Alicante Journal of English Studies 31 (2018): 83-107

"Sons of Two Empires": The Idea of Nationhood in Anzac and Turkish Poems of the Gallipoli Campaign

Berkan Ulu
Inönü Üniversitesi
berkan.ulu@inonu.edu.tr

Burcin Cakir
Glasgow Caledonian University
burcin.cakir@gcu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

An unexpected failure of the Allied forces and a monumental victory for the Turks, the Gallipoli Campaign (1915) is thought to be the first notable experience for Australians and New Zealanders on their way to identify themselves as nations free from the British Empire. For the war-weary Turks, too, the victory in Gallipoli was the beginning of their transformation from a wreck of an empire to a modern republic. Despite the existence of a substantial body of research on the military, political, and historical aspects of the campaign, studies on the literature of Gallipoli are very few and often deal with canonised poets such as Rupert Brooke or national concerns through a single perspective. Aiming to bring to light underappreciated poets from Gallipoli, this paper is a comparative study of less known poems in English and Turkish from Gallipoli. While doing this, the study traces the signs of the nation-building processes of Australia, New Zealand, and Turkey with emphasis on national identity. To this end, the paper examines a number of Gallipoli poems in English and Turkish that were composed by combatant or non-combatant poets by using close reading analysis in search of shifts in discourse and tone. The study also underlines how poets from the two sides identified themselves and the ways the campaign is reflected in these poems. At length, the study shows that Gallipoli poems display similar attitudes towards the idea of belonging to an empire although they differ in the way warfare is perceived. With emphasis on less known poems and as one of the very few comparative studies of the poetry of the Gallipoli Campaign, this paper will contribute to the current research into the legacy and literature of the First World War.

Keywords: The Gallipoli Campaign, poetry, nationhood, Anzacs, Turks

This document is under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (CC BY 4.0).

1. Introduction

On 26 December 1915, General Liman von Sanders, commander of the 5th Imperial Army, sent a telegram to Enver Pasha. In official terms, Enver Pasha was the commander-in-chief of the Ottoman army but in practicality he was the omnipotent of all, military or non-military, after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908. Typical of von Sanders's stereotypically straightforward German style, the contents of the telegram were clear. The Allied forces were getting ready for evacuation and it seemed to him that the Gallipoli wars had come to an end with a spectacular victory of the Turkish army (Atabay, 2012: 309). The Pasha was overjoyed and announced that he would make a speech at the parliament to honour those who defended the Turkish homeland. Enver Pasha was known to have a boastful character and his address inevitably reflected this:

> These men [the British] will not be able go further into the Strait and defeat our armies in the battlefield even if they bring a land army of half a million men. Having seen this… Kitchener, too, gave in to the idea of evacuation after his visit to Gallipoli. He, too, was well aware that our infantries were much better than his ("Meclis-i Mebusan," 1916: 320).

Enver Pasha's confidence was not vain. By the time he was giving this speech behind the lectern in the parliament on 10 January 1916, it had already been four days since the last battleship left the Gallipoli shores. Indeed, it was a sweeping victory for the Turk and an unexpected humiliating defeat for the Allied forces in the first legs of the war.

The Gallipoli Campaign was the first amphibious operation in modern military history that brought an end to the unvanquished title of the British Navy that unquestionably used to rule the waves since the victory at Trafalgar. The defeat in Gallipoli had other reverberations as well. In England, the government would soon change hands and Churchill's role as the leader of the navy would be pacified; the delay in the Allied helping hand would lead to the October Revolution in Russia; and, encouraged by the triumphant Muslim soldiers, resilience in other Ottoman fronts would grow harder. All these reasons and more often lead scholars, historians, and researchers to focus on the military, political, and historical reasons and results of the campaign.

The number of studies on the socio-cultural or literary edge of the campaign, however, is very few and majority of these works concentrate on the idea that there was a growing sense of 'mate-ship' between Turks and Anzacs during the last months of the campaign. According to this, particularly, after the August offensive in Suvla, the fearful and savage image of the Turk was replaced by a brave, resilient, and honourable enemy.[1] As George Skerret, a stretcher bearer from New Zealand, wrote in his diary, the "unspeakable Turk" was now a man who simply fought in defence of his country and loved ones (cited in Shadbold, 1989: 111-2). Other observations of the Anzac trooper seem to have galvanised this notion as well. Diaries of and newspapers articles about the Anzacs testify that they were aware that Turks had not attacked any Red Cross tents or wounded soldiers on their way to field hospitals, or used poisonous gas throughout the conflict (Tuncoku, 2000: 81; 85-119). Soon, this realisation turned into a sense of comradeship that would further be strengthened by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's address[2]

embracing the Anzacs who fell in Gallipoli as their own sons. In time, both sides came to believe that the other had justifiable reasons to fight in Gallipoli.

Another common idea in studies on socio-cultural aspects of the Gallipoli Campaign is that the campaign was a starting point for the brave bush-man image of the Anzac soldiers. Many studies in the second half of the 20th century, regard Gallipoli as the first notable stage where they proved their worth as the descendants of a mighty empire. However, contrary to these established views, more recent studies imply that the influence of the campaign was not actually quite like it had always been depicted. Undermining the “myth” about the birth of antipodean nations, Thomson argues that the real motives behind the “sacred and unassailable” story of the Anzacs was only a government-designed attempt to cover up the failure of the British Empire and her dominions in the first half of the Great War (1995: 64). He believes that the stories about the bravery of the Anzacs in Gallipoli were carefully crafted “myths” and researchers need “to challenge historical myths that empower some people at the expense of others” (*ibid.* 73).[3] A similar point of view is also advocated by Laffin. Based on the criticism that the theme of honest friendship between the Turks and Anzacs was a result of the realisation that the whole campaign was heading towards a defeat after the failure of the Suvla landings and, at length, the evacuation, Laffin argues that the courageous Anzac image was but a mask shrouding the frustration (1989: 174).[4]

Based on meticulous research in archives and military documents, the ideas posed by Thomson and Laffin share strong arguments although diaries, prose works, and newspaper articles of the time show that the idea that Gallipoli left a noteworthy mark on the nation building process of Anzacs and Turks actually holds true. Indeed, a close look at the works written in late 1915 and early 1916 shows that individual experiences of soldiers with their counterparts had created a mind-set that led to rupture of all three countries from the British and Ottoman empires, respectively. Partly based on constant failure at the battlefield as well as on the incapable and inconsiderate attitude of some, major and minor, British officers, many diary entries from Anzac soldiers, for instance, justify the shift from pro-British frame of mind to ideas that defied the British as untrustworthy leaders and motivated the Anzacs to turn to their kinsmen. It is because of this shift that historians like Jonathan King believe that Anzacs went to Gallipoli as British soldiers and came back as Australians and New Zealanders (2008: 1). As for the Turks, the development of the idea of a national Turkish identity was slightly different although the contributory role of Gallipoli as an effective stimulant towards a national—rather than an imperial—identity is undeniably similar to the shift observed in the Anzacs. Having lost a great portion of her lands after the rise of nationalism ignited by the French Revolution, the Gallipoli victory was a new beginning for the Ottoman Turks who now realised that relying on an ethnically Turkish identity free from imperial ties could save them from the ruins of a six-hundred-year old empire.

As it has been mentioned above, military records, historical accounts, and official documents have so far constituted the basis for analysis of the campaign. However, poetry written by soldiers who fought in Gallipoli also follows a similar pattern of change towards national identity. It is true that studies on the poetry of the Gallipoli Campaign have so far centred around mainstream poets like Rupert Brooke, Geoffrey Dearmer, A.P. Herbert, and Francis Ledwidge or approached the literary legacy of the campaign from a

single perspective—either Anglophone or Turkish—as in Jill Hamilton's *Gallipoli to Gaza*, Ömer Çakır's *Türk Şiirinde Çanakkale Muharebeleri*, and David Childs and Vivien Whelpton's *British and Irish Poets of the Gallipoli Campaign* are among the very few works on the poetry of the campaign. The aim of this study, therefore, is to trace the reasons and early signs of national awakening and consciousness in the less known poems written about the Gallipoli campaign in English and Turkish. In line with assumptions on the close connection between identity and nationhood such as Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, which suggests that the nation is a collectively interpreted through a process of imagining its identity and the identity of its citizens, and building up on recent commemorative studies on the Gallipoli Campaign, we propose that poems from Gallipoli employ strong evidences that prop up the notion that the campaign was highly effective in changing the way soldiers from Australia, New Zealand, and Turkey identified themselves. To do this, we provide a close reading of several works from minor and/or soldier poets who were in Gallipoli during the campaign and support our findings with evidence from diaries and historical records of the campaign to highlight the shift from the imperial to the national throughout the campaign.

