require careful consideration in any endeavour to establish a physical memorial.

It is also important to consider the "cultural life" of a memorial in discussions regarding physical memorials. According to Rigney (2008), the cultural lives of monuments are as significant as their physical appearance. For Rigney, preserving the cultural lives of monuments involves peoples' willingness to reinvest in monuments not only through commemoration but also through media representations of and human engagement with the monuments. As such, it may be beneficial to consider the various ways through which citizens can be encouraged to take active roles in memorializing (i.e. encouraging citizens to visit memorial sites). Finally, careful consideration must be given to the implicit and explicit meanings that become attached to memorials and monuments. As commenters have noted, attention must be given to the ways particular narratives shape memorials and the ways in which "other" or underlying objectives take precedence in the memorialization process (Gough 2007; Nevin 2005; Hite 2007). In addition, the presence of competing narratives may in turn obscure the voices of victims and victims' families seeking to memorialize their loved ones. As Gough (2007, 700) suggests, "memorial

schemes, by their very nature, often have to prioritize one story over another, with the result that entire swathes of memory - and by extension, layers of topography - can be rendered invisible." Therefore, careful attention must be given to the multiple experiences being acknowledged in memorials, as well the competing objectives of all stakeholders involved in the memorialization process.

Government Responses and Statements

It can be argued that government responses and statements regarding terrorist events constitute a form of memorialization. What is being referred to here are the public statements issued or made (primarily on the behalf of governments) by politicians and public officials. In seeking to identify responses and statements as forms of memorialization, it is important to keep in mind the elements that comprise a memorial. As discussed earlier in this report, within the context of terrorism and violence, "memorializing" is constituted by the intent to remember and preserve the memory of victims of traumatic and tragic events (Foot et al. 2006; Doka 2003). As such, government statements and responses that speak directly to these sentiments may be seen as a forum through which remembrance can be encouraged. More importantly, they also provide the opportunity for the open and national recognition of experiences of victims of terrorism.

Canadian governments have issued quite a number of statements that recognize the memory of victims of terrorism. However, the prominence of these statements must not override the need to understand some of the issues related to making responses regarding memorializing. For example, as public acknowledgements of terrorist events provide governments with the opportunity to incorporate statements regarding memorialization, it can also be argued that a lack of public recognition of terrorist events subsequently limits the opportunities for statements calling for remembrance to be made. The Canadian government's initial response to the Air India bombing is an example of this circumstance.

Accounts of the experiences of victims' families following the incident depict a scenario in which many families felt that they were being ignored by the Canadian government. Feelings of isolation, frustration and grief were among the many sentiments expressed by the families, especially in terms of the government's response to the tragedy. According to the report, family members "often said that they felt that they were not viewed as "real Canadians" and that [the bombing] was somehow not considered to be a Canadian tragedy" (Air India Report 2008, 99). Families also expressed frustration with the lack of emotional support from the Canadian government. As one person stated during the inquiry: "We received no contact at all. There was nobody to help us to offer any sort of support, either emotional or logistical. … I felt they were completely ignorant of any aspect of the impact that this had on the family members" (Air India Report 2008, 103). Given these and other similar sentiments as expressed by the families, it is clear that there was no room for statements later regarding the importance of honouring and remembering the victims when the event was not recognized at the outset. Many families have expressed that full acknowledgement of the tragedy as a Canadian tragedy has only recently been fulfilled as a result of the inquiry that began decades after the incident. Nevertheless, today, there are and continue to be many examples of government statements acknowledging and advocating the preservation of the memory of the victims of the Air India bombing but also of other terrorist events that have affected Canadians. The discussion below briefly highlights some examples of these instances.

In terms of the Air India bombing, many statements regarding the memorialization of the victims have been made primarily at memorial services. For example, during a memorial service at the House of Commons held on the twentieth anniversary of the tragedy, then Deputy Prime Minister Anne McLellan issued the following statement: "Twenty years after this tragic event in Canadian history, our thoughts continue to be with the victims' families. These symbols of remembrance will serve to pay homage to the memory of the victims of the worst terrorist incident in Canadian history" (Public Safety Canada 2005). Similarly, attendees at the unveiling ceremony of the Air India memorial in Vancouver heard the following statement issued from the city's mayor: "The Vancouver Air India Memorial in Stanley Park will be a place to remember the innocence we lost that horrible day. It will be a place for children to be children. And it will be a place for parents and families to reflect on the precious things in life" (Public Safety Canada 2007). Finally, similar sentiments have been echoed regarding the Canadian victims of the September 11 terrorist attacks. During a memorial ceremony for the Canadian victims of the tragedy, then Public Safety Minister, Stockwell Day, acknowledged the lives lost in the tragedy when he stated: "Today is a solemn day. Six years ago this morning, the world was abruptly reminded that terrorism is an acute danger to us all. Our thoughts and prayers are with the families and loved ones of the 24 Canadians who were lost that day" (Public Safety Canada 2007c).

