Memorial Assemblages: An Actor-Network Theory
Account of Collective Memory, Commemoration and the
National Holocaust Monument in Canada

by

Jordan Andrew Todd

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

Master of Arts

In

Sociology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2016
Jordan A. Todd

Abstract

Memory studies scholars often argue that the concept of collective memory is disparate and ambiguous, lacking theoretical and methodological development. Given this, the often studied relationship between physical memorials and collective remembrance remains problematic. Accordingly, this thesis draws on Actor-Network Theory (ANT), an approach that largely resides outside of memory studies literature, in order to situate memorials and monuments within a tenable analytical framework of collective memory. The utility of this framework is demonstrated through an empirically-based analysis of the National Holocaust Monument project in Ottawa, Canada. Rather than posit a fixed definition of collective memory, the aim is to treat collective remembrance as something that is enacted through and ultimately an effect of heterogeneous networks of material-semiotic relationships. It is argued that when it is taken as such, the role of the monument within collective remembrance becomes more attributable and coherent in regards to broader mnemonic processes.

Acknowledgements

I would like to sincerely thank Dr. Michael Mopas and Dr. Stacy Douglas for their guidance, support, and most importantly, their insightful and invaluable feedback on my work. They have helped me to become a better theorist and researcher and for that I am indebted. As well, I would like to thank Dr. Monica Patterson (internal examiner).

I am also grateful to several faculty members at Carleton University who have had a significant influence on my intellectual journey over the past few years: Dr. William Walters, Dr. Bruce Curtis, Dr. Justin Paulson, and Dr. Janet Siltanen.

As well, I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Katherine Watson, Dr. Chantelle Marlors, Dr. Darren Blakeborough, Dr. Ron Dart, Dr. Hamish Telford, and Stephen Piper. Their early investment in my intellectual and academic life have been inestimable and I will always remember the encouragement they provided.

I would also like to show appreciation for Dr. Nicholas Rowland and Dr. Stefanie Fishel, who willingly and constructively engaged with some of the ideas that have come out of this thesis.

To my peers, Alex Luscombe, Jordon Tomblin, and Jacob Forrest: our reading groups and discussions were thought-provoking and congenial, and your helpful criticisms of my work were indispensable.

I would like to acknowledge the financial, technical, and academic support of Carleton University and the Social Sciences and Research Council of Canada. A special thanks to Paula Whissell, who provided guidance and support in all things administrative.

Last but certainly not least, to all of my family and friends who have supported me throughout my academic pursuits, I cannot express how much I have appreciated your company and succor. To Randall, you were of seminal importance to the substantive focus of this thesis and therefore I am indebted. And of course, Denae, you have seen me through misery and excitement, the highs and lows that were inevitable by-products of this thesis, so thank you for your sustained affirmation.

This thesis is dedicated to all of you.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements	ii
List of Figures.....	iv
List of Appendices.....	v
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Memorials and Collective Memory.....	2
1.2 Research Question	6
1.3 Thesis Structure.....	7
2 Collective Memory as Actor-Networks.....	10
2.1 Collective Memory – Unit of Analysis	11
2.2 Collective Memory – Complexity.....	17
2.3 Collective Memory – Monuments	20
2.4 Actor-Network Theory.....	23
2.4.1 Moments of Translation	30
2.5 Collective Memory and Actor-Network Theory.....	32
3 Research Design and Method	38
3.1 Access to Information Requests as a Means of Data Production.....	44
3.2 Positioning Documents in Social Research.....	46
3.3 Some Abiding Methodological Philosophy.....	47
4 Ordering Heterogeneous Networks.....	50
4.1 The National Holocaust Monument: A Brief Overview.....	51
4.2 Problematization: Narrative Ordering and Nationalizing the Holocaust.....	56
4.2.1 From the never: an obligation to remember	59
4.2.2 Through the never: an obligation to recognize present threats	62
4.2.3 To the never: an obligation to act in the future	64
4.2.4 The National Holocaust Monument and Canada’s Military Identity	67
4.2.5 The interdefinition of the actors	70
4.3 The Devices of Interessement: How Allies Are Persuaded to Join	77
4.4 Enrollment: The NCC and the Circulation of Documents, Emails and Presentations.....	86
4.4.2 The design competition: how can a national monument be international?	96
4.5 The Mobilization of Allies: Setting Up Strings of Intermediaries.....	104
4.6 Translation Becomes Treason: Redesign and Delay	108
4.7 Translation Summary	110
5 Conclusion	115
5.1 The National Holocaust Monument Project and Collective Remembrance	118
5.1 Limitations of Study and Avenues for Future Research.....	119
5.2 Conclusion	120
Appendices:	121
Appendix A - Timeline of NHM Project Events	121
Appendix B - Figures.....	123
References.....	131

List of Figures

Figure 1	Map of Location (National Holocaust Monument)	113
Figure 2	Strategic Communications Plan	114
Figure 3	Ordered Knowledge of the Holocaust	115
Figure 4	Model of Design	116
Figure 5	Mobilization Diagram	117
Figure 6	Images Demonstrating Design Changes	118
Figure 7	Critical Path Document.....	119
Figure 8	Visualization of Ordering Process.....	120

List of Appendices

Appendices.....	111
Appendix A – Timeline of NHM Project Events	111
Appendix B – Figures	113

1 Introduction

On 12 May 2014, Foreign Affairs Minister John Baird announced the chosen design for Canada's National Holocaust Monument (NHM) at the National War Museum in Ottawa. Designed by a team led by internationally renowned architect Daniel Libeskind, the NHM will be the largest and most complicated monument created in the capital city since the National War Memorial built in 1939 (Butler 2015). One of the few commemorations to be legislated through Parliament, it has received approximately 4 million dollars of funding from the Government of Canada, a total that has been at least matched through private fundraising (NHMDC 2013). Since the unveiling of the design, construction of the monument has begun on the corner of Wellington and Booth streets, symbolically located across from the National War Museum (NWM). It is scheduled to be unveiled in 2017.

Due to its considerable size and cost, as well as its location in the carefully managed capital region, the NHM is of remarkable symbolic national significance. Further adding to its salience, the project enjoyed an atypical amount of direct government involvement. The Bill responsible for legislating the project was taken up in the House, Senate, and in various committees on and off from September 2009 until March 2011 when it received Royal Assent and became law. After it was legislated, the Conservative government kept close to the project with all major decisions having to be cleared by the Foreign Affairs Minister. Both the legislative process and the ruling government's direct involvement are uncharacteristic of the commemorative process, as proposals for new memorials are typically made by individuals and groups directly to the

National Capital Committee (NCC), the corporation whose job it is to manage the federal lands in Canada's Capital Region (Chalmers 2013:66; NCC 2016).

Regardless, the monument project was put through the legislative process where it received unanimous support in the House and Senate. As the leader of the opposition at the time put it, "the very act of planning this monument, building it, having it in our capital makes it significant. The idea is so simple that we have to ask why no one thought of it before? It is never too late to do something good" (Mulcair, Canada 2010a:6982).

1.1 Memorials and Collective Memory

Holocaust monuments, like the NHM, are products of their national milieus (Young 1993; Linenthal 2001; Alexander 2002; Engelhardt 2002; Carrier 2005).¹ Within these settings, "Holocaust memorials inevitably mix national and Jewish figures, political and religious imagery", often assuming "the idealized forms and meanings assigned by the state" (Young 1993:2). More broadly, contemporary state-sponsored commemorations are bound up in processes of political and state legitimization (Mitchell 2003:443; Carrier 2005:38; Hite and Collins 2009:380), as they act to mediate political landscapes and distinguish specific symbols that promote collective memory, identity and history (McDowell and Braniff 2014:15).

As sites where collective memory is cultivated, state-sponsored memorials engage in "the fabrication, rearrangement, elaboration, and omission of details about the past, often pushing aside accuracy and authenticity so as to accommodate broader issues of identity formation, power and authority, and political affiliation" (Zelizer 2000:3). Often, this is done through the use of historical narratives which are an important part of

---

¹ Following Young (1993) the terms 'memorial' and 'monument' are used interchangeably to refer to the NHM as well as more generally to monuments that are oriented towards remembrance (3). As well, the

creating a shared sense of the past founded on a collective feeling of belonging (Brescó and Wagoner 2016:72). Further, the collective memories (as well as the collective identities and histories implied by these memories) that are constituent of state-sponsored memorials help build and reinforce the imagined political community that is the nation (Anderson 2006:6).

However, it is difficult to assess the role the memorials play in collective remembering since the concept of collective memory itself is rather ambivalent. A primary reason for this ambiguity is due to the fact that within memory studies there has yet to be a theoretical framework that successfully operationalizes the concept of collective memory (Olick 2007:85; Hirst & Manier 2008:183). Even when attempts are made at defining what is 'collective' about memory, it is often unclear what scholars exactly mean (Gillis 1994:3; Hirst & Manier 2008:183). Further, even when definitions are clearly stated there is often disagreement over them (Winter & Sivan, 1999; K.L. Klein 2000; Wertsch 2002:34). In other words, though collective memory has acted as an organizing principle for academic research, the concept has arguably not been properly delineated. For these reasons, the concept of collective memory presents itself as a quagmire that should be addressed in research that addresses memorialization.

In response to the issues surrounding the definition of collective memory some have treated it exclusively as an organic metaphor regarding traditional communities (Novick 1999:267). Others have gone as far as to argue that the concept should be altogether abandoned (Gedi & Elam 1996), or that it is inappropriate to treat a 'fundamentally individual' phenomenon as a collective occurrence (Fentress and Wickham 1992:1). Sociologist and collective memory scholar Jeffery Olick has

suggested that we move beyond attempts to define, reify, and over-totalize collective memory (2007:89), and instead, he encourages researchers to treat collective memory as a ‘sensitizing’ concept rather than as an operational one (2007:85).² As a sensitizing concept, collective memory points to “a wide variety of mnemonic processes, practices, and outcomes, neurological, cognitive, personal, aggregated, and collective” (2007:34). Put differently, collective memory as a sensitizing concept points to a variety of phenomena and processes that can make up collective remembering. This is in contrast to an operational definition of collective memory that acts to strictly demarcate what collective memory is and is not.

Understanding memory as a variety of processes rather than as a thing in itself is a response to criticisms of both memory studies and sociology more generally – that some researchers have tended to reify their object of study. Such reifications are a result of certain sociological tendencies to take a substantialist approach (Cassirer 1953) to studying phenomena in which processes are often reduced to static conditions (Elias 1978), material objects, or outcomes (Forest et. al. 2004:374; Stone 2013:168). This is problematic since phenomena are often then abated to static conditions or states that separate them from their involvement within the processes that help constitute them. According to Olick, in order to avoid these inclinations, the analytical goal of collective memories studies should be:

[T]o understand *figurations of memory* – developing relations between
past and present – where images, contexts, traditions, and interests come

---

² Issues surrounding the defining of collective memory have been largely rooted in attempts to operationalize the phenomena: to clearly define the extent and measurement of the concept. In contrast, when a concept is treated as a sensitizing one, it lacks the burden of strict definition and measurement. Instead, a sensitizing concept points to a wide range of phenomena while encouraging research to explore beyond rigid operationalization.

together in fluid, though not necessarily harmonious, ways, rather than to measure collective memory as an independent or dependent variable, a thing determined or determining (emphasis in original 2007:91).³

However, an additional issue presents itself. Since a memorial is an object that physically exists outside of remembering persons or groups, how do we then account for how they help aid in remembering? Where do we situate them in the various mnemonic processes that collective remembering sensitizes us to? It is one thing to say that objects can in fact intervene in memory processes (Nora 1989; Middleton and Brown 2005; Guggenheim 2009; Hansen-Glucklich 2014), but it is another to explain how this occurs.

Here it is argued that Actor-Network Theory (ANT), an approach first developed in Science and Technology Studies (STS), provides a suitable framework for exploring figurations of memory and how memorials mediate collective remembering. How ANT understands phenomena (in this case memorialization) as heterogeneous networks allows for the range of mnemonic processes, practices, and outcomes previously mentioned to be analyzed. Moreover, how ANT traces the work of translation done in these networks reveals that various ordering strategies produce both knowledge (about the past, identity, and morality) and new material forms (e.g. the monument). Clarification of what is meant by heterogeneous engineering, translation, ordering, and knowledge production will be provided in subsequent chapters. This thesis offers an account of the memorialization process of a salient Canadian national monument that will provide insight into how a monument participates in processes of collective remembering.

---

³ Olick uses ‘figuration’ following Elias’s social figurations, to refer to memory as, “enacted and re-enacted networks of relations” (Olick 2007:91; see Elias 1978:134).

1.2 Research Question

The purpose of this thesis is to offer an understanding of the memorialization process surrounding the National Holocaust Monument by tracing the work done by those involved in the project to translate, order, and produce knowledge about the Holocaust, Canadian history, national identity, and ‘collective’ values. This thesis will also explore how these processes became embodied into the design of the monument. The focus is on the NHM for several reasons. First, one goal of the memorialization processes in this project is to nationalize the Holocaust – a phenomenon well documented in other national milieus (see Alexander 2009). Second, the NHM is arguably the most recent example of the institutionalization of Canadian identity rooted in the country’s military history (see Greenberg 2008). Both the nationalization of the Holocaust and the institutionalization of Canadian war history point to the importance of both in the national psyche. Third, the project involves a complex arrangement of different actors, agencies, and organizations, and therefore required extensive coordination between them in order to be successful. These arrangements are more particular to this project since they are bound up in the legislative process and implicate additional government involvement. This is unlike several other commemorative projects that have gone directly through the NCC in order to become established (Canada 2010e:9) Due to the above complexities regarding the demands to coalesce abstract meaning and to coordinate the myriad of actors involved, the NHM is a fitting case to explore the heterogeneous engineering of memorialization.

This research is guided by the following overarching question: what role can the National Holocaust Monument play in collective remembrance? Put differently, what do the mnemonic processes and practices that make up the monument project reveal about

the ability of the monument to assist in collective remembering, identity formation, and history? In an effort to address these important questions, this thesis will also be guided by subsequent questions: how do mnemonic processes become embodied into the design of the monument? What abstract meanings are being assembled and how are they brought to co-exist? When there is dissidence, how does this affect the process and design?

In Actor-Network Theory much of the analytical work done by the researcher has to do with tracing the translations that occur in the particular phenomenon being studied. Translation is a relation that persuades two actors into coexistence and that sometimes create traceable associations (Latour 2005a:108). Michel Callon provides a framework to help guide tracing accounts of translation. In what Callon (1986) refers to as sociology of translation, the following four moments of translation are identified and used to guide the analysis: problematization, interessement, enrollment, and mobilization. According to Callon, “these moments constitute the different phases of a general process... during which the identity of actors, the possibility of interaction and the margins of manoeuvre are negotiated and delimited” (1986:203). In sum, these phases will be used to explore heterogeneous networks, ordering strategies, and knowledge production associated with the National Holocaust Monument project, revealing how collective remembrance, identity, and history are contingently achieved.

1.3 Thesis Structure

Chapter Two explores what collective memory might look like in an ANT account, and further, what the role of a monument could be in the process of memorialization. In order to accomplish this, the discussion will be broken up into five parts. The first two will draw out two pressing issues within collective memory studies regarding the units of

analysis and complexity that contribute to problems associated with the concept of collective memory. The third part will situate monuments and memorial sites within collective memory as presented here. The fourth and fifth parts will elucidate ANT as an approach and present a possible rendering of collective memory within an ANT framework, respectively. The overall argument made in this chapter is that ANT can provide an analytical perspective that will help contribute solutions to the issues associated with units of analysis and complexity in memory studies, and also, that an ANT account provides an avenue through which the research question can be addressed.

Chapter Three addresses research design and methodology and it is contended that Access to Information requests (ATI's) and the documents gleaned from them are appropriate and useful sources of data within this ANT analysis. Data was primarily collected from two ATI's and numerous Parliament of Canada transcripts of House of Commons, Senate, and Committee meetings, obtained online. Data was also obtained from various government websites and some news sources. The analysis of the data is informed by ANT and Callon's sociology of translation to the extent discussed in the previous chapter. The often contentious use of ATI's as valid sociological data is also confronted and it is argued that ATI's provide special insight while studying governments as the texts gleaned from them often take part in mediating relationships between government agencies. Additionally it is argued that within ANT and this research documents can be treated as both a human resource to purposeful ends and as separate functional participants in social interaction and organization. Some struggles and issues regarding design and method that were met are also accounted for.

In Chapter Four, the case study of the National Holocaust project is presented. The analysis itself is split into five themes corresponding with Callon's moments of translation: i) nationalizing the Holocaust (problematization); ii) how allies are persuaded to join (interessement); iii) the Holocaust actors and the formation of a contingent or temporary associations (enrollment); iv) the setting up of strings of intermediaries (mobilization); and v) translation becoming treason (dissidence). In this chapter it is posited that through the moments of translation it can be seen that the networks that make up the NHM project go through a process of ordering and consolidation of both the actors involved in the initiative and the knowledges produced by the network. This ultimately leads to the embodiment of both the associations and the knowledges produced throughout the project in the design of the NHM.

In the Conclusion, the main arguments made about the National Holocaust Monument in the analysis are rearticulated. Here, the main research question about the monument's role in collective remembering will be focused on and future avenues for research are discussed. It is concluded that collective memory can be conceptualized as a material-semiotic arrangement of heterogeneous elements that become ordered and consolidated throughout time, and further, that this process creates new material forms that can act within the network to mediate what is collectively remembered.

2 Collective Memory as Actor-Networks

The purpose of this chapter is to explore what collective memory could look like through an Actor-Network Theory (ANT) lens and therefore, what an ANT account of memorialization could render intelligible. The possibility that ANT can contribute fruitfully in this way hinges on whether or not it is able to provide a tenable conceptualization of collective memory that is both sensitive to ongoing debates in memory studies and that can effectively account for the role of the monument. In what follows, the argument for ANT's ability to do so will be split into five parts. The first two sections will focus on collective memory studies literature, drawing out two themes or issues having to do with the unit of analysis and the varied processes, practices, and objects that are considered within the field. Unreconciled units of analysis or in other words what is being studied (e.g. cognitive processes, individuals, groups, organizations) and the considerable variation in what is studied represent two of the most salient complications within memory studies, both of which can be fruitfully engaged with via ANT.⁴ The third section will situate monuments and memorial sites specifically within collective memory studies. The fourth part will provide an overview of ANT and argue that it provides both an alternative framing of the unit of analysis in collective memory studies as well as an analytical framework suited to take on the variety of processes, practices, and objects already identified within the literature. The final piece of this chapter will synthesize the previous sections in an attempt to elucidate what ANT memory could look like, serving to provide a foundation for the analysis in Chapter Four.

---

⁴ The term 'unit of analysis' is used here as synonymous with 'object of study'. The former is preferred in this research because it suggests that researchers co-create what they study. The term 'unit' suggests that which is being measured could be measured otherwise, having an effect both on how the object being studied is constituted as well as the way through which it is measured within an analysis.

2.1 Collective Memory – Unit of Analysis

The concept of collective memory presents itself as a notable problem within the field itself. The definition of collective memory is imprecise and lacks theoretical development (Cattell and Climo 2002:4-5), and some argue against such a thing even existing (Sontag 2003:85). What is certain, however, is that issues regarding the tenability of the concept of collective memory center on a mutual tension between debates regarding the unit of analysis and the concept itself. This in turn results in a vast diversity of objects that are considered within the field. In other words, if collective memory can be said to exist at all, there is considerable amount of discussion regarding what or who should be studied (i.e. individuals, groups, organizations, material artifacts), and discussions concerning unit of analyses feed back into the development of the concept itself.

To begin, memory can be treated as a strict individual capacity: as only individuals possess the ability to remember the past. This has been particularly the case within the disciplines of neuroscience and psychology (Wilson 2005:227; Van Dijck 2007:2) where memory is taken to be a complex internal phenomenon involving various distinct systems and processes (Brebion et. al. 2007:99) focusing on universal properties of the brain (Ross 2004:3). In neuroscience, memory has been explored vis-à-vis behavioural properties, faculties, and physiology of the individual, focusing on molecular and cellular levels, circuit and network levels, and system levels – all of which are internally located (Nalbantian 2011:2-3).

Within these fields there is a general consensus that memory involves three stages: encoding, storage and retrieval. Encoding involves the transformation of perceptual data into memory code for storage (see Weinstein and Mayer, 1986); storage

points to the information as it is located in the mind when it is not being accessed and retrieval refers to the process of accessing stored data, often depending on certain cues in the environment (see Tulving and Thomson 1973). However, more recently psychologists have argued that the retrieval stage is more accurately described as a ‘reconstruction’ stage, as retrieval does not involve strict access to unmediated information held in the brain, but instead, on the environmentally cued recall of contingent and varying information (e.g. Howes and O’shea 2014; Lampinen and Neuschatz 2008).

Though the psychological study of memory began completely separated from sociological or cultural level of analysis and involved an intentional disregard of history and culture (Gardner 1985:6; Weldon 2001:68; Danziger 2008:9), many psychologists and neurologists now take external cues such as social factors seriously in their work (Hirst and Manier 2008:184; Anastasio 2012:53; see Weldon 2001), studying social-cognitive influence, social-motivational influence, interpersonal influence and various research on group memory and collective memory (Blank 2009:164).

The consideration of external cues, practices, and processes have led researchers to develop approaches to studying memory that move beyond the ‘internal individual’ to consider different units of analysis associated with extended cognition and aggregated data. The extended mind thesis (Wilson 1995; Clark and Chalmers 1998; Rowlands 2003), also referred to as extended cognition (Sprevak 2009; Poyhonen 2014) or distributed cognition (Perry 2003) takes the external cues, practices, and processes to be an integral part of human cognitive functions. Though traditionally considered to be separate from cognitive processes, these ‘externalities’ are considered to be inherent to human cognition itself. Studies focusing on the use of resources external to traditional

cognitive processes (e.g. Kirsh and Maglio 1994) have demonstrated that internal cognitive processes are in many ways dependant and overlapping with the environment around the human individual, challenging the idea that internal and external processes should be treated separately (Rupert 2009:3).

Thus, such external theories of mind are focused on how cultural factors help guide individual interpretation of mental states, the relationships between them, and how they relate to action (Franks 2011:243). In this vein, Clark has repeatedly argued that external and self-created cognitive technologies along with our basic biological modes of processing create “extended cognitive systems whose computational and problem-solving profiles are quite different from those of the naked brain” (quoted in Sutton et. al. 2010:526; see Clark 2001:134). So rather than social context being taken to help specify psychological capacities and states of individuals, the external parts of the world actually help physically constitute these capacities (Wilson 2005:230).

Alternatively, aggregated approaches presume that since only individual human beings remember, the closest we can come to studying ‘collective’ memory is by compiling and studying data gleaned from groups of individuals (Olick 2007:23), such as through interviews (e.g. McAdam 1988; Blee 1991), oral histories (e.g. Gill 2012) or survey research (e.g. Corning and Schuman 2015; Biondolillo and Pillemer 2015). Therefore, the collected memory approach understands memory to be sourced within individual minds and collective outcomes to be the result of aggregated individual processes primarily accessible through psychological or neurological investigation (Olick 2007:25). According to Schwartz, collective memory should also be conceptualized in this way, referring “to the distribution throughout society of what individuals believe,

feel, and know about the past”, since “only individuals possess the capacity to contemplate the past...” (2008:11).

As opposed to individual and aggregated approaches and differentiated from extended cognition, the collective memory tradition posits that memory can in fact exist separately from (or perhaps beyond) the perception of individual human beings. In other words, the collective memory of a group can be very different from the aggregated total of personal memories, as it includes memories that are commonly shared by most individuals (Zerubavel 1997:96). One of the strongest demonstrations of collective remembering is made through the observation that memory is constituted by and through, among other things, language, narrative and dialogue (Olick 2007:29). Like language, memory as a collective product can be understood as an idealized system – one that cannot be fully accounted for by its individual parts (Miszta 2003:11). Conversely, language itself can also be understood as a mnemonic system where “each individual utterance is a link in a chain of speech communication” with “any utterance, in addition to its own theme, always respond[ing] (in the broad sense of the word) in one form or another to others’ utterances that precede it” (Bakhtin 1986:93-4). Therefore, cultural products such as myths, legends and other stories, play an important role in establishing memory as a collective phenomenon (Brockmeier 2015:2).

Another way in which collective memory is articulated is in terms of memory media. Collective memory is said to exist in the world because it is anchored to sites, as well as material and immaterial things that mediate memory as they interact with people (Szpunar 2010:380). These sites and things of memory (Nora 1989:7) include museums, archives, cemeteries, and monuments, celebrations, rituals, and festivals, where

narratives, history, identity and representation are constituted (Weedon and Jordan 2011:844). Often these structures and the practices associated with them are fixed in contexts of expository discourse, “surrounded by questions and answers, comments and criticisms, personal memories and associations” all coming together with objects and structures to create collective remembrance (Brockmeier 2015:2).

The ability of sites and material things to mediate memory has been well documented. For example, in Ancient Rome, citizens understood commemorative architecture as actively involved in what constitutes collective memory (Kousser 2016:33). The city of Rome itself was an intricate network of buildings and monuments that participated in attempts to both remember and forget (Gowing 2005:132; Terdiman 1993:260; Young 1993:7), effectively functioning as a ‘repository of memory’ (Edwards 1996:29; Jenkins 2013:53). Through constituting what should be remembered and forgotten, monuments and other architecture were used to govern in both Rome as well as the provinces (Weisweiler 2016:75). They often provided the tangible and spatial contexts through which politicians attempted to reshape or preserve memories (Kalas 2015:172), as the ability to control, erase, or suppress memory was seen as an essential part of political authority (Gowing 2005:2). The important role of commemorative architecture and sites in memory mediation has also been noted in contemporary contexts. For example, several scholars have argued that contemporary state-sponsored commemorations are bound up in processes of political & state legitimization via commemorative memory (Young 1993:2; Mitchell 2003:443; Carrier 2005:38; Hite & Collins 2009:380). Just as is the case with language as a collective product, sites, objects,

and architecture can form commemorative networks (Schwartz 1997:469; Goebel 2011:168; Blumer 2015:130) that transcend individual parts.

