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Dedication:
A rose for Waitangi Day – in memory of my mother,
Reubena Jane Davis, (11 December 1909 – 6 February 2000),
and her Hyde family who like many others served New Zealand in twentieth century conflicts:

Uncle George died at Rhenoster Kop, South Africa, 29 November 1900.
Father, Henry James Hyde enlisted for World War I and was balloted his first farm at Owhango.
Brother Harry served in the World War II Pacific theatre. In the same war were sisters Sylvia and Beaulah (Julie), both WAACs and brothers-in-law LAC instrument mechanic Philip Anker on the Leander, and Trooper Jim Blank in Italy.

All were affected by war.
There's a lonely stretch of hillsides,
There's a tumbled, broken fort beside the sea,
There are fallen, triumphed graves,
And winding paths that wind unceasingly.

There's a torn and silent valley,
There's a tiny riddle,
With tears blinded upon the skies beside its mouth,
There are tears of fading hope,
There's a sound of gentle sobbing in the North.

—— From Leon Gallet's "Songs of a Campaign."
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This study examines the changing perceptions of Anzac Day in New Zealand, Australia and Turkey in the twentieth century. Changing interpretations of Anzac Day reflect social and political changes in the nations over that time.

Anzac Day is an annual commemoration which has profound significance in the Australian and New Zealand social landscape. It has undergone significant changes of meaning since it began, and may be regarded as being an example of the changeable script of memory. The thesis argues that memory and landscape intersect to influence the way commemorative gestures are interpreted. Personal and community memories are fluid, influenced by the current historical landscape. This means that each successive Anzac Day can have different connotations. The public perception of these connotations is traced for each of New Zealand, Australia and Turkey.

Anzac Day reflects the forces at work in the current historical landscape. Within that landscape it has different meanings and also functions as an arena for individual and community agency. On Anzac Day there are parades and services which constitute a public theatre where communities validate military service. Individual and communal feats are held high and an ethic or myth is placed as a model within the social fabric. Anzac Day is contested and reflects tides of opinion about war and society and the role of women. It is also the locale of quiet, personal contemplation, where central family attachments to the loved and lost and the debt owed by civilian communities to the military are expressed. Generational change has redefined its meanings and functions.

Anzac Day was shaped in a contemporary historical landscape. It reflected multi-national perspectives within British Empire and Commonwealth countries and Turkey. For Turkey the day represented a developing friendship with former foes and was couched within Onsekiz Mart Zaferi, a celebration of the Çanakkale Savaşları 1915 victory in the Dardanelles campaign. As Anzac Day evolved, Turkey, the host country for New Zealand and Australian pilgrims, became the focus of world attention on the day. Gallipoli is now universally recognised as the international shrine for Anzac Day.
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**Turkish Orthography**

Turkish orthography is highly phonetic and a word’s pronunciation is always completely identified by its spelling. The following table presents the Turkish letters and the sounds they correspond with in the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) and how these can be approximated by an English speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>English approximation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>As a in father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>As b in bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>/ç/</td>
<td>As j in job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ç</td>
<td>/ç/</td>
<td>As ch in chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>As d in dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>As e in red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>As f in far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>As g in gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ğ</td>
<td>/ɣ/</td>
<td>No English equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>As h in hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İ</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>As e in open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ĩ</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>As e in open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td>As g in montrage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>As c in cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>As l in let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>As m in man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>As n in nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ö</td>
<td>/ɔ/</td>
<td>As o in no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>/ɔ/</td>
<td>As o in no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>As p in put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>As the dr in ladder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>As s in sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>As sh in she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ş</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>As sh in she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>As t in top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>As oo in pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ü</td>
<td>/y/</td>
<td>No English equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>/v/</td>
<td>As v in valve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>/y/</td>
<td>As y in you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>As z in zip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turkish spellings and typography have been used for Turkish words:
N.B. R, r, in the table above is more commonly pronounced as r in rapid.
Ç as in Çanakkale or ç as in mehmetçik is pronounced ch.
ş as in Savaşları, pronounced sh.
ü as in Hüseyin, pronounced oo as in loot.
ğ as in Buzdağının, the g is almost imperceptible.
İ as in İstiklal – sounds like ee.
Ö as in Özal, pronounced er.
ý as in Açýkalýn, pronounced as short y, as in you.

Turkish names in the Turkish chapters:
Gelibolu for Gallipoli.
Izmir for Smyrna
Anzak Koyu for Anzac Cove
Introduction

Ithaca

As you go on the journey to Ithaca,
Pray that your way may be a long one,
Full of adventures, full of knowledge…

C. P. Cavafy (October 1910).

Anzac Day, 25 April, the ‘One Day of the Year,’ is a commemorative day in New Zealand and Australia. It began during World War I, and was conceived from the Gallipoli battles of the failed British and allied Dardanelles campaign. It has changed meanings since its inception in 1916, and Australasian public perceptions today about Anzac Day are different from those originally held. Developments in modern Turkey have influenced meanings attributed to the day. This thesis argues that Anzac Day is an example of the ‘changeable script of memory’. This phrase refers to the way memories and meanings attributed to events are reshaped over time. The key supports for this thesis are landscape and memory.

‘Landscape’ as used in this work refers generally to the metaphorical associations of a word or term, whether it is ‘Anzac Day’ or ‘Gallipoli.’ For the greater part it will refer to the force of current events, or to the impact of historical associations. To clarify the matter, where it is needed, descriptors, such as ‘current’ landscape will be used. Where the term is used solely geographically, the descriptor ‘physical’ landscape will be seen. The use of memory in this work will refer to both private and community memories. The work is not a ‘memory piece’ dependant of a research-survey process. Rather, the material presented originated from a wide selection of available primary and secondary sources, with an emphasis on the former. The work will primarily present views of each Anzac Day which were in the public domain. These views will be supported or challenged by exposing other, at times official, at other times, private views.

2 Alan Seymour, The One Day of the Year, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1976. The play was written by Australian playwright Alan Seymour after the Vietnam War. It questions the place of Anzac Day, regarded by many as sacred, and sets it in a contemporary situation of generational conflict.
3 Marita Sturken, ‘Absent Images of Memory: Remembering and Re-enacting the Japanese Internment,’ T. Fujitani, G.M. White and L. Yoneyama, Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s), Duke UP, NC, 2001, 34. Sturken outlines her belief that memory and history are entangled: ‘Memories are narratives that are told and retold, reenacted and reimaged. Memory is ontologically fluid and memories constantly subject to rescripting and fantasy.’ These ideas helped form the phrase, ‘the changeable script of memory.’
thesis demonstrates different generational and national interpretations, themselves reflections of
the changing historical landscape. This work will make an original contribution to scholarship
through comparison of the two trans-Tasman nations and an assessment of the role of Turkey in
the development of the day.

This is a New Zealand-based study with a wide scope. As such, parts of the thesis necessitated a
general approach, but particular issues such as the matter of the connection of commemorative
religious practices pre-existing the first 1916 Anzac Day, or the role of individual national
motivators of the day, and the impact of the Vietnam War will be assessed in detail. For Australia
and New Zealand, the focus will be on points of similarity or difference found in attitudes or
events issuing from Anzac Day. In the case of Turkey, the argument will be differently positioned
and will expose the largely unknown contribution of Turkey to the meanings of Anzac Day.

The New Zealand Free Lance (NZFL) archives provided a convenient public view from 1915 to
the end of publication in 1960. It was for the first half of the twentieth century a primary source.
The reasons for the choice of the weekly publication were: it had a wide readership, although
patently Wellington based; early editions to the mid-1930s reported Australian matters;
illustrations were clear and covered the country, particularly on the unveiling of memorials.
Additional material from New Zealand, Australian, British and Turkish newspapers provided a
clearer picture of what the public perceived as the day became established. Official reports and
other government papers provided the remaining material. Along with this array of material
gathered from archives in New Zealand, Australia and Great Britain were books and scholarly
accounts, some from Turkey.

The NZFL files, the archives of the ADCC (Brisbane-based Anzac Day Commemoration
Committee) and the AWM (Australian War Memorial, Canberra) Anzac Day cuttings are
analogous. The cuttings files of the ADCC provide a clear public view on Anzac Day in Australia
which at times included New Zealand, including important correspondence between the two
countries. On the other hand, the NZFL files contain reporters’ and editors’ views reflecting
public perception of Anzac Day within New Zealand. Analysis involved understanding that the

4 Arthur Burke, Hon. Historian ANZAC Day Commemoration Committee (Qld) Inc, to George Davis, 9 December
2008, informed me that despite JOL ADCC being archived until only 1972, the organisation has ‘never missed a
beat,’ and that later records for 1973 to 2000 will hopefully be archived in the JOL in December 2009.
sources approached Anzac Day from different perspectives. The research process demanded travel to archives throughout New Zealand, to the Australian War Memorial in Canberra and the John Oxley Library of the State Library of Queensland, Brisbane. In both countries interviews were conducted with some funeral directors, war veterans and widows, and RSA/RSL officials. In Turkey, I participated in Anzac Day 2007 at Gallipoli and conducted interviews with local Turkish historians, and later also researched London archives.

What each Anzac Day means reflects its landscape. In today’s world, Australasian peacekeeping forces are despatched to world trouble-spots. Each Anzac Day is observed now within a current of opinion that does not believe war is an acceptable state policy. This creates new dimensions and interpretations for older memories which developed in the landscape of a past imperial world. Also, the focus of geographical direction has changed. Present Australasian policy initiatives are today primarily found in Asian and Pacific regional neighbourhoods, rather than those of the old British Empire and Commonwealth.

Generational change has powerfully impacted on Anzac Day meanings and memories. Many Anzac veterans returning to Gallipoli in 1965 and 1990 recognised little of the land they had fought in, despite Gallipoli remaining for the century one of the best-preserved European battlefields. Memory for the older diggers was slipping and Anzac Day increasingly became a day to preserve the remnants of their memories. It raised the question, which memories are valued and transmitted on Anzac Day? Should it be only the esteemed Gallipoli memories, because they were causally-linked to the start of the day, or was there a case for all memories of war? Should the soldier experiences of World War II and subsequent conflicts be recorded and held high? Are Australian Gallipoli memories of more worth on Anzac Day because 25 April 1915 was ‘Australia’s Landing Day?’ Indeed, what about others’ experiences of war – such as that of women or Home Front personnel?

This thesis exposes trans-national connections and discontinuities. The threads of memory, influenced by ever-changing landscapes are reflected on Anzac Day. The day as an annual commemorative rite is couched within a larger framework of human understanding about death. This framework, part of ever-moving societal change, has been fluid in the twentieth century. More liberal attitudes towards death in Australasia reflected a larger cultural change which included greater freedom of personal expression. Did freer attitudes to death help the telling of
stories on Anzac Day to a younger generation? The thesis will also discuss the significance of a ‘binary relationship’ for Turkey, New Zealand and Australia revealed in Anzac Day commemorations, particularly at Gallipoli. Both New Zealand and Australia have experienced debates over whether Anzac Day should become the representative national day. Despite the importance of the day to the Australasian nations, and to Turkey, it has been the subject of little New Zealand academic writing. This thesis aims to help fill that gap.

There is no large body of publicly-accessible literature on the topic of Anzac Day. What is available to the public is found in epilogues or afterthoughts of Australian and New Zealand history books written about twentieth century wars, memorialisation, Gallipoli, and societal changes. Australian writing on Anzac Day has dominated the field, and continues to do so. This trend reflects the great national investment the country has in the subject. Not only has Australia a larger population and greater resources than New Zealand, but state and national organisations have supported research into war-related topics, and consequently Anzac Day studies have benefited to a greater degree than is found elsewhere. Australian scholarly discussion about Anzac Day has been recently dominated by the conflicting interpretations of Professor Ken Inglis, Adjunct Professor Bill Gammage and Adjunct Professor John Moses.

---

5 T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White and Lisa Yoneyama (eds.), Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s). The authors suggest that analysis of memory and the Pacific War have established ‘a binary’ between the USA and Japan. The focus within the US is on how the majority remember Pearl Harbour and Hiroshima and recently on how Japanese/Americans remembered and lived with the memory of internment. There are of course multiple sites of reconstruction, remembering and struggle-US internment of Japanese nationals, Liberation Day in Guam, Survivors of Hiroshima. Is there a ‘binary’ between Turkey and the Anzac nations? I think so, depending on developing consciousness and understanding of the ‘other.’ It has developed and changed through the twentieth century, and has been cemented by the remarks of Kemal Atatürk, and in recent monument-building found in Turkey, Australia and New Zealand.


The most enduring author on Anzac Day has been the respected Australian scholar Kenneth Stanley Inglis, whose writing on the subject spans the years 1960 to 2005.8 In his early writings to 1970, he clearly placed his authoritative and secular stamp on interpretations of the meanings and development of Anzac Day. His early works attached Anzac feats at Gallipoli to the image of the Australian Digger and advanced the idea that ‘The first anniversary of the landing was celebrated spontaneously and diversely by the troops in Egypt, England and France, and by soldiers and civilians at home.’9 He discussed the exact nature of solemnity on Anzac Day with the telling statement: ‘Of all the disagreements about April 25, none has persisted longer or caused more pain than the dispute over whether the living can pay proper homage to the dead if they spend part of the day enjoying themselves.’10 This is a central matter which receives discussion in this thesis. In the 1930s it became a matter of public debate. This issue will be spelled out in Chapter Three. Inglis confirmed that the character or ‘mettle’ of original Anzacs, as described by journalist C.E.W. Bean, was the defining characteristic of being a male Australian.11 His article ‘The Anzac Tradition,’ concludes that references to Christianity in the Anzac tradition are coincidental rather than intrinsic.12 This is debateable and will be challenged throughout the thesis. In 1966, Inglis wrote ‘Return to Gallipoli,’ based on accompanying the 1965 50th Jubilee Pilgrimage of Anzac veterans to Gallipoli.13 Inglis’ later works reveal his research on the place

February 2006, 58-77. Moses makes a clear case for the close relationship of the Church of England and its practices and the foundation and maintenance of Australian Anzac Day.


10 Ibid, ‘Anzac Day: The One Day will endure,’ 14. The article was originally printed in The Age, 25 April 1964. This essential matter is discussed in this thesis in Chapters One (Theory) and Four (Australia to 1945).

11 Ibid, ‘The Anzac Tradition,’ 18-42. The article was originally printed in Meanjin Quarterly, Vol. 24, No. 1, Autumn 1965. Much of Inglis’ interpretation of ‘Anzac’ is dependent on the journalist C.E.W. Bean, who bequeathed the Australian War Memorial (AWM) to the nation and ‘contributed largely to making a cult of Anzac;’ John Lack, ‘C.E.W. Bean, Australian Historian,’ 95. The paper was delivered in the John Murtagh Macrossan Lecture, at the University of Queensland 24 June 1969.


13 Ibid, ‘Return to Gallipoli,’ 43 -62. The article appeared first in the Australian National University History Journal, No. 3, October 1966. Inglis detailed the confusion in the Turkish organisers’ minds over Anzacs not being British and gave a colourful account of the meeting of Turks and Anzacs, Four young Australian hitch-hikers attended – the first of many. There is a clear evidence of poor organisation for the trip and some lack of empathy between Australians and Turks.
and meanings of built memorials in Australia. His 1998 highly respected book *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape* is widely used as a university text. The writing strikes a sympathetic chord with the thesis discussion on Anzac Day as a day of universal war commemoration.

Bill Gammage in 1974 presented his findings, based on a survey of about 1000 AIF World War I veterans, in *The Broken Years: Australian Soldiers in the Great War*. In the work he firmly attaches the Gallipoli Anzac heritage to Australian nationhood: ‘To many, Gallipoli was Australia’s Westminster Abbey, the fount of her traditions, the shrine of her nationhood.’ This is interesting for it blends religious iconography with national attachment. It also sidesteps thorny issues in Australia’s history before 1915, and proclaims with ‘fount’ that all matters flow from that source. Using primary sources, Gammage reinforced the idea that World War I had given Australia a chance to move away from Britain and ‘prove herself.’ The chapter, ‘The Outbreak of Peace,’ points clearly to post-war disillusionment which spread amongst the ex-soldiers when the gains they thought had been won through valiant sacrifice were simply not there. There are few concessions in the work to spiritual matters, and little mention of Anzac Day. Gammage’s arguments point to the early fixation which Australians developed for Gallipoli and Anzac Day as exclusively theirs.

In the 1990s academic cleric John Moses challenged Ken Inglis’ secularist views by identifying intrinsically religious dimensions to the beginnings of Anzac Day. Moses analysed World War I in terms of a ‘Holy War,’ forming a religious framework for his main point that ‘the celebration of Anzac Day was to be a means of sacralising the nation.’ For Moses, Canon David Garland’s

---


16 Bill Gammage, *The Broken Years: Australian Soldiers in the Great War*, Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1974; Dr William Leonard (Bill) Gammage is an Adjunct Professor and Research Fellow at the Humanities Research Center of the Australian National University, Canberra.  

17 Ibid, 115.  

18 Ibid, 268.  


vision was ‘the means of sacralising a profane, materialistic and hedonistic society [and to] make sense of Anzac, then, one needs to enter the mind of its chief architect.’\(^{21}\) Despite changes brought in the 1964 Anzac Day Act, the Garland model of ecumenical fellowship endured.\(^{22}\) Moses challenged the stand of Ken Inglis and ‘Australian sentimental humanism,’ and further claimed it was an ADCC initiative which set in motion the Westminster Abbey service and a message from the King to the people of Australia. This latter claim seems a bit of a stretch,\(^{23}\) because while the ADCC files testify to contact with the Australian Agent-General in London, they make no actual reference to the Westminster service.\(^{24}\) Moses again challenged secularists Ken Inglis and Bill Gammage with his 2002 paper, ‘Was there an Anzac Theology?’\(^{25}\) He emphasised that ‘prior to the outbreak of the First World War there existed a highly developed theology of empire in all leading nations that became by August 1914 a theology of war.’\(^{26}\) Both Germany and England developed positions which justified in religious terms their opposition to the other. Within this religious framework Moses positions events of 1915 in Brisbane churches, a ‘community of fate inspired by …widespread grief.’\(^{27}\) He points to the extraordinary degree of similarity towards sacrifice demonstrated in different Christian churches. In this matter, he drew similar conclusions to this writer. He again sallied forth in his 2006 article, ‘Anglicanism and Anzac Observance: The Essential Contribution of Canon David John Garland,’ and again stressed the key role of Canon David Garland for both Australia and New Zealand in the establishment of

\(^{21}\) Ibid, 63. Canon David Garland was joint-Secretary of the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee in Brisbane from 1916 to 1939.

\(^{22}\) John A. Moses, ‘The struggle for Anzac Day 1916-1930 and the role of the Brisbane Anzac Day Commemoration Committee,’ *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* Vol. 88, Part 1, June 2002, 54-74. This paper furthered his argument in a paper on the role of the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee of Brisbane and their struggles to 1930 to gain national acceptance for the day. Here, he challenged claims for a spontaneous beginning to the day. He addressed the omission of the religious movements which supported the establishment of Anzac Day. This factor, Moses persuades, matched the ‘undeniably dramatic reportage from the Dardanelles,’ as the prime motivator for the organisation of the first Anzac Day in 1916.

\(^{23}\) Ibid, 67-68. Moses refers to H.A. Diddams, ‘The Celebration of Anzac Day; A Short History of the great movement in Queensland,’ *Anzac Commemoration 1921*, ADCC, Brisbane, 1921, 9. This record, by one of the original ADCC leaders was designed to position Brisbane as the leading capital in the origin of Australian states’ Anzac Day.


\(^{25}\) John A. Moses, ‘Was there an Anzac Theology?’ *Colloquium*, Vol. 35, No. 1, 2003, 5. Moses made the pointed criticism that ‘the evidence they [historians] adduce is only that which supports their pre-conceived thesis…’

\(^{26}\) Ibid, 5-6.

\(^{27}\) Ibid, 8.
Anzac Day as a non-denominational day of mourning. Moses takes issue with Eric Andrews’ problematic statement stand on spontaneity, and with Ken Inglis’ secularism. He argues that Garland, the ‘Empire patriot,’ was the key figure in Brisbane who persuaded civic authorities to accept traditional religious dimensions in the observance of the day.

Moses, Inglis and Gammage are representatives of a fragmented spectrum of historians who are still coming to grips with what Anzac Day means in Australian society. Each stands for competing positions: was Anzac Day primarily a spiritual experience or simply a fellowship of the like-minded, remembering sacrifice on behalf of the state? A central problem here is not that of subject. The problem is one of particular aspect: Moses approaches the day primarily from a strongly defended religious perspective, while Inglis and Gammage approach the matter from a civic, experiential and pragmatic base. Because the material they engage with has so many dimensions, it is hard to see exactly where their discourses meet.

This thesis will not rework the academically well-covered ground of Anzac Day as an annual ritual. That matter was argued in depth by Maureen Sharpe in her 1981 thesis ‘Anzac Day in New Zealand, 1916 to 1939; Attitudes to Peace and War,’ and continued by Stephen Clarke in his thesis ‘The One Day of the Year: Anzac Day in Aotearoa/New Zealand, 1946 -1990.’ It is also covered by Wendy Mansfield and Janice Pavils in their Australian studies.

Maureen Sharpe's ground-breaking 1981 thesis begins by highlighting New Zealand Anzac Day in the 1920s, as ‘a day of solemn remembrance for all the war dead,’ and ‘the most important day of commemoration in the year. Contained within the ritual of the day were thoughts of national

---

pride and national sorrow.\textsuperscript{33} This viewpoint conforms to New Zealand histories of the 1980s when the country’s national identity was being widely discussed.\textsuperscript{34} Accordingly, Sharpe linked the imperial attitudes shown in pre-war individual and community enthusiasm with ‘New Zealand nationalism [which] emerged at Gallipoli\textsuperscript{35} and asserted ‘the battles of Gallipoli provided for New Zealand and Australia, a day of national birth.’\textsuperscript{36} She used the anthropological theories of Bronislaw Malinowski\textsuperscript{37} and Robert Bocock,\textsuperscript{38} to express the idea that ‘Ritual, myth and symbol were interrelated,’\textsuperscript{39} and also Emile Durkheim who maintained for group behaviour, rituals and symbols: ‘Rituals centering on symbols, served to recharge and maintain the corresponding sentiments and so enhance collective identity.’\textsuperscript{40} She concluded that ‘when New Zealanders established Anzac Day as a “holy” day they were expressing in ritual form their feelings about war losses,’ and ‘passing on to the future a day to keep alive the memory and message of the dead.’\textsuperscript{41} Sharpe described the 1920s as a ‘Time to Construct a Permanent Memorial,’ when debates arose over building utilitarian memorials, like halls, or symbolic monuments, such as cenotaphs.\textsuperscript{42} Her argument encompassed the peace movements of the 1930s and the gradually tightening hold of the RSA on the day.\textsuperscript{43} Her contextualisation of Anzac Day within general attitudes towards war led her to analyse the place of World War I in New Zealand literature. She leaned heavily on Ormond Burton’s statement that the deeds of New Zealand soldiers created ‘a full consciousness of who we are. New Zealand is a nation, distinct, separate

\textsuperscript{33} Sharpe, 1981, ii.
\textsuperscript{34} Her argument is dependant on the records of the Returned Soldiers’ Association (RSA) and contemporary newspaper reports. She developed her argument from a base which described the commemorations of 1922, by which date the open-grave ritual promulgated by RSA national President Dr Ernest Boxer had been adopted and the day had been legislated as a national holiday.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid, 21.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid, 25.
\textsuperscript{39} Sharpe, 11.
\textsuperscript{41} Sharpe, 13.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid, 50-85.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid, 105. Auckland was one of the few New Zealand cities which retained a thoroughly civilian aspect to the parade to the mid-thirties.
and apart.\textsuperscript{44} In her conclusion she surveyed widely, including the British experience of Armistice Day - Remembrance Sunday, and USA Memorial Day. Sharpe observed that it was ‘not until the Depression that Australian nationalism began to appear in literature.’\textsuperscript{45} This agrees with points made in this thesis. She expressed the notion that the Australian Anzac Day ritual and memorials were ‘probably less Christian in influence’ than those of New Zealand.\textsuperscript{46} She concluded claiming that Anzac Day helped to ameliorate the fear of unnecessary deaths, and that it was a force for unity and peace in a community over which the shadow of World War I hung heavily.

Stephen Clarke, writing thirteen years after Sharpe, also leaned heavily on records of the NZRSA and placed greater emphasis than Sharpe on the ritualistic base of Anzac Day.\textsuperscript{47} Clarke’s thesis is the only thesis on New Zealand Anzac Day post-World War II. He cited Clifford Geertz’s analysis of his ‘repertoire of forms in a culture.’\textsuperscript{48} Clarke traverses the late 1950s study by W. Lloyd Warner on American Memorial Day\textsuperscript{49} where that author saw the function of the commemorations as ‘periodically to integrate’ the community in which they happen.\textsuperscript{50} Clarke’s acceptance of dysfunction within ritual, as a form of ‘social interaction’ allowed greater freedom of definition for Anzac Day. Clarke found ‘Anzac Day is a New Zealand reading of a New Zealand experience, a story they tell about themselves.’\textsuperscript{51}

Central to Anzac Day meanings is the matter of spirituality or religion. Clarke wrestled with Anzac Day as an example of civil-secular religion in a framework of a secularising society. He argued that ‘Anzac Day does not provide evidence for the existence of a New Zealand civil religion in this period. The day instead continued to be a mix of civic and Christian sentiment. The day’s observance certainly had a much stronger Protestant religious content than in Australia.’\textsuperscript{52} This issue is reflected in present debates between scholars about the meanings of the

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ormond Burton, \textit{The New Zealand Division}, Clarke & Matheson, Auckland, 1936 [reprint].
\item Sharpe, 160-161.
\item Ibid, 161.
\item In his role as historian for the NZRSA Clarke has bridged the academic-public divide.
\item Clifford Geertz, \textit{The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays}, Hutchison, London, 1975, 453. Here Geertz analyses ritual as community performance in which both participators and observers are all the interpreters of various forms (styles and acts) of ritual.
\item Ibid, 248.
\item Clarke, 10; italics in the original.
\end{enumerate}
day. It also formed part of the ten year debate within the NZRSA over a ‘Sundayised morning and Saturdayised afternoon’ to its conclusion in Resolution 4/12 of the 1965 Dominion Executive Council. Clarke argued that 1965 was a key year: ‘The fiftieth anniversary of the Gallipoli campaign was fittingly the year when the first truly ecumenical Anzac Day services were observed in many places in New Zealand.’ He assayed the anti-Vietnam War protests between 1968 and 1972, and the resultant 1972 National Council of Churches in New Zealand consultation on Anzac Day, the challenge to the RSA’s dominance of Anzac Day, and the place of feminists’ group actions in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Wendy Mansfield and Janice Pavils wrote theses on Anzac Days in their home states in Australia. Mansfield’s 1979 thesis, a first for Australia on Anzac Day, outlined the Queensland experience to 1937 and was followed by an entry for Canon David Garland in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography.* Janice Pavils’ more recent thesis on South Australian Anzac Day followed an article which challenged John Moses and argued for a spontaneous beginning for Adelaide’s ‘Anzac Day’ on 13 October 1915.

---

53 Ibid, 81-94.
54 Ibid, 92. Clarke saw Resolution 4/12 as having great importance for two reasons: attitudes towards Sunday changed in New Zealand through the century, so connecting Anzac Day observance to that of Sunday had become problematic. The second reason was that the ecumenism of 1965 ‘finally resolved a dilemma which had plagued Anzac Day, and in the process caused considerable controversy and bitterness, since its inaugural commemoration in 1916.’ This is not quite correct, for in Auckland on Anzac Day, 1917, the Roman Catholic bishop was invited. ACC 288/115 Town Clerk’s Letter Book, 11 March-24 May 1917, 160, 22 March 1917, letter to Rt. Rev. Monsignor Mahoney, V.G., The Presbytery, Onehunga in requesting him to be a speaker, pointing out the similarity with the previous year and stressing the 15 minute limit for speakers; 166, 22 March 1917, Bishop Averill was informed of the change of date and that a representative of the Roman Catholic Church had been invited to speak.
56 Chris Maclean and Jock Phillips, *The Sorrow and the Pride: New Zealand War Memorials,* Historical Branch, Department of Internal Affairs, GP Books, Wellington, 1990, 162. The authors take the case further stating that the ‘Vietnam wreath-laying controversy marked the end of the RSA’s dominance of the day.’ Considering the organisational input and civic respect presently given to the RSA and RSL on Anzac Day, the situation has changed considerably from that of Maclean and Phillips’ perspectives of 1990.
Mansfield began by discussing the Anzac tradition as a ‘Foundation or Nationalist myth,’ which gave Australians a clannish unity through sharing in a dramatic event. This myth was elevated to determine the acceptable individual (male) type in society. Using the ADCC records, Mansfield traced the careers of the relatively unknown Thomas Augustine Ryan, a Brisbane auctioneer and Roman Catholic who ‘kindled the original flame’ and mooted a commemorative event for 25 April 1916, and Canon David John Garland whose ideas and drive shaped Anzac Day as it came to be in Australia, New Zealand and England. Mansfield’s position on spontaneity is clear: ‘it was not a spontaneous outburst so much as a quite skilfully orchestrated participation in ceremonies for which there was official approval and support.’ Arguments placed later in this work agree with the assessment of ‘skilfully orchestrated participation.’

Mansfield makes clear that civic control of Anzac Day remained until the mid-thirties in Queensland alone, of all the Australian states. Garland’s direction ensured that up until 1935, despite rigorous opposition from the RSSILA, the ADCC was a citizen’s organisation. Central matters of status and funding caused bitter conflict. It is here that we clearly see the application of matters of management contestation over landscapes. Mansfield claimed that it was the dividing force of sectarian interests among the civilians on the ADCC which allowed Raymond Huish and RSSILA affiliates to capture the control of the ADCC and Anzac Day by 1937. There are more factors at play than in the Mansfield analysis, such as personal jealousies. Not the least of these was that the ageing Garland was facing an ambitious and persuasive opponent in Raymond Huish, the Queensland President of the RSSILA.

This thesis strongly concurs with Mansfield’s interpretation that ‘Sacrifice and death were the twin spectres which were to haunt the civilian population’s observances of Anzac and both of

---

61 Ibid, 21 and 28, this involved Thomas Carlyle’s notions of the place of the hero in society, which Mansfield interpreted as underpinning the idea that the ‘Anzac became the Australian Hero.’
62 Ibid, 34-44. Mansfield detailed the chronic confusion in the public mind that Garland, instead of T.A. Ryan was thought to be the originator of Anzac Day. Local newspapers the Brisbane Courier 29 December 1923 and The Week 4 January 1924 in their obituaries for T.A. Ryan record him having expressed that ‘the crowning glory of his life was the national adoption of the Anzac Day ideal.’
63 Ibid, 49.
64 Ibid, 50-51.
these eventually took precedence over the patriotic and nationalistic sentiments of the observance.66 However, this interpretation was challenged in the 1980s by a more nationalistic approach. Mansfield persuades that uniform and nationwide observance provided ‘an arena for …divergent political forces,’ in which the minute’s silence became the agent for conformity.67 Mansfield’s important but relatively unknown 1979 analysis is sound. Since then the ground has shifted for Australia with acceptance of Aboriginal pre-Western exploration stories as part of the modern Australian landscape. This development questions her notion of Anzac as the sole Australian Foundation Myth; nevertheless, there is still much merit in her work.

Janice Pavils’s more recent article in defence of Adelaide’s ‘Anzac Day’ of 13 October 1915, her thesis on South Australian identity and commemoration practices and her book on Anzac Day, all have much to say and provide a South Australian foil to Wendy Mansfield’s Queensland study and John Moses’ articles.68 Pavils based her ‘Anzac culture’ doctoral study centrally in an examination of Australian national identity.69 More seriously, Pavils’ national identity base for Anzac culture reflects attitudes of the 1980s which were superseded in the mid-nineties when there was acceptance of commemoration in a less particularist framework. Her interpretation reflects the widely accepted Inglis and Gammage nationalistic interpretations.

Pavils outlined her opposition to John Moses over a spontaneous beginning to Anzac Day. Her assertion of a spontaneous beginning for ‘Anzac Day’ in Adelaide on 13 October 1915, built on the practices of fund-raising Violet and Wattle Days seems questionable.70 The evidence she provided argues both for relative spontaneity and planning within a wartime environment.71 Her work is dependent on RSL records, and includes comment on the New Zealand RSA’s attempts

66 Ibid, 104.
67 Mansfield, 124 and 127. She observed that Australian Anzac Day and the myth it carried was observed in the late 1970s during a time when Australia experienced ‘a resurgence of moral values,’ and that the ‘myth of foundation through Anzac [filled the] necessary demand for identity.’
69 Pavils, ‘The Emergence,’ 1. She stresses the common Australian belief that Anzac Day is ‘a commemoration exhibiting a sense of national identity.’ This stance is problematic. Commemoration issues cross national boundaries and Anzac Day commemoration has always been more other-nation inclusive than Pavils’ suggests.
71 This issue is discussed in Chapter Four of this thesis.
to make the day a ‘close holiday.’ Pavils argued that the 1922 South Australian *Holidays Act* (No. 1547) and its public discourse became part of the movement which cut British ties, and ‘replaced those ties with a new sense of Australian identity.’ Despite identity being central to the thesis, Pavils does not deepen the argument at this point to answer the question of when a distinct Australian identity was realised. She admits the vital role of Gallipoli, but barely acknowledges an official Turkish visit to Australia in 1953. This episode, important for its now forgotten memories, is lightly treated. In a valuable memory piece, ‘Harefield and the Remembrance Connection,’ Pavils cements the British - South Australian connection. On the matter of spiritual connection, Pavils claimed: ‘In 1993, at the time of the Keating Labor Government, the secular spiritualism of the civic memorial service at the funeral of the Unknown Australian Soldier provided a turning point in Australian identity and Australian culture.’ She concluded that the burial of the Unknown Australian Soldier ‘changed the original concept of Anzac memorial services that linked a Christian God to sacrificial service for preservation of the nation.’ This takes the case far too far. The Australian military still employs for Anzac Day ceremonies Christian chaplains for who use obvious Christian liturgies with references to ‘God’ and ‘Christ’ in both Canberra and at Gallipoli.

Pavils described Gallipoli visits as ‘ritualistic travel of Australians to overseas war cemeteries that in the case of Anzac Cove [constitutes] ‘a rite of passage as an Australian young man or woman.’ Pavils claimed that by 1965, pilgrimages to overseas military burial grounds had become ‘part of a national civil religion recognising the valour and sacrifice of Australian

---

73 Pavils, ‘The Emergence,’ 119. In this argument Pavils relegated the regard given to Australian Federation in favour of the forge of identity argument for Gallipoli. The 1922 Holidays Act Amendment Act (full title) embedded law making Anzac Day a South Australian public holiday.
74 Ibid, 155-156; *Anzac Day: The Undying Debt*, 71-72. The loose wording, ‘former Turkish enemies’ indicates perhaps the low regard for this important visit. Pavils gives no names for the Turkish visitors from the Korean War UN forces, nor any references to current newspaper reports.
75 Ibid, 214; Pavils also mentioned the New Zealand connection where the New Zealand High Commissioner attends an Anzac Day service at the parish church of St. Mary at Walton-on-Thames. Her research uncovered little-known, intermittent Anzac Day and Remembrance Day observances linking Harefield with Adelaide between 1916 and 2001. These connections provide some evidence of a more continuous link.
76 Ibid, 242.
77 Ibid, 270.
volunteers in the service of the British Empire and Australia.\textsuperscript{80} Her orthodox argument supports the Australian nationalistic myth of identity which was forged by the fires of war. She concluded that pilgrimages to overseas battlefields and burial sites are part of realigning Australian identity and consciousness away from Britain and towards Australia.\textsuperscript{81} There is much of value in Pavils’ thesis. She is consistent in her basic definitions of Anzac Day as an expression of civil religion and sees a core function in forwarding a distinctive Australian identity. This writer finds the material presented fascinating but the argument tendentious, leaning too much on the Inglis-Gammage secular and dated national identity interpretation.

Another writer struggling with this problem was Mary Wilson who described the success of the 1921 parade but wondered why this was not repeated until 1925 when Anzac Day was declared a public holiday in Victoria.\textsuperscript{82} Her analysis, unfortunately limited, is not a modern ‘memory piece,’ but does attempt to convey what Anzac Day meant to ‘the Common Man [who] very often saw Anzac Day as his “One Day of the Year.”’\textsuperscript{83} Another Melbournian, Graeme Davidson, in 2003 pondered the revival of Anzac Day.\textsuperscript{84} He felt that the figures indicating increased activity were the result of RSL investment and heightened media interest. He criticised the ‘nostalgic historians’ who propose that for young people Anzac Day fills a vacuum or that it has become less proprietorial and more tribal. On the other hand he agrees that Anzac Day demonstrates ‘bonding across generations.’\textsuperscript{85} The discourse illustrates a range of ideas but is too short to have substance.

Canberra historian Pat Jalland’s post-millennium works provided a wealth of information and some challenges for this work. There are three points arising from her writing that demand discussion. They are: her assessment that the great schism away from Victorian attitudes happened with the catastrophe of World War I, the death denial phenomenon, and her dismissal

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid, 350.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid, 360.
\textsuperscript{82} Mary Wilson, ‘The Making of Melbourne’s Anzac Day,’ \textit{The Australian Journal of Politics and History}, Vol. 20, No. 2, 1974, 197. Mary Wilson, looking at Melbourne’s Anzac Day, and allying herself with Ken Inglis, admitted that it was hard to consider afresh the proposition that Australian consciousness of nationhood was born on 25 April 1915 at Gallipoli. Wilson points to the tensions within the RSSILA and its fall in numbers from 167,000 in 1919 to 24,000 in 1924. Despite this trend, Anzac Day parades gathered acceptance and by the late 1920s were a notable annual feature in the Melbourne calendar.
\textsuperscript{83} Mary Wilson, ‘The Making of Melbourne’ Anzac Day,’ 209.
\textsuperscript{84} Graeme Davidson, ‘The Habit of Commemoration and the Revival of Anzac Day,’ \textit{Australian Cultural History}, No. 22, 2003, 73-82.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid, 81.
of Anzac Day. In 2002, *Australian Ways of Death: A Social and Cultural History, 1840-1918*, was published.\(^{86}\) ‘Epilogue, The Great War and Silent Grief’ outlined her reasons for determining that in Australia, ‘The Great War of 1914 to 1918 marked a turning point in the history of death, grief and mourning.’\(^{87}\) She views World War I, with its tragic loss of young lives, as the ‘stimulus,’ or the catalyst for hastening the process of funeral and mourning reform, a rejection of Victorian funeral pageantry.\(^{88}\) The enormous impact of slaughter was overwhelming, anonymous and ugly, given that about ‘half the men of the British Empire who died in action in the Great War were unidentified and have no known burial place, including 25,000 Australians.’\(^{89}\) Jalland’s analysis traversed matters related to Anzac Day - the bush legend, issues of cowardice or ‘funk,’ officers’ reports of soldiers’ deaths, the ethos of masculinity, the non-repatriation of Anzac bodies, and spiritualism.\(^{90}\) The masculine stoicism of the returned soldiers sublimated a determination to reinstate a world of normalcy and propriety. Indeed, post-war stoicism is a keynote in Jalland’s writing, contrasting with ‘alternative strategies’ such as spiritualism. She cites Jay Winter who rationalised spiritualism as a means by which the survivors coped with loss and trauma.\(^{91}\)

Jalland’s ‘Mourning for the missing’ scopes the enormous social disjuncture caused by trying to cope with the death process without the body. She graphically describes the ongoing, unresolved trauma for the families of the dead. She raised doubts about whether war memorials erected around Australia actually helped families at a private and individual level even if the rituals might have. While parents who knew the location of their beloved’s grave may have had solace, Jalland

---


\(^{87}\) Jalland, *Australian Ways*, 304.

\(^{88}\) Jalland, *Australian Ways*, 304-305.


Jalland’s positions on a World War I based rejection of open attitudes on death followed by half a century of ‘death denial’ are powerfully stated. They impelled me to consider what reflections they might have on the development of Anzac Day. Death denial presupposes suppression of individual and community expressions of grief. This raises questions about the development of Anzac Day. Was the establishment and waning of death denial reflected in the patterns of development of Anzac Day? Was there a causal connection? Year by year, between the wars and following, Anzac Day was regularly commemorated and held high by the state and community in Australia and New Zealand. Anzac Day commemorates death and sacrifice; some say it
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92 Jay Winter, Sites, 115, cited in Jalland, Australian Ways of Death, 325. Jalland concedes that her stand is different from that of the noted scholar Jay Winter, who wrote that public war memorials in Europe ‘were [a] means of avoiding crushing melancholia, of passing through mourning, of separating from the dead and beginning to live again.’

93 Beverley Raphael, ‘Grief and Loss in Australian Society’, in Allan Kellehear (ed.), Death and Dying in Australia, Oxford UP, Melbourne, 2000, 120. These social trends have been reinforced by the actions of the churches, which failed to provide a believable model of the place of death. Death was removed from the foreground of the conscious by the advances of medical science which shifted the high probabilities of death from infancy to old age.


95 Jalland, Changing Ways of Death, 371.
celebrates it. It sits uncomfortably alongside death denial, yet is hardly death celebration. What
does Jalland make of it?96

Jalland marginalises Anzac Day by defining it as an act of collective memory ‘reinforced through
rituals and commemorative ceremonies.’97 She places it among works in the processes of
memorialisation and national memory in sustaining the Anzac legend.98 However, she uses
evidence pointing to how the day functioned for individuals wanting to express personal grief.99
She admits that the day had importance, but that in the 1920s she feels the prevailing sentiment of
decorum in the ceremonies was reinforced by the need to retain a ‘stiff upper lip.’ In addition,
Jalland concedes that ‘some public commemoration helped some bereaved families and ex-
soldiers more than others,’100 but observed that Anzac Day and war memorials gave rise to
tensions between honour and celebration of sacrifice for country and mourning for the dead. This
indeed gets to the centre of things. Still, Jalland has little room for Anzac Day apart from a final
paragraph recording the growth in participation at the end of the twentieth century.

The fluctuating trends of Anzac Day do not match those for death denial. At times when Anzac
Day was most popularly observed, as in the 1930s or 1950s, death denial was at its height. When
the influence of death denial waned, Anzac Day underwent resurgence. Is there a possibility of a
causal relationship here? The fundamental reasons for Anzac Day changes were not to be found
in relaxation of attitudes towards death and greater freedom in mourning. Rather, they were
accounted for by renewed interest in soldier stories and a growing fascination with Gallipoli and
Anzac Day, which operated outside the boundaries of death denial.

The resurgence of interest in Anzac Day after 1980 had more to do with a growing respect for
memory, both personal and national. In New Zealand, Australia, and Turkey there was the
reflection of a world-wide growth of interest in the past. The 1980s marked a period, not just of

96 Tanja Luckins, ‘Review of Pat Jalland’s Changing Ways of Death in Twentieth Century Australia: War, Medicine
baldly states, ‘Thus, of the thousands who mourned on Anzac Day, Jalland is silent.’
97 Jalland, Changing Ways of Death, 8, 76.
98 Jalland cites Australian national historians such as Ken Inglis, Joy Damousi, Stephen Garton and Alistair Thomson
as part of this group.
99 Jalland, Changing Ways of Death, 44-46. The O’Loughlin family who had lost two sons, one killed in Gallipoli in
the first landing and the next at Bapaume in France in February 1917. The family posted notices for the first two
Anzac Days in the Melbourne Argus newspaper.
100 Ibid, 96-97.
trumpeted national interests, but a realisation that the memories of the war which shaped the twentieth century were in danger. The generation who experienced World War I was disappearing. In Australia and New Zealand, 2005 marked the departing point for the last World War I Anzac soldiers. In their last few years elderly veterans were encouraged to return to sites of conflict. New Zealand and Australia have been at the forefront of ‘Gallipoli recognition’, with the Wellington Atatürk Memorial at Tarakina Bay, the Anzac Memorial in Canberra, and the re-internment of a World War I soldier as the Unknown Warrior. War death has been brought into the foreground and celebrated. This in itself indicates a remarkable change from fifty years ago.

Tanja Luckins’ *The Gates of Memory: Australian People’s Experiences and Memories of Loss and the Great War* moves freely between memory and mourning. Luckins pointed to the dichotomy between the public face of the ceremony as conveyed by the speech of the Prime Minister, Paul Keating and the issue of loss, which is the focus of her work. She strongly argued that this vital aspect of Australian history has been neglected, ‘while homefront bereavement is becoming a topic of historical inquiry, loss as a concept and loss as an experience, both of those who suffered loss and those who remembered loss, have featured little in the larger picture of Australian history.’

She pointed to the tension between key ideas of vitality and youth, often associated with the birth of Australia and contrasting ideas of old age and death which ‘lack a positive type, metaphor, or historical approach.’ Australian historians seem reluctant to engage with death and loss because it does not fit Australia’s present image. In more acerbic tones she referred to the issue of national identity, which she identified as a masculine and exclusive interpretation: ‘we have become Australian at the foundation moments of our history. And this becoming has

101 ABC Online 24 May 2002, ‘Nation to farewell last Gallipoli veteran,’ the state funeral in Hobart for 103 year old Alec Campbell. His funeral was attended by John Howard, the Australian Prime Minister and the governors of Tas, NSW and Vic. One minute’s silence was observed in Qld, NSW and Vic at 11 am. to coincide with Campbell’s funeral; www.rsa.org.nz/remem/rsa_hist_milestones.html Accessed 20 September 2008. Doug Dibley, from West Coast, New Zealand, died 18 December 1997.
102 RSA and RSL tours to Italy in 2005, on the 60th anniversary of the Italian campaign.
103 Tanja Luckins, *The Gates of Memory: Australian People’s Experiences and Memories of Loss and the Great War*, Curtin University Books, Fremantle, WA, 2004. Dr Tanja Luckins, La Trobe University graduate, was co-winner of the 2002 inaugural Australian Historical Association’s Serle Award for the best postgraduate thesis in Australian History. Her book begins with the entombment of the Unknown Soldier on 11 November 1993 in the Hall of Memory at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra.
104 Ibid, 11-12.
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overwhelmingly been a masculine, public affair; importantly, the idealised Anzac soldier has contributed in no small way to a national identity.\textsuperscript{106} Luckins guides us towards a broader interpretation also shown in Australian historian Joy Damousi’s \textit{The Labour of Loss} and \textit{Living With the Aftermath}, where psychoanalytical studies show how ‘new identity and persona’ were forged following grief experiences.\textsuperscript{107} Luckins firmly parts loss and commemoration from the popular national identity trend:

It is my belief that loss and the Great War is best understood not as a matter of identity and ‘becoming Australian’, but as a matter of shared experiences and human relationships. These experiences and relationships were sustained with family, friends, fellow bereaved and those who belonged to the bereaved relatives’ organisations; they were the way that people shared information and gathered personal effects of the dead: they were actual and imagined experiences and relationships made with landscapes in Australia and overseas. People’s experiences of loss were rarely isolated incidents...they were shared experiences of loss.\textsuperscript{108}

Luckins focussed on the neglected sphere of women’s role and reaction to Anzac Day. Luckins, citing Richard Nile, stressed the point that fear and apprehension of loss were experienced before those of grief.\textsuperscript{109} In this matter there is agreement with the major concept of \textit{aporia} expressed by Jacques Derrida. Moreover, on public occasions such as the Armistice of November 1918 and personal moments such as anniversaries and holidays, loss was felt anew. This was aggravated by the profound distress of loss without a body. The bereaved were predominantly women and children. She outlined the cultural role of women as mourners:

in relation to Anzac Day, their public role as carriers of personal and collective loss [women] were the key players in the generational transmission and negotiation of memories of loss in the Great War. Furthermore, women played a pivotal role in linking the personal and the collective: women wore clothing to express loss, led collective lamentations for the dead and, in the long term, were usually the keepers of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid, 13. \\
\end{flushright}
Luckins is in agreement with the policies of the AWM in seeing a place for memory in material objects such as diaries, letters, war memorials, inscriptions, images, dress, documents in government archives, oral memories and histories, scrapbooks, women’s magazines, poetry, newspapers, records of organisations, photographs, children’s books, government reports, film and newsreels, among other things. Luckins generally agrees with Marita Sturken by viewing historians’ processes of research and writing as part of this cultural reflexivity. The objects are all that is left; they are the existing remnants of a past. They are what inform us of the depth of loss.

Recently, there has been much interest expressed in the Gallipoli tourism phenomenon. Anne-Marie Hede, Bruce Scates and Brad West published academic articles and featured in the media. Anne-Marie Hede was reported as seeing a reason for the attraction of Gallipoli pilgrimage for young people in thanatourism or ‘Dark Tourism,’ with ‘a symbolic encounter with death,’ which might bring pilgrims to an understanding ‘that veterans are now a dying cohort in the community.’ Consequently, she described the Anzac story as having ‘quasi-religious overtones.’ In 2006 she presented her findings of a limited survey of fifteen Dunedin Otago University student participants who attended Anzac Day ceremonies earlier that year. She found motives to attend local Anzac Day services in New Zealand or at Gallipoli in
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obligation to families or institutions, supporting relatives, to be with the family ‘in spirit,’ to learn more about the day, or through curiosity. Thanatourism did not register in the results. On the other hand, emotions of anger, fear and sadness, mixed with love, surprise and joy predominated. However, Hede expostulated that both hedonistic and thanatological experiences were reflected in the study. Bruce Scates at the 20th International Congress of Historical Sciences in Sydney, 2005 drew attention to the need to record the grief experiences of two generations of travellers to Gallipoli. He felt that:

A cultural history of Australian pilgrimages to those distant hallowed places offers a chance to reconstruct and understand what Jay Winter has called the languages of mourning. It will survey the restless memory of war, noting how the meanings of that great conflict have changed with each succeeding generation and how even individual testimony can be rich, complex and contested. And ultimately it may tell us a great deal about how a nation invents, and re-invents, a sense of community.

This is close to the work of this thesis. Scates combines public and private accounts to weave an understanding of Gallipoli and other European battlefields’ tourism phenomena. He analysed the boundaries between individual and community to garner an understanding about pilgrimage, grief and commemoration.

In April 2007, Mark McKenna and Stuart Ward attacked Scates’ analysis. They asked if the experiences of Gallipoli pilgrims were also expectations, prefabricated in Australia. They pointed to Brad West’s more recent analysis that encounters with the Turkish side of the story brings into focus a less nationalistic version of Australian pilgrimage, and foregrounds a larger historical landscape in which Australians and Turks were fighting in a war not of their making.

References:
117 Hede, 24. The participants did not actually reflect interest in death matters ie. thanatological experiences. Professor Hede read that conclusion into her findings.
119 Ibid, 12 of 12.
120 Mark McKenna and Stuart Ward, “It Was Really Moving, Mate:” The Gallipoli Pilgrimage and Sentimental Nationalism in Australia,’ Australian Historical Studies, Vol. 38, No. 129, April 2007, 141-151. McKenna is a Senior Research fellow at Sydney University who has published on Aboriginal history and is working on a biography of Manning Clark. Ward is Associate Professor at the University of Copenhagen; his specialisation is British and Australian history.
McKenna and Ward raise the possibility that the Anzac legend may teach us to ‘valorise war and military endeavour above all other forms of human activity.’

Scates defended his methodology from the attack by McKenna and Ward in a paper cuttingly entitled ‘The First Casualty of War.’ He reiterated his placing of Gallipoli pilgrimages within the political and commercial imperatives in contemporary Australia. He also referred to his discoveries while researching Return to Gallipoli, where he chose not to marginalise the dissenting voices of some interviewees. He aligns himself with the Jay Winter school of memory, which allows him a more nuanced and richer reading of war memory. This thesis accords with the position of Bruce Scates who sees alternatives to the nationalistic, heroic interpretation of war memory. His recognition of Anzac Day as “a personal possession,” and pilgrimages (always more a mourning ceremony than a parade) regularly remind us that war is a bad business’ resonates well. Scates, in rebuttal of McKenna and Ward, cited the engagement of Return to Gallipoli with the ‘highly subjective world of the emotions’ which bring ‘pain and loss to the fore.’ It requires a new sort of history: one which will ‘critique the deeply subjective realms of personal and collective memory.’ Into this space this thesis makes some headway.

Brad West writes perceptively about the replacement of the widely accepted identification of ritual in the past being identified with the nation-state and supports its contemporary condition. What replaces it is a style of ‘cosmopolitan internationalism.’ West promotes predominance of space over memory. In terms of this thesis, this allows a strong argument for the influence of
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Gallipoli in Anzac Day memories. For the Gallipoli pilgrim, Anzac Day offers an experience superior to that gained at home. West points to the increase in visitor numbers to Gallipoli between 1996 (4000 visitors) and 2000 (an estimated 10,000-15,000 Australians and New Zealanders alone). He supports McKenna and Ward’s claim that Gallipoli pilgrims have a subjective experience and their responses are dependent on Australian collective memory of places like Anzac Cove, The Nek, and Anzac trenches where viewing democratises heroes and where most of the headstones are of soldiers whose age at death parallels that of the visitors, creating a sense of personal identification. West also directs attention to the role of the Turkish tour guide whose stories stress notions of defence of a homeland. West argues that discovery of the Turkish death toll has a huge impact on visitor perception, and this forces a revaluation of national discourses which largely ignore Turkish opinions.

