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Introduction
An increasing amount of scholarly literature argues that contemporary memorialization is an indicator of the declining affect of national history. This involves two interrelated processes: a growing incredulity towards traditional memorial genres associated with modern warfare (Schwartz and Bayma, 1999; Werbner, 2009; Zuber, 2006) and the rise of ‘dark’ tourism at sites of death and tragedy that reduce history to spectacle (Lennon and Foley, 2007; Sather-Wagstaff, 2008; Strange and Kempa, 2003; Sturken, 2007). Analyzing the history of memorialization on the WWI Gallipoli battlefields, this article outlines an alternative memorial type that facilitates a reenchantment of national history by remembering the past in ways that directly recognises the ‘other’. Heavily evident in the late twentieth century memorials constructed on the site by the Turkish government, I refer to this as dialogical memorialization, adopting Bakhtin’s conceptualization (1981; 1984) of the referential and provisional nature of discourse, that “language is half someone else’s” (Bakhtin, 1981:293).

Working from a cultural sociological paradigm (Alexander and Smith 2010) it is argued that such tourism should be conceptualized in relation to its role within the contemporary public sphere. Where the sociology of tourism has focussed on the social consequences of tourism on the host culture, the cultural conception of the public sphere utilised below also considers the cumulative affect of discrete experiences of place on the guests’ society and the role of tourism in providing aesthetic and discursive frames for comprehending social life. In this regard there are a number of synergies with the proposed cultural paradigm and the postmodern turn in tourist studies that has seen an increasing empirical focus on heterogeneous tourist forms and ‘tourism like’ experiences (Franklin and Crang, 2001). However, in seeing tourism as a cultural entity which acts in ‘relative autonomy’ (Alexander, 2003) from material forces, the public sphere perspective provides a greater appreciation of human agency and contingency in social life (Turner, 1974) than appreciated by the idea of tourism being a mirror or a mere metaphor of postmodern society (Urry 1995; 2007). In positivistic terms I argue that tourism exists as a type of independent variable able to influence social change, a conception that avoids deterministic assumptions about the severing of ties with modernist belief systems and institutions (Alexander, 2007; Calhoun, 2002).

Dreams of Pilgrimage
The paper conceptualises the public sphere essentially as an arena between the bureaucracy of government and the private world of individuals, where the politics of identity are performed, negotiated and rethought, resulting in institutional political change. Where Habermas (1989) largely conceived of the public sphere as a historical entity driven by communicative rationality, I draw on recent cultural scholarship that has theorized it in more universal terms as a zone where the central value system of a society is emotionally debated and ritually contested (Jacobs, 2007; Jones, 2007; McGuigan, 2005). From this perspective memorialization at Gallipoli can be understood as an attempt at initiating societal engagement with national history at a time when such attachments to the past are fading (cf. Halbwachs, 1950:78). Halbwachs refers to this process as collective memory, which is “a reconstruction of the past [that] adapts the image of ancient facts to the beliefs and spiritual needs of the present”(1941:7). The relevant empirical focus for such an analysis is not limited to
the time period when dialogical memorialization is undertaken but also the events and discourses of the past that it recalls and reimagines. Particularly relevant to dialogical memorialization and tourism at Gallipoli are the historical ties between international travel, tourism and WWI (Fussell, 1975).

Where WWI in many ways was characterised by the new rational logics of modernity (Giddens, 1981:224), sacrifice was legitimised less instrumentally through the guise of patriotic duty (Hobsbawm, 1983:8). Part of the idea of warfare being seen as an ennobling pursuit was the engagement the ‘generation of 1914’ had with adventure, fleeing and great departures. At the start of the twentieth century, the myth of Odyssey and other travel literature was widely read as part of a popular fascination with new forms of transportation such as the steam ship, technology that would make it possible to reach the exotic lands one had read about (Wohl, 1979:226-227). The relevance of such interests for the remembering of WWI is illustrated by the Australian historian Richard White who from examining the diaries of soldiers has argued that counter to prevailing theories on war and nationalism, a tourist ethos was an essential component of Australian soldiers’ motivation for enlisting and their experience on the battlefield (White, 1990; 1991).