Akin to government statements and responses toward terrorist events, commissions and inquiries do not fall under the traditional definition of the term memorial (Bolan 2007). However, they do provide a chance to honour and remember the victims of terrorism and can also be described as government based responses to terrorist events. For example, in 1997 the Northern Ireland Government issued a call to set up a commission to examine the ways in which their government memorialized the victims of Northern Ireland's Troubles. The outcome of the commission was a report detailing the various ways the government could improve their efforts regarding the memorialization of The Troubles. The argument can be made that this particular commission and resulting report inherently function as a form of memorialization. First, the fact that a public report was produced signifies in many ways a public recognition of the experiences of the victims of the conflict. As well, the views expressed within the report also stand as instances of memorialization. For example, in his discussion on the rationale behind the development of a commission centred on memorializing the victims of the Troubles, Commissioner Bloomfield (1998, 23) stated: "We truly need to remember those who have suffered, to grieve at the side of this communal grave. … Not least among the objectives is the memory of dead individuals, of dead families, of dead communities should not fade into the mist of history as if they had never been." Finally, the Commission of the European Communities 2005 report on terrorism provides another international example of instances of memorialization through commissions and inquiries (Commission of the European Communities 2005). According to the commission, the report is dedicated to the memory of all European victims of terrorism. Similar to the Northern Ireland report, the Commission of the European Communities report stresses the need to openly and publicly recognize the experiences of victims and their loved ones.

In terms of the Canadian context, a similar assessment can be made of the Air India inquiry. Although the inquiry was mandated to address the complex issues associated with the bombing and ways to prevent future terrorist attacks, the first phase of the report has been described as a tribute to the memory of the lives lost in the attack, and an avenue through which the family members of the victims may grieve (Air India Report 2008). During the inquiry the family members and friends of victims were given the opportunity to share stories about their loved ones and their experiences of grief following the event.

Though many of the families had previously shared some of their stories through other avenues, such as the media, they expressed that the inquiry was particularly significant because it was a formal forum supported by the Canadian government (Air India Report 2008). As well, the report also cites the inquiry as an opportunity to cement the experiences of victims and their families in Canada's historical memory. As stated in the report (2008, 4), "…further passage of time cannot erode the public memory of the enormity of what happened. The pain and loss inflicted upon the families and communities of those who perished cannot be erased."

Overall, government statements, responses and commissions regarding terrorist events provide real opportunities to honour and remember the victims of terrorism. As such, any endeavour to memorialize the victims of terrorism may benefit from an examination of the role statements and responses made by governments (federal, provincial, municipal), city officials and politicians play in this process. Based on the experiences of the families of the victims of Air India flight 182, some issues to consider regarding memorializing through government statements are the importance of a timely response to terrorist events as well as the recognition of the experiences of victims and their families.

Groups and Organizations

Groups and organizations have always taken a prominent role when it comes to assisting the victims of tragedy. According to Young (2003), in the wake of tragedy, survivors and their families often experience additional hardships not immediately central to the tragedy in question. Dubbed "secondary assaults," these hardships may stem from social and educational institutions and the justice system (Young 2003). Victims of terrorism and their family members have often times turned to organizations or groups to assist with many of the issues they may experience following a terrorist event. The memorialization process is an example of this kind of circumstance. When it comes to the issue of memorializing the victims of terrorism, groups and organizations can play primary roles. First, they function as sources of funding for memorial projects (Shipley 1987), but more importantly, they function as one of several bodies through which the various needs of victim may be advocated (Young 2003). These needs include, but are not limited to access to victims' services, assistance navigating the criminal justice process and access to health services (Young 2003). In the aftermath of terrorist events, advocacy for the needs of victims and their families regarding the memorialization of victims has become key for many groups and organizations (Couch et al. 2008). Here, groups and organizations have addressed issues such as the location of a memorial, the kinds of memorials to be developed and the meanings attached to them.

International examples that highlight the important role groups and organizations play during the memorialization process can be drawn from the experiences of several organizations developed following the September 11 terrorist attacks. In their analysis of three September 11 victims' groups - the World Trade Center United Family Group, Peaceful Tomorrows, and the Skyscraper Safety Campaign - Couch et al. (2008) show that groups and organizations often serve as the primary means through which victims and their families can voice their needs regarding memorializing and remembrance of their loved ones. Some of the needs expressed by victims through the groups included the need to preserve certain sites around the World Trade Center, and the assurance that all victims of September 11 would be formally recognized on any physical memorial to be erected (Couch et al. 2008).

Another international example can be drawn from the group S.O.S Attentat (S.O.S Terrorism). According to the organization's website, S.O.S Attentat is a non-profit association whose aim is to advocate for the rights of French citizens victimized through terrorism, as well as preserve and honour their memory (S.O.S. Attentats, n.d.). To preserve the memory of victims, the association organizes annual ceremonies and openly advocates for a general society wide remembrance of victims.

