

AlmaTourism Special Issue N. 5, 2016: Yeneroglu Kutbay E., Aykac A., Battlefield Tourism at Gallipoli: The Revival of Collective Memory, the Construction of National Identity and the Making of a Long-distance Tourism Network

## AlmaTourism

Journal of Tourism, Culture and Territorial Development

### **Battlefield Tourism at Gallipoli: The Revival of Collective Memory, the Construction of National Identity and the Making of a Long-distance Tourism Network**

Yeneroglu Kutbay, E.\*  
Aykac, A.†  
Ege University (Turkey)

#### ABSTRACT

The Battle of the Dardanelles (Çanakkale), also known as the Gallipoli Campaign, played a crucial role in the construction and endorsement of national identity, irrespective of the immediate consequences such as the prolongation of the war or the resignation of Winston Churchill upon failure. The Battle of the Dardanelles is commemorated every year in Turkey, Australia and New Zealand, as a day of remembrance. The battlefields at Dardanelles were reinstated as the Gallipoli Peninsula Historical National Park in 1973. The park covers numerous cemeteries of soldiers from both sides, memorials, museums and the battlefields in an area of 33,000 hectares. The park provides a vivid setting and depiction of the war experience, and stands out as the most important battlefield site in Turkey.

The aim of this paper is to analyze battlefield tourism in Çanakkale in terms of its components and its impact on domestic and international tourism in Turkey. Battlefield tourism in Çanakkale encompasses not only the battlefield itself, but also the Çanakkale Victory Day in Turkey, March 18<sup>th</sup>, and the Anzac Day in Australia, April 25<sup>th</sup>. While domestic tourism contributes to the revival of collective memory and to the building of national identity, international tourism provides representations of national heritage as a source of political legitimacy. Unique to this case, battlefield tourism plays a significant role in the construction of a long-distance tourism network between Australia, and Turkey. The annual flow of descendants of ANZAC (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps) soldiers is an important source of tourism activity in the area.

**Keywords:** Gallipoli; Nation building; National identity; Battlefield tourism; Anzac

\* E-mail address: [yeneroglu@gmail.com](mailto:yeneroglu@gmail.com)

† E-mail address: [aslihanaykac@gmail.com](mailto:aslihanaykac@gmail.com)

## Introduction

Battlefield tourism occupies a specific niche within tourism industry, falling into the larger domain of alternative tourism, and under dark tourism according to several scholars (Miles, 2014; Ryan 2007). Interest in war heritage, whether focusing on war sites and remains or a more encompassing approach including modern day representations, reenactments and commemorations, stands to be a major motivation for special interest tourists. From a tourism perspective, battlefield tourism provides an opportunity to diversify tourism industry temporally and spatially. This is especially true for countries with sea-sun-sand based mass tourism. From a sociological perspective, battlefield tourism generates a multilayered encounter between the host and the guests (Smith, 1989), first because of the modern day representation of a particular confrontation, second because of the particular way history has been molded into a symbol, a representation or a reenactment. Third, a historical analysis of the battle under focus and the battlefield as site provides a deeper understanding of the particular construct, its meaning and its appeal to the tourist gaze (Urry, 1990).

This paper argues that the Gallipoli Campaign in 1915 has been an integral part of the nation building process in Turkey and Australia. The particular representation of the Campaign in the Gallipoli National Park, during the Victory Day celebrations in Turkey and Anzac Day commemorations in Turkey and Australia creates a sustained tourist motivation for both domestic and international tourists. The annual Anzac Day commemorations in Çanakkale create the basis of a long-distance tourism network. The research employs an interdisciplinary approach in analyzing the contribution of the Gallipoli Campaign in the nation building processes, the construction of the battlefield, commemorations and an accompanying discourse and the emergence of a long-distance tourism network between Turkey and Australia that would otherwise be much looser had it not been for the aforementioned representation of the Gallipoli Campaign.

The research benefits from several methodological approaches. Secondary sources provide a brief but comprehensive account of the Gallipoli Campaign and its implications. Second, official data on the battlefield and the National Park helps to expose the particular way the Gallipoli Campaign has been constructed and represented. Third, this official data is supported by the observations and findings from the ethnographic fieldwork conducted for the research in March and April 2016, which combines the visiting of the battlefield, the observations regarding the Anzac Day as well as several interviews conducted with tour guides, hotel owners, and officials from the Çanakkale Tourism Administration. Part of the aggregate data on Çanakkale tourism is also incorporated into the article.

The paper will include five sections. First, a brief historical account of the Battle of the Dardanelles will present the historical and the geographical significance of the area. Second, the role of the Gallipoli campaign in the nation building process will be presented. Third, a brief review of the establishment of the Gallipoli National Park and

its current state will present how historical elements have become representations of cultural and national heritage. The fourth section will provide a framework for battlefield tourism. This will help to clarify where battlefield tourism stands in relation to other tourism practices. Fifth and the final section will provide a detailed account of battlefield tourism in Gallipoli, Çanakkale. The paper will conclude by evaluating possible venues for future inquiry on battlefield tourism.

## **1. A Conceptual Overview on Battlefield Tourism**

A number of conceptualizations exist in analyzing the touristic interest towards the heritage of death, wars and related atrocities. The well cited conceptualizations of dark tourism (Foley and Lennon, 1996), thanatourism (Stone and Sharpley, 2008), black spots (Rojek, 1997), grief tourism (O'Neill, 2002, [www.grief-tourism.com](http://www.grief-tourism.com)), and morbid tourism (Blom, 2000). In addition, the varying units of inquiry employed include the heritage site associated with experiences of death, war, grief and loss, the special interest tourist in search for experiences of dark aspects, and tours as representative constructs of darkness, as well as other events and commemorations.

Battlefield tourism is an interdisciplinary research area of tourism studies, drawing attention from not only tourism scholars but also historians, political scientists, and archeologists. A comprehensive typology of the existing literature is beyond the objective and scope of this research considering this rather eclectic, multilayered and multidimensional nature of scholarly interest towards dark tourism. Instead, an operational definition within the framework of one unique subfield of dark tourism will help focus the research agenda and justify the methodological limitations of the research.

The primary task in constructing a comparative analytical framework on battlefield tourism requires a distinction of this particular type of tourism from other forms. Battlefield tourism falls into the category of heritage tourism, referring to visits to sites of cultural heritage, an overview of cultural artifacts and other representations (Butler and Suntikul, 2013). Dark tourism differs from other types of heritage experiences, as a commemoration and revitalization of darker experiences such as wars, disasters, death and suffering. According to the authors of this paper it is within this dark category of tourism that war tourism, battlefield tourism and thanatourism, namely the type of tourism associated with death and grief, fall into.

