

Cultural Heritage and Mobility from a Multisensory Perspective

Edited by

**Magdalena Banasziewicz and Karolina
Nikielska-Sekuła**

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-71374-8 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-71380-9 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-71378-6 (ebk)

Chapter 5

A Multisensory Approach to Interpreting Difficult Heritage Sites – KL Plaszow in Krakow (Poland)

MAGDALENA BANASZKIEWICZ

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781032713786-6

This chapter was funded by the Jagiellonian University.



5 A Multisensory Approach to Interpreting Difficult Heritage Sites – KL Plaszow in Krakow (Poland)

Magdalena Banaszekiewicz

Introduction

This chapter explores the multisensory interpretation strategy employed in the exploration of the difficult heritage of the KL Plaszow in Krakow, Poland. KL Plaszow is a heritage site located within 20 minutes from the Old Town in Krakow. In 1942, the German Nazi Labour Camp was established on 12 ha of the land formerly occupied by two Jewish cemeteries. During the occupation, it was located on the borders of Krakow's built-up areas, but now it is situated in the middle of an urbanised area between residential neighbourhoods. Initially, the camp was intended for 4,000 prisoners, but the first group of prisoners – Jews from Krakow's ghetto, which was liquidated in March 1943 – numbered about 10,000 people. Plaszow served as a place to imprison Jews from various liquidated ghettos and camps while it functioned. From 1943, it served as an *Arbeitserziehungslager*, a “labour re-education camp” for the Poles – Krakow citizens and the victims of the pacification of villages near Krakow. In January 1944, the camp was transformed into a concentration camp (*Konzentrationslager Plaszow bei Krakau*). KL Plaszow was also a transit camp. In the summer of 1944, it held about 25,000 prisoners on 80 hectares. Soon after, the Germans started liquidating the camp – dismantling the infrastructure and evacuating prisoners. It is estimated that about 30,000 people were imprisoned there throughout the time when the camp was active. The number of victims of executions carried out within the camp is estimated at approximately 5,000. The ashes of the victims burned on pyres were spread over the camp area. After the evacuation in January 1945, the Red Army was stationed in the camp area and destroyed some of the former camp buildings that the Germans had left. Very little of the camp infrastructure remained. For decades, the site was largely unmarked, undergoing the process of urbanisation. It was partially transformed into a semi-wild recreation area and partially incorporated the city infrastructure – apartment buildings, a filling station, a supermarket, playgrounds and local businesses. Since the late 1940s, several signs and monuments have been erected on the site commemorating its history as a concentration camp. KL Plaszow became widely known as was depicted in Steven Spielberg's movie *Schindler's List* (1993). The film

DOI: 10.4324/9781032713786-6

This chapter has been made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

resulted in the KL Plaszow area being on some guided trips, but the place was not transformed into a museum or memory park, largely because the basic infrastructure was not sufficient for tourists. The camp's history was exhibited in Schindler's Factory, a branch of Krakow Historical Museum (now: the Museum of Krakow) located several kilometres from KL Plaszow.

It was not until 2006 that the Krakow municipality expressed the desire to commemorate the victims of the former camp, resulting in a competition for an architectural design for the future commemoration. In 2018, the initial concept was modified based on a scenario developed by a team of employees of the Krakow Museum. Following the assumptions of the updated project, the commemoration will include the post-camp area – as an authentic witness to the death and suffering of the victims – as well as two exhibition buildings: the Grey House (a historical building) and the newly built Memorial and Educational Centre. The process of organising an institutional commemoration revealed many tensions and contradictory perspectives of various stakeholders, including the residents. Particularly problematic turned out to be the issues of delineating the boundaries of the memorial site, considering the burial areas, the transformation of the spatial function into a recreational, service, and residential one, the architectural design of the Memorial and the Educational Centre, as well as the distribution of accents in the narrative of the exhibition scenario (Banaszkiewicz and Grzybowska, in press). As the photo below shows, some residents treat the site solely as a recreational space.

Theoretical Approach

The area of the former KL Plaszow camp is not only on the periphery of the Krakow tourist routes, but also is barely known and rarely visited by the citizens as heritage site. It is also paradigmatic for the category of non-sites of memory – the neologism created in reference to sites of memory introduced by Pierre Nora (1986) – physical or symbolic places where collective memory is crystallised. Nora argues that traditional forms of memory, such as family or local oral traditions, have lost their importance in modern societies. Instead, societies create and maintain memory through sites, objects and rituals that serve as repositories of shared historical significance.

