

## **France/New Zealand Symposium on the French Memorial at Pukeahu National War Memorial Park**

### **Overview and Summary of Discussions**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION**

On the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the end of World War I, and at the invitation of New Zealand authorities, a French memorial gifted to New Zealand by the Government of France will be inaugurated within the Pukeahu National War Memorial Park in Wellington in 2018. The memorial will celebrate and bear testimony to the long-lasting friendship and the strong bonds forged between France and New Zealand since the days /time spent on the WWI battlefields.

In order to establish the general parameters of the memorial with regards to its design and remembrance purpose, it was decided that a symposium would bring together in France from December 6 to 12, 2015, six prominent New Zealanders who would spend a full week interacting with French organisations and experts involved in the WW1 commemorations, including museum curators, historians, elected officials, veterans' associations... The expected outcome of this symposium was a general design brief that could feed into an architectural competition for the memorial that the Embassy of France is planning to organise in 2016 in New Zealand.

This initiative arises from the strong belief that a memorial representing the relations between the two nations should have its main characteristics and purpose designed collectively, through a creative dialogue which unites French and New Zealand representatives from civil society.

The present report is an overview and summary of the discussions that took place during the symposium. It focusses on some of the “big ideas” that the memorial should reflect, leaving plenty of creative flexibility to the architects, designers and artists to best represent them. Its purpose is to serve as a source of inspiration and reflection for the design, jointly with the document “*Summary of discussions prior to the symposium regarding the French memorial at Pukeahu National War Memorial Park.*”

#### **II. PARTICIPANTS AND PROGRAMME**

The symposium was jointly organised by the French Ministry of Defence, the French First World War Commission and the French Embassy in New Zealand. It was financially supported by the French Ministry of Defence. The six New Zealand participants were:

**Rhys Jones, CNZM (head of delegation)**

Lieutenant General Rhys Jones was appointed as the Chief of Army on 1 May 2009 and in January 2011 was appointed as the Chief of the Defence Force. He served in this role until January 2014, during which time he was one of the drivers behind New Zealand's First World War Centennial project. On departing the Army, Rhys Jones was appointed as the Executive Director of the National Military Heritage Charitable Trust where his role was to coordinate the creative work of the film-maker Sir Peter Jackson with the fundraising, operational management and construction work required to support the project.

### **Dave Armstrong**

Dave Armstrong is a playwright, newspaper columnist and museum writer/concept developer. Dave's hit comedy, *Le Sud*, written in 2009, has been performed throughout New Zealand. *Le Sud* imagines that the entire South Island was colonised by the French, and has been enjoyed by thousands of New Zealanders. *King and Country*, written in 2005, drew on letters, telegrams, newspaper articles, and recordings to tell the story of New Zealand soldiers in World War I. In 2014-15, Dave worked as a writer and consultant on *Gallipoli: The Scale of Our War at Te Papa*, and as a writer and audio director on the groundbreaking *Ngā Tapuwāe* app, which provides e-guides for visitors to Gallipoli and the Western Front. He also wrote scripts for the first two series of *Great War Stories* presented by Hilary Barry on TV3.

### **Stephen McDougall**

Stephen McDougall has been a Director of Studio Pacific Architecture since the company's founding in 1992. He is a Registered New Zealand Architect and Fellow of the New Zealand Institute of Architects, with 30 years' work experience in the disciplines of urban design, strategic masterplanning, architecture and interior design. Studio Pacific Architecture, in collaboration with sculpturer Kingsley Baird, won an international design competition to design the New Zealand Memorial, located on Anzac Parade in Canberra, Australia. The Memorial was a gift from the New Zealand Government celebrating the relationship between the two countries. Other relevant Studio projects include the restoration and renovation of the Carillion, the Hall of Memories and the setting for Tomb of the Unknown Warrior at the head of Wellington's new Pukeahu Park.