In the Canadian context, there are several examples of victims' groups, organizations and associations that have incorporated memorializing victims as part of their mandates. One prominent example is the Air India Victims Families Association. The association has been credited as one of main forces behind the push for the Air India inquiry through which families were provided with the opportunity to share and present stories and memories of their deceased loved ones. Another example is the Canadian Coalition Against Terror. Although the group's primary objective is to enhance Canadian counterterrorism policies, several key members of the group have been very vocal in the push for the establishment of a national memorial honouring the Canadian victims of the September 11 terrorist attacks (Edwards 2008).

Based on the examples above, it is evident that groups and organizations can be a useful resource to individuals seeking to memorialize the victims of terrorism. However, it is also important to recognize the possibility for conflict between and within groups and organizations working for victims. For example, in the case of September 11, the presence of multiple groups working to memorialize the World Trade Center site in distinctly different ways posed a significant challenge to the memorialization process. Couch et al. (2008) contend that although these groups shared similar experiences, they also expressed different ideas regarding the ways in which to memorialize the tragedy. In addition, consideration may also need to be given to some of the effects of competing visions on the outcomes of objectives developed by victims of terrorism. As scholars have noted, the struggle to further certain memorial based objectives over others has the real potential to exclude and obscure the perspectives of others (Gough 2007; Graham et al. 2007). Overall, these examples underscore the need to address differences between and within groups, and the ways in which these differences can impede, as well as contribute to the memorial process. Finally, the presence of victims in the process must be considered, as well as the extent to which the voices of all victims can be effectively addressed.

Days of Remembrance

Similar to physical memorials, days of remembrance are among the primary ways victims of terrorism have been memorialized. In general, days of remembrance encourage the repeated rituals of recognition lending salience to particular interpretations of events which then influence and shape societal thinking about similar events or issues. A notable example of this is Remembrance Day in Canada. On November 11, Canadians pay tribute to the lives and service of Canadian troops. There are many current examples of days that have been established by governments as days to reflect on terrorist events and honour the lives lost or affected by those events. On the twentieth anniversary of the Air India bombing, Prime Minister Stephen Harper announced that June 23, chosen because of the Air India disaster, will be the official day to remember the victims of terrorism (Public Safety Canada 2005). In the European Union, March 11 serves as the national day to remember the victims of terrorism. Officially known as the European Day for the Victims of Terrorism, the primary impetus behind the creation of the day was the March 11, 2004 Madrid train bombings that took the lives of 192 people and injured 1500 others (Moreno 2005). As for official days of remembrance in the United States, there is no "official," national day

memorializing their major terrorist events (i.e. the World Trade Center attack of September 11th and the Oklahoma City bombing of April 19th), however the anniversaries of these events are marked throughout the country.

In general, a great benefit of implementing memorial or remembrance days is that they inherently support the call for memorialization or rather; they prevent the forgetting of significant events by reorienting memory towards that event. However, like the other forms and avenues of memorializing addressed in this report, they are also prone to many of the social and political issues that negatively impact the memorialization process.

In his research on establishing memorial days to honour the victims of the Holocaust, Stone (2000) presents some critical questions that should be addressed regarding memorializing via days of remembrance. According to Stone (2000), key issues to consider in this area are the extent to which the day being remembered is memorialized in a capacity worthy of the gravity of the event, and the implicit purposes and objectives being served through days of remembrance. This point addressed by Stone presents some significant implications for policies developed to address the ways in which to memorialize Canadian victims of terrorism. Given the severity of the Canadian instances of terrorism (e.g. Air India bombing, September 11 etc.), and the fact that a national day of remembrance has already been established in Canada, the key issue to address now becomes the extent to which the National Day to Remember the Victims of Terrorism effectively honours the memory of victims. Stone (2000) also highlights the issue of inclusion and exclusion.

Given the diversity of communities and the potential for varied experiences and meanings regarding particular events, establishing particular days of remembrance may pose some real challenges for society. According to Stone (2000), events such as the Holocaust which are particular to one or several groups should not be classified as a shared experience in culturally diverse nations such as Britain. For Stone, implementing a day of remembrance commemorating the Holocaust significantly skews the national identity of Britain because the Holocaust represents a very specific narrative particular to one group rather than many groups that comprise the British population. Translated into the Canadian context, Stone's arguments highlight the need to address the ways some groups in Canada have interpreted particular terrorist events and the subsequent ways they come to understand remembrance days memorializing these events. A way to overcome this potential issue is to place an emphasis on the universal aspects related to significant events rather than focusing on certain particularities that may further divide groups (Hoskins 2007). As Hoskins notes (2007, 247), highly politicized campaigns to memorialize victims have the potential to be beneficial to the greater society because they establish a "basis for cross-cultural and cross-national empathy and understanding."