Following Nora's concept, Roma Sendyka (2021) depicts non-sites of memory as places-witnesses of historical trauma whose commemoration is inconvenient for the collective identity of the locals, but which, despite the lack of information about their past, are not completely forgotten. This can also be seen in the physical aspect (they are undeveloped, unseeded and unmarked). They are "mnemotopographical objects, accumulating features of disturbed topographical relations and those to the past" transl. by the author (2021, 50). In such non-places, the ability to "read the space" is limited, as they lack a symbolic frame (plaque, monument, museum) that would programme and support responses to the place. This limitation, however, can become an asset



Figure 5.1 Residents sunbathing in the summer in the former Appel Square area
Source: Photo by the Author.

in the interpretation that transcends the gaze-centrism (Urry 1990) and engages a multisensory approach in the exploration of the place.

The site of the former KL Plaszow camp can also be described as a difficult heritage site (Logan and Reeves 2011, Wollentz 2020). Difficult heritage is a terrible gift, a burden of the past that the community does not want to bear but is under an obligation to preserve it for future generations (Owsianowska and Banaszekiewicz 2015). KL Plaszow's complex nature, literally combining the cultural with the natural, a hybrid of past and present, urbanity and abandoned land, is a perfect example of plural heritages that offer a counter-narrative to top-down practice (Whitehead, Schofield and Bozoğlu 2021). This site invites a different view of urbanity in the optics of deep city, understood as exploring cities to reflect upon cultural heritage and its usefulness to sustainable development (Fouseki, Guttormsen and Swensen 2021), as well as on the role of the senses in the process of experiencing the city and urbanity (Low and Kalekin-Fishman 2018).

The case study presented in this chapter lies at the intersection of critical heritage studies and mobility studies, understood on a macro scale as tourism studies and on a micro scale as mobile ethnographies. Heritage is not simply an object or a site, but it should be approached as a cultural process of creating meaning (Macdonald 2013, Smith 2006, Harrison 2012). Heritage is also created

in the context of tourism (Palmer and Tivers 2019). The reinterpretation of the senses of the past is particularly complicated when it comes to the consumption of death, disaster and atrocity, identified as dark tourism (Lennon and Foley 2000, Stone 2006, Ashworth 2017). Anthropology offers a specifically promising approach to the critical analysis of heritage thanks to its holistic and comparative framework, which brings the local and global together by recognising the interconnectedness of human, cultural and environmental. Anthropology's model of ethnographic research, between convention and creativity, universal and specific, within the framework of critical heritage studies is particularly notable in relation to tourism activities and the study of tourist attractions and products through the synergies of heritage sites with a tourist presence (Di Giovine 2009, Jelinčić and Senkić 2017, Salazar and Graburn 2014 Skinner and Jolliffe 2019, Bloch 2021). As with other academic disciplines, anthropology undergoes transformation at the levels of changing interrelationships, methodologies and epistemologies. One such change is the sensory and embodiment turn, which has been observed since the 1980s under the influence of phenomenology and critical reflection on the practice of anthropology itself through increased sensual and body awareness (Stoller 1989, Csordas 1990, Mascia-Lees 2011, Pink 2011). In this particular study, it is also worth highlighting the postulate characteristic of recent reflective and engaged anthropology, whereby not only the subject of research is an object to creative interpretation, but participant observation becomes participant collaboration (Rappaport 2008).

The performative turn has changed thinking about tourists experiencing space, but also about space itself as a construct not existing without a subject that defines it, as embodied performances create places by being in them, moving in them, feeling them, thinking through them (Bærenholdt, Haldrup and Urry 2017, Coleman and Crang 2004, Palmer and Andrews 2019). It is therefore clear that heritage is socially constructed, interpreted and experienced, meaning that a fundamental question is: "How is place actually sensed?" (Feld 2014, 179). Margan and Pitchard (2005, 41) point out that landscapes are not merely visionscapes, they are also touchscapes, soundscapes and smellscapes. The goal of this chapter is to explore the possibilities of using various senses to involve the audience more bodily in the process of interpreting a heritage that is semiotically difficult to access with the sense of sight alone. Following Seamon's (2016) reflections on "sensory placemaking", it was interesting to observe how the intentional use of a specific cultural landscape in the process of heritage interpretation creates a platform for emotional engagement.