During the 1980s and 1990s, outside the academy, Anzac Day was touted as the ‘forge of identity’ in both New Zealand and Australia. In Australia this persisted as a constant clarion call; also heard and repeated by New Zealand commentators. In 1990, Maclean and Phillips stated that Anzac Day was ‘the closest thing we have to a ceremony of nationalism,’ a position which moderates the staunch stand of Phillips in the mid-1980s when he pronounced that Anzac Day ‘represented, in men’s minds, the entry of New Zealand into national manhood. It was more a day of triumph than of sorrow.’ Chris Pugsley observed in 1984 that ‘“Anzac Day” means much more to the Australians. It was planned and largely fought as Australia’s Day’, ‘Anzac Day is an Australian national day, a paean to Australian manhood’ and that 8 August would better represent New Zealand’s interests. It seems he was keen to establish a definable point of difference. In 2004 he reiterated: ‘Australia sees [Anzac Day] as a national day…indeed in Australia the term “Anzac” is synonymous with “Australian”…it is a celebration of nationhood.’ In taking this stand, he pointed to the important difference between meanings for Australia in celebration of egalitarianism and voluntarism, and those for New Zealand in which
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the living memorialise the dead. This difference is reflected in Australia’s ‘forge of national identity,’ or for New Zealand in the more muted ‘marker in the development of a national identity.’ For New Zealand a crucial issue was sacrifice - the cost of war. Ultimately, Pugsley returned to a broader statement where Anzac Day was to ‘commemorate the dead in all wars…and ponder not just on the nature of heroic sacrifice but more importantly to stand in judgement of ourselves.’¹³⁵

The powerful notion that Anzac Day is Australia’s day was promoted also by British scholar Jenny Macleod in 2004.¹³⁶ She wrote: ‘Such is the importance of the Anzac legend that it is celebrated and commemorated each year in Australia on Anzac Day…[it] overshadows November’s Armistice Day commemoration and January’s Australia Day.’¹³⁷ Bronwyn Dalley and Gavin McLean in 2005 felt Anzac Day ‘began a lasting tradition in New Zealand. Although bolstering New Zealanders’ sense of national identity, the fighting at Gallipoli shattered their illusions.’¹³⁸ This statement projects the Phillips and Pugsley positions by combining ideas about national identity and cost of sacrifice. Nevertheless, Anzac Day also serves memory for these writers: ‘the solemn proceedings of Anzac Day every 25 April continue to remind New Zealanders of [World War I].’¹³⁹ Here, memory predominates, but carries a discord which sounds the national identity note more stridently than will be found in this thesis.

The general direction of this thesis was influenced in its early development by a rebuttal of traditional arguments based on ‘top-down’ national identity interpretations, as found in Anzac legend and British romantic myth writing. This thesis is qualitative in analysis, and depends largely on interpretations derived from a wide array of material. It seeks to assess evidence from a wide variety of sources and distinguish overall changes to the public perception of Anzac Day. Its concern is the boundaries between memory and meaning. It examines the meanings which

¹³⁵ Ibid, 313.
¹³⁶ Jenny Macleod, Reconsidering Gallipoli, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2004. This revision of Gallipoli tends to disregard New Zealand as largely irrelevant. She concentrates on portraying the Gallipoli experience as dominated by Australia. The work is based on her PhD thesis, ‘The Gallipoli campaign as assessed by some British and Australian participants, 1915 – 1939,’ Cambridge University, 2000.
¹³⁹ Ibid, 245.
individuals and communities placed at times during the twentieth century on Anzac Day. The work draws attention to commemoration, sacrifice, suffering, mourning and loss. These issues are the grist of this work. The methodology of this thesis has been informed by writers in the field of war and memory - Jay Winter, Paul Fussell, Simon Scharma, Joy Damousi, Ken Inglis, John Moses and Pat Jalland.

The thesis has six divisions: Introduction - the argument and the literary review; Chapter One - historical theories applied in this work; Chapter Two - rationalising the importance of Gallipoli; Chapters Three, Four and Five - the development of the day to 1945; Chapters Six and Seven - the development of the day from 1946 to 2000; and the Conclusion. The divisions permit examination of the disjuncture caused by World War II, and allow continuities shown in Turkish – Anzac military connections. Concluding the first half with the end of World War II clearly shows the break with the old era, and the beginning of a ‘new age.’ It marked the start of a noticeable broadening of interest and world-wide observance of the day. This permits the study to highlight changes in attitude revealing greater post-war realism. It also validated Anzac POW World War II experiences as a conclusion to the first half of the thesis. For the post-war period from 1946, it appears helpful to the argument to bring the two trans-Tasman nations together in one chapter for the purposes of comparison. While interpretations of the day and their connections with issues of national identity differ, at the deepest level, both nations have been telling the same story.

The first chapter opens with discussion of current anthropological and historical theories and their application to Anzac Day meanings and developments. The relationships between memory and historic landscapes of death and sacrifice are central because the deepest meanings of the day are commemorative. Commemorations were built first on stories which transferred meanings from Gallipoli to Australasia, cemented and reified in the annual rituals which developed for Anzac Day. Consequently, the writings of anthropologists Thomas Greider, Lorraine Garkovich, Eric Hirsch and Michael O’Hanlon on landscapes become relevant. Within this process, landmarks were named in the process of human management. This was one of the first tasks undertaken by Anzac forces on the Gallipoli Peninsula in 1915. Sharp issues of ownership are exposed in the management of Anzac Day and its associated symbols, such as poppies worn or shown in publications or television artwork, are examples of ‘impression management’ in the cultural
Marita Sturken introduces a notion applicable to the events at Gallipoli in 1915. It is the importance of thinking about collective memory and ‘juncture points’ based on the events of 9/11. A ‘binary’ relationship, based upon the United States and Japanese experience of each other during World War II, made me wonder whether a similar relationship existed between Turkey and the Anzac nations.

The chapter also discusses the centrality of death and mourning in commemoration. The notion of the shock of death is central to this thesis, as Anzac Day is founded on issues emanating from soldier death. Jacques Derrida, on shock, or ‘aporia’ of death and centrality of fidelity, proved to be critical writings. Jay Winter’s search for the language of mourning, informed this study of the ‘considerable evidence of the power of traditional modes of commemoration within communities.’ Susan Sontag in her 1973 essay ‘Plato’s Cave’ makes clear the powerful place of the photograph and its ability to capture layers of meaning. Anzac Day was, and still is, a time when old photographs of soldiers in uniform are brought out, handled and cried over. They are both ‘pseudo-presence and a token of absence.’ Jay Winter, the American doyenne of the modern memory school, draws attention to spiritualism emanating from war. On Anzac Day following World War I cartoonists frequently portrayed the dead in spiritualist and ephemeral drawings. A clear and typical example of this art form was drawn for the NZFL for Anzac Day 1922. Above the caption ‘Anzac Cove’ it depicts a grieving woman kneeling at the memorial laying a wreath. Beside her, the shadowy and injured figure of her beloved, who lives now only in her memory. Winter’s work blends memory and mourning and is based on the European
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tragedy of World War I. Much of Winter’s work is reflected in the observance of Anzac Day; particularly in its memories, meaning and rituals.

Gallipoli is the subject of Chapter Two. It was the conception place for Anzac Day and has been the most constant reference point for the day through the twentieth century. It was at Gallipoli, that the term ‘Anzac’ was first used, and the Anzac legend began. The chapter outlines both individual memories and community events in published material pointing to the endurance of Anzac Day. Much of this material enforces the opinion that Gallipoli memories dominated all others for most of the century. Today, Anzac soldier sacrifices at Passchendaele are not forgotten, but each Anzac Day public attention is still directed to Gallipoli. The chapter introduces the notion of Turkey’s part with Anzac Day at Gallipoli. This matter will be fleshed out in Chapter Five. It has only recently been publicly acknowledged that Turkey’s claim for sovereignty over the Gallipoli battlefields and cemeteries’ sites is valid. The changing public discourse over the ownership of these sites influenced Gallipoli pilgrims’ perceptions of their experiences.

Chapter Three, ‘Anzac Days in New Zealand to 1945,’ interrogates the argument of whether the first New Zealand Anzac Days began spontaneously.\textsuperscript{149} This thesis argues that Anzac Day in New Zealand did not begin spontaneously but was carefully orchestrated. The work of the founder of the Returned Soldiers’ Association, Captain Donald Simson, and cooperation by New Zealand political leaders led to the first Anzac Day in 1916. Simson’s brief work paralleled that of Canon David Garland in Brisbane, and it is possible they knew each other. The chapter traverses the developments of the day through the exercise of political will and monument building both of which happened in the 1920s and 1930s. By 1936 Anzac Day was well established, and the 20\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the 1916 day was chosen as a snapshot of Anzac Day in a society which was again confronting war. World War II brought changes to New Zealand society, but the Anzac Day landscape was transported around the world. This portability was carried into the war, even into POW camps. The little-known phenomenon of Anzac Day in Stalag 383

Hohenfels, Bavaria, allows a glimpse of the readiness of POWs to stage a day of remembrance and sports. It is important to tell the Hohenfels’ story, notable by its absence from previous New Zealand academic papers.

Chapter Four traces Australia’s development of Anzac Day from origin to 1945. It was subjected to different influences from New Zealand’s. John Moses’ and Janice Pavils’ debate over spontaneity for Australia’s first Anzac Day is examined in detail. Despite widespread Australian public acceptance, it was not until 1930 that all six states permitted the passage of federal legislation on a national day. Australian states’ representatives in the 1920s adopted intransigent positions opposing federal persuasion for a national observance of Anzac Day. Does Anzac Day reflect the masculinist trope of the rugged Australian? The writing of Joy Damousi and Tanja Luckins about ageing women in widows’ weeds losing status in the 1930s is confronted by evidence in this thesis demonstrating the involvement of women until World War II.

Turkey, the adversary of 1915 and ally of 1945, is the subject of Chapter Five. The part played by Turkey in the development of Anzac Day is little-known in the West, or in Turkey itself. The geo-political position of Turkey from 1915 to 2000 is of critical importance. Turkey’s Onsekiz Mart Zaferi (18 March 1915 Victory) and the celebrations which flow from it are little understood. This lack of appreciation was also reflected in the perceptions Turk and Anzac had of each other. The discussion tracks the distance the two groups moved in order to accommodate the change from wartime foes to friends. Within this context, the place of Atatürk’s now famous 1934 statement is reviewed. Today, this statement, carefully reworded in 1985, has a critical place. This work will present material which casts the 1934 statement in a new light. A reconciliatory policy towards Anzacs was furthered by the Freyberg-Çakmak (Chakmak) messages of 1940. It is clear from this material, published in The Times, that wartime Turkish politicians and military leaders wished to engage their memories by furthering the comradeship developed since 1915.

Chapter Six, which compares the day of commemoration in New Zealand and Australia, introduces the theme of separation with Peter Beilharz’s argument of a ‘parting of the ways’
between their national stories since 1945.\footnote{Peter Beilharz, ‘Australia and New Zealand – looking backward, looking forward and a parting of the ways,’ \textit{New Zealand Sociology}, Vol. 22, No. 2, 2007, 315.} The chapter examines whether the two nations had different interpretations of Anzac Day. One difference is found in the role of the New Zealand Maori in wartime, a role which could not be ignored. Such was not the case for Aboriginal Australians and Torres Strait Islanders. Their stories would not publicly surface until the 1990s, and they, with a few exceptions, would not be found in Anzac Day parades until then. On the other hand, Anzac Day was being observed internationally and becoming much more inclusive – reflecting experiences in World War II. Representatives of world war women’s units: WAACs, WAAF\textsc{s} and WRENS attended. Other nations were represented, and most notably for this study, Turkey.

Did Anzac Day undergo a period of decline during the Vietnam War? This thesis uncovers nuances in the entrenched orthodoxy and argues for a dip in public attachment in the years 1973 to 1975, and from that point increased public popularity. The comparison is New Zealand based, drawing into focus Australian material where appropriate. Public attention swung steadily towards Gallipoli during 1980 to 2000. With the advent of international migration, back-packing, and the impact of the visual media, particularly television, there was a great revival of interest in Anzac Day. At the same time that Gallipoli became a space to wander in on Anzac Day, other memories were rekindled – those of Passchendaele, Monte Cassino, El Alamein, Kokoda, and Vietnam.

Chapter Seven examines the role of Turkey in Anzac Day from 1946 to 2000. The Morshead Mission of 1948 stimulated memories for those who attended. There are continuities between that event and the 1965 Gallipoli veterans’ reunion. Events, once central to Turkish Çanakkale veterans’ memories, have been forgotten in Turkey. Personal and collective memories were subject to larger forces. It was eclipsed by the events of 1953 which were recognised as being a most significant turning-point for Turkey in relations with the West. Following that year Turkish military representatives were dispersed around the world to participate in various Anzac Day commemorations. In 1953 the Turkish government also embarked on its own monument building programme. It seemed strange to Turkish people that the battlefields where they had won the campaign were dominated by monuments, visible reminders in stone, not to their more numerous dead heroes, but to those fewer dead of the forces they had defeated. In 1973, Turkey embarked
on a renewed programme of monument-building within the newly-declared ‘Gelibolu Peninsula Historical National Park’ [HNP]. From that point, in Turkey at least, interest in Anzac Day began to grow. Foreign backpackers’ travels took them to Gallipoli in ever-increasing numbers at a time when World War I veterans were disappearing. In 1985, Turkey, Australia and New Zealand agreed on a reciprocal monument-building programme and Anzak Koyu (Anzac Cove) was officially re-named. In the same year, the Turkish memorial in Canberra was opened, alongside Anzac Parade, Canberra, and in 1990 the Wellington Atatürk memorial was unveiled.

From 1990 onward there has been obvious recognition of Anzac Day and associated matters by the Republic of Turkey. Heads of state attended the Gallipoli ceremonies. Increasingly, trade and academic links were established which further cemented the relationship. By 1999, Anzac Day at Gallipoli became so popular that urgency was given to changing the site of the dawn service. At the millennium, there was lively interest in Turkey about Anzac Day. The *Turkish Daily News*, which had run successive Anzac Day stories since 1998, invoked memories with printing *Şafakta Yanan Mumlar (Candles at Dawn)*. It questioned traditional concepts of war, enmity, friendship and freedom. The Gallipoli Anzac Day story had come full circle; from war to peace to memory. Gallipoli was now a shrine to common memories rather than the battlefield of war.
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Chapter One – Memory, Landscape, Death and Mourning

There is in our lives a wound which will never heal. Nor should it.

- Käthe Kollwitz, *Diary*.152

When I am laid, am laid in earth, may my wrongs create
No trouble, no trouble in, in thy breast…
Remember me, remember me, but ah!
Forget my fate…. Henry Purcell, ‘Dido’s Lament,’

*Dido and Aeneas* (1689).

The relationship between death and memory is central to Anzac Day. This deep and powerful but fluid relationship is at the core of this chapter and underpins the study. Both Käthe Kollwitz and Henry Purcell accurately reflect the enduring matters which bind death and memory. Death has meaning within a current historical landscape; it creates memories within that landscape. Mourning is the social and individual outcome of loss. This chapter therefore will examine the threads or factors of memory, landscape, death, and mourning and their attachments to Anzac Day. Memory, whether public or private, is imagined. It is fluid and what shapes it is the environment or landscape in which it is formed, reinforced or forgotten. Memory and landscape intersect and move, and ideas about commemoration and death are resultants of this intersection and movement. These factors comprise a reciprocal matrix which influences the conduct and meanings of any commemorative event. Consequently they affected the meanings of and memories stimulated by the commemoration of Anzac Day over the twentieth century. Changing attitudes to death and mourning also evolved concurrently with fluctuations in the fortunes of Anzac Day.

The threads or factors of memory, landscape, death and mourning will be treated separately, and later combined. However, war memories, with motifs of grief, mourning, loss, tragedy and suffering, conflate all. The tragedy of the human condition in war invites suffering and grief, and the events of war create a shared, communal experience.

This discussion will cover: how humans understand the landscape they find themselves in: matters of contestation; conferring meanings to Gallipoli, Anzac and Anzac Day; symbols and Anzac Day; women and mourning; the role of the State; physical memorials and their function on Anzac Day. In the discussion on memory the following topics will be covered: Pierre Nora’s famous prediction about the consumption of memory by the forces of modern history; Jay Winters’ merging of memory and mourning and his fixing of the schism between traditionalism and the modern age within World War II; Marita Sturken’s ideas on the relationship between concepts of the nation and collective memory studies, and her notion of the shock of cataclysmic events in human history; and lastly in this section the notion of a ‘binary memory’ existing between Turkey and the Anzac nations. The last portion of this chapter deals with death and mourning. It includes examination of the application of Jacques Derrida’s ideas about ‘fidelity.’ The section will examine possible causation between the end of ‘death denial’ in the late 1970s and the resurgence of Anzac Day in the 1980s. Finally, Tanja Luckin’s recent and inclusive Australian work on the people’s experiences and loss in World War I is linked closely with that of American Marita Sturken, and provides useful material on the place of material objects and their reflexivity.

Distance and individual experience become important in understanding how Anzac Day conferred meaning and became a political platform. Gallipoli, the conception point for Anzac Day was geographically far removed, but more potently, ‘Anzac’ and ‘Gallipoli,’ were initially unknown terms. Neither term had any of its later connotations before the landing of 1915. Meanings, conferred at the location during the struggles between Anzacs and Turks, were moderated by individual experience. Soldier understandings differed considerably from those of civilians removed from conflict experience and immediately following the failure at the Dardanelles. Soldier memories and meanings themselves were further moderated by the war experiences on the Western Front and in Palestine. Current landscape was a most important modifier of meaning and memory.

Why spend so long on the issues of death and mourning in a thesis about Anzac Day? These issues are central to the interpretation of Anzac Day. Death and mourning are part of the historical landscape and the deepest current of Anzac Day. Since World War II, and up to about 1990, Anzac issues have been predominantly interpreted in a framework of national identity. This interpretation does not stand alone, and indeed may not be the most valid one. It is certainly
paraded: each Anzac Day, especially since more significant anniversaries appear to be celebrated, the flags of national identity are unfurled. Pride in being Australian, or a New Zealander, or a Turk, itself captures media attention on the day.

**Landscape**

There is a useful relationship between the work of historians and anthropologists when dealing with ‘landscapes.’ Land or territory which societies occupy or imagine is the landscape for anthropologists; historical events and characters occupying that ‘landscape’ in time are central for the historian. Issues of self-definition, meaning, ownership, management, rejuvenation, and contestation, which are central to anthropology, are no less so to history. While ‘landscape’ for one is land or territory and its meanings for societies, for the other it is events and human relationships played out over time.

Anthropologists Thomas Greider and Lorraine Garkovich in 1994 wrote about the way humans understand the landscapes they create from physical environments. Landscape is interpreted as ‘the symbolic environment created by the human act of conferring meaning on nature and the environment,’ reflecting self-definitions of people within a particular cultural environment. This definition is widely accepted. ‘Landscapes as definitions of ourselves’ clarify our understandings of human relationships with the environment are cultural expressions which define who we were, who we are and who we hope to be; different people bestow a physical place with multiple landscapes. These meanings are social constructions and are the result of negotiations in a cultural context. In 1995, Eric Hirsch and Michael O’Hanlon’s work on landscape was published. Their edited material gathered ideas which have relevance to this study. They relate the relationship between ‘foreground’ matters or events of the present with a ‘background’ of idealised existence and impose on that notion issues arising from Paul Carter’s study, *The Road to Botany Bay* which challenges imperial history by admitting an existence of pre-Cook discovery history for Australia. This is similar to others not admitting a place for Turkish history in their
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155 Hirsch and O’Hanlon, *The Anthropology of Landscape*, ‘Introduction,’ citing P. Carter, in *The Road to Botany Bay: an Essay in Spatial History*, Faber and Faber, London, 1987, challenge ‘imperial history’ which reduces space to a stage on which actors enact historical events leading to Australia’s ‘discovery’ and ‘settlement’. In its place Carter advocates a ‘spatial history’ – a history of “spatial forms and fantasies through which a culture declares its
understanding of Gallipoli. It partly accounts for the low estimation which Anzacs initially held of Turkish troops. This partial view was prevalent in material uncovered relating to early Anzac Days. Hirsch and O’Hanlon also promote the idea of ‘cultural landscape’ being a process. This idea is realised in the way both Anzac and Turkish veterans place their own meanings and identifying landmarks on the Gallipoli Peninsula.

The notions outlined above relating to landscape and self-definition have applications in a study of Anzac Day. The first and over-arching interpretation of a particular landscape is in the human act of conferring meaning. If one asks the question what did ‘Gallipoli’ or ‘Anzac’ mean in 1915 and 1916 we find a number of factors present themselves. There are ‘here’ and ‘there’ factors – in the sense that interpretation of the first Anzac or Gallipoli landscapes grew out of reported conflicts of the Dardanelles campaign: for soldiers engaged in the area it was the locale of conflict. For those at home it had different connotations. There the ideal was imagined, victorious sons of the British Empire leaping over the Gallipoli Peninsula hills. But the foreground for Anzac troops was different. Conflict and the Dardanelles’ environment interplayed to create the ‘Bloody Gallipoli’ hated for its heat, dust, flies and lack of facilities experienced by the Anzac soldiers. Other understandings were conveyed by conflict and redefined through further hardships. Conferring of names gave a basic geographical knowledge and a framework of understanding for soldiers involved the conflict and for people at home. Place names created associations with the bloody actions at those places. For the public of New Zealand and Australia, Gallipoli place names were reminders of brave actions, courage, and refusal to withdraw in the face of overwhelming odds. For relatives and friends of the dead the names were the burial places of their loved ones. Their particular foreground was tragedy.

presence’. He uses the illustration of Captain James Cook and the ‘discovery’ of Australia and suggests what Cook did was apply European experience to create a comprehensible landscape of the foreign land, Australia. There was some difficulty in conjoining the here and now with a background to which this could be related. Carter relates the ‘foreground’ (here and now, place) and ‘background’ (horizon, space) as central to the way it was conceived by its inhabitants and is continually being re-enacted in the present. Historical space was enacted by aboriginals in dance and song and brought the country into view in the first place.

156 Ibid, 9, citing C. Sauer, ‘The Morphology of Landscape’, J. Leighly (ed.), Land and Life: A Selection of the Writings of Carl Sauer, University of California Press, California, 1963, 343. Sauer took a position that derived from criticisms of the French and German schools, and argued that culture shaped the landscape to produce a ‘cultural landscape’: ‘The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result.’

This marked sense of place reflected actions, a sense of identity through doing reinforcing Albert Camus’ notion that place is more than knowing or feeling, but something people do.\(^{158}\) With the withdrawal of the British Empire and French troops from the Peninsula in December, this factor was the ground for dismay: a complaint frequently voiced was leaving comrades’ bodies behind. That the withdrawal was quickly interpreted as in some way a heroic ‘victory’ is a remarkable feat of reinterpretation and a reflection of the need for a foil for the Allies from the dreariness of the Western Front battles.\(^{159}\) Turkish interpretation of Çanakkale Savaşları,\(^{160}\) the successful battles for the defence of their homeland, was dismissed by the British in 1916 and only was known in a limited sense after the establishment of the Turkish republic in 1923, and then little known in the West for most of the century. In this sense it had only potential meaning, until being brought intermittently into the foreground by events in Turkey. This situation changed in the 1980s with increasing Anzac curiosity about Turkey and a more active intervention in Gallipoli events by the government of the Republic.\(^{161}\)

Embedded within the action of naming is the gritty issue of contestation. In a section entitled ‘Competing and changing landscapes’ Greider and Garckovich give examples of contestation in Australia and the USA between indigenous peoples and invaders.\(^{162}\) This is what has happened from the beginning of the Anzac myth and its child, Anzac Day. On 25 April 1915, the British and their allies landed troops on the Gallipoli Peninsula. It was an attempt to claim ownership of the territory as a first step in a planned attack on Constantinople, the Turkish capital. During 1915, while temporarily occupying the Peninsula, the Allies acted as proprietors: naming key areas, placing direction posts, establishing an economic and command infrastructure, mapping

\(^{158}\) Albert Camus, *Noces suivi de l’été*, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1955, 88, in Steven Field and Keith H. Basso (eds.), *Senses of Place*, School of American Research, Santa Fe, NM. 1996, 83. Field and Basso see the primary purpose of their writing ‘to describe and interpret some of the ways in which people encounter places, perceive them, and invest them with significance.’ This idea about investing Gallipoli (Çanakkale) meaning was equally true for Turkish people, but not voiced extensively until after the 1980s.

\(^{159}\) Conversation with Professor Robert Hannah, Department of Classics, University of Otago, 13 July 2006. The discussion ranged across the possibility of defeats seen as victories, or at least as pillars in the landscape of national consciousness. He stated that not since Thermopylae has such a Pyrrhic feat faced almost immediate reinterpretation as a trans-Tasman national ‘victory.’

\(^{160}\) Çanakkale Savaşları, the successful Turkish defence of the region, called the ‘Dardanelles Campaign’ by the British and allies.

\(^{161}\) This conforms to the theories of Hirsch and O’Hanlon, (eds.), *The Anthropology of Landscape*.

\(^{162}\) Greider and Garkovich, 11. Their world concept is based on different sorts of connections than western science would accept ‘artefacts, plants, rocks, springs, and other elements in the non-human environment connect Indian people to their creation, to their ancestors, to each other, and to their future.’ Native Americans understand the world holistically but may not recognise the relationship between individual components. This reflects competing epistemologies (theory of method or grounds of knowledge) and leads to very different assessments of the sociocultural and environmental consequences of development projects e.g. the construction of a road.
the area, driving in roads, setting up perimeter defences, and establishing a foreign military society. Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, English war correspondent wrote descriptively of this:

Every camp, hill and gully now has a distinctive Australian name… The position facing north is known as Walker’s Ridge, and following the perimeter of defence right around until it strikes the coast to the south you are introduced in turn to Pope’s Hill, Dead Man’s Ridge, the Bloody Angle, Quinn’s Post, Courtney’s Post, McLaurin’s Hill, Scott’s Point, Johnstone’s Jolly, Bolton’s Hill and Point Rosenthal, each of these names recalling some incident of the campaign or some memory of peaceful times in ‘Down Under.’

By vesting their own definitions on Gallipoli, Anzacs demonstrated Greider and Garkovich’s proposition that ‘different people transport into a physical place multiple landscapes. These different meanings are socio-cultural phenomena or social constructions and are the result of ongoing negotiations in a cultural context.’ These negotiations reflect competing epistemologies. These competing epistemologies lead to very different assessments of the socio-cultural and environmental consequences of development projects, even those as common as the construction of a road.

In 2004-2005, and again in October 2008, extensive road reconstruction and widening above Anzac Cove was undertaken. Chris Pugsley observed that the entire perspective had changed with the contractors’ earthworks of significant parts of the first ridge up from the 1915 landing beach. The groups involved - farmers, tourism operators, contractors, and regional authorities like the Gallipoli Peace Park Commission - all had a different interpretation of what had happened and its significance. Turkish, Australian and New Zealand governments have each constructed different symbolic meanings for the land in question in a way that reflects their own self-definition. Turkish authorities bowed to Australian and New Zealand government pressure over increased use of the site to engage in redevelopment. Turkish central government agencies wished to appear amenable to New Zealand and Australian government initiatives addressing
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164 Greider and Garkovich, 4-5.
165 Ibid, 11.
167 Chris Pugsley ‘Lions and Donkeys: Revisiting National Mythologies of War,’ lecture in Otago University, Archway 4, 2 May 2005.
vehicle access, parking and accommodation. Overseas Anzacs viewed the change as ‘a threat to the fundamental meaning of [their] life-world,’ and felt Turkish residents had forfeited their guardianship of the landscape.\textsuperscript{168}

This contest over control of landscape focuses attention on ‘impression management’- the exercise and maintenance of power within a landscape. Discussions over the significance of Anzac Day pivot around this issue.\textsuperscript{169} Factors which underlie power in the process of domination by one group are: the ability to define what constitutes information (i.e. the ability to construct knowledge); the control of this socially-constructed information; and the symbolic mobilisation of support. ‘The maintenance and activation of power come from being able to convince others of the correctness of your position, of being able to appeal to those symbols which strike a resonance, of presenting one’s self in the appropriate and desired style.’\textsuperscript{170} This matter is also central to the management of Anzac Day. Anzac Day events appear so important that throughout the century control of the observance has been fought over and at times the conflict for control over-rode commemorative gestures and central meanings.\textsuperscript{171} Impression management occurs through a variety of cultural media. Laws, customs, myths, legends, novels, poems, stories, histories, biography, conversations, art, photography, music and movies are some of the media through which landscapes are created, recreated and redefined. Access to the media reflects the degree to which one set of managed self-definitions prevails over others. Each of the points above resonates in the development of Anzac Day.

Among the most obvious physical landscape features are war memorials. These conflate both memory and landscape. Anzac Day commemorations have often been held in dignified and important venues.. One of the most impressive ceremonies is the Dawn Ceremony in the forecourt of the AWM.\textsuperscript{172} For the majority of the people, halls and memorials in parks became

\textsuperscript{168} Greider and Garkovich, 14.
\textsuperscript{169} Ibid, 17: ‘In the context of landscapes, power is the capacity to impose a specific definition of the physical environment, one that reflects the symbols and meanings of a particular group of people.’
\textsuperscript{171} A clear example of this type of contestation is to be found in the Huish-Garland dispute for control of Queensland’s Anzac day in the 1930s. See Chapter Four of this thesis.
\textsuperscript{172} AWM Souvenirs 1, 5/1/1 Anzac Day Souvenirs Collection Subseries: Services held at the Australian War Memorial, 1942-1945. The Albert Hall was opened on 10 March 1928 by Prime Minister, Stanley Bruce. The War Memorial was not officially opened until 1941. In the Australian Commonwealth Territory from 1928, the Albert Hall was used for the Anzac Day Commemoration Services. In 1942, the service was transferred to the present ground of remembrance for the nation, the forecourt of the Australian War Memorial.
the physical location for Anzac Day. They were felt to be the most fitting locale, being a tangible expression of community commemoration. Memorials were surrogate burial places, where no actual burial markers were possible and the memorials with their lists of names became the impersonal bearers of memory. The topic is well covered by Australian historian, Ken Inglis, and in New Zealand, by Jock Phillips. In his 1991 classic *War Memorials – from Antiquity to the Present*, Alan Borg makes the point that to ensure the memory of the righteous dead, due homage must be given for the sacrifices made. He points to the numerous and widespread nature of war memorials: ‘they represent the biggest communal arts project ever attempted…it was the unprecedented scope of the First World War and its appalling statistics of death which caused the greatest upsurge in memorial building.’ He claims that the cenotaph, the most common locale of Anzac Day dawn ceremonies, was:

relatively uncommon in antiquity [and the] Greeks attached the greatest importance to the proper burial of the dead, to the extent that if no body was available a fictitious burial ceremony was held and a cenotaph erected over an empty grave. Inevitably, it was the bodies of soldiers who fell in foreign fields that could not be recovered for burial, and so the concept of the cenotaph became particularly, but not exclusively, associated with military memorials….In the 20th century, and especially after the building of the Cenotaph in London, the word has come to be synonymous with any war memorial that was not itself an actual sepulchre.

There is much in his work which is relevant to memorials in New Zealand and Australia, together with discourse on the tombs of unknown soldiers. In 1998, Sergiusz Michalski made observations about the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the Cenotaph in Whitehall which served as models, in terms of design and ideas, for later memorialisation in the Antipodes. In ‘Memorials to the Great War’, Michalski discusses the place of the *Tomb of the Unknown Soldier* which was unveiled on the second anniversary of the Armistice, 11 November 1920. He argues
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173 Ken Inglis, *Sacred Places*, 4-74, 280-347.
176 Ibid, ix. In some cases World War I memorials were barely completed by the start of World War II – this Borg sees as a reason for comparatively few memorials being erected in the post-1945 era.
177 Ibid, 67.
178 Borg, 133-135, Chapter 8, ‘Form and Function’ in which the Australian War Memorial is placed.
179 Borg, 141-142.
that the idea for the tomb was a ‘by-product of the process of democratization.’ 181 Three years later, the novel concept of the eternal flame was associated with the tomb. The Tomb in the London setting was symbolically overtaken by Sir Edwin Luyten’s Cenotaph in Whitehall. Michalski describes the Cenotaph as a ‘double model’ - reflecting the previous temporary Whitehall structure and acting as an actual sepulchre with the inscription *The Glorious Dead.* 182 It was the focus for London observances. He also remarks on the cultic implications of non-configuration found in the messages left at the foot of the Cenotaph on commemorative occasions. 183 Michalski mentions personal notes which reflect individual and family memory, but says little about the wreaths which from time to time have been the principal symbols of state and individual commemorative gestures.

Perhaps memorialisation is not a stone, but a process. Judith Bennett, Otago University historian, writing from St. John’s, Cambridge, notes the changes in attitudes to the slave trade:

> The best memorial to the sufferings and conflicts of the past as centred in that University is to open the issues up to dialogue. It is the process that is the memorial and more powerful than an apology…Moreover, she [Professor Ruth Simmons] is not into loading guilt onto this generation of whites but into giving people agency to assist to solve today’s problems. 184

This comment initiated other thoughts that perhaps we have embedded too much in stone memorials. Perhaps humans have a blind faith that they will mean as much for successive generations as they did to those who erected them. This cannot be. Those who erected them were directly affected by the tragedy which caused the initial sacrifice and the marks of the society whose memorials they were are seen in the wordings and designs. Whether they mean anything at all to the present generation has much more to do with transmitted processes across the years. No matter how powerful the original concepts for a memorial might have been, they cannot overcome changes issuing from the process of human activity over time.

183 Ibid. Michalski also draws parallels with practices at the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem and a closer one to the rituals carried out before Maya Ying Lin’s Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC (after 1984).
Greider and Garkovich focus on change caused by the way humans negotiate meanings within nature and the environment. They socialise and reorganise into a material or non-material reflection of their social structure. The Flanders poppy worn on Anzac Day, and flower wreaths laid on Anzac Day, are examples of evocative material symbols. Poppies individualise the spilt blood for the nation, and the wreaths represent respect and honour for the dead. The poppy, traditionally worn on Poppy Day and again on Anzac Day, recreated images of bloody sacrifice in Ypres, Flanders Fields for an older generation, but for the generation born in the last quarter of the twentieth century it takes different connotations: remembrance, tradition, sometimes a token gift to be made at a monumental wall with names of dead but unrelated soldiers. The practices of today bear overtones of the past but lack the poignancy of immediate relevance. They reflect the truth that, over time, people change the world they inhabit.

At a different level, the Australian War Memorial in Canberra represents a much more complex illustration of the power of symbolism. Symbols define the environment; they are part of the everyday pattern of life. Anzac Day provides what anthropologist Clifford Geertz calls ‘experience-near concepts [where] ideas and realities they inform are naturally and indissolubly bound up together.’ The Australian War Memorial houses those micro-symbols which go to the heart of the relationship of the individual with the day: photographs, badges, short descriptive statements of meaning. More related to memory generally, photographs, brooches, flowers and small gifts of all sorts take on symbolic meanings far greater than their intrinsic value.

185 L. Busch ‘Irony, tragedy, and temporality in agricultural systems, or values and systems are related,’ *Agriculture and Human Values*, 6 (4): 1989, 7. An illustration of this is found in the cards which were drawn for Anzac Day ceremonies or dinners on the Western Front or at sea for homeward bound World War I troops, and for POWs in various camps during World War II; AWM records, Miscellaneous collection. The shipboard and camp environment was restrictive and even hostile for Anzac Day commemorations, nevertheless New Zealand and Australian servicemen did not let the occasion go unmarked. Memory was more powerful than condition. Meanings of the day were preserved by serving personnel, in spite of adverse environmental conditions.

186 Poppy Day or Remembrance Day, on 11 November each year. There is some debate over when the tradition started. Canadians trace it back to the popularity of Lt. Col. Doctor John McCrae’s poem, ‘In Flanders’ Fields,’ and the practice of an American, Moina Michael, who wore a poppy in memory of those who died on the battlefields. A Frenchwoman, Madam Guerin learned of the custom and made handmade poppies to raise money to help the destitute children in war torn areas. In November 1921, poppies were distributed in Canada. [www.canoe.ca/RemembranceDay](http://www.canoe.ca/RemembranceDay) accessed 26 October 2005. Other sources place it with the British Legion and the Australian Returned Soldiers’ and Sailors’ League, both of which placed poppies on sale for the first time in November 1921.

The ‘Three Musketeers,’ Edward Brittain, d. 15 June 1918 (Vera’s brother), Roland Leighton died 23 December 1915 (her fiancé), Victor Richardson d. 9 June 1917 (school chum). Vera Brittain, *Vera Brittain’s War Diary: Chronicle of Youth*, 224-225.
In the case of English writer and inter-war peace activist Vera Brittain, an amethyst brooch with a flame-red stone, one photograph of her dead fiancé, Roland Leighton, and a collection of handwritten verse and letters represented him, and more forcefully, the characteristics which she admired and wanted to keep alive in her memory. Here, we see the margins of landscape and personal memories blurred. The landscape of meaning for her was found in her home and its evocative artefacts, the location of the last memories of Leighton. Post-war English writer Vera Brittain shared Derrida’s notions on the *aporia* of death after the death of close friends. Letters are re-read and photos scanned, memorabilia left out and the need to discuss the issue of the death with friends, many of whom were in a similar situation. This is part of the mourning process through maintaining fidelity.

Anzac Day has often been described as a masculine story but women have always occupied a significant place on Anzac Day. Women in the early part of the twentieth century were the carriers of memory as mothers, widows or fiancées of dead soldiers. The importance of their role was often not recognised. Since the 1970s women have had a more obvious role in Anzac Day ceremonies, reflecting general changes to their status in western society. One demonstration of this change has been the increased ability of women to take senior commissioned ranks in the armed services, or to occupy high positions in local and national government. Consequently women today officiate in Anzac Day services, something seen only occasionally before the 1980s. This thesis will provide evidence which will challenge the orthodox, masculinist interpretation of Anzac Day.

**Memory**

The development of Anzac Day from 1916 demonstrates the way memories are flexible and it also draws attention to a framework formed by their contemporary historical landscape. Soldier memories of the struggle for the landing at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915 and subsequent hardships were overwhelmed by feelings of relief about the successful withdrawal. Soldier memory often focussed on the loss of comrades left behind, but the first Anzac Day observances were celebratory. Parades and bunting were the order of the day in the metropolis, London, and in the
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190 Canberra 2006 Anzac Day service and march past in the parade of the AWM where the Administrator for Australia, Professor Dame Marie Bashir AO, spoke and took the salute.
periphery, whether in the New Zealand capital, Wellington, or in Sydney at Woolloomooloo. The historical landscape of war dictated that the exploits of the Anzacs at Gallipoli were lauded. Celebration swamped uncomfortable soldier memories and sensitive feelings of relatives of the dead. Before April 1916 there were solemn and commemorative observances in Australia and New Zealand. Their tone was heeded in some places but most centres held celebrations. This indicates both flexibility of memory and issues of management, and foreshadowed the great debate over Anzac Day observance.\footnote{See Introduction to this thesis, 5.}

Memory was revived each Anzac Day, and the most ubiquitous reference was Gallipoli. This constant reference reified the Anzac myth of mateship and masculinity and provided a model for the Australian society in particular. The moral strength it conveyed enabled the Anzac nations to face tough times, as found in soldier unemployment of the 1920s, the Depression of the 1930s, and World War II. Veterans of World War I occupied dominant positions in local and national Australasian society, and the messages each Anzac Day served to validate their war service and memories. An example is found in the work of George Ramsay of Sydney, whose memorable torchlight Anzac evening tattoos at the Sydney Showground in the 1930s earned him praise.\footnote{AWM private correspondence: AWM PR00079 Papers of Col. George F. Ramsay - Plan for Torchlight Evolutions by 17 BN at Anzac Tattoo - 25th April 1934. Intricate plans for a tattoo at night, hand drawn like a battle plan, on canvas backing. This was responded to with a letter of thanks on 26th April 1934 for the ‘excellent performance’ by Captain Marlan, the adjutant of the 17th Battalion. Ramsay had previously been responsible for the 17th Battalion tattoo on 28th January 1931 at Manly Oval, and the Tattoo of 9 February 1932 at St. Leonard’s Park.}

He expressed concern about the difficulty of providing a festive and military atmosphere while keeping the spectacle within the bounds of decency for a commemorative occasion.

Just as hearing Dido’s lament, ‘When I am laid in earth,’ evocatively appeals to memory, there were strong appeals to memory found in each Anzac Day. Recent history writing has witnessed an unprecedented growth in memory business. This trend goes much deeper than the truism that without memory, ‘we are nothing.’\footnote{Luis Buñuel, (1900-1983), the Spanish film director wrote: ‘You have to lose your memory, if only in bits and pieces, to realise that memory is what makes our lives. Life without memory is no life at all, just an intelligence without the possibility of expression is not really an intelligence. Our memory is our coherence, our reason, our feeling, even our action. Without it, we are nothing.’}

In a hard-hitting 1989 article, the French philosopher Pierre Nora forcefully argued memory faced a ‘final consumption in the flames of history.’\footnote{Pierre Nora, ‘Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire’, \textit{Representations}, No. 26, Spring 1989, 7-26.} Central to Nora’s exposition is the problem he has with change: he attacks ‘the growing belief in a right, a
capacity, and even a duty to change.'\textsuperscript{195} He meant the end of a collective consciousness that had existed in pre-industrial societies which saw in symbolic actions, statements and artefacts all that the society represented. In the twentieth century Nora witnessed this collective memory replaced by the forces of individualism and the multifaceted techniques of modern archival history. It is difficult to remain unaffected by Nora’s persistent plaints: ‘a historical past that is gone for good,’ ‘memory has been torn,’ ‘there are no longer milieux de mémoire, real environments of memory,’ but ‘a fundamental collapse of memory’ and many others made with a remarkable clarity and consistency. He makes much of the power of the ‘ephemeral film of current events.’ He revealed his desire to see the memory and the transmission of it in the same vessel.\textsuperscript{196} The comparison reaches its height with the claim that the mission of history is to suppress and destroy memory.

Nora feels that history has become reflexive, purely historiographical. Its attention has caused the end of the tradition of memory. Sites of memory, \textit{lieux de mémoire}, he feels are but a pale shadow of the real, a reconstituted object.\textsuperscript{197} His argument that we have substituted a cynical planning for natural occurrence seems thin. It is my opinion that this takes the case too far. As time wears on most societies change inexorably, and ‘sites of memory’ are all that are left. There is a difficulty with perception here. In retrospect and without the ready availability of first-hand evidence, past things seemed to ‘just happen.’ However, very few events happen with that degree of spontaneity. This relates closely to present Australian historians’ debates over spontaneity in the beginnings of Anzac Day.\textsuperscript{198} Nora’s writing helps to clarify issues of liminality between memory and history and warns against works that are primarily ‘a history of historians.’ Nora’s writing has caused debate and created awareness of the need for consultation of a community based body of evidence. The ‘sites of memory’ in this thesis are international and comparative,

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{195} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{196} He proclaims that memory is life, while history is problematic and incomplete reconstruction - an unbridgeable chasm and in doing so has driven his argument into question. Writing in almost Shakespearian blank verse he attributes to the environment of memory qualities of magic, responsiveness, having multiplicity and specificity, individualism and collective qualities, and is found in spaces, gestures, images, objects and is absolute. History, he qualifies with secularism, analysis, criticism, the prosaic, and it has limited abilities to perceive, being dependent on the relative.
\textsuperscript{197} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{198} The Moses – Pavils debate is outlined in the Introduction, and is amplified in Chapter Four on Australia.
\end{flushleft}
and relevant historical questions relate to the observance of Anzac Day through the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{199}

The influential and growing memory school of historians is guided by Jay Winter and his persuasive \textit{Sites of Memory, sites of mourning: The Great War in European cultural history.}\textsuperscript{200} He challenges the traditional view that the Great War was the moment of schism between ‘traditional forms’ and ‘modernism.’ It is Winter’s opinion that the ‘the rupture of 1914-18 was much less complete than previous scholars have suggested.’\textsuperscript{201} He finds continuity in the ‘communities of the bereaved’ in towns and villages of the European combatants. He wrote:

Primary mourners – those directly related to the men who died in the war – numbered in the tens of millions. The construction, dedication, and repeated pilgrimages to war memorials in the interwar years provided a ritual expression of their bereavement, and that of their local communities. The grief of widows, orphans, parents, and friends was ‘seen’ at the annual commemorative ceremonies, and, to a degree we will never know, their loss was shared by their neighbours and friends.\textsuperscript{202}

Winter referred to the ‘considerable evidence of the power of traditional modes of commemoration within communities…family circles, to séances…conventional forms of religious worship, to universities, ex-servicemen’s associations, widow’s organisations, to…unveiling war memorials, and finally, to the ‘imagined community’ of the nation itself.’\textsuperscript{203} The Great War brought disclosure about ‘social solidarities’ - both brutality and compassion came to the forefront of social life. Winter’s position on the continuation of traditional forms is supported and extended by John Keegan in his powerful work on World War I.\textsuperscript{204} The second part of Winter’s writing is an exploration of the ways in which the ‘search for a language of

\begin{itemize}
\item Winter, \textit{Sites of Memory}, 10-11. Winter makes the point that his work is trans-national, a comparative cultural history of the Great War.
\item Ibid.
\item Ibid, 3. Winter parts from the view that a ‘modernist’ movement began in the 1860s, and came of age after the Great War. The movement dissociated itself from nineteenth century assumptions which were seen as ‘dead conventions’, decayed Edwardian values, ‘broken statues,’ and ‘a botched civilisation.’ Winter does allow that some aspects of twentieth century art and literature are revolutionary. But he finds objectionable an argument that suggests that either pre-War cultural artists and writers were devoid of innovation or that post-War ‘modernists’ abandoned all the conventions and beliefs of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.
\item Ibid, 6.
\item Ibid.
\item John Keegan, \textit{The First World War}, Vintage Books, Random House Inc, New York, 2000, 423-427. Keegan argues that World War II was an extension of World War I and is inexplicable in terms other than the ‘rancours and instabilities left by the previous conflict.’
\end{itemize}
mourning’ went on during and after the Great War. He traversed the cinematic tradition which originated in earlier forms of popular religious art; conventional romanticism and apocalyptic visions and mourning; and finally the impact of war literature in terms of formulation of the sacred. Winter’s ‘sites of memory’ are also ‘sites of mourning.’ Arguments in this thesis align generally with Winter’s interpretation of these matters. Memory, in this landscape, acts not just as recall but to both rationalise and ameliorate suffering.

However, Winter’s unremittingly morbid view is open to criticism. He gives little credit to the power of the human spirit to overcome crushing obstacles and bitter sadness. There is no room for inclusion of the kinds of high jinks in which Anzac soldiers participated on Anzac Day. Fields and canals were freely used for sports in the afternoon, and battalion dinners were held at night. These diversions became treasured memories written about in letters to soldiers’ families. Winter is mindful of the strength of friendship, toleration, ‘fictive kinship’, and humanitarian aid offered to the bereaved. His writing on the work of the Australian Red Cross Information Bureaux and his sensitivity in handling the commemorative art of Käthe Kollwitz are testimony to that. There is no room, however, for antipodean levity. Yet this quality is essential to an understanding of the Anzac tradition. It was humour, often black, which was used to push back the unremitting pathos of the whole Great War situation.

Winter sees World War II as containing ‘more of a divide than the first.’ This parts him from Australian historian Pat Jalland who emphasises the schismatic effects of the Great War. Winter concludes, arguing that the Apocalypse belongs to the post World War II period. Anzac Day

---

205 Jay Winter ‘Sites of Memory, 10.
206 The major impact of the Great War on European cultural history was tragedy. Reading Winter is akin to listening to a non-stop playing of Henryk Górecki’s Symphony of Sorrowful Songs. There is little light, yet it is just that feature of light-heartedness, of humour which was a marked characteristic of Anzac servicemen. Winters’ consistently dour tone clashes with Anzac Day commemorations and sports on the Western Front; in 1916 in Egypt; in homeward bound ships in 1918 and 1919, and at home in Sydney and Dunedin.
208 Consider the BBC Blackadder World War I Series; and Jean-Pierre Jeunet, Un long dimanche de fiançailles (A Very Long Engagement), 2003 Productions and Warner Independent, 2004. The same sense of humour could be found in the trenches of all Western Front soldiers. A humorous or joyous episode does not preclude sadness, but gives an edge or depth to it which is lacking in a totally black interpretation.
209 Jay Winter, ‘Sites of Memory, 228.
210 Ibid, 229. The angel can only view the wreckage of Paradise as the storm of progress propels him forward to a bleak future. This was Klee’s vision of the post-Great War world, filled with the broken remnants of human civilisation; Walter Benjamin, Illuminations, trans. H. Zohn, Brace & World, New York, 1968. Winter refers to
developments in the twentieth century reveal a similar pattern for the period, of a divide occurring post-World War II. It was to be the ‘New Age,’ one where the forces of internationalism were to overcome the limitations and worst excesses of nationalism. Or at least that was the avowed hope.

American historian Marita Sturken’s writing is relevant. In her 1997 work, *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, The AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering,* she discusses how the commonly accepted scholarship shows how collective memory studies presume the culture of a particular period represents the contents of the ‘national psyche’ or ‘collective consciousness.’ Sturken reverses the direction of this statement to say that the role of cultural memory is active and produces ‘concepts of the “nation” and of a [particular] people.’ She explores the contested memories of the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, and the AIDS epidemic in the USA by using film, TV, photography, memorials and monuments, and discourse of popular science and the body. Visual images are powerful informants shaping an ‘imagined community’ of experience and memory. Importantly, she argues that history and memory are not adversaries, but are entangled components which continuously mould each other. This position is in agreement with this thesis. The study shows interdisciplinary understanding of how contests over historical memory and the meaning of the nation are played out.

Commenting on the after-effects of the 9/11 attack on the New York Twin Towers buildings, Sturken repeated the claim that Americans are standing at the ‘juncture of history.’ The memory of the towers in their absence became a most potent symbol. There was a sense of the shock of absence. This emotion parallels Jacques Derrida’s notion of the shock or *aporia* on revelation of death where premonition of disaster is felt. The same feelings relate to the

---


212 Marita Sturken ‘Memorializing Absence, www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/sturken Accessed 15 July 2005. The American Social Science Research Council website. Proclamations like these have been made before – The War to end all wars, Auschwitz, the Atomic Bomb, the Holocaust. After each the world would never be the same. An overwhelming sense of incredulity dominates feelings: the events were so unanticipated. How instantly the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center changed meaning.

213 As the Twin Towers stood for particular modernity, business, a cultural imperialism of the United States, their absence became a powerful tribute to the people’s resistance to forms of terror, personal sacrifices and bravery. Perhaps the present desire by many Anzacs and Turks to leave the Gallipoli battlefield free of roads and monuments reflects the same concepts.

214 For Derrida, see the discussion later in this chapter.
memories of the Anzacs at Gallipoli. Memories of 1915 Gallipoli were transfigured, as the Twin Tower memories have been, into representative symbols containing symbolic meanings which issued from the immutably changed physical landscape. These fundamental alterations do not invalidate memory; they translate it and show memory as a changeable script embodying a potential for tensions and disjuncture. The obvious dichotomy between soldier memory and the script provided for public memory created enormous tensions. Many returned soldiers from both world wars, even on Anzac Day, would not, perhaps could not speak of their individual memories because of the gulf of meaning they sensed between the two versions. For many, until the 1980s, memory was repressed. Forgetting was more desired than remembering.

In a recent work on memory, where the place of forgetting is analysed, Takashi Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White and Lisa Yoneyama suggest that memory and the Pacific War have established ‘a binary’ between the USA and Japan. While the history of World War II within the US has been dominated by American memory of Pearl Harbour and Hiroshima, it has shifted recently to accept how Japanese/Americans remembered and lived with the memory of internment. This has created what the authors term a ‘binary’ which is a late twentieth century growth of a duality of understanding. Similarly, a ‘binary’ arose between Turkey and the Anzac nations. This was initially marked by forgetting also. The Turkish dimension was omitted from Anzac memory. However, a remarkable reversal occurred which was crystallised in the remarks of Kemal Atatürk, furthered in reciprocal military actions and visits, and promoted by the more recent monument-building in Turkey, Australia and New Zealand. Fujitani, White and Yoneyama also reflect on the reconfiguration of memories over time. This directly corresponds to the primary notion of this thesis that Anzac Day has been subject to the changeable script of memory.

The deaths of many of the old Diggers from World War I became the subject of public scrutiny and discussion, more in Australia than New Zealand. As original Anzacs died, there was discernable state intervention, and an extension of the mechanisms of popular memory which

217 Fujitani, White and Yoneyama (eds.), Perilous Memories, 2.
have been feeding on published records of individuals’ memories. Memory suppression, apparently important for most of the twentieth century, was overcome. Surprisingly, some of the initiative has come from the returned servicemen – many of whom were reluctant to tell their story earlier in the century. From 1980 onwards there was a realisation that memories they had to offer were worth recording. This openness was supported by state agencies. Recreations of memory in this sense have taken a fascinating turn in the last ten years: to preserve the Gallipoli experiences before they are irrevocably lost. Ninetieth-year Anzac Day commemorations spawned a flood of memories where a range of cultural agencies – official and non-official, museum archivists and curators, and journalists have all contributed to the massive growth of memory making for twentieth century history. There is today, within this burgeoning growth, a growing Anzac appreciation of the meanings Turkish people place on the Gallipoli battles.

In the 2001 edited collection of writings reflecting on the deaths of close friends, *The Work of Mourning*, post-modernist French philosopher Jacques Derrida made observations on death and fidelity that go to the heart of the reasons for mourning and which also apply to participants in Anzac Day observances. At the centre of Derrida’s observation is the need of all humans to mark the death with a process of maintaining fidelity and fulfilling responsibility to the dead. It is part of grieving which not only shows respect for the other, but defines who we are. Encompassed in this definition is a realisation of mortality, that conditions an understanding governing responsibility in all close friendships: ‘One must always go before the other [there exists] the possibility that one of the two would see the other die, and so, surviving, would be left to bury, to communicate, and to mourn.’ Derrida describes his concerns with the singularity of death and its inevitable repetition, what it means to reckon with death, or the dead, with all those

218 News accounts of deaths of Diggers and John Howard’s attendance at the funeral of Alec Campbell in Tasmania and to the recent NZRSA trip to the battlefields for World War II ex-servicemen.  
222 Derrida, *The Work of Mourning*, 1. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas have gathered together those responses which Derrida made for the death of his friends, where he has tried to bear witness to the singularity of the relationship, and where he has expressed words fit for the friend, ‘words that relate life and friendship to death and mourning.’
who were once close to us but who are no longer, as we say, ‘with us,’ or who are ‘with us’ only insofar as they are ‘in us.’