Travel discourses were also central to memorialization during the Gallipoli campaign and in the immediate aftermath of the war, as the WWI policy on non-repatriation meant that only in a future of global mobility could pilgrimage be undertaken to the battlefields. Anzacs (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps) soldiers surrounded by bloodshed were comforted with the belief that if they died national pilgrims in the future would come to pay homage. This sentiment is evident in the Anzac Book, a collection of writing and drawings by Australian soldiers at Gallipoli in the weeks before the evacuation (Bean, 1916). For example, the soldier Hector Dinning wrote:

The day is far off (but it will come) when splendid mausolea will be raised over these heroic dead. And one foresees the time when steamers will bear up the Aegean pilgrims come to honour at the resting places of friends and kindred, and to move over the charred battlefields of Turkey (Bean, 1916:21).

The Turkish War of Independence and then WWII would prevent the pilgrimages that Australian soldiers envisioned. As such the influence of travel discourses in the commemoration of the war have been limited. Instead the focus has been on memorials at home. In Australia these Anzac memorials have privileged a parochial and isolationist form of nationalism, framing individual grief and loss in terms of national sacrifice (Inglis 1987, 1999; Winter, 1995). Under these circumstances Anzac mythology came to reinforce dominant Australian ideologies about frontier masculinity (Lake, 1992; Connell, 1995) and Eurocentric conceptions of citizenship (Castles et al., 1988; Curthoys, 1999). Representative of such accounts Buchanan and James (1998) argue that the myth of Gallipoli is essentially conservative, masking “such issues as rape in war, the betrayal of our war-time ally East Timor, and the wars of ‘settlement’ on our soil when colonisation of the Aboriginal peoples of this country allowed for the original ‘forging of a nation’” (1998:26). The problem with such a conception of nationalism is that it does not appreciate the possibility of ritual and collective memory reimagining national history in more cosmopolitan ways (West 2008a; 2008b). Pilgrimage and tourism are key historical forces in this process.
Where pilgrimage to Gallipoli en masse would not eventuate until the 1990s, the notion of pilgrimage was influential in the Allied memorialization of the battlefields at the end of WWI, the template upon which later dialogical forms would be built. The Anzac memorials on the battlefield have a similar design to many of the WWI memorials in Australia, for example being prominently marked by the Christian cross and the widely used remembrance expression Lest We Forget. The cemeteries though make the battlefield a different memorial context, providing a greater scope for the soldiers to be understood as individuals. Charles Bean, Australia’s official war correspondent and later official national historian of WWI, was particularly influential in the planning of the cemeteries at Gallipoli, having travelled to Gallipoli in 1919 leading a team of Australians to report on the state of the graves and make recommendations concerning the establishment of memorials (Bean, 1952:12). In Bean’s official report ‘On Graves at Gallipoli and the Future of Anzac’, cabled to the Australian Department of Defence on 13th March 1919, the first recommendation was that Anzac graves should not be located in a central cemetery but remain in their present locations, marking the battles of the campaign (Bean, 1952:385). As Bean notes, the whole Gallipoli area would become:

… one big graveyard, which would probably be visited by thousands of Australians and others yearly, and the dead, merely by being buried where they fell, or where their comrades had carried them, would commemorate their achievements ...