Interpretation, as defined by Black and Weiler (2014, 18, 35), is an "engagement with tourists/visitors in ways that provoke them to think about and connect with natural and cultural heritage, including places, sites, people, artifacts, and natural and historical events, and that foster a sense of care and stewardship among tourists/visitors". Freeman Tilden's classic interpretive principles have not lost their relevance, even though they were formulated in a very different world without mass tourism, social media, and artificial

intelligence. Over the past years based on those principles, other researchers and practitioners, describing the phenomenon of heritage interpretation (Blockley and Hems 2013, Macdonald 2013, Delanty 2017), have developed proposals for rules, procedures and strategies in heritage interpretation (Carter 2001, Black and Weiler 2014, Chowdhary 2022, Mikos von Rohrscheidt, 2021). The basis of any interpretation is communicating in a relevant way accurate, fact-based information that both facilitates understanding and provokes thinking and meaning-making (Pond, 1993). Among the seven principles of interpretation applied to tour guiding, as discussed by Black and Weiler (2014, 56), there is a guideline originating from an article by Davidson and Black (2007), explicitly stating that interpretation should be designed to promote the use of two or more senses. The same authors emphasise that interpretation should cause people feel empathy or emotion (Davidson and Black 2007).

The seemingly obvious relationship between thinking and feeling, which involves perception and therefore access to information through the senses and intuition, implies the need to think more deeply about how visitors analyse information and make sense of it (Chowdhary 2022, 63). This chapter presents a project aimed at interpreting KL Plaszow based on the potential that such a multisensory connection between body and mind offers. Critical studies of heritage and tourism conducted in the performative paradigm emphasise the interactivity of all actors involved in the interpretation process. Pearce and Mohammadi (2021, 54–55) proposed the orchestra model of tourist experience, treating issues of the relationality of experience (tourist-tourist, tourist-local, tourist-companion, tourist-service provider) as a compartment inseparable from the others (behavioural, sensory, affective and cognitive). As Armin Mikos v. Rohrscheidt (2017, 212–217) points out, the use of multisensory elements in the interpretation of heritage is most characteristic of spaces with an intense presence of sensory stimuli other than vision (e.g. a spice bazaar and a perfume factory), he lists among the most common subtypes: a thematic culinary tour, an object tour (an object where, due to its functions or space, one sense dominates), a compensatory tour (for people with disabilities) and an all-sensory tour. By multisensory sightseeing, the researcher means (Mikos v. Rohrscheidt 2017, 212): “any such tour offering in which not only the participant’s experience of heritage, but the guide’s interpretation of it, is based on more than the two senses classically exploited for this (sight and hearing). ... Decisive for fulfilling the conditions of a multisensory tour is to give the experience of taste, smell and/or touch and the accompanying interpretation a key or at least an important role in the tour as a whole.” In his understanding, Rohrscheidt singles out the senses, which from a multisensory perspective is counter-productive. The performative-bodily turn in the study of tourism calls for a rethink of the visitor experience through attention to the senses as a whole and as a process. The intended multisensory walk did not aim to highlight specific senses that are marginalised during guided tours. Rather, its purpose was to provide an immersive

experience that centralises reflection on the bodily and sensory encounter of the surrounding space. As such, a shift in priorities transpires. Instead of sightseeing for the sake of getting acquainted with a location, the tour participants engage in a shared process of interpreting the embodied heritage, which ultimately constitutes the tour's *raison d'être*. It is not a passive tourist gaze (Urry 1990), but a tourist emplacement in which the body builds places (Casey 2010). Although the tour was conducted in a group, the guide aimed to facilitate self-reflection among the participants regarding their individual experiences of the place, via shared bodily practices. Following Chronis's (2015: 125) observation that "strategic use of the body is intervened with discursive techniques in the purposeful construction of a tourist place", it is important to emphasise the role of the guide who acts more than as a mediator of interpretation. On-site interpretation has the undoubted advantage of the flexibility of the medium of interpretation, given that the interpreter, thanks to the high interactivity of the situation, adapts the content and form of transmission to the momentary needs and interests of a given group of visitors (Ham and Weiler 2007, Mikos von Rohrscheidt 2021).

Methodology

The design of the walk was prepared together with two experienced guides with many years of experience as pilots and guides specialising in urban exploration. One of them is a geographer by training and a trainer for the World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations. Six multisensory walks (three in Polish and three in English) were conducted in different seasons of the year with different audiences (Krakow citizens from various districts, students and international researchers). Whether the visitor is a local, a visitor or a tourist, everyone experiences space through the senses. The socio-cultural difference stems less from the sheer physicality of the experience of the biological body than from the reflexivity of the meaning-making process (Mauss 1979). Although the diversity of the audience was not the main variable considered in the analysis, the study confirmed that the effectiveness of interpretive strategies largely depends on the tour participants themselves, which goes in line with the observations of various researchers (Witcomb 2015, Smith 2021).