2. The Beginnings

When Britain declared war on Germany on 4 August 1914, Australia and New Zealand, then dominions of the British Empire, were also drawn into the fiery circle of this mainly European conflict. However, the Antipodeans looked enthusiastic about joining the war as it can be seen in Andrew Fisher's speech: "Should the worst happen, after everything has been done that honour will permit, Australians will stand beside the mother country to help and defend her to our last man and our last shilling" (Curtis, 2014).[5] Fisher was soon proved to be right. In weeks, thousands of men presented themselves at the military offices and marquees set up across Australia and New Zealand in order to fight for what Rupert Brooke called "Mother of men / England" (1970: 10-1). Written en route to Gallipoli, Brooke's lines depicting England as a mother giving birth to valiant men was indeed the summary of the ardour shared by volunteers from Australia and New Zealand. For many, enlisting meant a chance to pay the debts in return for everything the motherland had provided so far. James Drummond Burns was one of those soldiers who heard the call of "the bugles of England […] blowing o'er the sea" (2012:1-2):

> Oh, England! I heard the cry
> Of those who died for thee
> Sounding like an organ voice
> Across the wintry sea.
> They lived and died for England,
> And gladly went their way -
> England, Oh! England,
> How could I stay?
> (*ibid.* 17-24)

Based on Horace's *"dulce et decorum est pro patria mori"* dictum,[6] Burns draws a passionate picture of how honourable fighting for England could be. The tone of the poem

is so vehemently set that it almost sounds like a commissioned poem written for war propaganda. However, Burns, son of a Presbyterian minister, was merely a twenty-year-old scholar when he penned the poem. Soon after he enlisted in mid-1915, Burns was promoted to Corporal due to his devoted service while "For England" had already become known and was used to urge reluctant men to join the army when he ("James Drummond," 2016).

Burns, who fell in Gallipoli in September 1915, was one of the many soldiers who portrayed the spirit of those who felt indebted to England. However, the desire to support the Empire when the need was dire was only one of the motives for these men. Although many of these "lads" had already proven that they were good fighter material, young able men from Australia and New Zealand were still willing to show their families (as well as the world—especially the British) that they were not simply agricultural bush-men from the down under but also worthy sons of the Empire decorated with masculinity (Roper, 2016). Those who queued at enlistment offices were aware that they, as people of the antipodes, were soon to undertake their most important test (Fewster, 1983: 19-20). Major H. M. Alexander, a British officer who took part in the campaign, had observed that soldiers from Australia and New Zealand, though they were initially disappointed for not being sent to the Western front, were more than enthusiastic than anyone else to prove that they were fearless men that the Empire could count on (1917: 145). The British Major-General Hunter-Weston, who would be held responsible for some of the major tactical mistakes that cost thousands of lives in the days to come, also remarked that Anzacs were "…a fine body of men, but undisciplined in peace. I think they will be grand fighters. Grand physique, intelligent looking and, I should judge, with plenty of grit" (cited in Robertson, 1990: 59). In short, volunteering in the army was a matter of honour for the young men in Australia and New Zealand and it would be unacceptable for them to be left behind when England was sending "her bravest forth," (Harrington, 1988: 4):

> The drums beat loud, the banners fly, we're going aboard to-day,
> The transports, and the convoys too, wait ready in the bay.
> …
> We'll show how Austral sons can fight - and die, should need arise
> To guard their sunny Southern land, the fairest 'neath the skies.
> (*ibid.* 1-2; 20-1)

A trooper in the 4th Light Horse, Australian Imperial Forces (AIF), Edward Harrington's lines above is the reflection of the panorama in Australia, a British dominion with a population of fewer than five millions at the time of the war (Robertson, 1990: 16). Volunteers from New Zealand showed no less eagerness and they, too, were keen to prove their courage. *Diggers' Poems*, a small anonymous collection of poetry by returned soldiers, opens with a poem simply entitled "Anzacs." The speaker who watches the "great white ships… / Bringing the spent men back" is not at all discouraged by the scene (1920?: 1; 4). Instead, he feels proud and heartened since he knows that the reward of endurance is something that cannot be disregarded:

> What means these great white ships at sea,
> Ploughing their Eastward track.

> …
> They mean that New Zealand has been there
> They mean that she has played the game,
> And her wonderful sons have won their share
> Of everlasting fame.
>
> Battered and worn and war scarred-
> Those who had left their land
> Strong in their glowing manhood,
> By England to take their stand.
> Those who had sailed when a war-cloud burst
> Out on a distant foam,
> To the tune of "New Zealand Will Be There,"
> Thus they are coming home.
> (*ibid.* 1-2; 5-8; 9-16)[7]

As the poem presents, the load of homecoming ships only strengthened the newly enlisted young men who witnessed the appreciation the sick and wounded received on their return. They were ready to experience the battlefield more than ever, having more reasons to fight. It is true that some volunteers had more pragmatic reasons to join in; some enlisted to avoid unemployment, some due to public and/or family pressure, and some to take care of their relatives or friends who had already joined the war while some were there to win the heart of a sweet heart. But on a more idealist note, and in addition to the motive to show their manly virtues and allegiance to the Empire, these soldiers also shared a more philosophical incentive. The number of volunteers who believed that the Germans were violent oppressors and someone needed to give an end to their evil deeds was substantially large. Liberals in mind and romantics at heart, these men saw themselves as freedom fighters who were doing their bit for the future of a peaceful world. "Our Hope," an anonymous poem from *the Kiwi*, a troopship magazine compiled by the soldiers en route to Gallipoli—or Karipori, as it was known to Maori soldiers—employs this attitude fused with the pride people of New Zealand felt:

> We come from New Zealand, the land of our birth,
> A little Dominion, the greatest on earth,
> Our reason for ploughing this trackless sea
> Is to help in the struggle to make men free.
>
> We are not anxious for fight, but re-joice in the right,
> Our national principle—which we hold tight—
> For this, many of our land this day are at rest
> And we, too, now journey to join in the test.
> (2017: 1-8)

The spirits were high and Anzacs were ready for any hardship battlefield might offer. However, the test mentioned in "Our Hope" soon proved to be a difficult one. The naval attack on 18 March was a disaster and a land-based operation was imminent. Very few things went according to the plans after this point and the short-cut to end the deadlock on the Western front - as this was how the campaign was defined by the Allied decision

makers - did nothing but produced yet another stalemate of trench warfare. A considerable body of research has been devoted to the reasons behind the failure of the amphibious operation that began on 25 April and it would require a lengthy survey to go through these causes. At this point, it should suffice to say that the long list of reasons that brought about this catastrophe, military and non-military alike, were initially rooted in the haphazardly prepared battle plans. The maps were outdated; there was constant breakdown in the chain of command and communication lines; drinking water was scarce and this led to the spread of diseases like dysentery and typhoid fever; soldiers had not been propped up accurately for the windy, hot summer of Gallipoli; food was blunt; and the Turk, who had clearly been underestimated, was literally invisible in the labyrinthine territory of the peninsula. But as far as the morale of the Anzac soldier was concerned, the real fly in the ointment was the disaccord between the British officers and Anzac soldiers.