### **Elizabeth Knox**

Elizabeth Knox is the author of twelve novels and three novellas. Her book *The Vintner's Luck*, won the Deutz Medal for Fiction in the 1999 Montana New Zealand Book Awards, and the Tasmania Pacific Region Prize. *The Vintner's Luck* is published in ten languages. Among many awards, Elizabeth Knox was the recipient of the 1999 Katherine Mansfield Fellowship which, every year, enables a New Zealand writer to spend a few months in Menton, France, and the 2014 Michael King Fellowship. Her first novel, *After-Z Hour*, was first published on Armistice Day 1987 and won the PEN Award for Best First Book of Prose. In the story, a young New Zealand serviceman who died in 1920 soon after his return from France comes back to haunt the minds of six young people stranded in an old house.

### **Robin Laing**

Robin Laing is one of New Zealand's most experienced film producers. In addition to her long-term collaboration with director Gaylene Preston, she has worked with Christine Jeffs, Hamish Rothwell, Shirley Horrocks and Niki Caro on feature films, cinema shorts and television documentaries. Currently she serves on the boards for the New Zealand International Film Festival Trust, the Film Career Education Trust and WIFT New Zealand. She is a past board member of the New Zealand Film Commission, the New Zealand Film Archive (Nga Taonga), the Producers and Directors Guild (SPADA), the Copyright Council and Screenrights, and in 2002 she was appointed to the government's Screen Industry Task Force.

### **Monty Soutar**

Dr Monty Soutar is a senior historian with the Ministry for Culture and Heritage. He is currently the foremost Maori military historian in New Zealand. Following on from his successful book *Nga Tama Toa: the Price of Citizenship*, about the role of the 28th Maori Battalion during the Second World War, he is working on a major publication about Maori participation in the First World War. He has been a school teacher, university lecturer, holds several university degrees, has served in the NZ Army, holds a number of appointments on national advisory boards in New Zealand - including the First World War Centenary Panel - and was named in 2015's New Year's Honours list as an officer of the NZ Order of Merit.

Three French participants; photographer **Jean Richardot**, visual artist **Patrice Alexandre** and historian **Yves Le Maner** joined the New Zealand delegates to discuss how the French and New Zealanders look together at this part of our shared history. Also accompanying the group during the week were Mr Romain Bula, deputy Manager of Remembrance Sites and Necropolis from the Ministry of Defence, Mr Alexandre Lafon, deputy director from the French First World War Commission and Mr Raynald Belay, Cultural and Scientific Counsellor at the French Embassy in New Zealand. Numerous meetings were organised with such French personalities and experts as Alain Jacques, Archeological Director at the Arras City Council ; Hervé François, director of the Historial de la Grande Guerre (Péronne); Olivier Gérard, director of the Ossuaire de Douaumont ; Thierry Hubscher, director of the Verdun memorial; Antoine Prost, historian and President of the scientific committee of the French First World War Commission; Philippe Prost, architect and winning entrant for the Notre-Dame de Lorette memorial; Michel Rouger, director general of the Great War Museum of Meaux, and others.

The group was invited to visit some of the most significant places of remembrance for France and New Zealand that are located in France, to meet with various stakeholders involved in the commemoration of the war, and to reflect on the potential challenges raised by the memorial within the specific context of the Pukeahu National War Memorial Park.

The programme included:

### **Day One:**

*Les Invalides*

The symposium opened at Les Invalides, in Paris. This complex of buildings houses the military museum of the Army of France, the Musée des Plans-Reliefs, and the Musée d'Histoire Contemporaine, as well as the Dôme des Invalides—a large church housing the burial sites of some of France's war heroes, most notably Napoleon Bonaparte. The group was given a tour of the First World War exhibitions before meeting with representatives from different French ministries, the First World War Commission, the New Zealand Embassy in Paris, French experts on the First World War and the French participants of the symposium. After introductions, presentations were made on expectations for the week including one by Antoine Prost, historian and President of the First World War Committee's scientific panel. Mr Prost's address about French perspectives on war memorials was very enlightening.