The heterogeneity of the potential audience-co-creators places a special responsibility on the guide-interpreter. The debate over the heterogeneity of the tourists' needs, motivations, ways of experiencing the world and people, as well as the consequences of travel on physical, intellectual, emotional and spiritual levels, has for decades been conducted in an interdisciplinary way, balancing between the specifics of empirical studies and theoretical concepts based on circular arguments, ethics and heuristic devices). The project itself was not limited to the category of cultural tourists (McKercher 2002) or heritage tourists (Smith 2009), especially since the non-mobility of the Covid-19 pandemic period has forced heritage managers to think critically about diversifying their offerings to strengthen the presence of audiences drawn

from local communities. Therefore, the key issue in this project was not who visits the site, but how they visit. The project was intended to focus on engaging visitors in such a way that the senses became a tool for interpretation rather than an incidental context for it. Within this research strategy, the following interpretive goals were adopted:

- 1 to recognise the uniqueness of the site of the former KL Plaszow camp (cultural landscape, non-site of memory and difficult heritage)
- 2 to break out of the routine of sightseeing and self-reflection on corporeality and the senses
- 3 to create a community of heritage by personalising the bond about the past resulting from the emotional-cognitive engagement.

Significantly, interpreting heritage requires working with imaginaries and memories (the importance of media and prior personal experience). The visitors' experience of heritage is choreographed by the guide-interpreter using two basic tools: embodiment in space and narration. It is therefore a two-vector work: outward (with place markers, the guide's narrative and other participants) as well as inward (memory, knowledge and emotions). The preparation of the tour was a particularly important stage as it required the guide not only to use knowledge of the site but also to select such a repertoire of forms of visitor involvement as to shift the focus from acquiring knowledge of the site to the process of learning about the site.

The guide led a narrative combining two-time planes: the story of the past (about the camp, its functioning in the pre-war and wartime context and the subsequent history of the site) was intertwined with the story of the present (how the site functions today, who the inhabitants are, how the conflict over the



Figure 5.2 One of the goals of the project was to recognise the uniqueness of the non-site of memory

Source: Photo by the Author.

commemoration took place and what resulted from it). As with any tour, the guided route was divided into stages marked by moments of stopping at points relevant to the logic of the narrative. Although the nodal points for the narrative were places distinctive from a viewing perspective, a limited number of objects facilitated the semiotic deconstruction of meanings, making it possible to intentionally engage other senses than sight. Thus, it was assumed that a certain level of physical involvement and reflection resulting from a particular focus on body and sensory work individualises the experience through intense emotions, including those that may cause cognitive dissonance and discomfort.

Visitors were able to experience a range of emotions relating to the negative message about the horrors of the past, but also the very situation of embodied experience that involves stepping outside the tourist comfort zone, for example, confusion and insecurity (by being asked to act differently than simply listening to a guide and taking photos, or by necessity to co-operate with other participants). The guide was prepared to support participants in the process of naming their emotions. They were also discussed during the evaluation carried out at the end of the tour. The participatory observation of the whole process was directed towards describing the joint performance of the guide and the visitors. The final research question that accompanied the project was to verify whether breaking out of the touring routine by engaging in the interpretation process itself shifts the onus onto the visitors themselves, and whether the visitors became aware of their role as active agents in the interpretation process.

Findings

Urban Palimpsest

The beginning of the tour. We stand on the invisible border between the memorial and the city. Below us, the housing estate is bustling with life: cars drive by, mothers with prams walk along the pavement, and children from the nearby kindergarten have gone for a walk. At the Grey House, which is the only surviving building of the former camp, renovation work is underway to prepare it for its future function as an exhibition – the noise of the excavator stands out from the background of the traffic on the arterial street below, behind the blocks. From a distance comes the noise of a passing plane – a flight corridor from Balice Airport passes overhead.

The group looks disoriented, and the guide invites them to undertake the first task: reflecting on what they see and hear. Visitors can see the city, they can hear the city, but where is the camp? The group must walk further along the blocks of flats and the narrow street to spot two information boards marking the entrance to the former camp behind trees and bushes, dominated by giant nettles. A photo of the prisoners about to pass through the barrier – in the same place as the group only 80 years earlier and in a completely different context. Where the camp barracks used to be, there are now scrub and trees, blocks of flats and ordinary everyday life behind them.