Collective memory, as opposed to collected (aggregated) memory can therefore refer to publicly available symbols and meanings about the past that come together to form networks of interdependence, irreducible to its individual parts. These networks are often composed of material things, sites and semiotic relationships that mediate memories that can become more or less shared by a given group or population. Additionally, rather than forming something like a ‘collective mind’, collective memory can refer to memory that is increasingly ordered, formalized and stabilized. The gap between individual and collective memory can then be one that transitions from unmediated face-to-face interaction to mediated communication that can include informal practices, formal arrangements, and institutionalized transmission (Assmann 2007:34).

Due in part to the various conceptions of memory (i.e. individual, aggregated, extended cognition, collective), there is an arguably unresolved tension between the individual and the collective in collective memory literature. This tension can be seen as far back as Maurice Halbwachs’s (1980) foundational work on collective memory in which he was the first to systematically use the term (Misztal 2003:50; Ben Zion 2008:127). The tension in Halbwachs’s work was largely due to a theoretical disconnect between two important phenomena – socially framed individual memories and collective commemorative representations. Halbwachs was ultimately unable to reconcile the two within an analysis and therefore could not integrate the individual and the collective into a coherent theoretical account of collective remembrance (Olick 2007:20). The lack of continuity between the individual and the collective continues to exist between various

units of analysis and is likely due to the continued lack of interdisciplinary reading and research (Olick et. al. 2011:38; Schuman and Corning 2014:147).

2.2 Collective Memory – Complexity

Even though there has been increased research done on memory and remembering, the interdisciplinary nature of memory studies has led to a multiplicity of definitions and a variety of implications that lack robust elaboration (Cubitt 2007:2-3; Sutton 2008: 28; Keightley 2010:56). Collective memory can refer to “aggregated individual recollections, to official commemorations, to collective representations, and to disembodied constitutive features of shared identities” and it is said to be, “located in dreamy reminiscence, personal testimony, oral history, tradition, myth, style, language, art, popular culture, and the built world (Olick 2007:21). It can refer to how cultural history is transmitted via texts, objects, and practices (Corning and Schuman 2015:9), and it can include individual acts of remembering in a social context, group memory, or national memory (Erll 2010:2). This diversity is not surprising given the various units of analysis discussed above and it is perhaps most acute when memory is considered collectively. For example, under the purview of ‘collective memory’, scholars have differentiated various types of memory from official and vernacular (Nets-Zehngut and Bar-Tal 2014; Willman 2015; Mihelj 2013), to public (Fine 2013; Da Silva Catela 2015), to national (Schwartz 2000; Carrier 2005), historical (Evans 2013; Gabel 2013), cultural (Assmann 2006; Sugars and Ty 2014) and so on.

The proliferation of memory types has been one way through which scholars have traditionally attempted to explore the complexities that are inherent in collective memory phenomena. Another more recent approach has been to understand collective memory as

a diverse range of practices and processes that are irreducible to a dislocated object of study or mnemonic type. Though it is still the exception rather than the rule in collective memory studies (Stone 2013:168), understanding memory as a *process* instead of a material object or thing-in-itself is increasingly emphasized (e.g. Gongaware 2003; Olick 2007).

A prominent scholar within collective memory studies, Jefferey Olick provides a lucid critique of, and alternative to, treating memory as a thing-in-itself, while accounting for the complexity of collective memory phenomena. His response to criticisms of both memory studies and sociology more generally is that researchers have tended to reify their object of study. The term ‘collective memory’ has often been treated as a transcendental concept: one that is theorized outside of time and socio-historic context. This is Olick’s argument (2007:9) regarding collective memory, as it was Philip Abrams’ (1982) regarding sociology – both of whom were heavily influenced by Norbert Elias’s (1978) figurational sociology. In drawing from Elias’s figurational sociology, Olick attempts to account for the multiplicity of objects, as well as the complexity of processes and practices that have been identified within collective memory studies.

According to Elias, sociologists engage in process-reduction when they treat ongoing processes as if they were things in themselves (isolated objects), separate from all other things that surround and influence them, making possible the “separation of interrelated things into individual components – ‘variables’ or ‘factors’ – without any need to consider how such separate and isolated aspects of comprehensive context are related to each other”. (Elias 1978:116).

Process-reduction is part of what encourages sociologists to make transcendental claims about social life and is often part of what Ernst Cassirer (1953) referred to as *substantialism*, or the tendency of sociologists to theorize social entities in which “relation is not independent of the concept of real being; it can only add supplementary and external modifications to the latter, such as do not affect its real ‘nature’” (8). To put it differently, sociological approaches are substantialist when they assume reified social objects can be considered on their own, apart from the relationships they have with their environment and other social objects. The problem with substantialist approaches to theorizing the social is that they unnecessarily (and inaccurately) separate social objects from social processes, a mistake that is perhaps made most obvious through Elias’s oft-quoted example of process-reduction: “We say, “The wind is blowing,” as if the wind were actually a thing at rest which, at a given point in time, begins to move and blow. We speak as if the wind were separate from its blowing, as if a wind could exist which did not blow” (1978:112). According to Olick (2007), collective memory research regularly shares these assumptions, taking collective memory to be a thing or a group of things that can be considered outside of the process of measuring, instead of recognizing that the processes can also be constitutive of the object of study (90).

As a response and alternative to process-reduction and other substantialist approaches in sociology that depend on predetermined notions of the individual, actor, society, and system (Elias 1978: 116-118), Elias developed the concept of figuration. The concept of figuration is central to Elias’s relational sociology. According to Elias, figurations are made up of dynamic and fluid networks of interdependencies where people are mutually oriented and dependent (2000:481-482). Figurations are constantly

changing as they are the effect of unforeseen processes, consequences, as well as human purposefulness and intention (2000: 312).

This is the source of Olick's inspiration for his analytical focus within collective memory studies: to understand *figurations of memory*. Therefore, according to Olick, the type of figuration that collective memory sensitizes an analysis to is fluid (constantly changing), interconnected (a network), and interdependent (somewhat distributed across several actors/objects, processes, and practices) (see 2007:85-91). Treating collective memory as sensitizing an analysis to particular figurations of memory that include a variety of objects, practices and processes can help orient research to take into account the variety of units of analysis and objects of study that currently exist within memory studies. Seeking to study figurations of memory encourages a researcher to consider how memory networks may differ from each other, how their various parts are interconnected, and how they are constituted by a range of different things at different units of analysis.

2.3 Collective Memory – Monuments

Memorials and monuments are important objects within collective memory research that focuses on the media of memory, or material things that mediate memory. The relationship between memory and material contexts is a salient theme in memory studies (Connerton 1989:37; Basu 2013:115; see Yates 1966; Nora 1989). Monuments in particular are recognized as important sites of collective memory (Huyssen 1994; Assmann and Czaplicka 1995; Olick and Robbins 1998; Kansteiner 2002; Szpunar 2010) and have more recently been the focus of an increasing number of studies that consider

how these objects and sites help construct national identities and collective memories through complex symbolic landscapes (Yalouri 2001; Winter 2007).

Monuments have been said to perform a variety of tasks associated with collective memory. They can communicate by marking significant events and by materializing cultural and historical narratives (Jones 2011:94), acting to codify and organize such narratives (Jones 2011:98; see Giesen and Junge 2003). They possess the ability to make abstract social consciousness visible and can effectively act to provoke conversation (Hite 2011:6; Carrier 2005:7). They are charged with the task of remembering according to a plethora of national myths, ideals, political needs and the past experience of various communities (Young 1993:1). They also often act to mediate processes and practices that constitute collective understanding (Marontate 2005:286).

There are several reasons why monuments as commemorative media are potentially effective as mediators of memory. They can provide a sense of permanence and tradition during times of instability (Carrier 2005:174); they can mediate political landscapes by demarcating specific symbols that promote collective identity and history (McDowell and Braniff 2014:15); they can act as selective aids to memory (Ladd 1997:11); they can interact with people, appropriating their own knowledges, experiences, memories, and expectations in order to produce a variety of meanings (Jelin 2007:147; Wilke 2013:139); and they can educate future generations, instilling in them a connection to shared experience and destiny (Young 2007:178).

The materiality of a monument plays a critical role in their ability to accomplish these things as they are part of a variety of media and artifacts that channel what could be called abstract mental memories (Hodgkin and Radstone 2006:11). As physical

structures, monuments embody memories making them more durable by “anchoring the transient and variable nature of memory itself” (Zelizer 1995:232), with their durable materials, “forcefully convey[ing] the social necessity of remembering” (Beckstead et. al. 2011:195). As well, their durability can create a sense of permanence in contrast to other more fleeting images of modern media (Huyssen 1994:255; Foley and Lennon 2000:147). Linked to their material nature, monuments participate in various spatial practices where political perspectives and meaning are constantly articulated and reproduced (Raento and Watson 2000:708). These spatial practices are often situated within a broader landscape, or ‘culturally loaded geography’ that assist in creating historical and cultural discourse for social groups (Szpunar 2010:381). These geographies are often signifying systems that participate in exploring, reproducing, transforming, and structuring ‘the social’ (Tilley 1994:34).

There is a certain amount of consensus among scholars that monuments are an important form of political mediation of landscapes, and that state-sponsored acts and objects of commemoration help reshape personal memories into collective memories (see Shackel 2001). Traditionally it has been the responsibility of the state to commission memorial sites (although that is increasingly not the case), and often with the intent of using these sites and their power to further their own interests (Jones 2011:94). Nations often use monuments and memorials to reconstruct the past, typically to make it less violent and less antagonistic towards its own justification of existence (Hite 2013:4). Memorials are also bound up in pursuits of *political legitimization* and a myriad of other political interests for the institutions that sponsor them (Carrier 2005:38). According to James Young

(1993), “in assuming the idealized forms and meanings assigned ...by the state, memorials tend to concretize particular historical interpretations... for memorials to do otherwise would be to undermine the very foundations of national legitimacy, of the state’s seemingly natural right to exist” (1993:2).

Indeed, monuments as material objects and sites have certain capacities to embody collective meanings and memories while at the same time presenting them as permanent, legitimate, and natural. They are able to facilitate conversations and host practices that provoke collective understandings of our individual, collective, and national pasts.

2.4 Actor-Network Theory

So far two broad issues have been identified within collective memory studies – disparate units of analysis and the multiplicity of objects, practices, and processes – both of which contribute to difficulties regarding the conceptualization of collective memory. Concerning the former there are tensions between individual and collective theorizing of memory that lead to a lack of analytical integration between socially framed individual memories and collective commemorative representations. The unit of analysis is central to this tension, as there is always one taken for granted, whether it be an individual (the one remembering) or a nation. As well, the multiplicity of memory types, objects, practices and processes are so diverse and numerous that pinning something down that could be called ‘collective remembering’ is difficult. Therefore, taking something like Olick’s Elias-inspired relational and processual approach to studying collective memory is useful: collective memory becomes a concept that sensitizes instead of defining, opening up a range of interconnected phenomena for research.

As a point of departure, this thesis draws from Actor-Network Theory (ANT) as a relational and processual approach to studying collective memory. Similar to the process-relational approaches of Olick (2007) and Elias (1978), ANT rejects substantialism and process-reduction, or what Emirbayer refers to as the propensity to take “discrete, pre-given units such as the individual or society as ultimate starting points for sociological analysis” (1997:287). However, what makes ANT different from these other relational sociologies is its orientation towards material semiotics, involving the application of semiotics to objects, nature and other things out in the world (Baiocchi et. al. 2013:329). Elias’s and to a lesser extent Olick’s approaches tend to focus on human relationality and meaning, whereas ANT welcomes the possibility of nonhumans to participate socially to co-constitute meaning as well as other social actors. The potential of ANT’s focus on nonhumans lends to its usefulness within the context of studying how non-human objects, in this case monuments, Bills, and a variety of documents, participate in mnemonic networks, memory processes, and human identity formation.

The ‘infralanguage’ (Latour 1988:96) of ANT is an important part of what makes ANT’s material semiotics an effective analytical tool. According to John Law (2009:141):

Actor-Network Theory is a disparate family of material-semiotic tools, sensibilities and methods of analysis that treat everything in the social and natural worlds as a continuously generated effect of the webs of relations within which they are located... thus describ[ing] the enactment of materially and discursively heterogeneous relations that produce and reshuffle all kinds of actors including objects, subjects, human beings, machines, animals,

‘nature’, ideas, organisations, inequalities, scale and sizes, and geographical arrangements

There are several important parts to the above definition that make up the infralanguage of ANT’s conceptual framework and method.⁵ First, ANT’s *material-semiotics* assume that what is typically considered to be human social interaction and materiality go together. It implies that social stability is connected to material distinction (Law and Mol 1995:275) and further, that there exists a semiotic relationality that co-constitutes both abstract meaning and material or natural entities. Thus, semiotic relationality implies that through the formation of relational networks, meaning and materiality mutually effect each other, constantly arranging and rearranging a plethora of actors. ANT is then an extension of semiotics that frames and follows assemblages of actors including both natural and material entities (Latour 1996:9). In this way, ANT utilizes insights gleaned from the French semiotic tradition, particularly the narrative theory of Algirdas Julien Greimas (Latour 2005a:54; see Greimas & Cortés 1982), borrowing the openness that exists in narrative theories to account for a variety of actors and agencies within an analysis (Latour 2005a:55).

Second, ANT frames groups of material-semiotic relationships as *heterogeneous networks* and *actants*. Heterogeneous networks are patterns or assemblages of material-semiotic relationships that organize diverse (human and nonhuman) actors while defining the actors themselves in the process (Law 1992:380; Nimmo 2011:109; Law and Singleton 2014:380). An actor within ANT is referred to via the semiotic definition of an ‘actant’, pointing to any human or nonhuman entity that practices agency within a given

---

⁵ It is important to note that the, “infralanguage of ANT is seen as a tool to help explicate, amplify, and link – not as a detailed series of rigorous, cohesive, general, and substantive claims concerning the world” (Sayes 2014:142).

network (Latour 1996:373; Latour 2004:237; Potts 2009:286). As an actant enters into association with others, it is in turn defined and given substance, the ability to act, intention, and subjectivity. Actants are therefore considered to be inherently indeterminate, lacking any a priori essence (Crawford 2005:1). Further, as the term ‘actor-network’ suggests, an actant can be a heterogeneous network and vice versa: “reducible neither to an actor alone nor to a network...[an] actor-network is simultaneously an actor whose activity is networking heterogeneous elements and a network that is able to redefine and transform what it is made of” (Callon 1987:93; Callon and Law 1997:165).

Whether an entity is a network or an actant, an individual or a multiplicity, is a matter of *figuration* – the form and shape of agency.⁶ Taking on a different meaning in ANT than in Elias’s figurational sociology, figuration is not only an instance of fluid human interdependencies, but of agencies being distributed and redistributed among human and nonhuman entities. A figuration, then, is the form and shape that an actant (an entity channeling action) takes on within a network. An actant or source of an action can take on the figuration of a structural trait, a corporate body, an individual, or an aggregate of individuals, and any figuration an actant has within an account is no more or less real, concrete, abstract, or artificial than any other (Latour 2005a:54).

Therefore, at the beginning of an ANT account the units of analysis are always heterogeneous networks and actants. However, as an account develops, these units of analysis can take on various figurations that are articulated by the network being studied. Due to this openness – networks and actants being endowed with figuration during the

---

⁶ The term ‘network’ is also part of ANT’s infralanguage, therefore, it is not taken to be a thing in the world but instead as, “a tool to help describe something, not what is being described” (Latour 2005a:131).

analysis – ANT remains flexible in exploring phenomena without making pre-determined assumptions about the unit of analysis. Additionally, ANT can accommodate several units of analysis in a single account (individual, collective, aggregated), depending on how the network articulates the actants.

Third, *agency* takes on a specific meaning within ANT. Since heterogeneous actants and networks are granted the ability to act, the concept of agency is not something that is limited to human beings (Nimmo 2011:111; Best and Walters 2013:333). Rather, agency is a distributed phenomenon that doesn't require any special cognitive capabilities such as consciousness, will, or intention (Latour 2005a:44; Sayes 2014:141). Though agency may in fact include intentional and causal action, it takes on a broader meaning that encompasses many 'metaphysical shades' of agency: "things might authorize, allow, afford, encourage, permit, suggest, influence, block, render possible, forbid, and so on" (Latour, 2004:226). An actant practices agency when they bend space around it, making other entities dependent on it, translating other's will into it's own language (Callon and Latour 1981:286). Understood this way, ANT takes on a complex, minimal conception of agency, which includes any entity that makes a difference to another entity in a network (Sayes 2014:141; see Latour 2005a:71).

In order to emphasize agency in such a way and to stress the heterogeneity of an actant, ANT thus differentiates between what is referred to as an *intermediary* and a *mediator*. The former does not practice agency in the way described above since it does not transform any thing or entity within a network. In contrast, a mediator does 'bend space around itself', changing what is given to them (Latour 2005a:39). These terms are used to sensitize an analysis to the idea that complex and simple human and nonhuman

actors may or may not be important social players within an analysis. Strictly speaking, complexity does not necessarily have anything to do with an entity's ability to act.

Fourth, actants and the various agencies at work within a heterogeneous network produce certain *effects*. These effects can include people (Law 1992:383); text (Latour and Woolgar 1986:245); organizations (Alcadipani and Hassard 2010:425); ideas, identities, routines and policies (Fenwick and Edwards 2010:3); power (Law 1986:5; Corrigan and Mills 2012:259); agency (Oudshoorn et. al. 2005:86); knowledge (Law 1992:381) the actants themselves (Callon 1999:181-182; Law 1999:5), as well as a plethora of other social relations (Law 2009:146). Perhaps the most salient network effect in ANT are 'black boxes' (Callon 2001:64): networks that have been consolidated, taken for granted (Law 1992:385), and made a node in another network (Callon 1991:153), essentially becoming "stable entities, processes, or laws, dissociated from the circumstances of their production" (Mopas 2007:113). Black boxes are established through the process of punctualization where they are linked to other networks to create even larger, potentially more stable networks (Williams-Jones and Graham 2003:274). This is how ANT accounts for differences between 'micro' and 'macro' actors, as an effect of an ongoing process (Blok and Jensen 2011:120). Put differently, the 'scale' of the actor is the result of the actors own achievements (Latour 2005a:185; see Callon and Latour 1981)

Network effects are the result of social ordering, which are in turn effects (Law 1992:382; Law 2009:145) that are achieved through a variety of strategies of *translation*. Translation is the work done in order to make two separate things equivalent (Law 1999:8; Passoth and Rowland 2010:826) and to induce two actants into coexistence

(Latour 2005a:108) through, “creating convergences and homologies by relating things that were previously different” (Callon 1981:211). Linked to ANT’s material-semiotics, translation has a linguistic or symbolic meaning as well as a geometric one that refers to the movements and mobilization of human and nonhuman resources (Passoth and Rowland 2010:826). According to Latour, translation has this dual nature because “translating interests means at once offering new interpretations of these interests and directing directions’ (Latour, 1987:117). Therefore, to translate is to “establish relationships of equivalence between ideas, objects, and materials that are otherwise different” (Best and Walters 2013:333).

There are multiple strategies used to achieve translation, including pursuits towards material durability, strategic durability and discursive stability (Minn 2016:7). Material durability involves delegating social arrangements to nonhuman physical objects (Law 2009:148), embodying them into durable materials that tend to generate effects that endure (Law 1991:174; Law 1992:387; Fenwick 2012:104), lasting longer than the interactions that formed them (Sayes 2014:137). Strategic durability involves the translation of strategies developed in other actor-networks (Minn 2016:8), including teleologically ordered patterns of relations outside of human intention (Law 2009:148).⁷ Finally, discursive stability entails ordering through situated discourses, where conditions of possibility are defined, ordering strategies are standardized and realities are delineated (Law 2009:149). These three strategies are non-exclusive, are interdependent, and are meant to aid in understanding the complexity of network dynamics. As an example of interdependency, a document (text) circulated by an organization to its employees

---

⁷ Teleologically ordered patterns of relations refer to purposes, goals or principle directives that are ascribed to objects based on their uses or the roles that they take on to serve humans or that they take on within nature.

acquires strategic durability due to the rhetorical force behind it (the durable networks that stabilize the organization) as well as material durability since the text itself is a relatively abiding physical object (Swarts 2010:149).

Considering all that has been said to this point, the analytical goal of ANT can be understood as various attempts to account for the translations between actants (mediators) through the *traceable associations* that they may leave behind. Traceable associations proliferate since the focus of analysis is placed on material relations, “through which most of the ingredients of action reach any given interaction”, by way of “multiplication, enrollment, implication, and folding of non-human actors” (Latour 2005a:193). Actant's often use inscription devices in order to translate other's interests and to order a network. Inscriptions are the materialization of actants's interests that are embedded into texts, technologies and other materials that act to stabilize the network (Callon 1991:143; Usher and Edwards 2007:115) and are therefore important evidence of translation.

2.4.1 Moments of Translation

In one of the most frequently referenced accounts of Actor-Network Theory, Michel Callon (1986) applied ANT methodology to a study of scientists, scallops, and fishermen and in doing so outlined *four moments of translation* that have been used to guide subsequent ANT research (e.g. Davies 2002; Shin et. al 2011; Bliss 2013; Van Wezemael and Silberberger 2016). The first move, *problematization*, is one that involves the attempt of an actant to frame an issue as not only significant to others in a network, but also as one that convinces others of their indispensability in relation to the resolution. This double movement simultaneously defines the issue and provides an interdefinition of all other entities – placing the organizing actants at the center of the network. Organizing

actants thus position themselves as the ‘obligatory passage point’ (OPP) in the network, thus rendering them invaluable (Callon 1986:201).⁸ Entities that have been enlisted by the problematization then can either accept their role in the assemblage or challenge it, making them either intermediaries or mediators.

The Interessement phase includes attempts made by the actants who have defined the issue, the OPP, and the solution, to force other actors to take on specific identities which help to stabilize and strengthen the arrangements proposed in the problematization (203). Additionally, these actants go about defining the identity, the goals, and the inclinations of their potential allies. Devices of interessement are used to cut or weaken alliances between competing entities (204). However, these attempts do not necessarily lead to alliances. Important interessement devices are the *inscriptions* that get passed around in order to produce, refine, and make sense of knowledge. Effective inscription devices are both applicable and portable and can include anything from a document to a picture or video, or a piece of laboratory equipment. These inscriptions are therefore called ‘immutable mobiles’ since they are both mobile and stable (Latour 1987:227; Luyt 2008:391). Inscription devices are passed around to help establish actor-networks by enrolling other entities into their program (Best and Walters 2013:332-33).

Enrolment then entails successful multipartite negotiations, cunning, and trials, that allow the actants to triumph through their interessement attempts, forging alliances with others (Callon 1986:205). Since enrollment is contingent, dis-enrollment is also an

---

⁸ An obligatory passage point can be articulated by comparing it to a security point at an airport. Passengers who have already bought their tickets, have packed, and travelled to the airport are absolutely required to pass through security, one by one. No one can board the plane unless they pass through this point.

ever-present possibility that threatens the network's longevity (Singleton and Michael 1993:228)

The final movement of translation is the mobilization of allies. This involves the formation of delegates who are authorized to represent the masses. These delegates can be both human and nonhuman. In turn, this delegation process is the end result of chains of intermediaries – the continuing mobilization of entities. Mobilization involves several displacements where the designation of spokespeople result from a series of equivalencies (Callon 1986:209) through which entities are first displaced and then reassembled, occur at a particular place and time.⁹

All this being said, in ANT everything is based on relational contingencies, meaning that translation, actants, networks, and effects, are all contingent and temporarily ordered (Latour 1987:40; Law 2002:92; Barry 2013:183). As Callon himself points out, “at the end of the four moments described, a constraining network of relationships has been built. But this consensus and the alliances which it implies can be contested at any moment” (1986:210). Within the context of memorialization, a constraining network of relationships forms the alliances needed to carry out the memorialization process as well as a certain amount of restrained consensus regarding knowledges about the past.

2.5 Collective Memory and Actor-Network Theory

Given all of this, collective memory under ANT is a material-semiotic, heterogeneous, relational process and effect of various strategies of ordering via translation. The

---

⁹ Callon's example of displacement involves the scallops who “are transformed into larvae, the larvae into numbers, the numbers into tables and curves which represent easily transportable, reproducible, and diffusible sheets of paper” (209).

emphasis placed on material-semiotic relationships situates collective remembering as something that is the result of heterogeneous ordering strategies where both meaning and materials are co-organized and consolidated by way of translation. During these moments, actants take form (figuration) as they enter into association with others and engage in movements of negotiation through which memories are contingently constituted. If attempts to order and consolidate are successful, then what is ‘collective’ of memory becomes more or less shared, punctuated and mobilized.

Remembering is then a fluid and dynamic movement of entities within a network and memories are the potential effect of the network: figurations of knowledge and experience of the past.¹⁰ Therefore, studying memory under ANT becomes the act of providing an account of the material traces of translation and heterogeneous ordering strategies involved in ‘mnemonic processes’.¹¹ Agency then, is central to an ANT conception of memory, as what is considered to be ‘remembered’ does not exist separately from the movements that occur within ‘mnemonic networks’. Further, since agency in ANT is a distributed property that can be practiced by human and nonhuman entities, remembering is not limited to human cognitive capabilities. Instead, remembering hinges on attempts made by actants to mediate through a variety of metaphysical shades of action which translate and align those around them, having the effect of creating, negotiating, stabilizing, and concretizing memories.

---

¹⁰ Understood this way, ‘memory’ cannot be taken to be something that exists in itself as a separate object of study. Rather than taken separately from the process of remembering, memory and remembering become synonymous. Additionally, the term ‘memorialization’, already assumed to be processual, can come to refer to the process of remembering that involves certain phenomena that the term ‘collective memory’ sensitizes the researcher to, including the establishing of monuments and memorials. In this research, memory and remembering are used interchangeably for the reason noted above and memorialization is used to refer to a more specific subset of remembering.

¹¹ Following Olick, mnemonic processes may then be those that a researcher becomes ‘sensitized’ to through the nonoperational definition of collective memory.

Ordering strategies then focus on network consolidation, stability, and durability in order to ensure that certain memories of the past are transmitted, shared, and sustained. This is in line with Assmann's assertion that collective memory involves increased ordering, formalization and stabilization (2007:34). Material durability, strategic durability, and discursive stability represent different ways through which remembering is ordered: how the media of memory mediate within these networks, how systems of inscription are utilized to translate strategies external to mnemonic networks, and how discourse is used to delineate possibilities of ordering and achieving stability.