Battlefields as sites of casualties and death seem to be closely linked to thanatourism; however, the primary motivation in battlefield tourism is not necessarily death as a category and its various extensions such as forms, causes, consequences or extends of death. Seaton's well-cited article analyzes the historical evolution of Waterloo as a tourist attraction based on the construction of Waterloo (Seaton, 1999). Seaton borrows MacCannell's (1976) framework of site sacralization in order to expose the

growing interest in Waterloo as a site of battlefield tourism. However, the exclusive focus of Seaton on death undermines the place of the Battle of Waterloo in history and the contemporary depictions of the war. Seaton refers to five major categories of tourism behavior in thanatourism, all of which touch upon death, whether directly or indirectly. Battlefield tourism carries with it several different motivations, ranging from search for family members and their remains in battlefields, a commemoration of a national struggle and the cherishing of other historical and cultural metaphors that have played into the construction of a national imagery. Ancestors in war become a major source of motivation. A search for signs of courage and heroism may feed national sentiments. Periodic ceremonies, days of remembrance and other events ensure the continuity of interest in battles and battlefields. Rituals are more central than recreational activities.

Beyond death, war is another conceptual link that needs to be evaluated. Smith (1998) refers to two major points in analyzing the relationship between war and tourism, hence referring to war tourism. First, war generates significant elements of heritage and curiosity: "War ultimately becomes an important stimulus to tourism through population shifts and technical innovation, and after the war, through nostalgia, memorabilia, honorifics and reunions." (Smith, 1998: 224) Second, war is a major intervention in tourism because of lack of security and because of the destruction of tourist sites during wartime: "Thus war, or its threat, is at the cost of tourism, and is both an economic and political tool. The avoidance of war through intervention, if successful, preserves political hegemony and tourism revenues." (Smith, 1998: 220)

Battlefield tourism is different from thanatourism; it is not about death or curiosity of darkness that defines the tourism destination, the tourist motivation, or the tour. Battlefield tourism could be distinguished from war tourism because of its spatial fixity, and the centrality of the battlefield as opposed to a museum or days of remembrance, and because of the onsite authentic exposition as the source of tourist attraction. The spatial fixity is the most unique aspect of battlefield tourism that gives the visitors a genuine opportunity of revitalization or reenactment. Battlefield heritage is not necessarily an intergenerational reproduction of some cultural practice and artifact, but based on the remains of battlefields. Battlefield tourism is political, in terms of the way battlefield is protected, built, and represented; and the motivation of visitors engaging in battlefield tourism. Finally, battlefield tourism is in many cases a personal experience (Miles, 2012). Individuals choose to spend their recreational time in an unconventional form of tourism and seek a unique experience that would cater to their identity markers. This could be a national sentiment in relation to heritage, or a response to the contemporary representation of this heritage and its current political meaning.

Tourist interest in battlefields was a post-WWII trend that followed the reconstruction period in Europe and decolonization period in the rest of the world. The relative growth of the middle class in advanced capitalist countries and the existence of a peaceful setting on an international scale enabled tourism and travel to flourish (Smith,

1998). The tourist experience in battlefield tourism is significantly different from that of conventional mass tourism, in terms of motivations, emotional attachments, and personal experiences, and in terms of the spatial and temporal organization of the tours. The battlefields of Sommes and Ypres are particularly well-referred cases (Jansen-Verbeke and George, 2015; Winter, 2011a). The Battle of Waterloo, the remains of the Spanish Civil War and the battlefields of the Gallipoli Campaign under focus here are some other examples. Battlefield tours in Vietnam and in South Korea are some examples outside of Europe from the twentieth century. The Gettysburg battlefield from the American civil war is another example that draws scholarly attention (Chronis, 2005). Hence the central question becomes to what extent the case under focus, the Gallipoli Battlefield and its current exposition, provides a unique contribution towards a better understanding of battlefield tourism practices and dynamics?

## **2. The Gallipoli Campaign: The Basis for Nation Building**

Beginning with the second constitutional period (1908) the Ottoman state suffered heavy territorial losses following defeats in Tripoli War (1911-1912) and the Balkan Wars (1912-13). The Ottomans seemed to be on the verge of collapse and therefore were viewed by German military experts more as a liability than a valuable ally, but it was the German Kaiser who “decided, ‘for reasons of expediency’, to seek an immediate alliance with the Porte” (Macfie, 1983: 43). Although the alliance treaty between Germany and the Ottoman state was signed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of August, 1914 the Ottomans entered the war in early November, thus making it legitimate for the Entente Powers for a campaign against the Straits. The campaign, if successful, would serve several purposes. The first one is directly related to the European front: at the beginning of the war, many experts on both sides were of the assumption that it would last only a few months. When this assumption proved wrong and a stalemate was reached at the European front, the warring parties were forced to find new allies to contribute to their war effort by opening new fronts and forcing the enemy to fight at several fronts concomitantly. When the Ottomans entered war on the side of the Central powers another front was open in the Caucasus that the Russians would have to fight.

Second, a successful attack on the Dardanelles followed by the occupation of the Ottoman capital would have driven this state out of the war, bringing the Entente powers an important advantage over the Central powers. The defeat of the Ottomans would have led Russia diverting its war efforts at winning the war on the European front. Therefore, there was reason to believe that a successful campaign against the Dardanelles would have proven the most beneficial results for the Entente powers (Erickson, 2001).

The campaign had two stages: naval and amphibious. At the initial stages of the planning there were serious discussions as to whether only a naval campaign or a naval/ground troop undertaking combined campaign would be preferred to seize the Dardanelles. First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill was successful in persuading the government to launch a naval campaign although many experts were dubious about the success of an operation solely based on naval means (McKernan, 2010). Consequently, on January 15<sup>th</sup> 1915 the British War Council decided that, the Dardanelles would be forced with the navy alone since “there were not, and would not for some months be, any troops available for such an operation (Final report of the Dardanelles Commission).” The plan consisted of four stages; the first three of which was to destroy the defenses and fortifications on each side of the strait and reaching to the inner sea of Marmora, the final stage of clearing of the mines along the narrowest section of the Dardanelles. On February 19<sup>th</sup> 1915 the bombardment of the fortifications at the entrance of the Dardanelles began. The British contributed to the campaign with sixteen battleships which were spare and aged while the French sent six battleships (Türk Ansiklopedisi, 1963). The underestimation of the Ottoman strength and overconfidence on the naval strength of the Entente powers played an important role in the failure of the naval campaign. The strengthening of the fortifications on the strait began as early as the 19<sup>th</sup> century and the threat that the Bulgarians from land and the Greeks from sea posed in the Balkan Wars persuaded the Ottomans to establish detailed plans to defend the Dardanelles (Erickson, 2001). The decisive moment of the naval battle was on the 18<sup>th</sup> of March when a number of allied ships hit mines parallel to the Asian coast. Although the losses were quite negligible, the commander of the Allied navy Admiral de Robeck considered a military landing more appropriate before proceeding with a second naval operation. On the dawn of 25<sup>th</sup> of April, 1915, first troops of the allied powers began to land on the Western shores of the peninsula. The allied army included British and French forces, troops from the dominions and the colonies such as Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland, Ceylon, India, Nepal, Algeria, Morocco, and Senegal. There was also a Zion Mule Corps composed of Jewish refugees from Syria and Russia.