3. From Sons of the Empire to "Australians" and "New Zealanders"

The early signs of friction between the Anzacs and the British officers had surfaced in Egypt, where the antipodeans were given the acronym "ANZAC" replacing the impractical Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (Hamilton, 2003: 43).[8] Egypt was the home of the military camp where the Anzacs were initially transferred to be trained by the class-centred British officers. There are accounts from this period indicating that British officers were discontent by the sloppy attitude of especially Australian soldiers (Tuncoku, 2000: 35). From the British perspective, these unruly soldiers who were unable to abide by rigid British military discipline were untrustworthy (Laffin, 1989: 79). In the coming months of the campaign, this lack of faith would lead to further disputes and controversial reports and accounts. No matter how Anzacs were perfectly cut out for fighting both physically and mentally, it was true also that they needed to be instructed and trained. A ditty Anzacs used to sing in Egypt demonstrates that even they themselves were aware of their lack of military discipline:

> We're the Anzac Army,
> The A. eN. Zed. A. Cee,
> We cannot shoot, we don't salute,
> What bloody good are we?
> (1-4; cited in Hamilton, 2003: 43)

However, the state the Anzacs were in with regards to military skills cannot be compared to the mistakes made by the British high command and officers: orders were confusing, objectives and instructions were often complicated, and there was lack of communication between units. Decision makers in London were also aware that the whole campaign was planned in an unmethodical way. The reverberations of the shortcomings of the military schemes undeniably emerged during and after the landings in April. Food was monotonous, water was scarce and with the coming of a hot summer, flies had become "a bigger foe than the Turks" (McMullin, 2002: 135). On top of these, imprecise orders issued by commanders who did not take initiatives unsettled

communication protocols while minor officers ignored major sanitary issues and inadequate supplies. Also, there was lack of valuable intelligence including location of Turkish artillery positions (Prior, 2010: 120-31). Although a considerable number of soldiers were deployed in days after the initial landings, they did not know what to do. Reverend O. Creighton, chaplain to the 86th Brigade of the 29th Division, relates how the soldiers felt in his diary:

> *Wednesday, April 28:* … What are the Australians doing? How is the Navy getting on further up the Dardanelles? We know nothing.
>
> *Thursday, April 29:* This is a perfectly interminable wait. Day after day passes and we get no news and no orders… It seems quite inexplicable why they send us no orders. (2013: 53-4)[9]

This was the British point of view; the criticism Anzacs would soon raise would be much more bitter. As the campaign progressed and the soldiers remained pinned down to the narrow beaches of the Strait, Anzacs began to grumble about almost anything from indecisive commanders to the blunt diet they had nothing but to accept. These issues surfaced particularly after 24 May 1915. This was the day of the 24-hour armistice[10] to collect the rotting bodies on no-man's-land when the Anzacs encountered the "unspeakable Turk" for the first time only to realise that he was not as evil, cruel, or inhuman like he had been depicted in the British propaganda. During the supervised truce there were times when both sides exchanged food and cigarette with notes attached and, as an Anzac soldier wrote, "Two enemy friends left after having shaken each other's hands" (qtd. in Kerr, 1998: 90). The memoirs By Lieutenant Colonel Percival Fenwick, Deputy Director, NZ Medical Corps gives a very vivid account of this significant encounter and its psychological responses to the enemy and the conditions:

> May 24, Anzac Cove—The most ghastly day. We were met by some Turkish officers who arrived on horseback followed by 50 very fine looking Turks, carrying Red Crescent and white flags. One of the officers was a German doctor. We exchanged cigarettes with the other officers frequently and the senior Turkish medico gave me two pieces of scented wool to put in my nostrils. Further along the plateau, the distance between the trenches narrowed. We kept very carefully in the center. The narrowest place was not 17 feet apart. Our men and the Turks peered over the sandbags and all seemed pleased at the chance of seeing each other without the fear of immediate death as the price of curiosity (Fenwick, 2000: 89).[11]

Feeling as if they were "dumped" to the razor-sharp coasts of Gallipoli (East, 1981: 94), Anzacs were now more critical than ever and their complaints were becoming more straightforward and pungent and they believed that "the Indians, New Zealanders, and Australians are still doing magnificent work but loosing too many good men whilst the Tommies are holding back" (*ibid.* 78).[12]

Harley Matthews's "True Patriot" (1940b: 18-30) reflects the early beginnings of such condemnatory point of view of the Anzacs. The whole poem is a narrative of a group of Australian soldiers pushing onwards towards the hills to reach a Turkish village during the initial landings. Simply named after his hometown in Australia, Taree, a private in

AIF, engages in a heated dispute with a pro-British corporal when the company receives orders to fall back and return to the main camp with no logical reason. On the way back, Taree questions the previously given orders:

> "Anyway, what good will it
> Do us? There'd only be
> Women and children there."
> The corporal turns on him - "And who are you
> To judge the High Command?
> Where that fire burns the map shows there are stores
> Of ammunition. So we now can push
> Forward as it was planned-"
> "God! Ammunition? They've enough for me
> Just out in front. This High Command of yours
> I'll bet we never take the ridge ahead.
> It only knows what's on maps."
> "You only know what you see here. The High
> Command knows everything
> That happens everywhere." "My mate is dead,
> Out there in the barbed wire.
> Does it know that?"
> (*ibid.* 66-82)

Taree is the mouthpiece of the rest of the company while the corporal, who the poem reveals to be a bank clerk before the war, is depicted as an incompetent opposite of the uneducated yet sensible and reasonable bushman. When the soldiers are lost in the ridges, it is again Taree who finds the way back to the encampment while the corporal stubbornly follows the maps provided by the British commanders which soon prove to be faulty. Indeed, much of the intel the Allied High Command relied on was so outdated that this shortcoming was even noticed by von Sanders who noted that the "… only defect being that they were based on reconnaissance that were too old and that they underestimated the powers of resistance of the Turkish soldier" (2000: 64). Indeed, the reconnaissance was so bad that the Allied attacks and schemes laid out by British commanders began to seem like it was doing more good to the Turks:

> Water - It was behind our talk of guns.
> Guns - Why we heard guns drumming in the south?
> Slaughter by battleships —
> Mines blowing up advancing bataillions —
> Of generals' new schemes to have more killed.
> …
> "Who says the navy is no help? The fool."
> "I do. And our artillery is as bad.
> They've killed more of our own than Turks…"
> (Matthews, 1940c: 74-78; 104-106)

As it is related in Matthews's poem above, the recklessness of the British officers resulted in not just great losses but also lack of trust. By the end of the summer of 1915,

Anzacs were devastated by "the experience of great loss and the feeling of betrayal" (Edmund, 2015: 38). At the end of the campaign, the Anzacs had lost almost 35.000 men and sorrow, misery, and a deeply downhearted mood summarize the state Anzac soldiers were in during the evacuation (Karatay, 1987: 41).[13] The excitement to defend the Empire was now replaced by a sense of reserved, defensive individuality. It is known that the Great War brought about a great change on all levels, and redefined ideas of Englishness (Barlow, 2000: 8); Gallipoli was no exception to this assumption. The discourse that employs the idea that Turks were great fighters and an honest enemy along with the notion that the dislike Anzacs developed for the British was a result of the defeat of the Allied forces falls short when one considers how the campaign unfolded. As can be seen, the Anzac soldier had enough reasons to come up with these convictions which would play a significant role in the perception of an empire-free national identity.

With this new frame of mind, therefore, the tone of the poems gradually changed. For one thing, many Anzacs did not consider themselves unsuccessful; the commonly accepted notion was that they had done their best in the given conditions. D. H. Souter's lines display how they felt about the overall Gallipoli experience: "We are content: we had our day, / Brief but splendid, crowned with power / And brimmed with action every hour" (1929: 1-3). Published on the same page with Souter's untitled poem, J.C. Hackney's "Australia Hears" is a more intense representation of the same disposition:

> What, gone? The Australians gone? From Anzac gone?
> That lurid crater where for eight long months,
> They lived with death, dined with disease,
> Till one in every two fell ill,
> And one in every four was shot.
> And one in every eight lay dead.
> …
> The impossible to do, the impossible she did,
> And thrice had won had others done the same.
> And when the last, the greatest, task arose,
> That she must go
> At such a risk
> That five-and-twenty thousand beds were ready for the fall,
> She went:
> Nor lost one man, nor left one man behind:
> Triumphant thus
> Australia! Proud, but sad.
> (1929: 1-6; 15-24)

Sad but proud, Anzacs were now beginning to employ a more nationalist discourse in many poems like Hackney's. The Gallipoli Campaign was so devastating for the Australians that "[h]ardly a family was unaffected by the immense casualty toll and its enduring ramifications" (McMullin, 2002: 532). The focus in soldiers' poems were now on their own kinsmen from their own hometowns and the sons the Empire were now Australians themselves while the heroic deeds Anzacs showed were their own and not for the freedom of European nations.

Leon Gellert's "The Change" also provides a glimpse of this shift of interest. Reminiscing on his days in Gallipoli, he visualizes the dreadful conditions of the battlefield. Then he turns to the present when he hears "…men tell strange trembling tales / With big beseeching eyes" (Gellert, 1917b: 15-6). But he refrains from remembering these stories and regrets having answered the call; instead, all he can picture is his brothers-in-arms: "I do not feel the bush-call, now / I feel my brother's pain" (*ibid.* 19-20). The change Gellert projects is also reflected in his means and devices as a poet. As the title indicates in his sonnet "The Australian Muse," what Gellert the poet needs now is a native muse that can "…touch the tender strings" and "[a]dd fame to fame, and rhyme to gloried rhyme" (Gellert, 1917c: 1; 11).