The further up, the greener it gets, the path is natural, muddy in autumn, and dusty in summer. The further we go into the former camp, the more the presence of the city fades, the quieter it becomes, the more we can hear the buzzing of the bees, the smell of the grass, and the more the sun makes us feel lazy. The guide asks the visitors to focus again on their impressions of the surroundings. They are completely different from down below – we are surrounded by nature, bringing peace, encouraging us to relax and enjoy the beauty of the surrounding greenery. We can see individual people who come here just for that: walking their dogs, small children, cycling. For them, the memorial is a place of recreation.

(Co)mmemorating

A non-site of memory is seemingly invisible. Not only unremembered, but unmemorable. Nevertheless, one can try to find clues in the space, suggesting the existence of something more than just a park. Visitors are asked to look for traces of the past and to consider where the boundary of the camp might have been. The boundaries are both visible and symbolic. When the guide shows on the side wall of the exhibition board that the administrative part of the camp is the area of today's residential buildings, everyone is puzzled. Questions are raised about why this area was not commemorated earlier, who allowed people to live here and what they think of the fact that the site will now be part of a museum.

The process of creating the KL Plaszow Museum and Memory Site is underway, the first work being to tidy up the space can be seen, but there is still time to talk about the forms of commemoration – the memorials, the demarcation of the camp's boundaries, its accessibility as a green area. Participants are asked to personally mark the boundary of the camp with a line made of sand and ochre as Figure 5.3 illustrates. Not everyone wants to do



Figure 5.3 Marking the border by four participants
Source: Photo by the Author.

this (some argue that they do not want to get dirty), some act independently, some agree among themselves on how to carry out this intervention. The guide does not interfere, he leaves the group free to do as they wish. He then asks about impressions, so statements are made that the border should have a natural form, taking advantage of the possibilities offered by nature, that it could be an idea to ask everyone who will be visiting to do this; comparisons are made with other museums, where, for example, there is a visitors' book where comments and messages can be left.

However, a reluctance to do this type of activity becomes apparent among some, perhaps because in a group or on command. When, in the former Jewish cemetery, the remains of which are preserved within the camp's boundaries, the guide asks visitors to place a pebble on one of the slabs, everyone participates. So perhaps it is about the need for an individual relationship. The search for a place to place the pebble is done in silence, faces are focused, and everyone circles for a while before choosing their spot. Everyone chooses a different place for different reasons, which is revealed in the reflection the guide encourages when the group comes back together. The visitors give the impression of being intrigued by the tasks the guide has prepared for them. After each one they share their thoughts, but also ask questions, and comment among themselves on what is happening. More interpersonal interaction is evident, gradually emerging in more freedom for individual tour members to be with each other as a group. Each group builds up its own unique identity during the tour, which is usually ephemeral and is lost when the tour ends. However, individual memory is born in relationship with others and commemoration is a social activity. Therefore, experiencing a tour in a group is building memories that each visitor will carry with them further, but at the same time it will already be a memory that is shared.

Presence of the Past

How do we recall the past in order to make it more tangible? After all, it is impossible to physically experience the suffering, hunger and cold of the prisoners. The guide gathers the group at the edge of a green that looks like a meadow. It is trimmed, intensely green and occupies a large area, but is clearly cut off in a square shape from the rest of its surroundings. It is a former parade ground. However, the group only learns about this after hearing a song in German. The melody comes from the guide's phone, clearly out of context and heard as an old "crackling" recording. The visitors guess that it is a lullaby, one of the group members who comes from Germany explains the lyrics of the song – about a toy horse that a child asks his mother for. The guide tells how this song was played from the camp loudspeakers to carry out the most tragic action in the camp's history: the deportation of children to Auschwitz.

The sight of the former roll-call square now sends shivers down the spine – there, somewhere, on the other side of it, stood wagons with crying children, with the helpless parent left here and observing. Those who share the

experience of parenting look the most shocked. Silence reigns: the group stands in silence for a while, everyone trying to shake off a nightmare in which they did not participate, but which has now become part of their memory. We move on, and only a few people notice young women in bikinis lying on a blanket in the distance. Do they know what happened in the place where they are now sunbathing while enjoying a beautiful summer day? Should the past be evoked to make it more tangible?

In a place like the former site of the Plaszow Concentration Camp, it is possible to create a powerful and disturbing experience of the past due to the lack of a concrete material representation that would define this vision in itself. However, it would probably never occur to anyone to try to create a similar sensory walk in Auschwitz, whose semiotic literalism is incomparable. Evoking the past, especially a traumatic one, is work that requires a high ethical sensitivity, and an ability to build emotions that may lead to catharsis, but which do not cross the line into emotional manipulation and kitsch.