The Allied graves are marked by low rectangular slightly curved plaque measuring 2 feet, 8 inches in height. Every headstone contains the emblem of the soldier’s religion. While this is typically a cross, they differ to those erected in France by the United States where the headstone itself constitutes a cross. Aside from accounting for imperial religious diversity, it was decided that the rectangle headstones better represented the view that the Commonwealth soldier’s principal identity was not religious but rather national, and one of Empire (Inglis, 1998:255). In addition the graves were marked with the soldier’s rank, name, age at death, battalion or unit, badge of service, date of death and an inscription from the soldier's relatives. The family inscriptions are varied, defying any unified message, spanning nationalist, imperialist, personal and religious sentiments. Some samples of these inscriptions are provided below:

- Died the way he wished, To die for his country
- He died for righteousness and Empire, But as a soldier
- Death divides but memories cling
- He followed in his saviour's steps - nobly he lived, bravely he died

Where Bean had reported from the battlefield during the campaign, being a central figure in the initial mythologising of the heroic qualities of the Anzac soldier at Gallipoli, upon his return he began to appreciate what occurred on the other side of the trenches. Being able to roam and view the Australian trenches from the Turkish position gave him “a strange thrill” (Bean, 1952:50). Bean’s unexpected meeting with a Turkish military official, Major Zeki Bey of the Ottoman General Staff, though provided him with insight regarding the cultural basis for a future of mass pilgrimage by Australians to the battlefields (Bean, 1952: 327). Bean writes “I had never dreamt
of being able to obtain information of the Turkish side from an authority with such experience” (Bean 1952:126). Zeki Bey told Bean about Turkish military logistics but also of the heroism and honour of Turkish soldiers during the campaign. Particularly prominent were the legendary stories he heard about Mustafa Kemal at Gallipoli, later to be known as Ataturk, the founding President and ‘father’ of modern Turkey (Bean, 1952:224). These accounts encouraged Bean’s sympathetic portrayal of Turkish foes in the *Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-18* (Bean, 1924), a discourse which helped to address public concern and fear about the Turkish treatment of Allied graves in the two decades following WWI (Ziino, 2006) and in later years allowed Turkey to be ambiguously absent from Australia’s remembrance consciousness, as either enemy or friend (Fewster et al., 1985).

The paper will now shift its focus to Turkish memorialization of the Gallipoli battlefields in the late twentieth century. Like all memorials these are sociologically important as they induce space with human meaning, contextualising collective understanding (Smith, 1999). However these do this in a significantly new way by directly recognising the ‘other’, which as noted above is a memorial form I refer to as being dialogical in nature. According to Bakhtin (1981; 1986) the dialogic refers to the circumstances whereby “every word is directed toward an answer and cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that it anticipates…” (Bakhtin, 1981: 280). As he notes in *The Problem of Speech Genres*, discourse anticipates and attempts to act in accordance with an expected response: “I parry objections that I foresee, I make all kinds of provisos” (Bakhtin 1986:95). In dramaturgical terms (Goffman, 1959) dialogical memorialization fundamentally alters the stage on which history is narrated and performed (Alexander, 2004). The social and political consequences of this in the case of Gallipoli are detailed below. They draw on my participant observation of over twenty Gallipoli battlefield tours between 1998 and 2005, examination of memorial design at the site, interviews with local tour guides and analysis of historical accounts of the campaign.