*Le Musée de la Grande Guerre*

In the afternoon the delegates travelled to the *Le Musée de la Grande Guerre* (Museum of the Great War) in Meaux. This museum offers a new vision of the war through innovative scenography. It tries to illustrate the great changes and upheavals in society that resulted from the war.

*Arc De Triomphe*

The group attended the "Rekindling of the Torch Ceremony" at the base of the Arc De Triomphe.

**Day Two:***Grevilliers NZ Memorial*

The second day was spent in the Arras region, beginning with a visit to the New Zealand Memorial at Grevilliers. This memorial commemorates almost 450 officers and men of the New Zealand Division who died in the defensive fighting in the area from March to August 1918, and in the advance to victory between 8 August and 11 November 1918, and who have no known grave. This is one of seven memorials in France and Belgium to those New Zealand soldiers who died on the Western Front whose graves are not known.

*Notre Dame de Lorette cemetery and memorial*

By mid-morning the delegates were at the Notre-Dame de Lorette cemetery. The ridge that the cemetery sits upon is only 165 metres high, but with Vimy Ridge nearby it completely dominates the otherwise flat Douai plain and the town of Arras. The cemetery also marks the central ground (700 metres) where the two battles of Artois were fought. The rising church in the cemetery dramatically overlooks 42,000 Frenchmen's graves. Outside the cemetery is the recently erected and stunning Ring of Memory, which opened on 11 November 2014. The architect/designer, Philippe Prost, gave us a tour of the memorial. The elliptical monument bears the names of 580,000 soldiers who died in the Nord-Pas de Calais region during World War I. Forty nationalities are represented. The names are engraved in alphabetical order, regardless of nationality or rank.

*Carrière Wellington Museum, Arras*

Tuesday afternoon was spent at the Carrière Wellington Museum in Arras, northern France. Opened in March 2008, the museum commemorates the soldiers who built the tunnels and fought in the Battle of Arras in 1917. It displays historic artifacts and presents the historical

context of the Battle of Arras, including the work of the tunnellers and the military strategy that underlay the tunnels' construction.

In 1916, 500 miners from the New Zealand Tunnelling Company, including Māori and Pacific Islanders, recruited from the gold and coal mining districts of the country, were brought in to dig 20 kilometers of tunnels. The tunnels are accessed via a lift shaft that took the group approximately 22 meters below ground to the galleries around the Wellington quarry. At various places, graffiti and painted signs could be seen, along with relics of the troops such as cans of bully beef, helmets and bottles. The Arras tunnels linked the quarries to form a network that ran from the town centre, under no man's land, to a number of points just in front of the German front lines. The tunnel system could accommodate 20,000 men and was outfitted with running water, electric lights, kitchens, latrines, a light rail system and a fully equipped hospital. The tunnellers named the individual quarries after their home towns —Auckland, Wellington, Nelson, Blenheim, Christchurch and Dunedin for the New Zealanders, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Crewe and London for the Britons.

### **Day Three:**

#### *Les Invalides*

At Les Invalides again the delegation met for breakfast with the Associate Minister of State for Veterans (Mr Jean-Marc Todeschini), the President of the France/New Zealand Parliamentary Friendship Group (Senator Jean-Marie Vanlerenberghe) and French Members of Parliament of the France/New Zealand Friendship Group.

#### *Historial de la Grande-Guerre de Péronne*

The group travelled north to the Somme region where the battle Centenaries in 2016 will be a significant event in France. They met with the director of the Historical Museum of the Great War (Historial de la Grande Guerre), Hervé François. The museum looks mostly at the Great War, and the years just before and after. It tries to place war in a social context, stressing the common suffering of both combatants and civilians, both of whom were mobilised by the war effort.

#### *Thiepval Memorial*

In the afternoon the group was given a guided tour of the Thiepval Memorial, the Tower of Ulster Memorial and the Beaumont-Hamel Memorial. The Thiepval Memorial is the most important Franco-British Memorial in France. Erected in 1932 by the British government, it is dedicated to the 75,085 British soldiers missing in action between July 1915 and March 1918 who have no known graves. Their names are engraved on the 16 pillars that form the base of the 45-metre high arch.