Self-interpretation

The walk to the last point takes several minutes due to the topography of the terrain, but also because of the narration of the guide, who continues the story of life in the camp. As the guide narrates, he climbs along the path towards the highest point – a hill that cuts the town in two. The top of the hill is dominated by a monumental statue presenting human figures several metres tall with their heads bowed down, their arms along their torso and a hollow scar in place of a chest. Before the guide talks about it and other smaller monuments located nearby, there is a moment for free exploration. Participants are encouraged to walk through the area, individually or in pairs, and look for a spot from which they would like to take a photograph – the kind of photo that will have some special meaning for them. The group is provided with a camera that develops instant prints, as the idea is to take one photo and for it to reflect the relationship with the space. It is also a return to a ritual, lost in the age of digital photos taken with phones. On a psychological level, this task is intended to help bring the group out of the difficult emotions they have just been processing. The physical separation of the group members provides a moment of respite, and decision-making. Then comes the taking of the photo itself, which is intriguing for people who have never had this type of camera in their hands, distancing them from the past by focusing on the activity of the here and now.

Once everyone has taken a photo, the group gathers around the guide. First, everyone is asked to show their photo and talk about the motivation for choosing this particular frame. This opens up a more general reflection on the tourist's gaze and the relationship between the individual and group experience of visiting and interpreting heritage sites. The group feels comfortable enough with each other that some openly talk about the difficult emotions they experienced during the tour, which they say is related to their personal biographical and identity baggage. There is also praise for the guide,



Figure 5.4 Creating a personalised photographic souvenir
Source: Photo by the Author.

underlining that the tour had a unique character, not only because of the different forms of involving the senses, which are not usually a tool included in the strategy of interpreting a heritage site but also because of the very interaction with a knowledgeable and questionable person who makes the place comprehensible, which would be impossible with individual exploration. The free conversation at the end is a planned, but natural close to the tour. Conversations about the tour itself, as well as about the future of the place, accompany the group until the group says goodbye and disperses. Despite the feeling of togetherness, there is no proposal for a joint group photograph, everyone looks tired, both physically and mentally.

Discussion

As the conducted research project proves, the experience of place is corporeal, which can be reflected upon by visitors. Although the body experiences the outside world with all its senses, their interrelationships and intensity tend to remain outside the realm of consciousness, which only reinforces the need to understand how places are actually sensed (Feld 2014). The project showed that sensory attentiveness can be learned, but that it requires focus and time to experience. Therefore, slow walking played an extremely important role in this tour. Walking

being a form of meditation on the place enabled a relationship with the space to be created through the practice of mindfulness, which can be described as deep site exploration (Fouseki, Guttormsen and Swensen 2021).

The site of the former Plaszow Concentration Camp proves that less can mean more. In a world saturated with visual stimuli, the opportunity to immerse oneself in a space that does not offer ready-made, elaborate narrative scripts (in the form of badges, descriptions, photographs and audio guides) reminds us of the importance of human relationships in experiencing the world. The relationship between visitors and the guide, who, like a therapist, encourages and guides them to discover the non-obvious and difficult, must be based on mutual trust and cooperation. Above all, however, it should result from the guide's self-awareness and preparation for such a role, focusing not so much on describing the surrounding reality as on supporting visitors in their attempt to understand it. This is not possible in the dynamics of a standardised sightseeing offer, where the use of interpretation techniques is supposed to reinforce the persuasive aspect of the guide's narrative message. In deep site exploration, the relationship is a two-way exchange, the guide does not impose but proposes, while the group co-creates by engaging, taking an active role in moderating the tour. Thus, the subjective, individualised effects provide a filter for the interpretation of heritage, which becomes shared and co-created by the visitors and the guide.

The project also raised the fundamental question of the need and form of commemorating the past. Places are disturbing when it comes to understanding them, the sensory-oriented bodily experience of a place reveals the complexity of the challenge of commemorating a difficult past in a petrified, institutionalised form. Since everyone feels the space differently, experiencing conflicting emotions and uncertainty towards one interpretation, mononarrativity appears as a violent power of Authorised Heritage Discourse (Smith 2006). If the primary function of creating institutionalised commemoration is to convey the truth about the past and to educate, this must be done with a consideration of how the past is actualised in the current experience (why a difficult past should still be remembered). Every heritage site is visited by different people (Smith 2021), but, despite the cultural and individual differences of the visitors, a level of universal interpretation is needed in order to create a bond between the visitor and the past. The project presented here was a kind of experiment to reveal whether it is possible to work with the dissonance of heritage by focusing on that dissonance itself and the process of creating it. In other words, assuming that every act of experiencing heritage presupposes meaning-making, in this case there was a use of making to understand meaning.