While the glory Gellert relates was indeed a source of pride for the Australians, some poets underlined the idea that the deeds these soldiers undertook was in fact a collective effort. Projecting the typical down-to-earth bush-man characteristics of Australian soldiers, Harry McCann of the 4th ALH[14] argues that the image of the Australian hero found in the papers is nothing like what these "cobbers"[15] are in real life. These comrades-in-arms are no Caesars, Napoleons, or Cromwells, nor can they "…be classed "gallant guardians" of European nations (McCann, 1916: 25). From the second half of the campaign onwards, these soldiers were depicted as simple Australian laymen who were fighting for their honour but their actions should not be explained by Empire's glory or in exaggerated ways. McCann's lines eventually summarise this shift from soldiers fighting *pro patria* to plain Australian cobbers when he says: "I gaze on Bill, me cobber, sure I smile a little smile, / For his happy, careless nature doesn't fit the poet's style" (*ibid.* 20-1).

At length, the pro-Australian discourse reached its peak with the renowned Australian bard Banjo Patterson. His "We're All Australians Now" is an apt expression of Australian nationhood that played an important role in Australia's—not only political but also cultural and intellectual—rupture from a purely British identity:

> Our six-starred flag that used to fly,
> Half shyly to the breeze
> …
> Flies out to meet the morning blue
> With Vict'ry at the prow;
> …
> And with Australia's flag shall fly
> A spray of wattle bough,
> To symbolise our unity,
> We're all Australians now.
> (1917: 1-2; 5-6; 9-12 *sic.*)

A similar attitude also developed among New Zealanders. Just like the Australians, they pushed gallantly during the landings but they were also disappointed especially after the landings. "The cream of New Zealand's flock" felt that they were not "a chip off the old British block" anymore ("The Landing," 1920?: 30; 32). And again, as in the case of the Australians, the reproachful perspective was further galvanized towards the

evacuation and led soldier-poets to concentrate on themselves rather than the defenders of the Empire:

> Your New Zealand Sons are sleeping, far over in a lonely land;
> They did their best, along with the rest, and that's how died and fell.
> They showed the world New Zealand's lads knew well the way to die;
> And they sleep there, and they sleep there, quiet where they lie.
> …
> The wild flowers bloom around their graves;
> The sad sea breeze that blows
> Sings, "Never a coward came from the land
> Where the wild clematis grows."
> ("Gone-But Not Forgotten," 1920?: 1-4; 9-12)

Coming from the other end of the world, New Zealanders also lost thousands of men but this bitter experience—especially when it was culminated with the distrust of the British generated throughout the campaign—sparkled the notion that they had major differences from their ancestors in Britain. Many more poems like "Gone-But Not Forgotten" show how the sons of the Empire turned local colours and rendered the "Britain as motherland" discourse weakened, or even invalid. One final example disclosing this idea could be given from "In Appreciation." Addressed to a New Zealander soldier who the poet regards to be a stranger, the poem opens with an acknowledgement of the bravery of New Zealanders in Gallipoli:

> Dear stranger, I've read your grand verses,
> With brave and true heart shining forth;
> And whatever the trials or reverses,
> How grandly you noble men fought.
> ("In Appreciation," 1920?: 1-4)

In the following stanzas, the poem depicts the battlefield and reassures the idea that these soldiers deserve to be credited the honour they were bestowed. The poet speaks so highly of his own people that he struggles to find the words to honour their memory: "Can I find any words to express / Our pride in New Zealand's brave sons?" (*ibid.* 11-2). Towards the end of the poem, the poet explains the function of the word "stranger" in the first stanza:

> I called you a stranger, but surely
> I'm entitled to call you a friend,
> For did you not go forth so truly
> And offer your life to defend?
> (*ibid.* 13-6)

It is now clear that the poet did not really know who he was addressing at the beginning. It was clear to him that the stranger was a soldier yet an anonymous one. But now he has become a friend, a native friend, and a New Zealander defending his own country—and not Britain—against the German threat.

4. From Ottoman Subject to a New Turkish Identity

The Turkish reception of the campaign was more complicated. The main problem, of course, was the fact that the Ottoman Empire was already crumbling by the time the Great War started and the general idea was that the Empire needed to take sides with one of the “Great Powers” to survive.[16] This tendency was not in vain; corruption in authorities, a bankrupt economy, and ever continuing struggle to keep the Empire intact against the independence seeking dominions were only the starters in the long menu depicting the downfall of the Ottomans. The humiliating defeat in the Balkan Wars was the last straw for the war weary Ottoman army. On top of all these alarming issues, the First World War started before the Empire could pull herself back together.

In these atrocious times, people looked up to several theories and ideologies. Some believed that a new emphasis on the Ottoman identity could change the minds of the minorities who were openly expressing their wish to free themselves from the Empire. Others found hope in Islam and hoped that the Empire could go back to her glorious days if she placed her trust in Muslim communities. There were also those who believed that Ottoman policies should focus on ethnic Turkish communities. Enver Pasha himself was one those figures who were dreaming about a pan-Turkic union with the ethnically Turkic nations around the Caspian Sea.[17] However, these ideals remained to be only instrumental compared to the impact the Gallipoli Campaign, or *Çanakkale Wars*[18] as it is referred to Turkish, which played a significant role in the birth of the notion of national identity that sparkled the Turkish Independence War and stimulated the foundation of the modern Turkish Republic in the years that followed.

For Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, the celebrated Turkish poet of the early years of the newly established republic, the Gallipoli experience was the “preface” of a new country (2009: 13-4). The significance of Gallipoli for the Turks could be explained in a number of reasons. First and foremost, the result of the conflict was an irrefutable victory. Raising the morale of the nation, it was a memorable accomplishment that the Ottoman communities had been longing for ages (Karakoyunlu, 1987: v). It was also the remedy for the shame brought on the Ottoman Empire by the blows she received at her doorstep by Bulgaria, Romania, and Greece. Indeed, seeing Gallipoli victory as the antidote of the Balkan Wars was the summary of the initial reception of the campaign when it was over in early 1916. At the time, many believed that “…the victory in Çanakkale has now wiped off the blemish the Balkan Wars had placed on [Ottoman] people’s forehead” (“Temizlenen Leke,” 1915: 4).

The perception of the enemy in Turkish poems highlights the Allies as a pitiless industrial machine. The size of the Allied army, and the presence of troops from several nations are underlined at all times. In many instances, the names of each country of the Allies were spelt out individually; British, the French and the Russians were considered as the main perpetrators of this unjust and bloody war. Blaming the West in their inherent character of maximizing their own benefits was the common theme of poems, letters and memoirs. Overall, the Anatolian Turk was fighting against the lowest of all enemies: a horde of “infidels,” “pirates,” “savages,” “monsters,” and “cannibals.” So much so that it is not surprising that early examples of Gallipoli poetry were dominated by a strong sense

of hatred for the invaders. Many poems depicted the Allied forces, especially the British, as unrighteous oppressors.

In June 1915, official invitations signed by the War Ministry and the Sultan were sent to a number of prominent names in Ottoman literary circles asking them to participate in a trip to Gallipoli. Their mission was to produce works that would help to arouse patriotism both within the troops as well as among the public.[19] They were specifically instructed to avoid praise for any high rank officials and focus, instead, on the soldiers and write as much as possible on the multi-nationality of the Ottoman Empire to keep the harmony and Muslim brotherhood particularly among Arab troops. The group is known in Turkish literary history as "*Heyet-i Edebi*" which can be translated as the Literary Committee and it included writers, journalists as well as two painters and a musician. Invited 30 attended 19, the committee left Istanbul on 11 July 1915 by train at Sirkeci station and returned to the capital on 23 July 1915. Upon their return, what followed was an outburst of patriotic literary production in the manner outlined by the War Ministry.[20]

The majority of these works were poems on the qualities of an ideal Ottoman soldier such as heroism, sacrifice, loyalty, devotion but most importantly faith. Martyrdom was treated with particular focus as the ultimate honour bestowed upon those fallen for their land. The success of the naval defence as the revenge of the Balkan defeat was highlighted at all times and the readers were assured that the loyal soldiers of the Ottoman army were fully aware that they were fighting for "*Darü'l-hilâfe ve saltanat kapılarını muhafaza*:" "for the defence of the gates of the Caliphate and the Sultanate."