Spontaneous Memorials

Recent research on spontaneous memorials depicts the act as a relatively recent and growing phenomenon (Santino 2006; Doss 2006; Tay 2008). According to these researchers, spontaneous memorials can properly be dubbed one of the foremost forms of memorializing. Though the definition may appear self-explanatory, Doss (2006) notes that the term, "spontaneous memorial" is in some ways deceptive. According to Doss, spontaneous memorials are, in actuality, highly orchestrated forms of public mourning whose spontaneity lies in their quick use as responses to unexpected tragedy. They often take

shape in a variety of ways; for example, they may be in the form of roadside memorials, memorial walls, or public shrines (Santino 2006; Thomas 2006). According to researchers, spontaneous memorials serve several purposes. First, they function to memorialize the victims of tragic events. Second, they provide people with the opportunity to address social issues and problems, which in turn politicizes them (Santino 2006). Researchers claim that spontaneous memorials are political in the sense that they can be used to present citizen commentary regarding policies implemented by governments (Yocom 2006), while governmental responses to such memorials can serve as an affirmation of governmental power over the public domain or the recognition of public concerns (Thomas 2006). However, the political focus during spontaneous memorialization processes are primarily on the critique of government action or inaction regarding the event that has spurred need for spontaneous memorialization in the first place (Margry and Sanchez-Carretero 2007). International examples provide insight on the practical and socio-political aspects of spontaneous memorials.

Spontaneous memorials are among the foremost ways American victims of recent terrorist events have been memorialized. In the days following the September 11 attacks, the areas surrounding the World Trade Center and Pentagon building where the attacks occurred instantly became places of gathering for the public to pay their respects to the victims. At these sites, people left objects and performed various rituals for the victims. Personalized objects displayed at the sites included photos and picture frames, while less personalized objects included flowers, teddy bears and candles, to name a few (Greenspan 2003). The sites were also decorated with poems and comments on and around previously erected national monuments, especially in the case of the World Trade Center site. However, in the days following the initial creation of the spontaneous memorials at Union Station in New York, the Department of Parks is said to have removed the comments and messages that were scrawled on the ground and monuments. As well, a year after people displayed objects and wrote comments about the attacks and victims at a church near the site of attack, residents requested that these be removed.

One of the issues raised by this example is the timely removal of spontaneous memorials from publicly occupied spaces. Some research that has been done on roadside memorials has addressed this critical issue. Though not often associated with memorials for victims of terrorism, roadside memorials are used to memorialize victims of tragedies, such as car accidents. Scholars have classified them as a particular form of spontaneous memorialization (Santino 2006). In their research on roadside memorials in the United States, Collins and Rhine (2003) present several areas of contention regarding this form of memorialization. According to the authors, maintenance, visual blight, and safety are among some keys issues that have frustrated policy makers trying to appease the people that erect these memorials and the general public subject to their presence within their neighbourhoods. To this list, might also be added the possible archival value of artefacts forming the spontaneous memorial (Treasury Board of Canada 2008).

To summarize, there are several conclusions that can be drawn from the literature on spontaneous memorials. First, spontaneous memorials can be used to inform national or official memorials. According to Senie (2006), as a form of democratic action, spontaneous memorials carry important personal responses and public commentary that should be considered in the memorialization process. Given the fact that national memorials are designed to honour victims while promoting healing within society, spontaneous memorials can offer the opportunity to identify some of the sentiments citizens may want reflected through national memorials. However, the use of spontaneous memorials as an approach toward fostering the healing of victims, their families and the general public following a terrorist event may also

require the consideration of some issues associated with their erection in public places. Concerns about public safety, maintenance (especially in the case of roadside memorials and shrines) and the public response towards spontaneous memorials are some examples of issues that may benefit from some consideration regarding this particular memorialization process.

Considerations

Overall, the memorialization of victims of terrorism is receiving growing attention from scholars, governments and policy makers. Research has focused on the experiences and needs of victims, and specific issues such as victim compensation (Staiger et al. 2008; Shichor 2007). Although research on memorializing victims of terrorism can be described as burgeoning, the literature that currently exists has not addressed the Canadian context. As such, research relevant to the needs of Canadian victims of terrorism and their families may be needed in order to effectively gauge the ways in which these victims can be memorialized. Particular areas of focus include documenting the past and present ways Canadian victims of terrorism have been memorialized, the needs of victims' families, as well as a detailed account of the memorialization process in Canada.

Despite the sparse Canadian content regarding memorializing the victims of terrorism, the little that does exist, when coupled with the international instances of memorialization can inform policies about the ways to memorialize Canadian victims of terrorism. A key issue appears to be the varied meaning attached to memorials. As illustrated throughout this report, memorials, irrespective of their form, convey implicit and explicit meanings about the people and society in which they exist. More importantly, these potential meanings can have significant implications for victims of terrorism and their families, but also for the general public. As such, identifying the meanings conveyed within memorials for victims of terrorism, particularly implicit and obscure meanings, is central to creating memorials that honour the memory of victims while reducing the potential for re-victimization through memorials. Another way to decipher implicit meanings and messages present within memorials may be to examine the politics associated with particular memorials processes. As scholars have argued, memorializing is a highly political issue (Hite 2007; Hoskins 2008). When considering particular memorial schemes, it may be helpful to also address the objectives governing the creation of the schemes in question and the overall objectives of the various stakeholders involved in the process.