The multisensory experience of visiting and interpreting difficult heritage, understood in this way, has many limitations. The first is the site itself – the area of the former Plaszow Camp is undergoing a process of change, which will translate into forms of exploration. The very strategy of heritage interpretation based on multisensoriality is impossible to transfer *per analogiam* to other spaces. Finally, the proposed multisensory walk around the site of the former KL Plaszow camp seems to be a niche offer that will not be attractive to every tourist. Nevertheless,

adapting a multisensory heritage interpretation strategy as a tool for greater mindfulness, attentiveness and for strengthening (self-)critical reflection presents promising results. Thus, senses can be used to give a new sense of heritage.

The author would like to thank Tomasz Klimek, Agnieszka Kuźma, Monika Prylińska, Magda Rubinfeld Koralewska and project participants for inspiration, valuable comments and involvement.

References

- Ashworth, G.J. 2017. *Senses of Place: Senses of Time*. New York: Routledge.
- Banaszkiewicz, M. and K. Grzybowska. In press. Reconceptualising Counter-Heritage: Dynamics of Emancipation at KL Plaszow Memorial Museum in Poland, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*.
- Bærenholdt, J.O., M. Haldrup and J. Urry. 2017. *Performing Tourist Places*. London: Routledge.
- Black, R. and B. Weiler. 2014. *Tour Guiding Research: Insights, Issues and Implications*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Bloch, N. 2021. *Encounters Across Difference*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Blockley, M. and A. Hems. 2013. *Heritage Interpretation*. London: Routledge.
- Casey, E. 2010. *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-world*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Chowdhary, N. 2022. *Interpretation and Tour Leadership*. Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers Ltd.
- Chronis, A. 2006. Heritage of the senses. *Tourist Studies*, 6 (3): 267–296. doi:10.1177/1468797607076674.
- Chronis, A. 2015. Moving bodies and the staging of the tourist experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 55: 124–140. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2015.09.008.
- Coleman, S. and M. Crang. 2004. *Tourism: Between Place and Performance*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Courage, C., T. Borrup, M.-R. Jackson, K. Legge, A. Mckeown, L. Platt, and J. Schupbach. 2021. *The Routledge Handbook of Placemaking*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Crang, M. and P.S. Travlou. 2001. The city and topologies of memory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 19 (2): 161–177. doi:10.1068/d201t.
- Csordas, T.J. 1990. Embodiment as a paradigm for anthropology. *Ethos*, 18 (1): 5–47. doi:10.1525/eth.1990.18.1.02a00010.
- Davidson, P. and R. Black. 2007. Voices from the profession: Principles of successful guided cave interpretation. *Journal of Interpretation Research*, 12 (2): 25–43. doi:10.1177/109258720701200203.
- Davies, J., D. Spencer and P. Firm. 2010. *Emotions in the Field: The Psychology and Anthropology of Fieldwork Experience*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Delanty, G. 2017. *The European Heritage. A Critical Re-interpretation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Di Giovine, M.A. 2009. *The Heritage-scape: UNESCO, World Heritage, and Tourism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Feld, S. 2014. Places sensed, senses placed. In *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader*, edited by D. Howes. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Fouseki, K., T.S. Guttormsen and G. Swensen (eds). 2021. *Heritage and Sustainable Urban Transformations: Deep Cities*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ham, S. and B. Weiler. 2007. Isolating the role of on-site interpretation in a satisfying experience. *Journal of Interpretation Research*, 12 (2): 5–24.