Derrida ponders ways in which to maintain fidelity with the dead: to mimic or take him into oneself, to identify with him in order to let him speak within oneself, to make him present and faithfully represent him. Writing of Roland Barthes, he asks: ‘To keep [him] alive, within oneself: is this the best sign of fidelity?’ He answers this question in the affirmative by describing happy memories brought forth by re-reading Barthes’ works *Writing Degree Zero* and *Camera Lucida* and appreciating the role of Barthes’ mother. The role of the grieving mother is as central to Derrida as it was in the cases of dead soldiers in both World Wars. Derrida identified difficulty in bearing responsibility and maintaining fidelity, which comes in how to mourn and how to speak in mourning. In this way, Derrida’s matter of interiorising transcends the way we normally define memory. Memory of the past or of people in the past may change, may have integrity, but may preclude descending to Derrida’s depths of interiorising the Other. Nevertheless, in an unconscious way, that is what everyone does, who return for remembrance and conversations, as returned servicemen and women do on Anzac Day. In relation to the *aporia* or surprise at the paradox of death, Derrida argues its existence had been anticipated and prepared for well before death itself. Derrida persuades us of the presumption of death from the beginning of a relationship, and the absolute certainty of one partner ‘leaving.’ That presumption is elevated during wartime and for memories associated with war.

The central issue for Derrida on the death of his friends is fidelity. Without it there is no truth. This is the central issue for him and the central issue for those who attend the Anzac Day ceremonies – in the intonation of ‘Lest we forget’ and ‘We will remember them.’ The words encapsulate the *raison d’etre* for the Day. But the intoned words are a code for ‘we will remember them and what they stood and fell for.’ This raises many questions. Did the original Anzacs stand and die for a common cause? Are the reasons for their sacrifice applicable today?

---

223 Ibid, 3.
224 Interiorisation, a metaphorical incorporation or consumption of the other, is central to the understanding of the method of mourning by which Derrida maintains faith with the dead. It is, in fact, recognition of an impenetrable separation – that everything we say and do remains in us, or between us living, about the dead. All we have left is memory. Mourning consists in recognising that the dead are now only ‘in us’ and now only images ‘for us.’
225 Much in this way, soldiers who bury friends who die on the battlefield read the letters of the dead, and write to the parents of the dead, an act which provides valuable knowledge to the bereaved and places the writer within the circle of friendship.
What happens if we now have different values – does Anzac Day represent our present values or those of the original Anzacs?

Soldiers’ letters and diaries and the records of family members about the death of particular friends in war point to the validity of Derrida’s’ particularity of fidelity, but handling war death *en masse* is problematic. The problem is one of scale: Anzac Day commemorates the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands – a notion too hard to conceive. True to Derrida, one could only mourn the death of a few. A nation could collectively mourn the deaths of its young, but within that community individuals mourn the example of the single or the few, whose death is extended to symbolise the mass. The deaths of many must be individualised – and that is why photographs, diaries and letters are such valued mementos. In the Australian War Memorial, Canberra, where the primary focus is on the community of the nation, it is individual and family stories which attract and hold interest.226 The AWM is not just a temple to mass sacrifice; its priests, the archivists and librarians, are fully aware that the meanings of sacrifice can only be made clear by individualising memories.227 Here, viewers are encouraged to demonstrate empathy. This is most readily achieved with the individual record, or artefact belonging to a named individual. The names are significant.

Derrida does not address the problem of the missing dead. The scale and nature of the Great War left a huge legacy of shock in European societies, particularly for the French. While Derrida focuses on an individual’s reaction, a question arises is whether mass deaths are just a difference in scale and number, or are they a matter of degree and intensity? Do more deaths mean a shared grief is lighter, or are communities plunged increasingly into the depths of despair? To that, we must add absence. Derrida does not address the problem of absence, because all of the friends he wrote for, for whom he made works of mourning, did not die in war. Their bodies were present for funerals. Because the presence of the bodies of the deceased in Derrida’s cases is different from the situation of bereaved families without the body, there seems to be a case for more intense feelings than he expresses. There were many cases of families coping with no hope of repatriation of the deceased’s body. The need to remember and to mourn became so intense that


227 Participation is encouraged in the AWM: visitors are requested to place artificial poppies alongside the names of individual servicemen inscribed on the bronze memorial plaques above the courtyard of the Shrine. Many of the interior displays’ artefacts are derived from servicemen and women and their units. The entrance hall to the major displays has its walls lined with the photographs of service personnel from different campaigns.
withdrawal, often led to the onset of periods of intense depression. This sometimes led to admission to hospitals and asylums. Now this does not challenge the validity of Derrida’s writing but adds another dimension where there is added tension because of the absence of the body. The shock or aporia of loss was driven home when notification of the death arrived, but most poignantly with the absence of a body. Nations apparently need the symbolic return of the dead. This has been expressed by the return of Unknown Soldier/Warrior ceremonies. In this instance one represents the mass of dead. Derrida could not agree with this stretch of imagination and mourn to one for all. Even the USA, where repatriation of bodies from battlefields overseas has been customary, there has been a return of unknown soldiers bodies to Arlington National Cemetery since World War I.

Derrida’s point about naming is relevant. Correspondence from home to the front often reiterates the name of the addressee, as though by repeating the name there might be more hope of a future. This presents proximity, no matter how far away the battlefield was from the home. More significantly, for Anzac Day, names appear on community war memorial inscriptions and perpetuate individual memory. It would seem that the procedure of naming, or calling a roll of the fallen, as in commemorative services, bears within it a greater realisation of Derrida’s ‘first law of friendship’ than otherwise. There is a peculiar sense that the recall of names of the dead or volunteers on the memorials in Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere does give a sense of beating back death: as though the dead live, vicariously.

Derrida thinks about impulsion for those who mourn to participate in the codes and rites of mourning. They are caught between two impossibilities: the impossibility of speaking, and the impossibility of silence, absence or refusing to share one’s sadness. This has been a topic of concern for many RSA and RSL veterans – whether to go to Anzac Day parades and share in the memories and stories of dead comrades or not. Why is it that with the beginning of a new century, Anzac Day still carries that sense of imperative? Not all returned servicemen and women have decided ‘to participate in the codes and rites of mourning.’ Veterans are caught between two impossibilities: the impossibility of speaking, and the impossibility of silence, absence or


229 Ibid, 72. ‘In Memoriam: Of the Soul,’ translated by Kevin Newmark, from the homage to Paul de Man delivered on 18 January 1984 at Yale University.
refusing to share one’s sadness. The same discussion has been shared by families and organisers of Anzac Day. Attendance and participation by ex-servicemen and women in the Dawn Service and Anzac Day parades has a special connection with the feelings expressed by Derrida. The notion of keeping faith with the dead is axiomatic. The marchers and their comrades see themselves attending primarily for that purpose. It also provides the rationale for those who cannot attend, for the pain it gives them. The marchers in the parades are remnants of units, or at least were until the Vietnam War; they are the remainder who represent the larger detachment or field reconstructions. Solemnity becomes them because they do not march for themselves but in memory of the larger group who departed to fight. Returned soldiers on the day reconstruct and forefront the memories and friendships of service years while they are able to.

The place of photography in the annals of nineteenth and twentieth century human tragedy is unique. Photographic records of various Anzac Days in New Zealand, Australia and Turkey provide a rich resource for supporting arguments presented in this work. Susan Sontag in her 1973 essay ‘In Plato’s Cave’ comments in detail on the power of the photograph. She plainly makes the point that while photographs are images and, realistically, they can be no more, they have the power to seem ‘pieces of [the world]...miniatures of reality that anyone can make or acquire.’ The ubiquity of cameras and photographs allowed a universal experience, an accessibility which was as apparent to the Great War soldier as to his relatives and friends. Soldiers became tourists, and proof of their trip ‘over there’ to the Dardanelles was found in photographs which returned home. Sontag asserts the photograph conveys ‘a kind of immortality’ and it is this power which allowed bereaved family members and friends to recall or even experience intense feelings towards the lost one following war. Further, she claims that

231 From the Vietnam War on Anzac service personnel were not necessarily re-attached to their original units after the first tour of duty. This has caused a distinct difference in composition for post-1960s units marching in Anzac Day parades compared with the composition of units from the World Wars.
232 Conversation 20 March 2007, with James Blank who attended annual meetings for the 20th Div. Cav. Canterbury Battalion until his 82nd year, driving to Christchurch from Taupo. He is the uncle of this writer.
234 Ibid, 4.
235 Ibid, 8.
236 Ibid, 9; AWM photographic files.
‘All photographs are *memento mori*.’\(^{238}\) As such, they may freeze the moment that can never be relived. Sontag further claims that photographs are ‘pseudo-presence and a token of absence.’\(^{239}\) In this sense they provided a very powerful presence found on mantel-pieces and in house-chapels at the end of both wars. Photographs are the externalisation and realisation of memory, where memory is housed in things.\(^{240}\)

If there is great store to be set in photographs, what function do they perform in mourning? J. J. Long in a commentary on Thomas Bernhard’s 1985 work *Auslöschung*\(^{241}\) makes clear that photographs of the dead serve a dual role. Quoting Roland Barthes in *Camera Lucida*, Long defines the photograph as: ‘This image which produces death while trying to conserve life.’\(^{242}\) This duality evokes presence but marks absence of the dead. The ability of photographs to merge life and death, to over-ride accepted boundaries, is what elevates them to the status of precious objects for the bereaved. It also explains why communities perceived them as a palliative to the hurt of bereavement and allowed their publication in newspapers and periodicals.\(^{243}\) In the main, the photograph acted as an aid to mourning, allowing both memory and gradual forgetting.\(^{244}\) Post-1915 photographic lists in the NZFL bear testimony to the need for individuals and communities to see the dead Anzacs and to honour their sacrifice. They perpetuated memory. For a moment in time, all readers saw the sacrifice of a family, sometimes read a précis of the dead soldier’s life – and this extended personal memory, confirmed place in society and placed a marker for successive generations to recognise. This community recognition created an atmosphere of shared grief, where forgetting could slowly begin. Photographs were held, Susan Sontag suggests, as ‘unique objects’ which had beyond the power of recall an element of crossing boundaries, allowing the viewer an imaginative leap, or connection with the dead.

---

\(^{238}\) Ibid, 15. ‘*memento mori*’ - a reminder of human mortality.

\(^{239}\) Ibid, 16.

\(^{240}\) Karen Sánchez-Eppler, *Dependent States: The Child’s Part in Nineteenth Century America*, University of Chicago Press, 2005, 137. This notion is is supported by Marita Sturken and Tanja Luckins for the value placed on remaining material objects.


\(^{243}\) This is not entirely true for both New Zealand Māori and Australian aboriginal communities have issues with the publication of ancestors’ photographs.

\(^{244}\) The Anzac photograph becomes the centrepiece of Emine Çaykara’s *Emanet Gölge ‘The Entrusted Shadow - From New Zealand to Gallipoli 1915,*’ Istanbul, Everest Yayinlari, 2007. It tells the story of ‘Ted’ a New Zealand soldier killed at Gallipoli, whose camera and folders of negatives passed into the hands of a wealthy Istanbul family, and eventually were given to the author, who wrote a fictional story around them. Emine Çaykara and this author have pursued the identity of ‘Ted’ without success, so far.
Photographs were still novel and intriguing in 1915, and remained engaging through the twentieth century. For many bereaved they were a talisman, warding off the pain. It is outside the scope of this history thesis to treat this matter, but it is a rich ground for future research.245 There are outcomes of this general idea in Anzac Day ceremonies in New Zealand, Australia and Turkey. Children wearing a parent’s, or other relative’s medals are in a sense reconstructing the Other, they are bringing to public gaze both the relationship and the deeds in the family memory. They are proclaiming more than an association – they possess the ground of the deed. The attendance of children has had a mixed reception, but photographs have shown children present in most parades. It is a foolhardy RSA or RSL official who forbids the participation of children.246

Grandson Paul Holland carrying the photograph of his grandfather, Sir George Holland and wearing his medals in the 2007 Melbourne parade.247

246 2006 Victoria’s RSL President appeared on Channel 9 Sydney news two days before the Melbourne Anzac Day parade. He rescinded the decision a day later.
Yet, there is a sense that the Day is greater than that; and that flag waving and essays on the Anzac myth, Anzac and Gallipoli as the foundation of a nation, and Anzac virtues may be missing the point. The point of the first Anzac Day was to acknowledge the debt due by the many to those who sacrificed life and limb at Gallipoli. The debt is wrapped in sorrow; it is not a celebratory debt, but one born from tragedy and loss. It has taken New Zealand and Australia almost a century to get to the point of recognising it.
Chapter Two - Commemorating ‘Something Greater Than Victory’:

the Anzac Day - Gallipoli connection

‘It was Hegel who said history and theatre are made of the same materials,’ said Sunay. ‘Remember that, just as in the theatre, history chooses those who play the leading roles. And just as actors put their courage to the test on the stage, so, too, do the chosen few on the stage of history.’

‘Before the war, who had ever heard of ANZAC? Hereafter, who will ever forget it.’

Gallipoli is a constant in the equation which composes Anzac Day. The connection of Anzac Day with Gallipoli was inescapable between 1916 and 2000. Gallipoli provided not only the physical stage of action for the tumultuous events of 1915, but rapidly became the dominant World War I memory for Anzacs. From being a theatre of war, it had become another sort of theatre entirely. It is now a shrine to the cherished common memories of New Zealanders, Australians and Turks. Each Anzac Day the script of ritual is played out there. Officials and visitors alike become participants in a play of memory. Gallipoli was the place from which extraordinary stories emerged which captured the hearts of people in the British Empire. These stories formed the basis of the Anzac myth which itself supported the institution and maintenance of Anzac Day as a day of remembrance of heroism and sacrifice. The associations of ‘Gallipoli’ and its close reference to ‘Anzac’ in the minds of New Zealand, Australian and British readers and listeners transcended the collective memory of soldiers who served there. Even though Anzac Day endured when other anniversaries fell away, there is no collective memory among New Zealanders or Australians of the process of establishment of the day, only explanations of why the day was founded and what it means today.

---

1 London Daily Mail, Wednesday, 26 April 1916, 1 ff. AWM Anzac Day Cuttings 1916-1925, Box 1, 1916.
2 Orhan Pamuk, Snow, Faber & Faber, London, 2004 (paperback 2005), 202. Sunay Zaim was the owner of the Sunay Zaim Players, and spoke the words as the violence in Kars spread following the re-enactment of the 1930s play My Fatherland or My Headscarf. Hegel actually said ‘In the Course of World History...The principle of Development finds actual existence in the Spirit; which has the History of the World for its theatre.’ This offers a different nuance.
4 During the course of research I have encountered many people who have expressed surprise that Anzac Day began during World War I and not after. There is little awareness that the first Anzac Day was one year after the famous landing by British and Anzac forces.
Daily newspaper stories throughout the empire testified to the impact of the first Anzac Day in 1916. The London Anzac Day celebrations in 1916 gave royal sanction to the day. Anzac Day began jubilantly despite some discords, and became more sombre as the war years went by and grim reality sheeted home. This was reflected in the enduring concern for Gallipoli graves. At the war’s end, Gallipoli was a focus of the Graves’ Registration Unit efforts and subject to a general edict that the area was not suitable to visit. Nevertheless, visitors arrived, particularly from Australia and New Zealand, and often on Anzac Day. The Chanak Crisis of September 1922 again drew attention to Gallipoli. By the 1930s, and particularly for Australia on Anzac Day, Gallipoli was touted at state level as responsible for ‘the foundation of the nation.’ During World War II, local Gallipoli Legions kept the flag flying and frequent references were made measuring the standards and successes of 1940s soldiers against those of 1915. Each passing decade brought reminders of Gallipoli for Anzac Day. In the 1950s both Australia and New Zealand were visited by Turkish military representatives. Turkish officials began to participate, sometimes in leading roles on Anzac Day. By the 1960s and despite the increasing protests against war as a state policy, the 50th anniversary Gallipoli veterans’ visit was well publicised. This was a period of much negative publicity over anti-war protests held on Anzac Day. These served to bring Anzac Day to public attention as much as lead to any downturn in participation. The migration of Turkish nationals to Australia from the early 1970s reminded the public of the Gallipoli connection. At the same time it was apparent that old veterans’ ranks were rapidly thinning. The 1981 Peter Weir film, Gallipoli, did much to enliven interest in Anzac Day and reconnect with the place of origin. This film coincided with more affordable air travel and the back-packer phenomenon. For the Turkish people, Gallipoli battles, as part of the successful Çanakkale Savaşları, are recognised as a foundation point of the Republic. While this was not widely comprehended until recently by New Zealanders and Australians, it has long been a component

---

5 NZFL 22nd year, No 20, 16 Nov 1921, 14, Gallipoli Photo – ‘Where Our Gallipoli Heroes Sleep’ with Mr W.T. Jennings M.P, who visited Gallipoli’s Shrapnel Gully, Quinn’s Post and the NZ War Memorial site on Chunuk Bair. Private William Thomas Jennings, 1029, 1st Battalion, AIF. KIA 15 May 1915. Quinn’s Post Cemetery, PHP D.1. Since the NZFL 16 Nov 1921 photo is of Shrapnel Valley, it is likely that it is the gravesite of Edgar McIvor Jennings, his son.

6 JOL OMHA/3/2, [Box 3557] Anzac Day Commemoration Committee – Cutting Book Vol 2. 1928 – 1932, Brisbane Daily Telegraph of 20 April 1929 in a brief report from Canberra stated the New Zealand Governor-General was supported in his opinion by the Federal Minister for Home Affairs, Mr. C.L.A. Abbott, who said, ‘We should not be gloomy in celebrating this great occasion, but, on the other hand, we should always observe it with reverence. I don’t think that it is a day of mourning. I always think that Australia found its manhood at Gallipoli and became a nation.’ The opinion on manhood was taken even further by Major Charles Marr, Honorary Minister, who felt it should not be too mournful, but should be treated with reverence: ‘We recognise it as the day on which Australia was born.’
of Turkish Onsekiz Mart Zaferi - victory celebrations. The recent Ekip film, *Gallipoli – The Front Line Experience*, directed by Tolga Örnek, while outside the scope of this thesis, is worth mentioning. It is part of the Turkish awakening to a key moment in the growth of their identity, and it is eminently accessible in the West.

**Linking Gallipoli and Anzac Day**

Anzac Day is an annual ritual, dependent for its beginnings on a particular British interpretation of the events of the Dardanelles campaign of 1915. This interpretation grew rapidly to have the status of myth largely because of the popular and widely disseminated reporting of Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett (1881-1931) and his fellow journalist Charles Bean (1879-1968). Ashmead-Bartlett, a flamboyant British journalist, worked for *The Daily Telegraph* and was present at the Gallipoli landing on 25 April 1915. His sensational reporting was largely responsible for the dissemination of the Anzac myth. Highly critical of General Ian Hamilton, Ashmead-Bartlett used his influential London connections to bring him down. Charles Bean, the famous Australian journalist, wrote more carefully-worded reports, which were published after Ashmead-Bartlett’s. Bean’s work was more enduring, and the AWM is a tribute to his enterprise and thorough organisational skills. Both writers contributed considerably to the trans-Tasman understandings of the significance of Gallipoli. For a myth to be ritualised there must be preconditions of readiness or ‘imminence.’ Heroes and anti-heroes must engage in a great struggle, the cost or sacrifice must be significant in order to elevate the combatants to heroic status, the story of the struggle must grip a society’s imagination, and there must be determination by the leaders of the society to embed the story as a necessary part of the societal fabric. All these factors must exist for an event or events to be accepted into myth and subsequently ritualised. The beginnings of Anzac Day incorporated all these elements.

Much of the evidence relating to the initiation of Anzac Day as an annual commemorative ritual creates a sense of imminence. For the people of Australia and New Zealand, the Dardanelles campaign seemed like an event just waiting to happen, which in the chivalric sense of a test had

---

8 It is not central to this argument to recover the growth of the myth from the many works on the subject, but it must be stated that the heroic myth of the work of the Anzac troops on Gallipoli was sufficiently robust as to generate interest among various church leaders who were prepared to allow a service to be based in memory of the sacrifices made on Gallipoli by New Zealanders and Australians.
always been in the background. This feeling by Anzac troops was stronger for Gallipoli than it was for the battles of the Western Front. There was recognition in 1915, that the battle for Gallipoli was what both New Zealand and Australia had been ‘trained for,’ in a destiny of service to the Empire. Gallipoli was publicly recognised as the first of these events. For those at home, a feeling of imminence was fuelled by the news reports from the Dardanelles campaign which stressed the positive aspects of the campaign. Embedded within the enthusiasm was the unspoken fear that deaths would be the result of this war. A sense of precognition or Derrida’s aporia existed, which gave rise to commemorative gatherings where prayers for the soldiers overseas were heard. These ‘provided the combustible material’ which created a ‘cult of Anzac’ within the receptive populations.  

Why did the same situation not arise for previous wars in which Australians and New Zealanders were engaged? Most relevant was the 1899 - 1902 South African War. Both countries sent units to that war under British command and as colonies of Mother England. The most acknowledged reason was that in 1914 both countries were perceived to be more mature than during their previous status as colonies. Australia, having become a Federation in 1901, and New Zealand a Dominion in 1907, were seen as ready to prove themselves as valuable and responsible members of the British Empire. The issue of involvement in a great enterprise was more significant than maturity, or recognising Gallipoli as the first national campaign. While the South African War was important and provided lessons for the colonies, it was not the kind of conflict with potential to destroy the British Empire. World War I, where the major combatants were arguably the most powerful empires in the world, and for which they had been preparing for some years, had the potential to undo the British Empire. New Zealanders and Australians were uniquely coupled by chance in the largest imperial struggle of modern times. The men who enlisted felt they were engaging in the greatest adventure the world had ever seen.

12 John Moses to G.F. Davis, 5 June 2008: ‘it was out of concern for [the Prussian menace] situation that would have developed in the Pacific had Germany’s war-aim of destroying the Royal Navy that people were in both Australia and New Zealand were determined to support Britain in the conflict.’
It was not just a reflection of the Great War altering all; it was that issues springing from the Anzacs engagement with Gallipoli and the Dardanelles campaign were specific. The Gallipoli – Anzac connection contained powerful and mixed messages. Often the general progress of World War I had little impact on day-to-day events in New Zealander and Australian society. However, the deaths and injuries to troops on Gallipoli brought home the full, personal impact of war to families and communities half a world away. Paradoxically, while ‘Gallipoli’ created anxiety, it also evoked fascination and pride. It provided a chance, in an age of Imperial derring-do and jingoism to prove oneself. In poems, songs, news reports, town meetings and national statements both countries trumpeted the ‘glorious events’ on Gallipoli, which were recognised in the imperial capital and provided a platform for a new memorial occasion. The word ‘Gallipoli’ for the citizens of the period also contained romance. Classical references merged with contemporary to give the term meaning, create memories and confirm tragedy. Evidence of the linkage of the names ‘Gallipoli’ and ‘Anzac Day’ is prolific, but in 1916 little else was more persuasive than the choice for the anniversary of the Allied landing day for the new day of commemoration.13

For Australia, the key role of the Brisbane based Anzac Day Commemoration Committee (ADCC), in determining the objectives, designing the shape, and promulgating need for the day cannot be underestimated. In its first few meetings it decided that care of the graves of Anzacs at Gallipoli would be a focus. In the minutes of its third meeting, the ADCC cited the following as ‘objects of the observance of the day.’ Commemoration of the fallen heroes, the remembrance of the wounded, ‘honour of our surviving soldiers’ and ‘The recognition of the gallant courage displayed by Australia’s sons, in fighting for the preservation of liberty.’ These key objectives directed forward planning for the ADCC into the 1920s. Ensuring preservation of these ideals was carried in the minute,

the Education Department would take in hand the duty of making the children of the schools acquainted with the objects of Anzac Day; that the teachers would be directed to explain the meaning of the Day to the children, and on the last day before the Easter Holidays the children will be assembled for the special purpose of commemorating the heroes of Gallipoli; that a special number of the school journal will be issued devoted to Anzac Day. 14

13 In Australia, this was also called ‘Landing Day’ as though it transcended that other notable day of landing, of James Cook in 1770 at Sydney Cove.
Concern for Anzac graves on Gallipoli was tangible. The money collected from the sale of badges was to be ‘devoted solely to the care of graves on Gallipoli together with such sums as may hereafter be entrusted unto us.’\(^\text{15}\) This clearly reveals the earliest focus of the ADCC. The semantic and emotional connections that were made by contemporaries between the purposes of Anzac Day and its institution in the events of Gallipoli were obvious to the organisers, and confirmed for the public in the local papers.\(^\text{16}\)

At an individual level, the close connection was obvious to the railwaymen of Hornsby, New South Wales, acting under the direction of Guard Tom Stone and his fellow railwaymen. He devised an idea to exchange national flags with a depot in New Zealand and have them raised simultaneously on a suitably auspicious date. Tom Stone wrote to E.H. Hiley, the General Manager of the New Zealand Government railways in November 1915. The Hornsby depot men had:

\begin{quote}
purchased some Flags which [they] had decided should be the Grand old union Jack, the Flag of the Commonwealth [of Australia] and that of the Dominion of New Zealand whose Sons had sailed from these Southern Seas together with our own boys they had been Shipmates, had trained in Egypt, again had Sailed from there to the Dardanelles Landed there and fought there Side by Side Shoulder to Shoulder and Anzac will ever be a Name to be remembered by our children’s children for Generations yet unborn as that Spot where their fore-fathers fought and died but won as only heroes can do.\(^\text{17}\)
\end{quote}

The connotations of heroism and the need to remember were obvious. The first date settled between the men of both Hornsby and the officials of the Petone station, Wellington, was 4 March, unfortunately also the departure day of the 10th Reinforcement of troops for overseas service. This led to a postponement, and the new date suggested by the Australians was 25 April, which was eagerly responded to by the New Zealanders, in recognition of the upcoming first Anzac Day.\(^\text{18}\) The preparations heralded a grand affair.

\(^{15}\) JOL ADCC M&S 1916-1922, 18, 5 July 1916, letter Garland to Sir William Robinson, London Agent-General for Qld; JOL ADCC M&S 1916-1922, 79-79a, minutes of the 4th meeting 30 June 1916. In an inserted page the 1916 balance sheet records a balance of £315/15/8 available had increased to £363/0/11 to the Gallipoli Graves Fund and considered recommendations on taking steps to make the Day a National Commemoration, working with the Federal Government for the care of graves on Gallipoli.

\(^{16}\) Brisbane, *The Daily Mail*, 25 April 1916, 6, Editorial:‘Today’s Anniversary,’ and ‘Message From The King.’

\(^{17}\) Tom Stone ‘Trevallyn,’ Hunter Street, Hornsby, N.S.W. 25 November 1915 to E.H. Hiley, [General Manager, New Zealand Government Railways], ANZ(W) AAEB Acc W3293, Box 226, Record 15/5862.

\(^{18}\) R. Moore, Secretary, Wellington Patriotic Committee to E.H. Hiley, General Manager, NZ Government Railways, 18 February 1916. ANZ(W) AAEB Acc W3293, Box 226.
The idea was taken up enthusiastically by the officials of the New Zealand Government Railways. The Wellington stationmaster, George Troup, invited Railway Territorial Corps and National Reserve Section personnel from Wellington and outlying stations to participate.\textsuperscript{19} The General Manager of the Railways, Colonel E.H. Hiley wrote to members of Parliament who were likely to be in Wellington at the time, requesting their attendance.\textsuperscript{20} The \textit{Dominion}, 26 April 1916 covered the story – the Prime Minister William Massey unfurled the Australian flag and Sir Joseph Ward the New Zealand flag.\textsuperscript{21} The \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} 26 April 1916 covered the unfurling of the New Zealand flag at Hornsby by the Governor of New South Wales, Sir Gerald Strickland. Present at both ceremonies were representatives of the other country: Frank O’Connor New Zealand Government Railways guard representing Petone at Hornsby and T. Stone at Petone representing his father from Hornsby.\textsuperscript{22}

The New Zealand Government Railways’ archive provided a model for examining more recent trans-Tasman arrangements for Anzac Day. The same problems in organising Anzac Day at a distance are characteristic: although nowadays there is no difficulty settling on a date, there is frequently disagreement over who should take the lead organising the event, which representatives should attend, and often there is what World War II servicemen knew as a ‘snafu’ situation.\textsuperscript{23} For example, whether one country’s cultural ceremonies should be allowed to be performed at Gallipoli as part of Anzac Day has been a matter of fairly recent debate.\textsuperscript{24} Other hallmarks are obvious in the Petone – Hornsby event: the participation of state and local civic representatives, organisers wishing to present the best possible face, the need to erect a special

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{19} George A. Troup to E.H. Hiley, General Manager, NZ Government Railways, 22 December 1915. ANZ(W) AAEB Acc W3293, Box 226.
\textsuperscript{20} E.H. Hiley to MPs A.L. Herdman, J. Allen, Dr McNab, W. Fraser, G.W. Russell, A.M. Myers, Sir Francis Dillon Bell, W.D.S. MacDonald, J.A. Hanan, and Dr. Pomare; Ibid. Acceptances subject to availability record Messrs Russell (Internal Affairs), Hanan (Education), Fraser (Public Works), Herdman (Attorney-General), McDonald (Agriculture), Pomare (Maori Councils), Myers (Customs), W.F. Massey (Prime Minister), Sir Joseph Ward and Dillon Bell, 7 April 1916 (1915/5862). Apologies came from McNab (Justice), Allen (Defence); H.R. Potter, Lt Col N.Z.S.C. 12 April 1916 to Colonel E.H. Hiley, NZ Railways, on the attendance of the Trentham Military Camp Band. Hiley is not listed in the New Zealand World War I Service Personnel and Reserves Index (2nd Edition).
\textsuperscript{21} The Wellington story was carried in the \textit{Evening Post} and \textit{The New Zealand Times} of 25 April.
\textsuperscript{22} That the Hornsby example of trans-Tasman cooperation survived to provide an exemplar of early Anzac Day initiatives is surprising. The surviving records of the Department of New Zealand [Government] Railways are in disarray. It partially validates Pierre Nora’s claim that history is an attack on memory as he defines it. It is gratifying to think that someone had the foresight to see value in this bundle of letters and preserve it, so that later researchers might more by accident than anything else, it seems, find this treasure in the National Archives, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{23} ‘snafu’ – situation normal - all fouled up. Well known among New Zealand servicemen after the arrival of US personnel among whom it was common slang.
\textsuperscript{24} Two recent examples were New Zealand Maori official participation at Gallipoli in the late 1990s, and the representation by Serbian national representative marchers in the Canberra 2006 parade. The latter raised bitter memories.
\end{flushleft}
marker or memorial, holding a ceremony, and the waxing and waning or even disappearance of the ceremony from that site over time, and possibly the erasure of the event from community memory, as seems to have happened in Hornsby.

Key elements of the process were: the involvement of higher officials of the New Zealand Government Railways Department acting to ensure correct procedures; the confusion over the first settled time for the ceremony; involvement of local and influential patriotic committees; the invitations to and acceptance by most government officials; the exchange of greetings; and extensive newspaper coverage of the event. The speed which this event in Petone, Wellington, and Hornsby, NSW, occurred lends little weight to the notion that the initiation of Anzac Day was spontaneous. Careful examination of evidence reveals extensive planning and detailed negotiations.

The Petone - Hornsby episode viewed from the present provides a kaleidoscope of the transitions of Anzac Day in particular localities. In some areas, like Hornsby, it has a meteoric rise and dies away, pushed aside by the forces of modernity; in others, like Petone, it has a similar beginning, becomes established in the cultural landscape, suffers lapses, and also has periods of resurgence and revival in communal memory. The choice of 25 April as the day for the event had been suggested by the Hornsby railwaymen’s committee, and readily accepted by the New Zealand authorities after the fiasco of the 4 March. The day was attended by the highest government officials of both New South Wales and New Zealand. What had begun as an undertaking initiated with enthusiastic collegiality rapidly changed complexion with the eager participation of officials of the highest level in the state. On the Day a historical landscape was created, memories exchanged, where the conjunction of the events of Gallipoli and Anzac Day was affirmed.

In Egypt the 13th Infantry Brigade AIF held their *First Annual Anzac Dinner* at Serapeum Camp on the 25 April 1916. Soldiers keen to preserve memory called the poultry ‘Allah Enver Pasha.’

---

25 ANZ(W) AAEB Acc W3293, Box 226. This box carries ample evidence on the Petone-Hornsby exchange. *The Dominion*, 26 April 1916 covered the story – the PM Massey unfurled the Australian flag and Sir Joseph Ward the New Zealand flag. The same story was carried in the *Evening Post* and *The New Zealand Times* of the 25th. *The Sydney Morning Herald* 26 April 1916 covered the unfurling of the NZ flag at Hornsby by the Governor of NSW Sir Gerald Strickland. Present at both ceremonies were representatives of the other country: Frank O’Connor, NZR guard representing Petone, at Hornsby, and T. Stone at Petone representing his father from Hornsby.

The transport ship *Orontes* similarly celebrated the happenings of Gallipoli on Anzac Day with a menu of ‘Potage a la Suvla Bay, Filet de Merlans a l’Anzac Cove, Lone Pine Curry, Gaba Tepe Potatoes etc’ finishing with ‘Abdul Coffee.’ The material from battlefield and shipboard menu cards provides some of the first evidence of embedding the memories of Gallipoli among soldiers. Metaphorical meanings were reified and ownership of the historic landscape proclaimed. If Gallipoli had resulted in a victory for the Anzacs, it could not have been more joyously remembered.

*The Egyptian Mail*, Special Gallipoli Number, Cairo, Tuesday 25 April 1916, ran a front page spread with the bold banner headline of ‘THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE GALLIPOLI LANDING’ - a three column piece by Private Frank Reid, AIF who highlighted the bravery of the first Anzacs at Gallipoli.

April 25, 1915 – What a host of memories the date conjures up. Our thoughts drift back across the dead months and we see a great convoy of transports guarded by destroyers ploughing carelessly through the waters which lap the European side of the Gallipoli Peninsula. On these ships are men young and untried to the grim game of war, who have come across nine thousand miles of ocean to help the Motherland in her hour of need. We can see the gangways thrown out and men stepping into the small boats. They are quietly towed to the shore. To them, used to the great wide spaces and a free and easy life, they look forward to what is before them as a great adventure. They little think that ere the sun sinks o’er the land ahead of them that their wonderful bravery will have made their name immortal.

It is clear, that in 1916, Anzac Day was established with enthusiasm. Nevertheless, in a contrary tone and with equal passion civic organisers of the day considered that the day should be instituted as a national day of commemoration. The most influential group was the Brisbane-
based ADCC. Its communications with other Australian and some New Zealand centres over uniform action on the day and the possibility of national observance were taken seriously.

Both domestically and for soldiers on the high seas, the Gallipoli – Anzac Day connection was a given. At the outset in 1916 it is most difficult to find news reports or correspondence which challenged the connection. There were some intermittent questions on whether the adulation accorded Anzac troops for their performance on Gallipoli could be shared with others of the 29th Division who had fought and died there. From the outset, in Britain, there were appeals, subdued at first, then more strident during the 1920s, that the day should be called ‘Gallipoli Day,’ in order to acknowledge more widely the contribution of all on Gallipoli. Nevertheless, at first the Anzacs took the spotlight.

**The Imperial connection**

On the Imperial stage, elements of mysticism and hero-worship combined to create the first Anzac Day for London in 1916. The landscape was that of heroic Gallipoli memories. There was an air of a Roman pageant for victorious armies returning with their prizes. Outside the Westminster Abbey service there was some concession to the tragedy of Anzac deaths but this element did not dominate the day. Ownership of the day was firmly claimed by Australians. New Zealanders played a significant but lesser role. The newspapers feasted on the splendour of the day. The Anzacs were claimed as London’s own – the *Daily Mail*, Wednesday, 26 April 1916 gave extensive coverage which allows an analysis of the public reaction to the day. Some relevant extracts have been used to illustrate the depth and intensity of feeling evoked by this event, and the remarkable support which was given to it by the leaders of English and colonial society.

The day conferred the royal stamp of approval in the public spectacle of Empire. This alone was momentous enough to transfer ideas about the Anzacs and Gallipoli into a grand metaphor. Being held on the anniversary of the landing it transferred the landscape away from a wartime marginal area, Gallipoli, where there were only graves and memories, to the centre of empire. There was a swagger and panache to the whole occasion which countered the experiences on the Western Front: misery and cold were replaced by a warm welcome; the solitary and uncomfortable were replaced by enthusiastic crowds, and enjoyment.
The next day’s London *Daily Mail* front page report posed a close conjunction: Anzac Day and the heroism and sacrifice of the soldiers on Gallipoli was unbreakable. It was to be lauded, respected and would endure. The scene described was one of mixed rejoicing and grimness. Cheering children were met with a grim smile by soldiers who ‘carried on.’ These were men who ‘flaunted no advertisement of the panoply of war. They were just themselves; and that was enough. They were business-like, grim and silent….Here among them in the searching sunlight were the men who had come out of something greater than victory, and who carried still the indelible marks of their undying heroism.’ The soldiers paraded through ‘the hearts of [citizens of] the great capital of the Mother-country, [and] all too soon ended their march, to enter with bowed heads the thronged and hushed Abbey, to join their King and Queen in equal humility.’

This effusive report carried many of the elements which denoted both the intimate connection of Gallipoli and Anzac Day, along with elevation of the term ‘Anzac.’ Much is made of ‘England’s King and Queen present in the congregation offering their solicitude and paying their tribute,’ the ‘charge up the Gaba Tepe heights’ by the New Zealanders, the ‘grim and silent’ soldiers, the red badge of courage of the Australians, and national cries of ‘Cooee’ and ‘Kia ora.’ Official sanction and the conjunction of New Zealand and Australia with Anzac Day ensured that sacrifice, no matter how painful, had been for a worthy cause.

Prime Minister William Hughes’ speech at the Hotel Cecil after the Abbey service was quoted verbatim. He cemented the Gallipoli-Anzac Day connection:

> Soldiers of Australasia. This is Anzac Day and we are met here to commemorate not only a glorious incident in the greatest war of all time but also the inauguration of a new era in the history of the great Australian Commonwealth and its sister Dominion of New Zealand, and, indeed, of the Empire itself. On this day, called Anzac, one short year ago the Australasian soldier leapt unheralded into the arena of war and by a display of courage, dash, endurance, and unquenchable spirit proved himself worthy of kinship with those heroic men who throughout the history of our race have walked unafraid into the jaws of death thinking it glorious to die for their country.

He was joined by General Birdwood, ‘The Soul of Anzac,’ who gave anecdotes of life on Gallipoli. Despite the obvious attempt by Hughes to include the men of New Zealand within the parameters of ‘Australasian,’ the language directed to the ‘sister Dominion’ makes it obvious that

---

31 Ibid.
New Zealand’s role was perceived as secondary to that of Australia on the first Anzac Day. Much of the extract is a reflection of state justification of sacrifice and should be interpreted in the pressures of an unfinished war. The work of the original Anzacs was a model – a model to encourage and make more effective recruiting campaigns at home: ‘through self-sacrifice alone can men or nations be saved.’ He continued in a similar vein to proclaim the ‘toga of manhood’ for Australia, and to praise the ‘deathless deeds’ of the valiant dead.\(^{32}\) This speech operates at different levels: it granted the commendation of the State not only on the heroes but on the day, it deepened the myth of heroic mateship, it proclaimed ownership of the landscape and inextricably combined connotations of Gallipoli with Anzac Day. Hughes’ speech provided a key reference point for later Australian politicians who could detect veins of national identity in the ‘toga of manhood’ observation.

*The Times* coverage of the event was extensive. Sombre notes were sounded by a wounded New Zealand writer and reminded Britons that Anzac Day provided ‘a sadder and more sombre pageant [than the Crusaders’ return] in which the note of triumph was not so dominant.’\(^{33}\) A *Times* reporter at the Abbey service wrote:

> Hell Spit, Shrapnel Gully, Quinn’s and Courtenay’s, all have become memories, but memories that haunt waking hours and hours of sleep alike, memories seared in the brain. Yesterday in the Abbey these wraiths came back to us, and for a short time the dead lived again. Comrades of the trench and sap passed noiselessly through the aisles gazing wistfully at the kneeling soldiers.\(^{34}\)

The evocation of the spirits of the dead elevates the message from the mundane to the other-worldly and extends its boundaries to admit immortality, the sanction of the spirit world. It must have seemed that Heaven was giving its blessing to Anzac Day and praising the efforts of the dead on Gallipoli. This notion was copied by other papers, such as the *Daily Sketch* of 26 April 1916: ‘Then the service was over, but neither the King, Queen, nor clergy moved, a wondering stillness held the Abbey for a minute, for two minutes, and was rent by the bugles from the Henry VII chapel door calling the intricate and haunting “Last Post.”’\(^{35}\) This fused a royal seal of

---

\(^{32}\) Ibid.

\(^{33}\) *The Times*, 26 April 1916, 2.

\(^{34}\) Ibid.

\(^{35}\) Ibid.

approval with a religious sanction and ensured that the attachment of Gallipoli through the work of the Anzacs would endure as long as the British Empire.

Anzac Day was established with energetic organisation and popular fanfare. The events on Gallipoli provided the rationale for Anzac Day. All the elements were to be found in 1916 which were later features of the Day. Gallipoli provided the place of story, and Anzac Day the arena for anecdotal memories. For the societies of Australasia it was the *cause celebre* which had seen the efforts of the two nations recognised within the bounds of Empire. Following the success of the 1916 Anzac Day and admitting the need by the state for any extra measures to ensure better recruiting levels, there was again in 1917 and 1918, re-enactment of the same rites. The Anzac Day-Gallipoli connection was cemented in contemporary memory.

**Local civic and personal responses**

In New Zealand, the mayor of Dunedin, J.J. Clark, was concerned with the care of Gallipoli veterans and their families. Between 21 October and 10 December 1915 letters of condolence were written to twenty local families. Community support for rehabilitation of wounded Gallipoli veterans and the matter of access of returned Gallipoli men to farewell reinforcements leaving from the Dunedin railway station reified the Gallipoli – Anzac Day connection. Town Clerk, G.A. Lewin, also reinforced the Gallipoli - Anzac connection in his annual report and commented on the many civic receptions given the men for their sacrifices. In Lewin’s annual report for 1916-1917, he referred to the Great War and thought the tide had turned and that New Zealand ‘it [was] pleasing to record, [was] still doing her part. Her glorious Expeditionary Force has left the inhospitable shores of Gallipoli, bidden farewell to historic Anzac, and landed in France, and [was], along with the Empire’s best and bravest, holding an important section of the line, fighting as brave men and dying as heroes.’ This gives the Gallipoli – Anzac Day connection another dimension - no longer the only place of glory. In the same report Lewin recorded the Dunedin City Roll of Honour, which included all 114 enlisted men and the names of the 14 who died to

---

37 *The Times*, 26 April 1916, 5. Melbourne Anzac Day Town Hall meeting reported General Godley commanding the New Zealand and Australian Division sent a message from Cairo: ‘We are honouring the memory of our fallen comrades.’ Conscription was firmly supported by other speakers, such as Sir William Irvine.
40 DCC Archives City of Dunedin, Departmental Reports for the Year 1916-1917. 1917, 11.
that date. The Gallipoli – Anzac Day connection was not felicitous for many families. Attempts by some civic leaders to gloss over or forget the tragedy of war in order to promote enlistment were not universally appreciated. At this early stage in the development of Anzac Day, on a personal and community level, many memories being shared were those eliciting grief.

In April 1917, the same sentiments were expressed by Mayor Clark in the orders for the arrangements for Anzac Day:

In accordance with the expressed wish of the Council, arrangements have been made to celebrate Anzac Day in this City on the 25th April...Throughout the whole of New Zealand and Australia, and in London, the celebrations will follow the lines of last year and will largely be in the nature of memorial services for the heroic men who gave their lives for the Empire in Gallipoli and elsewhere.41

Gallipoli is the prime focus; the Western Front was ‘elsewhere.’ This announcement by the Mayor of Dunedin, demonstrably speaks of the high place for Gallipoli, despite Lewin, tempering his references with overtones of sadness. The realism in his statement reflected the failure of the expedition at the Dardanelles. The drive to retain memory and remain faithful was the principal motivator of action.42 The driving force behind memory creation was both the actions of the soldiers on Gallipoli and the graves of those who remained.

Among rank and file soldiers there seemed to be a need to remember and reminisce about the events of the Anzac landing on Anzac Day. The diaries of Sergeant A. L. de Vine of the 4th battalion A.I.F witness that:

25/4/16 Anzac day. Very quiet today. Slice of cake given to each man from Regimental funds as an extra ration to commemorate the day, this caused much indignation & amusement amongst the men...in evening met several of the old lads that landed at Anzac on the first day, we all met at A Coys headquarters & we had a very jolly time total casualties 60 bottles of champagne Capt Brown, Sgt Tanner, Cpl Goldwater, Pte. J. Mills, & P. Hogan, S. Williamson, Sgt Ramsay. C.Z.M.S. D. Irwin, & myself were present also several friends, every body very happy & full of it at 9pm.43

41 DCC Archives Mayor’s Letter Book, 2 Dec 1915 - 2 May 1918, DCC MO 1/3, 293-294, Mayor’s Minute, 14 April 1917, ‘Anzac Day’ with the marginal note, ‘Advt, All depts.’
42 See Chapter One of this thesis for the analysis of Derrida.
43 Diaries of Sergeant A.L. de Vine 4th Battalion AIF, AWM 1 DRL/0240.
Here we see the pattern for a soldier in the trenches, expressing relief on meeting the ‘old lads’ from his Gallipoli unit, drinking and talking. This reinforced memories and allowed their transfer elsewhere. This transfer of memories associated with Anzac Day was rife. It was occurring domestically, and is found in diaries, letters and autograph books.

On a different level, heroes of Anzac were lauded. Lieutenant Albert Jacka, V.C. was among the greatest of Australia’s heroes and his autograph book indicates the initial and intimate connection between Anzac and Gallipoli. The detail is revealing. Not only are there direct addresses to Jacka but the revelation of an important undercurrent of feeling showing that ownership of the Gallipoli–Anzac landscape was not the exclusive possession of soldiers: ‘The autograph book of Lt Albert Jacka V.C. from the Anzac Club, Williamstown, Vic 1915, signed by the patrons and Executive and Committee of the Anzac Club between 2 September 1915 and 15 Nov 1916.’

Below are a few extracts taken from notes by friends and neighbours from the district where his family resided. There are deep revelations here: families who made entries in the autograph book used the opportunity to record their own losses. Many of the messages contain information linking the writers to casualties and deaths of soldiers:

- Mr & Mrs Harry Hewet, Brother & Sister-in-law of Pte G.F. Hewet, reported missing later killed in action August 8th 1915.
- Corporal L.E. Hewitt No 204, A Company 24th Battalion 6th A.I.F. In the Southern General Hospital Dudley Section Birmingham, also wounded at Gallipoli.

There’s a gladness in Remembrance. 2/10/16
Son of Mr J. & Mrs Hewitt 161 Nelson Street Williamstown.

The Tyrrell family contributed four sons to the conflict – all are remembered:

---

44 AWM PR 84/333 Papers of Captain Albert Jacka 14th Bn A.I.F. [1893-1932]; Bede Nairn and Geoffrey Serle Australian Dictionary of Biography, Vol. 9: 1891-1939, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, Vic. 1983. 452-453. Jacka received the first Victoria Cross to be awarded to an A.I.F. soldier in World War I. He was instantly lionized, becoming a national hero receiving a prize of £500 and a gold watch from Melbourne businessman John Wren. As part of the 14th Battalion he was shipped to France in June 1916 as a lieutenant. Near Pozières in early August he was involved in a furious counterattack regaining Australian prisoners from German troops, for which he was awarded the Military Cross. The Autograph Book dates from after this action. On 8 April 1917 he gained a bar to his Military Cross. He was wounded by a sniper’s bullet near Ploegsteert Wood on 8 July and in September led the 14th Battalion in action against German pillboxes at Polygon Wood. He was badly gassed at Villers-Bretonneux and repatriated via the Euripides to Melbourne in September 1919.
-Sept 9th 1916,
England can find no braver band
Than those that hail from Austral’s strand.
No. 4321 Pte. W.A.E Tyrrell 13th Reinf 6th Battalion 2nd Brigade A.I.F. Alice Tyrrell
No. 5695 Pte B V Tyrrell B. Coy 23rd Battalion 6th Inf Brigade A.I.F. Jean Tyrrell
No. 2152 Pte G.F. Tyrrell C. Coy 29th Battalion 8th Inf Brigade Agnes Tyrrell
L.N. Tyrrell Ldg Stoker HMAS Psyche
Four sons of Mrs Tyrrell and The Late John Tyrrell 15 Stevedore Street, North Williamstown Victoria.
- To the boys who took the count. – S.M.

We the above members of The Returned Soldiers Association Thank the Ladies of the Anzac Club for the Kindness & Generosity shown to us this day. 7/10/16, [and, in the same hand] Private Tom O’Brien Late 6th Batt Killed in Action at Anzac on the Day of Landing 25/4/15.

The extracts mix Gallipoli and European experiences, but each Anzac Day records like this were pored over and memories recalled. This is a rich source, for it remains one of the few which survived and bears witness to the family/friend-soldier link. It accurately conveys the intensity of memories transported in material objects, as suggested by Tanja Luckins and Marita Sturken. These selected entries of many speak loudly of attachment and identification with the place of conflict and loss. At a local, personal level they validate the Gallipoli - Anzac Day connection, and provide the societal glue which pulls families back to Anzac Day and provides the motive force for some to later visit Gallipoli. There is a dichotomy here between these personal entries and the trumpeting of the press, or the reports of great civic occasions. This writing uncovers that which is lost in public stone memorials - a deeper vein of emotion closely linked with families. We recognise the perpetuation of memory of the dead. The autograph book stood as a memorial for Albert Jacka’s community, as real as those later erected by civic authorities. Families, and the work of women are valued and acknowledged – a factor supported in this thesis and challenged relating to the interwar period.
There was enormous diversity in the examples of the first Anzac Day and reactions to it. Anzac Day was intimately linked with the exploits on Gallipoli and this connection continued over the decades of the twentieth century. In the London event there is a sense of fetish, almost of desperation to make the Gallipoli episode stand out from a war mired in Flanders mud. There seemed to be a universal desire to elevate Gallipoli and Anzac Day from the mundane wartime landscape to a spiritual position. It was later vested with qualities which transcended the ordinary and hedged around with the protective armour of legislation.

**Enduring factors**

Between the wars, reports and stories demonstrated an eclectic mix. There was both shock and consolation about the Gallipoli situation revealed in British news reports at the end of World War I. Anxieties over the condition of graves were exacerbated by headlines such as ‘Gallipoli Graves Desecrated—Another Turkish Outrage.’\(^ {45}\) Some reassurance was offered in the report which confidently informed readers of a War Office notification that while the graves had been ‘grievously molested and desecrated by the Turks,’ the Ottoman Government had affirmed that the graves on the Gallipoli Peninsula would be carefully safeguarded, and the ‘Graves Registration Unit, composed of British, Australian, and New Zealand officers …landed on the Peninsula on November 10.’\(^ {46}\) Despite reassurances, memories of Gallipoli graves were coloured by proprietorial and adversarial attitudes. The work of the Graves Registration Unit (GRU) between 1919 and 1923 for the recovery and identification of remains and establishment of cemeteries on the Peninsula focussed public attention on the area. In 1920, newspapers ran relevant sections of the Treaty of Sèvres under which the British Government acquired ‘rights of ownership’ over the Gallipoli Battlefields site.\(^ {47}\)

---

\(^{45}\) *The Times* 21 Dec. 1918, 8; *The Times* 29 Dec. 1920, 7. The ‘sad and difficult task’ of concentrating the cemeteries was made more difficult when ‘the wooden crosses [were] torn up and used for firewood by the Turks, who are no respecters of the dead.’

\(^{46}\) Ibid, 21 Dec. 1918, 8.

\(^{47}\) *The Times* 30 Oct. 1920, 9. Comment on the Turkish Treaty maps as published in a ‘Blue Book [Cmd. 964]’ in which the writer states that the British Government Blue Book shows ‘the principal area on the Gallipoli Peninsula to be transferred to the British Government in accordance with Article 218 of the Treaty [of Sèvres], by which Turkey and Greece bound themselves to grant to the Powers interested full and exclusive rights of ownership over the land in which are situated the graves of those who fell in action, for the purpose of laying out cemeteries or erecting memorials. The area shown is Anzac Cove and the surrounding land. It is something over two miles in length and about a mile wide.’ This raises very interesting questions about the acquisition of foreign territory and the purposes which acquired land might be used for. What about Turk remains on the land? Issues of sovereignty arise, and future problems of administration loom large; See Charles Hyde ‘Conquest Today’ editorial, *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 30, No. 3, (Jul. 1936), 471-476, [www.JSTOR.org](http://www.JSTOR.org) Accessed 21 October 2007.
Britain’s, and in consequence of imperial loyalties, New Zealand’s and Australia’s relations with Turkey were conditioned by reports of Turkey’s responses to matters over the Gallipoli graves. Raising the tensions were: accusations of Turkish ‘false assertions’ and a ‘solemn farce’ in the Lausanne negotiations; Turkish resistance over the matter of ownership of the land on which Anzac graves were found; and non-compliance with the Australian request for ownership of the Anzac cemeteries and communication paths linking them. A correspondent in Lausanne reflected the British view that ‘until the safety of our graves [was] assured we shall not leave Gallipoli.’