#### *Tower of Ulster*

The Tower of Ulster is the memorial both to the Irish of the Battle of the Somme and to all Ulstermen who died in the Great War. The tower, financed through public subscription and built in 1921, in romantic Gothic style, is an exact replica of a tower near the 36th Division's training ground in Belfast.

#### *Beaumont-Hamel Newfoundland Memorial*

The Beaumont-Hamel Newfoundland Memorial is a memorial site dedicated to the commemoration of the Dominion of Newfoundland forces members who were killed during

World War I. The 74-acre preserved battlefield park encompasses the grounds over which the Newfoundland Regiment made their unsuccessful attack on 1 July 1916 during the first day of the Battle of the Somme.

#### **Day Four:**

##### *Longueval*

The group met with the mayor of Longueval, who laid out plans for the Somme centenary in 2016. He escorted the delegation to the Caterpillar Valley British war memorial cemetery, from where the remains of the NZ unknown soldier were removed in 2004.

##### *Delville Wood South African National Memorial*

Next we took a look at the South African National Memorial at Delville Wood. It is the only memorial dedicated to the participation of the South African Forces on the 1914-1918 Western Front. 229,000 officers and men served with the South African Forces in the Great War. They suffered 10,000 casualties.

#### **Day Five:**

##### *Verdun*

All of Friday was spent at Verdun. The group was welcomed at the City Council where the mayor told the delegation that Verdun symbolised the hell of WW1 for the French. Eighty different nationalities fought there. 300,000 soldiers on both sides died during the battle and 600,000 were wounded. In 1994 the city unveiled the World Centre for Peace, Liberties and Human Rights which is located in the old bishop palace in the town. The centre is a place for reflection to promote Peace and Human Rights.

##### *The Douaumont ossuary*

The ossuary contains the remains of unidentified soldiers who died on the battlefield during the Battle of Verdun. It is located in Douaumont, which is on the Verdun battlefield. The battle of Verdun lasted 300 days (21 February - December 1916). 26 million bombshells were fired by the artillery (i.e. 6 bombs per square meter). The result was thousands of shredded bodies, the unidentified remains of which were put in the ossuary.

##### *Verdun's Battlefields*

Outside the ossuary lies a cemetery containing known graves and nearby the battlefield lies untouched. The grass and trees have been allowed to grow back but the ground is still covered everywhere with indentations made by shell blasts, many remnants of trenches, ammunitions, fortifications...

##### *The Verdun Memorial*

The delegation was given a guided tour of the Verdun Memorial which is situated on the battlefield close to the destroyed village of Fleury-devant-Douaumont. This memorial building was opened to the public in 1967. While it remembers both French and German combatants as well as the civilian populations lost during the battle, it also serves as a museum which displays French and German armaments. Over time it has become more of an educational museum than a commemorative monument in an effort to keep younger generations aware of their communal heritage. It will reopen with a new scenography in 2016.

##### *Fort Douaumont*

The final stop for the day was Fort Douaumont. This fort was the largest and highest fort on the ring of nineteen large defensive forts that had protected Verdun since the 1890s. However, by 1915 the French General Staff had concluded that even the best-protected forts of Verdun could not resist bombardments from the German 420mm Gamma guns. As a result, Fort Douaumont and other Verdun forts, being judged ineffective, had been partly disarmed and left virtually undefended since 1915. On 25 February 1916, Fort Douaumont was entered and occupied without a fight by a small German raiding party comprising only 19 officers and 79 men. The easy fall of Fort Douaumont, only three days after the beginning of the Battle of Verdun, deeply shocked the French Army. It set the stage for the rest of a battle which lasted nine months, at enormous human costs. On 24 October 1916 the Fort was recaptured bringing closure to the Battle of Verdun.

### **Day Six:**

The delegation with its French counterparts (eleven people in total) spent all Saturday morning at *Les Invalides* reviewing the week and drafting the main ideas that would form the base of the brief for the designers of the French memorial in New Zealand. The meeting was chaired by French General Rémy Franco.