Another area for consideration is the role victims and victims' families can play in the memorialization process. First, addressing the role of victims and their families in the memorialization process is significant because it provides victims and their families with the opportunity to voice their concerns regarding memorials. Second, it supports the call for a more inclusive approach toward addressing the memorialization needs of victims (Bloomfield 1998). This is especially critical given the ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity of Canada's population (Fleras and Elliot 2002).

In terms of groups and organizations, research shows that they currently occupy a critical space in the memorialization process (Couch et al. 2008). As scholars have noted, victims' groups and organizations have had and will continue to have a real influence in the ways victims of terrorism and other terrorist type events are memorialized. As such, careful consideration regarding the ways in which groups and

organizations can effectively contribute toward memorializing victims of terrorism may be particularly beneficial.

Finally, logistical issues such as the location of a memorial, the timeline of a memorial project, and the costs and maintenance of memorial sites are all key areas for consideration. Although primarily technical, it is important to note that these issues relate to and are affected by the other identified issues associated with memorializing the victims of terrorism.

Despite the limited scholarship produced on the processes and issues associated with memorializing Canadian victims of terrorism, this review has demonstrated that there are critical challenges to address when considering memorialization as a viable option for Canadian victims of terrorism. By utilizing current research on memorials developed for victims of terrorism, and by exploring various cases of terrorist-type events, this report has gauged a number of policy related needs that may contribute to the realization of a grounded framework for memorializing victims of terrorism. No one issue is particularly paramount, as each is vital to the memorialization process. However, it can be argued that the voices and needs of victims, their families, and the general public are all critical components necessary in the memorialization process. Moreover, identifying the extent to which each group should feature in the memorialization process is a task that may require further research based on the Canadian context, as well as careful consideration in policy.

Bibliography

Abend, L., and G. Pingree. "Spain's Path to 3/11 Memorial: How Should Madrid Honour 190 Killed in Train Bombings?" The Christian Science Monitor July 14, 2004. Accessed August 28, 2008, from http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0714/p07s01-woeu.html.

Aizenberg, E. "Argentine Space, Jewish Memory: Memorials to the Blown Apart and Disappeared in Buenos Aries." *Mortality* 12 (2007): 109. Retrieved June 19, 2008, from the Canadian Research Network Database.

Berman, D., and A. Brown "Memorials and Redevelopment after Terrorism: The Responses of Oklahoma City and London. A Comparative for New York City After September 11th." *Lower Manhattan Recovery Studio*, February 4, 2002. Accessed June 12, 2008, from http://arch.columbia.edu/Studio/ Spring2002/UP/Downtown_Manhattan/PDF/OK%20v%20London.pdf.

Bloomfield. K. *We Will Remember Them-Report of the Northern Ireland Victims Commissioner*. Accessed July 2, 2008, from http://nio.gov.uk/bloomfield_report.pdf.

Bolan, K. "Air India Inquiry a Channel for Families' Grief: Report." National Post, December 11, 2007. Accessed from http://www.nationalpost.com/related/topics/story.html?id=161267.

Britton, D. "Arlington's Cairn: Constructing the Commemorative Foundation for United States' Terrorist Victims." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 35 (2007): 17. Accessed June 11, 2008, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3719/is_200707/ai_n21099921.

Burk, A. "In Sight, Out of View: A Tale of Three Monuments." *Antipode* 38 (2006): 41. Retrieved July 30, 2008, from Wiley InterScience database.

Carr, G. "After Ground Zero: Problems of Memory and Memorialisation." *Illumine* 2 (2003): 34. Accessed August 27, 2008, from http://csrs.uvic.ca/publications/graduate/illumine/Master%2030-10-03.pdf.

Clark, J., and A. Cheshire. "RIP by the Roadside: A Comparative Study of Roadside Memorials in New South Wales, Australia, and Texas, United States." *OMEGA* 48 (2003-2004): 203. Retrieved July 11, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.

Clark, J., and M. Franzmann. "Authority from Grief, Presence and Place in the Making of Roadside Memorials." *Death Studies* 30 (2006): 579. Retrieved July 11, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.

Collins, C., and C. Rhine. "Roadside Memorials." *OMEGA* 47 (2003): 221. Retrieved July 11, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.

Commission of the European Communities. Fighting Terrorism: A Memorial Report Dedicated to the Victims of Terrorism. Commission of the European Communities (2005). Accessed August 7, 2008, from http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/doc_centre/criminal/terrorism/doc/sec_2005_272_en.pdf.

Couch, S.R., B. Wade, and J.D. Kindler. "Victims' Groups Following the 9/11 Terrorist Attacks." *Sociological Inquiry* 78 (2008): 248. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Council Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism. Accessed June 25, 2008, from http://www.legislationline.org/legislation.php?tid=46&lid=5679.