İbrahim Aladdin [Gövsa,][21] the youngest of the poets in the government-funded delegation of literary figures sent to the front, portrays the enemy as intruders that should be pushed down the cliffs in Gallipoli:[22]

> There's a pain fortune has left in hearts,
> To their fate we left mothers, daughters in our land
> To see the destiny of the star of the Turk
> We'll soon be telling fortunes in the sand.
>
> Then we'll twist their bodies
> Of those English cry-babies
> We'll scare them off, those infidel flies
> And make honey at Cape of Bees.[23]
> (2009: 12-20)[24]

Relating the words of a Turkish soldier, the poem reflects the confidence of the Turkish soldier in victory. However, Gövsa also implies the doubts these soldiers might have at the time as the campaign was still going on. Having left his family behind and the memory of the Balkan Wars still afresh, the soldier is still placing his hope in destiny which can be observed in the use of the words "fortune," "fate," and "destiny" all in the same stanza. Yet, he is not in an escapist mood; he is still keen to fight and draw the enemy off his homeland.

A pioneer in the pan-Turkic ideas, Ziya Gökalp's poems are more straightforward than Gövsa's works. Simply entitled "Çanakkale," Gökalp's renowned poem opens with an accusative tone despising the English, the Russian, and the French as "both civil and

monstrous" (2007: 3). The poem draws a picture in which God asks the Turk to free the lands and seas from the Russian and the English (*ibid.* 17-20). For Gökalp, the story of how the Turks became the victorious in this struggle of empires starts in Gallipoli. He believes that the English fled and the Russians gave up hope as an outcome of the naval victory in March (*ibid.* 36-40). But the important result of the victory that the poem underlines is reflected in the possibility of Turkish nationhood and the idea of freedom instead of a prosperous Ottoman state:

> Turan is a dream no more,
> It has come true today.
> Turk will know one lore,
> A merry-making for the day.
>
> Çanakkale, you have shown
> Victory to four states so malignant;
> A hundred nations, slaves to the Tsar
> You have made them independent.[25]
> (*ibid.* 44-52).

The idea that Çanakkale was *the* representation of independence was a common theme. It was thought that the resistance the Turk displayed in Gallipoli was the beginning of a new era for the Ottoman Turks who had undeservedly been suffering for years. Influenced by the pan-Turkic concept of bringing all ethnic Turks together, the independence Gökalp's focuses on takes place on a wider context in the poem. There were many other poems, however, that focused on the white Turks in Asia Minor, or Anatolia as it is often referred to in Turkish. Written by Sergeant Ali [Çağlar] of İvrindi, one of the few Turkish soldier poets with undereducated commoners' background, "Çanakkale Destanı" is one of those examples implying the impossibility of success of the Allied forces:

> Three fig trees in Gallipoli plained,
> The bayonet is deep inside, my heart aches.
> Don't think that the Turk can be chained,
> Blood spilled, blood raged in Çanakkale.[26]
> (2013: 21-4).

As in the case of Ali of İvrindi's "Çanakkale Destanı," the image of the sturdy Turk defending his homeland is particularly special to soldier poets who took part in the campaign. In this respect, Ali of İvrindi's work is one of the few Gallipoli poems reflecting how simple Turkish soldiers saw the campaign. Another poem with the same title by Private Mustafa [Ömeroğlu] of Boyabat asks a similar rhetorical question after a lengthy depiction of the Turks in action: "Will the Turks ever give Çanakkale? / Is there a soul in the world / who would ever take our Istanbul?" (2007: 61-3).[27] Just as Ali of İvrindi, Mustafa of Boyabat, a private from the hinterlands of Anatolia, also presents the determination of Turks, rather than Ottomans, as well as the trust in his ethnic background. The high hopes and highlighted ethnicity reflected in solider poems had solid grounds; the Allied forces were unable to advance and each passing day meant

depression and desperation for the Anzacs and British. Spirits were high among the Turks and poetry of the time implies that this was achieved by a sense of determination of the Turkish soldier, not with the help of other religion or ethnic specific communities or minorities nor by Turkic kinsmen of the Caspian. In the coming years, it would be clearer to the Turk that putting faith in Ottomanism, Islamism, or pan-Turkic ideals would not be of much help during the Turkish Independence War. In this respect, it is safe to assume that soldier poems such as these were among the first examples of the beginning of this perception based on Turkish unity and nationalism.

Although he had never seen service in Gallipoli, Ahmet Nedim [Servet Tör]'s "Namaz" ("*Salat*") can also be regarded as one of the early examples showing this apprehension. At the time, Tör was among the Istanbul intelligentsia publishing in order to keep public morale high (Şahin, 2013: 204). Having heard about the deeds of Turkish soldiers, he composed "Namaz," a story of a man who encounters a soldier performing salat amid the whizzing bullets. The speaker in the poem waits for the soldier to finish his prayer to talk to him. But when the soldier completes his prayer, he says that he is in a hurry to take over sentry duty from his comrades and kindly turns down the speaker's wish as well as the tobacco he is offered and dashes away into the battlefield:

> What was his name? Where was he from? I couldn't ask,
> He was a Turk alright, his language told me,
> What does it matter if he was Mehmet or Ahmet,
> All gallant soldiers there were already as pluck as he.
>
> All god-fearing, all kind, all nimble, all brave,
> Spite for the enemy is what they all crave.
>
> Hail to you, oh, sons from Bursa, Ankara, Konya
> Who find honour in death for homeland and heed
> That a drop of scarlet blood you shed
> Makes the soul of a whole nation bleed.
>
> And now, whenever I see a crowd of soldiers
> I think of that soldier in repose at his prayers.
> ([Servet Tör], 2009: 94-105)[28]

Nedim's poem is notable as an indicator of how the idea of imperial brotherhood was beginning to be supplanted by a notion of nationhood. Instead of relying on Muslim subjects of the Empire, Nedim believes that the hope is only to be found in the ethnic Turks of Ankara, Bursa, Konya, in short, Asia Minor.

The poem above is indeed a sign that shows how the Turkish Independence War was initiated and won the modern Turkey her independence free from the restrictions imposed by the Treaty of Sévres, 1920. The man behind the Turkish resistance was Mustafa Kemal [Atatürk], who later became the founder and the first president of the Republic of Turkey. When Asia Minor was under siege on all fronts and the Turks were forced to retreat to the hinterlands of the Anatolian peninsula on all sides in 1919, Atatürk had often underlined in his speeches the trust he had in the ethnic Turks of Anatolia and the spirit of these men shared in Gallipoli. At the time, Atatürk was a Brigadier and inspector to

the 9th Imperial Army and he strongly believed that liberty was in the heart and soul of the Anatolian Turks and began campaigning for a government ruled by the people in Asia Minor.

Just as the story of Turkish nationhood is rooted in the hardiness exhibited in Gallipoli, Atatürk's fame as a tactical genius and a leader who could boldly use initiatives also became known in the battlefields of Gallipoli. Atatürk was a Colonel when he was appointed to command the reserve forces of the 5th Imperial Army, 57th Division in Gallipoli. On his first day in the battlefields he came across a group of Turkish soldiers fleeing from the enemy on his way to a position close to Quinn's Post. Upon learning that they were running away because they had used up all the ammunition they were allotted, he famously said "You may not have ammunition but you do have bayonets" and ordered the soldiers to fix bayonets and get down on the ground. This move led the rushing Anzac soldiers also to lie flat assuming that an artillery attack was imminent. Atatürk believes that this was the moment when the battle was won (Eşref, 2009: 22-3). On a similar note, it was also Colonel Mustafa Kemal who gave the following famous order prior to an attack on the Allied positions in the following days of the campaign: "I am not ordering you to charge; I am ordering you to die. During this time, other troops may come and replace us" (Atay, 1961: 87-8). British official history mentions Ataturk at the Gallipoli, as the "Man of Destiny" and his role and inspiration as imperishable (Aspinall-Oglander, 1929-1932: 468). In many of the texts, Mustafa Kemal is mentioned as playing an integral role in several of the battles as in "Anafartalar" in August.[29] It was also Mustafa Kemal who led the troops to victory a couple of times and prevented the invading forces from gaining ground in several key battles in Gallipoli.[30] In some of the historical accounts, he is presented as a "fanatical commander conducting his troops with passion" (Steel and Hart, 1994: 402). Michael Hickey summarizes the role of Ataturk as "a hitherto obscure Turkish lieutenant-colonel had just won one of the decisive battles of modern history, although he did not know it at the time" (1995: 119). In a way, it was a misfortune for the Allied troops to face Atatürk's tactical supremacy combined with an army "…defending their homeland against the infidel invader… [which] gave them an edge in their determination (Steel and Hart, 1994: 72).