Memorialization, therefore, is an example of various actants within a network attempting to strategically order and establish a new material form (Law and Mol 1995:283) – like a monument. Ordering strategies during memorialization can potentially be quite complex, especially when projects are state-sponsored attempts to establish a physical site/object of commemoration. In these instances, memorialization can involve one or several government officials, departments, corporations, as well as, one or several community groups, organizations, and public figures. When this is the case, strategic durability and discursive stability become important conditions of success as the various actants involved potentially have their own network strategies and discourses that must be translated. If built, a monument could then act as a delegate representing the various entities, their relationships, and the knowledges of the past that were temporarily organized as a heterogeneous network. If accepted as legitimate and authoritative, the monument itself could become a punctualized network or black box of assumptions about the past, potentially kept more durable and stable over time. Further, when placed within

a larger symbolic landscape, a monument also becomes part of a broader network of similar nonhuman delegates that serve to mediate remembrance, identity, and legitimacy.

There are some similarities between an ANT approach to memory and both the process-relational/figurational (i.e. Olick and Elias) and cultural memory approaches (i.e. Assmann) mentioned earlier. Like figurational approaches, through ANT memory is understood on both relational and processual terms, involving a diversity of mnemonic processes practices and objects. Like cultural memory approaches, material-semiotic objects are central to the mediation of memory. As well, ANT shares a concern regarding the relationship between materiality and semiotics and how memories are contingently constructed and maintained overtime.

However, where ANT diverges, and where it is potentially most useful, is in its object-oriented methodology and focus on heterogeneous ordering via translation. It has already been mentioned that nonhumans play an integral role in an ANT analysis as they are allotted the same potential to practice agency as a mediator within a heterogeneous network. Methodologically this is referred to as the ‘principle of symmetry’ (Law 2009:145) or ‘generalized symmetry’ (Callon 1986:199; Nimmo 2011:111). Most simply this means that researchers are to avoid making any a priori commitments to an asymmetry between human intentional action and the material world of causal relations (Latour 2005a:76) by using abstract and neutral vocabulary (i.e. actant, heterogeneous, translation) to understand and describe the entities being studied (Singleton and Michael 1993:228-9). This approach not only ‘bypasses’ commitments to a particular unit of analysis (since the individual human is not given any guaranteed preeminence) it also

places an emphasis on material-semiotic ordering of knowledge about the past, rather than on memory as an object that exists separately.

In the field of collective memory studies, where there exists a multiplicity of different memory types, systems, processes, objects, and conflicting units of analysis, ANT can provide a ‘non-assuming’, consistent analytical vocabulary and framework that are capable of exploring the complexity (Cloatre 2008:273; Sayes 2014:145) of mnemonic phenomena. Additionally, ANT can be used to study a wide range of units of analysis, from ‘micro’ accounts (e.g. Mol 2003; Latour 2010) to ‘macro’ accounts (e.g. Callon 1991; Yaneva 2012), and further, it can be used reflexively to explore how research in memory studies actively engineer heterogeneous networks, producing knowledge about different memory types as well as varying units of analysis.¹²

In conclusion, the purpose of this chapter has been to explore what collective memory looks like through an ANT lens. The variety of units of analysis and objects of study are positioned as ongoing issues within memory studies literature and ANT is posited as another understanding of collective memory which shares some affinities with process-relational and cultural approaches within memory studies. The utility of an ANT approach lies in its analytical consistency, i.e. its generalized symmetry, material-semiotic focus, and its treatment of phenomena as heterogeneous networks. As such, collective memory becomes a material-semiotic, heterogeneous, relational process and effect of various strategies of ordering via translation. Framing collective memory in this way allows for context-specific units of analysis (figurations) rather than predetermined

---

¹² ANT studies have previously explored how different disciplines engage in processes of heterogeneous engineering, where the social, technical, conceptual, textual, and natural are ordered and translated into a variety of discipline-specific products: scientific (Latour 1987; 1993), economic (Callon 1998; Mitchell 2011), medical (Singleton and Michael 1993; Mol 2003), engineering (Law and Callon 1988;), law (Latour 2010).

ones. Additionally, ANT can provide a loose but consistent analytical structure that can incorporate diverse and complex memory-mediators already identified in the literature as well as additional ones.

Accordingly, ANT can accommodate current frameworks of memory while remaining open to supplementary theorizing and methods. In other words, the possibility for any figuration of memory (neurons, an individual, a group, mnemonic objects, commemorative networks) remains open, however, relatively undetermined before analysis. Though this technique could potentially be antagonistic to disciplinary entrenched conceptions of memory, it does provide an avenue through which interdisciplinary collaboration could be explored.

Nevertheless, the presentation of the NHM project in this thesis is the result of implementing an ANT framework of collective memory, producing an account of a memorial network attempting to strategically order and establish a new material form, the National Holocaust Monument. This conceptual foundation lays the groundwork for addressing the research questions put forward by this study regarding the role that the NHM can play in collective remembrance.

3 Research Design and Method

In order to study the National Holocaust Monument (NHM) project, this thesis utilizes data gleaned from access to information (ATI) requests and treats documents a specific way within the analysis. After a brief description of data collection and reflection regarding the analysis, it is argued that the data gleaned from the ATI requests are both valid and useful sources in this study. Not only do ATI's involve the creation of useful sociological data, they reveal important information regarding the organization and inner workings of the government organizations being considered here. Further, the way in which documents are treated as actants in this study is justified due to their ability to mediate social interaction. Finally, in a reflexive admission, it is contended that this researcher and their research is in fact creating social reality. In response to this realization, the researcher has opted to take a position of relative reluctance to adopt preconceived analytical commitments regarding social groups and identities.

The data gathered for this research includes news articles, publicly released government documents, parliamentary transcripts, and a plethora of documents and emails released by the National Capital Commission and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade through two access to information requests made by the researcher. Most commonly, an ATI or access to information request involves submitting a written appeal accompanied by five dollars to the ATI office at the government department that most likely possesses the desired data. The majority of the data (the ATI files and the parliamentary transcripts) were gathered in January and February 2014. The rest of the data was gathered between January 2014 and November 2015.

At the beginning of this project, the intention was to draw primarily from interview data gleaned from key stakeholders who were involved with the monument initiative. However, this changed significantly after an adequate number of interviews could not be secured within the appropriate timeline. Though there were a promising number of potential interviews earlier in the data gathering process, many who had expressed interest in participating admitted that they were too busy to do so within the given time period, while a few others failed to reply to follow-up emails after they had initially expressed interest. Still others who were contacted through email failed to reply entirely.

Part of the trouble associated with garnering interviews had to do with the difficulties that came up when adequate contact information could not be located. Though the ATI request had included the names (and in many cases the contact information) of those involved in the project, the majority of the information was out of date as most were government employees who had since been moved to different departments or had retired.

Corresponding to the lack of success in acquiring interviews, the ATI data became increasingly interesting and useful in the analysis. Particularly useful were the emails and draft documents circulated between government employees that revealed the processes through which they practically organized and ordered the project throughout time. There was a considerable amount of tedious but useful information included in the ATI requests that would likely not have been gathered through interviews – mostly due to the researcher lacking awareness of these procedures and the likelihood that the participant would have not considered this information to be important.

This all being said, had they been accessible, interviews would have paired nicely with the ATI data as the researcher could have asked for clarification regarding the nature of the documents, contexts of the emails, and the meaning of various acronyms, many of which were difficult if not impossible for the researcher to figure out. Still, the lack of interviews forced the researcher down a path of analysis that corresponded with the methodological approach of the project, principally the following of actors through tracking the material traces left behind.

The ATI was acquired through a request made to the government departments associated with the information desired, which in this case implicated the National Capital Commission (NCC) and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT). What was obtained through these requests were two compact discs, one from the NCC and the other from DFAIT. The disc from the NCC contained almost nine-hundred pages of emails, draft documents, and presentations that were crafted, distributed, and circulated within the NCC. Though the raw number of pages indicates a daunting amount of data, about half of these pages contained duplicate information such as conversation threading in emails. The second disk (from DFAIT) was considerably smaller (at thirty pages) and contained the results from a public survey issued by DFAIT regarding the monument. These results included raw aggregated data as well as a short summary of the results prepared by the NCC.

Excluding the parliamentary transcripts, the majority of the data was gathered in response to a preliminary analysis of the ATI data. While attempting to understand and contextualize the ATI data, the researcher was compelled to search for supplementary data, much of which was garnered from government websites and publicly released

government documents. Additionally, more recent press releases and news articles were collected in order to keep ‘up to date’ with the project, as the ATI requests only contained data from 2009 to early 2014. As a result, the researcher ended up bouncing back and forth from site to site while heavily frequenting Google’s search engine in an attempt to follow the actors and understand their movements.

This work proved difficult as the majority of government sites had already archived relevant information about the project since some of it spanned as far back as 2011. In a similar way, some news articles were difficult to find as they too had become archived. Luckily, out of pure interest in keeping up with the developments in the monument project, a Google Alert notification for key words related to the project including specific names of people involved, as well as the terms, ‘National Holocaust Monument’, ‘NCC’, and ‘Ottawa’ was arranged at the beginning of the research project. This helped to both call attention to new information and to save records of these news releases that were automatically stored in an email account. This tactic proved to be extremely useful, although this did not help in the search for archived government documents and webpages. In these cases, the researcher was forced to follow a few hundred trails to broken links and to out-of-date and retired websites until a successful document or webpage was found – providing a rather lucid experience of the stubbornness and dissidence of technology.

In contrast, the parliamentary transcripts were all rather easily acquired online via a government website and were downloaded in portable document format (pdf).¹³ Altogether eleven transcripts were collected and analyzed: three House Debates, three

---

¹³ All transcripts were accessed through the search function on the following webpage: <https://openparliament.ca/>

Senate Debates, four House Committee meetings, and one Senate Committee meeting. Similar to the ATI documents, a grounded theory approach was used in order to identify repeated ideas or themes that were coded for and subsequently used to guide the analysis of the data. These transcripts were first surveyed quickly, followed by a closer reading intended to identify broad themes. During a third review of the documents, the salient themes that had previously been identified were then tested again against the data – i.e. they were specifically searched for in the data in order to confirm whether or not they were supported. Most of the ‘themes’ were taken to be part of the problematization ‘phase’ of the project.

During this time all four moments of translation were coded for, along with the identification of entities as mediators, intermediaries, interessement and inscription devices. The researcher’s theoretical comprehension of ANT is in this case inseparable from the application of its concepts as a methodological approach – as the former developed primarily through the practice of the latter. This cannot be over-emphasized. The ‘sensibilities’ of ANT are perhaps not all that sensible as the varied literature and disciplines through which ANT is drawn on is so discordant. This makes it both easy and difficult to understand and apply ANT in an analysis as concepts tend to be relatively vague and theory kept minimal as for the most part it seems that ANT’s growth has largely depended on the fundamental application of its methods within disciplines somewhat unfamiliar with the approach. It was not until the researcher attempted to practically apply ANT in an analysis that the sometimes muddled concepts were worked out contextually.

Perhaps one of the most difficult hurdles during the application of ANT was in identifying the roles of the entities within the studied assemblage. Not only can roles shift depending on the arrangement of the network, but they can also be determined by the position and the interest of the observer. This is often a matter of sometimes complicated decisions regarding the figuration of an entity along with the practice of bifurcating the means that the social is produced – are they intermediaries or mediators – based on their actions (Latour 2005a:38, 54). Given a specific action or group of actions, is an actant a structural trait, a corporate body, an individual, or other? Put differently, how are various groups formed and fortified?

For the most part, the figuration of an entity was left to either the self-identification of the entity in question or their reference by surrounding entities. For example, individual members of the National Holocaust Monument Development Council were almost never referred to in the data, so it was the group that acted. Also, at times the Minister was referred to as the entity that was acting, but at other times it was DFAIT even though the action was the same. In terms of identifying whether or not an entity was a mediator or an intermediary, this proved more difficult. The researcher eventually decided that a mediator would simply be an entity that had the effect of forcing other entities into certain relationships around itself. Intermediaries, on the other hand, were entities that extended the reach of mediators. During the post-legislation period of the initiative, the mediators that were given the most time in the limited analysis were inscription devices (mostly texts).

3.1 Access to Information Requests as a Means of Data Production

Some have suggested that it is through guilt by association that ATI requests, commonly associated with ‘lay’ journalism, are considered to be inappropriate sources of data by most qualitative researchers in the social sciences (Walby & Larsen 2012:31). Notwithstanding these disparaging opinions, it is unfortunate that ATI’s have not been utilized more as a means of data *production*, especially in cases where research focuses on government bureaucracy. The emphasis placed on ‘production’ here is meant to point to the active role of both the researcher and the ATI coordinator (government employee who facilitates these requests) as they both participate in the development of the texts that are eventually released (32).

Data gleaned through ATI requests are especially relevant within the context of studying government agencies since “the relationships that go on in governments as well as the relationships between government agencies and the subject populations that they govern are textually mediated (Walby & Larsen 2012:33; Smith 1999 and 2005). ATI requests often provide access to such documents and can therefore provide useful data. There are a few ways relevant to the research at hand that texts are commonly used by government agencies. First, there are texts that are used for governance purposes that *act to delineate* administrative policies, regulations, orders and directives. Second, there are texts such as submissions, memorandums of understanding (MOUs) and letters of intent that *function to help determine* various relationships, authorities, and capacities within the organization (Walby & Larsen 2012:33).

Also, and expressly relevant to this research, is how texts along with the work done to produce them are used to connect various different government agencies together:

Texts need to be sent and circulated and modified, interpreted, summarized, vetted, cleansed, and approved. They need to be discussed at meetings and organized according to internal information management protocols. Such texts encode certain messages about what government agencies are doing or what they should be doing—and how they should be doing it... The texts that are produced and the work that is done by government agencies... always demanding approvals and check marks from one another on various texts and kinds of work... actuate or enact... networks between various organizations, creating various textual trails that the ATI/FOI researcher can explore (Walby & Larsen 2012:34)

It is for these reasons, along with their ability to reveal unofficial texts (such as those outlining talking points and communication strategies), that ATI data pairs well with the methodological preoccupations of ANT – which often focus on how texts mediate or inscribe relationships and practices.

It is also worth noting the *phronetic* value of ATI data in social research. A conviction carried in this thesis is that the social sciences should more often embrace a phronetic model (one that emphasizes deliberation over which social actions are good or bad) as opposed to an epistemic model (the preoccupation of the natural sciences). The phronetic approach involves a commitment by the researcher to the reflexive analyses of *value* and *interest*, as well as their *impact* on various groups in society; and further, a commitment to ensure that the analysis is taken up *publically*, implemented in decision making, and that it involves all relevant stakeholders (Flyvberg 2005:39).

ATI documents lend themselves to this phronetic approach by providing “government information to more accurately understand and critique the process and politics of decision-making by government officials and other state agents...” (Kazmierski 2011:614). Moreover, the release of this information can play, “an important role in political discourse by fostering public dialogue and raising awareness of questionable and illegal... practices (Rigakos 2011:645).

3.2 Positioning Documents in Social Research

Though the ability of texts to *do things* is assumed in the literature above, more generally speaking, social scientists have treated texts as containers of information, denying the possibility of influencing social interaction.¹⁴ The notion that “documents exist as a mute, inert, non-reactive, isolated source of evidence” is inherent in many conventional social research methods textbooks (Prior 2008:823). In an attempt to encourage researchers to treat documents as functionally social, Prior summarizes the following four different ways through which social scientists have analytically treated texts: as a *resource* with focus on its *content*, as *topic* with focus on its *content*, as *resource* with focus on its *use and function*, and as *topic* with focus on its *use and function* (see 825).

According to Prior, approaches that focus on the content of the document tend to either be entirely concerned with what is in the document and/or how the topic of the document comes into being. Alternatively, approaches that focus on the use and function of the document tend to either be concerned with how documents are used by people and/or how the topic of the document influences social interaction and organization.

---

¹⁴ Prior (2008) recognizes that this is less the case in discourse analysis (823).

The fourth method, approaching the document as topic with a focus on use and function is generally how ANT researchers treat texts in their analysis. Though in the analysis presented here the researcher has treated documents as both a human resource to purposeful ends and as separate functional participants in social interaction and organization. This dual treatment is justified as faithful to ANT methods since the first aligns with ANT's commitment to using the language of the entities being observed, while the second explores how documents were active participants in the social.

3.3 Some Abiding Methodological Philosophy

There are a few things that are important to note about this research and its methods. First, the approaches to research used here not only describe reality, but they also help produce it (see Law 2004:5). Further, the 'realities' discussed here absolutely exceed the researcher's capacity to completely account for them. The world cannot be generally understood by simply taking on a methodological model of auditing (6). This being said, research methods in the social sciences have produced helpful and elucidating accounts of the world around us, even if they fall short of a holistic understanding of the social.

This is certainly not to suggest that methods are pointless or that any attempts to understand the world around us are vain. Rather, it is an admission that social scientists do not simply discover an objective external reality that exists around us waiting to be accurately portrayed; they alter it, create it, silence it, and elevate it. This makes research inherently political as social science investigations inevitably interfere with the world they are studying making a difference politically (7).

Beyond a rather typical reflexive admission that social scientists are inherently building realities and being politically active, there is something else worth conveying within a thesis that for the most part remains silent about things like race, class, gender. A philosophical tenet in this attempt at research follows Law in his commitment to separate methods from a particular version of politics:

[The] idea that unless you attend to certain more or less determinate phenomena (class, gender or ethnicity would be examples), then your work has no political relevance.

And further, a commitment to subverting methods by,

helping to remake methods: that are not moralist; that imagine and participate in politics and other forms of the good in novel and creative ways; and that start to do this by escaping the postulate of singularity, and responding creatively to a world that is taken to be composed of an excess of generative forces and relations (Law 2004:9).

The ‘singularity’ that Law is referring to here involves the idea that there are definitive and restricted sets of processes that can be objectively discovered only if one successfully performs a ‘healthy’ engagement in research. As an alternative, this research attempts to adopt a kind of balance or what Appelbaum refers to as a ‘poised perception’ (1995:64) that takes on a blindness that encourages the researcher to be sensitive to a range of phenomena and their interpretation that may be missed by someone who is already aided by preconceived analytical commitments (Law 2004:10). Rather than being over-dependent on the researcher’s own methodological *vision*, this approach opens up possibilities to become aware of new realities that could have potentially remained

unseen due to over-mechanical replacement favouring the automatic (11). In some ways the ambiguousness of ANT methodology helped the researcher maintain a sense of blindness and discovery throughout this project.

4 Ordering Heterogeneous Networks

‘writing [is]... not so much a method of transferring information as a material operation
of creating order’
(Latour & Woolgar 1986:245)

‘A fast-tracked schedule offers no forgiveness with regard to meeting key deadlines. Approval, turnaround times and dealing with the on-going consultations and approvals from all parties will have to be managed very carefully to minimize the impact on delivery. Precise mapping of these approvals and agreement on the process amongst all parties should be done at the earliest stages of the project’
(NCC Submission – NCC 2014:453).

The majority of memorial sites and monuments in the National Capital Region have been established directly through the National Capital Commission (NCC) requiring no direct legislation. The National Holocaust Monument (NHM), however, passed through the entire legislative process, implicating several politicians, the House of Commons, the Senate, and a few special committees. In order to frame the legislative process within this Actor-Network Theory (ANT) analysis, Parliament will be treated as a *centre of calculation*. According to Latour, a centre of calculation is a place where inscriptions (immutable mobiles used to order and stabilize networks) are assembled so that they can be used to enroll, align, and control larger networks (1987:233-4).

Though the circulation of these inscription devices throughout the legislative system is only touched on in this analysis, a more detailed analysis of inscription devices and their circulation is presented in a subsequent account of the NCC, the organization primarily responsible for the monument project after it was legislated. Instead, the focus will be placed on representation and inscription in Parliament. On this point, it is argued that human and nonhuman mediators are represented and used as interessement devices that help enroll and align diverse interests to support the monument project. After Bill C-

442 is legislated and the NCC takes over the project, the focus of the analysis will be on the circulation of inscriptions both within the NCC and between them and other entities. The argument here is that these inscriptions were responsible for mediating and coordinating relationships within the NCC as well as defining and aligning the NCC with other actors. Additionally, the movement of these inscriptions produces, distributes, and consolidates knowledge about the Holocaust as well as about procedures for establishing an effective internationally renowned national monument.

What this chapter seeks to accomplish is to provide a limited account of the complexity of the heterogeneous entities that assembled around the NHM project. As discussed in Chapter 2, this involves following traces left by those involved as they worked to pursue various ordering strategies, translation attempts, and increased consolidation of the actants involved. Throughout the memorialization process there is a movement from hypothetical postulating of interdefined relationships and memories of the past to a temporary assemblage of material-semiotic relationships that are increasingly ordered and consolidated in an attempt to appoint a durable delegate, the monument. After a brief overview of the NHM project, the memorialization process will be analyzed through the four moments of translation.

4.1 The National Holocaust Monument: A Brief Overview

During a course on the Holocaust at the University of Ottawa, it was brought to Laura Grosman's attention, an undergraduate student at the time, that Canada did not have a *national* memorial to commemorate the Holocaust (Chalmers 2013:12). In an effort to change this, Grosman approached her federal representative in the Thornhill riding at the

time, Liberal Member of Parliament (MP) Susan Kadis, with whom she discussed the possibility of establishing a commemoration (Canada 2011a:8).

On 14 May 2008, they decided to introduce Bill C-547, *An Act to establish a Holocaust Monument in the National Capital Region*, as a private member's Bill in the House of Commons (Canada 2008a:5853). The Bill died on the table due to the dissolution of Parliament and the call for a general election. It was reintroduced on 1 December 2008 as Bill C-238 by Liberal MP Anita Neville (Canada 2008b: 464), but it again died on the table. Grosman then went to Thornhill's recently elected MP, Conservative Peter Kent, to discuss the possibility of introducing another Bill in Parliament. He was indeed interested, however, since he held a governmental office and could not introduce the Bill himself, he passed the idea to draft and present a Bill to his Conservative MP Tim Uppal (Canada 2011a:8).

On 18 September 2009, Uppal introduced his private member's Bill (Bill C-442), *An Act to establish a National Holocaust Monument* (Canada 2009a: 5200). The Bill was then placed on the Order Paper for a second reading, signaling that members of the House agreed to have the information regarding the Bill made accessible to Parliament and the public. The second reading was held, during which various Members of Parliament discussed the general purview of the Bill and subsequently, Bill C-442 was referred to the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities (Canada 2009b:7821). The Bill was amended and continued on in the legislative process until it was reintroduced on 27 October, debated and finally approved by the House on 8 December 2010 (Canada 2010a:6986).

The Bill was then sent to Senate for consideration where it was debated over February and March of 2011, after which it was deliberated over by the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology on 24 March 2011 (Canada 2011a:3). On 25 March 2011, it received Royal assent and became law (Canada 2011b:2216).

An Act to establish a National Holocaust Monument (S.C. 2011, c. 13) outlines what and who is required to establish a National Holocaust Monument (NHM), or according to its summary:

This enactment requires the Minister responsible for the National Capital Act to establish and work in cooperation with a National Holocaust Monument Development Council to design and build a National Holocaust Monument to be located in the National Capital Region.

According to the *Act*, within a year of assent the Minister responsible for the *National Capital Act*, who at the time was Minister of Foreign Affairs John Baird, was to establish the National Holocaust Monument Development Council (Council) limited to five members (s. 4). This Council is to be composed of non-paid (voluntary) members of the public who have a strong interest in, connection to, or knowledge of the Holocaust, and their membership was to be determined through an open application process facilitated by the Minister (s. 5).

Further, the Minister was to partner with the Council in order to: oversee the monument plan and design, choose an appropriate area of public land within the National Capital Region, and to hold public consultations in order to be knowledgeable of and to incorporate recommendations made by the public regarding the planning, design, and site

(s. 6). The Minister was also made responsible for the general construction and maintenance of the monument, while the Council were to look after a fundraising campaign in order to help cover the cost of constructing the monument (s. 7). As well, the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada was legally allowed to assist the Council in its work outlined in the act (s. 8).

Also, the Council sent an annual report to both the Minister and to the appropriate Committee of the House regarding its activities and the project's status (s. 10). And finally, once the monument was completed, it legally would become the property of the National Capital Commission (NCC) along with any remaining funds from the fundraising campaign (s. 11).

On 2 April 2012, Tim Uppal announced the following members of the Council: Daniel Friedman, Ralf E. Lean, Alvin Segal, and Fran Sonshine. Daniel Friedman, who was appointed as Chair of the Council, is also serving as rabbi at Beth Israel Synagogue in Edmonton. Ralph E. Lean also holds a position on the board of governors of B'nai Brith Canada. Alvin Segal is a well-recognized philanthropist, and Fran Sonshine is currently the National Chair of the Canadian Society for Yad Vashem (Foreign Affairs Media Relations Office, 2014). At the same event Uppal also announced that the government has agreed to match private funds raised up to \$4 million (Mohammed 2012).

On 23 April 2013 during a National Holocaust Remembrance Day ceremony at the Canadian War Museum, MP Uppal announced the future site of the NHM:

Canada's National Holocaust Monument, to be located at the corner of Wellington and Booth streets in our nation's capital, will be a testament to the

importance of ensuring that the memory of the Holocaust is never lost...

(Foreign Affairs Media Relations Office, 2013)¹⁵

Later that year, an internationally renowned jury was assembled to judge over seventy design proposals. The jury consisted of seven members: Irving Abella (historian), Ydessa Hendeles (artist-curator), Herzl Kashetsky (artist), Raymond Moriyama (architect), Margi Oksner (Executive Director of the National Holocaust Monument Development Council), Vera Schiff-Katz (Holocaust survivor) and Greg Smallenberg (landscape architect). The jury met in September 2013 and recommended six finalist teams to move onto Phase 2 of the competition. A public viewing of the six concepts and discussion with the design teams was held at the Canadian War Museum on 20 February 2014 (Canadian Heritage 2015).