## **III. IMPRESSIONS AND KEY IDEAS ARISING FROM THE SYMPOSIUM**

### **1. Shared but different histories**

Participants were keen to comment on the similarities and differences between France and New Zealand that have deeply shaped our respective memories of the war. The major difference obviously lays in a relation to the land: from a defence of the motherland which called for immediate action and total commitment, to a distant war on foreign soil that could only be justified through loyalty to the British Empire. *“In our eyes, we were fighting a war ‘over there’. No civilians on New Zealand soil were killed as a result of the war. New Zealanders were primarily fighting to support the British Empire, and therefore its Allies”*, summarised one participant. Similarly, participants tried *“to understand the difference between how the French felt being invaded by Germany but supported by the Allies including New Zealand and how the New Zealanders felt supporting the French and fighting in a different country”*. This topic of the land, and by extension, nature, became more and more apparent during the trip, as explained below.

Participants were unanimous in the observation that in New Zealand there is still an under appreciation of how France suffered, how enormous its military efforts were, the impact on civilians and the overall devastation, how close the conflict came to Paris and how WW1 ended up being the major trauma for the country since the French Revolution. These marks are still very visible today, as many French regions live in the long casting shadow of the First World War, particularly emphasised during the Centenary years. As one participant put it: *“The dreadful suffering of a populace living in the path of a war was revealed to us daily in the clearly valued presence of memorials and community remembrances which remain embedded in the fabric of life. Civilian trauma is acknowledged everywhere”*.

Seeing Verdun as a major battlefield but also as a collective memory of almost mythical dimensions for French people was an eye-opener in that regard. In their own words, New Zealanders' understanding of the Western Front is not always consistent since it insists on particular places which are significant for New Zealanders but not necessarily from an overall understanding of the war. As several participants put it: *"New Zealand was a small cog in a huge machine"*. Reciprocally, they realised that New Zealand participation in the war is only well known by French people in places whose history is directly connected to New Zealand troops (Arras, Le Quesnoy, Longueval...). If only shared among locals, these memories are still obviously extremely vivid today and translate into permanent gratitude for New Zealand: *"This trip made me understand why the French people were so grateful for the efforts and sacrifice made by New Zealand and other Allied soldiers during La Grande Guerre (...) In these towns, the locals were acutely aware of New Zealand's wartime sacrifice"*. The importance of WW1 as a milestone of the relationship was constantly mentioned; *"a relationship that would mostly strengthen over the next 100 years"*.

## **2. Acknowledging the distance in time and space**

The geographical distance between the two countries, which made communications with relatives so difficult for New Zealand soldiers, is obviously a key element of the war experience as a tremendous technological and psychological challenge which had to be overcome to assert a friendship. This is well captured by the inscription at the Longueval memorial, that some of the participants mentioned as a key mantra for the memorial: *"From the uttermost ends of the earth / Des confins les plus reculés de la terre"*.

But this geographical distance now doubles up with a distance in time. The passing of time means that perceptions and the significance of the war have changed: nowhere is this more obvious than the monuments from past decades. Each bears testimony both to the war and to the particular time when it was designed, and the particular relation of this time to remembrance. Memorials thus teach us that facts are not independent from our *a posteriori* assessment – the significance of the war is still evolving today as our mentalities and history unfold. It is not the fact of the war in itself which is the link, but the memories that have been built and shared in relation to this event. This effect of time on any memorial should work as a cautionary tale: humility is required when trying to grasp history. Several participants were deeply impressed in that regard by historian Antoine Prost's presentation: *"One phrase that struck me was historian Dr Antoine Prost's repeated use of "as we know", rather than "as we now know". We're too often encouraged to have a slightly superior attitude to the past. "As we know" seems close to "as we must bear in mind"*.