This bitter comment was balanced by Gallipoli visitors’ accounts describing the plantings on Gallipoli and the care given Anzac graves. In 1923, the Anzac Day edition of the Sydney Morning Herald ran features like ‘Steadily the Anzac story becomes legendary’ and a Central Press photo of Gallipoli landscape between Shrapnel Valley and Hell’s Spit. The Daily Telegraph ran features on the role of publicist Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett and on soldier sacrifice and the debt of the Australian nation. In October 1923, Frank Hudson, NZFL correspondent in London was reporting that the British never would forget the valour of Dominion soldiers. ‘Hill 60, Chanak Bair, Helles are very sacred here’ and he commented positively on the effectiveness the visit of the New Zealand representative on the Imperial War Graves Commission, Sir James Allen, to Gallipoli graves and the report which states Allen was ‘delighted with the results of his experiences on the Turkish Peninsula.’

In 1924, news stories were again mixed. ‘Turkish Interference’ headed a story about the suspension of quarrying for Unger Deré stone used for cemeteries and memorial building.

---

48 The Times, 25 Jan. 1923, 10, Special Correspondent’s report from Lausanne.
49 NZFL 24th year, No 17, 24th Oct. 1923, 7: ‘Representing New Zealand – The Love that Burns in Britain.’
50 AWM 1923 Cuttings book, Book 1, 56 - 66.
51 NZFL 24 October 1923, 7, 1923, must have been a year of curious dissonance because of strange reports. A Brisbane Courier Anzac Day report ran: ‘An Australian soldier, who is now in Brisbane, is emphatic that a wounded Turkish officer was responsible for conceiving the [ANZAC acronym] idea. One of the first men to be taken prisoner, and of good education, he was being interrogated on board a hospital ship in the Bay, when he noticed the five letters on one of the documents. He at once referred to the extraordinary significance of them, pointing out that Anzac was a Turkish religious word with the lofty meaning, “Only just.” He regarded it as an omen that the Allies at Gallipoli were fighting for a cause which was bound to prevail, and he saw therein the fall of the Turkish Empire. Thus it was that a name came into being which will live in history.’ While this might to the modern eye be distracting, once again through mention of the Turkish connection at a time when the Chanak Crisis was fresh revived memories.
52 The Times, 25 Jan. 1924, 11, ‘War Graves at the Dardanelles’ carries the subtitle ‘Turkish Interference.’ This report details delays in the work of the IWGC and lays blame at the feet of Angora [Ankara] authorities who suspended quarrying at Unger Deré because they apparently suspected that the workers were engaged for military purposes as well as for work in the cemeteries. In addition, storm damage had wrecked quays and buildings and put work behind by about two months. ‘All hope of the completion of the Imperial memorial on Cape Helles by Anzac
Contrarily, the visit of Australian Prime Minister Stanley Bruce to many of the Anzac cemeteries on Gallipoli went well. He was given assurances by Çanakkale authorities that the sacredness of the cemeteries would always be respected.\textsuperscript{53} Reports through the late 1920s on the work of the IWGC under the leadership of Major-General Sir Fabian Ware served also to cement the Gallipoli connection by keeping the public aware of events there.\textsuperscript{54} Interest in the Turkish connection was kept alive with a publication, for the first time, of what in April purported to be a Turkish view of the Gallipoli battles\textsuperscript{55} and a September a \textit{Daily Mail} story on ‘Anzac Heroes – in Graves on Gallipoli.’\textsuperscript{56} The impetus was continued in 1925 with Sir James Allen departing London to unveil the New Zealander monument on Gallipoli.\textsuperscript{57} The same year saw an Anzac Beach tenth anniversary service disrupted through the inability of the appointed chaplain to arrive on time.\textsuperscript{58} In 1926 and 1927 attention was attracted by newspaper articles some of which centred on solemn remembrance and others which described the personal bereavement of individuals.\textsuperscript{59} Anzac Day radio broadcasts of the type given by Canon David Garland on Brisbane radio 4QG unequivocally made the Anzac Day - Gallipoli connection: ‘It is a day of remembrance of our debt to those Australians and New Zealanders, also our British comrades, who on April 25, 1915 made that memorable landing on Gallipoli.’\textsuperscript{60}

---

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{The Times}, 12 Feb. 1924, 11.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid; \textit{The Times}, 9 Nov. 1929, 9.
\textsuperscript{57} JOL Anzac Day Commemoration Committee Cutting Book, 1923-1928. [O/S 3556] Cutting Book No. 4, 134, \textit{The Daily Mail} 29 Apr. 1925 under the heading ‘The Unity of the Empire’ a London Reuter’s report of 27 Apr. of the luncheon at the Australian and New Zealand Club at the Hotel Cecil, when Earl Jellicoe was the principal guest stated: ‘The High Commissioner for New Zealand (Sir James Allen) presided, and [referred] to his impending departure for Gallipoli to unveil a monument to New Zealanders. Earl Jellicoe referred to the bringing up of New Zealand children to regard Anzac Day as a day of self-sacrifice which was a spirit much needed in the Empire today. He concluded by declaring that April 25, 1915, was the day on which the unity of the Empire was achieved.’
\textsuperscript{58} AW M 1925 Cuttings Book No 7, 74, a report in the Adelaide \textit{Chronicle} 18 Jul. 1925, carries information sent to the RSSILA from Mr R.A. Vickery of the IWGC that despite arrangements being made for Canon Whitehouse of the British Embassy in Constantinople to hold a commemorative service at Anzac Beach, Gallipoli on the tenth anniversary of the landing, the celebration of the ‘Turkish biram’ [Persian New Year or Zoroastrian Parsis, 20 March] stopped local Dardanelles shipping and the chaplain could not be present. Twenty people assembled at Beach Cemetery and five wreaths were laid, one on behalf of the Australian Returned Soldiers’ League: ‘Immediately after the wreaths were laid at the base of the cross one minute silence was observed. The Turkish Government was represented by Noureddin Bey, the local Governor.’
\textsuperscript{59} AWM 1926 Cuttings Book No 21, 248-250, Perth \textit{Sunday Times} carried a long poem dedicated to General Sir John Monash, called ‘The Memory of Gallipoli’ by May Kidson, with the subscript ‘To my beloved son of the “IMMORTAL 3RD Brigade,” who fell on the furthest heights of Gallipoli before noon on Anzac Day, 1915. And to The Youth of Our Land, that they ever remember that immortal landing through which Australia was born a Nation.’
\textsuperscript{60} AW M 1925 Cuttings Book No 7, 167, Brisbane \textit{Mail} 26 Apr. 1927.
The 1930s not only brought deepening Depression but new notes about Gallipoli and Anzac Day. By 1934, the current historical landscape permitted British admiration of their former foe. In that year, Captain W.E. Stanton-Hope, a Gallipoli veteran, observed the remnants of war still visible on the Peninsula and commented: ‘The Turks have a memorial, but they never collected their own dead on Gallipoli.’\(^{61}\) He also observed the generosity of Turks towards their former enemies. Stanton-Hope accompanied 700 British ex-servicemen on the 20 April - 12 May pilgrimage to Gallipoli on the CPR liner *Duchess of Richmond*.\(^{62}\) His account is full of memories and is conciliatory toward the former enemy.\(^{63}\) He commented on the litter of war, and records his visits to the Skew Bridge, Pink Farm, Twelve Tree Copse and Redoubt cemeteries. He mused on the designs, the ‘iris, stock and rosemary, the flower of remembrance,’ and was attuned to the times – one where floral appreciation abounded, particularly on Anzac Day.\(^{64}\) He recorded the readiness of the Turks to associate with former enemies, and recounted how one Blackburn, a naval rating, who had lost a hand, became a friend of a Turk with a missing arm. ‘Someone interprets the Turk’s smiling comment on the situation: “We are brothers.”’\(^{65}\) Stanton-Hope’s book, *Gallipoli Revisited*, also contained a photograph of Mehmet Bey, the Turkish officer commanding the large artillery piece known as ‘Asiatic Annie.’\(^{66}\) The physical landscape struck a chord for Stanton-Hope, not dissimilar to that recorded by late twentieth century pilgrims:

There is a living spirit in the hills and nullahs of Gallipoli, but you cannot become attuned to it among a mixed company. You must go from among them and be alone. No bursting shells or bombs, no crackling rifle-fire. Goats and sheep graze in the valleys. The sea is empty of warships, mine-sweepers and hospital ships. How quiet it is.\(^{67}\)

This evocative account is well supported in a London *Daily Mirror* piece called ‘Back to Gallipoli.’\(^{68}\) This feeling was also experienced by author Trevor Allen who had been to the Peninsula in 1928 via the *Stella d’Italia* and went again on the 1934 *Duchess of Richmond*.

---

61 Ibid.
62 *The Times*, 18 Apr. 1934, 11, notice of the intended *Duchess of Richmond* cruise to Gallipoli.
63 KCL, North Papers; I/4b/63: *Daily Telegraph* 12 May 1934, cutting called ‘Another Look at Gallipoli.’
64 Ibid: Floral tributes have constantly been significant for the day and themselves are worthy of study.
65 Ibid.
pilgrimage. He called the Aegean ‘a lovelier sea’ [than that found in coastal Devon], and Imbros and Samothrace the ‘dream isles.’ Of Gallipoli, he wrote: ‘It is a haunting place to revisit, you have memories…..a stranger who had visited Gallipoli several times since the war wrote me: “The peninsula has a personality, and belongs to the spirit. You’ll know what I mean.”’

Local papers like the Brisbane *Daily Mail* carried Gallipoli stories giving ‘Turkish view[s]’ and those of a French General who lost an arm on Gallipoli. There were questions raised in 1935 over whether Anzac Day, based as it was, largely on the events of the landing in 1915, had sufficient appeal. These discords did not cause a reduction of attention for Gallipoli but served to revive memory. In 1935 ‘Mrs Millington’ visited Gallipoli, and the major Australian dailies ran full page articles drawing attention to Gallipoli. Stories like the Melbourne *Herald* piece which related stories about the French military landing artillery at Gallipoli, and the placing of a simple cross and headstone at Gallipoli, as well as describing the scenes at the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance. There was enormous variety in the stories which ran before and after the day. The Melbourne *Star* ran with extracts from the late Chaplain-Captain Andrew Gillison’s Gallipoli

---

69 Trevor Allen was a British Gallipoli veteran who wrote *The Tracks they Trod: Salonika and the Balkans, Gallipoli, Egypt and Palestine Revisited*, Herbert Joseph, London, 1932.

70 KCL North Papers I/4b/67 *Daily Mirror* 20 Apr. 1934, 12. It is a pity the identity of the stranger who frequently visited Gallipoli is not revealed. It is possibly Pemberton.

71 JOL OMHA/3/2, [Box 3557] Anzac Day Commemoration Committee – Cutting Book Vol 2, 1928-1932, 28-30, *The Daily Mail* Brisbane 25 Apr. 1929., also on the same day, the same edition of the *Mail* printed the Gallipoli story from the ‘Turkish view,’ by F.E. Trotter. It supports an earlier story in the same paper by French General Henri Gouraud, who lost an arm on Gallipoli.

72 JOL OMHA/3/4, [Box 3559] 1935 Anzac Day Commemoration Committee – Cutting Book Vol 4. 1935-1938, 280-284: a letter over the signature ‘A Soldier’s Wife’ pleads for remembering not only Gallipoli but the whole of the war. An ex-Naval reservist, ‘Neptune,’ wondered whether Anzac Day as it was, based largely on the landing at Gallipoli, had sufficient or wide appeal.

73 JOL OMHA/3/4 Volume 4 (3559) 1935-1938, 300-299. [N.B. the whole volume has all pages pasted in reverse order] has a record of a visit to Gallipoli. The name of the paper is not recorded; it may be the *Courier*, and the story features a picture of a Mrs Millington, assumedly the writer.

74 AWM Cuttings Book 1935 Bundle 2, 1 Apr.–23 Apr. *Sun*, 20 Apr. Melbourne reports on the condition of Gallipoli ‘myriads of flowers’ and gardeners working constantly; *The Age*, 20 Apr., like most papers was running Gallipoli articles, such as ‘Memories of Anzac – The 1915 Armistice.’; AWM Cuttings Book #3 Anzac Day, 1935, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia, *Sydney Mail*, Royal Show Number, 24 Apr. 1935, vests several pages in the Anzac Day theme, 10-15 with a comprehensive coverage of not only Gallipoli, but the Western Front with two pages on the Battle of Mons and action at the Sea of Galilee by the Australian Light Horse; ibid, *Chronicle*, Adelaide, 25 Apr 1935, comments favourably on a recent publication, *Gallipoli Revisited*, by Stanton Hope. The voyage was of the *Duchess of Richmond* from 20 April to 12 May 1934. The book itself has photographs at the back, unpagd - one of Mehmet Bey, Officer Commanding the big gun known as ‘Asiatic Annie.’

diary under the banner ‘Why We Carried the War to Gallipoli.’ The *Sun* ran a most evocative piece. There was a picture of Mr Tasman Millington, at Gallipoli scattering the ashes of the Anzac Ribbons from the wreaths that had been placed at the Sydney Cenotaph. This is particularly important, for it gathered together collective memory. The connection between Australia’s Anzac Day and Gallipoli appeared axiomatic. Millington was Australia’s permanent full-time representative on Gallipoli. Meanwhile the Sydney *Bulletin* lead writer commented on the possibility of the issue of a Gallipoli medal and that France and Turkey had already issued special medals for the campaign. By 1935, it was difficult to find any copy material that did not emphasize the Anzac Day – Gallipoli connection.

In 1937, one of the founders of the NZRSA, Sir Donald Petrie Simson helped reinforce the vital connection in England. He held an ‘Anzac Day Luncheon. In celebration of the Anzac – Gallipoli Day, the Managing Trustees of the O.T.E.F. invited the members of the Australian and New Zealand Contingents to a Luncheon at St. Ermin’s, Westminster.” Portability of the day and its association with Gallipoli was characteristic of this period. Simson was representing both imperial and New Zealand interests. He was knighted for his work with the British Empire Overseas League.

World War II changed the historical landscape, and its impact on the Anzac Day – Gallipoli connection further cemented the association. There were shifts in interpretation. The war brought justification to organisations like the Gallipoli Legion of Anzacs in 1941, which could see good purpose in the pledge of ‘unswerving loyalty to King and Empire, and to preserve the spirit of Anzac.’ The war years saw a revival of soldier Anzac Days – sometimes in prison camps. On the home front, in New Zealand the turnout of civilian populations to Anzac Day continued unabated despite the absence of many men. Gallipoli veterans were now sometimes the majority

---

78 Ibid, *The Bulletin*, Sydney 24 Apr. 1935, short comment on the possibility of the issue of a Gallipoli medal and that France and Turkey have issued special medals for the campaign;  
of marchers in town parades and most often were given the leading unit position in the parade. In 1943, Anzac Day was on Sunday, and the Wellington *Evening Post* reported a very large civic turnout.\(^81\) The following year, as New Zealanders and Australians sensed the end of the war was near, the Wellington *Dominion* writers not only outlined the actions and words of the Dawn Service but also took the opportunity to cite material from the diary of General Sir Ian Hamilton, when he referred to the 1915 Anzac forces as ‘all the way from the Southern Cross, earning Victoria Crosses, every one of them’ and in doing so embedded the markers for military nobility of action in New Zealand and Australia. Sir Ian’s brief description praised the accomplishments of the New Zealanders at Gallipoli. Of the Maoris, who arrived in July, he wrote: ‘They proved themselves worthy descendants of the chivalrous warriors of the olden days, and remembered, in the fiercest battles, the last words of Hongi Heke, “Be brave that you may live.”’\(^82\) This proposes an inclusive story for Anzac Day and Gallipoli, and allows the Maori people a unique space in the proceedings of Anzac Day.

The connection survived the public debate over the Vietnam War despite protests. Indeed, as the century moved through its second half there grew a general awareness that the Gallipoli veterans, the original ‘Diggers,’ would not last much longer. Their numbers were quickly reducing. Indeed, the interest in this veteran remnant was in direct proportion to their numbers, a fact that cannot have been lost on the families of the men. By the end of the century, Anzac Day pilgrimages by these elderly men and their supporters, accompanied by a raft of state officials to Gallipoli, dominated the television networks around the day. In Australia it was reinforced by the RSL schools’ educational programme which stressed the Gallipoli origins of Anzac Day. The fact that the Prime Minister of Australia made a point of attending the funeral of Alec William Campbell, in Tasmania, again reinforced the Anzac Day – Gallipoli connection. Campbell died 16 May 2002, aged 103. He was the last Australian survivor among the Gallipoli veterans. He was honoured with his image placed on an Australian commemorative stamp in 2000 as a ‘Living Legend.’ He was given a State funeral in Hobart, Tasmania.

---

82 Ibid, 24 April 1944 Wellington *Dominion* (unpaged).
Returning to Gallipoli

That there was a return to Gallipoli by many at the beginning of the new millennium is not surprising: the impulsion to visit had been there from the beginning. The withdrawal was a matter of dismay for the first Anzacs. Many expressed distress on abandoning their comrades buried in foreign soil. Some felt they were letting down the memory of the dead by leaving them behind in order to fight somewhere else without a successful conclusion in the place where their friends had been sacrificed. Many Gallipoli veterans had an unrequited longing to return. Soon after the events on Gallipoli and following World War I a trickle of privileged Australasian visitors began to arrive on Gallipoli’s shores. Their reports served once again to remind readers of newspapers and periodicals of the intimate connection Australasians had with Gallipoli. Amongst the reports on the progress of the GRU, and during the period of Greek hegemony of Chanak, there is recorded the visit of a New Zealand MP, Walter T. Jennings, to the grave of his son, Edgar McIvor Jennings, at Shrapnel Gully cemetery. There was strong impulsion to visit the graves even during a period of prohibition, but only the rich and privileged could satisfy that need. The work of the GRU continued, punctuated occasionally by reports of Turkish intransigence, and none more strongly reported than that following the Chanak Crisis of September 1922. Turkish resistance to Britain’s proprietorial policy on the Gallipoli Battlefields’ site was met with forceful words.

One of the first print issues was the 1919 ‘Gallipoli Memories’ written by the cleric who conducted the first commemorative service at Gallipoli on Anzac Beach. By 1921, attention was not solely on Gallipoli graves but also included pilgrimages to Australian and New Zealand soldiers’ graves, such as those in Brockenhurst Church cemetery, and in other English graveyards associated with hospitals which provided medical and convalescent services to ill and wounded

---

83 Christopher Pugsley, *Gallipoli, the New Zealand Story*, Hodder & Stoughton, Auckland, 1984, 329, quoting ‘Lance Corporal Cobber, The ANZAC Pilgrim’s Progress,’ ‘But wouldn’t care/ That much, if I didn’t mind/ ’Bout the boys we’ll leave behind.’

84 NZFL 22nd year, No 20, 16 Nov. 1921, 14, Gallipoli Photo – “Where Our Gallipoli Heroes Sleep” with Mr W.T. Jennings M.P. who visited Gallipoli’s Shrapnel Gully, Quinn’s Post and the NZ War Memorial site on Chunuk Bair; J.O. Wilson *New Zealand Parliamentary Record, 1840-1984*, Government Printer, Wellington, 1985, 208. Walter Thomas Jennings, 1854-1923 was an M.P. for Egmont, Taumarunui and Waitomo between Nov. 1902 and Nov. 1922. He held no ministerial posts. The website [www.Anzacs.org/epitaphs](http://www.Anzacs.org/epitaphs) records Private Edgar McIvor Jennings, 10/136, Wellington Battalion, NZEF KIA 3 August 1915, aged 19, Shrapnel Valley Cemetery III.F.28. Since the NZFL 16 Nov 1921 photo is of Shrapnel Valley, it is likely that it is the gravesite of Edgar McIvor Jennings, his son. [He lost two sons in the Great War, one killed at Gallipoli, the other died of wounds received at the Battle of Loos. In 1916 he had another son on active service – [www.freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/~shamere/WW1.16IJ](http://www.freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/~shamere/WW1.16IJ) ]

85 AWM 1919 Cuttings Book No 2, 14, 7 May 1919.
Anzacs during the war. But attention could not be diverted from Gallipoli for long. The *Morning Post* of 26 April 1921, however, carried a message from Lt General Aylmer Hunter-Weston from Chanak in the Dardanelles that he visited and laid a wreath of ‘wild flowers gathered from the land made for ever Britain by the bodies of our heroic dead.’ Interest in Gallipoli visits both on or near Anzac Day and at other times overlapped with that other characteristic of the post Great War age, commemorative monument building.

Following World War II there were new heroes in New Zealand and Australia, few of whom had any experience of fighting in World War I, let alone being in the Dardanelles campaign. These men expected a place. It might be assumed that their input would weaken the Gallipoli - Anzac Day bond by supplanting the Gallipoli landscape with those from other more recent campaigns. Not so: examination of the frequency of references to Gallipoli, to the presence of Turks who had served their country in Gallipoli and who had joined local Australian RSL clubs, and to the increasing interest by returned servicemen’s organisations in hosting Turkish military personnel in New Zealand and Australia, challenges the idea of loss of the Gallipoli connection in Anzac Days. Infrequent visits by servicemen and their relatives to Gallipoli, and other soldier cemeteries in Europe supported the impression that there was no weakening of the connection. In 1948, there was extensive reporting that Cyril Bassett, the only New Zealander to be awarded the Victoria Cross at Gallipoli, attended the Dawn Service there. By 1953, the Turkish connection was reinforced by a visit to New Zealand by four Turkish army officers arriving for Anzac Day 1954. The visit was an enormous success; the representatives of former enemies of Anzac forces created a coup, and again cemented the Anzac Day - Gallipoli connection. No matter that they were all serving officers, none of whom had seen service in World War I, in the public mind they

---

86 Clare Church, *New Zealand Graves at Brockenhurst: 93 Soldiers Remembered from World War I*, Clare Church, Lymington, Hampshire, UK, 2002. Brockenhurst was the location of the No 1 New Zealand general hospital during the Great War.
87 AWM 1921 Cuttings book No 1, *exclusively English Papers*, 1921, 16; see also W.T. Jenning’s visit, Chapter Five.
88 Wellington *Evening Post* on 24 Apr. 1948. This matter is covered in the section on the Morshead Mission, Chapter Seven.
89 Foss Shanahan, Secretary for Cabinet to Minister of Defence, 6 Oct. 1953, Archives New Zealand AAYT 8490 NI 22/9/5 Part 2. Ceremonials Anzac Day 1929-1952, visit of Turkish Delegation 1954 and Archives New Zealand IA 1 Acc W2578, 152/1200. Turkish Delegation, Anzac Day, 1954. 6 Oct. 1953, C.M. (53) 50 Anzac Day 1954 visit of Turkish Delegation - reports Cabinet decision of 5 Oct. 1953 C.P.(53)1025. This visit is treated in Chapter Seven.
were all representatives of that indomitable force that successfully challenged the original Anzacs at Gallipoli.  

In 1960, Gallipoli veteran and NSW RSL president Bill Yeo led an official visit of 45 old diggers and their wives to Gallipoli. His recall was based on being a 19 year old stretcher-bearer who faced the dirt and horrors of the 1915 campaign. In 1960, most of his memory was for his lost friends scattered through the 21 cemeteries. He was particularly touched by visiting Lone Pine and heard there ‘a special message from the Turkish Government’:

Oh heroes, those who spilt their blood on this land, you are sleeping side-by-side in close embrace with our Mehments.

Oh mothers of distant lands, who sent their sons to battle here, stop your tears. Your sons are in our bosoms. They are serenely in peace. Having fallen here now, they have become our own sons.  

This fragment of the message from Kemel Atatürk again points to the existence of variations of the famous declaration. As it is nearer the Artuç 1992 version then it may well be the same as that which was heard by the Duchess of Richmand passengers in 1934. In the last part of the story, present and past are alternated to show the impact of the place upon those who visit in the present. The story ends, ‘Bill Yeo says softly: “Gallipoli is a place for memories. Gallipoli now has peace and serenity.”’

---

90 Archives New Zealand IA 1 Acc W2578, 152/1200. Turkish Delegation, Anzac Day, 1954. It was not until March 1954 that the Turkish Government replied, but the acceptance was cabled through the NZ High Commissioner in London. Of the party of four, Colonel Cemal Madanoglu and Captain Orhan Ayddmir could not speak English, and needed a translator, while Major Halim Kural and Captain Sinasi Capar could understand English. The party was to arrive by TEAL at Auckland 22 April departing from Wellington Friday 30 April. Mr Albert Szaszy, a 29 year old Hungarian was chosen from the panel of translators in the Department of Internal Affairs. A whistle-stop tour was organised from Auckland to Wellington to Invercargill and returning to Wellington with eleven stops for ceremonies. Arrangements were shared between the Internal Affairs department and NZRSA which was represented by its President Sir Howard Kippenberger. The Anzac Day Commemoration Service brochure for Wellington shows that the Turkish Delegation laid one of the five official wreaths at the service. A telegram received from the leader of the delegation sent on his arrival in Sydney read, ‘Your hospitality shown us deeply appreciated we shall never forget green New Zealand God bless you.’ Overall, the visit of the Turkish officers was a great success. The newspapers treated the stories lavishly and the visit did much to put Anzac Day back into the public consciousness in a positive way.

91 Brisbane Courier – Mail, 25 Apr. 1964, 2, ‘Ghosts at Gallipoli.’

92 Ibid; the issue of variations of the Atatürk message is discussed in Chapter Four.
In 1961 Australian author, Betty Roland toured Gallipoli. She was the only Australasian visitor there on Anzac Day. Local guides, Captain McMann (CWGC official) and interpreter John Demiroff accompanied her from Çanakkale across the channel to Eceabat and into the hills where she visited Lone Pine cemetery and reflected on the melancholy of the name. She was driven via Brighton Beach to Anzac Cove and up the ridge to Chunuk Bair. While there, she met the local Turkish army commander, Lieutenant General Refet Ulgenalph, who expressed surprise that Roland had made a journey from Australia to be at Gallipoli on Anzac Day. In the company of the general and her two attendants, she laid a small wreath of flowers on the grave of a Turkish officer, then another wreath on the Stone of Remembrance in the Australian cemetery. Notable points about this episode are that up until 1961 very few Australians or New Zealanders visited Gallipoli, but this rapidly changed. Betty Roland was a woman traveller, hosted by local CWGC personnel and local Turkish people. In a military area, where the General was the principal representative of a male-dominated society, she was made welcome.

1965 was to be a most significant year, as the 50th jubilee year of the Anzac Landing at Gallipoli. Even in 1964, the pace of proceedings quickened as returned men celebrated the 50th anniversary of the sailing of the Main Body from New Zealand. The 1964 preparations for the 50th anniversary in New Zealand included the possibility of a visit by three members of the Turkish Veterans’ Association. The New Zealand Government refused permission for this visit to proceed. This was at the height of tensions resulting from the Cyprus Crisis, and the New Zealand Government was sensitive to the issue. Nevertheless, preparations went ahead for a veterans’ visit to Gallipoli in 1965. The Turkish ship Karadeniz was being refitted to accommodate 350 passengers. This was a forerunner of the arrangements for the influx of tourists to the Gallipoli - Çanakkale area over the Anzac Day period. At the local community level attitudes reformed: Turkish representatives were welcome. In Sydney, the Gallipoli Legion of Anzacs featured a photograph in their 1964 bulletin of one of their most respected honorary

94 Ibid, 58.
95 Ibid, 65.
97 Archives New Zealand ABHS 950, Acc W4627, Box 1040, 29/1/10 Pt 4. Anzac Day observance 1/5/60-1/12/68.
99 Archives New Zealand ABHS 950, Acc W4627, Box 1040, 29/1/10 Pt 4. Anzac Day observance 1/5/60-1/12/68.
members, Ali Reschad, whom they nicknamed ‘Our Turkish Delight.’\textsuperscript{100} The 50\textsuperscript{th} anniversary Anzac Day Gallipoli pilgrimage will be covered in Chapter Six.

While the late 60s and early 70s were dominated by the nightly TV newscasts of the Vietnam War, it was more the forces of time that were beginning to tell on the memory of the Anzac Day - Gallipoli connection. Most of the survivors were now in their late 80s or early 90s; many were in retirement homes. The number of World War I ex-servicemen had never been large in the national demographic of either New Zealand or Australia, because as a sector of the greater society their death rates had been considerably higher than those who remained at home. World War I had worn many into a premature grave. Nevertheless, individual families and workplaces respected the few who remained. The \textit{Prospect} magazine of the Colonial Mutual Life Office in April 1982 ran a story called ‘Lest We Forget’ on one of their former employees and Gallipoli veteran, Harold Collins.\textsuperscript{101}

Print material has also fixed public and academic attention on Gallipoli in the last 25 years. In 1978 there appeared the first edition of Patsy Adam-Smith’s scholarly and influential account \textit{The Anzacs}. It was one of the first in depth histories about Australian World War I servicemen.\textsuperscript{102} She saw the rapidly thinning ranks of WWI servicemen in a 1977 Anzac Day parade, and pithily described the trend: ‘These are the dying years.’\textsuperscript{103} Her book is a tribute which has greatly contributed to appreciation of the nation’s role in Gallipoli and other battlefields of World War I. By the 1980s there was resurgence of interest in Gallipoli driven by film and print media. The C.E.W. Bean diaries were reissued in 1983, but it was an earlier film that attracted the greatest

\textsuperscript{101} AWM PR 01459 Papers of Harold E. Collins, \textit{Prospect} magazine printed by the Colonial Mutual Life Office Apr. - May Issue 1982, 32. ‘Lest We Forget In April every year we commemorate the spirit of the armed forces of Australia and New Zealand, the Anzacs. Anzac Day April 25, is not a day of celebrating great victories, it is more a day to remember the sacrifices made by many men and women in time of war. For the men that are left it is a time to remember friendships and comradeship that is unattainable [sic] in civilian life. Harold Collins now 90 years old is one of these men. Harold a staff member of the Colonial Mutual Collector department 1957-1967 is bone of the few surviving veterans of Gallipoli and the second oldest member of the Royal Australian Flying Corps, he was awarded a number of decorations for his World war I service, including the Somme Medal, the Albert medal and the Croix Combattant de l’Europe.’
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid, xi.
The 1981, Peter Weir film *Gallipoli* sounded a sympathetic chord. In a moment of fervent national awakening, it suited the mood of young Australians. This film was a significant milestone in Australia and New Zealand, although controversial in Britain. While the official Anzac Day observances continued, the advent of film and TV documentaries captured the imagination of the young who composed many of the Gallipoli visitors.

In 1981, New Zealand historian Michael King wrote *New Zealanders at War* coinciding with a great rise of interest in Gallipoli and Anzac Day. His summation of the section detailing the work of the Anzacs at Gallipoli was that:

New Zealand and Australia’s response to the ‘debt of suffering’ was to establish Anzac Day (25 April) as an annual day of commemoration. For the next three generations it was to be the focal point for national mourning for all wars, and for expressions of patriotism in those countries. The myth grew that nothing less than an evolution of a national spirit had begun at Gallipoli; that both Dominions had ‘come of age’ on 25 April 1915. Major Fred Waite, official historian for the New Zealand contribution, put it this way: ‘before the war we were an untried and insular people; after ANZAC, we were tried and trusted.’ But at what frightful cost.

This statement encapsulates many truths about the Gallipoli - Anzac Day connection: the annual rite, the suffering and mourning, and the myth of coming of age. His biting conclusion draws attention to the particularly New Zealand view on Anzac Day - the enormous cost to both nations. King’s work was closely followed in 1984 by Christopher Pugsley’s *Gallipoli, the New Zealand Story*, a book which enhanced his well deserved reputation as an expert in the field.

Ken Inglis makes the attachment of Gallipoli with bereavement and memorialisation obvious. Gallipoli was not as great a catastrophe for Australia as the tragedies at Mouquet Farm at the site of Pozières in the Somme in 1916, or that at Bullecourt on the Hindenburg Line in 1917, but was
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105 AWM Souvenirs 1, Anzac Day Souvenirs Collection, Subseries: Services held at the AWM 5/10/1 1985-1989 and Services held at the AWM 5/11/1. 1990-1999. The 75th anniversary of the Gallipoli Landing was marked in 1990. After the one minute’s silence ‘In Flanders Fields’ was delivered by RAAF Officer Cadet A.Y. Jacka [relative of the WWI hero] of the Australian Defence Force Academy, and the Memorial Ode by WWII veteran Stephen Sutton.


107 Ibid, 131.

most significant.\textsuperscript{109} He refers to Gellert’s ‘sound of gentle sobbing in the South’; \textit{In Memoriam} columns where lines like ‘Too far away your grave to see; In Gallipoli’s lonely graveyard; Far from the land of wattle’ would be found; and inscriptions on monuments like that at Balmain, Sydney which proclaims ‘\textit{Dardanelles, Gaba Tepe, Australia, April 25th 1915}.\textsuperscript{110} They serve as an enduring reminder to all, particularly on Anzac Day, that there is a constant in the relationship of Australians with Anzac Day, and that constant is undeniably Gallipoli.

Near the end of the century, the historical landscape changed. Both recent and fading memories impacted on a new generation, most of whom had little direct experience of war. The two factors at play in this situation were the resurgence of interest in New Zealand, Australia and Turkey in Gallipoli as the stage for Anzac Day commemorations, and the death of almost all World War I Anzacs. The focus on Gallipoli was also driven by international tourist agencies which were eager to make a profit from the obvious increase in visitor numbers to Gallipoli. Tours were arranged from London, Australia and New Zealand, and within Turkey itself.\textsuperscript{111} The New Zealand and Australian governments made extensive preparations for attendance of official parties which included a few old Gallipoli veterans able to travel. There was a realisation that the Anzac world was at a juncture. The loss of Gallipoli veterans represented the irreplaceable. The State had to recognise them before the last ‘went West.’

In 1996, New Zealand Trade Negotiations Minister Philip Burdon felt the numbers attending the Gallipoli services, about 1500-2000 at the Dawn Parade, were far in excess of what was expected.\textsuperscript{112} He was questioned on his view of Anzac Day as New Zealand’s national day and responded: ‘The significance of Anzac Day for all the reasons we’ve been reflecting [on] does give it a sense of national identity, a sense of creation that transcends all the other, shall we say, influences that tend to flow across any other day in the national calendar.’\textsuperscript{113}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{109} Ibid, 90, 94, 97.
  \item \textsuperscript{110} Ibid, 101, 109.
  \item \textsuperscript{111} Travelshop Turkey, Bodrum, is based on the Kalender family and their hotel. They operate a travel agency specialising in Gallipoli tours. This writer was accompanied by owner Murti Kalender to Gallipoli over Anzac Day 24-25 April 2007.
  \item \textsuperscript{112} Trade Negotiations Minister Philip Burdon interviewed by Giles Beckford, ‘Good Morning New Zealand,’ national radio programme, 26 Apr. 1996 Message 58/274/1 MFAT Wellington to Ankara, MFAT File 58/274/2 Vol. 1. (Confidential) New Zealand External Relations with Turkey: Anzac Day Commemorations, 1 Jan. 1996-30 Nov. 1997. \textit{This is the first referencing of NZMFAT restricted material in this thesis. Prior permission must be obtained in writing to cite this material.}
  \item \textsuperscript{113}Ibid. Burdon provided another significant political statement connecting Gallipoli and New Zealand identity. This line has been followed by most visiting New Zealand politicians since then– including Prime Minister Helen Clark.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
In 1997 Tolga Örnek, director of *Gallipoli/Gelibolu: The Front Line Experience* 2005 Turkish film, went to Gallipoli and thought about the meaning of the activities of Kemel Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Turkey, and the famous line commander of the Turkish Corps which faced the Anzacs in 1915.114 The appreciation for Atatürk which Örnek possesses has become part of the knowledge acquired by visitors to Gallipoli. Turkish nationals are as curious as Anzac visitors about why their forefathers fought there. Memory stimulates curiosity about identity and reasons for past events. The film *Gallipoli – the Front Line Experience* is but one from a range of media materials available which sets out to address the needs of Turks and Anzacs about the respective roles of their forces in 1915.115

At the end of the twentieth century the preparations for Gallipoli commemoration of Anzac Day were no less elaborate than they had been for the 50th anniversary. The New Zealand Government was deeply involved in preparations for the Anzac Day 2000 visit of Prime Minister Helen Clark with Australian Prime Minister John Howard to Gallipoli for the dedication of the new Anzac Commemorative site at North Beach.116 Elsewhere, preparations which would cement the Gallipoli – Anzac Day connection were proceeding. Most significant in New Zealand was the Anzac Day observance at the National War Memorial in Buckle Street, Wellington, and the attendance of the Turkish Embassy representative - Counsellor of the Embassy, Mr Recep Peker, Charge d’ Affaires.117 The Wellington ‘National Wreathlaying Service and Commemorative Ceremony’ was followed by the immensely important Wreathlaying Ceremony at the Atatürk Memorial Anzac Day 2000.118 The Memorial was a new feature in the national landscape, and not just Wellington’s, because the Ataturk Memorial symbolised the close relations between New Zealand and Turkey. MFAT files point to the Turkish relationship with New Zealand being firmly cemented through the Gallipoli - based millennium events.119 There was a renewed level
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115 Refer to the bibliography for available films and videotapes.
116 Wartime – Official Magazine of the Australian War Memorial, Nuance Multimedia Australia, Victoria 3205, Issue 11, Spring 2000. The dedication of the Anzac Commemorative Site at North Beach, Gallipoli by PMs John Howard and Helen Clark.
119 MFAT File PRD/CE/9 Vol 1, NZDF 1113/2 30 Mar. 2000 Administrative Instruction No 11/00. Ceremonial–Anzac Day, 15 Oct. 1999-18 Apr. 2000 - Dawn service at the Wellington Cenotaph will be arranged by the Wellington RSA with support from local defence units. The Citizen’s Service at the Wellington Cenotaph arranged by the Wellington City Council. The Wreathlaying ceremony for community representatives and organisations, then church service. WCC liaise with local Navy and Army units. National Wreathlaying at the National War Memorial,
of involvement for Turkey in the arrangements for Anzac Day and its clear connection with events in Gallipoli. It would now be unconscionable to leave the Turkish Embassy representatives out of the frame. The Anzac Prime Ministers were in Gallipoli with representatives of the Republic. Anzac Day on the millennium received its highest accolade since the inception in London in 1916.

**Conclusion**

An enduring concern with the soldier graves on Gallipoli dominated Anzac Day matters throughout the twentieth century. It was not just a concern of the immediate families and the first generation in the pre-World War II period which engaged the attention of individuals who wished to visit Gallipoli. Organisations such as the RSSILA, NZRSA and ADCC, and government agencies such as the Australian Government Department of Veterans’ Affairs and Veterans’ Affairs New Zealand – Te Tira Ahu Ika a Whira, were involved. The principal issue here is one of loss, and fidelity. It was important from 1916 to express concern for the graves. It was one of the few ways to respect the work done by the original Anzacs. Since 1970 the government of the Republic of Turkey exercised a more direct influence over the matter of Turkish gravesites, and engaged more fully with Australian and New Zealand governments over the procedures followed at Gallipoli on and around Anzac Day.

The influences of changing historical landscape have been exercised on Gallipoli, the place. From being captured, named and ‘owned’ by the Anzacs, despite the actuality of defeat by December 1915. Gallipoli was possessed by the Anzac nations and transfigured to a place of sad glory. It became the central and dominant reference for memory on Anzac Days throughout the century. Concern for the Gallipoli cemeteries, a reflection of the regret felt in leaving the dead ‘over there’ and so betraying them has also changed. By the time of 1965 Anzac veterans’ Pilgrimage the physical landscape, though among the best preserved of World War I battlefields, was no longer immediately recognisable to the men of 1915. Ten years later, with the Vietnam War, for many it was irrelevant. However, from 1965 Gallipoli has become a tourist mecca, and a focus of revived
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Buckle St, arranged by Dept Internal Affairs, Visits and Ceremonial Office (VCO) with support from HQ NZDF. Wreathlaying at the Ataturk Memorial where the Ambassador of Turkey will lay a wreath arranged by VCO HQNZDF support. Beating the Retreat Army service NZ Army Band and the Wellington and Hawkes Bay Regiment band at Te Papa commencing 1600 hours.
memories, both Anzac and Turkish. Both management techniques and ownership issues at the highest level contributed to make Gallipoli by 2000 a shrine to Anzac memory.

On a personal level, Gallipoli has come to mean much more than just the Peninsula, the place of a now long-past battlefield. There is a spiritual dimension to the place which lingers. Records of a range of observers who have visited the Gallipoli graves show sensitivity to some indefinable spiritual dimension. From the clear records of Ian Hamilton and W.E. Stanton-Hope in the 1930s to those of Australian writer Robert Kearney who recorded his feelings about visiting the Gallipoli sites in 2002 there has been a clear attachment to place. Kearney wrote: ‘I knew then as I do now that Gallipoli is more, much more than ceremonies, monuments, battle sites and graves.’ Memory and emotion intersect here and there is ownership of a privileged kind – a creation of a special landscape in a socio-cultural context. Kearney feels recognition and belonging in a foreign land yet made familiar by the actions so long ago by his countrymen.

Gallipoli has continued as a constant in the equation that constitutes Anzac Day. It has overcome the principal obstacle of time. This raises perplexing questions. How can a landscape of one era, now well past, continue to convey meaning in the present? What intrinsic features of landscape and memory contain elements which allow them to endure? Gallipoli became through the century an idealised background, the measuring stick by which all subsequent military actions would be measured. That function allowed it to survive. It represented the most impossible of cases – a defeat, yet redefined through the eyes of the Anzacs in the contemporary imperial British framework as a victory. Meanings as well as memories change over time, and the Gallipoli-Anzac Day connection was no exception.

Chapter Three, ‘the crimson rata [of] sacrifice…’
- Anzac Days in New Zealand to 1945.

This chapter traces the development of Anzac Day in New Zealand between its inception and the end of World War II. Did general public discussion about a day of commemoration before Tuesday 25 April 1916 reflect spontaneity or planning? This thesis argues that Anzac Day in New Zealand did not begin spontaneously. Both Maureen Sharpe and Stephen Clarke suggest spontaneity, although Sharpe’s statement is couched more cautiously, lacking the word ‘spontaneously’ as used by Clarke. This thesis challenges the notion that the day itself was the initiation of commemorative gestures, and further rebuts the suggestion that the day was a spontaneous reaction. A culture of commemoration existed prior to the 1916 Anzac Day, and there were extensive civic preparations for the first Anzac Day observances.

One of the key figures in the initiation of Anzac Day in New Zealand was Gallipoli veteran Captain Donald Simson. He established the Wellington RSA clubrooms and the RSA national association and became the focus of considerable public debate. In some ways his work briefly mirrored that of Canon David Garland in Brisbane, and it is possible they knew each other. The place of memorials is discussed, with particular reference to the lengthy debate over and construction of the Wellington National Memorial and Carillon. For most communities monuments, particularly cenotaphs, and their surrounding grassed areas became and remained ‘sacred spaces’ of memory which were tended with care. In 1936, Anzac Day had its 20th anniversary. The year serves as a snapshot of Anzac Day in a society which was again confronting the massing of clouds of war within one generation. World War II brought changes to New Zealand society, but Anzac Day was still commemorated, sometimes in unusual places. The little-known phenomenon of Anzac Day in Stalag 383 Hohenfels, Bavaria, allows a glimpse of the readiness of POWs to stage a day of remembrance and sports.

**Anzac Day ‘spontaneity’ in New Zealand?**

The landscape of the first Anzac Day was built from the memories and interpretations of Gallipoli, which in turn overlaid those of the early part of World War I, and historical events like the 1899-1902 South African War. Monuments in the physical landscape reminded communities of involvement in that conflict, supplemented by memories of more distant campaigns - the Crimean War of 1854-56, and the New Zealand Wars of the 1860s. The Gallipoli campaign rapidly overcame all previous experiences once the powerfully descriptive writings of Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett were published. Prior to the Dardanelles campaign, casualty lists of New Zealand and Australian servicemen appeared in local and regional newspapers. An eventful landscape brought to the foreground the dangers of sickness, wounding and death which foreshadowed that of Gallipoli.\(^{123}\) Did a similar culture of commemoration exist in New Zealand, as Moses proposed for Australia? Is it worthwhile to accept Sharpe’s position of a general demand arose for a day of remembrance? It does not go far enough.

Allan Davidson’s analysis of the stand of the New Zealand churches in World War I provides some light.\(^{124}\) He feels that the larger churches justified the Allied cause throughout the war, and that in 1915 there were memorial services. He cites Churchill Julius, Anglican Bishop of Christchurch, addressing ‘A special memorial service for the New Zealand soldiers fallen on the battlefield in the Dardanelles,’ on 6 June 1915 in the Cathedral, and local St. Barnabas’s Church, holding a special service for four Fendalton men.\(^{125}\) Davidson’s analysis appears fragile. There are simply too few examples provided to prove the case.

In a related exercise, this author examined New Zealand newspaper accounts and local church records for evidence supporting or denying the idea that a culture of commemoration existed prior to the first commemoration of Anzac Day in 1916. Newspaper evidence was fragmentary. References to the war were recorded in 1915 Easter services\(^{126}\) but there was no mention of special prayer meetings or commemorative services for sacrifice or for the war dead. By mid-May 1915, fifteen casualty lists had been distributed to newspapers - notice of which might
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\(^{125}\) Ibid, 453, 461-462.

\(^{126}\) Wellington *Evening Post*, 5 Apr. 1915, 2.
supply the motive for commemorative prayers. On the first anniversary of the war, 4 August 1915, news reports were of business as usual, ‘no financial panic, no industrial collapse.’ The papers recorded the annual conference of the New Zealand Chambers of Commerce’s appreciation and admiration for the conduct of the NZEF at Gallipoli, and sincere sympathy for the relatives of the fallen and wounded soldiers. The same report contained a notice for a ‘memorial service’ to be held in St. Paul’s Pro-Cathedral, Wellington, that evening. On the same day, the anniversary of the beginning of the war, ‘services of intercession’ were arranged to be held in another (un-named) Anglican church in Wellington, and three Congregational churches. But this was an anniversary occasion which allowed for services which could be described as commemorative only in the broad sense. Indeed, a mid-August criticism of the stand of the churches under correspondence was entitled in bold font ‘THE SILENCE OF OUR PULPITS’ in which C. N. Roberts of Wellington wrote to the editor of the Evening Post berating churches for the absence of consolation for the bereaved. He contrasted the dearth of appropriate services with the English situation where reports indicated a culture of commemoration existed. There, of course, the sounds of war at times could be heard across the Channel.

New Zealand church records were more forthcoming. Some Anglican churches held ‘Intercession Services’ where a list of names of members of the parish involved in the war, or who had died in the war, was read aloud. In the Dunedin Anglican diocese, only two churches recorded regular intercessory services, both of them in High Church parishes. In the working class district of Caversham, on the margin of the most densely populated and working class area of the city, the local Anglican church records have no mention of prayers or special services pre-Anzac Day.
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127 Ibid, 13 May 1915, 8.
129 Ibid, 18 Aug. 1915, 3, where the writer, Roberts quotes from the service for fallen Canadians held in St Paul’s Cathedral, London; the vicar of Weston, Rev. Charles Tweedale on soldier deaths; and the Rev. Henry Mayne in Westminster Abbey speaking on spiritualism and the everlasting soul.
130 All Saints Anglican Church (Dunedin) Records: Minutes – ‘The Annual Report of the Churchwardens and Vestry, April 27th 1916, 1, recorded “The Roll of Honour,” a list of over 60 names read at the weekly Intercession Service, keeps record of young parishioners serving in the war, most of them born and baptised in the Parish. Those who have fallen are Kenneth Sinclair Thomson, lieutenant in the Indian cavalry regiment, George Martin Chapman, surgeon-captain, RAMC; John Hugh Allen, lieutenant in the Worcester regiment, and Percy Cameron, Donald Herbert, Richard Ibbotson, Thomas Davidson, of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force.’ The Annual reports for 30 Apr. 1917, and 30 Apr. 1918 reflect the increasing numbers of deaths and the continuation of intercessory services. In 1919, the Annual Report for 25 April reported a Roll of Honour being prepared for erection in the church with more than 150 names of those who served, and thirty with crosses alongside names for the fallen. St. Matthews Anglican Church (Dunedin): Vestry Minute Book for 30 August 1915 records a motion to hold an Intercessory Service on Wednesday evenings at 7.45pm with advertisements placed in the two major dailies, and a retiring collection for the Wounded Soldiers’ Fund. Also the minute for 28 Mar. 1917 records that a collection was to be held on Anzac Day which was to be devoted to the Fallen Soldiers’ Fund.
The main concerns of this church were financial, including rates payments and maintaining incumbents. Class stratification was reflected in the enthusiasm that wealthier and High Church parishes attached to both intercessory and Anzac Day services. In contrast, the Dunedin Moray Place Congregational Church recorded a note of disappointment with low attendances at ‘week-evening’ services honouring the dead and wounded, and this despite an ever rising roll of the fallen. Roman Catholic churches carried no records for the period. Dunedin churches which held commemorative services were those attended by the influential and wealthy. Other churches had a markedly lower incidence of commemorative and intercessory practices.

Other evidence supporting Moses’ claim of a culture of commemoration as a principal driving force for Anzac Day can be found in the official magazines of the Methodist and Presbyterian churches of New Zealand. The church most closely allied with the Anglican faith, the Methodist Church, posted intercessory services for Sunday, 31 October 1915, following the recommendation of the British Conference, its parent body. In January 1916, it ran an editorial on Gallipoli graves, which strongly rebutted the notion of failure and proclaimed: ‘In these southern lands we have a personal interest in those graves at Gallipoli, [an] inextinguishable claim [where] their spirit lives on.’ Memory was invoked as having higher functions: ‘The touch of a vanished hand, / And the sound of a voice that is still.’

In early March 1916 the editor of The New Zealand Methodist Times, Rev. J. Williams of Christchurch recorded the activities of Chaplain - Captain J. R. Sullivan who had given an impassioned speech at the ‘Young People’s Demonstration’ at the Pitt Street Methodist Church,
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132 Moray Place Congregational Church: Records – Annual Reports (published), HOCK AG-036/031 55th Annual Report [1917] 4th Annual Report ‘during the currency of this great War.’
133 The Catholic Diocesan Office records and The Tablet Catholic newspaper searchable records for the period carry no entries for special services for the soldiers or for bereaved families. Although no special intercessory services may have been held, prayers for the souls of the dead soldiers, the injured and ill, and for their families would have been a part of the normal masses. Discussion with Fr. John Harrison, Chancellor, St. Joseph’s Cathedral, Dunedin, 17 Mar. 2008.
Auckland, on the eve of the church’s Annual Conference in late February 1916. Sullivan was a Gallipoli veteran who urged his listeners to see the Anzac call as a ‘call to prayer.’ In doing so, he not only steered the Conference in a spirited manner towards acceptance of Anzac themes but also foreshadowed the first Anzac Day events.136

The Methodist Times, Vol. VI, No. 20, 1.

The New Zealand Presbyterian Church followed a similar pattern. Sunday, 3 January 1915 was advertised as a ‘National Day of Prayer,’ following the ecumenical recommendation from the two Anglican Primates of England, conveyed in a message from the King’s private secretary, Stamfordham.137 Sunday, 8 August 1915 was posted as ‘Intercession Day’ in Wellington, a day suggested by Prime Minister William Massey in concert with the heads of various churches.138 At this service, the liturgy included one of those parts which became familiar in later Anzac Day services: a Memoriam of the fallen and the Dead March from ‘Saul.’139 In December 1915, the Presbyterian Church General Assembly recorded in its ‘Memorial Minutes’ a minute passed in

sympathetic silence ‘In memory to those who have fallen at the front.’ Controversially, in a tone more reflective of the 1930s, Moderator Rev. William Scorgie promoted the General Assembly’s intention to set apart Sunday 19 March 1916 as a ‘day of humiliation and prayer in connection with the war.’ While the wording attracted adverse reactions, the honouring of popular Chaplain-Major William Grant, who had been killed while ministering to the wounded at Gallipoli, was popularly received.

Similar intercessory gestures were reflected in country towns. The Riversdale Presbyterian Church, Southland ran ‘special services’ on Sunday, 12 March 1916, when the Roll of Honour was unveiled and its 18 names read aloud. The evening gathering took ‘the form of a special memorial in respect to the memory of those men who have died that we might live.’ On 11 April 1916, the editor of *The Outlook* recommended, as Moderator Scorgie had previously about the nature of intercessory days, that 25 April should be ‘a day of humiliation and prayer.’ This was the Presbyterian Church’s answer to the possibility of the day being promoted as a platform for enlistment. While the church had no problem with that directive from William Massey, it seemed to the editor of *The Outlook* that more important matters, like respect for sacrifice might be overridden.

Moses’ claim for a ‘local upsurge of “grief management” within the framework of traditional Christian liturgy as a source of energy leading to the institutionalisation of Anzac Day,’ seems convincing, and applicable to New Zealand in the light of the above evidence. Ongoing grief management practices support an argument that a social and spiritual framework existed prior to the first Anzac Day. This cultural framework eased planning for the day. The speed with which the first Anzac Day commemoration happened reflected an existing war infrastructure. Civic planning could be effective and swift. Its speed of occurrence would later assume the appearance of spontaneity.