The six finalist teams were led by Vancouver-based architect and urban designer Hossein Amanat, Toronto-based architect Leslie M. Klein, Toronto-based museum planner Gail Lord, Montreal-based architect Gilles Saucier, Toronto-based art historian and curator Irene Szylinger, and Cambridge (Massachusetts) artist Krzysztof Wodiczko (Mills 2014). On 12 May 2014, Shelly Glover, Minister of Canadian heritage and Official Languages, along with Minister Baird and MP Uppal announced that Gail Lord's team and their design, "Landscape of Loss, Memory and Survival" had been selected for the future NHM. Lord's team consists of architect Daniel Libeskind, photographer Edward Burtynsky, landscape architect Claude Cormier, and 'subject-matter advisor' Doris Bergen (Canadian Heritage 2014).

Since the winning design was announced, site preparation including decontamination has taken place, however, the official timeline slotting construction to

---

¹⁵ See Figure 1 Map of Location.

begin in the spring of 2014 with completion of the monument in fall of 2015 (National Holocaust Monument Development Council (NHMDC) 2013) has been significantly delayed. After the first delay, construction of the monument was supposed to begin in March 2015 with completion in December and an inauguration ceremony on 4 May, 2016. However, there were tendering problems with construction firm bids coming in substantially over the proposed budget. As a result, the project was halted until the NCC, along with the help of an Ottawa-based construction management advisor, could work with the Lord team in order to redesign the monument in an affordable manner (Willis et al. 2015:1).

On 18 November 2015 the NCC released pictures of the redesigned monument to the public which included several changes such as the removal of: all expanded mesh walls, portions of the roof, approximately 50% of the in-slab snow melt system, pathways, and stair access points. Additionally, many of the concrete walls were made thinner and reduced in size. These were a few of several changes made to the initial tendered version of the monument that were made in order to bring the project back into budget. These changes involved the reduction of materials required for the initial design, acting to make the design financially viable again. Currently, the opening ceremony of the monument is scheduled for Yom HaShoah on 24 April 2017.¹⁶

4.2 Problematization: Narrative Ordering and Nationalizing the Holocaust

On the top left-hand corner of the National Holocaust Monument webpage in bright white followed by bold yellow font it states that, “Canada is the only allied nation

---

¹⁶ See Appendix A.1 for a simplified timeline of the monument project.

without a Holocaust monument in its capital. This is changing” (NHMDC, 2013).¹⁷ This claim – that Canada is an undesirable exception among the Allied nations of World War II – is central to the justification(s) accompanying these efforts to establish a monument. Though Canada already has several memorials to the Holocaust, that there is not one in Ottawa is a principle concern expressed by various proponents of the monument. Though this will be discussed in more detail shortly, the location of the monument in the National Capital Region is what makes this memorial crucial for Canada’s self-identity, what is perceived to be its international reputation, as well as Jewish Canadians. Therefore, the monument’s location is an integral part of how those involved in the initiative frame the need for such a monument, or what is referred to here as the *problematization*.

Problematization is a hypothetical arrangement of issues, solutions, and inter-defined roles through which organizing actors situate themselves as central and indispensable. In this case, it is also a process where a narrative is developed and used to suggest a certain arrangement (order) of material-semiotic relationships. These relationships may then form a certain range of potential collective memories about the Holocaust and Canadian history that will be represented by the monument. As will be discussed, the problematization is not purely a framing of issues and solutions, nor is it simply a proposal of alliances. It is also the discursive constructing and ordering of the past, present, and future (Demers 2007:202).

There are aspects of the problematization that along with translation and ANT more broadly, are useful in this analysis. In the case of the NHM, memorialization involves the development and movement of both meaning and the material or physical

---

¹⁷ As of February 2016, the webpage could still be accessed at the following address:
<http://holocaustmonument.ca/>

objects, relations that are simultaneously between objects and concepts. Additionally, meaning and the physical are co-constructed and mobilized in a way that requires an analysis to not only account for semiotics, but also for action and material distribution. The initial phase of the translation process, the problematization, directs an analysis to focus on how certain actors suggest material-semiotic relationships, and further, how they plan to force others to comply with their program. The emphasis here is on accounting for how and what meaning and action are proposed as well as for how various actors are inter-defined and therefore encouraged to enroll in the hypothetical program. Therefore, the problematization is useful in this analysis because it accounts for material-semiotic relationships, proposed action, inter-definition of various actors, and the setting up of equivalencies of meaning in order to entice key actors to enroll in a network in order to achieve certain material-semiotic outcomes. As will be discussed in subsequent chapters, all of these are part and parcel to the memorialization process and exploring them within the problematization provides the analysis with direction and focus moving forward. As far as the problematization is concerned, the Holocaust is narratively posited as a unique example of human rights violations and as a contemporary call to defend human rights.

To begin, the recognition that Canada is lacking a *national* Holocaust monument is so central to the problematization that it is not only the opening point made in preamble of Bill C-442, but it was also a point reinforced by most who addressed the Bill in the House and Senate Debates, the committee meetings (Canada 2009b: 7815, 7815; Canada 2011c:1858; Canada 2011a:20), as well as one commented on across the various documents and communications made throughout the entire project. For example, one

MP during the House Debates expressed their apparent surprise when they discovered that Canada did not have a national Holocaust memorial:

Today is a historic moment when together we resolve to deal with the fact that we are the only country among the allies from World War II that has not yet established a national Holocaust memorial in its capital (Wasylycia-Leis, Canada 2009b:7819).

Outside of Parliament this sentiment was present in a variety of other contexts, including the Holocaust Memorial Project proposal to NCC (NCC 2014: 6), support letters from the Canadian Jewish Congress and B’Nai Brith Canada (13,14), and in a NCC briefing note on the memorial project (35), among others.

The problematization, however, is more complex than this. It has been *predominantly* framed as a threefold obligation to look to: the past (remember and commemorate), the present (identify contemporary need) and to the future (take action). In other words, the need for a national Holocaust monument is a long overdue (Canada 2009b:7820; 2010b:5455; Canada 2010b:5454; Canada 2011d:2081) and pressing issue due to a variety of concerns that exist between ‘never forget’ and ‘never again’, a commitment to always remember the Holocaust and to prevent or quickly respond to future genocides.

4.2.1 From the Never: An Obligation to Remember

The call to ‘never forget’ is defined as an obligation articulated through a commitment to the unique nature of the Holocaust, particularly as an atrocious abuse of human rights. This uniqueness is formulated through the construction of the event as an ontological evil

that is exceptional in scope. The framing of the Holocaust as a uniquely evil event is pervasive throughout the discourse surrounding the monument. A statement of the uniqueness of the Holocaust is included in the preamble in Bill C-442: “Whereas the establishment of a national monument shall forever remind Canadians of *one of the darkest chapters in human history...*” (2009:1, emphasis added). This statement was explicitly echoed by several Members of Parliament who addressed the Bill in Parliament (Canada 2009a:5200; Canada 2010b: 5455; Canada 2010a:6984; Canada 2010b:5456; Canada 2009b:7821) all of which were similar to the following statement made by a Liberal MP:

[Every] member in this place was taken seriously by the significance of the Holocaust, what it meant in human history and the importance of recognizing the tragedy that could visit humankind when evil went unstopped (Volpe, Canada 2010b:5452).

The scope, or the number of people killed and ethnic specificity were provided as evidence of the uniqueness of the Holocaust. The number of people killed was highlighted as a specific reason for commemoration of the event:

Given the magnitude of the atrocities that occurred during the Holocaust in the extermination of millions of Jewish people, it is crucial that we pay tribute to the victims of this crime and to their families (Jean, Canada 2009b:7820).

More generally, the importance of scope is reinforced through persistent referencing of an exact number of Jews killed. This number, six million, is referenced in the Bill and

was mentioned countless times in Parliament (Canada 2009b:7819; Canada 2009b:7818; Canada 2010a:6983; Canada 2010b:5454; Canada 2010b:5450).

The specific targeting of people based on their ethnic identity was provided as another reason why the Holocaust was so exceptional. Regarding the importance of singling out the ethnic nature of the Holocaust, one MP said, quoting Elie Wiesel, “not all victims were Jews, but all Jews were victims” (Cotler, Canada 2010b:5456). The idea that a society could get to the point where so many people are killed based on their ethnicity was a unique characteristic of the Holocaust. Senator Joan Fraser summed up this sentiment well:

The uniqueness of the Holocaust, therefore, lies not so much in its savagery as in the degree to which, over long years, the apparatus of one of the world's most civilized countries was devoted to the extermination of an entire people, the Jews... (Canada 2011d:2081).

Though there are other groups who were targeted by the Nazis during the war – the preamble of Bill C-442 mentioned the Roma, disabled people, and homosexuals – these other groups play a minor role in discussions regarding the Holocaust as they are only added onto a speech or text but never elaborated on. Additionally, that there were no disabled, Roma, or homosexual representatives on the NHMDC, nor were they a significant part of any stage of the initiative also points to the preeminence of ethnic specificity in the problematization.

4.2.2 Through the Never: An Obligation to Recognize Present Threats

There were three contemporary issues identified and provided as evidence supporting the need for a Holocaust monument during Parliamentary discussions. First, more recent examples of genocide were cited in order to show that genocides have happened since the Holocaust:

Honourable senators, we cannot be complacent. We have only to look to Rwanda, to Bosnia, to Darfur, or to the all-too-common acts of vandalism and violence that continue to arise out of hatred and intolerance to know that, as Canadians, we must be vigilant and proactive (Harb, Canada 2011c:1858).

These more recent examples were drawn from in order to argue that genocides like the Holocaust are still a possibility, requiring Canadians to be proactive and on guard. Second, it was argued that as time passes witnesses to the Holocaust (primarily survivors) are diminishing, along with their testimonies:

As it is the case in these other countries, with the passage of time there are fewer and fewer survivors who can bear the personal witness to the Holocaust. A permanent monument to those who died in concentration camps. Members of Parliament or in their own homes at the hands of the Nazis will serve as a lasting reminder... (Uppal, Canada 2009b:7815).

Without the presence of survivors and their testimonies, the warnings and lessons gleaned from the Holocaust could be lost, or at least greatly diminished. In this context, the monument is articulated as a permanent reminder as opposed to the fleeting personal testimonies of an *increasingly* small group of survivors. Third and by far the most commonly identified contemporary concern, was the presence of anti-Semitism:

With anti-Semitic incidents tragically on the rise around the world, I believe that it is necessary to understand the reality of the worst example in world history of where religious hatred can lead (Mulcair, Canada 2010a:6982).

Anti-Semitism was therefore not only posited as a currently existing concern, but as one that was becoming more acute. Linked to the NHM initiative and to concerns over anti-Semitism, those who spoke about the monument also discussed other initiatives that themselves and their parties have been involved in. On several occasions, Members of Parliament brought up their involvement in or their awareness of all-party government coalitions, committees, and initiatives that are meant to look into or ‘combat’ issues of anti-Semitism in Canada and around the world (Canada 2009b:7819; Canada 2009b:7818; Canada 2010b:5451).

It is also worth noting that the contemporary framing of the Holocaust in this case is closely linked to *the defense of human rights*. For example, an MP stated that the awareness and open dialogue that the pending memorial would inevitably help foster would be an important way to champion human rights:

raising awareness through open dialogue on the subject is certainly one of the most appropriate approaches for ensuring that similar campaigns of genocide and human rights abuses are not tolerated by members of the international community (Thibeault, Canada 2010b:5454).

Framing the Holocaust in terms of a call to defend human rights in Canada also exists beyond the discussion surrounding the memorial, the most striking example being the inclusion of a permanent Holocaust exhibit in the Canadian Museum for Human Rights.

4.2.3 To the never: an obligation to act in the future

Never again is articulated as an obligation to warn, guard against, and act in response to early signs and evidence of genocide. The monument is therefore understood as an expression of the call to prevent large-scale genocides:

This monument will be a testament to the Canadian commitment and resolve never to forget, and always to stand up against such atrocities... We as members of Parliament, through our support for a national holocaust monument, are taking a stand against hatred of the worst kind and saying to future generations, never again. (Uppal, Canada 2010b:5450-5451).

And,

as the preamble to the Bill puts it, our collective resolve never to forget, so that never again will not just be a matter of rhetoric but a matter of resolve and commitment to act (Cotler, Canada 2010b:5456).

During her speech on Bill C-442 in the Senate Debate, Senator Yonah Martin highlighted the role of the monument as providing a *warning*: “the word ‘monument’ originates from the Latin ‘monere’ which means ‘to remind’ or ‘to warn’” (Canada 2011e:1799). Senator Joan Fraser, before referencing Martin’s quote above, elaborated on why the monument should serve as an important reminder and warning:

I support this Bill... because in any murder there are two parties. There is the victim, but there is also the murderer, and, in this case, the many murderers. We need this monument not only to honour the victims but also to remember the fact that horrors of this kind can be perpetrated even in the most civilized societies. No country is immune. The dark corners of the human soul exist

everywhere. That is why we must be vigilant to ensure that they do not come out of the shadows and triumph again (Canada 2011d:2081).

Though anti-Semitism is still a primary concern, within the context of ‘never again’, the uniqueness of the Holocaust is brought to bear universal application. ‘Never again’ alludes to anti-Semitism, but it also calls attention to ethnicity-based discrimination, hatred, prejudice, and genocide more broadly.

In summary, the liminal space between ‘never forget’ and ‘never again’ is part of a narrative that problematizes the current state of affairs: the lack of a Holocaust memorial in Canada’s capital city. Similar to how one MP framed the preamble of the Bill, this narrative sketches, “a brief history of the Holocaust and its importance to our society” (Mulcair, Canada 2010a:6982). In other words, this narrative provides context, legitimacy and impetus to the initiative. What is cited in the Bill itself, along with the discussions over the Bill in the House and the Senate, reveal that key points in the narrative are the following: the perception of an unfavorable characteristic of Canada’s status in the international community; a call to ‘never forget’, rooted in a belief in the uniqueness of the Holocaust in part due to its exceptional scope; the identification of pressing contemporary issues including recent and current genocides, the diminishing of survivors and their testimonies, and cases of anti-Semitism both in Canada and internationally; and the sentiment ‘never again’, a more ubiquitous warning and a call to prevent, condemn, and intervene in any future instances of genocide, as well as ethnically-based discrimination and hatred.

This liminal space fulfills a specific role within the problematization as it creates an intimate connection between the Holocaust and Canadian identity by linking Canadian

citizens, and ‘Canadian values’ or morality to an event that is enrolled to situate the past, present, and future of Canada.¹⁸ It also positions the Holocaust as a unique example of human rights violations and as a contemporary call to defend human rights.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the narrative assembled around this Bill is a contextualized or localized rendering of the *broader narrative*: an international narrative that situates the Holocaust as an exceptional, universal, ontologically evil, transnational paradigm of collective identity (see Alexander 2002). This broader narrative is in part responsible for the ‘black-boxed’ status of the Holocaust in this native setting and cannot be ignored as it is a major contributor to the definition of the Holocaust in this problematization. A black-box is a term not unique to ANT that denotes an assemblage that is generally assumed to be unquestionable, assumed, common knowledge (Pinch & Bijker 1984: 404). If a network is black-boxed, what is actually a complex arrangement of entities that have been and may continue to be in constant negotiation, is instead perceived to be a single, harmonious entity. The connection between the local narrative and the universal or international Holocaust narrative is directly implied through how actors consistently articulate this initiative as an ‘overdue’ project counting against Canada’s identity and membership within the international community. As well, this connection is made when actors discuss the significance and infamous status of the Holocaust in Canada and all over the world. However, due to the limited ability of this thesis to do so, the broader Holocaust narrative is taken as an unproblematic assumption along with its implied influence over those who have assembled around the Bill.

---

¹⁸ The term liminal is used here to refer to how the problematization addresses the past, present and future simultaneously. The problematization proposes certain hypothetical relationships that not only span material-semiotic associations, but also space and *time*. The liminal space created by the problematization sets the boundaries of the past, present, and future, delineating where the material-semiotic relationships being proposed can operate throughout time.

4.2.4 The National Holocaust Monument and Canada's Military Identity

Equally important is another narrative regarding Canada's war history and military identity. This narrative is woven through the monument initiative in several different facets making an otherwise peripheral connection between Canada's military identity and the Holocaust quite salient. There are a few central forms through which this connection is made. First, there is a more obvious connection made between the Holocaust and World War II. During the legislative process, those who spoke to the monument periodically made explicit connections between the Holocaust and Canada's role in the war by making comments regarding their relatives who fought in World War II (Canada 2011a:17) as well as Canada's role in the war more broadly:

This Bill is very important because it speaks to the need for a public monument to honour the victims and survivors of the immense tragedy of the Holocaust that came out of the second world war. It speaks to the conclusion of the second world war; to the role Canada played in the victory over the Axis to ensure that the Holocaust came to an end...The burden of doing that, which the Canadian army and air force had to take on to end the terrible conflict in Europe, is a burden that all those people carried throughout the rest of their lives. I think of the construction of this holocaust monument and the importance it has to the Canadian public and to all those brave Canadians who took on that burden... (Bevington, Canada 2010a:6984).

Additionally, the sponsor of Bill C-442 discussed his experience learning about the Holocaust within the context of the war:

I learned about the history of the Holocaust as a part of the Second World War. Textbooks recounted the events that unfolded; the battles that were waged; the sacrifices of our soldiers, airmen, and sailors, along with their families; and the eventual victory of the allies against the Nazis... Our society is the dream for many around the world, and it's something that the thousands of men and women in our armed forces have fought for in distant war-torn and oppressed nations (Uppal, Canada 2010c:3).

One of the Members of Parliament made a more unique connection between the war and the Holocaust by referring to the latter as a war against the Jews:

In the aftermath of the 70th anniversary of the second world war, in fact, it is sometimes forgotten there were two wars at the time. There was the Nazi war against the allies and there was the Nazi war against the Jews. The Nazi war against the Jews sometimes overtook the Nazi war against the allies where the Germans diverted necessary supplies from the Nazi war against the allies to the war against the Jews (Cotler, Canada 2010b:5456).

Though these are relatively explicit connections made between the Holocaust and Canada's military history, there were also some more implicit connections. For example, the emphasis on Canada's relationship to the other WWII Allied Nations earlier in the problematization draws subtle connections between this initiative and Canada's military history. In the same way, the significance of the future site of the monument – being located across from the Canadian War Museum – draws symbolic parallels between the

Holocaust and Canadian war history.¹⁹ Moreover, many of the events associated with the project – the announcement of the future site (Levac 2013), the presentation of the six design finalists (Mills 2014), and the announcement of the winning design team (CBC 2014) – were hosted in and by the Canadian War Museum, reinforcing the connection between the two.

Though the relationship between the Holocaust and the Canadian War Museum is nothing new (the national Holocaust Remembrance Day which used to be celebrated on Parliament Hill was moved to the war museum around the time Bill C-442 was moving through the legislative process) these announcements further the symbolic ties between Canada's military history and identity, the Holocaust, and this memorial. These associations also help situate the monument within the broader symbolic landscape of the National Capital Region, which tends to link other aspects of what symbolically constitutes Canadian identity to its military history. Similarly, this relationship also implies a connection between the defense of human rights and militarism.

This narrative formed through the problematization suggest hypothetical associations between the Holocaust and Canadian identity in terms of military history and human rights obligations. These hypothetical associations imply a subsequent arrangement of material-semiotic relationships, one of which has already been mentioned regarding the proposed location of the monument. Further, this narrative serves to symbolically interest potential allies that have varied concerns not solely to do with the Holocaust (i.e. military, human rights, tolerance, multiculturalism). Along with the interdefinition of actors and the rendering of the issues at hand, the problematization

---

¹⁹ These parallels become more obviously intentional when the design team for the monument explicitly reports that the monument will be, “symbolically located across from the Canadian War Museum” (Lord Cultural Resources Inc. 2014).

reveals how proponents of the monument situate themselves as central within the network as they and their program attempt to become the obligatory passage point for all other interested actors. Rather than being just an analysis qua narrative account that reveals symbolic and semiotic connections, the problematization divulges how translation might be achieved and therefore, how action is to be distributed throughout the network.

4.2.5 The Interdefinition of the Actors

Though Bill C-442 was reintroduced in virtually the same form as the two previous Bills (C-547, C-238), there was one fundamental difference: A Conservative MP sponsored *this* Bill. This means that regardless of who previously sponsored similar Bills, and even notwithstanding the memorial starting out as Grosman's initiative – at the end of the day it would be the Conservatives who would finally be credited with seeing the project to fruition. Since the Conservative Party was in power at the time, successfully legislating a Bill introduced by a Liberal Member of Parliament would have been one of the only way the Liberals could have taken credit for the initiative, or even been directly involved with the project as it developed. This is due to how the Bill was structured: it placed the ruling government at the helm of the initiative, with the Minister responsible for the *National Capital Act* playing a central role. Taking the one paramount opportunity for another party to take direct credit for the memorial, the Conservatives positioned themselves at the center of the legislation.²⁰ Anita Neville, the sponsor of a previous bill identical to C-442, brought the issue of who deserves credit for the initiative to the forefront of a House debate when she said that she was “concerned to see the sponsor of the Bill, the member

---

²⁰ Several times in both the House Debates and throughout the Committee meetings which dealt with *Bill C-442* there were exchanges between Liberal and Conservative Members of Parliament over who deserved credit for initiative (see Canada 2010a:6983; Canada 2010a:6983).

for Edmonton—Sherwood Park... speak to the Bill to argue why the Conservatives deserved credit for their actions” (Canada 2010a:6983).

Since Members of Parliament from all parties supported the problematization surrounding Bill C-442, non-Conservative Members of Parliament seemed to be restricted in their partisanship and were left to take advantage of several opportunities to be involved by showing their support for the Bill during the House debates, committee meetings, and Senate debates. The Bill became an obligatory passage point (OPP) – forcing all politicians who wanted to align themselves with the idea of the memorial, the Jewish community, as well as various other values and concerns represented through the Holocaust narrative, such as human rights, freedom, toleration, anti-Semitism, and war – to converge and rely on Bill C-442.

Though the problematization formed by Bill C-442 forced some non-Conservative actors to the fringe of the initiative as the proposed legislation guaranteed the involvement of Conservatives in government, it also brought several actors into it. Though the definitions of these actors are at this point very rough, their practical roles quite vague, and their agreements non-binding, they are nevertheless arranged into relationships with each other according to the problematization. The Bill, along with its sponsor, demonstrates how the interests of every government official, the Jewish community, war veterans and Canadians more broadly are served through supporting the program suggested by the Bill. This process of interdefinition is how otherwise separate, dissimilar, or opposing actors are tied together with at least some of their interests translated or equated. Before Bill C-442 received Royal assent, however, these proposed

arrangements were all *hypothetical* – those actors who are interdefined through the problematization are not guaranteed to simply fall into place.

Most of the actors identified in or were part of the problematization embraced their role. As was asked of them by the sponsor of the Bill, Members of Parliament from all parties supported it and many requested that it be legislated quickly. In return, the Members of Parliament from all parties had the chance to show their support and receive at least some degree of credit in the initiative by having their validation of the memorial placed on record. The Bill also saw unrelenting support in Senate and the Senate committee to which it was referred. Even in the House Committee meetings, the Liberals supported the majority of the Bill without amendment while it was the Conservatives who were attempting to adjust it.

Several government officials had at that point already been involved in ventures related to the Jewish community such as the parliamentary coalition to combat anti-Semitism, the legislation of the Holocaust Memorial Day Act; the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research and a Jewish-Canadian advisory committee (Canada 2010b:5451). These other commitments made corresponding government officials more likely to accept their role as generally supporting Bill C-442. This was the case for Conservatives and Liberals in particular since the former were the sponsoring party while the latter had members who had introduced essentially the same Bill. These are just a few reasons why the Bill was able to successfully enroll the support it did through the legislative process.

After the Bill received the support of Her Majesty, the Senate, and the House of Commons, its hypothetical problematization and interdefinition of actors became law and

therefore gained an incredibly forceful ability to enroll the actors it had only hypothetically locked into place. No longer requiring the direct support of the government officials from various parties in the House and Senate, the Bill was free to define the roles of those who would then help realize the monument.

According to the National Holocaust Monument Act (*NHMA*) several actors would be implicated in the monument project. First, Canadians are now obliged “to honour the memory of Holocaust victims”, and Canadian survivors, “as part of our resolve to never forget” (Bill C-442, Preamble). Second, the Crown is to provide land for the monument site in the NCR that is accessible to the public at all times. Third, the National Holocaust Monument will include the victims and survivors of the Holocaust via commemoration (3). Forth, in order to equip Canadians to do so, the Bill charges the Minister responsible for the *National Capital Act* to establish the National Holocaust Monument Development Council (NHMDC) within one year of royal assent (4). The Minister is to hold, “an open application process whereby members of the public who possess a strong interest in, connection to, or familiarity with the Holocaust may apply to the Minister to become Council members” (5(1)). In cooperation with the NHMDC, the Minister is to oversee the planning, design, and site selection of the monument on public land within the National Capital Region (6). Fifth, the NHMDC is in charge of facilitating a fundraising campaign to cover the costs of constructing the monument and the Minister is then responsible for the maintenance of the monument (7 (1)(2)). Finally, the Bill states that the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada may also assist both the Minister and the NHMDC in the performance of their functions (8).

Though the interdefinition of actors within the Bill explicitly mentions these key actors, these actors are yet to be determined based on already established relationships. For example, otherwise a rather odd actor to be involved in such a project, Minister of Foreign Affairs John Baird (along with the *Foreign Affairs Department*) became directly involved with the project since Baird was the Minister responsible for the *National Capital Act*.

Also, some actors were enrolled because their involvement was implied by the *Act*. For example, though the National Capital Commission (NCC) is not mentioned within the purview of the Bill, the NCC would become one of the most important actors throughout the rest of the process. The implication of the NCC is due to its role as a crown corporation created through the *National Capital Act* (R.S.C., 1985, c. N-4), responsible for planning and development of the NCR, including the future monument. The enrollment of the NCC as an organization also implicates the involvement of several other actors, those within the organization and those who the organization works with (these actors and their roles will be explored later on).

Similar to how Bill C-442 was the obligatory passage point (OPP) for those who aligned themselves with the Holocaust narrative during the legislative process, the *NHMA* became the OPP for those involved in the initiative after the Bill received royal assent. If then the law is to be obeyed, the *NHMA* is through which all movements and detours must thereafter be defined as well as the alliances that must emerge. The problematization that was delineated by Bill C-442 proposed several alliances and associations that were then made legally binding after the *NHMA* was mobilized to represent the desire of the Parliament of Canada.