**Dialogical memorialization, the state and tourism at Gallipoli**

Where tourism is increasingly seen as replacing the role of nation-states in sanctioning remembrance, in the Gallipoli case we can identify a new nexus between tourism, history and the State. Rather than tourism on the battlefields emerging solely as a consequence of general increases in global mobility, its existence is intimately connected to nation-state memorialisation, commemoration and international diplomacy. The origins of the tradition are located in the official commemorations of the 75th anniversary of the campaign. To mark the event the Australian federal government organised for selected political, military and civil representatives to accompany fifty-eight WWI veterans, forty-six of whom served at Gallipoli, to commemorate Anzac Day on the battlefields. In anticipation of the date throughout the 1980s there was a flurry of memorialization taking place on the battlefields by Turkish authorities in consultation with Australia and New Zealand governments. This memorialization outlined below was accompanied by other forms of institutional remembrance, such as the establishment of a museum and information centre on the battlefields in 1983. Rather than reflecting existing dominant understandings of the campaign, as we will see the dialogical character of the memorials and associated tourism promoted and anchored new historical understandings in the physical environment.
There are a number of different forms of dialogical memorialisation at Gallipoli. At a basic level it can be seen in reciprocal relationships of diplomatic exchange and recognition. For example, the Turkish government officially renamed Ari Burnu, the beach where the Australians and New Zealanders first landed, as Anzac Cove. At the same time the Australian government unveiled memorials to Ataturk in Canberra and Western Australia (Taylor and Cupper, 2000:163). This has been significant for Australian tourists engaging with Gallipoli as a sacred site rather than just an event in their national history. Emblematic of the importance of such diplomacy is a small sandstone monument engraved "ANZAK KOYU" and underneath the English translation "ANZAC COVE" (Figure 1) erected in 1985 on the battlefields for the 70th anniversary of the campaign as ‘a sign of goodwill’ between Turkey and Australia. For Australian tourists it signals their arrival at a place they have grown up hearing about but have actual little knowledge of its visual appearance. It is one of the most emotionally significant sites on the battlefields, a monument they wish to be photographed alongside, marking a transition from the profane to the sacred, bringing about an emotional awe that they are now on hallowed ground.

Dialogical memorialization at Gallipoli is not only focussed on bi-lingual recognition of place or in fact temporally limited to the war itself. Australian tourists also find one of the most emotional sites the Ari Burnu memorial a large sandstone monument with an English only abbreviated version of Ataturk’s speech to a group of Allied pilgrims in 1934, one of the few visits by relatives and veterans in between the wars (Figure 2). Read to the group by the Turkish Minister of the Interior (Igdemir, 1978) the greeting was part of a diplomatic strategy addressing the potential for local hostility to the group and part of Ataturk’s broader modernisation efforts. The inscription reads:

Those heroes that shed their blood and lost their lives... you are now lying in the soil of a friendly country. Therefore rest in peace. There is no difference between the Johnnies and the Mehmets to us where they lie side by side here in this country of ours... You, the mothers, who sent their sons from far away countries, wipe away your tears; your sons are now lying in our bosom and are in peace. After having lost their lives on this land they have become our sons as well (Ataturk).

**Figure 1. Anzak Koyu/Anzac Cove Monument**
The enshrining of Ataturk message to foreign visitors tends to naturalise the activity of visiting the battlefields for Australians while diverting commemorative attention away from the violent conflict and the enduring cultural and religious differences of the former foes. Often recited by politicians on official memorial days speeches, its wider significance in reimagining the campaign is illustrated by these words also being inscribed on memorial to Ataturk in Canberra and Wellington, the capital cities of Australia and New Zealand.

Figure 2. Ari Burnu memorial and tour guide Ali Efe
Other dialogical memorials do focus on particular historical occurrences but in contrast to traditional war memorials that signify the mass loss of life through modern warfare, the concern is with humanistic exchanges between soldiers on either side of the front line. This is particularly evident in the Kanhsirt memorial, a bronze statue of a Turkish soldier carrying a wounded Allied captain (Figure 3). As quoted below, the memorial’s plaque tells the story of how the Turkish soldier carried his enemy to the Allied trenches, as described by an Australian witness, First Lieutenant Casey, who later would become Australian Governor General.

Chunuk Bair on 25th April 1915, there was heavy trench fighting between the Turks and the Allies. The distance between the trenches was between 8 and 10 metres. Cease-fire was called after a bayonet attack and the soldiers returned to their trenches. There were heavy casualties on both sides and each collected their dead and wounded. From between the trench lines came a cry for help from an English Captain who was very badly wounded in the leg. Unfortunately no one could leave their trenches to help because the slightest movement resulted in the firing of hundreds of bullets. At that moment an incredible event occurred. A piece of white underwear was raised from one of the Turkish trenches and a well built, unarmed soldier appeared. Everyone was stunned and we starred in amazement. The Turk walked slowly towards the wounded British soldier gently lifted him, took him in his arms and started to walk towards our trenches. He placed him down gently on the ground near us and then straight away returned to his trench. We couldn't even thank him. This courageous and beautiful act of the Turkish soldier has our love and deepest respect to this brave and heroic soldier.