142 Ibid, Vol. XXIII, No. 11, 14 Mar. 1916, 16 - 17. A memorial tablet to Chaplain-Major Grant was unveiled at Knox Theological Hall, Dunedin, where he was alumnus of 1884-1885. He died 28 August 1915.
145 Ibid, 3-4.
Stephen Clarke writing in the NZRSA website, states that the Christchurch RSA which formed in December 1915 was one of a number of organisations which had formed an ‘Anzac Day subcommittee’ and was seeking to hold a commemorative service.\textsuperscript{146} It had decided that an 11 am service was appropriate for 25 April and had written to the Canterbury Jockey Club asking them to postpone the commencement of racing until 1 p.m. in lieu of 12 noon. Clarke asserted:

Similar calls for a day of remembrance arose spontaneously from amongst returned soldiers and civic leaders throughout the country. It was a civic delegation in Wellington, in fact, which persuaded the government to gazette on 5 April 1916 a general half-day holiday for 25 April.\textsuperscript{147}

Did this pressure from a lobby group, appealing for change represent spontaneity or manipulation? Clarke, faced by the conundrum, had a shilling both ways. The words in fact made it sound as though he liked the idea of a spontaneous response to calls for a day of remembrance but conceded that it was precipitated by a delegation approaching Massey in Wellington. Does one preclude the other? The New Zealand experience is certainly not the same as the careful manoeuvring found in Australia. The more minutely we examine an event the more likely we are to deny it spontaneity. Anzac Day 1916 was an anniversary, and as such, required planning. At a distance however, events kaleidoscope and the preparation period seems conflated with activities of the Day. Memories are retained of the event, but not the conditions of its preparation simply because public focus is on the event itself.

It is a truism that the more distant we are in time from an event, the more likely we are to perceive it as spontaneous. There is also a sense of romance about spontaneity. It seems more acceptable at a distance to believe that the initiation of Anzac Day was a natural and respectful outcome of community recognition of war sacrifice and service. It avoids discussion and revelation of debates which happened at the time. Strongly held sectarian views which coloured Anzac Days in the first half of the century are obscured, and the atmosphere of the Day is ennobled.

The issue of spontaneity is linguistically and metaphorically related to scale. It is closely related to similar feelings about evolution and revolution. ‘Spontaneous’ seems to beg for the big bang.

\textsuperscript{147} Ibid, 1.
A small fire is simply ‘lit’ or ‘catches’ while an explosion is more likely to be seen as spontaneous. There is a case to be made for seeing the event as intensely emotional for the public. The Day seems greater if it contains this surprise or intensity. This is a reflection of the natural human trait of exaggeration – the first, the greatest, the most frightening – are all expressions found in community narratives. Any hint of planning or foreknowledge diminishes the possibility of spontaneity. Happening within the confines of an existing European War bogged down in trench warfare, and with an awareness of Gallipoli sacrifices, commemorative ceremonies must have been discussed.

W.F. Massey, the New Zealand Prime Minister, gazetted a notice informing the public that the Government had decided that a half-holiday, commencing at 1 pm, was to be observed on Tuesday, 25 April 1916, in commemoration of ‘Anzac Day,’ and ‘would be glad if the Mayors of all cities and boroughs, the Chairmen of County Councils and Town Boards…will similarly observe the day in remembrance of the notable deeds performed by the Australians and our brave New Zealand soldiers on that memorable and historical occasion.’

He recommended to ministers of religion and all congregations to hold services in the forenoon or afternoon as convenient. The New Zealand Ensign was to be displayed on all public buildings in the Dominion and shipping companies were to direct harboured ships to display flags on the day.

Official opinion was ‘That the day should not be marked by the holding of sports or similar forms of entertainment.’ Massey also recommended the use of the day as one where recruiting bodies and others could arrange patriotic meetings for the evening ‘not only to commemorate the anniversary, but also with a view to assisting the recruiting campaign, the question of how this may be best done being left entirely to the discretion of those immediately concerned.’ The main features of this pronouncement were to encourage a national day of observance based on the deeds at Gallipoli, discouragement of sports or frivolous activities, and to permit local activities which lifted enlistment. The stress shifted little in 1917; when the first date mooted was 23 April, St. George’s Day, because municipal elections were set for the 25 April. Again, the Gallipoli connection of ‘notable deeds performed…on that memorable and historical occasion’

---

148 New Zealand Gazette [NZG], 6 Apr. 1916, 977, Observances respecting Anzac Day.
149 Ibid. This issue solemnised the day, but went against the tone of contemporary soldier celebrations.
150 NZG, 6 Apr. 1916, 977, Observances respecting Anzac Day.
was reiterated, flags were to be flown all day, patriotic meetings were to be held, but sports and other entertainments were omitted.¹⁵¹

New Zealand in the Empire, ‘Our National Register –The Answer to the Summons,’ NZFL, 5 November 1915, 3. The cartoon featured a young recruit in civilian garb proudly saluting the helmed female figure of ‘Zealandia,’ daughter of Britannia. Behind her proudly flung out in the breeze is the Union Jack and the caption reflects the response of the volunteer: ‘The Answer to the Summons: Here I am, right willing to serve. Take me and use me, dear Mother Country.’ The attitudes and language are loyal to Britain, the ‘Mother Country.’

¹⁵¹ NZG No 52, 11 Apr. 1918, 1084; NZG No. 138, 7 December 1916, 3765, ‘Amending Notice as to the Use of the word “Anzac,” for prohibitions applying to the manufacture or sale of jewellery, ornaments, badges or other articles with the word “Anzac” thereon, or for the use of the word in design, trademark, trade-name or such description.’
Support for the argument of detailed planning at the highest level of state is found correspondence between Sir Thomas Mackenzie, the New Zealand High Commissioner in London, and Prime Minister William Massey. On 11 April 1916, Mackenzie cabled Massey with the following message:

It is proposed to have service in Westminster Abbey on 25th April in commemoration first anniversary of landing at Anzac (stop). Two thousand Australian New Zealand troops to take part and march through heart London. Movement originated by High Commissioner for Australia. Hope proposal meets with your concurrence. Mackenzie.¹⁵²

This vital cablegram has handwritten notes attached: one in the hand of Massey dated 12 April indicating the message was to be passed to James Allen, the Minister of Defence; the other, a marginal note from Allen to Massey: ‘I suggest you reply that the proposal meets with your approval provided that N.Z. soldiers are not kept from the fighting line who should be there.’

This correspondence resulted in a coded telegramme from Massey to the Deputy High Commissioner, London: ‘Uncheckal Carvists Anzacday protocele. Services patriotic gatherings hipnofobia throughout nexasle Massey.’ This message gave permission for the event to proceed in London and for New Zealand troops to be involved as long as they were not needed in France.¹⁵³ The discovery of this material directed this thesis to the matters of management features in landscape. In agreement with Hirsch and O’Hanlon where cultural landscape is a process and management is at the heart its control, this telegram has a vital purpose. This is essential material for appreciating the commitment of the nation, and the detailed organisation needed. It cements the New Zealand - Australian connection at the imperial level and credits Andrew Fisher, the High Commissioner for Australia with the origin of the idea.¹⁵⁴

Previously, and at a local level, Dunedin Mayor Clark, spoke in elevated tones to the crowd gathered at the Dunedin railway station for the departure of the 14th Reinforcements to the Western Front. He referred to the place of Anzac as and how the men before him had a standard to reach:

¹⁵³ Ibid.
¹⁵⁴ Andrew Fisher was the Australian High Commissioner in London from 1 January 1916 to 1 January 1921.
We have in this land many pages of which we are proud, but the page that fills us with greatest pride, and will for all time be the brightest page in our history, is the story of Anzac, of the men of New Zealand and Australia, who in their first fight, did such marvellous work for the Empire...We realise what the sacrifice is for these men, and more particularly to the loved ones they are leaving behind. We give all honour and praise to the wives and mothers and loved ones, who are sending these men away to fight for us. - (Applause.).

Clark’s speech preceded Anzac Day by six weeks and revealed the landscape in which the first anniversary was founded. The high and unequivocal praise heaped on the original Anzacs is set as a marker for the new reinforcements. The tone is unremittingly optimistic as one would expect from a civic leader addressing departing troops. Acceptable British masculine and civic virtues are stressed: ‘greatest pride,’ ‘brightest page,’ ‘marvellous work,’ ‘played the game,’ ‘honour and glory,’ ‘bulldog spirit,’ and ‘heroic men.’ Notably, the applause, as recorded, was reserved to the mention of the sacrifice of the affected family members – ‘loved ones’ – wives, mothers, and the impulsion behind sending the men. This provides the only hint of empathy and inclusion in an otherwise masculinist and upbeat address. In a background sense the place of British men is there: ‘marvellous work for the Empire,’ ‘incalculable work for the civilised world,’ ‘fight as British soldiers can fight,’ the rejection of the claim of decadence, and ‘the strong Imperial love of Empire and country.’ Through an interesting turn of phrase they are being ‘sent’ by those whom they would regard as their closest and most nurturing, their families. It reflected the times: masculine, bullish, and imperial.

The preparations were extensive. The mayor was fully engaged with patriotic matters: letters of condolence, managing the ‘Special Committee for all Civic Functions’ including welcomes for returned soldiers, following up enquiries from men keen to enlist, settling the qualms of a respected German-Jewish family whose son was serving in Egypt, arranging for local pipe and highland bands to be reimbursed for civic functions associated with the war effort, working with other regional representatives in compiling lists of the names of ‘shirkers’, correspondence with Prime Minister Massey over matters of citizenship and co-ordinating arrangements with the local RSA branches for the coming Anzac Day.

---

155 ODT, 10 March 1916, 2. ‘14th reinforcements leave.’
156 Ibid.
The detailed material in his 12 April letter to the Secretary of the Returned Soldiers’ club indicated forethought and willingness for cooperation with the military in the matter of the first Anzac Day ceremonies. The generally optimistic viewpoint on war was, curiously, also reflected visually, in the bunting covering the Dunedin Town Hall. The Anzac Day photograph shows a string of pennants and flags over the front of the building with a happy-looking, large crowd below the balcony spilling out into the upper Octagon. Sharpe describes the delivery of

---

158 DCC M/O 1/3 Mayors’ Letter Book, 2 December 1915 - 2 May 1918, 64: Mayor J.J. Clark to Secretary Returned Soldiers’ Association, Anzac Club House, Moray Place, Dunedin, 12 April 1916.
speeches in Dunedin to a large crowd at the Town Hall by the Mayor and Mayor-elect, and recounts employees from the Hillside Railway workshops marching into town with banners flying to meet the Minister of Defence. Sharpe cites New Zealand’s role as the first Dominion to offer assistance to Britain and the first to occupy enemy territory – German Samoa. It was a ‘period of initial enthusiasm, [where] the war seemed to offer New Zealand a chance to prove itself.’

Nevertheless, not all in the community shared the prevailing attitude. There were a few discordant voices focussed on the commemorative nature of the day. On 22 April 1916, Rev. H.B. Goertz, of The Vicarage, Port Chalmers, penned a letter to the Editor of the ODT, published on Anzac Day, remonstrating against the Government issuing ‘holiday excursion [railway] tickets’ for the day. He began:

When Tuesday, April 25, was set aside for special observance as ‘Anzac Day,’ the head of Government (Mr Massey) intimated that it was desirable that the day should be a ‘holy day’ in the truest sense – not devoted to festivity, pleasure-seeking, and junketing, but rather as an occasion for the remembrance of our heroic dead who performed a deed of valour unsurpassed in the annals of the world!

He compared the problem with that of declining Good Friday observance and felt that unwarranted levity on Anzac Day gave rise to feelings of which ‘callous dancing on a new-made grave would not be more ghastly.’ This was the only letter of this sort in the column, and not found in succeeding editions. It is difficult to gauge whether it reflected public revulsion over possible desecration of the day. However, it did foreshadow what was in the future a major debate in New Zealand and Australia over the special character of the day. He was not entirely alone. Near the chosen date for Anzac Day a NZFL report by ‘Rona,’ a Sydney correspondent, carried the news of a debate in New South Wales over whether the Anzac Day souvenir booklet ought to be black-edged. The same gossipy report also carried news about the activities of the ADCC; the Tasman was not a knowledge barrier.

---

159 Sharpe, 18-19.
161 NZFL Vol. XV, No. 824, 14 Apr. 1916, 5.
In its first January 1916 issue, the *NZFL* ran a poem written for New Year’s Day by a regular contributor, W. Goode Hamilton. It was ‘At the Front,’ a verse of which read:

And then I saw the breaking  
Of Dardanelles’ death door  
And watched our ‘Anzac’ shaking  
The Turks from Tepe’s shore;  
As packs of hounds they hunted  
The foe from ridge and rocks  
Nor halted till confronted  
By impenetrable locks.”

This verse emotionally pointed out the new war landscape which posed death in the Dardanelles as an image of passage, or a devil to wager with, and deified it in reference to sisters and mothers. It was published before Anzac Day and was a foretaste of the flood of interest in Gallipoli and any proposed memorialisation. It was not however the first reference to Gallipoli and Anzac Day which the *NZFL* had published. In late November, 1915, Wellington had held ‘Gallipoli Day Sports’ in which local Reinforcements participated in both athletic sports and a ‘hat-trimming competition.’

This was followed in late February 1916 by an ‘Anzac Remembrance day in aid of [the Wellington] Soldiers’ Home.’ Produce, flowers and buttons were sold on the streets in a manner reminiscent of Adelaide’s Anzac Day the previous 13 October. Captain Donald Simson, a man whose efforts on behalf of returned soldiers was to connect his name with Anzac Day in New Zealand in mid-January 1916 opened a ‘Club for Returned Soldiers in premises on Lambton-quay.’ It was not planning for Anzac Day in April which dominated the intervening months, but the casualty lists and stories about the efforts of individual New Zealanders. Also capturing the headlines were the stories of derring-do – like that of the ‘the brilliant war correspondent,’ Mr Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett. He was to give a series of lectures under the J. & N. Tait management in Australia and New Zealand in February 1916 recounting how he escaped death when the vessel *Majestic* was torpedoed by a German submarine, and had his life saved by

---

164 Ibid, Vol. XV, No. 818, 3 Mar. 1916, 10; ibid,Vol. XV, No. 819, 10 Mar. 1916, 21: photographs of ‘Anzac Remembrance Day in Wellington,’ with mainly women and children shown. This was no more a first ‘Anzac Day’ than was the previous effort in Adelaide, but does indicate keenness by the public to participate in an event of this sort.
the timely intervention of a cruiser’s cutter which rescued him. As a journalist for the London Daily Telegraph he had dished the more orthodox C.E.W. Bean by getting his reports offshore from Gallipoli more quickly than Bean, and created for himself the authority of being first.

In view of the existence of widespread public discussion about the exploits of the Anzacs, and promotion of their efforts by the journalists Ashmead-Bartlett, C.E.W. Bean and Malcolm Ross, but importantly the legislation passed by the Massey Government leading to the gazetting of the day as a public holiday, it is difficult to be a protagonist for the ‘spontaneous’ beginning argument for the day. Taking account of the pre-existing culture of commemoration is also cogent. Without it, Anzac Day in 1916 makes little sense, couched as it was in religious terms in a society not yet secularised.

**Captain Donald Simson**

At the time of Ellis Ashmead-Barlett’s visit to Wellington, another man, who promoted Anzac Day and returned soldiers’ causes, was coming to prominence. He was Captain Donald Petrie Simson, a Gallipoli veteran who worked tirelessly on behalf of the returned men, but whose furlough in New Zealand suffered mixed reviews. Despite the acrimony which surrounded his departure from New Zealand, his work in 1916 impinges on the establishment of Anzac Day in a way not dissimilar to that of the Brisbane-based Reverend David Garland, the Australian ‘architect’ of the Day. There is little written about Simson in New Zealand and even today he is

---

166 NZFL Vol. XV, No 813, 28 Jan. 1916, 16; No. 823, 7 Apr. 1916, 10; No. 824, 14 Apr. 1916, 6, 10. Ashmead-Bartlett was performing in the Wellington Town Hall on 13 and 15 Apr., prior to the anniversary of the Anzac landing, providing more than an adequate advertisement for the upcoming first Anzac Day. The glowing terms used to describe ‘the brilliant writer,’ Ashmead-Bartlett and his famous war lectures, ‘With the Anzacs at the Dardanelles…Australians and New Zealanders making history.’ Bartlett was busy hoping to make money from this lecture tour of New Zealand and Australia. He was reinforcing the memories which his optimistic writings had established in 1915. In May 1916 he was in Dunedin’s Burn’s Hall lecturing in his position as ‘official representative of the British press’ who had garnered ‘first hand information of the operations in the Dardanelles, and the many incidents which he witnessed.’ His despatches were lavishly described, as was his extensive war background, and he was to illustrate the talk with views and maps; [www.anzacsites.gov.au/landing/bartlett.html](http://www.anzacsites.gov.au/landing/bartlett.html) Accessed 1 Nov. 2008.

167 Richard Stowers, Rough Riders at War, Richard Stowers, Hamilton, New Zealand, 2002, 175. Records Lieutenant Donald Petrie Simpson [sic] 8 Contingent, D Squadron, accountant of Hepburn St, Ponsonby, Auckland, born in Otago, died in Auckland January 1961, was in the King Edwards Horse; a Captain 4/642A in the Great War, joined the New Zealand Engineers in Britain. Wounded in Gallipoli, three decorations, founder of the NZRSA 1916, KBE 1939 in South Africa, KCB in 1939 and holder of the King’s Coronation Medal; ATL ‘New Zealand Biographical Clippings’, 1950-51, Vol 1–1965 Vol. 2, Fiche 307, 71 (Auckland Star 24 January 1961, unpaged) adds little extra apart from addressing him as Captain Sir Donald Petrie Simson who had been commissioned with the Otago Contingent for the South African War, and he remained in South Africa for 10 years occupying administrative positions in Johannesburg. He returned to England for 21 years after his convalescence from Gallipoli in New Zealand and was the Honorary Secretary to the British Empire Service League – for which work he received honours.
unrecognised by the public. His role was vital to the establishment and perception of the Day in New Zealand, and there is a curious similarity with the Day as it was established in Brisbane. The similarity, in terms of form and timing, make the possibility of correspondence between Simson and Garland highly likely. The NZFL files for the period January to September 1916 outline the stellar career of Donald Simson. In January he first featured as opening a ‘Club for Returned Soldiers in premises on Lambton-quay.’\textsuperscript{168} By March, he was championing the rights of the returned soldiers by appealing for free tram rides for the men in Wellington, and in doing so earned the commendation of the editor of the NZFL who pointed out that if it was good enough for city councillors to have the privilege, why not ‘the valiant men who have returned disabled in many cases from the fighting front?’\textsuperscript{169} In the next issue he was the subject of editorial comment for his efforts for returned soldiers.\textsuperscript{170}

His star ascended rapidly. Just prior to Anzac Day he challenged the Government’s policies on recruiting as insufficient and supported Ellis Ashmead Bartlett’s claim that the war would last much longer than anticipated.\textsuperscript{171} In the NZFL post-Anzac Day issue, Simson was reported as the leader of ‘a great company of men of Anzac’ who had paraded down Lambton Quay and entered the Town Hall memorial service at 3 pm to a rapturous reception.\textsuperscript{172} His name was closely associated with that of the Prime Minister, Sir Joseph Ward, and with the style of that first Anzac Day. It would have been hard for the public to escape the notion that this was a great man doing vital work for the nation, and that the first Anzac anniversary was to some extent his doing. By May he was in demand as an after-dinner speaker and he featured in reports of the influential Patriotic Society.\textsuperscript{173} But also in that month a discordant note was sounded about perceptions of his work and his personal motives. It seemed that jealous forces were moving against him. There was a NZFL report that he had been appointed to the 12th Engineers and the hint of a schism between his personal inclination to finish the work of founding the Returned Soldiers’ Association and the national interest. Despite the tremor of May 1916 he was still in New Zealand.

\textsuperscript{170}Ibid, Vol. XV, No. 819, 10 Mar. 1916, 8, ‘Lancings.’
\textsuperscript{171}Ibid, Vol. XV, No. 824, 14 Apr. 1916, 6.
\textsuperscript{172}Ibid, Vol. XV, No. 826, 28 Apr. 1916, 15.
\textsuperscript{173}Ibid, Vol. XV, No. 827, 5 May 1916, 14.
Zealand in August, and riding high as President of the inaugural Conference of Returned Soldiers.\textsuperscript{174}

Captain Donald Simson as First President of the New Zealand Returned Soldiers’ Association, 29 April 1916. He is seated in the second row, 4\textsuperscript{th} from the left.

Captain Donald Simson was the first President of the inaugural Returned Services Association for New Zealand. By September 1916, despite the enthusiasm with which the reports describe him as having been a founder of the Wellington Returned Soldiers’ Clubhouse Society, which ‘stands as a monument to Captain Simson’s zeal and is now appealing to citizens to enrol as subscribers,’ there was a good deal of debate about whether or not he was self-serving.\textsuperscript{175} The debate was further strengthened by a rumour that he was going to suddenly leave the country. He had upset officialdom by publicly airing feelings not shared by many other highly-placed defence officers. Unfortunately, ‘when he centred a grievance which had been growing worse while awaiting

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid, Vol. XV, No. 845, 15 Sept. 1916
consideration, Simson’s move was to attack it with a foothold frontal move, forcing officiladom to defend it or to get out of the way.’ From September until 20 years later, in September 1936, there was no record of Simson in the columns of the NZFL.176

The papers of Sir Donald Petrie Simson, donated by Mrs Maureen Raison from Woolbridge in Suffolk, are housed in the Auckland War Memorial Museum Library and shed more light on the furore. They also include extracts from the significant 15 September 1916 _Freelance_ report,

There are two schools of opinion about the captain. One maintains his drastic measures were warranted to stir up the public conscience; the other that the captain merely sought notoriety. As he leaves New Zealand no better off in a military sense than when he came, though he returned a ‘ranker’ in a much improved position, the old proverb, that the end justifies the means, seems very apt in this case.

The materials held in the Auckland War Memorial Library show that Simson was well connected. There are letters of approval for work for him from the Prime Minister, W.F. Massey, on 11 August 1916 and from J.G. Ward, the Minister of Finance, on 14 August 1916. However, being well connected was one thing in New Zealand; he was still under attack.

Simson returned from Gallipoli and Egypt by the _Willochra_ after his convalescence in Cairo, in May 1915.177 It is quite evident during the whole period right up to his leaving in December 1916 that he had, or thought he had, much ill health. During a visit to the Riccarton Race Course in Christchurch in November 1915 he made a loud outburst accusing men who did not enlist as ‘rotters.’ Questions were raised about his fitness and some observers thought him as developing a mania. He came under the ire and ill-will of the very powerful Minister of Defence, James Allan. Simson’s integrity was questioned. Was he ever, as he claimed, a member of the 2nd Regiment of King Edward’s Force in England from 10 August 1914 to 27 September 1914? He later claimed to have transferred to the British section of the New Zealand Forces when they left for Egypt and while there had been responsible for the formation of the 1st Field Company of New Zealand Engineers under the control of Colonel Pudham. He was made a Military Transport Officer of Alexandria and Lemnos, was present at the landing in Gallipoli, and later wounded. He was given

---

176 Ibid, 37th year, No. 11, 16 Sept. 1936 [NZFL adopted a new issue system] - a report of the arrival in Auckland of Mrs Eva Simson arriving on the _Tamaroa_. She had been working for the BBC. It is highly likely that this was Captain Simson’s wife.

177 ANZ AABK W5568, record 68/0136444, Simson, Donald papers; ANZ 18805 W5553 0105118 NZDF Personnel Records, Donald SIMSON (022689PCM).
twenty-eight days extended sick leave, which expired on 28 November 1915. This was again extended to 16 December 1915. He was granted leave from 14 January 1916 to 3 February 1916, and there was a question in that period over Simson, and Brigadier General Robin did not know what to do with him. The extended sick leave was moved on to April 1916 and many medical reports show the attempts to assess the state of his health, with some concern expressed about the impact of internal haemorrhoids. A summary of Simson’s case was written for Brigadier General A.W. Robin who sent a copy to General Richardson on 15 June 1916. The whole issue was of great national interest because of the work that Simson had done for returned soldiers and with institution of the NZRSA. Simson felt in order to complete the work with the RSA, instead of receiving a discharge in England, he would take it under protest in New Zealand.

In 1939, he was knighted for his work for the British Empire Service League. He is little known in New Zealand, because much of his working life was spent out of the country. The style of modern Anzac Day is attributed to Dr Ernest Boxer. While there is proof in the ADCC minutes of correspondence between Garland and the mayors of the main centres in New Zealand, no evidence as yet has so far been found to cement the Simson-Garland connection.

Making a place for Anzac Day in the physical landscape

Public war memorials, so evident in the physical landscape of town and country places in New Zealand, grew from a community desire to recognise sacrifice by military servicemen and to address the grief of bereaved families and friends. It is in the latter that we find the beginnings of memory and memorials. An example of this simple memorial is a keepsake, a precious last letter or photograph, usually of a serving soldier who died. The NZFL printed in May 1915 a letter and accompanying photograph from a sorrowing mother of one of New Zealand’s gallant sons who died at the Dardanelles. She wrote to the editor:

---

178 Ibid.
179 ANZ IT1, W2439, 69/93, Western Samoa. Major General Sir George Spafford Richardson (1868-1938). Richardson was an efficient administrator, and during 1923 to 1928 was the Government Administrator of Western Samoa. His far-sighted opinions on Anzac Day as a day of general remembrance for the citizens of the territory brought him into severe conflict with the RSA.
180 ANZ APF case 7494, W 4948, record 71, 35/1/2, J.A. Simpson, Wellington, 5 Dec. 1916, to J. Allan, Acting Prime Minister,
181 Captain Dr. Ernest Boxer of Dunedin, 1917 Dominion President of the RSA, carried on the general directions of Simson in building the national organisation of returned servicemen. He worked to secure the control of Anzac Day commemorations for the organisation and the style of ‘open grave’ ritual is attributed to him – the ‘Boxer service.’
I just received this photo of our dear son, Alfred, last Thursday. He had it taken in Egypt, just three weeks before the New Zealand Forces left for the Dardanelles. He was only in his 23rd year. I would like the photo back safely when you are finished with it as it is all I have of him now.
Yours, etc, Mrs John Hayward, Caversham, Dunedin.
May 6th.\textsuperscript{182}

This speaks of shared sorrow and bereavement, and the place of women as transmitters of news, and demonstrates continuity with Victorian styles of public commemoration of death.

The first memorials, over the graves of the Gallipoli dead were wooden markers. A mid April 1916 issue of \textit{NZFL} printed a large photo of a grave on the Gallipoli Peninsula of Private R.G. Taylor, Otago Infantry, killed in action on 30 April 1915 just after the first landing. The photo was taken by a comrade, also killed six weeks later.\textsuperscript{183} It shows latent public interest in an event which had taken place a year previously.

The public display of institutional memory had many styles. In September 1915 the \textit{NZFL} published a Wellington rugby role of honour above a photo of two rugby team friends, D. Stuart McFarlane of the Petone Club, and a Wellington representative player, and Henry Dewar Melrose, a club provincial and national representative sportsman. Both had been killed in action at the Dardanelles.\textsuperscript{184} There was a close connection between sportsmen and military service. In the same edition the death of Lieutenant Robin (Bob) H. Deck is recorded as that of a ‘fine type of young colonial.’ Condolences were expressed for the family – ‘The sad news of when it came through was a cruel blow both for Doctor & Mrs Deck and family and from Lieutenant Deck’s young wife, néé Mabel A Skinner of Tinakori Road, Wellington.’ This obituary notice for Lieutenant Deck described ‘his serving qualities that once improved those who met him and these qualities, coupled with his capability, [which] made him a popular and respected officer. He met a soldier’s death and he died fighting for the cause of honour and liberty that may help assuage

\textsuperscript{182} \textit{NZFL} Vol. 15, no. 784, 14 May 1915. The reproduction of the photograph of the late Private Hayward appears on another page in this issue in the role of honour. He was one of the first to die on Gallipoli; ibid, Vol. 15, no. 784, 14 May 1915, 5, Private Alfred Richard Hayward, 8/751 of the Otago Infantry Battalion, Main Body. Nominal roll, volume 1; next of kin, John Hayward of Abbotsford, Otago.
\textsuperscript{183} Ibid, Vol. 15, No. 824, 14 Apr. 1916, 16 - the photo was too dark to scan; ibid, 14 February 1923, 16 for similar material on W.T. Jenning’s visit to Gallipoli.
\textsuperscript{184} Ibid, Vol. 15, No. 792, 3 Sept. 1915, 22.
his parents and young wife.’ Here an appreciation of a wider social scope is shown by the community recognition of the sorrow of the family.

The international and political landscape was rapidly changing, the war had not quite ended, but it was obviously nearing an end. Preparations were made for the return of soldiers and the proper care of the graves of soldiers who had died overseas. In September 1918, the honourable organiser of the New Zealand National Service League requested that four memorial workshops be started in the Dominion as a national tribute to fallen soldiers, where disabled soldiers and sailors could be taught such trades as tailoring, furniture making, basket-weaving, shoe-making and repairing. He quoted the Australian situation and the amount set aside for disabled soldiers. He also referred to the Lord Roberts’ Memorial Workshops in England which were established following the South African War and greatly expanded with the onset of World War I. It was a reasonable and utilitarian request. There was strong pressure, however, for more public and enduring stone memorials.

From the end of the war civic authorities promoted memorial building. ‘Lancings’, the editorial for the NZFL, on 9 January 1919 has a piece on soldiers’ monuments from Sir James Allen. He doubted that a new Anglican cathedral in Wellington would be suitable as a soldiers’ memorial. The NZFL editorial writer felt that all public memorials or monuments to the men who bled and died for their country in Egypt, Gallipoli or on the Western front should be kept entirely apart from and independent of all ecclesiastical buildings and any ecclesiastical control and interference: ‘The public will expect to see suitable memorials raised in every provincial centre and in many of the larger townships, and we join with the Acting Prime Minister in his hope that the services of New Zealand designers and sculptors may be as far as possible availed of in this connection.’

The matter of memorial building is central to the issue of Anzac Day ceremonies in Australia and New Zealand as cenotaphs particularly provided the venue and dominated the physical landscape for ceremonies. As Alan Borg states:

---

185 Ibid.
At the end of the First World War there was a widespread movement to create suitable memorials for the fallen … There was hardly a town or village in Europe that had not lost some of its sons in the conflict. Clearly there was a demand for national memorials and the memorials on the battlefields, but equally every local community felt the need to have its own monument to the dead.¹⁸⁸

Few memorials lacked contestation over site location or choice of architect-designer. There was a deal of contemporary humour about conflicting opinions generated by memorial designs and building. A current joke ran, ‘Well, says the man from Wairarapa, there’s one thing you can say about the war. There haven’t been any New Zealand atrocities.’ The reply was, ‘Hmm, said the man from windy Wellington, wait ‘til you see some of the plans for monuments for our soldiers and sailors.’¹⁸⁹ A period in which the physical landscape was changed by building a great variety of memorials and monuments began in 1919.

A trans-Tasman example of this is found in mid July 1919. It is that of Private Thomas Cooke of Kaikoura, who, as a member of the AIF, fought and died in a valiant action at Pozieres on 28 July 1916.

On July 29th, 1917 a memorial brass tablet commemorating the heroism of Private Thomas Cooke was publicly unveiled in Kaikoura School by Miss Opal Parker (the youngest girl pupil) and at the same time Mr R.T. Pope (Chairman of the Memorial Committee) on behalf of the mothers of Kaikoura and a few friends presented the hero’s aged mother with a gold necklace and inscribed Maltese Cross in recognition of her son’s bravery. His age was 35 when he died but his memory can never die. His name stands emblazoned on the most cherished page of his country’s annals - its Roll of Honour. We are indebted to the courtesy of Mrs Thomas Cooke for the loan of her late husband’s photo.¹⁹⁰

Small community memorials stand in stark contrast to larger New Zealand town memorials of the twenties and thirties. Individuality in memorial design was more common than not. Not all memorials were of a type that could be considered usual. The Sling Camp kiwi cut in the chalk of the overlooking hill provides an example of transferring landscapes from one country to

another.\textsuperscript{191} The Brockenhurst Churchyard cemetery where 100 New Zealand soldiers lie is another, often visited on Anzac Day.\textsuperscript{192}

In New Zealand, the pace of memorialisation quickened.\textsuperscript{193} In March 1920 the proposed soldiers’ memorial in Marlborough was discussed and the story covered rejection of the notion that Mabel Arm in the Picton Harbour would be a suitable site. There was a modernist debate over conservation - whether or not the memorial could be built without ‘destroying its native bush and primitive beauty.’ Seymour Square in Blenheim and the Picton foreshore were mooted as more suitable sites.\textsuperscript{194} In July 1920 there was a report of a Mr Wesley Spragg presenting a recreation area on the shores on Manukau Harbour to Auckland City as a memorial to his son who was killed in action. Today it stands as the Wesley Spragg Memorial.\textsuperscript{195} Also reported later in August was the Mullineaux Mission for escorted tours of European battlefields. This innovative feature on the historic landscape became a regular occurrence in the 1920s.\textsuperscript{196} In themselves, escorted tours of this period could be viewed as a metaphoric memorial. Their objective, revival of memory and memorialisation, was as effective for the participants as memorialisation in stone.

Anzac Day in 1921 took place within a background of ferment about issues of soldier memory. Controversy simmered with absence and omission - notably over the Government tardiness in publishing and issuing official war histories.\textsuperscript{197} Concern was voiced about the growth of socialism and its relationship to soldier organisations: Prime Minister Massey, in October 1920, warned socialists who might disrupt commerce in New Zealand. He contrasted the actions of disloyal socialists with ‘the brave lads who gave their lives to make this country safe toward

\textsuperscript{191} Ibid, Vol. XIX, No. 1008, 8 Oct. 1919, 27. The design had been drawn by Sergeant Major Blenkarne of the Education Board, assisted by a willing corps of sweating diggers. The giant kiwi covers an area of an acre and from the top of the back measures 135 metres, its bill is 48 metres, and the height of the letters NZ is 21 metres.

\textsuperscript{192} Ibid, Vol. XIX, No. 1011, 12 Nov. 1919, 7, Cox Taylor, the special travel representative to The Free Lance, reassuringly wrote of the graves in Brockenhurst churchyard where 100 New Zealand soldiers are buried: ‘It will interest the relatives and friends very deeply to know that these graves (with their white headstones) are tenderly cared for by the children of Brockenhurst. There are fresh flowers on many of the mounds and above the remains of the mortal men who came so far to fight and die for freedom, every time I visited this beautiful and historic spot...All the graves are in good order ... Maori and Pakeha - they are side by side ... And I saw village children gently laying little bunches of flowers on these sacred mounds, not once, but many times during my stay in Brockenhurst.’


\textsuperscript{194} NZFL, Vol. XIX, No. 1027, 3 Mar. 1920, 16.


democracy.’ In a feature cartoon, the NZFL made a serious comment about the nature of New Zealand society and the place for socialism among the feelings for our glorious dead.\textsuperscript{198} In January 1921 there were photographs of Armistice Day and the new London Lutyens’ Cenotaph reviewed by Cox Taylor, and a tribute to the Unknown Warrior.\textsuperscript{199} This reflected interest in the Empire metropolis and New Zealand’s place as ‘better Britain.’ Pomp and circumstance at the State funeral of King George V was without parallel in national emotion, ‘the nameless dead pass slowly through the London streets of the new cenotaph in Whitehall … The silence of the countless thousands would wait patiently for hours and who…had stood on the ice cold pavements to pay their homage to the Unknown was hardly broken by more than the whispers.’\textsuperscript{200} This took reverence to the dead to a new height and places issues of commemoration in a new landscape with a greater degree of solemnity. In this atmosphere the new Anzac Day legislation was confirmed.

From 1921 to 1923 the issue of the Wellington War Memorial seemed to quieten. Other centres gained memorials: Riccarton Borough’s two new German machine guns;\textsuperscript{201} Carterton’s unveiling;\textsuperscript{202} and Palmerston North’s Anzac Day commemoration programme which included the erection of a number of temporary crosses by Returned Soldiers over the graves of dead comrades in the local town cemetery. 1921 seems to have been problematic with red scares, flag burning, girl peace scouts, and disputes over the War Chest Fund. Hurst Seager’s designs for memorials became the focus of public interest in 1922. Most notable was the design for the New Zealand National War Memorial at Le Quesnoy in France, which was to have a symbolic figure of peace. However, it depicted New Zealanders clambering over the walls in their famous attack. Country centres were unveiled: Bunnythorpe Park Memorial at Rangitikei.\textsuperscript{203} In Patuanui the Governor-General was shown unveiling a soldiers’ memorial.\textsuperscript{204}

There was debate over the remains of an unknown New Zealand soldier being brought to be buried on Mount Victoria.\textsuperscript{205} The NZFL ‘Entre Nous’ columnist thought the issue of re-interring

\textsuperscript{199} Ibid, Vol. XXI, No. 1073, 12 Jan. 1921, 17.
\textsuperscript{201} Ibid, Vol. XXI, No. 1083, 23 Mar. 1921, 9.
\textsuperscript{202} Ibid, 15.
\textsuperscript{203} Ibid, 23\textsuperscript{rd} year, No 6, 10 Aug. 1922, 18.
\textsuperscript{205} This issue was not to be resolved until 11 Nov. 2004, 82 years later.
an unknown New Zealand soldier had fallen flat because other interests were foremost. Parliament would be reluctant to grant the expenditure, and the writer expressed the idea that it was time for thinking about ‘man’s inhumanity to man making countless thousands mourn,’ and since ‘the war clouds had lifted’ the public could remember the sacrifices made by those who lifted them.\textsuperscript{206} The story covered the expression of grief found in the observation of the two minutes’ silence following the English innovation of the Great Silence. Attacks by agitators, termed in the Cox Taylor reports ‘revolutionaries,’ had organised the unemployed ‘to make unseemly disturbances in various localities in England and Scotland during the Silence.’\textsuperscript{207} The uncertainties of the twenties were apparent.

Overseas ventures interested the readers. Just prior to Anzac Day, correspondent Nellie Scanlan described a visit to the Arlington Memorial Cemetery in Washington DC, the main U.S. military burial ground. She wrote about the American Government bringing over from France soldiers who were buried there. Each week a number of them arrived and were laid to rest finally at Arlington.\textsuperscript{208} The American repatriation scheme offered a different resolution to grief from that in New Zealand or Australia. Christchurch architect, Hurst Seager, had the task of erecting memorials to the members of the NZEF who fell in the war from Gallipoli to Flanders. Close to the first Poppy Day there was a report from Nellie Scanlan about United States’ Decoration Day. It followed Mothers’ Day when family members often placed flowers on the departed mother’s grave: ‘Decoration Day was instituted after the Civil War and graves of veterans were a special feature of the decorative scheme.’ She commented on the appropriate use of Decoration Day as a day of dedication of the Lincoln Memorial and observed that over 50,000 people who sat out in the blazing sun for the gathering.\textsuperscript{209} The description foreshadowed what was to become a motif for Anzac Days in the late 1920s and through the 1930s – floral tributes. It was not flowers which captured the public’s attention at this moment. It was the Chanak Crisis in Turkey.\textsuperscript{210} New Zealand was the only British Empire country to respond immediately and positively to Britain’s appeal for military aid in the crisis.\textsuperscript{211}

\textsuperscript{206} NZFL, Volume XXI, No 28, 11 Jan. 1922, 7.
\textsuperscript{207} Ibid, 22nd year, No. 30, 25 Jan. 1922, 25: Ian Brightly record a crowd of women were attacked and he had to seek refuge in the local police station.
\textsuperscript{208} Ibid, 22nd year, No. 42, 19 Apr. 1922, 24.
\textsuperscript{209} Ibid, 23rd year, No.5, 2 Aug. 1922, 12.
\textsuperscript{210} See Chapter 6, Turkey.
National Memorial debate

1923 continued the long correspondence regarding the tortuous process by which the Wellington National War Memorial was constructed. In September 1920, the NZFL had condemned the delay to the building of a national war memorial and it seemed at that point that neither the site nor a design had been chosen. The editor hoped that it would not suffer from bungling, which was the fate of the new Parliament House. This was the first of a great number of messages about the National War Memorial which were to occur over the next decade.

Pleasure was expressed in February 1923 when the project began. This initiated a discussion about funding and the hope was expressed that Wellingtonians would do as well as the people of Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin had with their memorials. The site of Wellington’s War Memorial, a proposed Maori War Memorial, and drawings for the Auckland War Memorial and Museum all featured on 14 March, with a debate over whether people were more valuable than memorials. A contrary note was sounded by Miss Lillie Butler, ‘the mother of Blighty,’ who had provided free provisions for allied soldiers in her parish, a ‘corner of Blighty.’ She spoke to a large meeting in the Wellington Town Hall on Wednesday, 11 April, advocating for the building of a New Returned Soldiers’ Club in Wellington as a worthy memorial of the men who gave their lives. Miss Butler had comforted many dying soldiers and spoke from experience of the needs of the returned men. With that knowledge she stated firmly, ‘The spirits of the dead would be better pleased with something useful for their surviving comrades than with cenotaphs, obelisks, broken columns and the like.’ This issue remained publicly contested.

Variety of expression was the keynote of the mid-twenties memorialisation process. There was a spate of unveilings: the Hunterville memorial; the mention of a plan for a great motorway in the United States; a tree planting scheme; soldiers’ memorial gates in Greymouth; the Anzac memorial in Port Said, Egypt; unveiling the Le Quesnoy memorial to New Zealanders; the memorial cenotaph in Greymouth; the Brooklyn Memorial; an argument over the Bridge of Remembrance of Christchurch; and also comment on the forward progress of the Auckland

---

212 NZFL, 23rd year, No. 33, 21 Feb. 1923, 20; ibid, No. 39, 4 Apr. 1923, 4.
Memorial compared with Wellington’s. This was a very sore point for the NZFL, which positioned itself as the national press banner, based in the capital but serving the country.216

By early April 1924 the issue of the absence of a permanent memorial in Wellington evoked a sarcastic reaction from NZFL editorial staff. On 24 March, Little Akaroa’s unveiling raised questions about Wellington, and by 16 April 1924 there was severe editorial criticism in the handling of the erection of the monument in Wellington, with bitter words printed:

The Wellington War Memorial Committee has made a decided blunder in conjunction with the RSA in the decision to hold Anzac Day opening a service on that sordid and grimy site where it proposes to set the city’s monument to fallen soldiers. No less inspiring or less dignified a spot could be found in the whole of Wellington.217

More amiably, on 30 April 1924, the editor continued reflecting on Anzac Day in Wellington, which he maintained had become established as a sacred day more strictly observed than any Sunday. That year it had a deeper and heart-stirring note, caused by the presence of the great ships of the Royal Navy. Wellington’s principal memorial service at the temporary cenotaph in Manners Street was made doubly memorable by the parade of 1,000 officers and men of the Naval Service, which had co-operated with Anzacs at Gallipoli. There was commendation of the work of the Navy.218

Simultaneously, the historic landscape of Anzac Day was beginning to become more inclusive with other nationals being recognised. Reports on the London cenotaph, were seen side by side with those on the Samoan graves of New Zealand soldiers.219 The most southerly monument in the world at Bluff, then Hawera, Hurst Seager’s Gravenstafel monument, and as well Inglewood with fine Italian sculpture, all featured later in 1925. Anzac Day and memorialisation bound the metropolis and the periphery of Empire. This homogeneity was clear to Nellie Scanlan whose reports were regularly found in NZFL issues. Her report, printed in the immediate post-Anzac Day 1924 issue bridges both Empire and class:

218 Ibid, 24th year, No. 42, 30 Apr. 1924, 4.
219 Ibid, 24th year, No. 48, 11 Jun. 1924, 26. There were 11 graves in the Apia Cemetery, headstones of New Zealand granite and of the same design as those in Europe and elsewhere. See also the ANZ files on Richardson The Administrator and his defence of the style of Anzac Day in Samoa.
The cenotaph to ‘The Glorious Dead’ that simple monument which daily receives its floral offerings, a simple posey, a gorgeous wreath, from someone who has cause to remember. Never have I seen anything so spontaneous and sincere as that foggy night on the bus. I always watch for it now, and the single reference with which every man, of every age and class, pays his simple, gracious tribute to the dead, is one of the most beautiful things I have seen in London.220

This kind of glowing report from London reified Anzac Day in the New Zealand landscape. Meanings were simultaneously conferred and transported to different locations.221 Still, problems of contestation shadowed the Day.

Floral tributes became *de rigeur* for remembrance of the fallen soldiers. Despite the poor rehearsal at the London Cenotaph with the molten offering from New Zealand, more floral tributes were placed each Anzac Day.222 Photographers delighted in taking photographs of monuments over the wreaths of flowers that had been presented.223 All of this challenges the current attraction with death denial. Some floral tributes both in London and in the far reaches of Empire, in Samoa, were so generous that they overwhelmed the monument. This does not reflect communities reeling in shock following the Great War. It challenges the universality of the notion that they were in denial and turning their back on issues of hurt and bereavement. There were some gender issues with the floral tributes at memorials. An exception was women only placing messages and flowers in the gratings of the Woolloomooloo gates at the departure point for soldiers leaving Sydney.224 However, most of the official wreaths were laid by men – a reflection of male gender predominance in leadership roles in the first half of the century. Contestation did not surface in the matter of floral tributes!

In late 1926 there was again editorial comment about Wellington’s War Memorial and the fact that a splendid central site had been chosen, and it congratulated Hurst Seager for his plans to the Government of a combined museum, national art gallery and national war memorial to be erected
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222 *NZFL*, 3 Sept. 1924, 16. Some were in foreign places, for example, the New Zealand wreaths at the War Memorial in Brussels.
223 Ibid, 25th year, No. 13, 24 Sept. 1924, 18. There was a new numbering system, from Jun. 1924.
on Mount Cook. The placing of the Wellington Carillon Bells in May 1929 was a highlight for
the city. The inscription on the largest five tonne Bourdon bell read: ‘Te Reo Wairua, to the glory
of God and memory of the 1,700 men of Wellington City and suburbs who gave their lives in the
Great War, 1914-1918. Ana! Te Tangi Aroha.’ Despite the fanfare of the carillon bells being
erected in 1929, it was not to be until Anzac Day 1932 that they were sounded. The intervening
years were full of the threatening spectre of the Great Depression.

In a curious blend of dynamics, 1932 became a year of great silence and loud cacophony. Frank
Hudson, who reported on London Armistice Day 1931, commented on the quiet of the Silence:

The weird wild shriek of the syren [sic] the Prince of Wales from the place usually
occupied by the King, had moved and made two scarlet wreaths, stepped back, and,
looking upward, saluted. They call it Silence. It was synascope; England stiller than
the Dead. The silence of one person is impressive. All overawed was there, dwarf-
like troops, the ritual, and even this great picture. Very small was Man and weak his
trumpets as the Last Post in (?) were borne away by the wail of drums.

This spectral description reflects the strength of spiritualism of the 1920s which had been a
marked feature of Anzac Days, especially in Australia.

On 27 April 1932, the NZFL ran ‘Bells of Memory Ring Out For the First Time in Wellington:
Impressive Dedication Ceremony.’ The NZFL published dramatic photographs on the days’
activities. Wellington was the centrepiece. The Carillon and Campanile was dedicated on Anzac
Day by the Governor-General and Lady Bledisloe. There were huge crowds in Wellington at this
particular event. The emphasis placed on Anzac Day, and particularly the inauguration of the
Carillon bells, must be seen against the unpleasant foreground of the Depression. The 1932

---

225 NZFL 27th year, No. 24, 15 Dec. 1926. The proposal was described as ‘the most effective method of reconciling
and focussing at one point the various suggestions put forward and giving the city a set of memorial buildings for
which the present and coming generations of citizens will manifest pride and love.’
226 Ibid, 29th year, No. 5, 31 Jul. 1929. Interest in tangata Maori was not restricted – the NZFL ran an obituary for
Canon Parata of Holy Trinity Church, Gore. He was a Maori padre who had served in World War I and was greatly
respected.
227 Ibid, 32nd year, No. 28, 6 Jan. 1932, 14. The meaning of ‘synascope’ is obscure. The possibilities of miss-spelling
and trademark names were examined.
229 Ibid, 32nd year, 4 May 1932, 29. Players at the clavier keyboard of the instrument were Miss Gladys Watkins of
Wellington and Mr Clifford Ball of Cadbury’s, Bourneville, England.
230 Despite the Depression biting hard in 1932, and public attention being captured by depression riots that had
happened in Auckland on Thursday, 14 Apr., Anzac Day was a noted feature.
NZFL Annual featured dramatic photographs: the Winged Pegasus and the Youth Victorious, the monument to the fallen of the Wellington Citizens’ War Memorial at the corner of Bowen Street, and Lambton Quay beside the House of Representatives’ Buildings. Of special significance was the dramatic night time photograph of the National War Memorial building and Campanile, high on Mount Cook, Wellington, showing the light which burnt night and day from the top of the tower. Memory and memorialisation were fused in this piece for public consumption. This was emotive material: the light represented both the direction given to the nation by the sacrifice of the fallen, and the light of hope in dark economic times.

It was also the year of the first commemorative service to those who had served with the New Zealand Army Nursing Service during the Great War. A service was held on the steps of the National War Memorial and Campanile on Sunday, 23 October, attended by 200 people, including ex-Army nurses and ex-servicemen. It was a initial step acknowledging the part of women in war. Public recognition of women’s roles did not develop steadily, but was rather spasmodic.

Anzac Day, in a way similar to Australia, was now a landmark symbolising the style of New Zealand. Gallipoli Anzac virtues of doggedness and self-sacrifice were public virtues during the depths of the Depression years. The NZFL report for Anzac Day featured a panoramic photo of an enormous crowd of Aucklanders, ‘a great concourse of people grouped round the cenotaph in front of the Auckland War Memorial Museum during the playing of the National Anthem’ and showed the success Anzac Day had become in 17 years since its institution.

At the Maori Memorial in Moutoa Gardens, Wanganui there was a special service. The entire arena held a large crowd at the Maori Anzac Day service - the only one of its kind in the country. More than 2,000 Maori and Pakeha attended and were addressed by Canon Williams and local Maori chiefs. Memorials in significant historical places continued to be unveiled, some making

---

232 Ibid, 33rd year, No. 18, 2 Nov. 1932.
233 Ibid, 32nd year, No. 45, 4 May 1932, 34.
234 Ibid, 25.
the New Zealand-Scottish connection. In September 1932 in Kintail Ross-Shire, Scotland, a memorial tablet was unveiled to MacRae Clan members who had fallen in World War I.  

Anzac Day by 1933 seemed to be the obvious day for choice of opening or unveiling memorials and for the institution of new regimental colours for Army units. Poetry published in this period serves as a memorial as well; for example, there were three short Anzac poems; one called ‘Poppy Day in 1933’ was written by a Dunedin woman, Jean Hamilton-Lennox, who observed a mother who had lost a son and sold poppies every Poppy Day. Memorial building went on apace, despite the financial stringencies of the Depression – it seemed that citizens wanted to challenge the prevailing mood of the times in an act of memory. The design for a symbolic statue and tall cross for Christchurch took hold of the imagination. It contrasts with the much smaller monument for Stewart Island, one of the most southerly memorials in the world; Waimate’s memorial gates pillars with Maori designs on the pillars; and lonely Cave in the Canterbury High Country with its eleven ton block of Timaru bluestone bearing the simple inscription of treasured and enduring memory:

So long as the rocks endure and the grass grows and water runs, so long will this stone be a witness that through this low pass in the hills, the men from Cave, Cannington and Moutakaika districts rode and walked their way to the Great European War.

In the Depression, paintings gained attention. ‘Carillon’, by William Longstaff, was presented to the people of New Zealand by Lord Wakefield of Hythe in January 1935. He presented reproductions which were to be sold in aid of the New Zealand War Charities by the Soldiers Civil Re-establishment League. ‘Carillon’ is the third in a series of allegorical pictures and was purchased in 1932. It depicts the New Zealand war dead standing near the Belgian coast and listening to the sound of bells from a Carillon in New Zealand. The first two in the series of

---

235 Ibid, 33rd year, No. 11, 14 Sept. 1932, 4, 24, picture and caption. The New Zealand Infantry supplied seventeen of these men and the NZ Mounted Rifles ten of them. Most of the men who had died were supplied by the Seaforth Highlanders and then the Camerons and the Gordons, but probably the most famous MacRae was Lieutenant Colonel John MacRae, M.D., who wrote the famous lines (‘In Flanders’ Fields,’ verse: ‘We are the Dead./ Short days ago/ We lived felt Dawn, saw/ Sunsets glow, loved and were/ Loved, and now we lie in/ Flanders Fields.’

236 Ibid, 33rd year, 19 Apr. 1933, 17.

237 NZFL, 21 Jun. 1933, 34.


240 Ibid, 22.
paintings were the famous ‘Menin Gate at Midnight’ (‘Ghosts of Menin Gate’), painted in 1927, and the ‘Immortal Shrine’ (Eternal Silence). The fourth, and last, was a painting of Vimy Ridge with the spirits of the Canadian Corps and was presented to the Canadian Government.\textsuperscript{241}

William Longstaff, \textit{Carillon}, 1932, New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs, National Collection of War Art, Ref: AAAC 898 NCWA Q197.

William Longstaff painting \textit{Ghosts at Menin Gate}, 1927, AWM Collection, AWM ART09807.

In mid-May 1935 the NZFL printed a photograph of the first tree in a memorial avenue. Lord Galway’s visit was an opportunity for the authorities to exercise their civil duties, and Lord Galway is shown in Wanganui planting the first tree of a proposed avenue of trees to stretch from the North Cape to the Bluff to commemorate the Anzac campaign and the King’s Silver Jubilee. Remnants of commemorative oak trees can be found in south Oamaru in the Thames Highway. Below each was placed a brass plaque, now replaced by a stone cross carrying the rank, name, place and location of death of each man. The Oamaru country district lost 400 men in World War I. The oak avenues and plaques were a constant reminder.