To sum up, within the problematization phase several things have been tentatively accomplished. First, an initial and overarching issue has been identified (i.e. the lack of a national Holocaust monument), and a solution is proposed (the NHM). Second, a narrative has been developed that abstractly orders the past (i.e. significance of the Holocaust, Canadian military history), present (i.e. treats of anti-Semitism, diminishing testimonies, genocide), and future (i.e. never again, commitment to stay vigilant). This narrative provides substance to the main issue and suggests the types of material-semiotic associations that need to be established. Third, organizing actors (the Conservative Government) have interdefined the roles of those required to successfully establish the NHM, while at the same time making themselves indispensable and Bill C-442 the only way to find a solution to the issues that have been raised.

The problematization that is presented here is only partial as it is limited by the data collected by the researcher. Therefore, it only points to an incomplete network based upon fragmentary traces. As well, the problematization is only an account of abstract ordering, or a proposal of an ordering scheme along with the impending associations and knowledge that are to be produced and consolidated. For there to be actual enrollment and mobilization to establish the NHM, entities must be enrolled and materials must be ordered.

The problematization demonstrates how collective memory can be a matter and effect of heterogeneous ordering. Initial ordering occurs through the narrative presented regarding the Holocaust and Canadian identity during the legislation of Bill C-442. The narrative delineates several important aspects that help to provoke support for the monument: what is to be remembered and what is to be forgotten; pressing issues and the

solutions to these issues; connections between values, collective identity, and responsibility. First, this is a move to restrict an arguably much larger range of possibilities concerning what should be considered within this context. This is articulated through the initial problem – that Canada is the only Allied nation that lacks a national holocaust monument – following a threefold obligation to remember, recognize present threats, and commit to act. The problem also immediately associated the project with Canada's military history vis-à-vis the nation's connection to other Allies of the Second World War.

Second, the narrative also points to a specific order of things: roles and responsibilities of Canadians, the government, and various others, as well as through the connections made between what was identified within the range of possibilities. In ANT, the order that this narrative arranges forms a reconstruction of the past, present, and future, and is evidence of casual relations between identified aspects of reality (Ponti 2012) since the connection between the abstract and the material is just a discursive construction (Demers 2007:202). Though the narrative indicates the presence of these relations beyond the account of the NHM presented here, the problematization depicted in section 4.2 nevertheless points to discursive constructions which establish new material-semiotic associations that were presented in this thesis. The narrative ordering that occurred during the problematization points to one avenue through which mnemonic processes and meanings can become aligned.

4.3 The Devices of Interessement: How Allies Are Persuaded to Join

House of Commons debates, Senate debates, and committees are important spaces through which ordering can occur and where actants/mediators are represented and in some cases employed as interessement devices. As we have seen in the problematization phase, a hypothetical or proposed ordering scheme has been articulated. Though it is tempting to restrict the understanding of what was tentatively accomplished during the problematization to the work of people fixing the meaning of things through speech acts, the movement of objects also assists in positioning both people and things.²¹

This can be seen in how material things are *represented* in the problematization within Parliament and in how material things are *produced* as a result. The former is a matter of bringing other actants into the fold by aligning them with the problematization and then translating this into a new material form. The latter are the new material forms (inscriptions) that make these coopted actants and their newly established associations into immutable mobiles which can then be circulated to order the network and enroll additional actors.

This process is important to the functioning of the Parliamentary system, but it is also important beyond it as these immutable mobiles “enable all interested parties to follow parliamentary business” by providing “a permanent record of debate, decisions made, and information about business due to come before the House and its committees” (Parliament of Canada 2015). These inscriptions are important as ordering devices within

---

²¹ It is true that, according to Austin (1975), spoken language or ‘utterances’ can move beyond mere description to be performative in the sense that social reality can in fact be modified through speech acts. However, in the case of Parliament, both representation of nonhumans and the production of inscriptions (i.e. transcripts, minutes, and evidence) point to the role of material things as mediating ‘social reality’ in a way that cannot be reduced to the speech acts that precede them. In other words, the production of material things can stabilize human social relations due to their ability to “last longer than the interactions that formed them” (Callon and Latour 1981:283-284). Also, see Strum and Latour (1987) for limits of speech acts and utility of material things.

the Parliamentary system as they help assemble, shape and connect practices, and constitute subjects (Nimmo 2011:114). As immutable mobiles these inscriptions are easily distributed and circulated with the added benefit of remaining consistent. Within the context of Bill C-442, they were used in order to accurately reference the specifics regarding the proposed initiative (Canada 2010a:6985) as well as to quote what had been said by other Members of Parliament regarding the initiative throughout the legislative process (Canada 2010a:6983). Additionally, they were used to keep track of decisions made regarding amendments to Bill C-442 and as references during debate over these changes (see Canada2010d).²² It is difficult to imagine the possibility of Parliamentary business being conducted without the aid of Bills, Notices of Meeting, Minutes of Proceedings, Evidence, Reports to the House, Order Paper and Notice Paper, debate transcripts (Hansard), Journals, and a plethora of procedural reference material (e.g. House of Commons Procedure and Practice, Committees Practical Guide).²³

The production and circulation of these immutable mobiles is also significant outside of Parliament as they act to mediate networks associated with Parliamentary actors (i.e. their relationships to members of constituencies, lobbying groups and individuals) as well as more broadly making issues public, establishing them as salient to elected officials and to Canadians.²⁴ Of particular interest here are the publically available symbols, meanings, narratives, and rituals (Olick 2008:157) that are represented, embedded in, and recirculated within these parliamentary inscriptions.

---

²² Clear examples of how immutable mobiles work within this network will be the focus of part four of this chapter.

²³ See 'Procedural Reference Material' for a lengthy but non-exhaustive list of documentation used in Parliament at <http://www.parl.gc.ca/ProceduralReference.aspx?Language=E>

²⁴ This thesis is itself an example of how Parliamentary inscriptions can help mediate broader public networks. With the exception of the Access to Information data, most data referenced in this analysis are drawn from these publically available inscriptions either directly or indirectly (information based on said inscriptions).

The distribution of these material actants beyond the Parliamentary system is made possible because of the context in which actants are first deployed. The debates and committee meetings are not just local, but extended networks that span both space and time. This is due to the fact that what is said and done in these spaces are produced or inscribed via audio, picture, video, and transcript, and are subsequently circulated and distributed through various media outlets including websites, television (CPAC), newspapers, and the radio (Soroka et. al. 2009:568, 569). These media are to various degrees both mobile and durable and therefore are effective means through which meaning can be stabilized and transported (Law 1992:387).²⁵

These publically available inscriptions are represented because they are in many cases preexisting mediators that can be effectively deployed as interessement devices by those who have articulated the problematization. They are acknowledged by the actors themselves as having changed the way *they identify* with the issues at hand while at the same time, pointing to things outside Parliament that can persuade the public to accept the problematization and to support (or at least not oppose) the monument.

Of these mediators, most widely represented were other commemorations, museums, and related government initiatives. Several different Members of Parliament spent time listing off numerous examples of other commemorations and museums that currently exist across Canada and the world (Canada 2010a:6985; Canada 2010b:5455; Canada 2009b:7820). According to a couple Members of Parliament, these other commemorations and museums served to demonstrate how “many countries have recognized the importance of commemorating, of recognizing this major event in world

---

²⁵ The ability of these mobile inscriptions to mediate in public can be seen when these immutable mobiles end up being circulated among organizations and news agencies which then often redistribute similar information.

history that influenced them” (Mulcair, Canada 2010a:6982) and that these others “form the basis for the establishment of such a memorial here in Ottawa” (Wasylycia-Leis, Canada 2009b:7819).

These inscriptions are potentially effective because they function to reinforce the problematization by further indicating Canada’s sub-par status in the international community and by highlighting the already established commitment to Holocaust commemoration in several Canadian cities. These actants are brought forth to testify and convince the viewing public that a national monument is not only a logical addition to national identity, but it also strengthens Canada’s ties to the rest of the world. Further still, by representing these entities, government officials also align the proposed national monument with a national and an international assemblage of commemoration. Drawing connections to these networks can serve to encourage enrollment from a public that has either firsthand experience with these commemorations and museums, or who have knowledge of them through popular culture or education.

Alongside these commemorations and museums, Members of Parliament also represented entities that allude to knowledge already assumed to be present in the public. Some of these entities were popular culture accounts of the Holocaust, including work by Anne Frank, Elie Wiesel, and Branko Lustig: “I think we have all heard of Anne Frank. We certainly studied Anne Frank when we were in public school” (Maloway, Canada 2010a:6985; also see Uppal, Canada 2009b:7814 and Lavallée, Canada 2009b:7817).

However, alongside the representation of these entities are arguments that they are insufficient. The mortal nature of the survivors and their accounts have already been

mentioned as part of the problematization, but the limit of texts is also a cause for concern:

Some people have suggested that a monument is not necessary, saying “After all, who has not heard of the Holocaust? Do we really need a monument?” I believe that yes, we do. Remember after the Second World War was over, people began speaking about the Holocaust? Newspapers printed the crimes that had been committed, but they were not understood. No one really grasped what had happened. It was not until we saw the photographs, until there was a more tangible, more visible way to understand, that the significance of the Holocaust began to sink in. That is why I believe that reading about the Holocaust in a textbook is not enough”. (Uppal, Canada 2010c:3).

Though the limiting nature of textbooks was commented on it is important to recognize how influential other books were, particularly Abella and Troper’s (2012) *None is Too Many*. This book was not just an authoritative device used by Grosman to enroll political support, it was also referenced explicitly and implicitly several times throughout Bill C-442 legislation. For example, during the Senate debate on 22 March 2011, a Senator used the account provided by the book in order to argue that this monument is important for Canada especially because of its notorious immigration policy at the time (Canada 2011d:2082).

As a witness called to represent the Jewish community during a senate committee meeting, Bernie M. Farber, the Chief Executive Officer of the Canadian Jewish Congress, also recalled the account provided by the book highlighting the “policy tragically played

out in the government's refusal in 1939 to allow the mooring of the MS St. Louis carrying over 900 Jewish refugees” (Farber, Canada 2011a:22). In fact, the specific story of the St. Louis was a focal point for many government officials who used the book to convince the public of the significance of the Holocaust in Canadian history (Canada 2010b:5457; Canada 2010b:5455; Canada 2010b:5451). Though no explicit reference to the book was made in these instances, it was implied as the story of the St. Louis was said to be already well known and infamous.

However, it was still argued that though textbook accounts are important, they do not effectively convey what happened. Witness accounts are also valuable, but they are disappearing. The difference between the textbook and Abella and Troper’s book perhaps rests on the association between textbooks and an impersonal, distancing *historicity*. History, as Bill C-442’s sponsor articulates it, “may exist in a textbook, but... real significance is lost”, leading to the, “dangers we as a country now face... complacency and fatigue, to allow things like the Holocaust to rest on the pages of history” (Uppal, Canada 2010c:3). On the other hand, *None Is Too Many* is perhaps an exception since it has been taken up popularly.

In opposition to texts that ‘over-historicize’, pictures are more tangible and are therefore more effective than text. Part of the reason for this might have to do with the importance of *site* as both a mediator and an intersement device. In both the House and the Senate, statements regarding government officials and their *experiences* visiting commemorative Holocaust sites were almost as numerous as the lists shared of commemorations and museums. These Members of Parliament and Senators emphasized how visiting these sites was “inspiring” (Maloway, Canada 2010a:6985), “humbling”

(Thibeault, 2010b:5454) and “impressive” (Jean, Canada 2009b:7820) and how they were “deeply moved” (Poilievre, Canada 2009b:7816; Uppal, Canada 2010b:5450) and that they “learned a lot” through the experience. One MP even said that visiting Yad Vashem was, “one of the most powerful events I have ever taken part in” (Fast, Canada 2010b:5455). The sponsor of one of the previous monument Bills made the connection between site and tangibility:

I had the opportunity to visit Auschwitz, Dachau and Majdanek this past year.

It was a profound experience. It reiterated to me the importance of monuments, symbols, obviously of a very different nature there. It reiterated the importance to me of having a tangible remembrance of what took place (Neville, Canada 2010a:6984).

The significance of tangibility, and further that of *permanence*, were two of the defining features of the monument that Members of Parliament constantly referenced as important characteristics enabling the monument to strengthen the knowledge and salience of the Holocaust in Canada. Tangibility would make the monument a stable demonstration (Canada 2010b:5454), a visible icon that would both give an impression and educate (Canada 2009:7815). Linked to the tangibility of the monument, its value as a relatively permanent structure is stated in the *NHMA* preamble as, “important to ensure that the Holocaust continues to have a permanent place in our nation’s consciousness and memory” (S.C. 2011, c. 13). The value placed on the permanence of the monument was echoed by several Members of Parliament (Canada 2010a:6983; Canada 2010b:5456; Canada 2009b:7815), and it was generally thought that the permanent presence of the

monument would help “resist viewing the Holocaust as a purely historical event” (Thibeault, Canada 2010b:5454).

In summary, during the legislative process there were many entities that were brought to bear in the discussion. Many were represented because they seemed to be mediators for parliamentarians and were recognized by parliamentarians as influential in the public sphere. As these mediators were represented they were interposed between the public and competing definitions to further align the public by highlighting how Canadian identities had been broadly defined by the Holocaust. Some of these represented entities were used to remind Canadians that they as individuals and as a society have already invested in the Holocaust narrative through previously established monuments, membership in an international community, education, and through exposure to witness accounts, movies, and pictures. Other entities, including Holocaust-related sites, previous commemorations, and government committees were used as testimonies to how much the Government of Canada, representing the people, have already invested in commemoration of the Holocaust, as well as in related tasks of promoting the Jewish community and organizing against anti-Semitism. Though regardless of their specific function, these mediators all served to enroll the support of others directly involved with the legislative process as well as the broader Canadian public in order to stabilize the assemblage that had gathered to promote the NHM project.

These entities point to previously established local networks where the identities of entities have already been formed and adjusted during action, and that are to an extent connected through a broader global network. Those who are using these entities as interessement devices are in some cases taking advantage of assemblages that have

already formed and have since remained fairly stable (i.e. other Holocaust commemorations and museums). In other cases, these assemblages are used as examples of instability and are therefore framed as a concern in support of the NHM project (mortal witnesses and ‘over-historical’ texts). The stable assemblages are contrasted against the less stable ones through arguments that highlight the efficacy of the former due to their tangibility and permanence – and the ‘experience’ that they provide – as well the inadequacy of the latter due to their fleetingness and tendency to relegate the Holocaust to an un-relatable historicity.

What has hopefully been shown is how outside actants can be brought in and enrolled as mediators to help support the problematization. This is possible due to how materials are produced and organized within the Parliamentary system to create immutable mobiles that can then be circulated both within Parliament and among the broader public. As was previously mentioned, centres of calculation like Parliament function by collecting and creating inscriptions that can then be used to mobilize larger networks. In this case, what could be called a broader ‘commemorative network’ was enrolled and mobilized by incorporating actants (i.e. commemorative sites, texts, memorials) into local inscriptions. These inscriptions served to integrate the actants into the problematization and then to make them both durable and able to be circulated within Parliament and beyond.

The discursive constructions established during the problematization are made more durable and circulate as material-semiotic actants (immutable mobiles), or inscriptions that help to assemble, shape and connect practices and constitute subjects. Within the Parliamentary system, these inscriptions are produced, circulated, and kept on

record in order to help ensure the passing of Bill C-442 into law. Part of the process of ordering involves the representation of objects recognized to be public mediators (i.e. commemoration sites, museums, books, movies, photographs). Due to the Parliamentary system of creating material inscriptions, these mediators were associated with and enrolled in the NHM by way of textual, audio, and video accounts of the problematization that they were hypothetically implicated in. More importantly, Bill C-442 is a discursive construction that hypothetically arranged a group of associations, as well as an inscription device that act to gather political representatives around the issue. After Bill C-442 received Royal Assent, it tentatively enrolled the actors it identifies, while at the same time insisting on vague, but nonetheless interdefined roles, many of which can lead to the establishment of new material-semiotic associations.

4.4 Enrollment: The NCC and the Circulation of Documents, Emails and Presentations

After Bill C-442 was legislated it all but guaranteed the enrollment of the actors it had already interdefined as they were all now legally required to follow through with their prescribed roles. At this point, the enacted Bill still had to be *enacted*: its interdefinition of roles and identities, though backed by law, had yet to lead to the enrollment of all required entities. In this case, enrollment was pursued during the post-legislation phase of the project through a process of creating, circulating, and distributing inscriptions (primarily documents). Broadly speaking this process occurred in two parts. First, inscription documents were drafted and circulated among NCC employees, commented on, and edited. Second, they were finalized into immutable mobiles that were then

distributed to other actors with the intention of enrolling them. Throughout this process several ‘layers’ of inscription were pursued which created and established roles and responsibilities of the actors involved, as well as knowledge about the monument and the Holocaust.²⁶

The NCC was the organization at the center of the monument project as they were continuously coordinating and negotiating with almost every stakeholder. This constant coordination was made possible through hundreds of emails, dozens of meetings, calculated press releases, and the circulation of a variety of documents, PowerPoint presentations, webpage links, books, and contact information. Through this coordination, various roles were defined and key information was strategically shared, resulting in ordering strategies that generated intersement devices, agents, committees, and relationships between organizations. The NCC’s role as a ‘technical advisor’ would place them at the center of this ordering process, allowing them to translate their own interests into material form via inscription documents and then circulating them in order to enroll other pertinent actors such as DFAIT, the Council, the Canadian public, and additional government departments. At this point it is important to note that the centrality of the NCC is skewed based on the data gleaned from the ATIP requests, which was overwhelmingly provided by the NCC itself. However, it was suggested in the data that the NCC was assigned the primary role of technical advisor, responsible for coordinating the majority of the logistics associated with the NHM project.

---

²⁶ Layers of inscription refer to the existence of several different inscription schemes that can coexist within an actor-network. These layers can seek to create order by establishing different knowledge and arrangements between actors, or by reinforcing similar knowledge and relationships in different ways. In either case, the goal is to strengthen the network.

To trace the ordering strategies that existed during the post-legislative phase of the project is to explore how enrollment and ultimately the mobilization of allies were achieved through various documents that act as mobile and material inscriptions which, “assemble, shape and connect practices, and in doing so enact objects, constitute subjects, and inscribe relations, ontological boundaries and domains” (Nimmo 2011:114).

As the NCC works at creating order within the NHM project, it is “constantly performing operations on statements; adding modalities, citing, enhancing, diminishing, borrowing, and proposing new combinations” (Latour & Woolgar 1986:86-87). This involves the utilization of pre-established formats, bureaucratic relationships and procedures; however, it also requires innovative formats, contingent relationships and new procedures. Both are essential to the success of the project and both will be explored in what follows. As will be shown, in order to negotiate and coordinate roles the NCC engages in a constant cycle of drafting, circulating, editing, recirculating, and distributing documents relevant to the project. Typically, these documents were circulated internally until they become final drafts (or nearly finalized) and then they are distributed to stakeholders outside of the organization (such as DFAIT and the NHMDC).

Accompanying this process are emails between NCC employees through which information about the drafts is exchanged in order to enable editors to problem solve by adding, subtracting, and clarifying information in the documents so that they may effectively shape and connect practices and inscribe relationships. The circulation of these documents and the emails surrounding them encompass meetings between stakeholders and together these three constitute the ordering strategy of the project.

Creating Inscriptions and Circulating Immutable Mobiles

Shortly after the legislation of the monument, the actors enrolled by the *Act* quickly began organizing and planning. However, due to the new relationships established between DFAIT and the NCC, a great deal of time was spent attempting to define roles and responsibilities (NCC 2014:58). Though the NCC had worked alongside the government in previous projects, this instance required contextual negotiations and arrangements. One of the earlier draft documents circulated between members of the NCC was a briefing note for the Minister that included the summary roles identified by the *NHM Act* as well as some project ‘considerations’.

The primary focus of this document was to suggest and confirm, “the respective roles of the Council versus that of DFAIT” as well as to, “develop terms of reference for the activities of the council; and implement an application process for the selection of the Council members” (NCC 2014:28). The document also suggested that the next step to be taken should entail NCC Commemoration personnel discussing the, “details of... NCC’s assistance to the Government in this matter” (30). This is an instance through which the drafting and circulation of a document created an inscription that would then become an immutable mobile, helping to create order within the network, defining the roles of and the relationships between actors. This occurred in two parts. First, an editable electronic document was circulated between actors until the interests of the NCC were solidified in a final, immutable draft. Second, the immutable document was then circulated and used to guide the subsequent meeting between the NCC and DFAIT.

During the first part of ordering mentioned in the above paragraph, an email correspondence concerning track changes in the draft of this briefing note was initiated.

During this exchange several NCC employees discussed what should be included in this document about the NCC's typical role in commemoration projects (NCC 2014:20-25). One NCC employee proposed that they include the following suggestion, "outlining the project management role the NCC could play for the Holocaust monument" (NCC 2014:31):

The NCC has on a few occasions accepted to manage commemorative projects on behalf of other government departments... In these instances, the NCC was mandated to oversee all project planning aspects, to direct the design development phase and to undertake the construction of these monuments in exchange for a management fee (28).

Additionally, the final draft of the inscription recommended that DFAIT confirm the respective roles of the Council versus that of the government, develop a reference document for the responsibilities of the Council members, and implement an application process for member selection. It was also recommended that the NCC be responsible for the identification of available monument sites, development of the design criteria, site construction, unveiling, ongoing interpretation, and design selection (ibid). During the second part of the ordering process (following the circulation of this inscription to DFAIT) there was a meeting between the NCC and DFAIT to discuss potential roles and how to move forward, using the finalized inscription document to guide the discussion. One of the first roles established after the meeting was that DFAIT would be, "taking the lead from a Communications perspective" (44). This would mean that communications advisors from Foreign Policy Communications at DFAIT would initiate and coordinate with the NCC and other stakeholders regarding the projects webpage and press releases:

primarily through exchanging draft news releases (305). The NCC would then take the role of ‘technical advisor’ to their clients who would be primarily DFAIT, but who would also include the NHMDC and to an extent, the Departments of Citizen and Immigration Canada and Canadian Heritage (264). As technical advisor, the NCC would be largely responsible for the various stages of the project mentioned in the inscription as recommended by the NCC.

The two-part ordering process as outlined above helped to achieve order by first organizing actors within the NCC and then by circulating immutable documents as interestment devices so that actors outside of the NCC could become aligned to the program now largely being defined by the commission. During the first phase, NCC employees confirmed a cohesive understanding of NCC’s role as an organization through circulating and editing the briefing note document, as well as by communicating through the emails on which these drafts were attached (see Figure 8 for visualization of ordering process).

This two-part ordering process occurred several times throughout the NHM project and in each case actor’s roles are defined and coordinated, strategies of enrollment were developed, or knowledge regarding the Holocaust and the monument is created. For example, shortly after the meeting a document titled Critical Path: National Holocaust Monument was circulated within NCC (see NCC 2014:393). This document was passed between NCC employees receiving several edits, leading to at least eight drafts. The final version of this document was sent out to all members of the Inter-Departmental Working Group on National Holocaust Monument, which included representatives from DFAIT, the NCC, Immigration Canada (Multiculturalism Policy),

and Canadian Heritage. The Critical Path contained a chart that listed what activities needed to be performed throughout the project as well as their deadlines and who would be held responsible for their completion (see Figure 7). The Critical Path was one of several documents, like the briefing note described earlier, that served to help define and coordinate roles of the various actors implicated in the project.²⁷

The Critical Path document also points to several other ‘layers’ of inscription that cumulatively take place within the NHM project. Each layer of inscription is responsible for distributing different ordering schemes, some having to do with actor roles and responsibilities, while others help produced knowledge about the Holocaust and the monument itself. These layers include narratives about the monument and the Holocaust, delivery of the monument including the development of design criteria, news releases, and a communications plan detailing communication approaches and tactics (NCC 2014:217-219). These layers were developed later in the project via inscription processes that produced documents such as the Holocaust Monument presentation document that was utilized during a meeting with NCC’s Executive Management Committee (EMC), the group responsible for reviewing new and ongoing projects and for making strategic decisions about the organizations operations.

The EMC presentation document included the most encompassing ordering of the project as a whole, including the following information: a brief history of the Holocaust (91); examples of Holocaust monuments, museums, and education centres in Europe, Israel, as well as North and South America (92); a brief history of the Holocaust as it

---

²⁷ Other such documents include an NCC information document on the monument (NCC 2014:27), a CEO briefing note (82), a design adjudication process chart (190), a proposed visioning session itinerary (234), a National Holocaust Monument letter of intent (278), Holocaust Monument short term to do list (334), among others.

pertains to Canada (99); important Holocaust commemorative dates (100), a summary of Bill C-442 (101); proposed roles and responsibilities (104); DFAIT's proposed steps, milestones, and roles (105); NCC processes and timelines (109); required support and resources (111); expected next steps (114); and NCC recommendations (115). Beyond summarizing key logistical points, the EMC inscription consolidated knowledge regarding the Holocaust and collected what were deemed to be key points which contextualized the Holocaust within a Canadian milieu, including Holocaust memorials, exhibits, provincial and territorial curriculum, as well as important Canadian commemorative dates (99-100). This document, as with the others mentioned previously, was the result of two-part ordering process: an immutable mobile that could be presented and distributed as a stable source of information regarding the project. As with many immutable mobiles that were created throughout the project, it was used to enroll actors during presentations regarding the monument, guiding what was deemed to be significant enough to discuss during occasional meetings among stakeholders.

The meeting with the EMC, like many of the gatherings had between key stakeholders, was a practice vital to the ordering strategy of the initiative as they were key moments where shared vision regarding the monument and further planning were developed (NCC 2014:234). However, the ordering processes that came before and after these meetings were also fundamental to the project, as the circulation of draft documents and the interactions (primary through email) that accompanied them set meeting agendas and aligned actors both before and after these gatherings. Throughout the entire ATI document referenced here, the same practices were demonstrated time and time again: a document would be drafted, circulated among NCC employees through email,

information would be shared, a new draft would be issued, and eventually a finalized document would be sent out to other branches of the NCC or externally to the NHMDC, DFAIT, or to other organizations supporting the project (such as Public Works and Government Services Canada).