Damphouse, K., S. Hefley, and B. Smith. "Creating Memories: Exploring How Narratives Help Define the memorialization of Tragedy." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta, GA, August 16, 2003. Accessed June 16, 2008, from http://hicsocial.org/Social2003Proceedings/Kelly%20%20Damphousse.pdf.

Doka, K.J. "Memorialization, Ritual and Public Tragedy." In *Living with Grief. Coping with Public Tragedy*, edited by M. Lattanza-Light and K.J. Doka, 179-190. New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge, 2003.

Donohue, J. "Dwelling With Monuments." *Philosophy and Geography* 5 (2002): 235. Retrieved August 27, 2008, from Igenta Connect database.

Doss, E. "Memorial Mania: Fear, Anxiety and Public Culture." *Museums* March/April (2008). Accessed June 24, 2008, from http://rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/2007/RAND_OP180-1.sum.pdf.

Doss, E. "Spontaneous Memorials and Contemporary Modes of Mourning in America." *Material Religion* 3 (2006): 294. Retrieved July 30, 2008, from Igenta Connect database.

Drake, C.J.M. "The Role of Ideology in Terrorists' Target Selection." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 10 (1998): 53. Retrieved August 28, 2008, from Informaworld database.

Edwards, S. "Delays Plague Ground Zero Memorial." Canwest News Service, July 1, 2008. Accessed August 2, 2008, from http://www.canada.com/topics/news/world/story.html?id=62d07153-3cd1-463f-b5eb-776c8d30a126.

Fletcher, G.P. "The Indefinable Concept of Terrorism." *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 4 (2006): 894. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Fleras, A., and J.L. Elliot. *Engaging Diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada.* Toronto: Nelson Thomson, 2002.

Foot, K., B. Warnick, and S.M. Schneider. "Web-based Memorializing After September 11: Toward a Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication* 11(2006): 72. Retrieved July 11, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Gordon, D.L., and B.S. Osborne. "Constructing National Identity in Canada's Capital, 1900-2000: Confederation Square and the National War Memorial." *Journal of Historical Geography* 30 (2004): 618. Retrieved July 30, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Gough, P. "Contested Memories: Contested Sites': Newfoundland and its Unique Heritage on the Western Front." *The Round Table* 96 (2007): 693. Retrieved August 11, 2008, from Informaworld database.

Gough, P. "Sites in the Imagination: the Beaumont Hamel Newfoundland Memorial on the Somme." *Cultural Geographies* 11 (2004)" 235. Retrieved August 12, 2008, from Sage Publications Online.

Gough, P. "'Invicta Pax' Monuments, Memorials and Peacekeeping: an Analysis of the Canadian Peacekeeping Monument, Ottawa." *International Journal of Heritage Sites* 8 (2002): 201. Retrieved August 12, 2008, from Informaworld database.

Graham, B., and Y. Whelan. "The Legacies of the Dead: Commemorating the Troubles in Northern Ireland." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25 (2007): 476. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from EBSCOhost Electronic Journal Services database.

Greenspan, E. L. "Scaling Tragedy: Memorialization and Globalization at the World Trade Centre Site." PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2006.

Grob-Fitzgibbon, B. "What is Terrorism? Redefining a Phenomenon in Time of War." *Peace & Change* 30 (2005): 231. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Guillermina, S. "Terror, Reconciliation, Redemption: The Politics of Memory in Argentina." *Radical Philosophy* 147 (2008): 8. Retrieved July 16, 2008, from www.radicalphilosohpy.com.

Hill, J.K. Working with Victims of Crime: A Manual Applying Research to Clinical Practice (2nd Edition). Department of Justice Canada, 2004.

Hite, K. "The Eye That Cries': The Politics of Representing Victims in Contemporary Peru." *A Journal on Social History and Literature in Latin America* 5 (2007): 108. Accessed June 16, 2008, from http://ncsu.edu/project/acontracorriente/fall_07/Hite.pdf.

Hoffman, B., and A.B. Kasupski. "The Victims of Terrorism: An Assessment of their Growing Role in Policy, Legislation, and the Private Sector." *RAND Center for Risk Management and Assessment Policy*, 2007. Accessed June 10, 2008, from http://rand.org/pubs/occasional_papers/2007/RAND_OP180-1.sum.pdf.

Hoffman, B. ""Holy Terror": The Implications of Terrorism Motivated by a Religious Imperative." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 18 (1995): 271. Retrieved August 28, 2008, from Blackwell Synergy database.

Hoskins, G. "The Politics of Memory and the World Trade Center Memorial Site." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 38 (2007): 242. Retrieved June 19, 2008, from Synergy Blackwell database.

Hough, M. "Domestic, International and Transnational Terror after 2001: Towards a New Typology?" *Strategic Review for Southern Africa* 29 (2007): 39. Accessed on July 21, 2008, from www.up.ac.za/dspace/bitstream/2263/4018/1/Hough_Domestic%282007%29.pdf.