The Anzac troops landed on Ari Burnu, which is today known as the Anzac Cove. The purpose of the Anzac mission was to secure the beach and take control of the higher ground, but this quickly proved impossible because the hills were too steep. The initial mission failed under heavy fire from Ottoman troops. The decision to withdraw was already taken by September. The last Anzac troops left the peninsula on 20 December. The Gallipoli campaign was officially over with the withdrawal of the last British troops on January 9<sup>th</sup> 1916. The total number of casualties on both sides is estimated at 500,000. Approximately 8,000 out of 50,000 Australians and 2,500 out of 14,000 New Zealanders died on the front while the Ottoman losses amounted to 57,000. The Anzac troops were transferred to the Western front where they gave even higher casualties.

### **3. The Role of Gallipoli in nation-building**

The Gallipoli campaign played an important role both for Turkey and Australia as an effective instrument of nation-building. The stark contrast between the Turkish and Australian experiences was that at the time the battle took place Turks had won and the Australians were defeated. In 1918, when World War I was over, Australia was on the victorious side whereas the Ottoman state was on the defeated side. Nevertheless, the Gallipoli campaign was turned into a vital reference point in the nation-building process of the two nations almost immediately after it took place.

Several factors were effective in transforming this defeat into the building block of a nation state on the Australian side. First, the campaign was the first battle that the Australians joined after 1901, when the six self-governing colonies of Australia were merged into a federal state. Thus, the participation of Australia in the war meant creating a separate national identity from that of the English and giving the citizens of the loosely bounded federation a sense of unity, solidarity and common purpose. Australia was the only country where conscription was not introduced; this created a proud sentiment among Australians who offered their lives for their country (Inglis, 2008,). Australians' total loss was around 420,000. The losses in Gallipoli were much less than those of the Western front, yet it was the 25<sup>th</sup> April, the landing on Gallipoli which turned into a national myth, the Anzac Day.

Although building of national identity and collective memory is a collaborative process, in the case of Australia it is worth mentioning one particular person, C. E. W. Bean, the official war correspondent of Australia in World War I. Bean's various efforts during and after the war played a crucial role in turning the Gallipoli campaign into a national myth through attributing some character traits to the Australian soldiers later to be known as the Anzac spirit. His most widely quoted<sup>1</sup> words, which described the withdrawal of Australian troops from Gallipoli, takes the word Anzac from just being an acronym for the purpose of efficiency in cable communications, and gives it a prominent place in defining Australian identity:

"By dawn on December 20th [1916] Anzac had faded into a dim blue line lost amid other hills on the horizon as the ships took their human freight to Imbros, Lemnos and Egypt. But Anzac stood, and still stands, for reckless valour in a good cause, for enterprise resourcefulness, fidelity, comradeship, and endurance that will never own defeat". (<https://www.awm.gov.au/>)

Bean's impressions about the Anzac spirit were shaped while he was working as a journalist in Australia. Earlier Bean had written a passage about comradeship in outback Australia and he finished with a prophecy that if ever England were in trouble she would discover in Australia 'the quality of sticking ... to an old mate' (<http://www.gallipoli.gov.au/>). Thus, the qualities attributed to the bushmen of rural Australia, were transferred to the diggers, the unofficial term that the Anzac soldiers called themselves.

"The essentially civilian nature of the members of the Australian Imperial Force, their air of nonchalance, and their prodigious feats of bravery were all, according

to Bean, essential indicators of 'Australian character'. His continued lauding of the digger as a typical Australian bushman indicates that Bean's belief in this creed had not diminished since the war (Seal (2004), as cited in Bates (2013), p. 15)".

*The Anzac Book* published in 1916 was a collection of articles, jokes, cartoons compiled from the Anzacs in Gallipoli and carefully edited by Bean so as to leave out any harsh depictions of the war or negative qualities of the Anzacs. Although Bean preserved the rejected submissions for a more objective account of the war later on, the book sold over a 100,000 copies, further contributing to the Anzac legend (<http://theconversation.com>). As early as 1916 Bean contemplated the building of a war museum, not to glorify war but to commemorate it and this materialized in 1941 with the opening of the Australian War Memorial.

Out of defeat the Anzac myth and the Australian nation was born, albeit with much criticism, such as the militarization of Australian history or Australians always fighting other people's war (Bongiorno, 2008). Despite the fact that Australians fought other wars the importance and sentiment attached to the Anzac Day is very much felt. There had been periods in Australian history where Anzac Day was commemorated less enthusiastically, but since 1990, the 75th anniversary there is a revival of interest in Anzac Day. There is also a generational shift in the perception of the war and its meaning for the Australians, while the first generations who participated in the war or had lost someone in the battle tended to view it in patriotic terms, the younger generations tend to perceive the battle as a demonstration of how meaningless war is (Scates, 2002).

The Gallipoli campaign (referred to as Çanakkale War by Turks) is an important moment in the nation-building process for Turkey. The commemoration in Turkey is, however, on 18<sup>th</sup> March, the day that the naval campaign of the allied powers ended. From 2002 onwards, this day is also officially commemorated as Martyrs' Day. The Gallipoli Campaign was one of the two battles that the Ottomans were successful in World War I, therefore a crucial departure point for the construction of the national myth. A ten-day journey organized by the Ministry of War in July 1915 to Gallipoli while the land campaign was still going on had the aim to,

"enable a group of leading Ottoman artists to gain a firsthand experience of the front. They were asked in turn to give "truthful representations" of the battlefield with specific instructions to avoid praise for any high rank official, to celebrate instead, the regular soldier"(Kirişçi, 2014:184).

There was a deliberate attempt by the government to boost morale through the press and narratives that were expected from Ottoman literary circles. The Gallipoli campaign was to remind the Turk of his glorious past in the Ottoman/Turkish collective memory. "After all, the defenders of the Dardanelles were the sons of warriors who had 'roared' in Europe for five centuries (Kirişçi, 2015:163)."



The campaign was also an inspiration for the events that followed the end of World War I. Ottomans lost massive territory by the treaty of Sevres. During the armed resistance (the so called Turkish War of Independence (1919-1922), the representatives of Ankara government occasionally referred to Gallipoli in their speeches in the Grand National Assembly, to express their confidence in the invincible Turk, how the defense of Gallipoli resurrected the nation, how they stood against all the powerful armies of the world, and how they would fight once again to save their motherland (Sınmaz Sönmez, 2015). Gallipoli became so much identified with the national foundation myth that people often mistake it as a part of the war of independence. The crucial place that Gallipoli has in constructing the official history of modern Turkey is best expressed by the famous poet Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, in his work "The Epic of Gallipoli." In 1965, he was commissioned by the government to produce a literary work for the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Gallipoli campaign. The Epic of Gallipoli "consisted of more than one hundred poems introduced by the phrase 'Gallipoli is the preface of modern Turkey' thus capturing a widely accepted notion in modern Turkey (Kirişçi, 2015:171)."