- Harrison, R. 2012. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Jelinčić, D.A. and M. Senkić. 2017. Creating a heritage tourism experience. The power of the senses. *Etnološka Tribina*, 47 (40): 109–126. doi:10.15378/1848-9540.2017.40.03.
- Jensen, M.T. 2016. Hypersensitive tourists: The dark sides of the sensuous. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 57: 239–242. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2016.01.002.
- Larsen, J. and J. Urry. 2011. *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage Publications UK.
- Lennon, J. and M. Foley. 2010. *Dark Tourism the Attraction of Death and Disaster*. London: Continuum.
- Logan, W.S. and K. Reeves. 2011. *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with "Difficult Heritage"*. London: Routledge.
- Low, K.E.Y. and D. Kalekin-Fishman. 2018. *Senses in Cities: Experiences of Urban Settings*. New York: Routledge.
- Ludwig, T. 2015. *The Interpretive Guide: Sharing Heritage with People*. Werleshausen: Bildungswerk interpretation.
- Macdonald, S. 2013. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London: Routledge.
- Mascia-Lees, F.E. 2011. *A Companion to the Anthropology of the Body and Embodiment*. Somerset: Wiley.
- Mauss, M. 1979. *Sociology and Psychology: Essays*. London: Routledge.
- McKercher, B. 2002. Towards a classification of cultural tourists. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4 (1): 29–38. doi:10.1002/jtr.346.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 2011. *Phenomenology of Perception: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Mikos von Rohrscheidt, A. 2017. *Współczesne przewodnictwo miejskie*. Poznań: Prok-senia and Kultour.pl.
- Mikos von Rohrscheidt, A. 2021. *Interpretacja dziedzictwa w turystyce kulturowej: konteksty, podmioty, zarządzanie*. Poznań: Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Poznańskie Centrum Dziedzictwa.
- Owsianowska, S. and M. Banaszekiewicz. 2015. Trudne dziedzictwo a turystyka. O dysonansie dziedzictwa kulturowego. *Turystyka Kulturowa*, 11 (0): 6–24. <http://turystykakulturowa.org/ojs/index.php/tk/article/view/662/610>.
- Palmer, C. and H. Andrews. 2019. *Tourism and Embodiment*. London: Routledge.
- Palmer, C. and J. Tivers. 2019. *Creating Heritage for Tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Pearce, P. P. and Z. Mohammadi. 2021. Building the orchestra model of tourist experience, integration and examples. In *Routledge Handbook of the Tourist Experience*, edited by R. Sharpley, 50–63. London: Routledge.
- Pink, S. 2011. Multimodality, multisensoriality and ethnographic knowing: Social semiotics and the phenomenology of perception. *Qualitative Research*, 11 (3): 261–276. doi:10.1177/1468794111399835.
- Pond, K. 1993. *The Professional Guide: Dynamics of Tour Guiding*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Rappaport, J. 2008. Beyond participant observation: Collaborative ethnography as theoretical innovation. *Collaborative Anthropologies*, 1 (1): 1–31. doi:10.1353/cla.0.0014.
- Salazar, N. B., & Graburn, N. H. H. (Eds.). (2014). *Tourism imaginaries: Anthropological approaches*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Seamon, D. 2016. *A Geography of the Lifeworld: Movement, Rest and Encounter*. London: Routledge.
- Sendyka, R. 2021. *Poza obozem: nie-miejsca pamięci – próba rozpoznania*. Warszawa: Instytut Badań Literackich.

- Sharpley, R. and P.R. Stone. 2011. *Tourist Experience: Contemporary Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Sigala, M. and E. Steriopoulos. 2021. Does emotional engagement matter in dark tourism? Implications drawn from a reflective approach. *Journal of Heritage Tourism* 16 (4): 412–432. doi:10.1080/1743873X.2020.1851697.
- Skinner, J. and L. Jolliffe. 2019. *Murals and Tourism: Heritage, Politics and Identity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, L. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, M.K. 2009. *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, L. 2021. *Emotional Heritage Visitor Engagement at Museums and Heritage Sites*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Speier, A. 2019. Yoga as an embodied journey towards flexibility, openness and balance. In *Tourism and Embodiment*, edited by H. Andrews, 220–259. London: Routledge.
- Stoller, P. 1989. *The Taste of Ethnographic Things. The Senses in Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Stone, P. 2006. A dark tourism spectrum: Towards a typology of death and macabre related tourist sites, attractions and exhibitions, *TOURISM: An Interdisciplinary International Journal* 54 (2): 145–160.
- Tilden, F. and B. Craig. 2008. *Interpreting Our Heritage*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Tuan, Y.-F. 1977. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Urry, J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Velasco, C. and M. Obrist. 2020. *Multisensory Experiences: Where the Senses Meet Technology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Waterton, E. and S. Watson. 2015. *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weiler, B. and S.H. Ham. 2001. Tour guides and interpretation in ecotourism. In *The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism*, 549–563. Wallingford: CABI.
- Whitehead, C., T. Schofield and G. Bozoğlu. 2021. *Plural Heritages and Community Co-production*. London: Routledge.
- Wierciński, H. 2023. *Ruchome etnografie. Praktyki, przestrzenie, ciała*. Oficyna Naukowa.
- Witcomb, A. 2015. *Reimagining the Museum: Beyond the Mausoleum*. London: Routledge.
- Wollentz, G. 2020. *Landscapes of Difficult Heritage*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.