Technical knowledge (i.e. the knowhow needed to coordinate and establish public commemorations) was indeed embedded in the drafting and circulating procedures involved in crafting these documents and effective inscriptions point to successful alignment and organization of staff roles. As the documents were passed around, both the NCC staff and the documents were being co-constituted: they acquired characteristics and are reshaped through their interactions with each other. This is seen as employees exchange drafts between each other as well as their questions, concerns, and opinions – subsequently learning more about the project, the documents formats, and their role within the organization more broadly. Through the development and circulation of these inscription devices, each encounter led to other actors becoming more aligned with the project as a whole²⁸.

Digital and paper documents as inscription devices therefore cannot be understood simply as containers of information, but rather as actants that do things as active agents in networks of social action (Prior 2008:822). They are central to how social interaction is arranged and structured and can be seen to instigate and administer as well as be directed (828). Digital documents that enabled editing (i.e. track changes) allowed NCC employees to not only distribute knowledge, delegate roles and

---

²⁸ Along with the other documents previously mentioned, the Strategic Communications Plan is an example of such an inscription device. This document was circulated to all relevant stakeholders in order to ensure that everyone was, ‘on the same page’. This document included communication objectives, background information on other Holocaust monuments and related government initiatives, strategic considerations among other key information. See Figure 2.

responsibilities, and develop future plans of actions, but they empowered them to seek information and direction regarding their own roles as well as NCC policies and procedures. Additionally, those who drafted these documents were able to coordinate between themselves in order to produce effective enrollment plans and inscription devices (final drafts) that could then be used to position themselves strategically among other significant actors (i.e. DFAIT, the EMC, the NHMDC). Finalized inscription devices also made arrangements between actors more stable, providing them with durable reference points that could be used to align those new to the initiative (i.e. members of the jury and NHMDC).

As well, what is evident is how these inscriptions enable the project to become more ordered throughout time. At the start, the NCC's role in the project was unclear, and the Council as well as DFAIT had very limited knowledge regarding the process of establishing a public monument. Additionally, a common understanding of the *NHMA*, the knowledge of the Holocaust (especially within a Canadian context), and the vision of the monument site and design were established over time and through the drafting and circulating of inscriptions.²⁹ Given that the project was being 'fast-tracked', ordering strategies had to be intense, efficient, and effective, and as demonstrated in the early stages of the project, it only took approximately five months after Bill C-442 received royal assent for the initiative to go from ambiguous and vague legislative parameters to an ordered assemblage of previously existing organizations and new entities.

Composing a text and then circulating it is an effective material operation for creating order has been explored within the context of the National Capital Commission

---

²⁹ For an example of the type of knowledge of the Holocaust and Canada was being ordered, see Figure 3 Ordered Knowledge of Holocaust.

(NCC). Digital and paper inscription devices actively participated in organizing NCC employees as well as to strategically align other actors (i.e. DFAIT, the EMC, the NHMDC). As well, along the way knowledge of the Holocaust is being ordered and consolidated via documents that represent the types of connections that are to be made between Canada and the Holocaust (e.g. Figure 3.). These empirical examples point to the co-constitution of meaning and material that ANT takes as one of its central tenets, and further, to the material-semiotic constitution of memory. Collective memory, therefore, can be considered a product of “mediated symbolic communication” (Assmann 2007:34), however, according to ANT it should be more appropriately understood as mediated ‘material-symbolic agency’, since memory is a matter of translation and effect, rather than of strict communication per se. The co-constitution of meaning and materials points to another avenue through which mnemonic processes and meanings can become aligned.

4.4.2 The Design Competition: How Can a National Monument be International?

After the NHMDC was formed and the relationship between the NCC and DFAIT was in place the project was ready to press ahead. The NHMDC would be in charge of the fundraising as well as act on behalf of the Jewish community, the NCC would be the expert regarding the process of establishing a commemorative site in the NCR and DFAIT would be responsible for press releases and all other public communications. However, other associations would need to be established, mainly between the future monument and both national and international entities. These associations would be

integral to the future monument according to the problematization: the monument must be both nationally and internationally significant.

To be both national and international requires that the monument itself be associated with other entities considered as such. By the time visioning sessions were held, the monument had already established preliminary relationships between national entities. It was previously mentioned that the Bill gave the monument an early connection to a national entity. These connections were provisionally made during discussions surrounding Bill C-442 as it was being legislated – primarily through the drawing together of various government initiatives, committees, taskforces, as well as Canadian Holocaust commemorations, popular culture accounts. The decision to build a monument in the NCR also immediately connected the future monument to a variety of other nationally significant monuments and a landscape of collective identity and memory.

The monument was also set up for international association. Central to the problematization was the idea that Canada, though part of an international community (particularly the Allied nations, but more broadly all nations with Holocaust commemorations), was falling behind on its membership responsibilities. Additionally, there were several instances where a variety of international Holocaust commemorations were brought up and connected to this initiative both during the legislative process and subsequently in PowerPoint, briefing notes, and other documents circulated by the NCC. The monument would therefore be internationally significant because it would join the ranks of the other national monuments and provide a solution to Canada's membership woes.

However, these preliminary connections, like the problematization itself, are relatively fleeting. After the monument is built, almost no one would remember the Parliamentary debates and most would have never been aware of the conversations that were had between the NCC, DFAIT and the NHMDC regarding the national and international significance of the monument. These connections would have to become more durable and lasting in order for the monument to be a solution to the problematization.

In order for the monument to be an enduring local connection between the national and international, these associations would have to be embedded in the physical monument. In pursuance of this, those involved with the project had to negotiate how to achieve durable associations, and as it turns out, this took place primarily through the design competition process.

At first, the stakeholders were not sure whether or not the competition should be a national or international one. In September 2011 the presentations that were constructed and given regarding the competition outlined strengths and weaknesses in either approach. According to the PowerPoint presentation, a national competition would showcase Canadian talent, competitors would have more context regarding national context and construction standards, and this process would most likely involve lower costs. But, it would be restricted by a small pool of candidates, and would not be within the nature of commemorative theme. On the other hand, an international competition would be universal in theme and have global reach (keeping with the commemorative theme), it would broaden the pool of candidates, and increase the profile of competition. However, an international competition could imply that Canadian talent is not up to par,

the international candidates would have less knowledge of Canadian context, and this option would require both more time and money (NCC 2014:163).

After a certain amount of debate, it was decided that an international competition was more desirable. Though an explicit reason for this choice was not given in the data, there is a good chance that it was decided that the advantages to this approach communicated earlier outweighed its disadvantages. In other words, an international competition was likely chosen because it would keep “with the fact that the Holocaust was a global tragedy and that genocide is a universal concern”, and because it would heighten, “the profile of the project and of the competition” (295).

However, there were issues and risks associated with this approach. Due to the possibility of an international competition sending the message that Canada’s talent is not on par, there could potentially be some backlash from the Canadian visual arts and design community. As mentioned previously, this option would be costlier and would be a lengthier process – “longer time frames for development of competition documents, international promotion of competition, registration of competitors, travel logistics” (ibid). This last point presented a considerable amount of risk since the project was on a fast-tracked schedule.

Increased staff time spent organizing and processing the notably higher number of applications was also a concern. Never having hosted an international competition, the NCC would also require more time and effort in order to figure out how to facilitate such a process. Many emails were exchanged between NCC employees and sent outside the organization in an attempt to acquire advice on how to proceed. For example, one email

was sent out to several people who were pre-existing contacts with the NCC asking for help:

Running an international design competition for the Holocaust monument is an option we need to explore. Within your circles, do you know anyone who could provide us with some insight/advice on international competitions or do you know firms/individuals that have run international competitions for monuments or other? (229)

Some possible contacts were exchanged, but eventually the NCC had to coordinate their efforts by creating an information form with details regarding the project (formatted as a cover letter to send to contacts), as well as both questions to ask and a detailed contacts list (297-301). This document would be shared between NCC employees who then worked their way through the contact list referencing the information sheet provided.

What was yielded from these efforts was a five-page document summarizing the feedback received. Among those successfully enrolled to assist the NCC included a Public Art Consultant (referred by the City of Vancouver), a member of a Toronto design firm, and the executive director of the New England Holocaust Memorial project. Broadly speaking, the response from each consultant was made into a bullet point list that summarized their own experience facilitating their own international competition. The NCC eventually took some of the key recommendations made including: the international competition route (to do its large budget justice and to increase the notoriety of the project); an open call and two-stage approach to the contest; international representation on the jury; and a 'team' approach, so that there could be more room for Canadian representation in the winning design team (289).

On 12 May, 2014 the winning design team of five was announced. The team leader was Gail Lord, the president of a Canadian firm that helped plan the Canadian Museum for Human Rights and who is regarded as “one of the worlds” most accomplished museum planners. The architect was Daniel Libeskind, whose other projects include the Ohio Statehouse Holocaust Memorial, the Amsterdam Holocaust Memorial, as well as the Royal Ontario Museum, among others. The artist-photographer was Edward Burtynsky, a Canadian photographer whose work has been displayed at over fifty major museums around the world. The subject matter advisor was Doris Bergen, a Holocaust Studies professor at the University of Toronto and an author of several books on the Holocaust. And finally the landscape architect, Claude Cormier from Quebec, someone who, “has acquired a solid reputation as a prolific designer” (NHM Website).

The design itself – *Landscape of Loss, Memory and Survival* – is prominent with six tall triangular volumes (cement walls), pointed with the overall shape intentionally resembling a hexagram or the Star of David that is clearly seen from the roof of the Canadian War Museum.³⁰ According to project slides from the team, the monument will stand, “as a silent and dignified space shielded from the highway and road traffic providing controlled vistas toward the Canadian War Museum... and the Canadian Parliament” (Lord Cultural Resources Inc. 2014:1). It will also feature contemporary photographs of Holocaust sites: camps, killing fields, and forests. These photographs will be imbedded into the concrete surfaces via a photo-transfer technique that will assure the permanency of their display. The design also includes underground heating throughout the site so that the monument can remain open and ice-free throughout the winter. NCC CEO Mark Kristmanson had said that it was very important to the members of the

---

³⁰ See Figure 4 Model of Design.

NHMDC that the monument is accessible twenty-four hours a day throughout the year (Butler 2014).

The design competition along with the winning design are both telling in that they reveal a few of the important ways through which national-international associations were made more durable. An obvious first choice was to make the design competition an international one. This would ensure that the competition was legitimately ‘international’ since the winning design would be from a pool of applicants from around the world. Akin to this was the decision to open up the contest to ‘teams’ rather than individuals. Teams would allow for a single design to encompass both international and national representation, solving the issues associated with either approach: particularly in terms of awareness of Canadian context (history and construction standards), the number of applicants, and in guaranteeing the ‘international nature’ of the commemoration.

This being said, the resulting design is the avenue through which these associations will become durable. A team whose members have been responsible for projects both national and international (some of which were Holocaust commemorations), and who are aware of the context of both, inevitably influenced the aesthetics of the project. Much of what was said and written during the legislative process and in the meetings, emails, documents, and presentations to follow, would now be calculatingly incorporated into the physical form of the design itself. With its national significance already provided through the location of the site – in a prime downtown location close to Parliament and across from the Canadian War Museum – it would be further reinforced through design: vistas and views integrated with the war museum and

with Parliament. In crafting these architectural connections, war history is linked to democracy and freedom through an unimaginable tragedy.

Through concrete forms, what was previously a narrative woven together through speech and text in parliamentary debates, transcripts, emails, government documents, and official meetings, would become cemented into a physical and symbolic landscape. To question this narrative would be to challenge this formidable structure. To be critical of the intimate connection between Canadian history, war, and democracy would then be to deny the obviously real and “dramatic view of the Parliament Buildings” (Lord Cultural Resources Inc. 2014:2) from the monument, or to ignore the fact that the hexagram is clearly recognizable from the roof of the war museum.

Equally important is how the monument design hosts characteristics typical of its architect – with the pointed triangular volumes representing a quintessential feature of many of Libeskind’s work across the world. This along with the contemporary photographs of various global sites etched into the cement walls would inevitably strengthen the link between this monument and other internationally significant commemorative sites.

The monument itself is to become the embodied representative of the actor-network that has temporarily formed to produce it. All that has been bound up in this initiative – the temporary associations between actants, the production of knowledge regarding the Holocaust, national identity, history – have been strategically ordered and consolidated so that a new material delegate can represent these associations over time.

4.5 The Mobilization of Allies: Setting Up Strings of Intermediaries

This project is about nothing else if not *representation*. The monument is meant to act as a durable witness and commemoration to an event, a history, and millions of victims and survivors. It is intended to be the tangible result of a national will or resolve to remember, act, and prevent. It is intended to illustrate the collective desire of Jewish Canadians. The monument has also been nominated to anchor Canadian identity to a history of war and an associated politics of freedom and democracy. In one way or another, all of this amounts to the representation of over 35 million people.

Is the Holocaust salient enough in Canada to deserve a *national* commemoration? How then can a single structure, a lone site, come to be a spokesperson of an entire nation on the matter? The success of this entire project relies on the answer to these questions. The answer is itself the result of various chains of intermediaries that are part of the progressive mobilization of actors “who render the following propositions credible and indisputable by forming alliances and acting as a unit of force” (Callon 1986:14): ‘the Holocaust is significant in Canada’ and ‘Canadians want a national Holocaust monument’.

The mobilization of allies involves the formation of several chains of intermediaries that collectively reduce the number of representative interlocutors through a series of material displacements. As an effect of these displacements, those who are being represented are also being silenced. The displacement of individuals, groups and populations through intermediaries can be seen throughout the various stages of the initiative. For example, in accordance with the provision in Bill C-442 that required the Minister and the Council were to “hold public consultations and take into account the

recommendations of the public when making any decision” regarding the planning, design, and site of the monument (6(c)). This ended up being fulfilled in a few key respects, but in terms of Canadian citizens more broadly, it seems that the lone survey was the only attempt made to consult with the public. This served to fulfill the stipulation of the Act, and more importantly, the survey became the spokesperson or representative of the Canadian public.

Jewish Canadians would be treated a similar way. Before and during legislation they were represented generally by politicians (as were non-Jewish Canadians), but also by a hand full of spokespeople and a few organizations. For example, letters of support accompanied the proposal that Grosman submitted to the NCC in 2009 from key representatives of the Jewish Canadian community including Bernie Farber (CEO of the Canadian Jewish Congress), Frank Dimant (Chief Executive Officer of B’Nai Brith Canada), Rabbi Reuven P. Bulka (Congregation Machzikei Hadas), and R. Joel Dimitry (National Holocaust Remembrance Day Chairman). Additionally, there were already spokespeople supporting the initiative outside of the legislation as a few different Members of Parliament alluded to:

With the level of interest displayed by various organizations and individuals in Canada, I am confident that this initiative will generate adequate financial resources... (Jean, Canada 2010a:6983)

As well, during the Standing Senate Committee meeting that discussed Bill C-442, Bernie Farber and Yaron Ashkenazi (Executive Director of the Canadian Society for Yad Vashem), were called on as witnesses on behalf of the Jewish Canadian community to support the monument initiative. In all cases there were already other well-established

assemblages that had resulted in these spokespeople being positioned as acceptable heads of these populations.

Pre-established assemblages were also present via their spokespeople in other cases. Cities and nations (and assumedly their governments) from around the world were spoken on behalf of their leaders, which in this case were various commemorations and museums. These delegates were, not unlike the various individuals and organizations in the above paragraph, heads of their populations and represented by government officials in Parliament. They would also be involved in the post-legislation planning process as they were constantly included in presentations and discussions that influenced the direction of the project.

Though some would argue against the symmetrical treatment of these human and nonhuman delegates, they nonetheless function the same. Just as the human individuals and organizations (presumably) had to achieve their roles as delegates through negotiations, trials, and the mutual agency of many actors, these nonhumans were positioned through a similar process. Like the argument regarding the establishment of the National Holocaust Monument being posited here, commemorations are the end result of a collective endeavor of several entities (human and nonhuman) that lead to a single delegate – physical object and site – embodying the meaning and effort of numerous actors spanning over time. Similar to human spokespersons, commemorations are the result of a mobilization of allies, including those who are being simultaneously represented and silenced. This is how a commemoration starts as a large assemblage of entities, but ends as a single site: a single entity that comes to represent many, a complex

and varied history that becomes reduced and succinct, and a collective identity that becomes ambiguous and focused.

In the case of the NHM, the mobilization of allies occurred in two broad strokes corresponding with the legislation and post-legislation phases of the project. The first involved a massive reduction of entities through delegation, and the second, a similar but less condensed reduction. Each phase was forced through a primary OPP, the first being the *NHMA*, and the second, the monument itself.³¹ There could be an argument for the existence of other OPPs in the assemblage. For instance, the Minister could be an additional OPP since the *NHMA* granted him final say in almost every decision made. As well, the NCC could have been recognized as an OPP since it was legally responsible for establishing the monument in the NCR. Also, due to its considerable amount of previous experience with commemoration projects, it had the technical knowledge that few (if any) of the other stakeholders had.

However, these instances are better understood as the definitive roles that were established and maintained within the assemblage rather than OPPs. Though he legally had the final say in any decision, the Minister would almost certainly never exercise such force, except under extreme circumstances. Lacking the knowledge, ability, and representation needed to achieve a successful commemoration, the Minister was in no position to make proficient decisions. Though absolutely central to the process (a centre of calculation³²), the NCC had to negotiate the process with all of the key stakeholders.

---

³¹ See Figure 5 for simplified mobilization diagram.

³² Developed by Latour in *Science in Action* (1987), a centre of calculation is a location where knowledge production builds on the gathering of resources through circulatory movements to other places. The NCC goes about producing historical, symbolic, and mnemonic knowledges by linking particular locales in space and time through the circulation of human and nonhuman entities along with their capacities, ideas and emblematic resources.

This balancing act limited their ability to make decisions, particularly ones that were outside of their ‘technical’ mandate. The NHMDC, though they were essential for funding the process as well as providing the project with additional legitimacy (by way of enrolling additional spokespersons), they still lacked the technical ability/legal mandate of the NCC along with the final say of the Minister.

These roles (along with the other stakeholders) reveal how each entity’s *margins of maneuver* have been delimited during the process of mobilization. At the beginning of the initiative, the problematization provided various definitions and negotiable suggestions regarding the identity, associations and goals of several entities. What these arrangements point to is the outcome of *consensus*, a successful negotiation over the representatively of a variety of delegates resulting in a constraining assemblage of relationships that occur at the end of the four moments of translation (see Callon 1986).

4.6 Translation Becomes Treason: Redesign and Delay

Consensus and the resulting alliances are still only provisional, and as such remain open to contestation. This certainly reigned true as the project entered into 2015. With the site and design chosen the NCC put out a tender for the construction of the project. The NHMDC successfully raised about 4.4 million of their 4.5-million-dollar goal through private fundraising and the project would receive an additional 4 million from the federal government (Butler 2015). Despite successful fundraising the project came to a halt on 26 March 2015 when bids from construction firms came in significantly over budget. Though considerably surprised by this, both the NCC and the Council remained confident

that their original cost estimates were correct. Nevertheless, they were forced to pause the project and figure out how to resolve this issue.

In order to move the project forward, the NCC reviewed the tender results and presented three options to the other stakeholders. Together, the stakeholders approved an approach involving a, “careful redesign and re-specification with as little impact on the monument as possible, followed by a second construction tender” (NCC 2015:1). Redesign was the only viable solution since, according to the executive director of the NHMDC, they were “starting to suffer from donor fatigue” (Butler 2015). Through this approach, the NCC consulted an Ottawa-based construction management advisor and worked with the design team to come up with a new monument.

On 18 November 2015, NCC employees working on the project submitted a redesign proposal to its Board of Directors. Though the changes made to the monument were reported in the media as ‘minor’ (Butler 2015), the NCC submission described the changes as significant in scope (and the primary reason why the changes had to be approved by the Board). To reduce costs, the revised design included several changes – the majority of which entailed the removal, simplification and/or thinning of concrete throughout the structure. The in-slab snowmelt system was also reduced by approximately 50 percent and some stair access and pathways were also removed (NCC 2015:2). Additionally, there would no longer be any construction over the winter due to the increased costs of doing so. This would further delay the opening of the site.³³

Though considerably surprised by the original tender coming in so far over-budget, both the NCC and the Council remained confident that their original cost estimates were correct (Butler 2015). What then was responsible for the budget issue?

---

³³ See Figure 6 Images Demonstrating Design Changes.

There was no definitive answer given within the data. Contrary to their statements, the NCC and the Council could have miscalculated their original estimates. One could argue that the donors, who in the early stages of the project were represented as being able and willing to provide “more than adequate financial resources” (Jean, Canada 2010a:6983), failed to hold up their end of the bargain. Perhaps it was the construction firms that overestimated their bids for the contract during the first tendering period, or the economy that had shifted resulting in the higher prices of materials.

In any case, the result was the same. Team Lord would be forced to change their design, the monument would no longer be as accommodating to future visitors, and the entire project would be delayed, moving the completion date beyond what was stipulated by the *NHMA*. These alterations demonstrate how controversy – the legitimacy of various spokespeople were questioned, renegotiated and rejected – can emerge despite consensus and alignment.

4.7 Translation Summary

Four distinct moments of translation were used in this thesis to guide the focus and development of the analysis. In actuality, however, translation is rarely so straight forward and sequential. This being said, the moments of translation do capture three important characteristics of the NHM project: the general move towards material durability, mobilization, and network consolidation.

Material durability was demonstrated in a few different respects. First, a certain degree of durability was achieved through the material inscriptions that were produced by both Parliament and the NCC. Second, durability was pursued through enrolling pre-

established mediators known to the public. Third, durability can be taken as the primary goal of the NHM project, which is to establish a new durable actant: The National Holocaust Monument. The four moments of translation orient the analysis to be sensitive to the process through which a network pursuing stability produces durable actants, beginning with hypotheticals and then moving towards the mobilization of material-semiotic allies.

Mobilization, or the formation of delegates who act on behalf of particular populations, was already a reality at the beginning of the account, as the Parliamentary system itself operates based on the constant negotiation of representation and the mobilization of groups of citizens. This is perhaps most obviously the case in regards to Bill C-442 and its sponsor MP as they represented and mobilized several populations, including but not limited to, Holocaust survivors, Jewish Canadians and organizations (such as the CJC, B’Nai Brith Canada, Congregation Machzikei Hadas), war veterans, and Canadians more generally. After Bill C-442 was passed, mobilization was achieved by legal appointment of government actors (the Minister, DFAIT, Canadian Heritage, and the NCC) and through establishing the National Holocaust Monument Development Council (NHMDC) and the monument design jury, as well as through NCC conducted public consultations (e.g. the survey).

Consolidation is directly connected to mobilization. In its most successful form, consolidation is how “networks may come to look like single point actors” (Law 1992:380). In this study, two main punctualized actors were identified: *The National Holocaust Monument Act* and the NHM design (see Figure 5). Though the former is referred to post-legislation as a single actant that mediates subsequent efforts to establish

the monument, during legislation and after it is also a consolidated network composed of hundreds of government officials, a Parliamentary system, and the individuals and groups that backed Bill C-442. The same can be said about the monument design, only in this case what is consolidated is actually more comprehensive, including even more actors.

The mobilization of allies requires the designation of a spokesperson, or what is referred to here as a ‘delegate’. A delegate is the representative of a population able to act on their behalf due to a series of intermediaries and equivalences put into place throughout the translation process. The analysis presented in this thesis has traced the development of the NHM project to the point of consensus over the design of the monument, a relatively successful process of negotiation over representation resulting in a constraining assemblage of relationships. Therefore, the argument here regarding the primary research question is that the design of the monument (and perhaps eventually the monument itself) has become the representative of this network of memorialization, that is to say the material delegate of the assemblage. Assuming that the NHM is built, it will be an actor-network – a durable actant that continues on to represent the relatively fleeting group of associations accounted for in this thesis.

The ultimate aim of the NHM project was to establish a monument that would represent the narrative ordering set forth in the problematization. This involves the translation of material-semiotic relationships and the knowledges produced through these relationships into the physical monument itself. The design of the monument tentatively accomplished this in several ways, addressing the subsequent questions posed in this study. First, the monument connected the national with the international through its association with both Canadian and global designers (members of Team Lord), some of

whom were involved in other Holocaust commemorations. This was a very intentional move as the choice to move forward with an international competition was one that was thoroughly discussed and debated by the NCC and other stakeholders. This association was also implied through the contemporary photographs etched to the monuments concrete walls, linking the monument to other Holocaust sites from around the world.

As well, the monument was designed in order to become a part of a particular set of relationships with others in the surrounding symbolic landscape. Three examples of this were provided in the analysis – the view of the monument from the roof of the war museum as well as the controlled vistas between the two, and the view of Parliament Hill from the monument – all of which served to testify on behalf of those who wanted to establish correspondence between Canada's military identity, its democracy, and the Holocaust. In this way the design of the monument is meant to represent the associations identified in the problematization. The associations of the assemblage were also fixed in the monument's design.

However, unintended controversy would also become embedded in the monument design. As was pointed out in the analysis, even after required entities were enrolled and successful ordering of the assemblage was achieved, betrayal was not far behind. After it was clear that the construction costs of the original design were too high and that there was little chance of additional fundraising, the design itself was altered. This dissidence therefore transferred as an effect of disorder from of the assemblage to the eventual physical form of the monument itself, with the snowmelt system and a couple of access pathways removed. A monument that was meant to be symbolically and practically open

to everyone throughout the year would now be more questionably accessible, along with its symbolic significance.³⁴

---

³⁴ NCC's CEO had informed the Ottawa Citizen that it was very important to the NHMDC that the monument be fully accessible 24 hours a day for, "symbolic reasons" (Butler 2015).

5 Conclusion

This study set out to explore the concept of collective memory and identifies how the National Holocaust Monument (NHM) project developed collective remembrance through ordering and consolidating heterogeneous networks and actants so that a durable delegate (the monument) could be designed. This study demonstrates how ordering and consolidation is a material-semiotic process that involves the strategic movement of associations of both meaning and materials. Generally, the theoretical literature on collective memory is disparate in regards to what collective memory is. This problem has resulted in a variety of different units of analysis that implicate several assumptions about figuration and agency that do not necessarily coalesce. An additional and interrelated issue has also been identified as the proliferation of memory types and analytical approaches to studying memory. It is argued that these two broad issues need to be confronted if the guiding questions of this research are to be properly addressed. However, rather than taking existing approaches to task, these issues have been used to point to the inherent complexity involved in accounting for mnemonic phenomena. Therefore, the aim here is not to be overly critical of current approaches, but instead, it is to take these two broad issues as a context through which the research question can be situated in collective memory studies.