Jagger, A.M. "What Is Terrorism, Why Is It Wrong, and Could It Ever Be Morally Permissible?" *Journal of Social Philosophy* 36 (2005): 202. Retrieved August 28, 2008, from Wiley Interscience database.

Leman-Langlois, S., and J.P. Brodeur. "Terrorism Old and New: Counterterrorism in Canada. *Police Practice and Research* 6 (2005): 121. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from Informaworld database.

Low, S.M. "The Memorialization of September 11: Dominant and Local Discourses on the Rebuilding of the World Trade Center Site." *American Ethnologist* 31 (2004): 326. Retrieved June 11, 2008, from AnthroSource database.

Margry, P.J., and C. Sanchez-Carretero. "Memorializing Traumatic Death." *Anthropology Today* 23 (2007): 1. Retrieved August 27, 2008 from Wiley InterScience database.

Marsella, A.J., and F.M. Moghaddam. "The Origins of and Nature of Terrorism: Foundations and Issues." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma* 9 (2004): 19. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from EBSCOhost database.

Miller, L. "Family Therapy of Terroristic Trauma: Psychological Syndromes and Treatment Strategies." *American Journal of Family Therapy* 31 (2003): 257. Retrieved September 11, 2008, from Informaworld database.

Moreno, L. "The Madrid Bombings in the Domestic and Regional Politics of Spain." *Irish Studies in International Affairs* 16 (2005): 65. Accessed July 31, 2008, from http://www.iesam.csic.es/doctrab2/dt-0413.pdf.

Nevins, J. "The Abuse of Memorialized Space and the Redefinition of Ground Zero." *Journal of Human Rights* 4 (2005): 267. Retrieved August 5, 2008, from Informaworld.

Office of Pubic Sector Information. "Terrorism Act 2006," Office of Public Sector Information, http://www.opsi.gov.uk/ACTS/acts2006/ukpga_20060011_en_2#pt1-pb3-l1g10.

Oliner, M. "The Externalization Function of Memorials." *The Psychoanalytic Review* 93 (2006): 883.

Public Safety Canada. "Air India Memorial Re-dedicated in Ottawa on National Day of Remembrance for Victims of Terrorism." Public Safety Canada (2008). Accessed August 2, 2008, from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/media/nr/2008/nr20080623-eng.aspx.

Public Safety Canada. "Air India Memorial Unveiled in Vancouver." Public Safety Canada (2007). Accessed August 2, 2008, from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/media/nr/2007/nr20070727-eng.aspx.

Public Safety Canada. "Air India Memorial Unveiled in Toronto." Public Safety Canada (2007 b). Accessed August 2, 2008, from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/media/nr/2007/nr20070623-1-eng.aspx

Public Safety Canada. "Public Safety Minister Honours Victims of 9/11 and Affirms Dedication to Fighting Terrorism." Public Safety Canada (2007c). Retrieved August 2, 2008, from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/media/nr/2007/nr20070911-eng.aspx.

Public Safety Canada. "Government of Canada to Mark the 20th Anniversary of the Air India Tragedy." Public Safety Canada (2005). Retrieved August 2, 2008, from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/media/nr/2005/nr20050622-eng.aspx.

Rankin, K. "Anthropologies and Geographies of Globalization." *Progress in Human Geography* 27 (2003): 708. Retrieved August 5, 2008, from SAGE Publications Online.

Rigney, A. "Divided Pasts: A Premature Memorial and the Dynamics of Collective Remembrance." *Memory Studies* 1 (2008): 89. Retrieved August 11, 2008, from Sage Publications Online.

Riley, A. "On the Role of Images in the Construction of Narratives about the Crash of United Airlines Flight 93." *Visual Studies* 23(2008): 4. Retrieved June 26, 2008, from the Canadian Research Knowledge Network.

Roach, K. "A Comparison of Australian and Canadian Anti-Terrorism Laws." *UNSW Law Journal* 30 (2007): 53. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from Hein Online.

Rosenberg, S., and R.I. Simon. "Beyond the Logic of Emblemization: Remembering and Learning from the Montréal Massacre." *Educational Theory* 50 (2000): 133. Retrieved July 31, 2008, from Wiley InterScience database.

Ross, J., and T.R. Gurr. "Why Terrorism Subsides: A Comparative Study of Canada and the United States." *Comparative Politics* 21 (1989): 405. Retrieved July 30, 2008, from Jstor Database.

Rowlands, M. "Trauma, Memory and Memorials." *British Journal of Psychotherapy* 15 (1998): 54. Retrieved July 30, 2008, from Synergy Blackwell database.

Santino, J. Performative Commemoratives: Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death." In *Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death*, edited by J. Santino, 5-16. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillian. 2006.

Shay, T. "Can Our Loved Ones Rest in Peace? The Memorialization of the Victims of Hostile Activities." *Anthropological Quarterly* 78 (2005): 709. Retrieved June 10, 2008, from Project Muse database.