Perhaps the key role in merging Gallipoli into the official history of modern Turkey was played by Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), the leader of the resistance movement and founder of the Turkish Republic. Mustafa Kemal was promoted to the rank of colonel after his heroic defense of the area. After the Turkish Republic was established the role he played in Gallipoli campaign became a reference point of his following actions, and perceived as a prophecy of the savior of the Turks (Aydın, 2007). Mustafa Kemal's role in Gallipoli campaign is so prominent in official Turkish history that the contributions of other commanders in the field are almost entirely forgotten. Many people in Turkey and other countries mistakenly think that he was the commander of the entire army in Gallipoli; in fact, it was Marshall Liman von Sanders who was in charge of the 5<sup>th</sup> army in Gallipoli and a number of German officers accompanied him.

The words attributed to Mustafa Kemal forms the basis of this sympathy towards the Anzacs. Although there is much ambiguity as to the original wording, his conciliatory statement, as inscribed on the monolith in the Anzac Cove is as follows:

"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."

This statement was read by Prime Minister Şükrü Kaya in 1934 at the Anzac ceremony. Today the statement is widely accepted as the beginning of cordial relations between the Anzacs and Turks. A number of memorials and monuments in Australia and New

Zealand have this statement inscribed as a symbol of the high regards that Turkey has for its former enemies.

#### **4. The Building of the Gallipoli National Park: Representations of the National Identity and Reinforcement of Collective Memory**

The first steps towards turning Gallipoli into a pilgrimage site were taken during the war with the establishment of cemeteries along with a memorial in Arıburnu region which is today officially called as Anzac (Bozkurt, 2012). These efforts gained an official character when Britain set up an Imperial War Graves Commission in 1918 to take care of their dead in the most proper and honorable manner.

“The dead could not be brought home by relatives but would lie in official war cemeteries, there would be no private memorials and except for Victoria Cross winners. Each soldier would have uniform headstones of similar wording irrespective of rank or civil status, the missing would be named on memorials, and larger cemeteries would have a Christian Cross of Sacrifice and a secular Stone of Remembrance (Gammage, 2005, p. 60).”

However, the Commission’s efforts in Gallipoli materialized only after October 1918, when the Ottomans signed the armistice agreement. The initial reports of the allied powers indicated that the graves were desecralized, and there was much tension between the Ottoman government and the allied powers on whether desecration was intentional or caused by natural circumstances. C. E. W. Bean played a key role as the head of Australian Historical Mission to report and locate the Anzac graves. He agreed that the graves were damaged, but was not of the opinion that it was intentional (as cited in Gammage:62). During the period between 1919 and 1922, along with the cemeteries the Cape Helles Memorial to the Missing; The New Zealand memorial in Twelve Tree Copse cemetery; Memorial to Eric Duckworth in Redoubt Cemetery; Chunuk Air-New Zealand, Australia and New Zealand, Hill 60-New Zealand memorials in Anzac Cove were built (Bozkurt, 2012).

Australians were the most sensitive about how their dead. They were not enthusiastic about the Commission’s decision to establish burial sites, the War Graves Commission’s decision was carried out and 105 Anzac cemeteries scattered in an area of 60 km long and 20 km wide from Suvla Bay to the tip of Cape Helles (Smith, 2010; Gammage, 2005).

As far as the status of the area is concerned,

“Bean envisaged the whole Anzac area as one big graveyard, which would probably be visited by thousands of Australians and others yearly ... one’s mind could see Anzac, the most striking battlefield of that war, being the goal of

pilgrimages from Britain and the Anzac countries. Here was a battlefield in which ... the graves themselves would mark the front line and even the furthest lines reached in the struggle, so heroic on both sides (Gammage, 2005: 64-65)."

Although the cemeteries were reduced in numbers the allied powers were successful in urging the Ankara Government to grant a special status to the Anzac region. By article 128 of the Lausanne Peace Treaty of 1923, the Government granted the land where the allied powers' graves existed and article 129 specifically pronounced "the area in the region known as Anzac (Arı Burnu)." Given its strategic importance, the occupation of the area is subject to a number of restrictions, including visitors. The visitors are not allowed to carry guns and Turkish Government must be informed in advance should the party of visitors exceed 150 (article 129, paragraphs 7 and 8).

The peninsula became a pilgrimage site for civilian Australians in 1925. One of Bean's recommendations to the Peace Conference was the strict prohibition of the visitors to the area until the "remains [were] buried and the work entirely completed," (Bean, 1948: 385) as there were still remains of some bodies out in the open, even four years after the evacuation. The area was opened to visitors towards the end of 1924, when the works were finished and Australian Prime Minister Stanley Bruce paid a three day visit to the peninsula. In May 1925, the first civilian visitors came to Gallipoli, numbering 400 followed a few months later by the visit of the High Commissioner for New Zealand to open the New Zealand Memorial (Bean, 1948).

On the Turkish side, initial financial difficulties hindered the process of turning Gallipoli into a national myth parallel to official history narrative. The first official ceremony took place on 18<sup>th</sup> March 1916. The official commemoration site for Turkish ceremonies was Mehmet Çavuş Memorial until 1960, built in 1919 in memory of the sergeant and 25 troops who defended Cesaret Tepe (Courage Hill) against the Anzacs. The memorial was renovated and covered with marble in 1934. The official attempts to build a gigantic monument that would appropriately represent the sacrifice of the soldiers began in 1927, but the construction overlooking the entrance of the Dardanelles (Morto Bay) started in 1954. The corruption of contractor firms further delayed construction and the monument was completed only in 1960 with the help of public donations (Bozkurt, 2015).

The Peninsula gained the status of historical national park in 1973. The launching of the project "Geography of Martyrs" in 2000 is the first serious attempt to locate the actual cemeteries and burial sites of Turkish soldiers. There has been a dramatic increase in the number of Turkish monuments, memorials and cemeteries in the area, both actual and symbolic (Çanakkale Savaşları Gelibolu Tarihi Alan Başkanlığı, 2015 Faaliyet Raporu). The Simulation and Information Center for the Legend of Gallipoli established in 2012 aims to reenact the war through animations, simulations and 3D movies.