The Turkish had fight for another four years for their independence after the Great War. By the time the ever-continuing wars were over and the republican rule was established, it was inevitable for poets to associate Mustafa Kemal Atatürk the commander and the politician who fervently defended the idea of Turkish nationhood. The first poem ever written that mentions Atatürk as the ultimate representation of Turkish freedom is Mehmet Emin Yurdakul's "Ordunun Destanı." Yurdakul was one of the members of the literary delegation mentioned earlier. Having met Mustafa Kemal in Gallipoli as a delegate in the battlefields, he shows his appreciation of the Colonel as the saviour of the Turkish land and representation of Turkishness in the poem (Yurdakul, 2007: 1-3). The poem is a powerful expression of how this "land of great deeds" was bestowed to the Turks and Turks alone (*ibid.* 17). Having paid the liberty with the blood of countless martyrs, Yurdakul emphasises that these lands have come back to life as "Turkish lands" promised by the idea of *Turan*, the utopian union of Turkic people (*ibid.* 16; 20). Yurdakul initially hopes that Turan would be an ideal way-out for the Turks in

Asia Minor, yet he proposes at the end that Gallipoli is the place of birth of a free Turkish nation:

> Yet this place is the proof of reputation,
> Heroism, honour of a self-sacrificing nation;
> And the place where every sound you hear
> Is a song of liberty singing of us into the future.
> (*ibid.* 29-32)

Yurdakul's poem is one of the early examples of Turkish poetry promoting Turkish nationalism with the emphasis he puts on "a self-sacrificing nation," "us," and "liberty" altogether. The tone in Yurdakul's poem was shared by a considerable number of poems especially after 1923 when Turkey officially chose to be a liberal, secular republic. In order to contribute to the promotion of the new Turkish identity, poets drew much from the Gallipoli campaign in the early years of the Republic as they regarded it as the starting point of the story of modern Turkey. Faruk Nafiz Çamlıbel, one of the prominent poets of the Turkish renaissance, was one of those intellectuals who believed that the Turkish nation would not exist if it had not been for the victory in Gallipoli:

> Be proud Çanakkale, be proud till the end of time,
> Never an enemy had a day in your clime;
> You are where a great nation started to fight
> A hundred other nations besieging for a smite.
>
> Be proud Çanakkale, for you are the place
> Where for the first time Mustafa Kemal
> Stood with a hundred nations face to face.
> (Çamlıbel, 2007: 1-4; 19-20)[31]

In many works like Çamlıbel's, Mustafa Kemal's encounter with the Allied forces was a symbolic confrontation. Culminated with the bravery of Turkish troops, his presence in Gallipoli as the founder of the republic is a strong motive in Turkish literature that sparkled and paved the way for many more nationalistic pieces.

Conclusion

Gallipoli evokes distinctly diverse responses. For Churchill, it was the place of "terrible 'if's" (James, 2016: 353). For the Anzacs, Gallipoli translates as a sorrowful memory of the bravery of Australians and New Zealanders, a memory still commemorated on 25 April—the first day of the landings—every year. For the Turks, Gallipoli connotes a glorious victory signifying the headstrong character of the Turkish people. Just as this remote, narrow piece of land had left an ineffaceable mark in collective memory of the Antipodeans, the success of the Turkish soldier is celebrated on 18 March—the day of the naval victory—as the Victory Day in Turkey today. While these commemorations along with countless books, articles, novels, plays, films, documentaries are enough to qualify Gallipoli as a substantially significant phenomenon in the nation making process

of Australia, New Zealand and Turkey, the poetry dedicated to the campaign is also quite telling in terms of the impact Gallipoli experience had on the process that built the national identity of these people. Either for Gellert, Harrington, Patterson or for Gövsa, Çamlıbel, Yurdakul and countless many others, Gallipoli represented the dawn of an awareness towards nationhood.

Soon after the campaign ended, the impact could already be seen starting from the first commemorations of the Gallipoli Campaign. In Australia, the national media covered nothing but the selfless efforts of Australian boys in Gallipoli on 25 April 1916, the first anniversary of the landings while the war was still fought in Europe. These commemorations soon won Gallipoli a never-ending popularity in the common memory of Australia (Robertson, 1990: 245-7). Forged with the efforts of C.E.W. Bean, the official historian for the AIF who was with the Anzacs from the beginning until the end of the campaign,[32] the Australians were able to shake off the imperial influence for “a national sense of sturdy self-sufficiency” (Fewster, 1983: 20). Following the reputation of Gallipoli-related works and news reports as well as issues entirely dedicated to the heroism and determination of the Turkish soldiers in Gallipoli such as *Yeni Mecmua Nüsha-i Fevkaladesi,* the Gallipoli story also played an indispensable role in the nation making process of modern Turkey (Köroğlu, 2010: 225; 229-32).[33] In Erickson’s words “Çanakkale is the same to Turks as Gettysburg, the Somme, Verdun, or Leningrad to Americans, British, French, and Russians, respectively” (2001: 76).

The Great War was much more than the central military and political event of its time. It was also the great imaginative event. It altered the ways in which men and women thought not only about war but about the world, and about national identity and its expressions. In this regard, literature could become an imaginary mirror in which the nation reflects itself and where people experience themselves as members of such a union. If nationalism is a narrative, which attempts to include the present as it constructs a legitimate past and as it projects a future for which the present is constructed, then, literature functions as a means for “orchestrating that ideological consensus” in the creation of collective identities, an assumption that holds true especially about the Gallipoli experience. Texts played a prominent role in the making of national subjects and literature functioned as a machinery that served to consolidate the Turkish and ANZAC nation-states. On the centenary of the event, it becomes evident that this shared Gallipoli memory created a specific the legacy of the past with a strong tone of reconciliation and international diplomacy. The encounter is no longer a deadly conflict between two but a long-lasting alliance and mate-ship involving later and future generations. The former enemy/new friend here is generally depicted as the Australians or New Zealanders rather than any other nationality, and a focus on the human aspects of the Campaign almost always underlines peace and brotherhood. This narrative is persistent in almost all current literary and artistic works on Gallipoli. In his Introduction to *The Faber Book of War Poetry,* Baker sets off by stating that poetry shapes a nation’s identity. He gives a list of examples such as the Greek states and Imperial Rome who had their poems and poets singing highly of their successes, France with her *Song of Roland,* Portugal with her song *Lusiads*, and England with Shakespeare’s Henry V as the prime national hero strengthening English patriotism (Baker, 1996: xxiv-xxv). However, the question whether poetry can really be instrumental in configuring a nation would be a

spurious one, also implied in Baker's list. What poetry can do, however, is to impel masses, future generations, artistic and social tendencies to ensure the continuation of certain values, ideas, and concepts. This is what Gallipoli has achieved for Australians, New Zealanders, and Turks. As it has been exemplified with numerous poems in our study, the Gallipoli Campaign has played a major role in the mindset that conceived the idea of nationhood in these countries although the campaign itself has so far been regarded as a secondary front during the course of the First World War.

Notes

1. See Tunçoku (2000: 137-176) for a questionnaire given to 27 Gallipoli veterans from Australia and New Zealand justifying the positive attitude of the Anzacs towards the Turks.
2. "Those heroes that shed their blood and lost their lives 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" (İğdemir, 1978: 39-40).
3. See Macleod (2004) 1-14 for more on similar arguments.
4. As seen in Liman von Sanders's telegram in late December 1915, Turks knew about the evacuation from the newspapers published in Egypt. For Laffin, this is one of the signs that shows that the secrecy of the evacuation was actually compromised from the beginning (1989: 175).
5. This extract from Andrew Fisher's address was a part of an election speech given on 31 July 1914, in Victoria. Fisher was the opposition leader for Australian Labour Party (ALP) at the time and he would become the Prime Minister in a month.
6. "It is sweet and proper to die for one's homeland."
7. Several versions of this poem have also been attributed to the Australians in other anonymous local collections.
8. It is still unclear whether the acronym was invented by General Birdwood or Sergeant Keith Little, a signaller from New Zealand who felt the need to shorten the name for ease of telegram communications (Hamilton, 2003: 43).
9. See the diary of Kenneth Best (a British chaplain at Gallipoli) for a similar account which underlines that there were "no clear orders" from the high command (dated 5 June 1915) (2011: 141).
10. After the May 19 attack, hundreds of corpses were lying in the no-man's-land under the sun and beginning to decompose out of the reach of either side. Commander of the Anzac forces, General Birdwood, asked for a supervised truce to bury the dead and General Liman von Sanders agreed. The truce took place on May 24, when soldiers from both sides buried the bodies in large mass graves under the supervision of Colonel Aubrey Herbert from the Allied side and Colonel Ohrili Kemal Bey from the Turkish side.
11. Fenwick was among the first New Zealanders to land on Gallipoli on April 25th 1915. He kept a diary which vividly records the terrible conditions the men endured and his growing disillusionment at what he considered to be the direct consequences of the decisions of the commanders.
12. From the diary of Sergeant Lawrence, 2nd Field Company Engineers, AIF.
13. The figures of diseased and lost soldiers are as follows: 26.094 Australians; 7571 New Zealanders: total number of Anzacs lost is reported to be 33.665 (Karatay, 1987: 41).