With this in mind, the study attempts to answer the following questions: primarily, what role can the National Holocaust Monument play in collective remembrance; and subsequently, how do mnemonic processes and meanings align and become embodied into the design of the monument, and how do failed attempts at translation effect the design of the monument? In order to address these questions, this

thesis utilized insights gleaned from Actor-Network Theory (ANT) in order to establish a framework for understanding collective remembrance that could connect the physical monument to the networks of memory that existing literature argue they mediate. Put differently, through an ANT analysis, the memorialization process reveals how the monument is being positioned as a material-semiotic actor.

In chapter two, it is argued that collective memory within the context of ANT is a material-semiotic, heterogeneous, relational process and effect of various strategies of ordering and translation. Remembering is therefore not only a process, but one that exhibits an interplay between meaning and the material, relationships between human and nonhuman entities, and ordering of knowledge through translation.

Following the understanding of collective remembrance established in the second chapter, there are three main focal points of the analysis that contribute to answers regarding the guiding questions that were posed here. First, the problematization surrounding the NHM not only created a narrative which gathered politicians and publics around an issue, but it also established a dependency on the proposed monument by framing it as the solution to many of the issues that were identified. This dependency was rooted in the materiality of the future monument, particularly its durability, tangibility, and permanence. As well, the narrative that was formed was an abstract ordering process through which meaning was organized and consolidated. Apart from elucidating what abstract meanings were being assembled and how they were made to coalesce, the problematization also provided a part answer to the role that the future monument could play in collective remembrance, as a durable and more permanent material representative of the narratives formed within the problematization.

Second, there is a focus within the analysis on the production and circulation of new material forms, referred to here as inscriptions and immutable mobiles. Within Parliament, these new material forms helped to not only order the legislative process surrounding the *National Holocaust Monument Act (NHMA)* but also served to take human and nonhuman entities that were represented during legislation and incorporate them into inscriptions that were then distributed within and outside of Parliament. These inscriptions circulated as immutable mobiles which contained certain represented entities (i.e. publically available symbols, narratives, rituals, and people) that were included because they were recognized by actors as public mediators that lend support to the problematization.

There was also attention given in the analysis to how the circulation of documents within the NCC contributed to the ordering of the NHM network by providing employees with the opportunity to strategically gather information about the past and present, organize actors, and impose their own interests through the drafting of documents, their circulation over email, and then the issuing of immutable mobiles to those outside of the NCC. What the role of inscriptions here suggests is that nonhumans can play an important part in how knowledge of the past is created as well as in how remembrance is performed.

Third, the analysis points to the embodiment of the problematization in the design of the monument. Embodiment involves the creation of material objects that stabilize the associations made during the translation process. In this case the most obvious form of embodiment is the monument design through which associations made between Canadian identity, history, war, human rights, and the Holocaust were physically built into the

design. In other words, embodiment is about making memory material. However, the monument does not just take on associations of meaning, but also associations between actors in the NHM network. Creating knowledge of the past was part of the translation process, but so was the negotiating of relationships between stakeholders (i.e. the NCC, DFAIT, the design team, the NHMDC). The physical design of the monument along with what it communicates was established based on these relationships and was altered when these translation attempts failed, the most ardent example provided here being the redesign of the monument after the project came in over budget. This suggests that the NHM's role is to not only provide durability in terms of knowledge about the past, Canadian history and identity, but also to provide stability and a certain amount of permanence to the associations between actors that were formed during the translation process.

All this being said, the conclusions reached within this analysis are only tentative. The NHM is yet to be built and therefore, how it actually participates in collective remembrance is yet to be seen. It should be emphasized that once the monument is built, it will be actively engaging with a pre-existing commemorative network, as well as with ongoing associations with narratives about the Holocaust and Canadian identity, not to mention interactions with thousands of future visitors. How the NHM participates in these networks and contexts is contingent and yet to be seen.

5.1 The National Holocaust Monument Project and Collective Remembrance

This thesis began with the assumption that memory is a variety of processes rather than a thing in itself. The analytical goal of this research is to understand some of the figurations

of memory that have occurred around the NHM project by utilizing insights provided by ANT. Within the context of collective memory studies literature, this research encourages memory studies scholars to consider treating remembrance as a process of translation involving both humans and nonhumans in potentially the same capacity. As part of the translation process, remembering can involve enrolling and mobilizing actors while at the same time increasing order and consolidating knowledge about the past, with material actors playing important roles throughout the process, particularly in how they can provide stability and permanence to mnemonic networks.

5.1 Limitations of Study and Avenues for Future Research

There are some marked limitations to this research project, and many of them are due to the limited scope of a master's thesis, somewhat preventing more depth in analysis. Even in terms of the data that was collected, more could have been taken up in the analysis. In addition to this data, interviews could have provided more robust insight into the monument initiative, particularly in the post-legislation process. Where the researcher was left to make sense of data from corporate and departmental bodies with their own knowledges and processes, some context provided by a group of 'insiders' would have aided in the analysis. Another notable limitation of this research is apparent as the monument has yet to be built. The data referred to in the analysis will quickly become dated as the project continues to unfold and much can happen in the meantime.

Future research could address the limitations mentioned above. As well, research could probe the initiative further by including data on the design and construction process. Assuming that the monument will be completed, subsequent research could also

explore how the monument and its visitors interact with each other, therefore exploring the potency of the material delegate. Similar investigations could be made into other sites that make up the symbolic landscape in the NCR that could provide insight into the broader commemorative network. Future directions of this research could more explicitly explore the flow of power from networks preceding a physical commemoration to those existing post-construction. All of these potential avenues of study could further support, challenge, or provide nuance to the analysis and conclusions presented here.

5.2 Conclusion

The central aim of this thesis is to situate monuments within a tenable analytical framework of collective memory. Accordingly, conceptual tools and sensibilities gleaned from Actor-Network Theory are used to develop an account of the National Holocaust Monument project. To this end, collective remembering is understood as something that is enacted through and ultimately an effect of heterogeneous networks of material-semiotic relationships, with the monument design acting as a material delegate, representing the memorial network it was constituted by. It is hoped that this study will encourage subsequent research in memory studies to consider using Actor-Network Theory as a toolkit to explore the multiple processes, practices, and objects of collective remembering as they occur in their various contexts.

Appendices:

Appendix A - Timeline of NHM Project Events

14 May 2008: Bill C-547 introduced by MP Kadis in the House of Commons.

1 December 2008: Bill C-238 introduced by MP Neville in the House of Commons.

18 September 2009: MP Tim Uppal introduces his private members Bill (C-442), An Act to establish a National Holocaust Monument.

8 December 2009: Bill C-442 given second reading in Parliament. **3 June 2010:** Amended version of Bill C-442 adopted by the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities. **9 June 2010:** Amended version of Bill C-442 is presented to the House.

8 December 2010: Bill C-442 given third reading, approved, and sent to the Senate for consideration.

9 December 2010: First reading of Bill C-442 in Senate. **22 March 2011:** Second reading of Bill C-442 in Senate. Bill referred to Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology.

24 March 2011: Report on Bill C-442 by Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology presented to Senate. Third reading of Bill also given.

25 March 2011: Bill C-442 receives Royal assent and becomes law. **2 April 2012:** MP Tim Uppal announces the members of the National Holocaust Monument Development Council (NHMDC) as well as the government funding for the monument.

23 April 2013: The future site of the NHM is announced at the Canadian War Museum. The monument will be located on the corner of Wellington and Booth streets.

September 2013: Jury assembles to judge over 70 monument design proposals that had been submitted through the international design competition.

12 May 2014: Gail Lord's team and their design, "Landscape of Loss, Memory and Survival" is chosen as the future NHM.

26 March 2015: Construction tender closed, however resulted in bids that were over-budget.

13 October 2015: NHMDC approves design revisions.

18 November 2015: NCC releases pictures of the redesigned monument, including several changes that resulted from the redesign process.

24 April 2017: Opening ceremony for the NHM is scheduled during Yom HaShoah.

Appendix B - Figures

Figure 1. Map of Location (National Holocaust Monument)

Wellington-Booth Gateway

Figure 2. Strategic Communications Plan

STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS PLAN – DRAFT National Holocaust Monument

20(1)(b)

COMMUNICATIONS OBJECTIVES

- To convey to Canadians the significance and relevance of having a National Holocaust Monument in Ottawa that will:
  - ~~commemorate~~ the victims of the Holocaust and its lessons, remind Canadians that anti-Semitism was not confined to Germany during the Second World War but that it continues around the world;
  - promote a better understanding of the historical events of the Holocaust and how they have affected Canadian history;
  - encourage visitors to reflect upon the events of the Holocaust and on the responsibilities of each citizen to value and protect human rights and human dignity; and
  - be a lasting symbol for Canadians and visitors to the National Capital to remember the Holocaust.
- To position the Monument not only as a tribute to the victims of the Holocaust, but also as a symbol of Canada's diversity, its leadership in promoting values of pluralism and tolerance, and its tradition of defending fundamental human rights, including freedom of religion, as a result of lessons learned.
- To explain to Canadians the process that will be put in place to create the National Holocaust Monument.

Comment [R1]: I'd suggest Canada has already done this by joining the ITF, having the JCCA conference happen here last fall and through several speeches by the PM and Minister Kenney.

Deleted: <#> To position Canada as a country that remembers the Holocaust in hopes of never again allowing a similar atrocity to happen

Deleted: <#> ¶

Deleted: ensure that

Deleted: are never forgotten and that will

Deleted: , even today, the enduring evil of anti-Semitism

Deleted: that will allow

Deleted: every day of the year

Comment [r2]: NCC+RB should this be discussed at the visioning session that will be held to determine the monument's main messages and sub-themes before it is included in the communication plan?

Comment [VG3]: Note that all cases of "advisory council" in this document have been changed to "development council" to reflect language in the *National Historical Monument Act*.

Deleted: -- including the selection of the Development Council members and the fundraising campaign

Comment [R4]: Not sure it should be up to commit to make sure the project is complete

Deleted: <#> To encourage the completion of the project by facilitating the establishment and ongoing efforts of the Development Council

Deleted: <#> ¶

BACKGROUND

The Holocaust was the systematic, bureaucratic, state-sponsored persecution and murder of approximately six million Jews by the German Nazi regime and its collaborators during the Second World War, 1939-1945.

Jews were the primary victims — but Roma, disabled persons and Poles were also targeted for destruction or decimation for racial, ethnic, or national reasons. Millions more, including homosexuals, Jehovah's Witnesses, Soviet prisoners of war, and political dissidents also suffered grievous oppression and death under Nazi tyranny.

Several National Holocaust Memorial Monuments exist throughout the World, including:

Berlin, Germany:

- In 2005, the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in the center of Berlin was inaugurated. It is Germany's central Holocaust memorial site and is a place for remembrance and commemoration of six million victims. The Memorial consists of the Field of Stelae designed by architect Peter Eisenman and of an underground Information Centre. The site is maintained by a Federal Foundation. Since its inauguration, millions of people have visited the Memorial.
- In 2000, responsibility for the realization of the Memorial and the Information Centre was given to an independent foundation under public law, the Foundation for the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe. Since the completion of the planning and construction phases it remains responsible for running the Memorial. The Foundation's Charter also commits it to ensure that all victims of National Socialism are remembered and honored appropriately.
- The Memorial site selection, design competition, as well as its production, were all the subject of controversy in Germany. The monument has also been criticized for only commemorating the Jewish victims of the Holocaust.

Jerusalem, Israel:

- Yad Vashem, the national Authority for the Remembrance of the Martyrs and Heroes of the Holocaust, was established in 1953 by an act of the Knesset (Israel's parliament) to commemorate the six million Jewish men, women and children murdered by the Nazis and their collaborators during the years 1933-1945.
- Located on the Mount of Remembrance in Jerusalem, Yad Vashem is a 45-acre complex containing the Holocaust History Museum; the Children's Memorial and the Hall of Remembrance; The Museum of Holocaust Art; The International School for Holocaust Studies, as well as outdoor commemorative sites. Yad Vashem is the second most-visited tourist site in Israel, after the Western Wall.
- Yad Vashem is committed to four pillars of remembrance: documentation, research, education and commemoration of the Holocaust. Yad Vashem also commemorates the heroism and

Figure 3. Ordered Knowledge of the Holocaust

**BRIEFING NOTE ON A NATIONAL HOLOCAUST
MEMORIAL IN OTTAWA**

- The Holocaust refers to the attempted genocide of the Jewish people by Nazi Germany during the Second World War, 1933-1945. Motivated by a perverted racial ideology, the full weight of the massive Nazi bureaucracy was brought to bear on what it methodically called, "the Final Solution to the Jewish Question." The Holocaust was unprecedented in the sheer scope and nature of its murderous agenda, where genocide was conducted on an industrial scale, trans-nationally across the entire European continent. The ultimate goal was to make the world *judenrein*, that is, free of Jews. In the end, the Nazis murdered the vast majority of Jews that were under their control during the Second World War. The murder of one-and-a-half million children was part of the horrific scheme to eradicate the Jewish genetic pool.
- The concluding declaration of the January 2000 Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust recognized that, "The Holocaust (Shoah) fundamentally challenged the foundations of civilization. The unprecedented character of the Holocaust will always hold universal meaning....The magnitude of the Holocaust, planned and carried out by the Nazis, must be forever seared in our collective memory."
- The need for Holocaust memorialization has both universal and Canadian dimensions, which collectively underscore the need for the permanent memorial in the National Capital as envisaged in Bill C-442.
- In a general sense, the Holocaust represents a watershed in human history, a period of horror that redefined the limits of the depravity of human nature and expanded humanity's consciousness of evil. The lessons of the Holocaust are universally applicable to the dangers of xenophobia, hate and racism and it has become the seminal point of departure for understanding the general potential of humankind for such inhumanity.
- Canada is virtually the only Allied country without a state-sponsored or -run memorial to the Holocaust. It is an issue of fundamental importance for the Government of Canada to commit to establishing a national site for remembrance and sensitization about the Holocaust for generations to come. As Canada's national capital, Ottawa is the perfect location for a Holocaust Memorial. Ottawa is a city for all Canadians, and as the capital it attracts millions of visitors a year, including busloads of students. The Memorial would also serve as a meaningful site of remembrance and education for the Parliament of Canada and the Diplomatic Corps based in the nation's capital.
- The memorial will serve as a reminder of the need for everyone to combat racism and discrimination in Canada and wherever it is found, since the Holocaust represents the starkest illustration of what happens when ethnic and religious hatred are allowed to permeate society while individuals and peoples remain bystanders.

Figure 4. Model of Design

Figure 5. Mobilization Diagram

Mobilization of Allies

* List of entities is not exhaustive; graph does not represent perfect flow of mobilization.

** Pinch points represent OPP's and delegation (spokesperson).

Figure 6. Images Demonstrating Design Changes

Submission	Public

Appendix 1 – Images demonstrating design changes

Figure 7. Critical Path Document

**Critical Path
National Holocaust Monument**

Draft 10 – August 29th, 2011

Inter-Departmental Working Group on National Holocaust Monument

Departments involved: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (*Lead*)
                                          National Capital Commission (*Lead*)
                                          Citizenship and Immigration Canada
                                          Canadian Heritage

Members: Chair: Lynne Thomson, Director, Visits and Operations Division and Responsible for the NCC, DFAIT
                          Sébastien Beaulieu, Director, Office of the Associate Deputy Minister, DFAIT
                          Jim Junke, Director, Human Rights Policy, DFAIT
                          LatifaBelmahdi, Director, Foreign Policy and Corporate Communications, DFAIT
                          Natalie Page, Coordinator for the NCC, DFAIT
                          Mark Kristmanson, Director, Public Programming, National Capital Commission
                          Sylvie Tilden, Manager, Commemoration Programs, Public art & representation, National Capital Commission
                          Nicole Sauvé, Manager, Strategic Initiatives, National Capital Commission
                          Colin Boyd, Director, Multiculturalism Policy, Citizenship and Immigration Canada
                          Klara Steele, Deputy Director, Multiculturalism Policy, Citizenship and Immigration Canada
                          DemetraZouzoulas, Senior Officer, Multiculturalism Policy, Citizenship and Immigration Canada
                          Denis Racine, Executive Director, Major Events and Celebrations, Canadian Heritage

ACTIVITIES	DEADLINE	RESPONSIBILITY	COMMENTS
<u>Development of Whole of Government Communications Plan</u> 1. Objectives, roles and responsibilities 2. Communications approach and tactics 3. Timeline of communications products and activities	August 31 st , 2011	DFAIT with support from CIC, Heritage and Office of the Minister of State for Democratic Reform (MoS DR)	
<u>Launch of Open Application Process</u> 1. Determine Selection Criteria 2. Application Process (Website with criteria, deadline, Communication's background) -Website ready for applicants -Hyperlinks to other Departments ready 3. News Release 4. Application Process 5. Receive applications – web portal 6. Screening of applications 7. Preparing the top list of applicants and present to Minister's Office	1. August 23 rd , 2011 2. August 31 st , 2011 3. August 31 st , 2011 4. September 1 st , 2011 to September 21 st , 2011 5. From September 1 st to September 21 st , 2011 6. From September 22 nd to 28 th , 2011 7. September 29 th and 30 th , 2011	1, 2, & 3. DFAIT with support of CIC, Heritage and MoS DR 3. DFAIT 4. DFAIT with CIC 5. CIC with DFAIT, Heritage and MoS DR 6. CIC and DFAIT 7. DFAIT	

Figure 8. Visualization of Ordering Process

References

- Abella, Irving and Harold Troper. 2012. *None Is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe 1933-1948*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Abrams, Philip. 1982. *Historical Sociology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Alcadipani, Rafael and John Hassard. 2010. 'Actor-Network Theory, Organizations and Critique: Towards a Politics of Organizing.' *Organization* 17(4):419-435.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. 2002. 'On the Social Construction of Moral Universals: The 'Holocaust' from War Crime to Trauma Drama.' *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(1):5-85.
- Alexander, Jeffrey C. 2009. *Remembering the Holocaust: A Debate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anastasio, Thomas J., Kristen Ann Ehrenberger, Patrick Watson and Wenyi Zhang. *Individual and Collective Memory Consolidation: Analogous Processes on Different Levels*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Appelbaum, David. 1995. *The Stop*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Assmann, Jan. 2006. *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Assmann, Aleida. 2007. 'Response to Peter Novick.' *GHI Bulletin* 40:33-38.
- Assmann, Jan. 2008. 'Communicative and Cultural Memory.' In *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, edited by A. Erll. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Assmann, Jan and John Czaplicka. 1995. 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity.' *New German Critique* 65:125-133.
- Austin, John L. 1975. *How to Do Things with Words*. Edited by J.O Urmson and M. Sbisà. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baiocchi, Gianpaolo, Diana Graizbord, and Michael Rodríguez-Muñiz. 2013. 'Actor-Network Theory and the Ethnographic Imagination: An Exercise in Translation.' *Qualitative Sociology* 36:323-341.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1986. 'The Problem of Speech Genres.' In *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*, edited by C. Emerson and M. Holquist, translated by V. W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barry, Andrew. 2013. *Material Politics: Disputes Along the Pipeline*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Basu, Paul. 2013. 'Memoryscapes and Multi-sited Methods.' In *Research Methods for Memory Studies*, edited by M. Pickering and E Keightley. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Beckstead, Zachary, Gabriel Twose, Emily Levesque-Gottlieb and Julia Rizzo. 'Collective Remembering Through the Materiality and Organization of War Memorials.' *Journal of Material Culture* 16(2):193-213.
- Ben-Zion, Sigalit. 2008. *A Roadmap to The Heavens: An Anthropological Study Of Hegemony Among Priests, Sages And Laymen*. Brighton: Academic Studies Press.
- Best, Jacqueline and William Walters. 2013. 'Actor-Network Theory and International Relationality: Lost (and Found) in Translation: Introduction.' *International Political Sociology* 7:332-349.

- Biondolillo, Mathew J. and David B. Pillemer. 2015. 'Using Memories to Motivate Future Behaviour: An Experimental Exercise Intervention.' *Memory* 23(3):390-402.
- Blank, Hartmut. 2009. 'Remembering: A Theoretical Interface Between Memory and Social Psychology.' *Social Psychology* 40(3):164-175.
- Blee, Kathleen M. 1991. *Woman of the Klan*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Bliss, Catherine. 2013. 'Translating Racial Genomics: Passages in and Beyond the Lab.' *Qualitative Sociology* 36:423-443.
- Blok, Anders, and Torben Elgaard Jensen. 2011. *Bruno Latour: Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World*. London: Routledge.
- Blumer, Nadine, 2015. 'Expanding Museum Spaces: Networks of Difficult Knowledge at and Beyond the Canadian Museum for Human Rights.' *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 37:125-146.
- Boswell, D and Evans J. 1999. *Representing the Nation: A Reader, Histories, Heritage and Museums*. London: Routledge.
- Brébion, Gildas, Anthony S. David, Rodrigo A. Bressan and Lyn S. Pilowsky. 2007. 'Role of processing speed and depressed mood on encoding, storage, and retrieval memory functions in patients diagnosed with schizophrenia.' *Journal of International Neuropsychological Society* 13:99-107.
- Brescó, Ignacio and Brady Wagoner. 2016. 'Context in the Cultural Psychology of Remembering: Illustrated with a Case Study of Conflict in National Memory.' In *Contextualizing Human Memory: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Understanding How Individuals and Groups Remember the Past*, edited by C. Stone and L. Bietti. New York: Routledge.
- Brockmeier, Jens. 2015. *Beyond the Archive: Memory, Narrative, and the Autobiographical Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Callon, Michel. 1981. 'Struggles and Negotiations to Define What is Problematic and What is Not: The Socio-logic of Translation.' In *The Social Process of Scientific Investigation*, edited by K. Knorr, R. Krohn and R. Whitley. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Co.
- Callon, Michel. 1986. 'Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Briec Bay.' In *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?*, edited by J. Law. London: Routledge.
- Callon, Michel. 1987. 'Society in the Making: The Study of Technology as a Tool for Sociological Analysis'. In *The Social Construction of Technical Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*, edited by W. E. Bijker, T. P. Hughes and T. J. Pinch. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Callon, Michel. 1991. 'Techno-Economic Networks and Irreversibility.' In *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination*, edited by Law, J. London: Routledge.
- Callon, Michel. 1998. 'An Essay on Framing and Overflowing: Economic Externalities Revisited by Sociology'. In *The Laws of the Markets*, edited by M. Callon. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Callon, Michel. 1999. 'Actor-Network Theory – The Market Test'. In *Actor Network Theory and After*, edited by J. Law and J. Hassard. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

- Callon, Michel. 2001. 'Actor–Network Theory'. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, edited by N. J. Smelser and P. B. Baltes. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Callon, Michel & Bruno Latour. 1981. 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Macro-Structure Reality and How Sociologists Help Them Do So.' In *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-Sociologies*, edited by K. Knorr Cetina & A.V. Cicourel. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Callon, Michel, and John Law. 1997. 'After the Individual in Society: Lessons on Collectivity from Science, Technology and Society.' *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 22(2):165-182.
- Carrier, Peter. 2005. *Holocaust Monuments and National Memory Cultures in France and Germany Since 1989*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Cassirer, Ernst. 1953. *Substance and Function*. Translated by W. C. Swabey and M. C. Swabey. New York: Dover.
- Cattell, Maria G, and Jacob J. Climo. 2002. 'Meaning in Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives.' In *Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by M.G. Cattell and J. J. Climo. Oxford: Altamira Press.
- Chalmers, Jason. 2013. *The Canadianisation of the Holocaust: Debating Canada's National Holocaust Monument*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from https://www.ruor.uottawa.ca/bitstream/10393/26170/1/chalmers_jason_2013_thesis.pdf
- Clark, A. 2001. 'Reasons, Robots, and the Extended Mind.' *Mind and Language* 16:121–145.
- Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). 'The Extended Mind.' *Analysis* 58(1):7–19.
- Cloatre, Emilie. 2008. 'Trips and Pharmaceutical Patents in Djibouti: An ANT Analysis of Socio-Legal Objects.' *Social & Legal Studies* 17(2):263-281.
- Connerton, Peter. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Corning, Amy and Howard Schuman. 2015. *Generations and Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Corrigan, Lawrence T. and Albert J. Mills. 2012. 'Men on Board: Actor-Network Theory, Feminism, and Gendering the Past.' *Management & Organizational History* 7(3):251-265.
- Crawford, Cassandra S. 2005. 'Actor-Network Theory.' In *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*, edited by G. Ritzer. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cubitt, G. 2007. *History and Memory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Cunningham, David, Colleen Nugent, and Caitlin Slodden. 2010. 'The Durability of Collective Memory: Reconciling the Greensboro Massacre.' *Social Forces* 88(4):1-26.
- Danziger, Kurt. 2008. *Marking the Mind: A History of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Da Silva Catela, Ludmila. 2015. 'Staged Memories: Conflicts and Tensions in Argentine Public Memory Sites.' *Memory Studies* 8(1):9-21.
- Davies, Anna R. 2002. 'Power, Politics and Networks: Shaping Partnerships for Sustainable Communities.' *Area* 34(2):190-203.