What is most obvious from the evidence is the overwhelming variety of memorials, not only stone memorials which always commented on the typical memorials for war, but buildings, church windows, workplace memorial plaques and boards, stone tablets, rest and rehabilitation homes, bell towers, poetry, mausoleums and museums (which often appeared like mausoleums), roads, streets, avenues, avenues of trees, wreaths, cards, photographs, art exhibitions, stamp issues, chapels and gates. This list is not exhaustive and the act of commemoration is only bound by the limits of human imagination in making a connection between the memorial and the memory of sacrifice.

Memorials have an important place within both the historical and physical landscape of Anzac Day. They constantly foreground the memories of soldier sacrifice. More consciously and publicly community memorials and monuments are venues for public ceremonies on Anzac Day. Memorial building began in earnest by 1920 and continued unabated until 1935. By 1937, most of the major memorials had been erected in New Zealand. The debated issue of the National War Memorial in Wellington sheds light on contestation in memorial planning and building. This thesis opens the public, rather than officials’ and building committees’ perceptions on the matter. Sites, meanings and designs were contentious. In Wellington’s case two major memorials were constructed - the Citizens’ War Memorial in Buckle Street and the National War Memorial and Campanile at Mount Cook. The progress of human memorial construction illustrates changes in the historic landscape. One of the last large public memorials constructed in this period was the Citizen’s War Memorial in Christchurch Cathedral grounds, unveiled on 9 June 1937. By the

---

end of 1936 the flush of monument building was over and what followed were observances of different kinds at memorials.

**The pre-war situation in 1936**

From 1933 onwards in New Zealand, interest in military matters became obvious in New Zealand. Despite the advances made by peace groups, military spectacles at different times of the year attracted public attention. Training of soldiers was increasing throughout different camps in New Zealand.244 On 14 June the popularity of King’s Birthday review of troops in Dunedin was well illustrated by a large crowd on the Oval in Dunedin.245 There seems to be a contrary movement here where Anzac Day appeared to diminish slightly while military reviews gained ground. Reviews were public spectacles where the military would perform and revive memories for ex-servicemen and their families and friends. These public spectacles reiterated the meanings of Anzac Day in the mind of citizens and reflected the state of preparation of the military for war.

Dire warnings of impending conflict took the foreground of the landscape and marginalised Anzac Day. On the 20th anniversary of the Anzac landing, it would have been natural to assume that periodicals like the NZFL would feature a notable and memorable occasion. Apart from a double page photo feature and reporting of a vice-regal visit to Dunedin for wreath-laying on Anzac Day there was no other coverage.246 Other matters took centre-stage: the progress of aviation, and the success of Michael Joseph Savage and the Labour Party.247 Despite the relatively low attendance and interest in New Zealand, across the Tasman things were different. The Melbourne march prominently featured a wide-stepping group of New Zealand veterans.248 This points again to the remarkable adhesion that Anzac Day had in Australian society, while it seemed more subject to winds of change in the current historical landscape in New Zealand.

The trend was reversed in 1936, a busy year for Anzac Day. It marked the 21st anniversary of the landing at Anzac Cove and started with the commemorative postal issue of a stamp designed to
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244 Ibid, 7 Jun. 1933, 29-30. Wanganui and New Plymouth mounted rifles in camp at Waverley; the Queen Alexander mounted rifles from the Wanganui-New Plymouth districts attend the annual camp at the Waverly Race Course.
245 Ibid, 14 Jun. 1933, 21, ‘King’s Birthday Review of Troops.’
246 Ibid, 35th year, No. 44, 1 May 1935, 30-31 and No 45, 8 May 1935, 37.
248 JOL, ADCC Cuttings Box 1935, Melbourne Sun, 26 Apr. 1935, unpaged cutting including a photograph of the ‘Riderless Charger.’
celebrate the landing on Gallipoli. A private soldier of the New Zealand Permanent Forces was selected by Trentham Camp as the model for the figure in the postage stamp. He was dressed in uniform and girded with equipment representing a typical New Zealander of 1915, complete with peaked hat, complete with four dents and posed with a chin raised, standing alone on a ridge flanking the historic Anzac Cove. Maori motifs were used for the outer border of the stamp, laurel leaves were represented in the vertical position at each side of the picture, and four stars appeared in the corners. The top banner reads: ‘New Zealand, postage, NZRSA,’ and the lower: ‘1915 Anzac 1936 - 21st anniversary.’ There was collaboration between the NZRSA and the New Zealand Postal Department and the two commemorative stamps were to be released for sale after 25 April. The proceeds were to be shared 50% with the NZRSA, which was to use the funds to help needy ex-soldiers and their dependents.249

The weather on day was cold and miserable; however it drew large crowds in Wellington and Auckland.250 The Governor-General officiated in Christchurch where attendance was poor due to the rain and cold. Dunedin crowds were unexpectedly large considering the bad weather; many of the servicemen were attired in heavy overcoats with Homburg hats, and there was an attendance of Girl Guides and a number of women visible in the crowd. Once again, there was a Maori memorial service at Moutoa Gardens in Wanganui, and a reasonable sized crowd gathered round a number of seated Returned Servicemen. In early May there were again photographs of the ‘Anzac Day of the Year’ from Dannevirke, Invercargill, Waimate, Timaru and Wanganui.251

A most remarkable Anzac Day ceremony was held in China. In June 1936 a story called ‘Remembered in Shanghai - Anzac Day Ceremony held in China’ published the details of the event. It recounted Anzac Day events in Shanghai originally reported in the *North China Daily News* and *Shanghai Sunday Times*. The story narrated the observance of the 21st anniversary of Anzac Day organised by the Anzac Society in Shanghai. At 8.30am there was a procession to the

249 *NZFL*, 36th year, No. 34, 19 Feb. 1936, 5; ibid, 36th year, No. 44, 6 May 1936, 37. The idea originated with the Dunedin RSA, which had originally proposed a stamp for the 20th anniversary, but because the stamps at that time had to be printed in England there was too little time. The new stamp was to be made in Australia and this was regarded as ‘appropriate that such a stamp - the first of its kind to be issued in New Zealand - had been made in Australia.’ This, again, shows the conjunction between Australia and New Zealand over the issue of Anzac Day and memorabilia associated with it. A photograph shows the Anzac stamps for sale in Dunedin, with Mr Isaacs, the Chief Post Master in Dunedin, selling the first Anzac stamps to Mr Ferens, Secretary, NZRSA, the originator of the idea.

250 Ibid, 36th year, 29 Apr. 1936, pp. 28 ff.

251 Ibid, 36th year, 6 May 1936, 40, in Timaru there was a photograph of Returned Soldiers placing their poppies in a basket in front of the war memorial during the Anzac Day service.
cenotaph and a wreath-laying ceremony at which the President of the Society, Mr S.P. Simpson, delivered an address. Subsequently the members of the Society proceeded to the Bubbling Well Cemetery and there also laid a wreath on the grave of Norman Kwong-Tsu, who was born in Dunedin in October 1886 and who died in Shanghai in November 1921 from the effects of being gassed during the Battle of the Somme, 1916.\textsuperscript{252} This was a curious example of an offshore gravesite being used in the observance of Anzac Day. It illustrates powerfully the notion of portability of commemoration.

What accounts for the downturn in numbers during the period 1934 through to 1936? Much must lie with the Depression, though even then the real loss seemed evident only in 1935. By 1936, twenty years after the first observances, the momentum soon picked up again. It seems strange that so long after the events of the landing that the public lost interest in attending Anzac Day but almost simultaneously there was a revival of official and Government interest in the training of territorial troops. Official interest reflected a response to the rise of militarism overseas.

\textbf{Prelude to war}

The onset of war brought substantial changes to the public’s views of Anzac Day. Many young men were absent and the spectres of injury or death were palpable. Anzac Day, more than other commemorations, even more than Armistice Day, reminded the community of sacrifice and loss. The premonition of war carried differences from that for World War I. There existed an awareness of possible attack from German raiders on coastal shipping or on small towns in Australia and New Zealand. This idea was less remote than in 1914. After the entry of the Japanese into the war in December 1941, there was the fear of territorial invasion. Anzac Days in memory of World War I now had to include a foreground of the activities and consequences of an impending world conflict. The changes in perception were incremental, and there was forewarning for New Zealanders well before 1939.

The coronation of George VI dominated proceedings in 1937. A contingent of ex-World War I New Zealand servicemen was being prepared for travel to London.\textsuperscript{253} The \textit{NZFL} featured a full

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{252} Ibid, 36th year, No. 52, 1 Jul. 1936, 5.
\textsuperscript{253} Ibid, 10 Mar. 1937, 59; ibid, 17 Mar. 1937, 12. The contingent was led by Major D.F. Leckie of the Territorial Detachment, New Zealand Military Contingent for the Coronation. Captain Keith Rodney Park and his wife were photographed in Buenos Aires on their way to London. Park was a significant New Zealand figure in war, being an Air Commodore during World War II in the Bomber Command for the RAF.
\end{flushright}
page of Gallipoli photographs entitled: ‘Anzac Day Recalls Epic Tragedy of the Great War;’ with familiar scenes - the cemeteries, the Sphinx and landing site with soldiers climbing the hills, the remains of boats, and the remains of the water distillation towers.\(^{254}\) This was one of the most evocative revivals of Gallipoli memories since the 1920s, and would have been more suited to the anniversary of the previous year. Public interest in Auckland for the memorial service on Anzac Day was shown by the attendance of a ‘dense crowd.’ However, photographs show a scanty crowd around the memorial.\(^{255}\) In all the main centres, except Dunedin, photographs illustrate there were fewer present.\(^{256}\) It seems interest was fluctuating. The Honourable Walter Nash, New Zealand Minister of Finance, attended London’s Anzac Day, and Mrs Nash laid a wreath of poppies at the Cenotaph. She was pictured bending over a wreath of pohutukawa blossoms, successfully encased in a block in ice, from the Auckland branch of the Mothers’ Union.\(^{257}\)

Defence issues dominated the NZFL columns from late 1937. There was enthusiasm for the Australian connection in Anzac Day news.\(^{258}\) This was matched by publicity of the growing warlike situation caused by the extension of totalitarianism in Europe. New Zealand was represented at the Anzac Day march in Sydney for 1938, an important anniversary of the end of the Great War and the bicentennial year for Australia. There was to be ‘a good show.’ The chartered ships, Maunganui (carrying 700) and the Monowai (with 650) berthed on 23 April; and the Awatea on which some Anzacs travelled arrived earlier. Sir Andrew Russell led the New Zealanders and it was anticipated that 2,000 New Zealanders would attend with the 3,000 ex-servicemen out of the state and make one of the largest gatherings for Anzac Day that had ever been seen in Sydney.\(^{259}\) The New Zealanders who marched in Sydney were widely reported. More than a million people lined the streets and 60,000 veterans marched to pay tribute to those who did not return.

---

255 The Christchurch Star-Sun, 12 May 1937, 10, ‘Dominion Celebrates Coronation,’ and other stories, also covering other New Zealand centres illustrate how Anzac Day was overshadowed by the preparations and celebrations for the coronation of George VI. Communities invested much more resources in this close by occasion than on Anzac Day activities in this year.
257 NZFL, 26 May 1937, 32.
258 Ibid, 37th year, No. 42, 21 Apr. 1937; a new photograph of Lone Pine Cemetery taken during a visit of HMAS Australia and HMAS Sydney, and a photo from the landing of 25 April, barges on Britain Beach and the evaporators to distil seawater during the occupation by Anzac troops.
Representatives of the NZEF laid a wreath to the men of the Main Body who went to Gallipoli at the Cenotaph in Martin Place, Sydney. The Maori representatives, Noho Toki, a flag-bearing Ngati-Kahungungu chief, and Wiri Morangi of Ngati-Porou, were at the head of the march. It was estimated to be the greatest reunion of ex-servicemen since World War I.260 This resurgence of interest was reflected elsewhere. Crowds in Dunedin and Christchurch were larger than in the mid 1930s. Dunedin was visited by a French sloop, the Rigo de Genouilly. The captain laid a wreath at the Dunedin cenotaph for Anzac Day.261 In London, the attendance of members of the visiting Australian cricket team provided the Anzac Day sports’ connection.262

In London in October 1938, war preparations were made because of the Central European crisis - air raid precautions with gas masks, bags and trenches.263 At the same time there are photographs of Hitler and Mussolini - labelled as dictators who caused crises.264 For Anzac Day April 1939 the Lancings’ editorial appropriately commented:

> The commemoration this year must have held a deeper significance than usual for every citizen because of the trend of fears in Central Europe. Today this country is faced with the necessity of preparing for the worst while hoping for the best. As Major General Sir Andrew Russell put it, the world has passed from an era of law making and law abiding in international politics to treaty breaking and power politics. The situation is on a par with that in 1914 when Germany went forth to conquer the Western world and her European neighbours. In 1914-1918 New Zealand shirked none of her responsibility as Anzac Day regularly reminds us.265

The Sydney parade featured, again with veteran New Zealand Maori leading larger units including special reserves from Burnham Camp. New Zealanders in the Sydney parade objected to the flying of a Nazi flag in front of the office of the German Consulate-General in Bridge Street:

> Booing and hissing, the ex-soldiers demanded that the Nazi flag should be pulled down. Feeling was so intense that if the request had not been complied with…the flag would have been removed by force…The leaders of the demonstration...were

260 Ibid, 38th year, No. 44, 4 May 1938, 5.
261 Ibid.
262 Ibid, 38th year, No. 47, 25 May 1938, 41, 60. W.J. Jordan, the High Commissioner for New Zealand, went to St. Clement Danes Church on Anzac Day, where he read one of the lessons. Photographs show Don Bradman and S.J. McCabe, famous Australian cricketers, going to the same Anzac Day service.
264 Ibid, 38th year, No. 49, 8 Jun. 1938, 29.
265 Ibid, 39th year, No. 43, 26 Apr. 1939, 5.
four New Zealand Anzacs. One of them...said they objected to the Nazi flag being flown at full-mast. The commander of the parade, Major-General H. Gordon Bennett and another officer dissuaded the men from any action which might have been embarrassing.266

This event is not remembered today, either by RSA or RSL members. That New Zealand returned men led by New Zealand Maori, rather than Australians, initiated the attack on the Nazi symbol poses a strange turn of direction.267 Such actions were accepted from Diggers who had taken part in the World War I campaigns, possibly because they were Maori.

With the outbreak of war came the first anticipated war related deaths of New Zealanders in England. Aircraftmen were the first New Zealand casualties and dominated the casualty lists and records of those taken prisoner in the initial stages of the war.268 Casualty photographs were again printed in the NZFL. One of the distinct differences that occurred in Anzac Days through from 1940 was that women featured prominently in the parades. In 1940, fifty Red Cross nurses were featured marching in a parade. ‘In their bright red capes and flowing white veils they presented a most colourful spectacle as they made their way to the war memorial to attend a service where a large crowd gathered to pay homage to the heroes of 1914-1918.’269 Great War service memories were soon revived: NZEF soldiers were photographed in old stamping grounds - Cairo, Luxor and Alexandria.

A post-Anzac Day Ken Alexander cartoon, ‘The Torch is Handed On,’ shows the Anzac torch being passed from a 1915 digger at Gallipoli to a 1941 New Zealand soldier standing at Mount Olympus.270

266 Ibid, 39th year, No.45, 10 May 1939, 48.
267 Ibid, 39th year, No. 45, 10 May 1939, 37.
268 Ibid, 39th year, No. 23, 6 Dec. 1939, 64. Two young pilot officers who had died in aircraft accidents and NZFL, 40th year, No. 25, 20 Dec. 1939, 5: the first prisoner of war was Pilot Officer L.H Edwards, who was shot down in an air raid on the Kiel Canal in Germany.
269 Ibid, 40th year, No. 44, 1 May 1940, 4.
270 Ibid, 41st year, No. 45, 7 May 1941, 3.
This spectacular cartoon embodies much of the contemporary perception of Anzac. It shows the change of landscape by the entrance of the new generation of Diggers, and new memories. The handing over from older generations the Anzac spirit is reflected in the ‘handing on the torch’ seen today in some Australian ceremonies. By picturing the coupling of Mount Olympus and Gallipoli it illustrates the high ideals which were held by the New Zealand soldiers. Words used
to describe the tone of services by 1942 were: ‘simple,’ ‘quiet,’ ‘impressive,’ ‘solemnity’ and ‘significance.’ With many men away on active service and women engaged in essential war work, attendances at ceremonies reduced. Also, foreigners, troops of the United States began participating. Wreath laying in Auckland showed a tribute paid to New Zealand by Brigadier General J.P. Hurley, who laid a wreath at the Auckland cenotaph on behalf of the USA. American soldiers had found a new meaning for the Anzac acronym: ‘Australian, New Zealand, American comradeship.’

POW experiences

Through the agency of the International Red Cross organisation, photographs arrived home from prisoner of war (POW) camps in Germany, most of them showing groups of soldiers. Photographs from Italian camps, such as Campo Concentramanto No. 52 came later. There is evidence of Anzac Day activities happening in camps. Printed leaflets supporting this claim are to be found in the Auckland War Memorial, the Kippenberger Military Museum, and in the Australian War Memorial. Anzac Day was important to forces overseas during World War II. Observances were also carried out in the most trying field conditions. New Zealanders were held in 103 POW camps in Europe, the majority of these were in Germany. Where some few commandants thought it prudent to keep prisoners compliant by granting some concessions, Anzac Day ceremonies and activities were permitted. Stalag 383 (formerly officers’ camp Oflag IIIC) Hohenfels, northern Bavaria, was an example where this situation prevailed.

In 1943, the diary of medical platoon Sergeant Ted Everton records that while he was a POW in Stalag 383, Anzac Day was observed. The brief entries for 25 April show more enthusiasm for the sports in the afternoon and the concerts than the church services. In 1943 Anzac Day fell on Easter Sunday and the ‘Alleluia Chorus’ was sung, but his comment shows that ‘The chorus was

272 There were Anzac Days at some other camps: Patrick Lindsay, The Spirit of the Digger, Then & Now, Macmillan, Sydney, 2003, 184 cites the example of Italian Campo Concentramento No. 57 at Gruppignano, where in 1943, Anzac Day included a neatly turned out Australian and New Zealand parade. The New Zealand Padre-Major took the salute. See Barton Maugham, ‘Australia in the War of 1939-1945,’ Series 1 (Army), Vol. III, Tobruk and El Alamein, AWM, Canberra, 1953.
273 AWMML Ephemera U27 Box 1 Ephemera Collection, Title: Army-Air Force, Envelope 6, MS2000/21 Everton, E.H. (Ted), POW Papers Diary 1941-1944 E.H.Everton 31126 Sgt. 1 NZ General Hospital; David McGill, P.O.W.: The untold stories of New Zealanders as prisoners of war, Mills Publications, Lower Hutt, New Zealand, 1987, 56, 57, photograph of the successful ‘Silver Ferns’ sports team; ibid, 71, the existence of radios at Hohenfels; ibid, 206, photograph.
grand in church but as usual not appreciated.” In 1944, despite rain, sports were held but his involvement with the concert dominated the record. He recorded: ‘A very good Maori item at Concert. Section gave Haka & an Action song...Have had a bit of Catarrh so have not continued with Oboe. Shows have been Wind in the Rain, Band Concert & Black Limelight.” This shows his brief engagement with camp culture, awareness of the part played by Maori in their traditional song and dance, and the important and different role of Anzac Day in the camp routine. Coincidentally, Australian POW, AIF Lt. (rank of Warrant Officer (II) when in POW camp) William Foxwell, who was captured in Crete with his AIF Battalion 2/7, also became a resident of Stalag 383 for the remainder of the war. His record is most significant from the view of memory - he was an Anzac veteran, having served in World War I and re-enlisted for World War II. He was in close contact with New Zealand prisoners and records the Australian-New Zealand combined Anzac Day activities in detail. On a cold day in 1942 he records the holding of Anzac Day silence, a 3 p.m. inspection parade, the rumours of Rommel’s surrender in Libya, and playing a solo cornet in the concert. His record for Anzac Day in 1943 is the most extensive in his diary. In an optimistic tone he recorded that there was ‘a great morning dawn service at 5 a.m. Quite a thousand attend – very impressive number.” He also recorded a full day after the service, one in which there was a march past at 10 a.m. with the 32 original Anzacs taking the salute, an extraordinary event. Representative units of Australian, New Zealand, Canadian, South African, English, Cypriots, Isle of Man, Irish Guards, Welsh Guards, and Scots honoured the old soldiers on the day and recalled memory. The day proceeded with a large programme of sports in which New Zealander Day-Smith won the Aussie Championship 100 yards – ‘a great race to finish up a days sports having Variety Show in Theatre by Aus & NZ Concert Party. Marvellous show the Maoris staged a haka...a grand days entertainment.’ The next year, 1944, he again

274 Ibid.
275 Ibid, Everton Papers; AWM SOUVENIRS 2/1/1. An unusual very well printed card colour card is that of Sgt. F.B. Taylor (POW 175) Stalag 383, for a Dawn service, March Past and Anzac sports on 25 April 1943. Handrawn and coloured is the 1943 programme for the ‘Ofladium Theatre, Oflag IIIC which in true Anzac fashion was Produced by S.Q.M.S. MacPherson NZEF and Cpl Jack Harris AIF.’ Item 9 was a bracket of ‘Traditional numbers Rendered by THE MAORIS.’ A special pass was designed and printed for Major Brooke-Moore AIF.
278 AWM PR 00798 Papers of Australian AIF Lt. William Stephen George Foxwell M.M. 2/7 Battalion. Part 1/2 [VX5489, B Coy, 2/7 Bn A.I.F.].
recorded the day as going off well apart from the rain. The Anzac concert was better attended than in 1943, and the after-function party went to 12.30 a.m.\textsuperscript{279}

The same 1944 occasions were recorded by New Zealand POW, Gunner Robin Gray, in his photograph album showing ‘Shots From The Shows – Stalag 383, Hohenfels Bavaria Germany 1942-1945.’\textsuperscript{280} The last entry is entitled ‘Anzac Day Show – April 25\textsuperscript{th} 1944 produced by J. McPherson, [sic] (NZ) and N. Whitehead (Aust.).’ The MacPherson mentioned was the same serviceman recorded in Everton Papers. The photographs are tributes to human ingenuity. They show full Anzac Day costume productions undertaken under extremely difficult conditions.\textsuperscript{281}

What occupies the foreground in this current historical landscape is the condition of being a prisoner. But on the day memories of the activities provided a respite. Held high in the collective memory was the place of original Anzacs and what they stood for, sports, the concerts and the part played by the Maori. The wartime prisoner landscape was one where class and rank prevailed and this was reflected in the comments about the original Anzacs taking the salute, a function usually reserved for the most senior officer present. That a group of mixed non-commissioned officers from New Zealand and Australia were accorded the salute by other British Commonwealth troops must have appeared highly unusual, particularly to the German officers in the camp. The action is not to be regarded as a case of charivari or the emanation of a topsy-turvy world for a day, but as the deliberate repositioning of men into a place of honour, for by their Great War service they had earned their stripes. This action elevated memory: these non-commissioned men were chosen to represent what Anzac stood for. It was not a creation of new memory but a reinvigoration of Gallipoli memories. That this highly unusual action occurred at all reinforces the point of a ‘changeable script of memory’ where the servicemen present did not consider it enough to have the original Anzac veterans march as they usually did, at the front of home-town Anzac Day parades.

\textsuperscript{279} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{280} KMA Waiouru 1987.2304 Photograph Album: POW Germany – WWII, 20625 Gunner Robin Henry Gray (POW 8179), 27 Field Battery, NZ Artillery; \textit{NZFL}, 10 May 1944, 26 – three photographs of New Zealand POWs in Stalag 383 in 1944, posted back to New Zealand through the Red Cross postal service. The \textit{NZFL} made a feature of publishing POW photographs near Anzac Day with captions like ‘Hitler’s Boarders,’ or ‘A Place in the Sun in Germany.’ \textit{NZFL} 5 May 1943, 24; ibid, 12 April 1944, 22; ibid, 10 May 1944.
\textsuperscript{281} \textit{ODT} 20 Apr. 1978, 3 New Zealander Fred Stuckey who was a prisoner-of-war in Germany for four and a half years. He wrote and published \textit{Sometimes Free}, in 1977 with much material about his incarceration in Stalag 383, but nothing about the Anzac Day activities.
Anzac Day in both wars had a strong association with competitive sports. Often mates who were part of local sports’ teams formed the basis of substantial military units who enlisted. Sports on Anzac Day reinforced memories of home as well as providing an enjoyable outing. Sports are mentioned by two of the diarists, Everton and Foxwell, in this study of POW activity. The Foxwell papers have detailed accounts of the sports fixtures and their results, particularly for 1943, and in less detail for 1944. In 1943, Foxwell reported:

Sports began sharp at 1030 am Programme 100 yards 1st heat Harrison 10/4/5 2nd heat Cholton 11/1/5 3rd heat Batt 10/4/5/ 4th heat Ford 11, 5th heat Byrne 11/1/5 6th heat Henderson 11/3/5 7th heat Johnson 11/3/5. High jump Sirakas 5’6”, Black & Reach 5’3” 880 yds 1st Campbell 2.15” Poole, Philpott & Veluiuan, English, Gaughan, Ligan, French…[also] 220 yds….Anzac veterans 75 yds…Hammer Throw…120 yds hurdles…Lunch 12 – 1pm great day so far cold wind…440 yds…Aussie Championships 100 yds…1st Day Smith NZ, 2nd Hull W.A. 3rd King Queensland …discus…tug-o-war…a great race to finish up a days sports.282

In 1944 the day was particularly wet in Hohenfels camp: ‘Dr Faulkner, Major Burkemore, Bill Baxter, Ivan Stevens, Jim Welsh, Harry Burton decided to start sports at 1pm very muddy entered for veterans race came an awful cropper when going well Covered in mud from head to foot over 100 feet of film taken of me swimming in mud. Sports cancelled halfway thro.’283 This passion for sports on Anzac Day reflects an ongoing soldier practice on the day. Memory was being recalled of similar practices by Anzacs on the Western Front where the afternoon of the day was always given over to sports.

The concerts and the part played by Maori were entirely another matter. It was an occasion for relief and humour. There was serious intent as well. The ‘Anzac Souvenir Programme’ stated that special invitation cards would be issued to admit the bearers to the Veteran’s Reserve at the Anzac Sports, the Anzac Night Entertainment – ‘ANZACS ON PARADE.’ Only the official invitation cards would admit POWs to the special Anzac Supper in the Stalag School. The notice carried a stern warning in capitals: ‘VETERANS ARE WARNED NOT TO LOSE THESE CARDS AS THEY ARE NOT REPLACEABLE – NOR ARE THEY TRANSFERABLE.’ 284

283 Ibid, 25 Apr. 1944. It is strongly suggested by the wording ‘100 feet’ that the film was 8mm. cinefilm. This material has not been found.
The strong language reflects the prescriptive atmosphere of military life and existence within a POW camp but also reveals an obvious demonstration of pride invested in memory. Here, while the foreground was dominated by the tedium of POW life, the Gallipoli and Anzac Day background was always there, creating justifications for enduring the current conditions.

In New Zealand, by 1945 the ceremony had reached a low point. There is very little coverage for Anzac Day. The reasons are that not only were men away but there was widespread despondency about the war. It had dragged on and war weariness had set in. Many returning men were injured, or ill, and there was a great increase in numbers of notified dead. The columns of the NZFL show a marked change in the current landscape: bitter memories were being revived for the families who had suffered loss. Despite overall numbers of dead being lower than in World War I, the spectre of death grew as communities waited out the war to its end.

**Conclusion**

The institution of Anzac Day in New Zealand was orchestrated rather than spontaneous. There was a current landscape of intercessory services and acts, most noticeable among Protestant churches in wealthier suburbs, but probably also in Catholic churches but blended with usual masses. This landscape of intercessory actions helped the initiation of the day and boosted its maintenance. The work of Prime Minister William Massey points to a careful eye to the management of the day in terms of conferring meaning through legislation, and through instructions to representatives in London for assent to the Westminster Abbey service and granting permission for New Zealand troops to participate.

The work of Donald Simson, on behalf of returned soldiers, and in his participation in the first Wellington community meeting on the day points again to issues of management. Through his work, the stamp of the returned men on the day was ratified. It would be fatuous to claim a direct comparison between Simson and Garland over Anzac Day initiation and development. There are some valid points though. Both were energetic men, somewhat intolerant, but with a clear vision of what was needed. Simson’s work in New Zealand was brief, spanning only late 1915 to late 1916. In that time he successfully inaugurated the national organisation for the returned soldiers of New Zealand. Both men are little known in their respective countries. Very few people, apart from historians specialising in commemoration and returned services’ officials, are aware of the
work of Canon David Garland for Australia or Captain, later Sir Donald Simson for New Zealand. Their works were largely forgotten in the post-World War II period.

Memorials are found in the city and country physical landscape. Frequently they became the natural venues for Anzac Day outdoor observances, particularly after the advent of the dawn ceremony in the 1930s. Their central issue was contestation, and it was that matter which often accounted for a long delay in construction. The Wellington War Memorial and Carillon - the national war memorial, was no exception.
Chapter Four- ‘the golden wattle [of] glory…’

Anzac Day in Australia to 1945

The narrative has its power as the story of innocence betrayed, the fittest young men of the nation giving their all for their country and empire and shot down cruelly, endlessly, the fault not so much of the Turks as of the brutal idiocy, the criminal foolishness, of the British command who sent them there. These soldiers came to be known as the ANZACs, though in Australian usages of the term the NZ part tends to be forgotten.

Chapter Four traces Australia’s development of Anzac Day which was subject to different influences from New Zealand’s from its origin to 1945. The debate over spontaneity for Australia’s first Anzac Day is assessed: John Moses’ position challenges spontaneity and allies the commemoration of Anzac Day with a pre-existing religious culture. This thesis also rebuts Janice Pavils’ argument that the South Australian model of 13 October 1915 saw a spontaneous eruption of ‘Anzac Day’. The ADCC record of the organisation and energy of Canon David Garland provides convincing evidence which challenges spontaneity. This remarkable man and his efforts to secure a civic organisation for a national day of commemoration also influenced New Zealand. Australia experienced a furious debate between the ADCC under Garland’s leadership and the forces for returned servicemen, the Returned Sailors and Soldiers Imperial League and Association (RSSILA, the forerunner of the RSL), led by State president Raymond Huish. This conflict was resolved when the RSSILA captured the national management of Anzac Day in the mid-1930s. The 1920s decade of struggle to create a national day of commemoration in Australia was a prelude to that argument over power and management. States’ representatives took protective and intransigent positions in the 1920s against federal persuasion for a national observance of Anzac Day. The result was that despite widespread acceptance that Anzac Day was ‘Australian,’ it was not until 1930 that all six states permitted the passage of federal legislation making it a national day of commemoration.

Does Anzac Day reflect the masculinist trope of the rugged Australian? The discourse of Joy Damousi and Tanja Luckins on ageing and bereaved women losing status by the 1930s is

---

confronted by evidence about the involvement of women at all levels of Australian society. An example can be seen in the leadership of Dr Mary Booth, the founder of the powerful Anzac Fellowship of Women. The advent and growing popularity of the dawn service had an effect on the place for women in Anzac Day. It played a part in appearing to diminish their role in the day.

The spontaneity argument

Recent writing on the subject of whether the first commemorations of Anzac Day happened as spontaneous reaction to the events on Gallipoli in 1915 has been led by the historian John Moses of the University of New England. In June 2002 he challenged the widespread opinion that Australian Anzac Day somehow began spontaneously. He gathered the proponents of spontaneity - Eric Andrews whose secularist view allowed him to see the day as a ‘natural’ outcome of the ‘more or less spontaneous’ activities of soldiers overseas, and a reaction to the ‘excitement’ the day caused in Australia, and the evangelical Richard Ely who forwarded a variant of a growth of self-awareness among Australians, based on post-Gallipoli journalism, especially that produced by Ashmead-Bartlett and Bean.

While Moses admits that some movements do have ‘a habit of suddenly breaking out and flaring up, certainly in some historical writing,’ he argues that news reporting of the activities in the Dardanelles’ campaign alone was not sufficient to ignite a day of commemoration. What was missing from previous analyses was ‘the religious movement of commemoration that began first in Anglican cathedrals throughout the country from June 1915, encompassing other denominations, that has hitherto been neglected by historians of Anzac.’ Further, ‘this local upsurge of “grief management” within the framework of traditional Christian liturgy is at least

---

4 Roland Perry, Monash -The Outsider Who Won A War, Random House, Sydney, 2004, 245, which describes Anzac Day at Tel el Kebir, 25 Apr. 1916 where Monash turned out the whole brigade of Australians at 6.45am for a review and short religious service, followed by cricket and swimming in the Suez Canal. The day finished with lavish mess dinners and band concerts; ibid, 364, ‘Monash had [sic] instigated the recognition and commemoration of Anzac Day.’ This statement needs to be seen in the limited sense of the Australian soldier observance of Anzac Day.
7 Moses, 54.
equally [in relation to 1915 Gallipoli events] a source of energy leading to the institutionalisation of Anzac Day.\(^8\) He cites as evidence of a culture of commemoration pre-dating Anzac Day the celebration of a solemn Requiem held in St John’s Anglican Cathedral, Brisbane, where the Russian *Kontakion* for the Souls of the Departed was sung to 600 worshippers.\(^9\) This event was supplemented by prayer meetings in other Anglican cathedrals, and weekly services of commemoration for the rest of 1915, a practice followed by other denominations. He also cites evidence from another location – at St. George’s Anglican Cathedral in Perth on 30 June 1915; and another denomination, the Methodists.\(^10\) He also draws attention to the withdrawal of troops from Gallipoli which coincided with a widely accepted appeal to make 11 December 1915 a day of penitence and prayer.\(^11\) Despite Moses’ claim that ‘The evidence of a surge of commemorative activity leading up to the 10 January [ADCC] meeting in Brisbane is overwhelming,’\(^12\) the evidence he presents shows activity, but neither overwhelming nor constituting a surge. This leads us to question the validity of his conclusion, that: ‘We may conclude that a culture of commemoration preceded the institutionalisation of Anzac Day.’\(^13\) This claim seems probable, but whether sufficient critical mass exists to substantiate the claim appears uncertain.

Moses’ challenge to spontaneity was rebutted by Janice Pavils in her article ‘The emergence of South Australian Anzac culture 1915-1925.’\(^14\) She challenged Moses on the grounds of what had happened in Adelaide on 13 October 1915 when ‘Anzac Day emerged instinctively from existing grass roots organisations.’\(^15\) This is a serious claim because it raises the possibility that similar movements may have been happening throughout Australia.

---

8 Ibid, 55.
9 John Moses, ‘Anglicanism and Anzac Observance: The Essential Contribution of Canon David John Garland,’ *Pacifica* (Feb. 2006), 61. Moses makes the point that Governor of Queensland was present making this a State occasion.
10 Ibid, 72-73; footnotes record that in the St George’s Anglican Cathedral, Perth, a memorial service for fallen soldiers was held on Wednesday 30 Jun. 1915 and attended by 1350 (also cited in the *Pacifica* Feb. 2006 article, 62), and the Methodist Church in Brisbane founding the first Anzac Memorial Church in Indooroopilly, Qld.
11 7-9 Dec. 1915; there was already re-embarkation of men and stores from the Anzac area and the plan for mass evacuation was only made known to the NZ Infantry Brigade HQ on 14 Dec.. The coincidence which Moses makes is just that and could not reflect a causal connection.
12 Ibid, 57.
13 Ibid.
15 Ibid, 123.
Pavils challenges Moses’ description of the South Australian commemoration, by casting
doubt on the date attributed to the day given in Moses’ evidence. This seems unwarranted
when it is clear that Moses refers to 1924 (and not 1915 nor 1916). However, it does provide a
convenient platform for Pavils to launch her argument based on the first Adelaide ‘Anzac Day’
in October 1915. She cites evidence for spontaneity by examining the institutional origins of
the day. She accepts Moses’ arguments over modern historians’ reluctance to engage with the
spiritual or sacred nature of the response to Anzac Day, and acknowledges the ‘broad Christian
heritage at the time.’ Her argument is based on evidence of the secular culture of patriotic
fund-raising button days – ANZAC, Violet and Wattle Days. She makes a claim for the
activities of the ‘Anzac Day Committee’ which inaugurated the first South Australian patriotic
day. It was called ‘Anzac Day’ in Adelaide, and held on 13 October 1915. However, Pavils
admits that it is difficult to accept now that a day other than the anniversary of the landing
could be widely accepted as ‘Anzac Day,’ and then proceeds to present a body of local
evidence that gives credence to her argument that indeed, 13 October 1915 was the first ‘Anzac
Day.’ What is important here is not whether it was first, but whether it was activities over a
period of five weeks - a massive and successful organisational effort.

What distinguishes human, planned organisation from that which is spontaneous? What often,
as she claims, ‘spontaneous.’ Her evidence cites enthusiasm for the day among the civic
organisations of Adelaide. All of this clearly points to well-directed organisation, aimed at
gaining civic assent, and individual seems to distinguish the spontaneous is its velocity. But
because an event has rapid planning and execution, does that make it spontaneous? In
hindsight, it would certainly seem to, because those movements which propelled the event to

---

16 Embedded in Moses’ endnote 42 which outlined the mid 1920s problem of lack of resolve the RSSILA was
having with consensus on a national Anzac Day and its observance.
1924 because it is neither a description of Adelaide’s response to the Brisbane ADCC’s letter of 28 Feb. 1916, nor
a description of the first “Anzac Day” held in Adelaide on 13 Oct. 1915.’
18 Ibid, 124.
19 Also kept as ‘Eight Hour Day’ [Labour Day].
20 *JRAHS*, Volume 89, No. 2, Dec. 2003, 125: here Pavils cites authors ranged against her – P. Kitley, Lee Sackett,
Richard Ely, Eric Andrews, Chris Flaherty and Michael Roberts.
22 Ibid, 125-126. For example: Fred Seager’s letter of 6 Sept. 1915 on behalf of the ‘Anzac Day Committee’
requesting civic sanction for sandwich board advertising on the upcoming day; the letter of 24 Sept. requesting
permission to follow a designated route; the third letter by W.J. Powell to use Victoria Square and Cresswell
Gardens for distributing refreshments on Anzac Day, the local newspaper notices of the planned street procession,
the meetings by community groups involved in the activities for the day, and merchant advertisements taking
advantage of patronage on the day.
fruition are over time conflated with the event itself. Taking another view, it could be argued that the evidence provided by Pavils of extensive organisation for the event undermines her argument for spontaneity.

Belatedly, Pavils concedes validity to Moses’ argument for the Brisbane ADCC organisation being ‘the first in Australia to seize the initiative in trying to establish Anzac Day as a national day of mourning for the fallen.’ Caution must be exercised here - while Moses wrote about the improbability of a spontaneous institution of a national day of mourning, Pavils was raising the possibility of a spontaneous outburst of a local Anzac Day. She moves further to argue that retention of Anzac Day depended on ‘changes made to Anzac processions and commemorative services in an endeavour to accommodate differences within the Australian community relating to an evolving Australian identity or consciousness.’ Here she appears to be conflating events to the eventual acceptance of a national day of commemoration. This too, is problematic. While changes to the procedures and protocol of Anzac Day have been enacted to fit societal changes, the day does not ‘still take place’ because of them. It may well still happen because it is seen as an intimate expression of Australian identity in a way which resonates there and less in New Zealand. Certainly there are other factors at work here.

Planning is evident when considering 25 April 1916, and other days like Adelaide’s 13 October 1915, or Wellington’s ‘Gallipoli Day’ on 27 November 1915. Whichever example chosen, the whole current landscape of the day caused by: naming the day; placing it in the annual calendar; using religious liturgies; appointing leading figures to roles of supervisory and ceremonial importance; - all point to the exercise of humans managing a new phenomenon. This is hardly an exercise of the Carl Sauer type, because he was examining the input of a

---

23 Ibid, 132. The italics are Pavils’, not Moses’.
24 Ibid, 132.
25 A point of view unequivocally put by the Australian Minister of Defence, Brendan Nelson, during the Dawn Service at North Beach, Gallipoli 2007. G.F. Davis attended.
26 Briefly, they are: the political initiatives to embed Anzac Day in the Australian landscape; the retention of soldier memories through reiteration to an extent that civilian Australians identified with them; and possibly the evolution of more relaxed attitudes to death which challenged soldier exclusivism that once hung over Anzac Day like a pall. This last factor Pat Jalland claims was potent in creating an atmosphere of inclusion, and allowed Australian, New Zealand and Turkish citizens greater participation in the events of the Day.
27 NZFL Vol. XV, No 805, 3 Dec 1915, 7 photos taken at Wellington’s Gallipoli Day sports; The Dominion, 25 Nov. 1915;3 ibid, 26 Nov., 1915, 6 for arrangements for the day; ibid, 2 Dec. 1915, for the Gallipoli Day report which showed £2,616 raised for NZ troops overseas.
cultural group on a ‘natural landscape.’ Its features were ex-servicemen’s parades, newspaper advertisements, church services, town meetings and smoke concerts. The earliest Anzac Day preparations and commemorations are in agreement with Greider and Garchovich’s central proposition, i.e. the act of conferring meaning on the environment in a manner which reflected self-definition. The ready response of citizens was not just because of factors like sacrifice or comfort for the bereaved. It was also strongly related to the way the people of Australia saw themselves as compassionate and respectful. Gallipoli and graves of Australian soldiers were both ‘here and over there.’ Families and friends of the dead felt this most keenly with a realisation that most would never be certain of the place of burial, be able to visit a grave, lay a flower, or in modern terms ‘have closure.’ This duality caused a tension that needed resolution. Compassion dictated community responses which were enthusiastically taken up and Anzac Day was planned and provided a resolution in most of Australia by 1920.

**David Garland, leadership and struggle with the RSSILA**

The Australian Anglican cleric, the Reverend Canon David John Garland, has been described as the ‘architect’ of Anzac Day in Australia, and the ‘motivator’ of the Brisbane-based ADCC. Some of the most powerful evidence for his leadership of Anzac Day is found in the ‘Minutes and Suggestions’ records of the Brisbane-based ADCC, lodged in the archives of the John Oxley Library, the State Library of Queensland. A caution – Garland was the compiler of the ADCC records to 1937, and may have glossed his own contribution. This does not, however, challenge the assessment of his direction of the organisation as the ‘architect’ of the national day of commemoration.

Taking up the suggestion of a well-known Brisbane auctioneer, Thomas Augustine Ryan (whose son, Major Angus Ryan served overseas), Colonel Thynne of the Queensland Recruiting Committee recommended to a small gathering of local dignitaries that a committee be formed to commemorate the anniversary of the Australian landing at Gallipoli.

---

30 JOL ADCC – ‘Minutes and Suggestions,’ 1916-1922, 82-83. There is much confusion over the initiation of the Day, and Garland is popularly and mistakenly credited with originating the idea. Confusion also arises over mistaking T.A. Ryan, the originator of the idea of Anzac Day, with the Labor Premier of Queensland who chaired many of the meetings of the ADCC; *The Brisbane Courier*, 7 Jan. 1919, 9; *The Queenslander*, 5 Jan. 1924, 40, 28, photograph of the late T.A. Ryan.
The first meeting, on 10 January 1916, called by Brisbane Alderman Diddams, was presided over by Alderman Downs (the Mayor of Brisbane), and was addressed by the Governor, the State Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Inspector-General of the Australian Forces and David Garland. A major outcome was that ‘it was decided that the first anniversary of the Landing at Gallipoli shall be suitably celebrated in Queensland, and the other States be invited to similar action.'
At the meeting which originated with and was carried out by the Queensland Recruiting Committee: ‘a committee was appointed to make all the necessary arrangements for, and carry out, the celebrations of Anzac Day.’

That Garland had already assumed a leading role is demonstrated by his moving the first resolution. From the inception of this steering committee, it is clear that thorough organisation was the priority for the proposed day. Moses places Garland in the position of stage-managing the first public meeting of the ADCC in the Brisbane Exhibition Hall, acting as its ‘spiritus rector’.

There was a feeling of celebration evident from the outset. Moses quotes the local Courier report on Garland’s appeal, in which he advocated moderation of celebration over the Gallipoli withdrawal on the basis that bravery, honour and courage were all to be valued for their own sakes.

Recognition of Garland’s organising abilities was immediate. He was asked to formulate a draft plan of observance of the day in time for the next meeting, set down for 11 February 1916 in the State Premier’s office. From being an enthusiastic suggestion discussed at a public meeting by a small committee, the movement gained momentum by being the object of attention from political leadership in Queensland. By the third meeting, held in the Premier’s Room on 18 February, its membership indicated the widespread community of interest and itself greatly ensured success for the Day. Representatives comprised some of Queensland’s most influential figures - the Premier, the two Archbishops, representatives of the other churches, community leaders and military representatives. The only reply declining a position came from the University of Queensland Vice-Chancellor. R.H. Roe. Some religious leaders, Jewish, Presbyterian, Baptist and Congregational Union, apologised for their absence. The Premier moved to have Canon Garland appointed Secretary and this was unanimously accepted. This confirmed in the working platform of the committee a man already recognised as the driving force behind the planned day of commemoration in Queensland, and would be a driving force.

---

31 JOL ADCC - ‘Minutes and Suggestions,’ 1916-1922, 1, document ‘Anzac Day Commemoration, 25th Apr. 1916.’[Not all of this agrees with the handwritten minutes of 3 Feb 1916, 62 - 63, signed by the Chairman, T. Ryan. In these fuller minutes, the initial meeting was in the Exhibition Hall on 10 Jan. 1916, ‘Alderman Diddams stated he had, at the request of Col. Thynne, Chairman of the Queensland Recruiting Executive which had originated this movement, called the present meeting.’ Alderman Diddams reported that at the public meeting the following were appointed a committee to take action for the observance of the 25th of April next as the first anniversary of the landing of Australian troops at Gallipoli.] The Committee then appointed consisted of: The ‘Mayors of Brisbane and South Brisbane, the State Premier, the Hon. James Tolmie, the Chairmen and Honorary Secretaries of the Queensland Recruiting Committee and the Patriotic Entertainments Committee, and Canon Garland, with power to add to their number.’; The Courier, Brisbane, 12 Jan. 1916, unpaged cutting in ADCC, ‘Minutes and Suggestions, 1916-1922,’17.


33 JOL ADCC cuttings Brisbane Courier, 11 Jan. 1916.
for Anzac Day in the future for Australia. In the first instance ‘it was decided (after an unsuccessful appeal from the Queensland Patriotic Fund Committee to help with fundraising for Disabled and Wounded Soldiers’ Fund of the Queensland Patriotic Fund) that no effort be made for the raising of funds on Anzac Day.’ The day was to be commemorative, with no other distractions.

The successful institution of the day altered the landscape in a number of ways. It created a platform from which expressions of gratitude for the sacrifice of the citizens of the nation could be voiced. It signalled a position to other Australian states of models of heroism that might aid the flagging enlistment. This was not a given, as shown by the lack of enthusiasm by the domestic Australian community for the two referenda on conscription held in 1916. It gave priority and status to the returned soldier, and appeared to guarantee gratitude and sympathy towards bereaved families. It required a physical place in the community where the necessary ceremonials would be held, and in doing so gave impetus to monument and memorial building. The day also provided an arena for and gave credence to war narratives - all of which built and strengthened the ‘Anzac myth’ of mateship, courage under fire, boldness and exercise of personal initiative, disregard of class and a degree of larrikinism.

In terms of memory, the creation of the day itself was novel. Memories of returned men featured in newspaper columns and the day seemed specially set aside for honouring the men, particularly those who were Gallipoli or ‘original Anzacs.’ There were seeds of conflict embedded here. Garland, however, envisaged a civic commemoration of the day from the outset and it was not long before this became clear to the organisations representing the returned men. However, because Garland had leadership, mana and initiative during the early days of the ADCC, his direction prevailed. It was not, however, uncontested. By the 1930s bitter struggles surfaced over the direction of the ADCC. The RSSILA was well aware that returned servicemen would never be able to direct the development, direction or executive policies of the ADCC while Garland was at the helm. With the support of the various Queensland premiers who chaired the committee ex officio, Garland ensured that as Anzac Day was a civilian tribute, the committee should remain civilian. The Returned Sailors’ and

Soldiers’ Imperial League of Australia under Raymond Huish in 1937 gained control of the committee and thereby of Anzac Day management in Queensland.

This crisis, which incrementally escalated from 1934 to 1936, culminated in the loss of civilian control of Australian Anzac Day. It began innocuously enough with questions raised by the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce over the sombre tone of the observance.\(^{35}\) In 1934, there seemed to be an accord between the ADCC and the RSILLA and affiliates.\(^{36}\) It was, however, only a respite. In October 1934 minutes of the ADCC record a meeting dominated by the bloc of RSILLA members and their affiliates where disappointment was expressed about an ice-encased ADCC wreath being in poor condition on reaching London.\(^{37}\) The possibility of curtailing religious sentiment in Anzac Day ceremonies was discussed. The notes on this are curt, indicating a split between Huish and the RSILLA and the proponents from the Manufacturers’ Association who wished greater rejoicing on the day. The contentious matter of flying the New Zealand flag was also raised. This last matter went further and in March 1935 there seemed to be a turn-around.\(^{38}\) Near the end of the meeting the equilibrium was disturbed over an appeal by the Incapacitated Wounded Sailors’ and Soldiers’ League for representation on the ADCC. However, the RSSILA already represented their interests and the request was therefore declined. Garland explained that the Committee was originally formed by the Citizens who desired to honour the Soldiers. It was hoped that it would remain mainly a Citizens’ Committee:

\(^{35}\) JOL ADCC Minutes 1 Feb. 1934: Mr. F.B. Bolton, Chamber of Commerce representative felt that the ‘general tone of the Observance was too sad, he considered that as time had softened the horrors of war, the Observance should be brightened by the spirit of Thanksgiving’ and went further, suggesting ‘“Onward, Christian Soldiers” replace the Dead Mar. in the Evening Meetings, and that the flags need not be at half-mast all day.’ The meeting discarded this in favour of what had been in previous years. A reflection on what was happening elsewhere came in a letter from J.E. Bell, representative of the 9th Battalion who attended the Anzac Celebration in Sydney in 1933, who wrote, ‘Sydney’s colourful sports on Anzac afternoon and their tattoo [sic] at night was a diversity to Brisbane’s continued solemnity of services throughout the day and evening, and I consider that nowhere else is Anzac Day so sacredly kept and memories so keenly hallowed, after the years having reached our 18th anniversary.’

\(^{36}\) Ibid, Joint Sec Report 1934, 1: ‘On Anzac Day there seemed to be but one sentiment in the heart of the whole community – that of profound reverence to the memory of the men through whose service and sacrifice in the war we retain the liberties and privileges as a people that are ours today.’

\(^{37}\) JOL ADCC Minutes, 18 Oct. 1934.

\(^{38}\) JOL ADCC M & S 1923-1937, 7 Mar. 1935. The ADCC was to ask Queensland and other State leaders for flying of ‘the Dominion [of New Zealand] flag on Anzac Day together with the Union Jack and the Commonwealth flag.’ This matter was later raised when the ‘Suggestions for Observance’ pamphlet was being considered and F.B. Bolton promoted the idea that ceremonies on the day should make ‘special reference to New Zealand.’ To be included in the same publication were articles by Ion Idriess and the Archbishop of Brisbane, and extracts from *The Silent Division* by New Zealander Reverend O.E. Burton.
otherwise when in the course of time the Returned Soldiers were no longer there to assist, the Committee would cease to function, instead of as was the hope of everyone concerned with the Observance of Anzac Day, carry on and preserve the memory of the gallant deeds of the Sailors, Soldiers and Sisters of Australia for many years after the last one died.\(^\text{39}\)

In this important statement, Garland made his position obvious. While his intent for the preservation of the ADCC and its controlling interest over Anzac Day in Australia was honourable, many of the returned servicemen would have taken a hostile view of this stance. The next two years were to see a transition in the leadership of the ADCC and the management of Anzac Day with proponents and affiliates of the RSSILA taking control. The 5 September 1935 meeting of the ADCC, was for the first time dominated by military representatives.\(^\text{40}\) It recorded that despite the request to fly New Zealand flags, ‘no [sic] many such flags had been flown.’ The most important matter, however, was the vote conducted by the RSSILA which supported the observance retaining the solemn format. The vote over this crucial matter foreshadowed victory for the forces of conservative ex-servicemen’s interests. Interestingly, both Huish and Garland supported the solemn style of observance. However, the action of holding a national vote among the returned soldiers on the observance effectively led to a capture of the initiative by the RSSILA representatives, and sidelined the lengthy leadership of Garland. Not all returned servicemen appreciated the stand taken by Huish and his associates: 

\textit{The Telegraph} [Brisbane] on 29 April recorded five letters - one over the nom-de-plume ‘Five Medals.’ This writer felt uneasy with the factionalism he saw in the RSSILA and its influence on Anzac Day. He felt that the actions of the State President of the RSSILA amounted to grandstanding and that the day had ‘grown out of all proportion,’ and needed to be simplified. ‘Let the landing at Anzac be commemorated in the simple and sincere form of the Dawn ceremony, and let the rest of the day be regarded as an occasion for public rejoicing.’ He made a solitary plea for ‘the proper day for solemn commemoration seems to be that observed in all other parts of the world – Armistice Day.’\(^\text{41}\) This view was not widely accepted in Australia.

As it transpired, the 1935 tensions between Huish and Garland were a prelude to a greater battle – a bitter power struggle between the two men and their followers for control of the ADCC in

\(^{39}\) JOL ADCC M&S 1923-1937, Minutes of the ADCC 7 Mar. 1935, 3.
\(^{40}\) JOL ADCC M&S 1923–1937, Minutes of the ADCC, 5 Sept. 1935, out of the twenty present, eleven were representatives of returned men or their interests.
1936 and 1937. The matter came to a head in discussions over the arrangements for Anzac Day 1937, where the day fell on a Sunday. Huish reminded the committee of the previous occasion in 1926 when ‘the Churches had referred to the Observance on the Sunday, the Parade had been held in the afternoon, and the usual Anzac Day Services together with the evening meetings held on the Monday.’