First Lieutenant Casey
(Later to become Australian Governor General 1967-71)

Figure 3. Kanhsirt Memorial
Where the Treaty of Lausanne following WWI had provided the Allies with control over memorialization in the main parts of the battlefield, the development of dialogical memorials by the Turkish government has facilitated a greater sharing of this sacred space. In the above cases this is fairly consensual. While the memorials are Turkish, in that they are officially initiated and built by the Turkish government, they are the result of high levels of consultation and diplomacy, making it difficult to align them to one particular nation. Where dialogical memorialization recontextualizes and softens the original meanings attached to Allied memorials on the battlefields, in the case of Turkey the relative absence of national memorials in the Anzac Cove has seen the construction of several monuments focussing solely on Turkish history and culture. This is vividly illustrated at Chunuk Bair that has become a contested site of both New Zealand and Turkish military victories. In close proximity to the New Zealand memorial the Conkbayin Ataturk memorial was constructed, a bronze statue of Mustafa Kemal- Ataturk (Bademli 1997:16), telling the legendary tale of this being the location where a piece of shrapnel hit him in the chest, but he was saved by it impacting his pocket watch (Taylor and Cupper, 2000: 199). The 57th Infantry Regiment Memorial is a similar illustration of counter-memorialization. Unlike Allied soldiers, very few of the Turkish dead received individual graves during and immediately following the war. However, in 1992 a symbolic cemetery was built on the battlefields containing individual rectangular headstones (while made of marble they are not dissimilar in shape and size to those of the Anzacs) inscribed with some of the names of the men who accompanied Ataturk in the counter-attack which stopped the Allied invasion. Built largely in kevser stone, a traditional material used in construction of Ottoman caravanserais, its design is neo-classical and constitutes a monument, a fountain, an open air mosque for prayer, a pole flying the Turkish national flag and a large relief of the 57th infantry Regiment charging the enemy’s advance. This representation of militarism, which is missing from the dialogical memorials Turkey built in the 1980s, can be thought of being in dialogue with the patriotism of the original Allied memorials. This is also evident in the Turk Askerine Saygi Memorial (an English translation being ‘Respect to the Turkish soldier’). Located across the road from the Turkish cemetery and simultaneously built in 1992 it features a 5.6 meter bronze statue of an infantryman, rifle in hand with bayonette attached, in a forward motion stance. Other contemporary Turkish memorials contain greater Islamic symbolism, working to provide a more balanced representation of religion in the memorial landscape of the battlefields. This is most evident in the Conkbayiri Mehmeteik memorial made up of five stone monoliths representing a hand turned upwards to God, the gesture for Muslim prayer. Alongside the dialogical memorials this memorialization has been important in fostering interest in the battlefield amongst Turks, who have traditionally focussed on their nearby naval victory over the ‘mighty’ British fleet at the Dardanelles Narrows prior to the land campaign in 1915.

