

Word 'glorification' is overused

(Re: Vimy anniversary put purpose of Cenotaph into perspective, May 18)

I take issue with this current use of the term 'glorification'. It suggests that while remembering those who have made the ultimate sacrifice is okay we must dissociate ourselves from the trappings of war as if to say, 'we're not like that anymore.'

My wife and I were at Vimy last month (after the big show when it was quieter and much colder).

Three of the eleven thousand names of those with no known grave were related to me.

True, there are no weapons on display, but the grimness of war is there.

On Hill 145.

It is in the trenches, the shell holes, the tunnels and the small signs warning of unexploded ammunition.

It is a sobering monument to sacrifice erected on blood-soaked ground.

As you say, in Aurora we have a Cenotaph where we can remember the fallen. The LAV monument simply reflects the sacrifice made by young Canadians in a different place and time.

Aside from the fact that the LAV was mainly used to offer our troops protection, we should be reminded that the point isn't to glorify the vehicle, but rather to remember those that were sent into harm's way to use it.

Lest We Forget.

Barry Hall

Received Online