He then shifted ground to argue adamantly for the RSSILA stand that Sunday 25 April should be the commemoration with ‘no suggestion of any transfer of the observance to the Monday.’ He moved that:

> in view of the actual landing on Gallipoli taking place on Sunday, April 25 1915, this Anzac Day Commemoration Committee consider it most fitting and therefore strongly recommends and earnestly requests that –
> All City, Town and Shire Councils, Public, Religious and Returned Solider [sic] Organisations organise and conduct all their Anzac Day Commemoration Services and/or meetings on Sunday, 25th April, 1937.
> The people of Queensland observe and commemorate Anzac Day 1937, on Sunday 25th April, 1937.

This was seconded by ‘Mr. Bostock.’ [J.O.B. Stock, in the record of those present]. An unusual number of mistakes in this minute indicated the stresses felt by Secretaries Garland and Pike. Previous minutes were meticulous and error-free with few exceptions, but for this and later meetings, details such as the names of the organisations’ representatives were omitted. Tension was building, despite Garland and Pike’s assurances in their Report for the year that ‘The Returned Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Imperial League, both Headquarters and Branches, have again closely co-operated, and taken care that the programme laid down by the [ADCC] Committee was observed, and its policy endorsed.’ This issue pushed the committee to its limits, and revealed the strains between the citizens’ outlook and those of the returned servicemen as represented by the RSSILA. The RSSILA wanted the Day to be observed on 25 April regardless of the agreements of 1926.

Discussion ranged on the position of each of the Churches and was clarified with the Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Presbyterian representatives expressing difficulty with a Sunday-only commemoration. Co-secretary Pike reminded the Committee of the Government legislation, G. Brahms countered giving the United Council of AIF Units’ position, supporting Huish’s stand,

---

42 JOL ADCC M&S 1923-1937, Minutes of the ADCC 16 Dec. 1936, 1.
43 Ibid, 2.
and Garland reiterated the stand that the ADCC had been originated by citizens and would be carried on by them ‘long after the Returned Soldiers were not there to help.’ This central idea did not sit well with the determined Huish, who stated that he had no desire to embarrass the religious bodies, and while appreciating the difficulties that his motion created, he did not wish to spread the observances over two days. Garland and Pike probably cringed at this disingenuousness. The minutes record the vote on the resolution which was carried to observe the day on 25 April, although a sub-committee was appointed to further discuss the issues of the evening meeting. The meeting of the subcommittee was held on 23 December 1936 in the Queensland Ambulance Service Transport Brigades’ Rooms (QATB), not in the usual venue, the Executive Offices of the Queensland Government. Huish moved that the Anzac Day evening meetings take place from 9pm to 10 pm on Sunday. This was to be taken forward as a recommendation to the next meeting.

A crisis point was reached at the next ADCC meeting. The Most Rev. John W.C. Wand, Anglican Archbishop advised that the Sunday services would follow the liturgy for St. Mark’s Day and that there would be no public luncheon. The Church of England Help Society could not arrange the lunch, as it had done in 1921 and 1926 on a Monday. The Roman Catholic Church decided it could do no other than have its Service and luncheon on Monday, 26 April. The Presbyterian and Methodist Churches could hold theirs on Sunday, but the Baptists could not hold their usual Tabernacle Service and Annual Luncheon. Huish moved to the point raised in previous discussions, that if the observance were stretched over Sunday and Monday this would mean ‘there would be forty eight hours to be kept solemnly, this in his opinion would strengthen the argument of those who held that the Observance of Anzac Day in Queensland was too mournful and too solemn, and would not meet with the approval of the rising generation.’ Huish is seen here playing both sides, being prepared to support the notion of solemn observance (clearly supported by the RSSILA), but not for too long! The determination of Huish to push his ambitions was seen in Garland’s minute: ‘his great anxiety being to confine the Observance to the 25th, and this had been supported by the highest in the land and

46 Ibid, Minutes of the ADCC 12 Mar. 1937.
by the press, he was prepared to go to any lengths if the desire of the soldiers could be carried into effect, and to prevent the spreading of the Observance to make two days of solemnity.  

Ultimately, Huish triumphed and forced through a mild motion of censure, in which the ADCC noted it ‘keenly regret[s] the inability of some religious bodies to accede to the wishes of the Commemoration Committee’ and appealed to them to ‘confine their activities to the 25th.’ A further successful motion earnestly appealed to the Brisbane City Council to conduct its Anzac Day Evening Citizens’ Commemoration Meeting on Sunday 25 April. The local paper reporting the meeting gave no indication of the bitterness in the meeting. The effect of this was that the public was unaware of any debate over the matter. The only slight discord expressed was the ADCC reported as expressing that ‘a wish that all churches should co-operate.’

Garland, having seen the successful capture of the initiative of the ADCC by Huish and the soldier representatives, considered his own resignation, but was persuaded otherwise by Co-Secretary Pike. Huish rubbed salt into the wound, offering to relieve the heavy responsibilities of the Joint Secretaries through the appointment of an Executive Committee. He then took the opportunity to upbraid Garland and Pike for their part in the ‘unnecessary and unsuitable publicity in the press.’ This was a curious remark, in view of the scant reporting of the matter. The adoption of a monthly Executive Committee was agreed, and Garland was left isolated at the end of the meeting to explain the delay in getting the Premier or his representative, Mr. F.A. Cooper, to call the meeting. Both Archbishops of Brisbane indicated that their churches would respond to Anzac Day in their own way. The usual ‘Suggestions for Public Observance’ were posted, but a hand-written addition in the minutes draws attention to the ‘Dawn service,’ as having been overlooked by both denominations.

There is an additional and bitter record for the first meeting of the Executive of the ADCC held at the QATB Rooms in Ann Street 1 April 1937. Garland tendered an apology. By the next

48 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
51 ADCC M&S 1923-1937, Minutes of the ADCC ADCC Circulars, 18 and 24 Mar. 1937. Hon. Secs. to ADCC. 
52 Canon Garland informed the Committee by letter he could not attend ‘as he was not willing at present to sit with Mr. Huish, Mr. Lloyd, or other representatives of the Returned Soldiers League who had adopted an attitude of hostility to him personally…He objected to a reference made by Mr. Lloyd at a meeting of the Committee that he, Canon Garland, had stayed at home while others had gone to the front. [and] the implications made by Mr. Huish in connection with the calling of meetings of the Anzac Day Committee, and the reference to luncheons given to
Executive Meeting on 20 April, the Church of England Cathedral Service was scheduled for 25 April, but the Roman Catholic on the next day, Monday. The Secretary reported that Garland would broadcast as usual from 4QG. In the following meeting of the Executive Committee on 30 August, concern was expressed about the dwindling returns and the consequent preparations for making lesser grants. There was no mention of the letter from Garland. The ‘Joint Honorary Secretaries’ (sic) Report of 1937,’ showed that despite reservations from the religious representatives of the ADCC, the day had gone well. Huish must have been delighted. The next Executive Meeting minutes records Pike’s observation that ‘in publications and press matters supplied by the League [RSSILA], no reference was made to the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee.’

Capitulation was complete. At the last full meeting of the ADCC for 1937, where twenty-one members including Garland were present, eleven were RSSILA representatives or affiliates. The returned men had captured the initiative. Early in the meeting Garland acquiesced in the application for the T.B. Sailors’ and Soldiers’ Association of Queensland to join the ADCC.

The Committee heard the account of the financial position and suggestions that payments to beneficiary organisations be lessened. A question was asked about the investments, and Garland pointed out that the £3000 accumulated by the ADCC in earlier years was originally for the upkeep of Gallipoli graves but since responsibility for the care of graves abroad had been taken by the Imperial War Graves Commission the [interest on the] money had been used pay for tending the graves at Toowoong in Garland’s parish. Pike shielded Garland from an obvious attack by suggesting the issue of the care of these graves could be taken up with the Brisbane City Council. Garland’s sensitivity was exposed when Mr Mills of the Fathers’ Association proffered thanks for the arrangement of the Sunday service at the Toowoong Cemetery on Anzac Day. Garland’s response was sharp. He said ‘he would take exception to

men following the Church Services as bait.’ Further discussion on the letter was deferred to the next meeting. Huish enquired as to whether Canon Garland would be holding the usual 9 a.m. service at Toowoong on 25 Apr., and also whether he would broadcast on 4QG. This is not elaborated, but indicates a deal of nervousness about Garland’s influence. Again, the main local paper, the Brisbane Courier-Mail, 2 Apr. 1937, 14 reported only selected minutes of the newly appointed ADCC Executive with no mention of the internal debate.

53 ADCC M&S 1923-1937, Minutes of the ADCC, Meeting of the Executive of the ADCC, 2 Nov. 1937. It is interesting to see the minutes of this group loosely called ‘Executive’ e.g. 30 Aug. 1937, or ‘Executive Committee’ for 20 Apr. 1937 and 2 Nov. 1937.

54 The Premier, Hon W. Forgan Smith, apologised for not attending the Queensland Anzac Day, because he was at the London observance. He attended with the High Commissioner, S.M. Bruce, and the Federal Treasurer, E. Casey, and heard the sermon preached by the Archbishop of New Zealand in St. Paul’s.
such an action as he had held a service at 9 a.m. at Toowoong on Anzac Day for at least fifteen years and had neither expected nor received thanks for doing so."55

This is a sad end to a record of noble service by a man whose main ambition was to preserve the proper observance of Australian Anzac Day. He struggled on, attending subsequent meetings as his declining health allowed. The 21 September 1939 meeting was his last and he withdrew early, but not before tabling the joint Secretaries’ last report which touched on that matter close to his heart – the continued maintenance of soldier graves in Toowoong cemetery.56 The minutes of a subsequent meeting briefly record a brief tribute to Garland, who died in October 1939. The Chairman, F.A. Cooper, moved a motion of sympathy. In seconding the resolution Secretary Pike said ‘Even if he were not actually the originator of the Observance,’57 he had been closely and intimately associated with it since its commencement. No one had worked more assiduously nor expressed the view more strongly that Anzac Day should be a Holy Day and not a Holiday.58 Garland deserved better, however, it was wartime.59 The historic landscape was scarred by this extended conflict. It set a tone for entrenched possession for Anzac Day of a sort not shared in New Zealand.

Wendy Mansfield, writing for the 1981 edition of the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, places Garland at the forefront of Anzac Day initiatives.60 His contribution to the inception and proper maintenance of the day to 1939 cannot be underestimated. His unswerving determination to make the day sacred, to imprint the connection of the day with the mainstream

---

55 JOL ADCC M&S 1923-1937, Minutes of the ADCC, 4 Nov. 1937, 4.
56 JOL ADCC Minutes OHMA/1/5, 21 Sept. 1939 and Joint Secretaries’ Report [undated].
57 A reference to T.A. Ryan.
58 JOL ADCC Minutes OHMA/1/5, Folder 1, 22 Feb.1940, 1.
59 Ibid, Folder 2, Minutes of the ADCC, 13 Feb. 1941, a letter of commendation from King George VI, expressing thanks for specially bound copy of the Anzac Day booklet, and his regret on hearing of the death of Garland; Ibid, 24 Jul. 1941, a motion was later tabled, which had been prepared by S.C. James (T.B. Sailors and Soldiers’ Assoc of Queensland) and seconded by the Rev. Allan McKillop (Presbyterian Church) and S.H. Richardson (Fathers’ Association). This moved that the sum of ten guineas would be made available for a memorial to the late Canon Garland.
60 Wendy Mansfield, ‘Garland, David John (1864-1939)’ *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Vol. 8, 1891-1939, Melbourne University Press, Victoria, Australia, 1981, 619-620. ‘Garland initiated the Anzac Day Mar., the returned soldiers’ luncheon, the two minutes’ silence, the wreath-laying ceremonies at memorials and the special church services. He also began a trust to use money raised from [the sale of] Anzac Day badges for the care of soldiers’ graves at home and abroad. The royal blue silk badges devised by Garland include the winged lion of St Mark, because St Mark’s Day coincided with Anzac Day. The badge and ceremonies, vigorously backed by Garland, were taken up in other States and to a very large extent in New Zealand and Great Britain. Garland was overpoweringly energetic with a distinctive flair, if not genius, for organisation. He was appointed O.B.E. in 1934. An enthusiastic Jacobite, he bore various titles in the Order of King Charles the Martyr. Widowed in 1933, he died on 9 Oct. 1939 and was buried in Toowong cemetery.’
churches, particularly his own, the Church of England, to work for a standardised day of national commemoration, to base the administration of the day within the view of civic rather than exclusively military authorities, defined the day in a way still recognisable today.\textsuperscript{61} The ADCC, despite administrative problems in the 1950s, remained true to Garland’s vision. His sense of inclusion eased the way for the memories of future generations of soldiers and their families to be placed in that landscape. Today, the ADCC public declaration states that it ‘continues to prosecute the original aims for a holy day of commemoration rather than another public festival holiday… [and] it will always represent the citizens’ gift of the people to Queensland’s war veterans.'\textsuperscript{62} David Garland’s guiding light still shines.

It would be appropriate to compare the significance of Garland’s legacy with that of C.E.W. Bean, the great military historian. Bean’s legacy is found in the preserved military archives, the building of the AWM and most of all in the absorption of the bush legend into the ethos of the Australian community and particularly the military. Garland’s contribution lies in the nature and continuance of Anzac Day throughout Australia, and to a lesser extent, New Zealand.

In the extraordinary struggle between Garland and Huish for control over the ADCC, we can see strong elements of ‘impression management.’\textsuperscript{63} Metaphorically, this was generational struggle between a Young Turk and an old warrior, which the latter lost. The changing landscape reflects a desire, conscious or otherwise, by the RSSILA to emulate the well-known New Zealand situation where civic authorities capitulated early on to the wishes of the RSA for control over Anzac Day events. The Huish - Garland struggle is a remarkable episode reflecting divergent interpretations of Anzac Day and deserves deeper study. It represented victory for the forces of localism and conservatism in Australia. For the nation, emerging slowly from the depths of the Great Depression, the RSSILA victory appeared reassuring. It seemed a victory for a group which appeared better equipped in the society to represent the interests of the ADCC than the civic representatives had been able to before 1936. The result carried the seeds of both optimism and future disunity.

\textsuperscript{61} \url{www.anzacd.org.ac} the website of the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee of Queensland. Accessed 3 Nov. 2008.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{63} Greider and Garkovich, 14 and P.M. Hall, 51.
A national day of commemoration and a sacred name

An essential difference between the Australian and New Zealand establishment of Anzac Day lies in the issue of ‘centrality.’ Australia, unlike New Zealand, was a multiple-state entity with a recently founded federal capital and six autonomous areas which potentially challenged the authority of the central government. While Garland and the ADCC early on provided the drive for speedy adoption of Anzac Day as a national day of commemoration, the tendency of individual Australian states to preserve their integrity delayed its adoption until the late 1920s. Despite the work of Garland and the ADCC, Australia came to the point of legitimising a national day of commemoration almost a decade after New Zealand. Its legislation was referred to on 22 September 1921 by Queensland Premier E. G. Theodore in the second reading of the ‘Act to constitute Anzac Day a National Holiday.’

How could a national day of commemoration in Australia be accomplished within the federal structure? There was public discussion, and sympathy for the sanctity of the word ‘Anzac.’ The Federal Parliament in 1916 held discussions over whether the planned capital, Canberra, ought to be renamed ‘ANZAC.’ Choice of a nationally-commemorated ‘Anzac Day’ in the States’ calendars was another matter. The principal problem was the sovereign powers of the states over matters not contingent on Federal government agency. Additionally, it was not just a case of regional authorities jealously preserving their powers, but also the tyranny of distance. In a sense, it was easier for Queenslanders to identify with what had happened in New Zealand, compared with Western Australia. The relative isolation of communities both between and within states made universal acceptance of such an event well-nigh impossible. Overlaying this, in societal terms, there was a matter of particularity. Western Australians saw their actions as uniquely different to those from Victoria or Queensland and vice versa. In this context, John Moses notes ‘the persistent efforts of that [ADCC] committee until 1930 when legislation was enacted at last to establish Anzac Day [as] the unchallenged sacred national day of mourning
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65 Hansard, [Australia], Parliamentary Debates, 1916, Vol. 79, 7977–7978. Senator Lynch’s appeal that the name Anzac had greater justification for choice as a name for a national capital than that of Washington, DC.
for the nation’s fallen.” The words ‘persistent’ and ‘at last’ betray admission of the chronic and difficult nature of the task. Indeed, the title of his article, ‘The struggle for Anzac Day 1916 – 1930’ concedes the substance of the difficulty.

It was clear from the outset that the positions of the states were diverse. The unifying factor of the London imperial connection monopolised the news in 1916. Unfortunately, the ADCC archives do not record material relating to public perception until 1917. In that year, the states’ positions become clear. In 1917, Australian newspapers made explicit the variety of arrangements: Perth local papers announced an intention to repeat the successful celebrations of the previous year on 25 April, Launceston was to hold an ‘Anzac Day’ on the same day despite some complaints about the closing of shops. Melbourne authorities had made arrangements for a Button Day on 27 April and Memorial Sunday on 29 April, confidently advertising the latter would be ‘fixed as the official commemoration day throughout Australia of the landing on Gallipoli.’ Independently of Melbourne, the temporary federal capital, the Sydney War Council chose 25 April. The Sydney committee, chaired by Brigadier-General Ramaciotti planned noon church services, a 4 p.m. open air military service at Moore Park Show Ground and a minute’s silence for all men out of doors at noon on the day. Even in Melbourne, a compromise was found after the Federal Prime Minister William Hughes persuaded the Lord Mayor that 25 April, ‘the real anniversary’, would be the day of the soldiers’ march. However, because the Salvation Army had booked the Town Hall for the day, there instead would be ‘a citizen’s [sic] demonstration on the night of the 24th.’ At least this was drawing events closer to the 25th.
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67 AWM Anzac Day Cuttings Boxes, Daily Mail, Wednesday, 26 Apr. 1916. [London], 1; The Daily Mirror, 26 Apr. 1916, 10; Daily Sketch, Wednesday, 26 Apr. 1916, 6-7.
69 Ibid, 1917 Cuttings book No.1, 10, Daily Telegraph, Launceston, 24 Mar. 1917; ibid, 1917 Cuttings book No.1, 10 Mercury, Hobart, 12 Apr. 1917. Not everyone was enthusiastic about the notion of a holiday on Anzac Day. The Mercury carries a letter to the editor: ‘Sir, - In your report of the meeting [about Anzac day] nothing was said about the day being declared a public or bank holiday. Let us hope it will be neither.’ The writer complains of the frequent holidays – Reinforcement Day when ‘the morning’s trade was a complete frost… and the three days of Easter, now another on the 25th…’ ‘Why not advertise when we are going to open shops, and not when they will be closed?…Celebrate the day by all means, especially by some solemn memorial service, not in the tomfoolery way that generally obtains, and certainly not by closing down business….Yours, etc., HONOUR THE BRAVE.’
The Sydney commemoration was marked by dissent over the place of the returned soldiers. The confident pronouncements of 10 April turned to rancour by 16 April, with the Sydney *Evening News* running a story about the day’s purpose being subverted by State Recruiting Campaign organisers who were about ‘to filch and collar the day for recruiting and military purposes.’ The nascent Returned Soldiers’ Association was barely in a position to challenge the recruiting authorities over the matter, and the complaint of one soldier expressed their position: ‘It is supposed to be the returned soldiers’ day but where do we come in?’ Here we see clear divisions between the plea for recognition by the returned men and the state’s desire for lifting enlistments. The state showed little concern for local communities wishing to mourn the fallen and honour their sacrifice. Indeed, it is an early reflection of a deep schism over meaning and management of the day.

A clear intent to mediate between recruiting needs and finding a place for returned men soon appeared in the Sydney *Daily Telegraph*, which reported the State Campaign recruiting official secretary insisting that ‘returned soldiers will certainly be given every prominence’ and that they were to muster ‘with their bands and banners at the Central Avenue, Hyde Park, Liverpool street end, and march in procession to the Show-ground, via Oxford and Flinders Streets and Anzac Avenue.’ They were the first military unit into the Showground Ring and in the place of honour. A further concession was notified on 18 April – incapacitated soldiers wearing medals or ribbons were accommodated in the Coronation Stand at the Show-grounds. The need for the Sydney War Council to placate the ruffled feathers of the returned men was revealed in the news just before Anzac Day that the recruiting rally in Martin Place, would be addressed by returned soldiers only. The item also outlined the shape of a proposed education circular which defined heroism and described the sacred cause in which that heroism was displayed. Instructions from Augustus James, Minister for Education of New South Wales, made clear the investment of the state in the perpetuation of memory for Anzac Day. James ended: ‘I feel sure that teachers will respond gladly to the department’s wish to the memory of Anzac Day, with all that it means, [and it] should become a permanent and proud reality to the
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74 Ibid, 1917 Cuttings book No.1, 3, *Daily Telegraph*, Sydney, 1 May 1917 [incorrect date, as the material was written prior to Anzac Day].
children, in the history of Australia. This material went further than just insisting on honouring memory; from a State level, it created a new landscape with features which related to it. By determining the accepted procedures for schools’ participation on the day, James set an enduring pattern melding the shape of the day for the young in society clearly accords with the possession and management parameters articulated by Greider and Garkovich.

In Brisbane, the influence of ADCC organisation was evident. Just over a week prior to Anzac Day, the Brisbane Courier detailed arrangements for 25 April, which included: the nature of observing the day as being one with ‘a deep feeling of solemnity,’; distribution of posters reading ‘Remember Anzac Day’; selling of badges with the winged lion of St. Mark; closing of bars by members of the Licensed Victuallers’ Association between 2 p.m. and 4 p.m.; stopping of all Queensland trains to for one minute at 9 p.m.; the Education Department issuing a special Anzac Day edition of the school journal; and the extensive canvassing of church denominations to hold special services on the day which members of the Sailors’ and Soldiers’ Imperial League could attend. The proliferation of arrangements must have impressed Commonwealth Prime Minister William Hughes. In order to ensure a degree of uniformity he issued instructions on the nature of the processions in the capital cities of each State. Their composition would be ‘members of the A.I.F. Light Horse and Artillery, with equipment, and members of the Australian Military Forces [and] as many of the returned soldiers as possible will take part, and the various brass bands will assist.’

Was the public aware of the differences between the states? Probably not. Local press news concentrated more on local and international situations. That Anzac Day was conducted differently in New South Wales from Queensland was much less a matter of public concern than it was for the ADCC and for federal authorities who saw desirability in uniformity.

77 Ibid, 1917 Cuttings book No.1, 3, Daily Telegraph, Sydney, 1 May 1917 [incorrect date]. James wrote of Australians ‘federating themselves into nationhood… [children] to take an active part in what is going on…selected portions of Mr. Ashmead Bartlett’s and Captain Bean’s stories of the landings should be read…returned [Anzacs or] parents of Anzacs should be made special guests…At noon every school flag is to be placed at half-mast in memory of the fallen Anzacs and their brave Allies. Each pupil will stand at the salute as the flag is lowered, and the flag will then be raised again to the masthead in honor of the day.’
78 See this thesis, Chapter 1.
79 Anzac Day was on the feast of St. Mark the Evangelist.
80 AWM Anzac Day Cuttings Boxes, 1917 Cuttings book No.1, 6, Brisbane Courier, 16 Apr. 1917.
Despite numerous appeals for uniformity and a day of national commemoration, little came of it. After the directive by William Hughes in 1916, the flood of appeals for a national day continued. Even in Brisbane, where the situation seemed most favourable for a holiday for returned soldiers employed as public servants, and where private employers were asked to contribute by doing the same, the Queensland Prime Minister’s department declared it could not support such a move because the state government alone exercised that prerogative. The Governor-General could issue a proclamation, but that would only affect public servants employed by the Commonwealth offices of the State. At a personal level this action broadened to an appeal for a public holiday and resulted in a flurry of strongly worded opinions in the newspapers. Despite this, the Premier (also chair of the ADCC), T.J. Ryan, predicted ‘The day would come when Anzac Day would have the same significance to Australia as the 4th of July to America, and the 14th July to France.’ From a broader perspective, universal acceptance of 25 April seemed clear, with The Times proclaiming ‘Without debate it has been agreed to hold April 25 sacred to the Australian and New Zealand dead…Not unmindful of her own dead, England joins in the tribute.’ Despite frequent reminders of how important Anzac Day was for the nation’s ex-servicemen, widows and parents of the dead, nothing came of it until 1930. However, by the early 1920s most states had settled on 25 April as the appropriate day. There was an enormous variety in the designated activities of the day, indicating the lack of cohesion over what it really meant. Comparisons with the settled situation in New Zealand evidently cut little ice.

Other pleas for a national day of commemoration and for a more structured and sacred nature of the day fell on deaf ears. New Zealand, by reference to its 1920 legislation for a national day, was held as a role model. By the mid-1920s little had changed. At the Hotel Cecil, London,
following the 1925 Anzac Day commemorations, the gathering of London ex-Anzac soldiers and wives on 27 April was entitled ‘The Unity of Empire.’ Sir James Allen, the High Commissioner for New Zealand, presided and Earl Jellicoe of the Fleet was the principal guest. The latter referred to raising New Zealand children to regard Anzac Day as a day of self-sacrifice - a spirit much needed in the Empire. He concluded by declaring that 25 April, 1915, was the day on which the unity of the Empire was achieved. This may well have been an imperialist’s dream and supported the British Empire self-image. While his appeal did not lack power or support, the degree of unity Jellicoe hoped for remained elusive.

By contrast, at the periphery of Empire, in Gympie, North Queensland, the local paper was urging a national sacred day. In an impassioned plea, the _Gympie Review_ proclaimed:

to set aside a Day as a Memorial to the 60,000 of Australia’s manhood who fell defending the Empire, is the aim of the Returned Soldier of Australia...

To perpetuate the memory of these ‘Heroes of Australia’ much energy and consecrated service has been expended in the building of monuments, halls, etc., but these will crumble into decay, for they are built of perishable materials; but a day set aside, to be recognised by Australia as a Nation, as Australia’s Saints’ day (if a Saint’s Day we have), kept sacred like Good Friday, will not become a prey to the elements, but will increase in significance as time rolls on…

Remember Anzac Day, the 25th April, and keep it sacred.

The issue was kept public in 1926 as Anzac Day fell on a Sunday, and local newspapers again reflected the debate. Most correspondence reflected the RSSILA’s view that Anzac Day should be observed on the 25 April, even if that day was a Sunday.

Through 1927-1929 there was a coalescing of Anzac Day issues put before the public. Holding the dawn service became increasingly common. This was to gather great momentum and during the century, came to symbolise what Anzac Day meant for many people. Its beginnings can be traced to an action of members of the Sydney Australian Legion of Ex-Servicemen’s Clubs who joined an un-named elderly woman laying flowers at the base of the Cenotaph in Martin Place,
Sydney, in the early hours of Anzac Day 1927. They stayed by her for a period of silent prayer. By 1928, 150 people attended, and in the following year, 1929, 250 people attended; prayers were led by Dean Talbot and bugle calls featured. By 1933, the State Governor attended, and 8,000 people participated. In Melbourne in 1933, the dawn service was labelled the ‘zero hour’ pilgrimage where 7,000 men gathered in bitterly cold weather. The development of the dawn service seemed to provide an inspirational answer to the call for a sacred day, one starting with a vigil of prayer.

While dawn service gained momentum, strong opinions were being voiced. In June 1927 the Brisbane papers reflected opinion that the true solemn and commemorative significance of Anzac Day was being lost and that it was in danger of developing into a general holiday. In November, the same paper recorded a letter to the secretaries of the ADCC from Marcus Marks of Wellington, retired New Zealand Government Printer, in which he defended the New Zealand position:

> Anzac Day is treated as a holy day in New Zealand, and it is very faithfully observed as such by all. The returned soldiers are jealous of any alteration to this observance, and the amended Act was placed on the Statute Book so that the day might be treated not as a public holiday – which might (and probably would) mean that races and other sports might be held - but as a holy day (to be observed as a Sunday, upon which day all the hotels are closed and there are no race meetings.

A tide of opinion supported a single, national day of commemoration and sacred observance. There were calls for a ‘close holiday,’ or a ‘sacred Close Industrial Holiday,’ or a day
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90 [http://users.bigpond.net.au/penrslsb/addss](http://users.bigpond.net.au/penrslsb/addss) City of Penrith RSL Sub-Branch site-The Dawn Service. Accessed 1 Jan. 2008; *The Gallipoli Legion Gazette* Vol. 6, No 5. May 1965, Published by the Gallipoli Legion Club, Sydney 1965. E.W. Miscamble, ‘How the Dawn service Started,’ states that a delegates’ meeting of the Association of Returned Sailors and Soldiers’ Clubs (Later known as the Australian Legion of Ex-Servicemen’s Clubs) resolved ‘that a wreath be placed on the Cenotaph at dawn, 4.30 a.m. on Apr. 25th, 1928.’ The event happened with two minutes’ silence being followed by the laying of two wreaths, 14. It is most likely that the 1927 action was seen as a precursor to a formal initiation of the ceremony by the Australian Legion of Ex-Servicemen’s Clubs.

91 *London, The Times*, 26 Apr. 1933, 16. ‘Zero hour’ was the military term for the moment of attack.


93 Ibid, 163; *Brisbane Courier*, 4 Nov. 1927. Marks enclosed copies of the two Acts upon the New Zealand Statute Books, 1920 and 1921.

94 Ibid, 160; *Daily Mail*, 5 Oct. 1927 records the plea for a ‘close holiday.’ References were made by the speaker Major H. Maddock at the Brisbane sub-branch of the RSL to the situation in New Zealand.

95 Ibid, 157; *Queensland Digger*, 1 Dec. 1927 recorded the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee’s motion supporting the RSSILA’s desire to gazette the 25th Apr. as a sacred close Industrial Holiday.
aligned with Easter.\footnote{Ibid, 157; an undated reprint of Archdeacon Moline’s statement from the Northern Churchman connects Good Friday and Easter with Anzac Day} This corresponded with Garland’s unequivocal stand - that 25 April should be a national day of remembrance of the debt to Australians, New Zealanders and British, to be kept in a ‘solemn and sacred manner.’\footnote{Ibid, 167; Daily Mail report on Canon Garland’s speech for Broadcast Radio 4QG – undated [1927].} Pressure for these objectives increased through the late 1920s. By early 1929, RSSILA branches believed that genuine progress towards national observance had been made.\footnote{Ibid, Vol. 2, 1928-1932, [OMHA/3/2, O/S 3557], 11, Brisbane Courier and Brisbane Daily Mail 6 Feb. 1929. Agreement with local traders had been achieved in some states to get agreement on distribution and display of notices informing the public about the day. In Brisbane requests were made for the display of the newly purchased William Longstaff painting, \textit{Ghosts at Menin Gate}. This painting fitted exactly the call for uniformity and spirituality on the day; JOL ADCC Cutting Book, 1923-1928. [O/S 3556], 153, Melbourne Age 25 Apr. 1927 reported the solemn celebration of Anzac Day, but with spectral overtones: ‘In fancy, we will visualise another army, 60,000 strong, our Deathless Army, that constitutes Australia’s contribution to the weighty cause of liberty and peace. To those upon whom fell the sorrow of direct bereavement will come unbidden the stabbing memories of a desolating day; memories that are becoming sweetened by the passage of the years. Their grief remains, nevertheless, as it ever must, but there is consolation in the knowledge that every soldier who has made the great Sacrifice is mourned and honoured by a nation completely united. Upon their sacrifice Australia sprinkles devoutly incense of fragrant memory.’} Purpose was evident in reports that the McCormack Labour Government was ‘prepared to legislate upon the lines of the Victorian Anzac Day Act during the coming session.’\footnote{Ibid, 16 Feb 1928, 1. Letter Premier McCormack to the Joint Secretaries of ADCC.} James McCormack expressed to the ADCC the now commonly held opinion ‘that it is a matter for extreme regret that uniform action has not been taken in all the States of the Commonwealth to gazette this day as one sacred to the memory of a feat of arms unexcelled in the whole history of war.’\footnote{Ibid.} The public was alerted to the availability of windscreen stickers carrying the words ‘Remember Anzac Day’,\footnote{Ibid, 17, The Telegraph, Brisbane and Brisbane Daily Mail, 16 Apr. 1929.} which would adorn the vehicles of the rich and mobile.

As Anzac Day 1929 approached, a new comparative note entered the discussion. The Governor-General of New Zealand, Sir Charles Fergusson, was reported as commenting that Anzac Day should be less mournful.\footnote{Ibid, 17, Brisbane Courier, 18 Apr. 1929.} This was immediately rebutted in the afternoon edition of the Brisbane \textit{Telegraph} where the editorial writer hastened to assure readers that the Governor-General:

would have the solemnity of the occasion treasured jealously. It is certain that public sentiment in this country or in New Zealand ought never to sanction the introduction of a festive holiday spirit into the observance of Anzac Day…there will be many who agree with him [Sir Charles Fergusson] that the softening influences of time
have sufficiently healed the wounds of the bereaved to allow of the sadness of the Day giving way to its glories. There need be no suspicion of forgetfulness in such a change…

This was an attempt to clarify a potentially awkward situation between Anzac partners by condoning the possibility of less public grief without allowing it to degenerate into a ‘festive’ occasion. This matter, the tone of Anzac Day, is seen by Ken Inglis as the central debate. Two days later, there were reports of discussions involving federal ministers on the issue. The Federal Minister for Home Affairs, C.L.A. Abbott, supported reverent observance but eschewed mourning. However, the Minister for Customs, H.S. Gullett, said that he had always subscribed to the ideals of observing Anzac Day in the same manner as Sunday with sports curtailed and hotels closed. Major Charles Marr, Honorary Minister, felt it should not be too mournful, but should nevertheless be treated with reverence.

By 1929, there was general acceptance that Anzac Day occupied a place in the landscape greater than the local interests of the states. Inability to clearly define exactly whether the day was one of sombre and solemn commemoration or one in which the festivities of life and sports were appropriate clouded the decision on its status. In this sense, it seems a case of which memories prevailed – those of the mournful widow, family or friends, or those of the state? State interests were subject to the economic and other forces at play in the world, and open gravitas would be subsumed to the need for displays which offset the gloom of the Depression. This issue is central. It was as difficult to deal with in the 1930s as it became in the 1960s. In

103 Ibid. This extract has much of Canon David Garland’s style.
106 Ibid.
107 JOL 1935. OMHA/3/4, [Box 3559] ADCC – Cutting Book Vol. 4, 1935-1938, 280-284. A.M. Lumsdaine, honorary secretary of the ex-Imperial sub-branch of the RSSILA and late captain and adjutant of the Special Service Battalion wrote commending the Dawn Service as a ‘soldiers’ ceremony [which] stands alone in the day’s observance.” He felt the rest of the day was for the living, the church service as thanksgiving for those who returned and praise for the country’s deliverance from peril, the march past as a reaffirmation of allegiance and a statement of readiness to serve again if needed, followed by a soldiers’ luncheon with no speeches but centred on fellowship, then ‘healthy and manly sports,’ lastly an evening concert in which the happy spirit of the A.I.F. would prevail. A letter over the signature ‘A Soldier’s Wife’ pleads for remembering not only Gallipoli but the whole of the war. The writer supported the idea of a day in keeping with the spirit of the soldiers as it was in the war years and felt the Dawn service at the Flame of Remembrance to be the most moment of the day, ‘when ex-soldiers can remember in solemn manner their fallen comrades, and…relatives of those who did not come back can pay their tribute to the memory of their dear ones.’ She calls for ‘the enjoyment of healthy games and athletics’ for the remainder of the day because ‘no men were fonder of sports or better sportsmen than the members of the A.I.F.’ She thinks with the way the day was in 1935, children would dread its approach.
the latter, the age was one where personal freedoms and individuality mitigated against a day of solemn commemoration. Both of these questions hanging over Anzac Day contributed to widespread feelings that the day might be irrelevant. In both cases the day survived but not without undergoing a considerable buffeting.

National identity and Anzac Day

There is contiguity between identity issues and the call for a national day of commemoration. Similarly, there is connection between national identity issues and matters of masculinity found in Anzac Day practices. It is difficult to prise the strands apart in much of the archival material. Nevertheless, matters of identity have a long ancestry evident from the outset, in the first Anzac Day publicity. In material dating from 1916 and 1917, there is an almost automatic attachment of being Australian with participation in Anzac Day. An important question is whether this resonated with the domestic community. In 1916, Don Jordan, the artist for the Sydney Town Hall Anzac Day commemorations, joined a female form of Australia skirted in the Australian federal flag and zoned by symbolic Gallipoli hills and the Aegean Sea.\footnote{AWM Anzac Day Souvenirs Collection ID Number RC00069 Subseries: Celebrations – concerts and dinners, 1916-1992.}

There is a strong sense apparent in his depiction that the feminine Australia is protected and honoured by the actions of the men in Gallipoli. This commonly-held masculine sense of the protection of Australia was taken further by others. The Sydney \textit{Freeman’s Journal} in 1916 declared Anzac Day as the moment of ‘The Birth of a Nation,’ and claimed before the Gallipoli landing the national character had been of ‘a flabby and sprawling character.’\footnote{Reprinted in Ken Inglis, ‘The Australians at Gallipoli - II,’ \textit{Historical Studies}, 14:55, 374; Lionel Dennis, \textit{Australia Since 1900}, Longman, Melbourne, 1997, 57.}

A spirit of friendship existed between Australia and New Zealand in World War I, but there was also rivalry. Tensions emerged when Australia appropriated and monopolised the term ‘Anzac’ and engaged in actions which made its exclusive claim public. \textit{NZFL} files reveal many reminders of trans-Tasman comradeship, ‘fighting off the unspeakable Turk’ together in Suez in February 1915,\footnote{NZFL Vol. XV, No 763, 13 Feb 1915, 3.} and Australian and New Zealand chums meeting for camel and horse rides in Egypt.\footnote{Ibid, No 769, 27 Mar. 1915, 21.}
In a personal tribute, Captain William Hardham VC, of the Wellington Mounted Regiment, stated that while he was proud to be a New Zealander, if he had been other, he would have liked to have been an Australian.\textsuperscript{112} Through the initial period of euphoria and hyperbole generated by the writings and lecture tours of the correspondent Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett much affection was expressed.\textsuperscript{113} The two nations’ representatives combined efforts to aid the poor

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid, No 818, 3 Mar. 1916, 4. \textsuperscript{113} Ibid, No 824, 14 Apr. 1916, 10; advertisements for the upcoming illustrated lecture series by Ashmead-Bartlett in New Zealand; Fred and Elizabeth Brenchley, \textit{Myth-Maker: Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett-The Englishman Who Sparked Australia's Gallipoli Legend}, John Wiley and Sons, Milton, Qld, Australia, 2005, 204-205, in their only comment on New Zealand in the book, reports Ashmead-Bartlett’s reaction to his visit to New Zealand – ‘New Zealand, however, proved worse than Australia.’ He had suffered from depression and loss of revenue during his visit to New Zealand.; \textit{NZFL} Vol. XVI, No 846, 22 Sept 1916, 5; reports from Australian news, references to Ashmead-Bartlett’s financial problems.
over the Christmas and New Year, with events such as a dinner for Ragged School Union children in the Guildhall.\textsuperscript{114}

Combined efforts by individuals and groups from both countries did not preclude their wish to be separately identified. Contrary notes of disaffection are found almost exclusively in New Zealand-based evidence, and little can be traced in Australia. It was not long before complaints emerged from New Zealand troops that they were not Australians. For English journalists to not understand the difference was unforgivable.\textsuperscript{115} From mid-1916, there were more frequent reports of the capture of the term ‘Anzac’ and domination of Anzac Day proceedings by Australians.\textsuperscript{116} These intermittent discords persisted, and suggest trans-national rivalries in an otherwise cordial relationship.\textsuperscript{117} The attachment of Australians to ‘Anzac’ had not gone unnoticed in Britain. Newspaper columns relayed for domestic New Zealand consumption carried complaints that the word had been ‘captured.’\textsuperscript{118} Such complaints carried little weight among the British, and still less Australian public: the worthy cause of the Empire itself was judged more significant than piffling dominion jealousies.

Similar sentiments were reflected in writings for the AIF soldiers in Egypt by Private Frank Reid in a special 1916 Gallipoli number. Here he highlights the distance Australians who came to help Britain ‘in her hour of need,’ and who had passed the test with glowing colours.\textsuperscript{119} A year later, the RSSILA appealed for returned men to be freed from work to attend Anzac Day commemorations on the basis that they had ‘done so much to make the name of Australia famous.’\textsuperscript{120} In that year, Prime Minister Hughes was proclaiming that the deathless [Gallipoli] deeds ‘will yet be sung in sagas to generations of Australians to the end of time.’\textsuperscript{121} In the

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid, No 818, 3 Mar. 1916, 12.
\textsuperscript{115} NZFL Vol. XVI, No 838, 21 Jul. 1916, 6 ; an editorial comment by ‘Lancings.’
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid, No 848, 6 Oct 1916, 6.
\textsuperscript{117} NZFL Vol. XV, No 784, 14 May 1915, 21; Private W. B. Knight from Waipori in the AIF; ibid, Vol. XV, No 835, 30 Jun. 1916, 10 mention of AIF Captain Alfred Shout VC, ex-Wellington, who died of wounds received on Gallipoli; ibid, Vol. XVI, No 845, 15 Sept 1916, 7; 16\textsuperscript{th} NZ Reinforcements in the Sydney Show Grounds; ibid, Vol. XVI, No 861, 5 Jan 1917, 22, a NSW father sought information on the Gallipoli death and burial of his son, who had been enlisted with the Wellington Mounted Rifles.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid, 1917 Cuttings book No.1. 6, Brisbane Courier, 23 Apr. 1917.
'Great Patriotic Meeting’ at Melbourne Town Hall on the evening of 24 April, the connection between the Australian effort and loyalty to Britain was cemented and ennobled by comparison with the Greeks at Thermopylae.\textsuperscript{122} The Rev. Fr. W.J. Lockington gushed: ‘Over the white grounds on Gallipoli would blossom the crimson rata and the golden wattle, fighting symbols of sacrifice and glory.’\textsuperscript{123}

There was a dual alignment of Australian national identity with Anzac Day and also to the use of Anzac Day in 1917 as a proper place to voice the significance of sacrifice and loyalty to Britain. Although many saw the day as representing sacrifice, others recognised it as an opportunity for community and state messages. These messages could not be separated from their imperial framework, and because of that attachment appeals for inclusion of the British ‘Gallipoli Day’ could not be overlooked. The Times correspondent regarded Anzac Day as a misnomer, and appealed:

Let Australia and New Zealand keep Anzac Day as a day of solemn remembrance, but here in England you should have a Gallipoli Day….The beaches of Helles were as red as those at Anzac, and the Lancashire Landing and the River Clyde are as famous as Hell Spit and Brighton Beach…Let us, the Colonials, keep our Anzac Day, but let us [also] take part in a bigger and more historical Gallipoli Day from now onwards.\textsuperscript{124}

In a speech for Peace Day 1919, Australian General Sir Brudenell White proclaimed: ‘Up to the time of this war we were merely an offshoot of the British race…Now we are a Nation.’ In the same year, C.E.W. Bean reaffirmed that position with: ‘Australia rides safely in harbour today, a new nation…She has been given a place in the conference of nations; the great world has recognised her right to mould her future as she pleases.’\textsuperscript{125} These word provided directions for others seeking to cement the Australian Anzac Day-national identity connection.

In 1924, London proceedings were dominated by the Australians led by their High Commissioner, Sir Joseph Cooke, and Mr Theodore, the Queensland Premier. The Australian wreath of waratah encased in ice, with the word ‘ANZAC’, had received good coverage in London daily papers, but with no mention of ‘Anzac Day.’ Correspondent Nellie Scanlan

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{125} Bill Gammage, The Broken Years, 268 from the AWM 3DRL/3018 Grace Stafford Collection.
reported going to the New Zealand office and heard that Sir James Allen was to lay the New Zealand wreath at the cenotaph at 11.30am. It unfortunately had thawed out to ‘a wet, pulpy mass of dull flowers.’ It had been laid at the side of the cenotaph but with no soldiers, no flag, and no Last Post being sounded. Scanlan attended the combined Anzac service in St. Clement Dane’s Church and concluded: ‘Anzac Day is still a proud and poignant memory with Australia.’ She was scathing about the fact that ‘N.Z.’ was lost from the word ‘Anzac.’ Acrimoniously, she claimed: ‘The ceremony I joined at the cenotaph was not ANZAC but AAC. Although NZ is at the very heart and core of the word it seems that in England, at all events, Anzac in Australia will soon be synonymous terms.’ She had observed transformation of the historical landscape by capture. Simply put, a ‘waratah leaf’ successfully encased in ice proclaimed that London’s Anzac Day was Australia’s. Ann Curthoys put it succinctly: ‘these soldiers came to be known as the ANZACs, though in Australian usages of the term the NZ part tends to be forgotten.’ It was true from the beginning, and rather surprising how easily the notion was crystallised.

In 1996, Australian historian Stephen Garton qualified the conjunction between the events at Gallipoli and the birth of a nation concept by arguing that there was no immediate response to them; indeed, that this aspect was not obvious at the time. Instead, the predominant note was one of ‘a triumph of race and manhood’ reported by writers like Ellis Ashmead-Barlett who regarded Australians at Gallipoli as being the equals of the heroes of Mons, Ypres and Neuve Chappelle. Garton argues that if there was any consciousness of new nationhood, then it was couched within the parameters of the British Empire. He quotes Empire loyalists like Rev. W.H. Fitchett who proclaimed Gallipoli the equal of Waterloo:

for Fitchett, like many others Australia and the Empire were inextricably linked. The Australian ‘touch’ was something that strengthened ‘the Empire’. In complex ways the themes of Empire, race, manhood, bravery, valour, and nation were present from the first announcements of Gallipoli, but the balance of imagining began to shift from Empire to nation. Gradually the diverse strands of meaning were woven to say something new about ‘the nation’. Returned-soldier groups and commentators, such
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126 NZFL, 25th year, No. 1, 2 Jul. 1924, 10.
127 Greider and Garkovich, 4-5, the proposition that ‘different people transport into a physical place multiple landscapes. These different meanings are socio-cultural phenomena.’
as Bean, played important roles in constructing these meanings. The first anniversary of the landing became a moment when this message could gain final confirmation. In reporting the 1916 Anzac Day celebrations, the *Sydney Morning Herald* could proudly proclaim: ‘the great awakening came...they made new Australia...when Australia suddenly emerged to adult nationhood’. Similarly, a Returned Soldiers’ Association publication, *In Memoriam*, pronounced Gallipoli as: ‘the first great fruitage of Australian nationhood...on that day of testing Australia became fully one with the Empire...as a true man goes to his bride, they dared the embraces of Death. We are a nation of freemen cemented heart to heart by the blood our brothers shed for us’...Other accounts used a similar metaphor to that of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, depicting Australia as the son or daughter who had finally grown up. Whether as bridegroom or grown child, numerous statements proclaimed Australia’s achievement of national maturity.

Garton argued that the maturity or relationship with ‘Mother Britain’ did matter, and the Gallipoli - birth of nationhood connection was only relevant within the Imperial framework.

Is Garton correct, and did the first commemorative Anzac Day declaim ‘fruitage’ of the notion or consummation of widespread realisation of national difference? Certainly, Prime Minister Hughes was in no doubt as to the significance of the first Anzac events at Gallipoli: the ‘toga of manhood’ and the ‘deathless deeds’ of the valiant dead took place within a recognised Imperial framework. There are difficulties in meanings: understandings of 1916 were always located within the context of Empire. Proclamations of nationhood are not to be viewed in the same light as those made in the post-1945, post-colonial worlds. There is still a point of distinction to be made: many Australians, while loyal British Empire subjects, viewed themselves as different from the British, and indeed from the New Zealanders.

At a personal level, May Kidson, in 1926, in memory of her lost son, wrote: ‘They who fell on the furthest heights of Gallipoli before noon on Anzac Day, 1915. And to The Youth of Our Land, that they ever remember that immortal landing through which Australia was born a Nation.’ This kind of expression was common currency by the late 1920s in Australia, and
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134 AWM Anzac Day 1926 Cuttings Book No 21, 248-250; Perth *Sunday Times* 26 Apr. 1926, carried a long poem dedicated to General Sir John Monash, called ‘The Memory of Gallipoli’ by May Kidson, with the subscript ‘To my beloved son of the ‘IMMORTAL 3rd’ Brigade.’
indicated a shift in direction, away from the ideals of Empire and more towards the nation and national memories. By 1929 the Gallipoli ‘forge of a nation’ idea was well recognised in Australia. The Federal Minister for Home Affairs, C.L.A. Abbott, stated: ‘We should not be gloomy in celebrating this great occasion, but, on the other hand, we should always observe it with reverence. I don’t think that it is a day of mourning. I always think that Australia found its manhood at Gallipoli and became a nation.’ By 1931, Sydney was leading the way in spectacular displays of national pride for Anzac Day. The papers of Colonel George Ernest Ramsay reveal thorough preparation and enthusiasm for military display which would challenge royal tattoos in late-twentieth century Edinburgh.

At the street level, by 1930, most Australians confidently expressed Anzac Day as Australian. The meanings of ‘Anzac’ defined the Australian character, and ‘Anzac Day’ seemed for many to be the annual day for celebrating one’s Australian-ness. This outlook was succinctly enunciated in 1965 when the attributes gained by Anzacs at Gallipoli were defined as the most enduring Australian features, ‘a tribute and a memorial to those men who gave us Nationhood.’ These descriptors, however, marginalised many: Aboriginals, first generation migrants of most sorts including the English, and not to mention women.

**Masculinity and marginalisation of women -**

A pervasive orthodoxy about Anzac Day is that it has always reflected a masculine view of the world. This view is more evident in Australia than New Zealand, where the view is dominated by the C.E.W. Bean masculine ‘bush tradition’ interpretation. This view of Anzac
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136 AWM PR00079, 17 of 20, DPI 200, Papers of Col. George Ernest. Ramsay E.D; Tattoo Official Programmes for Oval Manly 1931 Grand Naval and Military Tattoo, The St Leonard’s Park, North Sydney, 9 Feb 1932, Grand Military Torchlight Tattoo; the Manly Oval Empire Festival of 21 Feb 1933 (I/C Bands); the RSSILA Anzac Night Tattoo in the R.A.S. Showground Tuesday 25 Apr. 1933; and the Grand Anzac Military Tattoo on the R.A.S. Showground Wed 25 Apr. 1934. In the last Ramsay was a designer of the ‘Torchlight Evolutions’ put on by the 17th Battalion from Manly and North Sydney. Without doubt these Tattoos were celebratory affairs, giving way to the derring-do of the past and showing off the prowess of the military; AWM PR00079, 18 of 20, DPI 200, Papers of Col. George Ernest. Ramsay E.D.
138 In a discussion between Australian historians Dale Blair and Jonathan King on ABC’s ‘Lateline’ programme, *The Making of the Anzac Myth*, 23 Apr. 2001, Blair asserted that the digger was ‘inherently masculine’ and cast in the ‘heroic mould.’
Mythology and its extension to Anzac Day and its management and ceremonies had less impact in New Zealand. From the nineteenth century, pastoralism was the essential and defining background for Australians and its romantically-regarded heroes were the bushmen, stockmen and the pioneer farmers; rarely their wives and daughters. Despite Australia being predominantly urban in terms of its distribution of population and economic activity during the Dardanelles campaign, there was a widespread belief that most Australians came from the rural back-blocks. The pioneer rather than the suburban or urban image was dominant. The mores of the times supported the notion that the harsh physical landscape of much of Australia evidently necessitated a rough and masculine life. Bean saw a clear parallel between the hard life and independence of the stockman and that of the Australian ‘digger’ or soldier where mateship, loyalty, and resourcefulness were mixed with a rough disregard for status.\(^{139}\)

These attributes were discussed in Stephen Garton’s article ‘War and masculinity in twentieth century Australia.’ He argued that ‘manhood’ as attributed to servicemen or reflected in popular culture and the press was problematic. The social picture for the returning soldier was not one-dimensional. He claimed:

> Masculinity (and femininity) are never entirely self-contained categories, nor isolated attributes awaiting appropriation. Rather they are diverse fields of meaning often constituted, elaborated and disseminated through other discourses, such as nationalism, war, citizenship, race and sexuality. And because of these discursive relationships, dichotomies like masculinity and femininity are never simple but complex and contradictory domains.\(^ {140}\)

He pointed to the return in 1945 of emaciated POWs, and the reception for the Vietnam veterans complicated by the activities of the anti-war movement. Nevertheless, he makes much of the fact that what distinguishes Australians’ preoccupation with ‘warrior manhood’ was its persistence following World War I. He questioned whether warrior manhood was a reaction to the early granting of female suffrage. New Zealand was the only other country in a similar situation,\(^ {141}\) a sort of ‘assertion of fecundity of manhood at the very moment when women


seemed to be claiming a status as citizens.142 Or did it reflect the cult of Australia’s convict origins? Were the convicts of Australia rebels rather than merely felons? Garton concludes that these conjectures were baseless because for contemporaries, Australia’s actions at Gallipoli seemed to prove that concerns based on racial fitness and masculine vigour were misplaced. The inter-war years, Garton argues, threw up uncertainties about the qualities of accepted masculinities. He describes the condition as ‘masculinity under strain.’ This strain, he asserts, was caused by slow government action on repatriation, the division of society caused by promoting the returned soldiers and their dependants instead of other worthy women and children,143 the difficulties of integrating returned soldiers into civilian society, and the fears that women left at home might betray the loyalty of their partners serving overseas.144 All these features of ‘masculinity under strain’ came to the surface in Australian Anzac Days. For most of Anzac Day’s history women appear marginalised but there exists sufficient evidence of women’s attitudes and participation on Anzac Day to claim that their roles were and are significant. However, women have been constantly under-assessed. The activities of women who were nurses or WAACs on the Front have long been underrated, indeed often unmentioned.