- Demers, Christiane. 2007. *Organizational Change Theories: A Synthesis*. London: Sage.
- Edwards, C. 1996. *Writing Rome*. Cambridge
- Elias, Norbert. 1978. *What is Sociology?* Translated by S. Mennell and G. Morrissey. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Elias, Norbert. 2000. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Edited by E. Dunning, J. Goudsblom and S. Mennell, translated by E. Jephcott. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa. 1997. 'Manifesto for a Relational Sociology.' *American Journal of Sociology* 103:281-317.
- Engelhardt, I. .2002. *A Topography of Memory: Representations of the Holocaust at Dachau and Buchenwald in Comparison with Auschwitz, Yad Vashem and Washington, DC*. Brussels: P.I.E.-Peter Lang
- Erl, A. 2010. 'Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction.' In *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, edited by A. Erl and A. Nunnings. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Evans, Susan. 2013. 'Personal Beliefs and National Stories: Theater in Museums as a Tool for Exploring Historical Memory.' *Curator: The Museum Journal* 56(2):189-197.
- Fentress, James and Chris Wickham. 1992. *Social Memory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fenwick, Tara, and Richard Edwards. 2010. *Actor-Network Theory in Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Fenwick, Tara. 2012. 'Reading Educational Reform with Actor-Network Theory: Fluid Spaces, Otherings, and Ambivalences.' In *Researching Through Actor-Network Theory*, edited by T. Fenwick and R Edwards. Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Fine, Gary Alan. 2013. 'Sticky Cultures: Memory Publics and Communal Pasts in Competitive Chess.' *Cultural Sociology* 7(4): 395-414.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2001. *Making Social Sciences Matter: Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, Malcolm, and John Lennon. 2000. *Dark Tourism: The Attraction of Death and Disaster*. New York: International Thomson Business Press.
- Forest, Benjamin, Juliet Johnson and Karen Till. 2004. 'Post-Totalitarian National Identity: Public Memory in Germany and Russia.' *Social & Cultural Geography* 5(3):357-380.
- Foster, J.K., and M. Jelicic. 1999. *Memory: Systems, Processes or Function?*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Franks, Bradley. 2011. *Culture and Cognition: Evolutionary Perspectives*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gabel, Ines. 2013. 'Historical Memory and Collective Identity: West Bank Settlers Reconstruct the Past.' *Media, Culture and Society* 35(2):250-259.
- Gardner, H. 1985. *The Mind's New Science: A History of the Cognitive Revolution*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gedi, N. and Y. Elam. 'Collective Memory – What is it?' *History and Memory* 8(2):30-50.
- Giedion, Sigfried. 1944. 'The Need for a New Monumentality'. In *New Architecture and City Planning*, edited by P. Zucker. New York: Philosophical Library.

- Giesen, B. and K Junge. 2003. 'Historical Memory.' In *Handbook of Historical Sociology*, edited by G. Delanty and E. Isin. London: Sage.
- Gill, Sandra. 2012. 'Recalling a Difficult Past: Whites' Memories of Birmingham.' *Sociological Inquiry* 82(1):29–48.
- Gillis, John R. 1994. *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Goebel, Stefan P. 2011. 'Commemorative Cosmopolis: Transnational Networks of Remembrance in Post-war Coventry.' In *Cities into Battlefields: Metropolitan Scenarios, Experiences and Commemorations of Total War*, edited by S.P. Goebel and D. Keene. Surrey: Ashgate.
- Gongaware, Timothy B. 2003. 'Collective Memories and Collective Identities: Maintaining Unity in Native American Educational Social Movements.' *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 32(2):483-520.
- Gowing, Alain. 2005. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenberg, Reesa. 2008. 'Constructing the Canadian War Museum/Constructing the Landscape of a Canadian Identity.' In *(Re) Visualizing National History: Museums and National Identities in Europe in the New Millennium*, edited by R. Ostow. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Greimas, A. J. and J. Courtés. 1982. *Semiotics and Language an Analytical Dictionary*. Bloomington: Indiana U.P.
- Guggenheim, Michael. 2009. 'Building Memory: Architecture, Networks and Users.' *Memory Studies* 2(1):39-53.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1980. *The Collective Memory*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. 'The Legendary Topography of the Gospels in the Holy Land.' In *On Collective Memory*, edited and translated by L. A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, Stuart. 1996. Introduction: 'Who needs "Identity"?'. In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by S. Hall and P. duGay. London: Sage.
- Hansen-Glucklich, Jennifer. 2014. *Holocaust Memory Reframed: Museums and the Challenges of Representation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Hirst, W and D Manier. 2008. 'Towards a Psychology of Collective Memory.' *Memory* 16(3):183-200.
- Hite, Katherine. 2011. *Politics and the Art of Commemoration: Memorials to Struggle in Latin America and Spain*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hite, Katherine and Cath Collins. 2009. 'Memorial Fragments, Monumental Silences and Re-Awakenings in 21st-Century Chile.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 38(2):379-400.
- Hite, Katherine. 2013. *Politics and the Art of Commemoration: Memorials to Struggle in Latin America and Spain*. New York: Routledge.
- Hodgkin, Katharine, and Susannah Radstone. 2006. *Memory, History, Nation: Contested Pasts*. London: Transaction Publishers.
- Howes, M.B. and G. O'shea. 2014. *Human Memory: A Constructivist View*. Waltham: Academic Press.

- Huyssen, Andreas. 1994. *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. New York: Routledge.
- Jelin, Elizabeth. 2007. 'Public Memorialization in Perspective: Truth, Justice and Memory of Past Repression in the Southern Cone of South America.' *The International Journal of Transitional Justice* 1:138-156.
- Jenkyns, Richard. 2013. *God, Space, & City: In the Roman Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Paul. 2011. *The Sociology of Architecture: Constructing Identities*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Jones, P. and M. Krzyzanowski. 2008. 'Identity, Belonging, and Migration: Beyond Constructing "Others".' In *Identity, Belonging and Migration*, edited by G. Delanty, R. Wodak and P. Jones. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Kalas, Gregor. 2015. *The Restoration of the Roman Forum in Late Antiquity: Transforming Public Space*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kansteiner, Wulf. 2002. 'Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies.' *History and Theory* 41:179-197.
- Kattago, Siobhan. 2015. 'Introduction: Memory Studies and Its Companions.' In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies*, edited by S. Kattago. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Kattago, Siobhan. 2015b. 'Written in Stone: Monuments and Representations', In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies*, edited by S. Kattago. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Kazmierski, Vincent. 2011. 'Accessing Democracy: The Critical Relationship Between Academics and the Access to Information Act.' *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 26(3):613-622.
- Keightley, Emily. 2010. 'Remembering in Research: Memory and Methodology in the Social Sciences.' *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 13(1):55-70.
- Kirsh, D. and P. Maglio. 1994. 'On Distinguishing Epistemic from Pragmatic Actions.' *Cognitive Science* 18:513-549.
- Klein, K.L. 2000. 'On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse.' *Representations* 69:127-150.
- Kono, Tetsua. 2014. 'Extended Mind and After: Socially Extended Mind and Actor-Network.' *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* 48:48-60.
- Koselleck, R. 1986. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, translated by K. Tribe. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Koselleck, R. 2002. 'War Memorials: Identity Formations of the Survivors.' In *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*, translated by T.S. Preser et al. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kousser, Rachel. 2016. 'Monument and Memory in Ancient Greece and Rome: A Comparative Perspective.' In *Cultural Memories in the Roman Empire*, edited by K. Galinsky and K. Lapatin. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.
- Ladd, B. 1997. *The Ghosts of Berlin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lampinen, J. M. and J.S. Neuschatze. 2008. 'Reconstructive Memory.' In *Encyclopedia of Psychology and the Law*, edited by B. Cutler. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. 1988. *The Pasteurization of France*. Translated by A. Sheridan and J. Law. London: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 1993. *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 1996. 'On Actor-Network Theory: A Few Clarifications Plus More Than a Few Complications.' *Soziale Welt* 47:1–14.
- Latour, Bruno. 2004. *Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 2004. 'Nonhumans.' In *Patterned Ground: Entanglements of Nature and Culture*, edited by S. Harrison, S. Pile and N. Thrift. London: Reaktion Books.
- Latour, Bruno. 2005a. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 2005b. 'From Realpolitik to Dingpolitik or How to Make Things Public.' In *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, edited by B. Latour and P. Weibel. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 2010. *The Making of Law: An Ethnography of the Conseil d'Etat*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Law, John. 1986. 'On Power and Its Tactics: A View from the Sociology of Science.' *The Sociological Review* 34:1-38.
- Law, John. 1991. 'Strategies of Power: Power, Discretion and Strategy.' In *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination*, edited by J. Law. London: Routledge.
- Law, John. 1992. 'Notes on the Theory of the Actor-Network: Ordering, Strategy and Heterogeneity.' *Systems Practice* 5:379-393.
- Law, John. 1999. 'After ANT: Complexity, Naming and Topology.' In *Actor Network Theory and After*, edited by J. Law and J. Hassard. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law, John. 2002. 'Objects and Spaces.' *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (5/6):91-105.
- Law, John. 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Law, John. 2009. 'Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics.' In *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, edited by B. S. Turner. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law, John, and Michel Callon. 1988. 'Engineering and Sociology in a Military Aircraft Project: A Network Analysis of Technological Change.' *Social Problems* 35(3):284-297.
- Law, John and A. Mol. 1995. 'Notes on Materiality and Sociality.' *The Sociological Review* 43:274-294.
- Law, John, and Vicky Singleton. 2014. 'ANT, Multiplicity and Policy.' *Critical Policy Studies* 8(4):379-396.
- Linenthal, Edward T. 2001. *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Luyt, B. 2008. 'Centres of Calculation and Unruly Colonists: The Colonial Library in Singapore and its Users, 1874-1900.' *Journal of Documentation* 64(3):386-396.
- Marontate, Jan. 2005. 'Museums and the Constitution of Culture.' In *The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Culture*, edited by M. D. Jacobs and N W. Hanrahan. Oxford: Blackwell.

- McAdam, Doug. 1988. *Freedom Summer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McDowell, S. and M. Braniff. 2014. *Commemoration as Conflict: Space, Memory and Identity in Peace Processes*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Middleton, David and Steven D. Brown. *The Social Psychology of Experience: Studies in Remembering and Forgetting*. London: Sage.
- Mihelj, Sabina. 2013. 'Between Official and Vernacular Memory.' In *Research Methods for Memory Studies*, edited by E. Keightley and M. Pickering. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Minn, Michael. 2016. 'American Long-Distance Locomobility and the Spaces of Actor-Network Theory.' *Social Sciences* 5(14):1-17.
- Misztal, Barbara. 2003. *Theories of Social Remembering*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Mitchell, Katharyne. 2003. 'Monuments, Memorials, and the Politics of Memory.' *Urban Geography* 24(5):442-459.
- Mol, Annemarie. 2003. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mopas, Michael. 2007. 'Examining the 'CSI Effect' Through an ANT Lens.' *Crime Media Culture* 3:110-117.
- Nalbantian, Suzanne. 2011. 'Introduction.' In *The Memory Process: Neuroscientific and Humanistic Perspectives*, edited by S. Nalbantian, P. M. Matthews, and J. L. McClelland. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Narvaez, Rafael F. 2013. *Embodied Collective Memory: The Making and Unmaking of Human Nature*. New York: University Press of America.
- Nets-Zehngut, Rafi and Daniel Bar-Tal. 2014. 'Transformation of the Official Memory of Conflict: A Tentative Model and the Israeli Memory of the 1948 Palestinian Exodus.' *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 27:67-91.
- Nimmo, Richie. 2011. 'Actor-Network Theory and Methodology: Social Research in a More-Than-Human World.' *Methodological Innovations Online* 6(3):108-119.
- Nora, Pierre. 1989. 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire.' *Representations* 26: 7-25.
- Novick, Peter. 1999. *The Holocaust in American Life*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Olick, Jeffrey. 2007. *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*. New York: Routledge.
- Olick, Jeffrey. 2008. 'From Collective Memory to the Sociology of Mnemonic Practices and Product.' In *Cultural Memory Studies: An Interdisciplinary Handbook*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Olick, Jeffrey. 2009. 'Between Chaos and Diversity: Is Social Memory Studies a Field?', in *The International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 22:249-252.
- Olick, Jeffrey and Joyce Robbins. 1998. 'Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices.' *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:105-40.
- Olick, Jeffrey, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi and Daniel Levy. 2011. 'Introduction.' In *The Collective Memory Reader*, edited by J. Olick, V. Vinitzky-Seroussi and D. Levy. Oxford University Press.
- Oudshoorn, Nelly, Margo Brouns and Ellen van Oost. 2005. 'Diversity and Distributed Agency in the Design and Use of Medical Vide-Communication Technologies.' In

- Inside the Politics of Technology: Agency and Normativity in the Co-Production of Technology and Society*, edited by H. Harbers. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Paez and Hou-Fu Liu. 2011. 'Collective Memory of Conflicts.' In *Intergroup Conflicts and Their Resolution*, edited by D. Bar-Tal. London: Psychology Press.
- Passoth, Jan-Hendrik, and Nicholas J. Rowland. 2010. 'Actor-network State: Integrating Actor-Network Theory and State Theory.' *International Sociology* 25(6):818-841.
- Perry, Mark. 2003. 'Distributed Cognition.' In *HCI Models, Theories, and Frameworks: Toward a Multidisciplinary Science*, edited by J. M. Carroll. Burlington: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Pickering, Michael and Emily Keightley. 2013. 'Introduction: Methodological Premises and Purposes.' In *Research Methods for Memory Studies*, edited by M. Pickering and E. Keightley. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pinch, Trevor and Wiebe Bijker. 1984. 'The Social Construction of Facts and Artefacts: Or How the Sociology of Science and Technology Might Benefit Each Other.' *Social Studies of Science* 14(3):399-441.
- Ponti, Marisa. 2011. 'Uncovering Causality in Narratives of Collaboration: Actor-Network Theory and Event Structure Analysis.' *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 13(1), Art. 11.
- Potts, Liza. 2009. 'Using Actor-Network Theory to Trace and Improve Multimodal Communication Design.' *Technical Communication Quarterly* 18(3):281-301.
- Pöyhönen, Samuli. 2014. 'Explanatory Power of Extended Cognition.' *Philosophical Psychology* 27(5):735-759.
- Prior, Lindsay. 2008. 'Repositioning Documents in Social Research.' *Sociology* 42(5):821-836.
- Raento, Pauliina and Cameron J. Watson. 2000. 'Gernika, Guernica, Guernica? Contested meanings of a Basque place.' *Political Geography* 19:707-736.
- Rigakos, George S. and Stephen R. Worth. 2011. 'Access to Information (ATI) as a Double-Edged Sword for Critical Policing Research.' *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 26(3):645-652.
- Robertson, Iain and Tim Hall. 2007. 'Memory, Identity and the Memorialization of Conflict in the Scottish Highlands.' In *Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity: New Perspectives on the Cultural Landscape*, edited by N. Moore and Y. Whelan. New York: Routledge.
- Ross, Norbert. 2004. *Culture and Cognition: Implications for Theory and Method*. London: Sage.
- Rowlands M. 2003. *Externalism: Putting Mind and World Back Together Again*. Chesham: Acumen.
- Rupert, Robert D. 2009. *Cognitive Systems and the Extended Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sayes, Edwin. 2014. 'Actor-Network Theory and Methodology: Just What Does it Mean to Say That Nonhumans Have Agency?.' *Social Studies of Science* 44(1):134-149.
- Schackel, Paul A. 2001. 'Public Memory and the Search for Power in American Historical Archaeology.' *American Anthropologist* 103(3):655-670.

- Schacter, D.L. and E. Tulving. 1994. 'What are the Memory Systems of 1994?' In *Memory Systems*, edited by D.L. Schacter and E. Tulving. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Schuman, Howard, and Amy Corning. 2014. 'Collective Memory and Autobiographical Memory: Similar but not the Same.' *Memory Studies* 7(2):146-160.
- Schwartz, Barry. 1997. 'Collective Memory and History: How Abraham Lincoln Became a Symbol of Racial Equality.' *The Sociological Quarterly* 38(3):469-496.
- Schwartz, Barry. 2000. *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schwartz, Barry. 2008. *Abraham Lincoln in the Post-Heroic Era: History and Memory in Late Twentieth Century America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shin, Dong-Hee, Choo, Hyunseung, and Khisu Beom. 2011. 'Socio-Technical Dynamics in the Development of Next Generation Mobile Network: Translation Beyond 3G.' *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 78:514-525.
- Singleton, Vicky, and Mike Michael. 1993. 'Actor-Networks and Ambivalence: General Practitioners in the UK Cervical Screening Programme.' *Social Studies of Science* 23(2):227-264.
- Smith, D. E. 1999. *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory, and Investigations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, D. E. 2005. *Institutional ethnography: A Sociology for People*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira.
- Sontag, S. 2003. *Regarding the Pain of Others*. New York: Picador.
- Soroka, Stuart, Erin Penner and Kelly Blidook. 2009. 'Constituency Influence in Parliament.' *The Canadian Journal of Political Science* 42(3):563-591.
- Sprevak, Mark. 2009. 'Extended Cognition and Functionalism.' *The Journal of Philosophy* 106(9):503-527.
- Strum, S.S. and Bruno Latour. 1987. 'Redefining the Social Link: From Baboons to Humans.' *Social Science Information* 26(4):783-802.
- Stone, Dan. 2013. *The Holocaust, Facism and Memory: Essays in the History of Ideas*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sugars, Cynthia and Eleanor Ty. 2014. *Canadian Literature and Cultural Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Surprenant, Aimee M. and Ian Neath. 2009. *Principles of Memory: Essays in Cognitive Psychology*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Sutton, John. 2008. 'Between Individual and Collective Memory: Coordination, Interaction, Distribution.' *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 75(1): 23-48.
- Sutton, John, Celia B. Harris, Paul G. Keil and Amanda J. Barnier. 2010. 'The Psychology of Memory, Extended Cognition, and Socially Distributed Remembering.' *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 9:521-560.
- Swarts, Jason. 2010. 'Recycled Writing: Assembling Actor Networks From Reusable Content.' *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 24(2):127-163.
- Szpunar, Piotr M. 2010. 'Monuments, Mundanity and Memory: Altering 'Place' and 'Space' at the National War Memorial (Canada).' *Memory Studies* 3(4):379-394.
- Terdiman, Richard. 1993. *Present Past: Modernity and the Memory Crisis*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Tilley, C. 1994. *Phenomenology of Landscape*. Berg: Oxford.
- Tota, Anna Lisa. 2005. 'Counter-Memories of Terrorism: The Public Inscription of a Dramatic Past.' In *The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Culture*, edited by M. D. Jacobs and N W. Hanrahan. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tulving, E. and D.M. Thomson. 1973. 'Encoding specificity and Retrieval Processes in Episodic Memory.' *Psychological Review* 80:352-373.
- Tulving, E. and F.I.M. Craik. 2000. *The Oxford Handbook of Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Usher, Robin, and Richard Edwards. 2007. *Lifelong Learning – Signs, Discourse, Practices*. New York: Springer.
- Van Dijck. 2007. *Mediated Memories in the Digital Age*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Van Wezemael, Joris, and Jan Silberberger. 2016. 'Emergent Places: Innovative Practices in Zurich, Switzerland.' In *Actor Networks of Planning: Exploring the Influence of Actor Network Theory*, edited by Y. Rydin and L. Tate. New York: Routledge.
- Walby, Kevin and Mike Larsen. 2011. 'Access to Information and Freedom of Information Requests: Neglected Means of Data Production in the Social Sciences.' *Qualitative Inquiry* 18(1):31-42.
- Walby, Kevin and Mike Larsen. 2012. 'Access to Information and Freedom of Information Requests: Neglected Means of Data Production in the Social Sciences.' *Qualitative Inquiry* 18(1):31-42.
- Weedon, Chris, and Glenn Jordan. 2011. 'Special Section on Collective Memory.' *Cultural Studies* 25(6):843-847.
- Weinstein, C. and R. Mayer, R. 1986. 'The Teaching of Learning Strategies.' In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, edited by M.C. Wittrock. New York: Macmillan.
- Weisweiler, John. 2016. 'Making Masters, Making Subjects: Imperial Ideology and Memory Policy in the Early Roman Empire and in the Later Roman State.' In *Cultural Memories in the Roman Empire*, edited by K. Galinsky and K. Lapatin. Los Angeles: Getty Publications.
- Weldon, Mary S. 2001. 'Remembering as a Social Process.' In *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, edited by D. L. Medin. London: Academic Press.
- Wertsch, James V. 2002. *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilke, Christiane. 2013. 'Remembering Complexity? Memorials for Nazi Victims in Berlin.' *The International Journal of Transitional Justice* 7:136-156.
- Willman, Skip. 2015. 'Reframing "Official Memory": Don DeLillo's *Libra* and the House Select Committee on Assassinations.' *Arizona Quarterly* 71(3):139-168.
- Williams-Jones, Bryn, and Janice E. Graham. 2003. 'Actor-Network Theory: A Tool to Support Ethical Analysis of Commercial Genetic Testing.' *New Genetics and Society* 22(3):271- 296.
- Wilson R.A. 1995. *Cartesian Psychology and Physical Minds: Individualism and the Sciences of the Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Robert A. 2005. 'Collective Memory, Group Minds, and the Extended Mind Thesis.' *Cognitive Processing* 6:227-236.

- Winter, Jay and Emmanuel Sivan. 1999. *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winter, T. 2007. 'Landscapes in the Living Memory: New Year Festivities at Angkor, Cambodia.' In *Heritage, Memory and the Politics of Identity: New Perspectives on the Cultural Landscape*, edited by N. Moore & Y. Whelan. New York: Routledge.
- Yalouri, E. 2001. *The Acropolis*. Berg: Oxford.
- Yaneva, Albena. 2012. *Mapping Controversies in Architecture*. Surrey: Ashgate.
- Yates, F. 1966. *The Art of Memory*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Young, James E. 1993. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Young, James E. 2007. 'Holocaust Memorials in America: Public Art as a Process.' In *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*, edited by H. F. Senie and S. Webster. Washington: Smithsonian Books.
- Zelizer, B. (1995) 'Reading the Past Against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies.' *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12:214–39.
- Zelizer, Barbie. 1998. *Remembering to Forget: Holocaust Memory Through the Camera's Eye*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zerubavel, E. 1997. *Social Mindscape: An Invitation to Cognitive Sociology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Data References:

- An Act to establish a National Holocaust Monument (S.C. 2011, c. 13). Retrieved from: http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/hoc/Bills/403/Private/C-442/C-442_4/C-442_4.PDF
- Bill C-442: An Act to establish a National Holocaust Monument. 2011. 1st Reading September 18, 2009, 40th Parliament, 2nd Session. Retrieved from the Parliament of Canada Website: http://www.parl.gc.ca/content/hoc/Bills/402/Private/C-442/C-442_1/C-442_1.PDF
- Butler, Don. 2014. 'Security concerns could prompt NCC to close National Holocaust Monument at night'. Ottawa Citizen, September 16, 2014.
- Butler, Don. 2015. 'Tendering problems cause one-year delay in National Holocaust Monument'. Ottawa Citizen. August 9, 2015.
- Canada. 1998. Parliament. A Study into the Future, Funding, and Independence of the Canadian War Museum. Report of the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology. Retrieved from: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/361/vete/rep/reportwarmay98y-e.htm>
- Canada. 2008a. Parliament. House of Commons. Debates. 39th Parliament, 2nd Session, 142(95): 5841-5881.
- Canada. 2008b. Parliament. House of Commons. Debates. 40th Parliament, 1st Session, 143(10):429-491.
- Canada. 2009a. Parliament. House of Commons. Debates. 40th Parliament, 2nd Session, 144(84):5181-5220.
- Canada. 2009b. Parliament. House of Commons. Debates. 40th Parliament, 2nd Session, 144(126):7749-7824.

- Canada. 2010a. Parliament. House of Commons. Debates. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, 145(113):6947-6998.
- Canada. 2010b. Parliament. House of Commons. Debates. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, 145(88):5399-5457.
- Canada. 2010c. Parliament. House of Commons. Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, No.17, May 13, 2010.
- Canada. 2010d. Parliament. House of Commons. Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, No.18, May 26, 2010.
- Canada. 2010e. Parliament. House of Commons. Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, No.21, June 3, 2010.
- Canada. 2010f. Parliament. House of Commons. Debates. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, 145(86):5251-5315.
- Canada. 2011a. Parliament. Senate. Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, No.23, March 23, 2011.
- Canada. 2011b. Parliament. Senate. Debates. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, 147(99): 2213-2245.
- Canada. 2011c. Parliament. Senate. Debates. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, 147(88): 1849-1858.
- Canada. 2011d. Parliament. Senate. Debates. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, 147(96): 2059-2110.
- Canada. 2011e. Parliament. Senate. Debates. 40th Parliament, 3rd Session, 147(85): 1778-1804.
- Canadian Heritage. 2014. *Archived – Design for National Holocaust Monument Announced*. Canada. Retrieved from <http://news.gc.ca/web/article-en.do?nid=847059>
- Canadian Heritage. 2015. *Upcoming Projects: Design Competition (National Holocaust Monument)*. Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.pch.gc.ca/eng/1396266083257>.
- Foreign Affairs Media Relations Office. 2013. *Ottawa Site Chosen for Canada's National Holocaust Monument*. Retrieved from <http://www.international.gc.ca/media/aff/news-communiques/2013/04/23b.aspx?lang=eng>
- Foreign Affairs Media Relations Office. 2014. *Canada Announces Members of National Holocaust Monument Development Council*. Retrieved from <http://www.international.gc.ca/media/aff/news-communiques/2012/04/02a.aspx?lang=eng>
- Lord Cultural Resources Inc. 2014. National Holocaust Monument: Landscape of Loss, Memory and Survival. Retrieved from: <http://www.lord.ca/NHM/NHM-project-submission.pdf>.
- Mills, Carys. 2014. 'National Holocaust Monument finalist unveiled', in *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://ottawacitizen.com/news/local-news/national-holocaust-monument-finalists-unveiled>
- Mohammed, A. (2012, Apr 03). 'Financial boost for holocaust memorial; federal government to match funds up to \$4M'. *The Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/docview/967567859?accountid=9894>

- National Holocaust Development Council (NHMDC). 2013. *National Holocaust Monument*. Retrieved from <http://holocaustmonument.ca/>
- NCC. 2006. *Canada's Capital Commemoration Strategic Plan*. Retrieved from http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2012/ccn-ncc/W93-31-2006-eng.pdf
- NCC. 2014. 'Holocaust Monument' A-2011-00058. Access to Information Document, requested from the National Capital Commission in February 2013.
- NCC. 2015. National Holocaust Monument: Federal Design Approval. Submission No. 2015-P55.1e.
- NCC. 2016. *Commemorations*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncc-ccn.gc.ca/property-management/what-we-manage/commemorations>
- Parliament of Canada. 2015. 'Compendium: Parliamentary Publications'. Retrieved from: http://www.parl.gc.ca/About/House/compendium/web-content/c_g_parliamentarypublications-e.htm
- Willis, S., Robert, C., F. Gasper, Y. Charette, S. Fisher and J. Hutchison. 2015. *National Holocaust Monument: Federal Design Approval*. NCC Submission No. 2015-P55.1e.