Tourism and memorial interpretation
The new memorial context at Gallipoli in itself does not promote dialogical social relations, rather it provides a context for meaning making, human engagement and cultural interaction (Wagner-Pacifici and Schwartz, 1991:382), central to which is tourism. Here we can identify two key ‘reputational entrepreneurs’ (Fine, 1996), those individuals that are influential in the popular and formal understandings of history. Where collective memory studies have tended to identify traditional elites in this role,
tourism allows for new actors to shape understandings of the past. First the tourists themselves give life to the memorials. There has been an emerging literature profiling the young backpacker tourists, typically Australians and New Zealanders, who increasingly visit the battlefields (McKenna and Ward, 2007; Scates, 2006). Less appreciated has been their role in changing established historical understandings of the battle (West, 2008a). The 75th anniversary of the campaign was not limited to the designated ‘political pilgrimage’ (Hollander, 1981) that facilitated dialogical memorialization, it also immediately sanctioned and publicised the battlefields as a place able to be visited for tourism. In addition to the carefully selected political, military and civil representatives hundreds of young backpackers had arrived unexpectedly, many reported to have travelled for days across Europe to be there (Kelly, 1990:1). In 1998 an elderly Turkish tour guide from the Troy-Anzac travel agency recalled to me the tourist nature of their behaviour:

75th anniversary... Some of the Australians and New Zealanders, the young Aussies and Kiwis, after drinking too much beer, some of them they were very much drunk. And their behaviour was not so familiar to the Turkish people (Uluaslan).

Since 1990 the numbers of Australians attending Anzac Day services on the battlefields has constantly grown. For the 90th anniversary in 2005 there were a reported 20,000 foreign guests in attendance. While many of the tourists are still backpackers, their travel has helped establish a tourist infrastructure that supports and attracts more mainstream forms of tourism. Whatever the type, international tourists seldom visit the battlefields ‘independently’ but for various logistical reasons their experience of it is through locally run tours. Here the role of the Australian visitor is not only in interpreting the battle from a corporeal experience of sacred ground but doing do as part of a larger travel itinerary and thus their interpretation being influenced by the logics of tourism.

These tourists provide a particular audience for tour guides. The Turkish government regulation that battlefield tours must be led by a licensed guide has seen foreign tourists provided with a new perspective on the campaign that accounts for both Turkish and Allied histories. Here the memorials provide physical cues for historical interpretation by the guides, whose role as a reputational entrepreneur represents a wider historical transformation of the tour guide from instrumental to more discursive functions (Cohen, 1985). On the one hand insights are given of the local perspective. For example the Ari Burnu memorial provides a prompt for the guide to tell the heroics of Ataturk (Figure 2). This is an extract from the tour of guide Ali Efe, a retired submarine Captain in the Turkish Navy.

Colonel Kemal …had no authority at all to move any single unit of his troops without the permission of …German General name it Lee von Sanders… but the German General was dealing with the demonstration made by the 19th British mine brigade…so Colonel Kemal with his own initiative, risking his own head… took one of his best regiments… not to the actual landing area but to the highest grounds recognising the importance of the higher ground. That was a very critical race between Monash and Kemal. …It was a fair race. Any of them, Monash or Kemal, he who could have arrived at the dominating hills first and position their men there first, he would have decided the fighting
there and then but unfortunately for the Australians it took them one hour ten minutes to climb up the first ridge. Too much time (Ali Efe).

The idea that the outcome of the campaign was in the balance and decided by such crucial moments is in contradiction to the dominant post-colonial narrative in Australia of glorious defeat in which victory was doomed from the beginning.

Tour guide accounts though do not simply reflect Turkish collective memories but are produced for both guests and locals in the context of the tourism industry. It involves a tradition of popular historical interpretation whereby the guides dialogically reimage differing national histories. A central figure playing this role at Gallipoli has been Kenan Celik, an ex-guide and local university tutor who I interviewed in 1998. After studying in the United States on a Fulbright Scholarship he returned to Turkey in 1983 and was one of the original battlefield guides following the demilitarization of the battlefields, a role he acquired prior to the rise of backpacking tourism. While awaiting customers in the tour agency he would read books on Gallipoli, originally Turkish ones but he would subsequently also learn about Australian historical accounts from tourists and historians on the tours, some of who later would mail him English language books on the campaign. As well as interweaving different national historical accounts, Kenan openly admits that the desire to promote peace and understanding influenced the history he would provide to both locals and foreign tourists. Noting that very few locals knew much about the Gallipoli campaign in the 1980s he says he felt a responsibility to concentrate:

...on the mutual display of understanding, not hatred. So just imagine fifteen years, I don't know how many people (visited) but many, maybe 40,000; or 50,000. So I told them stories, so they learnt stories and they told the stories again, so it was handed over again and again. So I think I am like an ambassador here and I think I have a share in this growing, mutual respect and understanding between Australia, New Zealand and Turkey (Kenan Celik).