The ruling Justice and Development Party tends to glorify the Ottoman past, which some scholars refer to as neo-Ottomanism. "The dome in the style of Ottoman

architecture” of the simulation center serves as an example to re-establish connections with the Ottoman past, which JDP considers to be neglected (Gallipoli Peninsula Historical National Park Simulation and Information Center for the Legend of Gallipoli, 2012:12). The efforts spent on Gallipoli seem to be a part of this policy together with the revival of other military and cultural symbols of the Ottoman heritage.

The historical national park status peninsula was abolished in 2014, and the Directorate of Çanakkale Wars Gallipoli Historical Region was established. The government’s rationale in the draft bill undertaken, despite dissenting voices, reflects its determination to create a much stronger emphasis on the Gallipoli war and linking it with spiritual/religious values.

The main argument for the new establishment was that, the commemoration of the glorious Çanakkale Wars should not be squeezed into one day of the year, and the area should function as an open air museum (Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Sıra No: 601(1/927).

The centenary of the Gallipoli campaign witnessed commemoration events on an unprecedented scale in both Australia and Turkey. Australian events cover a four year period with an ambitious budget. Although the Australian Government announced the allocation of a total budget of \$83.5 million for the Centenary of Anzac (<http://www.budget.gov.au>) the number estimated and not denied by the Australian government reaches up to \$561 million (Fathi, 2016). The Centenary events in Turkey included not only commemorations on both 18<sup>th</sup> March and 25<sup>th</sup> April, but all-year-round events with the participation of all the ministries, the Military Chief of Staff, universities, non-governmental organizations, and private institutions<sup>2</sup>. (Çanakkale Savaşları Gelibolu Tarihi Alan Başkanlığı, 2015 Faaliyet Raporu).

## **5. Battlefield Tourism in Gallipoli, Çanakkale**

Tourism industry in Turkey relies heavily on conventional mass tourism based on the sea-sun-sand trilogy, which attracts high numbers of international tourists and generates significant amount of tourism revenues, it also carries the risk of early completion of the tourism life cycle of destinations and a gradual decline of tourist numbers. Turkey already benefits from heritage tourism, mostly on pre-modern remains that cater to a specialized interest in ancient history, archeology and civilizations of the Near East. The need to diversify the Turkish tourism industry aside from mass tourism and heritage tourism can partly be fulfilled by investing more resources to areas such as battlefield tourism.

Çanakkale as a site for battlefield tourism is unique in many respects. First, it is a site of heroism and a historical marker of national identity for Turks, Australians and New Zealanders. Second, the Gallipoli Campaign and its current representation make battlefield tourism a tourist attraction for both international and domestic tourists.

Although the primary focus of this study is Anzac tourism, a significant number of international tourists from other countries also visit the site. There is a sustained flow of domestic tourists to Çanakkale from metropolitan areas. Third, considering the heavy reliance of Turkish tourism industry on mass tourism, battlefield tourism in Çanakkale may contribute to diversify Turkish tourism in two respects. First, battlefield tourism is a different type of tourism; second, the time for visiting Çanakkale may not necessarily coincide with peak season, hence it may extend the seasonality of Turkish tourism.

The commemoration of the ANZAC is both a personal and a national experience for visitors. Given the geographical remoteness of Australia and New Zealand on the one hand and Turkey on the other, the Gallipoli Campaign serves to be a unique historical connection that links these societies.

“There can be few, if any, other places and instances in the world where a battle site marks the birth of a nation, thousands of kilometers away from it, and fighting which represents an ostensible defeat. It is for this reason that the case of Australians and New Zealanders visiting the battlefield of Gallipoli probably represents something more than thanatourism.” (Slade 2003: 780)

The contribution of the Gallipoli Campaign in the construction of nationhood in Australia and New Zealand suggests that visiting ANZAC sites means more than a recreational activity or touristic curiosity for the people of these countries; it is also a personal, political and national experience.

“Hence, every year thousands of Australians and New Zealanders go to Gallipoli because that is the place and a point in historical time at which their respective nations came into being in a very real and profound manner. In many ways, both countries’ contemporary histories start at, and proceed from, Gallipoli on April 25, 1915.” (Slade 2003: 782)

Hall defines the interest of Australian and New Zealander tourists in Gallipoli as secular pilgrimage. The visits are repetitive, heavily shaped by the national myths about Anzac soldiers, the heroism at war and the formation of a national identity: “Instead, Anzac is related to a secular pilgrimage of national identity in which the myths of nationhood are paramount. Such pilgrimage has importance for both domestic and international travel.” (Hall, 2002: 84) “Such travelers are locating identity in a symbolic pilgrimage to the birthplace of an important set of national myths including Australian and New Zealand nationhood and certain essences of national identity.” (Hall, 2002: 86)

Anzac tourists visit Gallipoli throughout the year, however, visitor numbers increase during April because of the Anzac Day. The majority of the tourists are from Australia and the number of visitors from New Zealand stands around 10%. Therefore, a separate and/or comparative evaluation of Australian and New Zealander tourists is beyond the scope of this research. Similarly, although there are a small number of

Aboriginal soldiers involved in the war, their exclusion from the Australian discourse of the Anzac experience reflects upon the tourist profile as the Aboriginal visitors are exceptional in Anzac tourism. As a reverse example, the exclusion of the Aboriginal dimension from the historical discourse and the contemporary tourism indicates that Anzac tourism is a direct product of the particular form and content of the Anzac construct. As the tour operator interviewed states, “Australians completely ignore these people because they have remained backward. One female Aboriginal tourist came to visit and she did not speak English.”

During the fieldwork, several business owners, hotel managers of relatively larger hotels, personnel from tour operators, hotels and bus companies were interviewed. Official information and data came from Çanakkale Tourism Office. Almost of all of the respondents drew attention to the declining tourist numbers since the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Gallipoli Campaign in 2015. The interviews focused on the organization of the tour in order to expose the tourism contribution of Australians to Çanakkale. Certain points that come up in informal discussions reflect upon the weaknesses of the tourism industry in Çanakkale, the impact of Turkish foreign policy and the tourist perception it generates.

Almost all of the tourists arrive in Istanbul first and spend some time in Istanbul as part of an extensive and longer tour organization. The border data on Çanakkale indicate that only a minor portion of international tourists enter Turkey from Çanakkale. Some tourists also visit Çanakkale as part of a European tour, but most tours are via Istanbul. The tours are organized for a total of one or two weeks, during which tourists visit several attractions and destinations in Istanbul and its vicinity, including Çanakkale. The duration of the tour in total has to be extended because of the distance, the possibility of jetlag and the exhaustion of the tourists. Their rooms are booked one day before their arrival in order to check them in as early as possible. The duration of stay in Çanakkale is rather limited, not more than a couple of nights, one of which is spent on site at the battlefield for the Dawn ceremony. Tourists are transported either by busses or by cruise ships to Çanakkale, where they do some sightseeing and spend most of the time on the Gallipoli peninsula. Table 1 shows the top ten nationalities that visit Çanakkale and the duration of their stay. Interestingly, the average length of overnight stays roughly exceed one night for all nationalities.