Shipley, M. To Mark Our Place: A History of Canadian War Memorials. Toronto: NC Press, 1987.

Shichor, D. "Thinking about Terrorism and Its Victims." *Victims and Offenders* 2 (2007): 269. Retrieved July 14, 2008, from Informworld database.

Senie, H.F. "Mourning in Protest: Spontaneous Memorials and the Sacrilization of Public Space." In *Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death*, edited by J. Santino, 41-56. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillian. 2006.

Sorek, T. "Cautious Commemoration: Localism, Communalism, and Nationalism in Palestinian Memorial Monuments in Israel." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 50 (2008): 337. Retrieved June 26, 2008, from Scholars Portal.

S.O.S. Attentats. *Fight Against Oblivion*. Accessed July 4, 2008 from http://www.sos-attentats.org/association-lutte-oubli.asp?lan_id=eng.

Staiger, I., R. Letschert., A. Pemberton., and K. Ammerlaan. 2008. *Victims of Terrorism; Towards European Standards for Assistance*. Report of the European Forum for Restorative Justice.

Stephens, J. "Memory, Commemoration and the Meaning of a Suburban War Memorial." *Journal of Material Culture* 12 (2007): 241. Retrieved July 31, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Sternberg, R.J. "A Duplex Theory of Hate: Development and Application to Terrorism, Massacres, and Genocide." *Review of General Psychology* 7 (2003): 239. Retrieved August 28, 2008, from ESCOhost database.

Stone, D. "Day of Remembrance or Day of Forgetting? Or, Why Britain Does Not Need a Holocaust Memorial Day." *Patterns of Prejudice* 34 (2000): 53. Retrieved August 14, 2008, from Canadian Research Knowledge Network.

Minister of Public Works and Government Services. 2008. The Families Remember. Commission of Inquiry into the Investigation of the Bombing of Air India Flight 182. Ottawa: PWGSC.

Tay, R. *Roadside Memorials and Traffic Safety*. Unpublished Manuscript, AMA Chair in Road Safety, University of Calgary, 2008.

Thomas, J.B. "Communicative Commemoration and Graveside Shrines: Princess Diana, JimMorrison, My "Bro" Max, and Boogs the Cat." In *Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death*, edited by J. Santino, 17-40. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillian. 2006.

Tota, A. "Terrorism and Collective Memories: Comparing Bologna, Naples and Madrid 11 March." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 46 (2005): 55. Retrieved June 10, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Tota, A. "Ethnographying Public Memory: The Commemorative Genre for the Victims of Terrorism in Italy." *Qualitative Research* 4 (2004): 131. Retrieved July 11, 2008, from Sage Journal Online.

Treasury Board of Canada. "Guide to the Management of Movable Heritage Assets." Ottawa, ON: Treasury Board of Canada. Accessed September 12, 2008 from http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=13872&section=text.

Updegraff, J.A., R.C. Silver., and E.A. Holman. "Searching for and Finding Meaning in Collective Trauma: Results from a National and Longitudinal Study of the 9/11 Terrorist Attacks." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 95 (2008): 709. Retrieved September 11, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Veterans Affairs Canada. *Cenotaph/Monument Restoration Program: Program Guidelines*. Veterans Affairs Canada (n.d.). Accessed August 20, 2008, from http://www.vac-acc.gc.ca/remembers/ sub.cfm?source=memorials/cenotaph/guidelines.

Weigend, T. "The Universal Terrorist: The International Community Grappling with a Definition." *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 4 (2006): 912. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from Scholars Portal database.

Weinberg, L., A. Pedahzur, and S. Hirsch-Hoefler. "The Challenge of Conceptualizing Terrorism." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 16 (2004): 777. Retrieved June 5, 2008, from Informaworld database.

Weston, G., and J. Aubry. "The Montreal Massacre." *The Ottawa Citizen*, February 09, 2007. Accessed August 12, 2008 from http://www.canada.com/ottawacitizen/features/rapidfire/ story.html?id=bd7367a7-1f49-4c5d-949d-7e5a85941b40.

Wohl, M. and N. Branscombe. "Remembering Historical Victimization: Collective Guilt for Current Ingroup Transgressions." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94 (2008): 988.

Yocom, M.R. "We'll Watch Out for Liza and the Kids": Spontaneous Memorials and Personal Response at the Pentagon, 2001." In *Spontaneous Shrines and the Public Memorialization of Death*, edited by J. Santino, 57-98. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillian. 2006.

Young, A. "Victim Advocacy in the Aftermath of Tragedy." In *Living with Grief. Coping with Public Tragedy*, edited by M. Lattanza-Light and K.J. Doka, 219-230. New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge, 2003.

Zittoun, T. "Memorials and Semiotic Dynamics." *Culture & Psychology* 10 (2004): 477. Retrieved July 31, 2008, from Scholars Portal database. http://www.dca.gov.uk/corbur/war-memorial-guidance.pdf