14. Australian Light Horse Brigade.

15. Australian English: a trustworthy friend or comrade.

16. In the immediate pre-war period, the Minister of the Navy Cemal Pasha made an offer to France for a possible alliance, but was rejected due to French concerns over their agreement with Russia. Shortly after, Talat Pasha proposed an alliance to Russia, yet, was rebuffed. Finally, the Committee of Union of Progress (CUP) leaders, the Turkish government at the time, decided to approach Germany, and, the Minister of War, Enver Pasha met Hans von Wangenheim, the German ambassador in Istanbul, on 22 July 1914. Throughout July, secret negotiations were held between German and Ottoman officials, and, an alliance was finally signed in August 1914.

17. It was almost unanimous among the Ottoman cadre that Germany's victory was a sure thing; Muslims could not miss this opportunity to become free of European economic and political intrusion; the Islamic world was ready to act with the orders of its Caliph to revolt; it was the last chance to capture the lost territories from the Balkans. For the Young Turks, First World War was a "war of independence." It was from this elitist perspective that popular sentiments of Ottoman subjects were mobilized and people were called to arms. The newly emerging Turkish nationalist movement under the Committee of Union of Progress government immediately embraced Pan-Ottomanism and immersed in the aggressive propaganda of Pan-Islamism by November 1914. This gained momentum with the proclamation of Jihad on 11 November 1914.

18. *Çanakkale* is the name of the largest settlement around the Dardanelles as well as the province including the Gallipoli peninsula today. As there were very few settlements, the area where the campaign was carried out was also referred to as "the *Çanakkale* district" in 1915.

19. After receiving special trainings, the photographers were also assigned and worked closely with infantry headquarters. Sigmund Weingberg, Makis Herdel, Necati Bey and Arakisyan Efendi were among those who were sent to Gallipoli to film and photograph in the trenches of the Peninsula.

20. For a detailed account of propaganda via literature, see Erol Koroglu, *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity: Literature in Turkey during World War I* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007). Also, Trudi Tate's *Modernism, History and the First World War* (Penrith: Manchester UP, 1998) provides an expansive approach and historical analysis including the literary criticism dealing with fiction and non-fiction works including motifs such as witness of war, warfare, civilian war neuroses, and propaganda.

21. Brackets in Turkish names indicate the surnames adopted by poets after the Surname Act of 1934. Before 1934, Turkish names were accompanied by progenitorial (father's or grandfather's) names. In the case of soldier poets, they were referred to with their hometowns in addition to their adopted family names if any.

22. All translations in this study were made by the authors.

23. Many locations did not have names prior to the campaign. *Arıburnu*, however, was an exception. *Arıburnu*, which literally translates as "Cape of Bees" or "Bee cape," is known to the English-speaking world as the Anzac cove, named after the landings in April 1915.

24. Gönülde talihin açtığı sızı,
Kadere bıraktık anayı, kızı.
Felekte nasılmış Türk'ün yıldızı
Remlatıp kumlukta fal yapacağız.

Kıvırıp o cansız bileklerini
Kaçırıp İngiliz bebeklerini
Ürkütüp kâfirin sineklerini
Şu Arıburnu'nda bal yapacağız.

(Gövsa, 1989: 12-20)
25. Artık Turan hayal değil
Hakikate döndü bugün
Türk bilecek yalnız bir dil
Bizim için bu bir düğün

Çanakkale, dört devlete
Galebeyi sen çevirdin!
Çar kölesi yüz millete
İstiklali sen getirdin!
(Gökalp, 2007: 44-52)
26. Gelibolu önü üç ağaç incir
Süngü derin işler yüreğim sancır
Sanmayın vurulur Türk'e bu zincir
Kan aktı,kan köpürdü Çanakkale'de
([Çağlar], 2013: 21-24).
27. "Çanakkale'yi hiç verir mi Türkler / İstanbul'umuzu alacak bir er / Var mıdır dünyada nerede o asker?" ([Ömeroğlu], 2007: 61-63).
28. Adı nydi, nereli idi? Soramadım kendisine,
Fakat onun Türk olduğu lisanından belliydi,
Adı Mehmet, ya Ahmet'miş anlamaya hâcet ne?
Oradaki yiğitlerin hepsi de bir halliydi.

Hepsi dindar, hepsi nazik, hepsi tosun, hepsi mert
Hepsinde de düşman kini bir onulmaz acı dert.

Selam size ey Bursa'nın, Ankara'nın Konya'nın
Vatan için ölümleri şeref bilen avladı!
Emin olun, sizden akan bir damlacık al kanın
Elemiyle bir milletin ruhu kanadı.

Şimdi hâlâ, nerde görsem kalabalık bir asker
Hatırıma gelir hemen namaz kılan o nefer.
([Servet Tör], 2009: 94-105)
29. *Anafartalar Muharabeleri* (Battles of Anafartalar) are known as the Suvla Bay landings in English. The Suvla Bay operation was an amphibious landing made at Suvla on the Aegean coast of Gallipoli peninsula in the Ottoman Empire as part of the August Offensive, the final British attempt to break the deadlock of the Battle of Gallipoli.
30. The encounters in Chunuk Bair (*Conk Bayırı*) and Gaba Tepe (*Kaba Tepe*).
31. Öğün, ey Çanakkale, cihan durdukça öğün!
Ömründe göstermedin bin düşmana bir düğün,
Sen bir büyük milletin savaşa girdiği gün,
Başına yüz milletin birden üştüğü yersin!
…
Öğün, ey Çanakkale, sen Mustafa Kemal'in,
Yüz milletle yüzyüze ilk görüştüğü yersin.
(Çamlıbel, 2007: 1-4; 19-20)
32. Charles Bean were among the team that wrote *Official History of Australia in the War of 1914–18;* and the first volume, covering the formation of the AIF and the landing at Anzac Cove

was published in 1921. It should be noted that it was Bean himself who was the driving force behind the establishment of Australian War Memorial, the first national archive and museum of Australia.

33. As a new periodical financed by the CUP *Yeni Mecmua* aimed to promote Turkish nationalism. The most significant issue was published in 1918 in commemoration of the 3rd anniversary of the Naval Victory at Gallipoli. The special issue brought together a number of works, ranging from military accounts, historical essays and interviews to short stories, poems and plays. Even the Ottoman Sultan contributed to this issue with a poem.

References

Alexander, H.M. (1917): *On Two Fronts: Being the Adventures of an Indian Mule Corps in France and Gallipoli*. New York: E.P Dutton.

"Anzacs" (1920?) Anonymous poem. *Diggers' Poems*, 1-2.

"Approximate Casualties by Months for the Dardanelles Campaign (25th April 1915- 8th Jan. 1916)" (1922): *Statistics of the Military Effort of the British Empire during the Great War 1914–1920*. London: HM Stationary Office, 284-287.

Aspinall-Oglander, Cecil F. (1929-1932): *Military Operations: Gallipoli*. *History of the Great War based on Official Documents: Historical Section, CID*. 2 vols. London: Heinemann.

Atabay, Mithat (2012): *Tasvir-i Efkar Gazetesinde Çanakkale Savaşları*. İstanbul: E Yayınları.

Atay, Falih Rıfkı (1961): *Çankaya*. İstanbul: Dünya Yayınları.

Baker, Kenneth, ed. (1996): *The Faber Book of War Poetry*. London: Faber and Faber.

Barlow, Adria (2000): *The Great War in British Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Best, Kenneth (2011): *A Chaplain at Gallipoli: The Great War Diaries of Kenneth Best*. Gavin Roynon. ed. London: Simon and Schuster.

Brooke, Rupert (1970): "Lines for an Ode: Threnody on England." In G. Keynes, ed. *The Poetical Works of Rupert Brooke.* London: Faber & Faber, 203-204.