**Table 1 The Ten Nationalities Visiting Çanakkale and Overnight Stays**

2015	Visitors	Overnight Stays
People’s Republic of China	55.373	55.778
Australia	21.541	37.891
USA	13.615	15.102

Germany	6.179	7.972
Romania	7.192	7.725
UK	4.697	7.672
South Korea	5.944	6.153
Malaysia	5.481	5.488
Greece	3.961	5.475
Japan	4.946	5.044

Source: Çanakkale Tourism Administration, 2016.

The annual number of Anzac visitors from Australia and New Zealand vary significantly. The tour operators and the officials in the local tourism administration expect an average of 5000 to 6000 tourists from Australia and New Zealand. In 2015, the Anzac Day visitors from Australia and New Zealand exceeded 10,000 due to the centenary of the Gallipoli Campaign. However, in 2016, during which the fieldwork for this paper was conducted, the number of visitors from Australia and New Zealand on the Anzac Day declined to around 2000. A number of factors have contributed to this decline. A series of explosions in major cities and some touristic sites generated security concerns. As a consequence, the tours taking place this year include security personnel and use bomb detectors. As one tour operator states: "Security is the primary factor in tourism activity. The lack of material basis, natural disasters like flood or earthquake might also have an impact, but security is the primary determinant. People do not take an insecure tour; they might go as far as cancelling and losing their money." The refugee influx in Turkey and the deal with the EU regarding their returns also created an ambiguity in terms of security and tourism. Finally, the regional conflicts in the Middle East, particularly along Turkey's borders with Iraq and Syria, also had some impact on the safety concerns of tourists.

Considering the distance between Gallipoli and Australia and New Zealand, this visit is relatively longer in distance and more expensive than conventional visits to seaside destinations. One type of tourist profile is either the elderly who have some sort of a national, personal or sentimental connection to battles and battlefields in general or to Gallipoli in particular. Economically, this group comes from an upper middle income segment, who might demand special arrangements in their tour organization. The second most common type of tourists is the backpackers who travel on a budget yet search for more than the recreational seaside activity. High school and university students come in groups as part of a teaching tour. Tour operators regard the backpackers with caution as they are the budget tourists with limited profitability for tour sales. The least common tourist profile is the family with children; as such a long distance tour would be too costly for a single household. Also middle aged tourists are less likely to take an Anzac tour, as they are the working age population and seek more recreational choices in their limited paid vacation time. A special group of Anzac tourists are Anzac fanatics, who come for the Dawn ceremony. This is a very small group of Australians who have strong national sentiments that motivate them to

engage in Anzac commemorations, however, they can hardly be regarded as a representative group. Similarly, repeat clients who visit Gallipoli several times are also very few.

The tourist experience on Anzac Day is very sentimental and valuable for the visitors. They come well prepared for the Gallipoli experience, collecting information through guidebooks, the internet and tour companies, knowing the historical account of events and the nature of confrontations. The visitors take the midnight ferry from Çanakkale to Gallipoli and spend the night on site. The entry to site is closed after 2:00 AM for security and the Dawn ceremony begins at 5:30 AM. The Dawn ceremony is a valuable experience for the tourists, as they relive the experiences of the soldiers, the way they have endured in cold, against a barren nature in an unknown land. There are special interest tours for tourists with military background or interest in war, military power and battlefields, that seek to enact the experience of Anzac soldiers. They take walking tours; following the course of troops that landed on the Anzac cove. For the Anzac centenary special cruises were organized to follow the route of Anzac deployments from Australia to Gallipoli via Egypt. Every year, a number of tourists come in search from ancestors buried in Gallipoli; either they have a name, or a location or some sort of information that leads them to the battlefield. Although early visits to the Gallipoli battlefields were examples of family pilgrimage (Scates, 2006), later visits have more national than familial motivations. This could be due to two factors; first the passing of the generations who were directly connected to the Gallipoli Campaign and second the recreation of the Gallipoli heritage through official narratives of involved states. "Tourism can be important to a people's sense of national identity because it serves to operationalize the stories, the history and the linkages with the land" (Winter 2011b: 181). In that sense, even if direct family connections to war events weaken, tourism becomes an important link between the nation and the war heritage that lie outside of the nation-state boundaries.

Anzac tours are different from other heritage tours in Turkey. The tour guides are also different from the usual tour guides in many respects. There is a significant extent of emotional labor involved as they engage in personal encounters and information exchange with the Anzac tourists. A certain discourse has to be constructed in an amicable manner that would override the memory of wartime hostilities. The physical aspects of an Anzac tour are also different from other heritage tours. The battlefield is a different site than an archeological site. The Dawn ceremony requires an overnight shift on tour, where they stay in tents or on the bus. One tour operator states: "Many tour guides refrain from the overnight stay because there may be special demands and it's an exhausting job."

The interest from domestic tourists is as intense as the international ones. The national and political motivations for visiting Gallipoli are quite parallel in both cases, although the dates and the historical discourses vary. Domestic tourists visit Çanakkale throughout the year, especially student groups from all around the country take bus



tours to visit Gallipoli and experience the historical exposition. Second, town councils and municipalities also organize Çanakkale tours as part of their public relations agenda, and they use Çanakkale tours as a political instrument to expose and propagate their ideological positions. Third, families with children usually visit Çanakkale in order to inflict national sentiments and identity discourses to their children. Stories of Mustafa Kemal and the heroism of Turkish soldiers are some discursive elements used in the intergenerational transmission of national identity.

Table 2 shows the monthly distribution of domestic and international visitors in comparative perspective. The number of overnights stays and the average length of the stays are also given for both groups. This data is important in showing the seasonal variations in numbers as well as the comparative numbers of visitors. First, domestic visitors outnumber international visitors by a large margin for all time periods. This could also be interpreted as a sustained domestic interest in Çanakkale. Second, although there is a relative increase in summer months, the number of visitors does not indicate a seasonal variation. Therefore the seasonality of Çanakkale tourism is significantly different from that of mass tourism that characterizes Turkish tourism across the board. Third, the length of stay for both groups do not exceed two days, except for the months of July and August for domestic visitors, which does not make a groundbreaking difference. Different dates of Anzac Day commemorations in April and Turkish Victory Day in March do not reflect upon the number of visitors. For both domestic and international tourists, Çanakkale visit is a well-focused, special interest activity rather than a recreational one. It is regarded more as a mission than a holiday.