In the 1980s Kenan was one of the few English speakers in the towns nearby the battlefields and many of the younger guides taking the tours today were once his apprentices and are greatly influenced by his historical narratives. One such guide, Ilhami Gezici, popularly known to tourists by his English nickname of TJ, now runs his own tour and hostel with his Australian wife who he met while she was touring the battlefields. He has been particularly important in dramatizing and embellishing some of Kenan’s more dry historical details, techniques he has passed on to his own apprentices. As illustrated in the below quote, tourism is used as a frame to encourage visitor empathy for the fallen Allied soldiers.

A sense of respect grew between the Anzac and Turkish soldiers in the trenches...Sometimes you know Turkish would throw them fresh water, milk, bread, cheese or everything. During the war Anzacs and Turks they were really friendly. They did not ever hate each other... Anzac soldier did not know why they were here. They didn't know why they were fighting here. Just here for a holiday (TJ).

In this scenario the soldier himself is portrayed as a tourist. It is a revisionist history evident to varying extents in all the tours of the battlefields, extending Kenan’s
emphasis on good relations and mutual respect between the trenches. Earlier in his
tour TJ also promoted the idea that Allied soldiers held a contemporary tourist ethos
through showing a book containing a recruitment poster selling soldiering as a way to
achieve world travel, drawing on the available history of the war outlined earlier in
the article (Figure 3). Emphasising this particular enlistment strategy is important as it
avoids issues of racial and religious hatred between the Allies and Turkey while
encouraging the tourists to make a cultural connection between their experience of
travel and that of the Anzacs. The influence of these discourses is evidence by their
current prominence in the Australian public sphere (West, 2008a). For example, West
(2008b) has demonstrated how this collective memory of Gallipoli provided a cultural
frame for Australia’s patriotic response to the 2002 Bali bombing, with Australian
victims being mythologically aligned with Anzac soldiers at Gallipoli as ‘innocents
abroad’.

Figure 4. Tour guide Ilhami Gezici (TJ) with WWI recruitment poster

As a key dimension of the public sphere the media is important for communicating
the tourist experience from Australian ‘pilgrimages’ to Gallipoli and Anzac Day, a
focus that now competes with journalists’ concern with domestic observance in
Australia. Equally important though is the cumulative affect of the largely middle
class tourists and official visitors to the battlefields with new historical narratives
spreading by word of mouth as visitors tell their family and friends. For school
teachers who have visited the battlefields it alters how they teach history on Anzac
Day (West, 2008a). The politicians who visit and desire to associate themselves with
this popular engagement also alter the scripting of their memorial speeches to account
for their experiences.

Such dialogical revisionism outlined above is in direct contrast to the type of ‘culture
war’ contestation about history that is typically thought to dominate the contemporary
public sphere (Gitlin, 1995; Hunter, 1991). This is not to say that dialogical discourses
at Gallipoli are consensus based; quite the opposite, they are riddled with tension. As
Bakhtin notes, the two sides of double-voicedness do not exist in some organic
harmony but frequently cause discursive combative relations, unstable positions,
discord and narrative shifts (Vice 1997:49). These conflicts at Gallipoli though are
largely ‘backstage’ and countered by ‘frontstage’ diplomatic ‘performances’
(Goffman, 1959). For example, while it is not publicized the Commonwealth War Graves Commission has had to frequently enforce details of the Treaty of Lausanne at Gallipoli, as in cases where Turkish authorities have constructed trenches for tourist display where none had been during the war. While the Australian media freely notes controversies about the behaviour of young Australians on the battlefields, such as drunkenness and the leaving behind of litter, little is noted of local Turkish frustrations about being banned from attending these events or cases of sexual harassment of Australian female tourists by local men. Turkey’s federal Islamic government banning New Zealand indigenous Maori groups performing their traditional dances as part of the Anzac Day ceremony on the battlefields, due to the revealing state of traditional dress and the erotic nature of the movements involved, also has failed to develop into larger controversies. The lack of any public panic in Australia over such instances highlight the dialogical relationship between Turkey and Australia, with both countries needing to uphold a certain account of the campaign. The vested interest of Turkey is the desire to encourage tourism and receive recognition of their history by Western nations. The concern for Australia is to retain commemorative access to the battlefields and maintain the historical accounts that have encouraged new forms of patriotism amongst its youth.