Simultaneously, as the last contemporaries of the war have died, this event itself has become history, with no direct witness to speak about it. This marks a milestone in how we perceive the war and the relationship that has unfolded since. Any present acknowledgement of the war must now weave the past, for which nobody can speak directly, into something significant not just for us, but for our descendants too. The past, the present and the future become connected at a crossroads where any present memorial is both an acknowledgement of what happened and a promise and a statement to future generations, to which it entrusts what we would like to be remembered from our own contemporary perspective. In a way, the memorial should

also address inexistent audiences: the dead, but also those who are not yet born and who will look at this memorial 50 years or a century from now. From a participant: *“What must be done for remembrance must be done for the younger and the future generations”*.

Our time in history is also a turning point because increasingly remembrance is coming more from civil society and families than from governments. Alain Prost repeatedly mentioned that most French memorials were built bottom up and not top down. That is also true of such a particular monument as the Ring of Remembrance at Notre-Dame de Lorette, which had such a large impact on the delegation. Initially this monument began as a regional initiative from the Nord-Pas-de-Calais region but was, in the end, inaugurated by the President of the French Republic on 11 November 2014 during Remembrance Day, becoming one of the major official gestures related to the Centenary.

However, participants were adamant that the French memorial at Pukeahu should not be a tribute to the fallen: *“The visits to the monuments and battle sites emphasised that there are enough statues and monuments to the WWI dead already and we need to avoid the French monument in Wellington becoming another one. Instead it needs to be a monument to what grew out of that “devastated soil”. This should be a monument to the relationship between the two countries, during and since the war”*.

The distance in time and space easily found its main metaphor in a journey. Participants were not always in agreement on the significance of it. For some, it was, for both countries, a journey *“together, through adversity and tragedy to a better world”* that could turn into an indicative catchphrase for the French memorial, such as *“a strong and enduring relationship that has grown out of the tragedy of the First World War”*. For others, one couldn't assume a necessary progressive evolution through time: *“There are times when “but look what came of this” can come across as our generation congratulating ourselves on something that previous generations would probably only shrug about, having nothing they felt they could say”*.

To acknowledge this journey through space and time, the memorial could be understood as both a testimony and a commitment, leaning on the past but looking at providing the future with a legacy from our present, and thus reuniting together all three dimensions of time.

### **3. A mark on the land**

The third major topic has to do with the land. In one participants' words: *“when you no longer have survivors, you have to look for remnants either at museums or in the landscape”*. Because nobody can directly speak about the war, it is as if the physical and emotional connections we have to those times must be looked for in the scars and wounds of the land, which is still something tangible today. Besides all obvious metaphors connected to the land as a mutilated and marked body, this connection is still very literal. A marker of the France/New Zealand relationship lies in the bodies of the 7,553 New Zealand soldiers still buried in France - New Zealand having a much higher ratio of unrepatriated bodies than other countries because of the distance. Cemeteries offer striking views as the magnitude of the loss physically occupies the space in regular rows and lines of crosses, marking the land.

The land was thus analysed with scrutiny as if it could bear testimony to or reveal its past ordeals. Landscapes also contrasted between themselves, from the Somme plains that were immediately returned to agriculture, even if they still annually yield shells and bodies, to the

Verdun “red zone” forest where everything was frozen after the war. This series of contrasts offered opportunity for interesting thoughts, and this has been very well described by many participants from the delegation: *“The extraordinary beauty, calm and serenity of the perfectly kept, gently rolling landscape hiding the pockmarked, shattered landscape ploughed into the ground with no sign of the battles, the hardship and horror of one hundred years ago”*; *“The light is everywhere and about to be nowhere. The cemeteries are very prominent in a landscape of rolling fields. The trees are bare, the filigreed branches so regular in shape they look pruned. Everything is cultivated, these groomed sanctuaries of formal mourning, in the middle of this well cared for farmland”*; *“The power of nature to wrap up and hide the remnants of such a destructive time”*.

The metaphors of healing, regrowth, triumph of human industry (fertile Somme plains) or nature (Verdun forests) over devastation have been frequently used to describe these impressions. However, they were interpreted differently, and not necessarily as the expected regeneration of life after death: *“How to capture that – not the rhetoric of recovery and growth, but this natural and severe beauty of graveyards, and crop land, and pasture?”*; *“Trees at Verdun: not so much healing as freezing and concealing the brutalized land”*.