**Table 2 Domestic and International Visitors and Length of Stays in Comparison**

	Monthly Distribution of Domestic Visitors			Monthly Distribution of International Visitors			Total		Average Length of Stays
	Visitors	Overnight Stays	Average Length of Stays	Visitors	Overnight Stays	Average Length of Stays	Visitors	Overnight Stays	
2015									
January	14.928	26.527	1,78	5.941	6.870	1,16	20.869	33.397	1,60
February	15.333	26.111	1,70	9.274	9.723	1,05	24.607	35.834	1,46
March	25.561	41.292	1,62	11.072	11.802	1,07	36.633	53.094	1,45

April	33.853	50.089	1,48	18.345	31.721	1,73	52.198	81.810	1,57
May	48.117	67.190	1,40	19.590	22.739	1,16	67.707	89.929	1,33
June	30.146	52.236	1,73	22.163	24.594	1,11	52.309	76.830	1,47
July	33.462	74.163	2,22	23.713	28.586	1,21	57.175	102.749	1,80
August	41.516	93.637	2,26	21.344	26.303	1,23	62.860	119.940	1,91
September	29.116	54.017	1,86	21.499	25.267	1,18	50.615	79.284	1,57
October	21.942	33.530	1,53	17.403	19.443	1,12	39.345	52.973	1,35
November	17.530	25.963	1,48	8.558	9.442	1,10	26.088	35.405	1,36
December	15.126	22.134	1,46	6.743	8.004	1,19	21.869	30.138	1,38
Total	326.630	566.889	1,74	185.645	224.494	1,21	512.275	791.383	1,54

Source: Çanakkale Tourism Administration, 2016.

There is a sustained and growing interest in Gallipoli Campaign and its heritage in Çanakkale, in both international and domestic tourism. However, tourism policy in Turkey, whether as government policy towards tourism development or private investment towards economic development has not addressed this interest. This undermining of potential is best observed with the low rates of accommodation capacity in the area and the low numbers of overnight stays. On a macro level, Çanakkale as the primary site for battlefield tourism in the country would contribute to Turkish tourism by way of diversifying the industry and by expanding the seasonal and geographic scope of tourism activities in the country.

## Conclusions

The objective of this research was to present the ways in which modern day representations of a particular historical phenomenon translates into a tourism motivations beyond mainstream recreational stimulants of the sea, sun and sand, hence results in a long-distance tourism network between Turkey as host and Australian and New Zealander tourists as guests. Three major arguments contribute to this causal relationship. First, the Gallipoli Campaign, as a multiparty confrontation contributed significantly to the nation building process for Turks as well as for Australians. The political implications for the war may vary on different levels of analysis, yet it has become a significant and symbolic identity marker for national parties directly involved in the campaign.

Second, the particular ways in which the campaign has been portrayed, expressed and represented directly plays into the nationalist sentiments and the personal motivations of tourists. These motivations have changed from the time of initial visits in the aftermath of the Gallipoli Campaign to contemporary annual commemorations of the Anzac Day. The political projects undertaken by governments as well as dominant ideology of the time played directly into the representations of the Campaign and the way tourists have been mobilized, both domestically and internationally. The particular representations of collective memories of Turkish and Australian sides resulted in the flourishing of a unique long distance tourism network, which makes Gallipoli a singular site for battlefield tourism.

Third, a comparative analysis of Anzac visitors and domestic visitors indicate that there is a sustained interest in Anzac Day commemorations taking place in Çanakkale on an annual basis. However, the potential of battlefield tourism based on the Anzac experience is only indirectly employed in the Turkish tourism industry. Anzac visitors do not directly come to Çanakkale but to Istanbul instead, they spend only a minor portion of their stay in Turkey in Çanakkale. In conclusion, although battlefield tourism on the basis of Gallipoli Campaign holds significant potential in diversifying Turkish tourism industry temporally, spatially and in terms of tourism types, this potential is heavily undermined in the case of Çanakkale.

Future research on battlefield tourism in general and Anzac tourism in particular may trace two major lines. First, a longitudinal analysis of the discursive transformations and changing practices, rituals and symbolization of nationhood may provide a comparative angle on the way tourist motivations are being modified by external political and cultural factors. In a reciprocal manner, the existence of a long-term tourism network may feed into the making of a particular discourse on national identity, more likely in terms of tolerance and sympathy than enmity. In the case of battlefield tourism there seems to be a complementary relationship between tourist demand and political relations. Second, several policy alternatives may contribute to the flourishing of battlefield tourism in Çanakkale, in line with its existing potential. Increasing investment in infrastructure, especially in transportation and accommodation, would enable longer stays in the destination. The Gallipoli experience could be expanded to meet the demands and motivations of the Anzac visitors. Anzac Day commemorations and the Dawn service provide limited opportunity for tourists to access and experience the battlefield. The authenticity of the Anzac experience needs to be protected from the political ambitions of governments. This would enable the special interest tourists to relate with the Gallipoli area.

## References

- Anzac Spirit*, (n.d.). Retrieved from, <https://www.awm.gov.au/encyclopedia/anzac/spirit/>
- Aydın, S. (2007). Çanakkale Savaşları, In: Başkaya, F. and Ersoy, T. (eds.) *Resmi İdeoloji Sözlüğü* [Dictionary of Official Ideology], pp. 63-81.
- Bean's Anzac Book shaped how Australians think about Gallipoli* (2015). Retrieved from <http://theconversation.com/beans-anzac-book-shaped-how-australians-think-about-gallipoli-38203>
- Bean, C.E.W., (1948). *Gallipoli Mission*, Australian War Memorial, Canberra. Retrieved from <https://www.awm.gov.au/images/collection/pdf/RCDIG1069740--1-.pdf>.
- Bates, S. (2013). *The Anzac Day Legend: Its Origins, Meaning, Power and Impact on Shaping Australia's Identity*, Sydney, unpublished Master's of Peace and Conflict Studies Dissertation, Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Sydney.
- Blom, T. (2000). Morbid Tourism - A postmodern market niche with an example from Althorp. *Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 54(1), 29-36.
- Bongiorno, F. (2008). Whose War Was It Anyway? Some Australian Historians and the Great War. *History Compass*, 6(1), 62-90.
- Bozkurt, A. (2012). Gelibolu Yarımadası'nda İtilaf Blokuna Ait Harp Mezarlıklarının İnşası ve Statüsü [The Status of Graves, Cemeteries and Monuments of the Entente Bloc], *Atatürk Merkezi Araştırma Dergisi*, 8(84), 57-101.
- Bozkurt, C. (2015). Çanakkale Şehitleri Abidesi'nin İnşaatı ve Türk Kamuoyundaki Yankıları [The Construction of the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial and Its Reflection in Turkish Society], *Turkish Studies*, 10(5), 79-94.
- Butler, R. and Suntikul, W. (eds.) (2013). *Tourism and War*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Commemorating the Centenary of Anzac* (n. d.). Retrieved from [http://www.budget.gov.au/2012-13/content/overview/html/overview\\_32.htm](http://www.budget.gov.au/2012-13/content/overview/html/overview_32.htm)
- Chronis, A. (2005). Coconstructing Heritage at the Gettysburg Storyscape. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(2), 386-406.
- Çanakkale Savaşları Gelibolu Tarihi Alan Başkanlığı, 2015 Faaliyet Raporu* [Annual Report of the Directorate of Çanakkale Wars Gallipoli Historical Region] (2015). Retrieved from <http://catab.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,159996/faaliyet-raporlari.html>

Erickson, E.J. (2001). Strength against Weakness: Ottoman Military Effectiveness at Gallipoli, 1915. *The Journal of Military History*, 65, 981-1012.