**Concluding remarks**

The classical sociologist Emile Durkheim acknowledged that the rituals and beliefs of one era may not suit another, so he would not be surprised that at this particular point in history many have a “difficulty [in] imagining what the feasts and ceremonies of the future will be” (1995:429). In the longer term though Durkheim held that any society in order to continue existing requires ritual commemoration “at regular intervals to maintain and strengthen collective feelings and ideas...” (Durkheim, 1995:429). This article argues that the dialogical memorialization inspired tourist orientated commemoration at Gallipoli is such a ritual form. Where postmodern scholars have rightly identified that the established memorial genres, and the traditional grand narratives of Western power that they support, have been subject to widespread incredulity, this study suggests they are wrong to think that this necessarily translates to the terminal decline of the nation-state. Ironically, at Gallipoli it is the limiting of national autonomy in remembering the past that has subsequently resulted in the reenchantment of national history.

In advancing such a cultural sociological analysis I have not argued that the Gallipoli case of memorialization and tourism is representative. Where early tourist literature applying Durkheimian insights argued that tourism universally provided sacred experiences, these were as deterministic as the critical theory it wished to oppose. Rather this article has argued that tourist studies in accounting for the heterogeneity of tourist forms in contemporary society should also be open to the power of tourism to create multiple social consequences and outcomes. The dialogical forms of memorialization and tourism at Gallipoli have resulted in the reenchantment of national history and a new diplomatic role for the nation-state, but this too has a contingent quality that rests on the continuation of a travel tradition, reliance upon the politics of international diplomacy and in debt to individuals within the local tourism industry.
To appreciate such dynamics it has been argued that there are epistemological advantages to examining tourism in relation to the public sphere. A central aspect of this approach is moving beyond empirical snapshots of contemporary tourism to account for the process of collective memory. Where tourist studies occasionally offers brief references to the historical emergence of tourism, such as the influence of Thomas Cook or early travel forms such as the grand tour and religious pilgrimage, its empirical investigations are largely ahistorical (Franklin 2004). As a consequence they are overly reliant on theory to account for longer term social trends. As well as being historically and empirically sensitive, a public sphere analysis also requires appreciation of the political influence of embodied experience of place. As noted above, the sociology of tourism has traditionally only been concerned with the influence of guests on the host society. Tourist studies though is not alone in its failure to comprehend the social consequences of visiting sacred sites. It is also under developed in the theorizing of the contemporary public sphere, scholarship that has overwhelmingly focussed on traditional and new electronic media (Jacobs, 2007; Jones, 2007; McGuigan, 2005). As highlighted above, while the media is important in tourism creating new discourses that enter the public sphere, they also emerge in more everyday ways through word of mouth and the political and social influence of individuals. A large proportion of dialogical relations and discourses also involve politics being undertaken outside of the media spotlight and as such must be accounted for by more ethnographic style and historically conscious investigations (Alexander and Smith, 2010). Through such studies the specific environment and actors producing the discourses that enter the public sphere can be identified, as well as the broad socio-cultural circumstances in which they emerge.
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