Burns, James Drummond (2012): "For England". In D. Roberts, ed., *We are the Dead: Poems and Paintings from the Great War: 1914-1918*. London: The Red Horse Press, 98.

[Çağlar], İvrindili Ali [Çavuş] (2013): "Çanakkale Destanı". In A. Ayhan, ed., *Ah Çanakkale Ah*, 5th ed. İstanbul: Uyanış, 108.

Creighton, Oswin (1916): *With the Twenty-Ninth Division in Gallipoli: A Chaplain's Experiences*. London: Green and Co.

Curtis, Jonathan (2014): "To the Last Man: Australia's Entry to War in 1914". Taken from a speech byAndrew Fisher (ALP), 31 July 1914, Victoria. Parliament Library Database, Parliament of Australia [Accessed 10 October 2016].

Çamlıbel, Faruk Nafiz (2007): "Çanakkale". Şahinboy, 39.

Dağlarca, Fazıl Hüsnü (2009): "Önsözü." Sevim, 186.

Davis, George Frederick (2008): "Anzac Day Meanings and Memories: New Zealand, Australian and Turkish Perspectives on a Day of Commemoration in the Twentieth century". Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Diggers' Poems by Returned Soldiers (1920?): Timaru (New Zealand): Timaru Post Press, Christchurch City Library Database [Accessed 9 Nov 2017].

East, Ronald, ed. (1981): *The Gallipoli Diary of Sergeant Lawrence of the Australian Engineers: 1st AIF - 1915*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Edmund, Murray (2015): "Whatiwhati Taku Pēne: Three First World War Poems from *The Penguin Book of New Zealand Verse*". *Journal of New Zealand Literature JNZL,* 33: 38-49.

Erickson, Edward J. (2001): *Ordered to Die: A History of the Ottoman Army in the First World War*. Westport, Connecticut and London: Greenwood.
Eşref, Ruşen (2009): *Anafartalar Kumandanı Mustafa Kemal ile Mülakat*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
Fenwick, Percival Lieutenant Colonel (2000): *Gallipoli Diary: 24 April to 27 June 1915*. New Zealand: David Ling Publishing Limited.
Fewster, Kevin (1983): *Gallipoli Correspondent: The Frontline Diary of C. E. W. Bean*. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.
Gellert, Leon (1917a): *Songs of a Campaign*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
Gellert, Leon (1917b): "The Change." Gellert *Songs,* 123.
Gellert, Leon (1917c): "The Australian Muse." Gellert *Songs*, 124.
"Gone-But Not Forgotten" (1920?): Anonymous poem. *Diggers' Poems,* 12-13.
Gökalp, Ziya (2007): "Çanakkale." Şahinboy, 14-15.
[Gövsa], İbrahim Aladdin (1989): "Asker Ağzından." *Çanakkale İzleri: Anafartalar'ın Müebbet Kahramanına*. Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yayını No: 28; Türk Kültüründen Görüntüler Dizisi No: 14. 3rd edt. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Tarih ve Dil Yüksek Kurumu, 46-47.
Hackney, J.C. (1929): "Australia Hears." *The Brisbane Courier*, 27 April 1929: 23.
Hamilton, Jill (2003): *From Gallipoli to Gaza: The Desert Poets of World War One*. Sydney and New York: Simon and Schuster.
Harrington, Edward (1988): [Trooper; 4th Light Horse Regiment]. "An Embarkation Song." *Digger Poets of the 1st AIF*. Kevin F. Tye. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Sydney (AWM Archives, Canberra).
Hickey, Michael (1995): *Gallipoli*. London: J. Murray.
İğdemir, Uluğ (1978): *Atatürk ve Anzaklar,* 20 (6). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları.
James, Robert Rhodes (1999): *Gallipoli*. London: Pimlico.
"In Appreciation" (1920?): Anonymous poem. *Diggers' Poems,* 16.
"James Drummond Burns" (2016): Scotch College Melbourne World War I Commemorative Website entry. <www.scotch.vic.edu.au> [Accessed 5 December 2016].
Karakoyunlu, Sadri, ed. (1987): *Türk Askeri için Savaş Şiirlerinden Seçmeler (1914-1918)*. Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu Türk Kültüründen Görüntüler Dizisi Vol. X. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi.
Karatay, Baha Vefa. (1987): *Mehmetçik ve Anzaklar*. Ankara: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
Kerr, Greg. (1998): *Lost Anzacs: The Story of Two Brothers*. London: Oxford University Press.
King, Jonathan (2008): *Gallipoli Diaries: The Anzac's Own Story Day by Day*. 2nd ed. New South Wales: Simon & Schuster.
Köroğlu, Erol (2010): *Türk Edebiyatı ve Birinci Sünya Savaşı 1914-1918: Propagandadan Milli Kültür İnşaasına*. 2nd ed. İstanbul: İletişim.
Laffin, John (1989): *Damn the Dardanelles: The Agony of Gallipoli*. Gloucester and Wolfeboro: Alan Sutton.
Macleod, Jenny (2004): *Gallipoli: Making History*. London and New York: Frank Cass.
Matthews, Harley (1940a): *Vintage of War: Poems of Anzac*. Syndey: Stafford.
Matthews, Harley (1940b): "True Patriot". Matthews *Vintage of War,* 18-30.
Matthews, Harley (1940c): "Women Are Not Gentlemen". Matthews *Vintage of War,* 31-41.
McCann, Harry (1916): "When It's All Over…" *The Anzac Book: Written and Illustrated in Gallipoli by the Men of Anzac*. Intro. W. R. Birdwood. London and New York: Cassell and Co., 151.
McMullin, Ross (2002): *Farewell, Dear People: Biographies of Australia's Lost Generation*. Melbourne: Scribe.

"Meclis-i Mebusan Zabıt Ceridesi" (1916): Devre: 3, İctima Senesi: 21. Cilt. 28. Kânun-ı Evvel 1331 (10 January 1916). Vol. I. 16. Birinci Celse. Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri, 319-321.
Moorehead, Alan (1956): *Gallipoli.* New York: Harper and Row.
"Our Hope" (2017): Anonymous poem. *The Kiwi*. (no date). Christchurch City Library Database, 12 [Accessed 9 September 2017].
[Ömeroğlu], Boyabatlı Mustafa (2007): "Çanakkale Destanı." Şahinboy, 59-61.
Patterson, Andrew Barton [Banjo] (1917): "We're All Australians Now". First published in *The Warwick Examiner*, 16 July 1917. pp.1. Rpt. in Hamilton, 38.
Prior, Robin (2010): G*allipoli: The End of the Myth*. New York and London: Yale University Press.
Robertson, John (1990): *Anzac and Empire: The Tragedy and Glory of Gallipoli*. New South Wales: Mead & Beckett.
Roper, Michael (2016): "The Long Great War: A Family History." Voices of the Home Front: National Archives and the Everyday Lives War Engagement Centre Conference. 10 September 2016. National Archives, Kew Gardens, London. Keynote address.
Sanders, Liman von (2000): *Five Years in Turkey.* Rpt. (First published in 1928). Nashville: The Battery Press and War and Peace Books.
[Servet Tör], Ahmet Nedim (2009): "Namaz." Sevim, 48-52.
Sevim, Osman, ed. (2009): *Destan Destan Çanakkale: Şiirler*.İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat.
Shadbold, Maurice (1989): *Voices of Gallipoli.* Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton.
Souter, D.H. (1929): Untitled poem. *The Brisbane Courier* 27 April 1929, 23.
Steel Nigel and Peter Hart (1994): *Defeat at Gallipoli*. London: Macmillan.
Şahin, Elmas (2013): "Ahmet Nedim Servet Tör: Türk'ün Destanı." *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi,* 2(2), 203-218.
Şahinboy, Ayşe, ed. (2007): *Çanakkale: Seçme Şiirler*. İstanbul: Yarımada.
"Temizlenen Leke" (1915): Anonymous newspaper article. *Sabah*, 5 June 1915 (23 May 1331), Cat. No. 9240, 3-4.
"The Landing" (1920?): Anonymous poem. *Diggers' Poems,* 9-10.
Thomson, Alistair (1995): "Memory as a Battlefield: Personal and Political Investments in the National Military Past". *The Oral History Review* 22(2), 55-73.
Tunçoku, A. Mete (2000): *Anzakların Kaleminden Mehmetçil: Çanakkale 1915*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi.
Yurdakul, Mehmet Emin "Ordunun Destanı." Şahinboy, 22-23.