*Final report of the Dardanelles Commission, part II, conduct of operations &c. (n. d.)*. Retrieved from <http://www.nla.gov.au/apps/cdview/?pi=nla.aus-vn2035864-s8-e> and <http://www.nla.gov.au/apps/cdview/?pi=nla.aus-vn2035864-s9-e>

Fathi, R. (2016). Is Australia Spending Too Much on the “Anzac Centenary”? A Comparison with France, *Honest History*, 14 April 2016 (retrieved from <http://honesthistory.net.au/wp/fathi-romain-is-australia-spending-too-much-on-the-anzac-centenary-plus-hh-background-on-spending-politics/>)

Foley, M. and Lennon, J.J. (1996). JFK and Dark Tourism: A fascination with assassination. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 2(4), 198–211.

Gallipoli Peninsula Historical National Park Simulation and Information Center for the Legend of Gallipoli (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.milliparklar.gov.tr/kitap/55/55.pdf>.

Gammage, B. (2005). The Graves of Anzac, in *Gallipoli in Retrospect: 90 Years On*, in Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Atatürk and Gallipoli Campaign Research Center, Çanakkale, 59-69.

Grief Tourism Definition, 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.grief-tourism.com/grief-tourism-definition/> on May 9, 2016.

Hall, C.M. (2002). ANZAC Day and secular pilgrimage, *Tourism Recreation Research*, 27(2), 83-87.

Inglis, Ken (2008). *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Jansen-Verbeke, M. and George, W. (2015). Memoryscapes of the Great War (1914-1918): A paradigm shift in tourism research on war heritage. *Via@*, 2015-2(8).

Kirişçi, C.A (2014). The representation of Gallipoli in Turkish literature: A brief overview, In: İlhan, M.M. (eds.) *Gallipoli: History, Memory and National Imagination*, Ankara Türk Tarih Kurumu, pp. 183-201.

Kirişçi, C.A. (2015). The face of the ‘enemy’: The image of the adversary in Turkish literary works about Gallipoli. *Journal of New Zealand Literature*, 33(2), 160-181.

MacCannell D. (1976). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Schocken Books: New York.

Macfie, A.L. (1983). The straits question in the First World War, 1914-18. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 19(1), 43-74.

- McKernan, M. (2010). *Gallipoli, A Short History*, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.
- Miles, S.T. (2012). Battlefield tourism: meanings and interpretations. Unpublished PhD thesis. Retrieved at <http://theses.gla.ac.uk/3547/> on May 9, 2016.
- Miles, S.T. (2014). Battlefield Sites as Dark Tourism Attractions: An Analysis of Experience. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(2), 134-147.
- O'Neill, S. (2002). 'Soham pleads with trippers to stay away', Daily Telegraph. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1405391/Soham-pleads-with-trippers-to-stay-away.html> on May 9, 2016.
- Rojek, C. (1997). Indexing, dragging and the social construction of tourist sights. In: Rojek, C. and Urry, J. (eds.) *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, London: Routledge, pp. 52–74.
- Ryan, C. (ed.) (2007). *Battlefield Tourism: History, Place and Interpretation*; Oxford: Elsevier.
- Seal, G. (2004). *Inventing Anzac: The Digger National Mythology*. Santa Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
- Scates, B. (2002). In Gallipoli's shadow: Pilgrimage, memory, mourning and the Great War. *Australian Historical Studies*, 33(119), 1-21.
- Scates, B. (2006). *Return to Gallipoli: Walking the Battlefields of the Great War*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Seaton, A.V. (1999). War and thanatourism: Waterloo 1815-1914. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(1), 130-158.
- Sınmaz Sönmez, C. (2015). Çanakkale Savaşları'nı Anma ve Kutlama Etkinlikleri (1916-1938) (Commemoration and Celebration Events of the Gallipoli Campaign (1916-1938) *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yılığ*, 13(19), 173-195.
- Slade, P. (2003). Gallipoli Thanatourism: The Meaning of ANZAC. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 30(4), 779-794.
- Smith, M.S. (2010). *The Relationship Between Australians and the Overseas Graves of the First World War*, unpublished master's (MA) thesis, Queensland University of Technology, Humanities Program, Queensland.
- Smith, V.L. (1989) *Hosts and Guests: Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, V.L. (1998). War and tourism: An American Ethnography. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 25(1), 202-227.

Stone, P. and Sharpley, R. (2008). Consuming dark tourism: A thanatological perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35 (2), 574-595.

Türk Ansiklopedisi (Turkish Encyclopedia) (1963), v. IX, Milli Eğitim Basımevi, Ankara.

Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi, Çanakkale Savaşları Gelibolu Tarihi Alan Başkanlığı Kurulması Hakkında Kanun Tasarısı ve Milli Eğitim, Kültür, Gençlik ve Spor Komisyonu Raporu (Turkish Grand National Assembly, Report of the National Education, Culture, Youth and Sports Commission on the draft bill for the establishment of a Directorate of Çanakkale Wars Gallipoli Historical Region), Sıra No: 601(1/927). Retrieved from <https://www.tbmm.gov.tr/sirasayi/donem24/yil01/ss601.pdf>.

Understanding Anzac Day, Past, Present and Future,  
[http://anzacportal.dva.gov.au/sites/default/files/publication-attachments/Gallipoli\\_Anzacs\\_Unit7\\_0.pdf](http://anzacportal.dva.gov.au/sites/default/files/publication-attachments/Gallipoli_Anzacs_Unit7_0.pdf)

Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage Publications.

War Correspondent Charles Bean – Biography (n.d.). Retrieved from  
<http://www.gallipoli.gov.au/battle-of-the-landing/charles-bean/biography-cew-bean-1879-1968.php>

Winter, C. (2011a), Battlefield Visitor Motivations: Explorations in the Great War Town of Ieper, Belgium. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13, 164–176.

Winter, C. (2011b). Battlefield Tourism and Australian National Identity: Gallipoli and the Western Front. In: Fren, E. and White, L. (eds.) *Tourism and National Identities: An International Perspective*, Oxon and New York: Routledge. pp. 176-189.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first sentence is often omitted, perhaps to deliberately disassociate the Anzac legend with defeat.

<sup>2</sup> For a full list of events please visit <http://Çanakkale2015.gov.tr/tr>.