All participants were impressed at how the landscape was incorporated into French memorials as views from or through several of the various constructed monuments, notably at the Ring of Remembrance. Scale was also mentioned as an important factor, as only the scale of large monuments, like Thiepval, seem sometimes to be of enough proportion to deal with the enormity of human and material loss.

However, several participants also paid close attention to more subtle and subdued forms of remembrance, where the explicit purpose was not overwhelming or didactic. These allowed for the imagination and emotions to flow and take shape more easily: *“despite the impressive scale of the postwar memorials, it is the smaller, less formal “memorials” that stay in the mind – a shell embedded in a library book, the low tech equipment on display in a museum (camp kitchen, pigeonier, bicycles, the Marne taxi), the fort at Verdun, the tunnels at Arras, the reconstructed brick towns, the replanted forests, the flowers that regenerate annually on ex-battlefields”*. An indirect evocation of the war was often seen as more moving and compelling than purpose-built infrastructures because it allows for more empathy and requires more active efforts from the viewer to elaborate their own state of mind. From here comes the idea, repeatedly expressed, of a living memorial, which would enable some kind of participation or exploration from the audience, and will not be just a static and formal tribute with a straightforward meaning.

At another level, the terrain and its features – mud, tree stumps, shell and mine craters, trenches, fortifications - was frequently mentioned as a key part of the experience. The slow and almost gentle erosion of trenches and craters around Benin-Heaumont or in Verdun’s undergrowth are very moving as they are slowly fading and disappearing remnants, and thus include a perception of time by the viewer. This wrapping together of time and space within the land was also held as something of much importance.

Several participants asked if it would be possible to transplant a small tree from that forest to the Pukeahu site to grow beside the sculptured memorial. More generally, the idea of bringing something from France to New Zealand to be included in the memorial as a testimony, a material and symbolical presence, was held as a powerful idea.

#### 4. Telling the story

Although the trip was dominated by the remembrance of war, participants were unanimous in expressing their views that the French monument at Pukeahu should not be a monument to the dead but to the living, and should go beyond the atrocities of war to encapsulate the lasting bonds of friendship that were forged between France and New Zealand. If some insisted on the necessity of telling a positive story, others were not too confident with the progressive view of history; there was no necessity from something good to happen after this disaster. It is only because of numerous human efforts, big and small, that reconstruction was possible. Moreover, negative long term consequences of the war are still unfolding. Progress is never guaranteed and “*the world is still a dangerous place*” as one of the participant put it. Therefore, friendship and values have to be asserted again and again because they also engage a future which is always contingent, fragile and unpredictable, and can only gain certainty from the commitment made by the present. Indeed, the way French institutions and monuments, especially the modern memorial at Notre-Dame-de-Lorette, look towards the future and not only acknowledge the enemy dead, but invite reconciliation, made a strong impression on participants, as they realised that many French monuments of the past decades include foreign soldiers, both Allied and enemies.

As previously expressed, the story told by the memorial would need to address different audiences within the same society, as perception and understanding of the war vary in the public: “the top speaks of sacrifice: of sacrifices made to maintain civil society. The bottom speaks of suffering and loss”, as expressed by one participant. This duality of remembrance is a key element of complexity, although participants also stressed that if there can't be unanimity of understanding, it might be possible to reach consensus through emotions, which cut across social groups and generations. Emotions were also found to be of key importance when discussing how some of the visited memorials, but not all, bear the passing of time. Even if codes of representation have changed as our own vision of the war, and if it is not possible to make the same monument as decades ago, participants emphasised that emotions are intergenerational and bridge the distance between us and some of the most dated expressions of remembrance. Other audiences obviously include both French and New Zealand nationals, younger generations who have never been in relation with WW1 veterans, officials coming for ceremonies and simple passer-byes enjoying a stroll through the park. Finally, several major ideas arose again and again when participants discussed how the memorial should tell a story:

- the experiential dimension of the memorial, which could be “*a bodily experience as well as a spectacle*” something that should engage the active participation, exploration and inclusion of the public with it. How to experience remembrance instead of just being formally invited to remember was a key point in the discussion, emphasising that the memorial should be as much challenging as assertive.
- the challenge related to telling a story which was voluntarily silenced by many of its contemporaries and how not to betray today this silence, along with the paradox that all witnesses have to disappear to be able to speak. A participant mentioned the words use by Fernand Léger, one of many French artists who fought at Verdun : “*I adore Verdun (...)*”

*Verdun authorises all pictorial fantasies*” which, beyond the terrible irony, is also a warning and a cautionary tale from an artist regarding the possibility of representing the war.

- the long lasting impressions that war made on men, but also that men left on the landscape (from footprints to the scarring of the land). Ideas of impression, footprint, mark, stamp, imprint... were found to be a productive concept, which could refer to both the impact on the soul, on bodies, on the land, but also referred to its representation through art practices: photographs, sculpture, and castings are all impressions. Representations of the war are thus impressions of the war at a power of two, reflected by a human mind and shaped through art.

To tell this story, French participants and visited institutions offered support to the project in order to contribute to its design. This was particularly true from the *Ecole Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts de Paris*, represented by Patrice Alexandre, and the Arras City Council.

Finally, some keywords were identified to summarise the impressions of the week: loss, silence, distance, footsteps, progress, trauma, skin, landscape, scarred, hope, mud, liberation, transmission, determination, mourning, fire, unknown, time, remnants, dismembered, pocked, generations, prints, legacy, friendship, enduring, bravery, remembrance, memory.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

As a conclusion, the participants came up with a short summary of their ideas, also being careful not to provide ready-made solutions but to stimulate the creativity of whoever would take part in the competition. This text, which is also included in the competition, is as follows:

*A. As a gift from France to New Zealand, the memorial will acknowledge and illustrate the enduring friendship between the two countries, a relationship built through shared experiences of war and peacekeeping but also including deep cultural affinities. A marker of this relationship is that the bodies of 7533 New Zealand soldiers from the First World War still lie buried in France. However, the memorial is not to be conceived purely as a tribute to the fallen of the First World War, but rather as a living monument, acknowledging the shared history of the past 100 years and the shared interests of the two countries that guide their mutual future.*

*The memorial will acknowledge the journey of the friendship between the two countries and the barriers of time and distance that had to be overcome for that friendship to unfold, as reminded through the inscription on the New Zealand Memorial in Longueval: “From the uttermost ends of the earth / Des confins les plus reculés de la terre”. This was primarily a journey through the hardship of war and its aftermath to create a better world based on shared values.*

*B. A memorial designed as a bold and visionary experience should aim for these qualities:*

- It should aim to create a deeply emotional response.*
- It should provoke a physical and spatial engagement with visitors.*
- It might relate to the landscape and textures of the French terrain during the First World War.*

*- It should invite exploration and perhaps visitor participation.*

*C. The memorial will be seen by the public as a reflection of France, therefore applicants are strongly encouraged to include a French component into the memorial, either through the participation of a French creative professional in the design, the collaboration with a French organization, or through the inclusion in the construction of elements symbolic of France or coming from France (objects, plants, memorabilia).*

*Applicants are also encouraged to rely on the experience gathered by the participants to the symposium, through the ideas contained in the report or by associating them to their proposal.*

*D. The memorial should appeal to different categories of visitors:*

*- It should be designed to have significance for both New Zealand and French visitors.*

*- It should seek to be understood by different generations and demographics: from people who don't know much about the First World War and focus on the present of the bilateral relation to those who might have lost relatives in it.*

*- It should invite further inquiry and stimulate the imagination.*

*- Should there be any inscription, it would have to be included in 3 languages: English, Maori, French.*

*- It must be suitable for official ceremonies (for example, there should be space to congregate for wreath-laying ceremonies etc.). A dedicatory plaque indicating France as the donating country and the date of opening shall be visible and accessible for the same purpose.*