At the Australian Base depots in Rouelles, France, the 1919 Anzac Day programme describes activities which include a WAAC (Womens’ Auxiliary Army Corps) running race immediately before the break for afternoon tea, and following that the final of the WAAC tug of war contest. The front of the same programme featured in pastel colours a young French woman farewelling a Digger and handing him a victor’s wreath with the ribbon inscribed “Victoria et Pax”. This was much in keeping with contemporary feminine roles as they were generally perceived.

---

145 AWM Anzac Day Souvenirs Collection ID Number RC00069 Subseries: Celebrations – concerts and dinners, 1916-1992. A beautiful and star-studded Anzac Day programme for Apr. 25th 1919 at the Australian Base Depots, Rouelles, France. The cover in pastel colours depicts a French mademoiselle farewelling a digger and handing him a victor’s wreath with ‘Victoria et Pax’ on a hanging ribbon. The festivities were to start at 1030 through several athletics heats to finals between 1300 and 1445. This was to be followed by a ‘parade of fancy costumes’, gymnastic entertainers, a pillow fight, tug of war, finally a W.A.A.C. race before a break for afternoon tea. Other similar events including a W.A.A.C. Tug of War (final) and relay race then an ‘International Boxing Contest.’ From 1900 on there were pictures, a concert and a dance Diggers and Officers separate venues.
Records of early Anzac Days show a continuity of involvement by women. In 1917, at the Melbourne Cricket Club, where 15,000 people attended the open air memorial service, ‘Many women present broke down and sobbed bitterly.’ This was again fitting for the period and followed the mores of women openly expressing mourning and being the keepers of memory. Other material relating directly to women’s role at differing levels in memory exists: the Anzac Day leadership of Lady Davidson in 1918 in Sydney and a woman stooping to place a wreath at the foot of the Anzac Memorial on Anzac Avenue.

The same paper ran a short article on the role of women which focuses on the part played by the Centres for the Soldiers’ Wives and Mothers, and the key role of its Woolloomooloo Women’s branch in fastening wreaths to the Domain No. 1 gates so that Anzac marchers might see them. Tanja Luckin’s The Gates of Memory traces the fate of the gates at Woolloomooloo and the associated drinking fountain. Her account of these mnemonic structures illustrates their significance and use by a generation of women through placing garlands of flowers and cards with simple messages. This was a place of feminine pilgrimage - a ‘Mecca of soldiers’ wives and mothers.’ By 1928 the gates were conjoined in popular imagination with spiritualism - a very strong movement in Australia. The late 1920s, however, signalled other changes which marginalised the use of the gates as a mnemonic aid. Radio broadcasts for Anzac Day did not feature the service at the gates, and from 1930 to 1934 attention was shifted to the Cenotaph and the Domain. From 1934, Rayner Hoff’s Anzac Memorial in Hyde Park was the main focus of attention. Both Luckins and Damousi claim

147 AWM Anzac Day 1918 Cuttings Book No.1, 2, unattributed, Sydney, 25 Apr. 1918; un-named woman placing a wreath.
148 AWM Anzac Day 1918 Cuttings Book No.1, 1-3, unattributed, Sydney, 25 Apr. 1918, ‘Among the wreaths was a beautiful double heart from the Woolloomooloo Women’s branch, bearing the inscription, “For theirs shall be the glory of it,” and others from branches in memory of “the brave Anzacs,” “The men of the British Navy who fell at the Landing at Gallipoli,” and “For Soldiers’ Wives and Mothers”…The wreaths and bunches of flowers were afterwards taken to No. 1 gates of the Domain…”
150 Luckins, 191; Sydney Morning Herald, 27 Apr. 1925.
152 London The Times, 26 Apr. 1933, 16, despite the inroads of radio and shifting locations for ceremonies ‘Thousands of women during the morning visited the Gates of Remembrance on the road to Woolloomooloo (sic) Bay…” London The Times, 25 Apr. 1935, 6 listed the broadcasting programmes which intimated the national memorial programme at 8pm would be ‘Gallipoli’ which would have been heard in Australia by those listeners with short wave receivers and long wire aerials.
153 Luckins, 195; AWM PR00079, 17 of 20, DPI 200, Papers of Col. George Ernest. Ramsay E.D.
that involvement by ‘the sacrificial mother’ in black weeds, the archetypal figure of Anzac Day, was marginalised in the mid-1930s to the status of an ‘ignored by-stander.’ Luckins goes further to claim that the growing political power of the RSL by then and the shift of the day from a day of mourning to a ‘day of marching’ propelled fathers’ and mothers’ associations into the wilderness. The events are contemporaneous with the attack on David Garland. Issues of proprietorship and management prevailed and in the competitive climate of the 1930s, feminine and familial roles were marginalised in favour of those perceived to be strong, central and masculine. The Anzac Day archetypal figure became far less the black widow or grieving mother and much more the soldier-son. Nevertheless, there is much evidence for female participation.

Claims of marginalisation of women were voiced by Sara Buttsworth in an article examining representations of women and war. She maintained that even when representations of women are available, they are not well known or widely recognisable, and have not attained the status of male soldier representations. Much of what she writes applies to Anzac Day. In her article she references Marilyn Lake’s claim that deification of the bushman was the culmination of a gender struggle for the control of the national culture. Annabel Cooper’s analysis of Lake’s article claims that Anzac mythology centralised masculinity and marginalised femininity, in which ‘the very word Anzac is as “piti...” In her short discourse, Buttsworth references the universal claim by Vera Brittain that dying men have no nationality. Her conclusion is that ‘The dominance of the [masculine] war narrative, and this construction of absence, enhances the marginalisation of women from discourses of nation and politics.'

155 Luckins, 196-197.
160 Buttsworth, ‘Antipodean iconography.'
Does this pattern apply to the involvement of women on Anzac Day? Is it possibly an outcome of feminist expression of the turn of the millennium?

A graphic example of women’s involvement in Anzac Day is found in the activities of the Anzac Fellowship of Women in the 1920s and 1930s. These activities were both local, and at the centre of Empire. Pressure for the retention and commemorative observance of Anzac Day is found in the activities of Dr Mary Booth, a ‘Fiercely patriotic’ campaigner and founder of the Anzac Fellowship of Women, an organisation of which she remained president until 1956. The organisation was founded ‘with the object of fostering the commemorative character of ANZAC Day as an inspiration to future generations. In 1930 a London branch was also established.’ In September 1924 Booth led a delegation of 50 citizens including the Very Rev. Dean Talbot to the office of the NSW Colonial Secretary and Minister for Public Health, C.W. Oakes, to gain recognition and preservation of Anzac Day as a sacred day. Oakes’ response was to defend the position that the day could be a ‘national day but not a sacred day entirely in its religious sense.’ The day would be scheduled in the same manner as Christmas Day and Good Friday. In that position, NSW would be aligned with Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia. Archdeacon Darcy Irvine protested that this position allowed the government too much discretion and appealed for more binding legislation. Oakes’

---

162 NW Australian Women, Corporate entry, ‘The ANZAC Fellowship of Women (1921-).

’Tis Anzac Day, ’tis Anzac Day,
O Soldier comrades far away,
You died in war, may we in Peace,
So live and reign that war may cease.

163 Dean Talbot, AIF Senior Chaplain and NSW President of the Returned Services League 1917.
164 JOL ADCC Cutting Book, 1923 – 1928 [O/S 3556], 73, Brisbane Mail 11 and 12 Sept. 1924 reports that a deputation of 50 representatives of women’s war leagues and the churches including the Salvation Army, led by Dr Mary Booth ‘swarmed into the Chief Secretary’s office today to demand that Anzac Day be made a holy day – that theatres, pictures, races should be prohibited and hotels closed. Mr. Oakes assured them that the hotels would be closed, and that there would be no racing on Anzac Day, but made no definite promise about theatres and pictures.’(There is a handwritten annotation signed ‘M.B.’ bracketing ‘theatres, pictures,’ in the first paragraph with the words ‘not true’ - denying any attack on theatres and pictures for the day.)
165 The other two states had yet to legislate on the matter. Oakes promised to look into closing hotels on the day and confirmed that there would be no horse-racing on Anzac Day in 1925.
reply was that the Government should not be too tightly constrained on the matter for fear that in the future the [NSW Anzac Day] Act might be repealed.  

This lobbying to institute a populist action challenged a cautious state authority. Oakes’ responses indicated a reluctance to deviate from decisions by those states which had already legislated on Anzac Day. On the other hand, the actions by Booth indicate a charitable response to the needs of others. In February 1920, a well-attended meeting of War Widows of Manly and District at the Town Hall appealed for financial help to address the hardships caused at the time. Booth’s response was to form several charitable organisations of which the Anzac Fellowship of Women (founded in 1921) was one. Joy Damousi, writing in *The Labour of Loss: Mourning, Memory and Wartime* makes it clear that while the prime function of the organisation was to ‘foster the spirit and traditions of Anzac Day,’ it also promoted the comradeship of women engaged in war work, and expressed concern for the welfare of the soldiers and their bereaved. Booth’s public defence of the sacred nature of Anzac Day was consistent with her actions in founding agencies to help distressed women immediately following the Great War. Her case is an interesting one for it not only indicates the depth of feeling for a uniformly commemorative national day but highlights the role of women at high levels within the state. There has been little study of the impact of women on the advent and development of Anzac Day.

This material contradicts the orthodoxy that women’s involvement peaked in the late 1920s and was marginalised by the mid 1930s. There is a consistent pattern of involvement by representatives of the Soldiers’ Wives and Mothers’ organisation and the Anzac Fellowship of Women in 1925 and 1927; and 1930s pre-war reunions of the London branch of the Anzac Fellowship of Women. By 1933, the *Times* Sydney report of the day’s ceremonials indicated a:
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deeper note and wider interest…than in any year since [its] inauguration. Before dawn 8,000 people, including women and children, gathered at the cenotaph to vow remembrance. The record number of 23,000 ex-soldiers marched through the streets, and 80,000 people assembled at a commemoration service in the Domain. Thousands of women during the morning visited the Gates of remembrance on the road to Woolloomooloo Bay, where so many soldiers embarked during the war.\(^\text{171}\)

As the Depression deepened, the need for all, including women and children, to pay tribute for the sacrifice of the Great War evidently rose. This runs counter to demands made by state ministers for a relaxation to mourning. In 1934, at the heart of the Empire ‘the many-coloured mass of flowers included tokens from the Government and people of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Royal Navy…the Victoria Leagues in Australia and New Zealand, the Australia and New Zealand groups of the Women’s League of Empire’ were seen.\(^\text{172}\) In Melbourne, 10,000 people ‘including women and children’ assembled at the Shrine of Remembrance for the dawn ceremony and 22,000 men took part in the march past.\(^\text{173}\) Heightened activity was recorded. In 1935, at the twentieth anniversary of the Gallipoli landing there were many special ceremonials. That year significant engagement in activities was undertaken in London by both New Zealand and Australian women’s representatives. Sir James Parr and his daughter Christine laid wreaths at the Cenotaph for the government and people of New Zealand and Stanley Bruce for Australia. The *Times* announced that ‘Lady Muriel Gore-Browne will place a wreath on the Cenotaph to-day on behalf of the Australian and New Zealand Group of the Women’s Guild of Empire.’\(^\text{174}\) From Melbourne, a reviewer of the third dawn service observed ‘12,000 people, including many War widows and orphans, attended a service at dawn at the Shrine of Remembrance.’\(^\text{175}\) The large attendance of women and children at the traditionally masculine, ‘stand to’ dawn service points to two trends: the growing
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\(^{171}\) Ibid, 26 Apr. 1933, 16.
\(^{172}\) Ibid, 26 Apr. 1934, 11.
\(^{173}\) Ibid, 26 Apr. 1934, 13.
\(^{174}\) Ibid, 25 Apr. 1935, 6. The attendance of women, and children especially, was not without controversy; AWM Anzac Day Cuttings Book 1935, Bundle 1, the Melbourne *Star*, Tues evening edition 26 Mar. headlined ‘Anzac Dawn service For Returned Men Only–League Is Firm–No Children in March.’ Mr Joyce, the Victoria State secretary of the League said: ‘The league has always opposed the tendency of some Diggers to bring their children with them in the march. The children interfere with the step of the men and detract from the dignity of the march. This is purely a soldiers’ ceremony, reminiscent of the dawn vigils kept by the men before their hop-overs. The presence of other people robs the ceremony of its significance.’ This masculine attitude was supported by some women: Melbourne *Herald*, 28 Mar. 1935 stated ‘Dawn Service Not For Army Nurses.’ The secretary of the Returned Army Nurses’ Association, Miss M. Ambler, said, ‘We feel that it is the men’s own ceremony. After all, we were not at any landings’; AWM Anzac Day Cuttings book, 1935, Bundle 3 indicated a wavering in support exclusively for males by the secretary of the Returned Army Nurses’ Club, Miss M. Ambler – she was quoted in the Melbourne *Age* 24 April as saying ‘It is our very own day.’
\(^{175}\) Ibid, 26 Apr. 1935, 15.
popularity within Anzac Day of an alternative to the church services and the street parade, and the loss of attraction of the local suburban memorials, such as the gates of Woolloomooloo and associated fountains.

In the period immediately preceding World War II, a decline appeared in participation of women in Anzac Day observances. This can be accounted for by two factors: the increasing age of the spinsters and widows left by the Great War. Many of them were of the parents of dead servicemen and would have been in their sixties by the mid-1930s and given the contemporary life expectancy many of those alive, would have been elderly or frail. Also, the black widows’ weeds passed out of fashion as the archetype for women on the day. In these movements, the validity of the arguments of Luckins and Damousi can be seen. What is puzzling is the quantum loss of initiatives by women.

Part of it is due to the western world defining war tasks as men’s work, and the closer one comes to the outbreak of war in 1939, the more applicable that explanation seems. There is another explanation, perhaps more visible in the New Zealand situation, and also reflected in the career of Vera Brittain, namely the attachment of many society women to the world-wide peace movement in the 1930s. The work of such women was being broadcast on the new and engaging media of radio and newsreel. By the mid-1920s, the weekly newsreel was a fixture in most movie cinemas, and the newspapers vied with the screen to present world events. News of the peace movement attracted more adherents, and many of them women. The less frequent attendance by aged mothers and spinsters in Australian Anzac Day ceremonies and the attraction of a peace movement, combined with the rising ‘masculine’ clouds of war changed the face of Anzac Day and for a few years made it seem a much more masculine affair. It also coincided with the rise in control of the day by the RSL, which added momentum to the trend.

It is important to accept that memories change with the involvement of a new generation going to war. In the 1940s the new guard was more accepting of the part played by women in the war. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to trace the vital part played by women in World War II, but
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www.bu.ac.uk/databases/newsreels/learnmore/docs/newsreels_long_history.pdf Accessed 10 Mar. 2008. Pathe, Gaumont, Topical and the Empire News Bulletin companies all found profit to be made in publishing the latest news in film. In 1929, British Movietone News distributed sound-tacked film which swept gradually through the Australasian world as cinemas were adapted with the needed equipment.
nevertheless, the quality of their involvement was recognised, and generally accepted during and following the conflict.

On Anzac Day 1945 in Melbourne, on the eve of VE (Victory in Europe) Day women and children were present in large numbers. The Legacy Club ran a schools’ Anzac Commemoration ceremony at the Shrine of Remembrance.177 Stories were published which deliberately targeted children, educating them about Anzac Day.178 Visiting Women’s Australian Auxiliary Air Force personnel ‘turned up in full force for the Dawn Service [and] caused a mild sensation.’ Despite being requested by RSL officials not to attend, they did so.179 The situation in other state capitals was similar. In Adelaide, nurses from both wars marched and the local paper proclaimed ‘Two-War Sisters In March Today.’ Also included in that city were Anzac fathers marching with their sons, and a Maori welcome by Kiwi soldiers led by A. McDonald, a member of the Maori Pioneer Battalion in World War I.180 While masculine activities were still obvious in the organisation and personnel of the day the inclusion of women and children in Anzac Day activities reflected the directions of a new world order. These changes reflect a challenge to the stereotypical picture of masculinist hegemony on Anzac Day.

Conclusion
Anzac Day as a national and local commemoration required civic assent and detailed planning even when there was popular enthusiasm for the day. In my view, John Moses rather than Janice Pavils has captured the essence of organisation for the day. The universality of a ‘culture of commemoration’ as the driving force for the national institution of the day is an acceptable concept. Canon David Garland, through his tireless effort to make Australian Anzac Day a civic-driven and national day of solemn commemoration, did much to set the pattern for the observance of the day in Australia. However, contestation prevailed and his initiatives eventually brought his leadership into conflict with the representatives of the returned servicemen. This contest was over in 1937 and the day has subsequently been organised primarily by the RSSILA/RSL with the cooperation of serving military units and civic authorities.

The problem of the investment of day by the six states in the federal structure, and their relative isolation, largely accounts for the slowness of adoption of a national day of commemoration. Again contestation counted for the individual states were reluctant to allow federal determination of the day, as was suggested by a national day of commemoration. Also debated was the style of the day, a thought much reflected on by Ken Inglis. Associated with that matter of style is the matter of masculinity. Australians strongly identify with the Bean ‘bushman myth,’ and there is a fixation of Australian nationalists with the Anzac myth. Australian national identity aligns easily with Anzac Day and from the 1930s Gallipoli was described in terms of forging the nation. The issue of masculinity and the marginalisation of the role of are not as clear-cut as previously assumed. For much of the period 1915-1945, with the exception of the immediate pre-war period, the has been considerable engagement of women in Anzac Day.

Do not ignore the ground on which you have walked,
It is not ordinary soil.
Reflect on the thousands of people who lie beneath
Without a shroud.
You are the son of a martyr –
Do not hurt your ancestor,
Do not give away this beautiful motherland,
Even for the whole world.

Mehmet Akif Ersoy (1873 – 1936)

The purpose of this chapter is to position Turkey within the discourse of Anzac Day, 1915-1945. Since 1915, a little-known reciprocity has existed between Turkey and Australasia regarding the commemoration of Anzac Day. This chapter argues that Turkey occupies a vital space in the creation and maintenance of memories of Anzac Day. In this chapter the focus will be on the relationship between Anzac Day and the Turkish people.

Turkey was the Dardanelles campaign adversary of 1915 and ally of 1945. The part played by Turkey in the development of Anzac Day is little-known, either in the West, or in Turkey itself. The geo-political position of Turkey from 1915 to 2000 is of critical importance. Turkey’s victory of Onsekiz Mart (18 March 1915) and the celebrations which flowed from it are little understood in the West. This lack of appreciation was reflected in the perceptions Turk and Anzac had of each other in 1915. This discussion gauges the distance the two groups moved in order to accommodate the change from wartime foes to friends. Within the developing but fragile relationship, events like the Chanak Crisis of 1922 and the imposition of treaties by victor nations formed impediments. During the 1920s Australasian sensitivities about the Anzac graves emerged. Gallipoli was visited often, and was described as the ‘pilgrimage’ destination. Many visits coincided with Anzac Day. Recognition was given by the British government in 1932 to Mustapha Kemal for allowing these events to continue. In the 1930s a more confident Turkish
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1 Halil Berktay (Sabanci University), ‘The Project of Europeanisation in Turkey: Mental and Cultural Requirements,’ Angelos Giannakopoulos, Conference Report: The European Perspective of Turkey after the Dec. 2004 Decision, Galatasaray University, Istanbul, 3-4 Jun. 2005, 12. Berktay makes the point that the words of the poem are a ‘relatively generalised and abstract rehash of the basic vocabulary and metaphors introduced in Ersoy’s “Hymn to the Martyrs of Gallipoli,”[sic, Turkish title], written in 1915.’ In that piece, the European invaders are defined as ‘a shameless assembly,’ ‘predators, merciless herds of hyenas…identified as Europeans…released from their cages.’ He further sees Ersoy as fixing the Gallipoli moment of 1915 as one of ‘eternal contraposition to Western civilisation…Civilisation, that one-toothed monster.’ This exposes both the ongoing debate over Turkey’s policies towards Europe and the close attachment to Gallipoli.
nation emerged, desiring recognition by the West. Within this context, the place of Atatürk’s now famous 1934 statement is reviewed. Today, this statement, carefully reworded in 1985, has a critical place. Reconciliation between Anzacs and Turks was promoted by the Freyberg–Çakmak (Chakmak) correspondence of 1940. It is clear from this material, published in The Times, that Turkish politicians and military leaders wished to engage memory and carry forward into World War II the comradeship developed since the situation of 1915.

For Turkey, the post-war period was one of momentous transition: from victorious Empire in 1915-1917, to defeat in 1918; from autocratic Ottoman rule to a republic in 1923, and being subjected to exacting treaties to 1934. All of this was set within westernisation. This profoundly unstable period of Turkish history witnessed its negotiation to modernity. Turkey was subject to the victorious allies’ initiatives and the imposition of the treaties as a vanquished nation at the end of World War I and later under the mandate of the League of Nations to 1934. From the Mondros (Mudros) Armistice of 1918 to the August 1920 Treaty of Sèvres which parcelled Turkey among the Allied powers when Greek forces were occupying the heartland of Anatolia, there was concern about Turkey’s very survival. Following the Turkish nationalist forces victory over the Greeks, the Treaty of Lausanne established Turkey’s present boundaries.

On 29 October 1923 the Turkish Republic was proclaimed, by 3 March 1924 the Caliphate abolished, soon to be followed by religious (Sharia) courts, and four years later the State was
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2 The Times, 30 Oct. 1920, 9; ‘Turkish Treaty Maps–The Anzac Graveyard.’ The treaty was signed on 10 Aug. 1920 as granted under Article 218 ‘Turkey and Greece bound themselves to grant to the Powers interested full and exclusive rights of ownership over the land in which are situated the graves of those who fell in action, for the purpose of laying out cemeteries or erecting memorials. The area shown is Anzac Cove and the surrounding land. It is something over two miles in length and about a mile in depth.’; Charles Cheney Hyde, The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 30, No. 3, (Jul 1936), 471-476 for editorial comment on the acquisition of land by conquest. He quotes the Sèvres acquisition of Turkish territory as ‘abortive.’

3 The Times, 20 Jan. 1923, 7; article on the vexed issue of Turkish frontiers and occupation by the Greeks. On the matter of Gallipoli graves there was a misunderstanding of the size of the area caused by a misreading of the scale; ibid, 25 Jan 1923, 10. The writer conceded that there had been movement on the exchange of populations, but that there had been Turkish resistance over the matter of ownership of the land on which the Anzac graves were found: ‘in the Sub-Commission on Graves the Turks have utterly declined to agree to the British proposal in regard to the Anzac zone, 2½ miles long and 1¼ miles deep, in which are nineteen cemeteries containing Australian dead. The Australians naturally desire the ownership not only of the cemeteries (to which the Turks have agreed) but of the ways of communication between them. This the Turks refuse, on the ground presumably that the zone might at some future time be used for strategic purposes.’ He further stated the Turks have abrogated previous agreements on established cemeteries and are now demanding reduction in size of these. ‘It was pointed out to the Turks that it is we who are at present in possession of Gallipoli, and that the suggestion that we should interfere for their benefit with cemeteries in territory that we are giving back to them is an insult. It was also pointed out quite firmly that until the safety of our graves is assured we shall not leave Gallipoli’; John Keegan, The First World War, Vintage Books, Random House, New York, 2000, 425.
declared secular, with a Roman alphabet. These were huge changes for any state, the turmoil of which reduced the chances that Anzac Day in Çanakkale might have widespread impact. In 1932, Turkey joined the League of Nations, a respectable and significant step for the times. In 1936, the Montreux Convention was signed and on 10 November 1938 Atatürk died after a long illness. All these events point clearly to a period when foreign policy was dominated by concerns about sovereignty and external relations with European neighbours. These cataclysmic changes and consequent uncertainties affected the ability of the Çanakkale authorities to comply with requests by New Zealand, Australian and British individuals and government agencies to allow visits to the Peninsula on or near Anzac Day. Local authorities proved helpful much of the time, even occasionally offering Çanakkale-based militia personnel to attend, help with and observe ceremonies. At other times, local bureaucracy intervened and delays or obstruction occurred. From 1936 until 1945, Turkey’s guarded responses to requests for visits by Anzacs to the Gallipoli Peninsula reflected a desire to appear neutral and to avoid actions which might be interpreted by the Axis nations, Italy and Germany, as belligerent.

Most Anzac historians omit acknowledgement of the part played by Turkey. In Western scholarly and popular writing there is only a glimpse of the role of the Turkish soldier (the mehmetçik), and limited recognition of Mestapha Kemal, the Turkish leader. Most traditional military and academic writings discussing the Gallipoli shrine and tourism phenomenon neglect Turkish actions and involvement. This may be the result of a chronically low level of contact with Turkey, but also reflects a paucity of translated Turkish Arabic documents. This chapter and Chapter Seven attempt to balance the books by exploring how Anzac Day at Gallipoli was received by the Turks. From 1934, Turkish attention became focussed on ‘Onsekiz Mart Zaferi,’
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4 *The Times*, 4 Sept. 1936, 12. There had been an expression of concern during the Montreux Conference about upkeep of Gallipoli graves and access to cemeteries. The Turkish Foreign Minister, Tewfik Aras, reassured the British representative, Lord Stanley that ‘the Turkish Government will continue to maintain the same facilities as in the past in regard to the upkeep and supervision of, and visits to, the cemeteries.’

5 Metin Heper, *Historical Dictionary of Turkey* (Second Edition), Scarecrow Press, Lanham, USA, 2002, xxiv-xxvi for the events’ list from Mondros 1918 to the death of Atatürk, 1938. Kemel Ataturk died on 10 Nov. 1938, and his body was embalmed and laid in state in the Dolmabahçe Palace for nine days before being transferred to Ankara. There he was given a state funeral; NAM, Birdwood papers GWW1 6707-19 Birdwood Diaries Box 2, 1944. The funeral was attended by a disabled Lord Birdwood. A news photograph of Birdwood in Ankara unable to walk in the procession at the State funeral of Kemal Ataturk, saluting the coffin as it passed the People’s House in Angora. He was paying a last tribute to his former foe and, in the words of our Special Correspondent, it was ‘a sight long to be remembered.’

6 *The Times*, 13 Sept 1926, 14.
(18 March Victories) – the date and name chosen to celebrate the Turkish defeat of the British and their allies in 1915.7

Appreciation of a view from contemporary Turkish sources is very difficult without access to Ankara state documents, presently being translated.8 However, a clearer perception than has previously been revealed is available through examination of official documents and news collections from repositories in Britain, New Zealand and Australia. These register official diplomatic, military and public reaction to Turkish actions over Gallipoli graves and Anzac Days on the Peninsula. Also, the process of gathering oral and written material from Turkish scholars, Professor Ahmet Mete Tunçoku of Onsekiz Mart University Çanakkale, Kenan Çelik AO, Lieutenant Sahin Aldogen, and Öü assisted understanding. Mete Tunçoku addressed important and largely unknown factors related to Turkey and the Çanakkale battles.9 He used the metaphor of an iceberg to inform the reader that even among recent Turkish academic studies discussion is restricted to few issues, the ‘tip of the iceberg.’ He considered the Çanakkale battles as a watershed in modern Turkish history and the foundation of the Turkish nation.10 The Çanakkale battles are both the conception point of Anzac Day and the foundation of the Turkish nation. The leadership of Mustapha Kemal provides the crucial link.

Çanakkale battles and Anzac Day

Awareness of the geography and history of Turkey are essential to understandings of Turkish attitudes towards Anzac Day. Firstly, the geography of the region has importance, particularly the relationship of Çanakkale with the centre of power, Constantinople [Istanbul]. Çanakkale Province, after which the Turks name the Dardanelles’ campaign, is not close to Constantinople. It is situated at the north-western quadrant of the country, and is separated into European territory on the Gallipoli Peninsula, and Asian territory – Anatolia. Çanakkale Province is part of

---

10 There are issues shared by today’s Turkish academics with Anzac scholars in Gallipoli studies, such as the military aspects of battles and leadership by notable persons. Stories about the sinking of the allied warships on 18 Mar. 1915, the role of the trawler-minelayer Nusrat, and the leadership of famous commanders such as Lt-Col Mustafa Kemal and Lt. Col. Hüseyin Avni Bey are most familiar; Gürkan, Özge, ‘Çanakkale Campaign; a Turkish view,’ New Anatolian News Extra, 18-19 March 2006, 12, 20.
the Marmara region, the land south-west of the Sea of Marmara through which the Dardanelles Strait lies in a south-west direction towards the Aegean Sea. Çanakkale city is the administrative capital, situated on the Asian side of the Narrows, and was known to the British in 1915 as ‘Chanak’ or ‘Chanak kalesi’. The Turks named the battles of the Dardanelles campaign, 1915, Çanakkale battles (‘Çanakkale Savaşı’ or ‘Çanakkale Savaşları’) after the province.

On the European side of the Dardanelles Straits, near the Narrows, lies Eceabat, known by the Greek name ‘Maidos’ in 1915. It is the nearest town to the battlefields of Gallipoli. The name ‘Gallipoli’ derives from the northern district and small town of Gelibolu. The importance of the region was that of passage – it was a route from the Mediterranean Sea to Constantinople. For the British and their allies, the route would allow the Russians to be relieved. For the Turks, the Gallipoli Peninsula constituted a barrier which the allies were not to pass.

The distance of 325 kilometres from the 1915 battlefields to the capital, Constantinople, played a vital role in the defence of Turkey from the allies in 1915. Turkish infantry units took a week, or longer in bad weather to march from the capital’s garrison quarters to Çanakkale. The Gallipoli Peninsula formed an outpost, often more easily accessible by water than by land. The long, narrow and rugged isthmus is dominated by high hills. Most of the fighting in the campaign took place in southern tip, a 50 kilometre portion of the 100 kilometre-long peninsula. In 1915, it was an agricultural district in a poor area.

---

11 Çanakkale city is based on an Ottoman fortress called Kale-i Sultaniye or Sultanıye kalesi (Fortress of the Sultan). The area became famous for pottery, and this gave the name Çanak kalesi or ‘pot fortress.’ This name is to be found on 1915 British maps of the area.
12 This naming focuses attention on the Turkish region of the battles, and uncovers a different world view from that understood by the imperial troops and their allies. It is outward-looking from the view of Turkey, as opposed to the inward, closely-focussed Anzac view. The Turkish view comprehends a geo-political dimension of awareness of the country at a crossroads. Physically, it is at the western end of the Elburz-Zagros mountain chains, and at the junction of Asia and Europe, at the confluence of the Aegean and Bosphorus seas.
13 Particularly for the ‘Easterners’ in the British War Cabinet, Fisher and Churchill, once Constantinople was overcome.
A satellite image of the Gallipoli Peninsula, showing the topography in 1987. The green colouring is the area of the red pine forest, much which was destroyed by fire in 1994. The dominant cover is maquis, low scrub, which predominated in 1915. The Narrows are a clear barrier and the Anzac sector hills and ravines show clearly.

While Turkish troops in 1915 had access to some fresh vegetable and fish supplies, providing potable water to their troops became difficult. Clean water was even more difficult for the Anzac troops to acquire and was the root cause of much of their inability to recover from disabling illnesses like dysentery. While the distance from Constantinople provided a buffer for the Turks and a barrier for the Allies, it also imposed other restraints. Chief among them for the Turks was separation from well-equipped hospitals for those who were injured or ill. Distance shaped the memories of many survivors on both sides of the campaign.

By 1915, Turkey had reached a crossroads. It had been long defined as a ‘tired’ Empire by Europeans, and seen as ripe for dismemberment. By the end of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire had become engaged in a slow process of modernisation influenced by Germany and France. The Empire was an autocracy, divided racially and by classes. Polyglot peoples had moved within its borders and clear divisions emerged between the minority rich and the majority urban poor and the peasant class. The ruling and educated classes constantly feared that Greece and other Balkan nations would attack. The educated classes, increasingly influenced by European education and modernisation, longed for change, and provided important leaders and forces for future Turkish society.

Turks celebrate the victory at Çanakkale under Mustapha Kemal’s command on 18 March [Onşekiz Mart Zaferi], the anniversary of the Turkish defeat of the allied fleet in 1915. ‘Onşekiz Mart Zaferi’ celebrations extend through the year and include anniversaries of other famous 1915 battles. Anzac Day in Turkey, therefore, is enfolded in a framework of Turkey’s celebrations of victory. Within the shared space is the commemoration of the dead and recognition of valour. The victory of the Turks was a pyrrhic one: their losses in holding the Peninsula in 1915 were vastly greater than those of the opposing forces\(^{14}\) and ultimately the Allies were the victors of the war. These events influence the nature of the relationship between Turks and Anzacs over Anzac Day.

\(^{14}\) Department of Veterans’ Affairs, Gallipoli, 25 Apr. 2007, Department of Veterans’ Affairs, Canberra, ACT, 2007, 41. The Turkish dead are listed as 86,692, and total casualties 251,309. Total Allied deaths were 44,092 and total casualties, 141,029.

¹⁵ Fewster, Kevin, Vechi Başarin and Hatice Hürmüz Başarin, Gallipoli: The Turkish Story, Allen & Unwin, Crow’s Nest, NSW, 2003 edition, ‘Endpapers’ features the same Turkish rug, and provenances it to Australian rug dealer and collector, Jacques Cadry.
Turkish and Anzac perception of each other to the 1922 Chanak Crisis

It is important to understand the reactions of New Zealanders and Australians to the Chanak Crisis in terms of their general perceptions of Turkish people in the period. To a great extent the Turkish people were unknown to Anzacs prior to their landing on Gallipoli on 25 April 1915. However, wartime tensions had led to popular images being disseminated in both Australia and New Zealand. Derogatory descriptions and images of Turks as incompetent, slothful, overweight and dark-skinned can be found in the popular press. This judgemental view was apparent in the mistaken assessments of Turkish military capabilities.


The NZFL in early 1915 reflected anti-Turkish feelings which were held by the New Zealand public. A parade of articles and cartoons lampooning the Turks was stock in trade. On 6
February, a photograph of Enver Pasha was captioned ‘THE NOTORIOUS ENVER PASHA, Turkey’s Evil Genius and War Minister.’ A week later a hapless Turk soldier in traditional costume is pushed back from a ladder by the staunch, well-attired soldierly New Zealand and Australian troops in Egypt with the caption ‘New Zealand takes a hand…The Unspeakable Turk: By the beard of the prophet, this German sausage has let me in for a tough contract. Good-bye, John Bull junior; I’m off home again.’ The episode relates to New Zealand troops who earned ‘the good opinion of all,’ while under Turkish fire at the Suez Canal. It demonstrates a superior, racist position, with a strong Imperial connection. A week later, the next edition’s main feature cartoon shows a New Zealand European cavalryman and a Maori infantryman running alongside with the caption ‘New Zealand colours to the front - both of them warranted not to run.’ This cartoon conjoins Maori and Pakeha and did not reflect contemporary New Zealand racial positions. By implication, it underlines that the Turkish soldier, pictured the week before, was not considered a worthy opponent.

In 1915 the 600 year-old Ottoman Empire was under considerable strain after being at war for the previous four years. It was under attack externally and from within, and on the threshold of violent transformation from Empire to republic. The forces mustered against the Anzacs at Gallipoli were derived from different regions within the Turkish Empire. Both empires gathered troops from marginal territories. Turkish forces came from their Mediterranean, European and Anatolian territories, British forces from the world-wide empire, and French troops from metropolitan France and North Africa. American military researcher, Edward J. Erickson, maintains that the majority of the Turkish forces were Turkish rather than Arab or Kurdish. Turks comprised a population of 10 to 12 million in the diverse Ottoman Empire of 20 to 22 million. Erickson argues despite this they were disproportionately involved in the Empire’s defence. He feels that they were often let down by minority Arab, Kurd and Greek forces, sometimes described as ‘military liabilities.’ Despite common Western perceptions of its backwardness and sprawling geography, it is remarkable that the ‘sick old man of Europe,’
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16 NZFL, Vol XV, No. 762, 6 Feb. 1915, 22.
18 Ibid, 20 Feb., 1915, 3.
19 Edward J. Erickson, Ordered to Die: History of the Ottoman Empire Armenian and Greek, as ‘most Turks were lying dead in the trenches.’ These ideas reflect an ongoing debate in the First World War. Greenwood Press, Westport, Ct, 2000; Kenan Celik interview 16 Apr. 2007, Eceabat, Turkey. Celik commented on Peter Stanley’s Quinn’s Post notion that those who took flight from the Turkish side w about the impact of colonial forces in the Turkish Army in the Çanakkale campaign. It is mirrored by similar disputes of assessments about the efficiency of the Anzacs and the 29th Battalion.
Turkey, outlasted its neighbours, the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires. Erickson accounts for later twentieth century misconceptions about Turkey’s performance to two main factors: firstly, the inability of most Western commentators to read Arabic Turkish; and secondly, the widespread media campaign found in mid-century popular films like ‘Lawrence of Arabia,’ ‘The Light Horsemen,’ ‘Gallipoli,’ and ‘All the King’s Men.’ Myths of the Turkish units being prone to desertion and facing imminent disintegration, while having clear numerical advantages and being constantly advised or commanded by clever German leaders, and being predisposed to cruelty were current both during and after the Dardanelles campaign.

The 36th Divisions of the Ottoman Regular Army and their four Army groups were mostly mobile and well trained, but had been tremendously strained during the Balkan Wars and faced massive reorganisation, which began before the Balkan War, and lasted through to 1914. During the Balkan Wars the Turkish Army had been shattered by the decimation of the first and second Army groups with the loss of 250,000 men, consisting fourteen out of forty-three divisions in the Adrianople Garrison. Only the third corps of the first Army remained intact (pre-1912 form) and this corps composed the central defenders of the Gallipoli Peninsula in the Dardanelles campaign. It constituted a formidable, experienced foe for the combined British and French forces which faced it.

Turkish troops and officers on the Peninsula gathered most of the enemy under the generic titles of ‘Franks’ or ‘English,’ and apart from recognising Indian troops, at first did not distinguish between national groups among their foes. A reservist Turkish officer, formerly a law student, Hasan Ethem (1890-19 April 1915) writing to his mother two days before his death, described the enemy as ‘English and French.’ It was not long after the 25 April landing, however, that they became aware of the different qualities of the Anzacs at Ari Burnu and distinguished them from others. Turkish academic, Ahmet Mete Tunçoṣoku, relates that after the initial attack at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915 some Maori of the Pioneer Battalion performed a haka and the Turkish newspapers reported for the first time that British forces were being supported by
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20 A Mete Tunçoṣoku interview 21 April 2007 supports this idea and further claims the Turkish army had been remodelled on French and German patterns of the 1890s.
21 CAC Churchill-Amery papers 5. AMEL 1/3/7. File 1 of 2. General Ian Hamilton to Leo Amery, 1 Sept. 1917, Hamilton’s admission, ‘When I was there the flower of the Turkish Army was entrenched on the Penninsula.’[sic].
22 Kenan Celik interview, 17 Apr. 2007.
‘cannibals.’

Gallipoli battlefields historian Kenan Celik asserts that Turks thought of Anzac soldiers as having light-coloured hair and being significantly larger than other English troops. It is most likely that the mehemetçik, with limited understanding of world geography, comprehended neither the relationship of Anzacs with ‘Mother Britain’ nor the relative geographical position of their countries. The educated Turkish and German officer class possibly would have possessed more accurate perceptions. This matter was peripheral for Turkish troops as their concerns were more immediate.

BIR ÇANAKKALE ŞEHİDİNİN SON MEKTUBU

Reserve officer Hasan Ethem (1890-19 April 1915) 3rd Army Corps, 19th Division. War magazine *Harp Mecumuasi*, No. 22, 1915, 351.

Three pieces of verified and translated primary evidence indicate that, among the Turkish officer class, all attention in correspondence focussed on the care of the family rather than any national

---

distinction or particulars of the enemy. Reserve officer Hasan Ethem’s letter of 17 April 1915 spoke of care of the family and the beauty of the Turkish countryside. He must have felt that his army had a chance of victory and was confident of a wedding: ‘If God pleases the enemy will make a landing and we shall go to a wedding ceremony I wrote to Kadir.’ His deep premonitions were disguised in: ‘Dear Mother, don’t give the deeds and other documents to anybody. If they ask tell that you don’t know. Take the bag and put it into the chest. I made you previously understand, this is the World.’ Two days later he was killed by shell-fire. 25 Another letter begins, ‘Musta Mahomet, Captain, 13th Turkish Infantry, Achi Baba, To my high-born Royal wife, Ayesha,’ and expresses fear that the ‘persistent English’ will put ‘our lovely Constantinople into ruins…Nothing but some great favour from Allah can stop it.’ His view is of an enemy, whom he generalises as ‘These English’ who have ‘no fear of death’ and who ‘watch like wolves in the night and are upon us like sour devils.’ 26 This view is one of the few expressions of Turkish officer class opinion. It reflects the tough fighting and fear among the defenders of the Peninsula. 27

In a letter of May 1915 from Ari Burnu, Lieutenant Mehmet Tevik prayed for his wife and family:

I thank God that he enabled me to become a soldier and reach this rank. You, as my parents, did all you could to raise me and make it possible for me to serve my country and my people. You are my heart, you are my soul, and you are the inspiration of my life. I am eternally grateful to God and to you. Beloved father; dearest mother, I entrust my beloved wife Münevver, and my dear son Nezih first to God and then to your shelter. Please do for them whatever is possible. Please help my wife in raising my son and providing him with the necessary education. I know that we are not wealthy or people of means. 28

There are no references to Turkish or British Empire, only a perception of the enemy as English, and a great yearning for the family and loved ones at home. Despite prevalent beliefs of a different world view being held by the enemy other, both Turkish and Anzac writers shared

---

25 Hasan Ethem, to his mother, 17 Apr. 1915. Copy in the Kabatepe Information centre wall display.
26 NZFL Vol. XVII, No. 904, 9 Nov. 1917, 9. This letter was taken from the pocket of the dead Turkish officer by a Scottish soldier who posted it to a friend in New York for translation. From there it was sent to the Scottish soldier’s family, who sent a copy to relatives in New Zealand, who forwarded it to the NZFL for publication.
27 DPL Peninsula Press, 12 May 1915, 2 transcribed a report allegedly from the Turkish newspaper, Tanine, which confidently predicted the end of the Straits campaign for the British and their ‘demoralised soldiers.’
28 This letter forms the postscript to the Ekip production film Gallipoli/Gelibolu: The Front Line Experience, and was emailed to the author by the film director Tolga Örnek.
common themes in their letters – family, fear for the future, trust in a deity. One occasion when shared humanitarian feelings were shown was with the ‘Armistice’ of 24 May 1915. The health situation in the Gallipoli Anzac and Turkish trenches in mid-May rapidly deteriorated with warm weather following a Turkish attack beginning on the 17th. Turkish officers applied for a ceasefire late on 20 May but their overture was rejected. When the Turkish officers again applied for a limited cease-fire and dispersal of burying parties between the trenches, the officers in the New Zealand and Australian lines at Anzac were receptive. Private George Doherty of the 8th Canterbury Mounted Rifles recorded:

Everything very quiet today, and it is the greatest day I have ever put in. An Armistice was arranged (the Turks applying for it) from 7.30 a.m. till 4.15 p.m. to allow both parties bury dead and look for wounded…The Turks carried numbers of white flags and it was a great sight….We were very keen to have a good look at the men we were fighting against, and a small party of their Ambulance men came right up near us in [the] charge of a German officer, who was dressed ‘to kill.’….At 4 o’clock we got into our trenches and the white flags began to dwindle away. We watched the Turks pretty closely to see that they didn’t plant any snipers and that sort of thing – they are very treacherous; but the country is that hilly that a lot of this sort of thing could go on without being seen. At 4.15 the Armistice had ended, but nothing happened.

The armistice of 24 May was widely reported, and became a reference in reducing the demonisation of the Turkish soldier. There is a paucity of Turkish primary evidence, and reliance must be placed on other assessments. Writings and graphics in the popular press, often racist, give interpretations affecting the Turkish. New Zealand’s first widely read Anzac Day responses were predicated on a lack of understanding and racial stereotyping of the enemy.

31 Percy George Doherty, Diary, 7/437, 8th Canterbury Mounted Rifles, Oct. 13th 1914-Nov. 24th 1915, Bannerman Family Collection, 24 May 1915, Part 2, 9; DPL, Peninsula Press, No. 13, 25 May 1915, 1; ‘3000 Turkish Dead,’ reported the completion of the burial of Turkish soldiers in the Anzac sector; DPL, Peninsula Press, No. 14, 26 May 1915, 1; favourable reports on the arrangements by the Turks and the conduct of their officers during the burial of the dead on the 24th.
32 Tolga Örnek, Turkish film director, accounts for this lack of evidence on several grounds: the change in the language from Arabic to Latin script by the Republican People’s Party in 1924, the mobility of the population in the years of turmoil 1915-1927, and the relative illiteracy of the Turkish soldier, when compared with Anzacs, who as a group were some of the most literate soldiers in the British Empire.
During the campaign, Anzacs heard and read tales of Turkish buffoonery, treachery toward Red Cross attendants, the strange tale of shooting a Turkish convalescent soldier, dirtiness and cowardly Turks fleeing from fierce Australian infantry. These relentless impressions of Turkish incompetence were over time moderated by an understanding that the Turks bravely defended their own land, providing stiff opposition for the combined allied forces. In September 1915, the editorial writer for the NZFL ‘Lancings’ column perpetuated the rumour that Turk munitions were running low. Only ‘the doggedness of the British and their Allies would send them through in God’s good time to the desired haven of Stamboul.’ This acknowledges successful resistance by Turkish defenders and rebuts many of the popular convictions about their lack of capacity to fight.

In early April 1916, surprisingly, the Sydney-based Wattle Day League was hoping to plant wattles on the graves of Australian soldiers buried on Gallipoli, in the belief that the Turks would respect the plantings. This belief in Turkish integrity was reflected elsewhere. It had become common knowledge by 1917 that Turk soldiers did not desert the battlefield: a popular piece of doggerel circulating among British troops in Mesopotamia went:
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33 NZFL Vol. XV, No. 784, 14 May 1915, 4. A column under the title ‘All Sorts of People’ relates the treatment of New Zealand Red Cross servicemen near Ismalia on the Suez Canal; some of the wounded were Turks and Bedouins, each of whom reacted differently to the ministrations of the Red Cross men. ‘Bedouins gratefully, often smilingly, accepted the attentions of the Red cross men, the wounded Turks often snarled angrily like mad dogs when picked up by the stretcher parties. Turks showed no respect for the Geneva Cross in the Gallipoli fighting. The ambulance men, according to the cables, being shot down mercilessly.’; ibid, No 811 14 Jan 1916, 9. As a result of the Turk prisoner telling how he only wanted to get home to his wife and children, a listening Wellington man became depressed and shot the Turk; ibid, No. 827, 5 May 1916, 9; NZFL Vol. XVI, No. 879, 11 May 1917, 19 ‘Touchline’ in ‘The Future of Athletic Sport’ wrote a column called ‘The War Standpoint’ persuades the readers that the love of athletics has not made degenerates of Britishers. ‘Who but athletes at the top of their form could have leapt ashore from boats on to the Anzac beach, and with their bayonets cleared it of the Turks? Who but athletically-trained soldiers could have rushed up the steep parts of the Gallipoli cliffs, wherever foothold could be found, in the half-light of daybreak?’ ‘So vigorous was the onslaught, writes Sir Ian Hamilton, that the Turks made no attempt to withstand it, but fled from ridge to ridge pursued by the Australian infantry.’ General Birdwood stated: ‘It was a magnificent feat, which has seldom, if ever, been surpassed.’

34 NZFL Vol. XV, No. 792 3 Sept. 1915, 5; Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge, UK, Churchill-Amery Papers AMEL 1/3/25 Part 5 of 5 in a confidential message to XMO Jul. 1915, he reinforced the notion that the Turks were short of artillery ammunition; The Star, Christchurch, 29 Apr. 1915, 1; ‘Turkey’s Peril,’ a telegram cable from Paris reported a ‘secret meeting in Constantinople’ presided over by Talaat Bey, and attended by the general commander Enver Pasha and Halil Bey who expressed concern over low ammunition supplies which would lead to an inability to defend the Dardanelles. This story may have been the origin of the rumour; DPL, Peninsula Press, No. 46, 5 Jul. 1915, 1; Translation of field orders by Col. Rifat, Commander of the 11th Turkish Division, indicate low quantities of practice rounds available, and warnings against carelessness and surrendering of trenches. The allies took these to indicate low ammunition supplies and poor morale. This matter is much debated.

35 NZFL Vol. XV No. 792, 3 Sept. 1915, 5.

36 Ibid, No. 823 7 Apr. 1916, 5. The League’s President was Mr Maiden, Director of the Sydney Botanic Gardens and the Hon. Sec. was Mrs Kettlewell, better known as ‘Agnes Storriea,’ writer of Australian verse.
You gets your compensation when it comes to real work,
For you’re fighting ’gainst a good ‘un when you’re fighting ’gainst the Turk,
’Es not the bloke for shabby tricks; ’e ain’t no bloomin’ ’Un,
And when you charge with bay’nets fixed ’e don’t turn round an’ run.  

This indicated respect not seen prior to Gallipoli. This attitude was visualised in the Ted Colley ‘Abdul’ drawing found in C.E.W. Bean’s very popular 1916 *Anzac Book*. The image reflects a stocky, muscular and self-sufficient Turkish soldier with a wily look in his eye. There was awareness that the mehmetçik was not an opponent to be trifled with. By 1918 there was knowledge among Anzacs about other acts of chivalry shown between Allied troops and Turks in Gallipoli. However, these more generous Anzac views of the Turks were fragile. From the war’s end to the Chanak Crisis, enmity resurfaced. In 1919, the *Free Lance* ran a piece called ‘Haranguing the Pasha’ which showed little tolerance for the Turkish situation in regard to Greek ambitions in Asia Minor. In early 1920, following stories of atrocities perpetrated on the Armenians, the ‘unspeakable Turk’ image resurfaced.

Hostile attitudes were reinforced in May 1921 with the publication of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s book, *The Road to Endor*, which related experiences of British prisoners of war in Turkish camps. As the Chanak Crisis unravelled during September 1922, bitterness and confrontation, never far from the surface, re-emerged in the Australasian view of Turks. The mid-September edition of the *NZFL* posed allies Britain, France and Italy advancing on the Asiatic side of the Straits, an area granted to Greece at the end of the Great War. There were calls for the dominions to stand with Britain and supply a contingent to challenge the Turks’ attempt to regain

---

39 *NZFL* Vol XVII, No. 912, 4 Jan. 1918, 9. Entre Nous stories of camaraderie between pilots of the Allies and Turks: ‘one of our planes went over the Turks’ lines and came down within a few hundred feet of the Turkish aerodrome, which he bombed successfully, notwithstanding the Turks’ anti-aircraft guns. Next day a Taube [aircraft] came over and dropped a message congratulating our airman on his bravery and success and wishing him good luck and hoping to meet him in Australia after the war.’
41 Ibid, No. 1027, 3 Mar. 1920, 13 in the cartoon events of the week a caricature of the ‘unspeakable Turk’ and the peace terms for World War I. The cartoonist parodies apprehended Turk attitudes to Christians and sits on the wounded figurine of Armenia – which may have been the reason for the resurgence in stereotypical attitudes.
42 *NZFL* Vol. XXI, No.1092, 25 May 1921, 9. There is an observation by the reviewer, Morton: ‘The Turk is a queer mixture. Personally, I never met a Turk who did not leave me a debtor for some kindness. I know also that it is perfectly impossible to ascribe any moral sense in the Turk where the Armenians are concerned. A Turk, [who] is in all other respects a gentle and humane man, will kill an Armenian with no more compunction than he would kill a rat.’
43 *NZFL* 23rd year, No 12, 20 Sept 1922, 3. [In Jun. 1922, the *NZFL* issue / numbering system changed].
part of the old Ottoman Empire. However, there were some few contrary private reports like that of a Mrs Noel Pharazyn, who had been in Constantinople with her husband.

The Chanak Crisis erupted in September 1922 when Turkish troops, after capturing Smyrna (modern Izmir) from the occupying Greeks, threatened British and French troops stationed near Çanakkale, the capital. In the affray and just after the entrance of the Turkish nationalists into Smyrna the town caught alight and much of this cosmopolitan trading centre was burned to the ground. The British and French troops were stationed in the area to secure the Dardanelles as a neutral zone. Divisions emerged in the British Cabinet over the handling of the affair, with Lloyd George and Winston Churchill both determined to show the Turks that an open challenge to British world power could not be allowed. In New Zealand and Australia there was readiness on the part of ex-soldiers in particular to enlist and join an attack on the Turks. Despite the admiration for the fighting skills of the mehmetçik there was an underlying racially-based distrust of things Turkish. In the six months from September 1922 to February 1923 interest in the crisis in Turkey remained high. There was editorial concern that the Turks might be given too free a hand by the French, to the jeopardy of British interests, and some mixed reactions to the plight of retreating Greek troops. Old stereotypes prevailed and Anzac Day 1923 reflected them.

---

44 Ibid, 3; NZFL Special King Country Supplement – ‘New Zealand and the Empire’s Call,’ vi; the writer supports the Prime Minister’s call for a contingent to support Britain in the crisis developing in Turkey: ‘New Zealand will play her part steadfastly.’
47 On 16 Sept. some Cabinet supporters of the Lloyd George – Churchill group issued a communiqué threatening Turkey with a declaration of war by Britain and the Dominions. Lord Curzon, the Foreign Secretary, returning to London on 18 Sept. actively worked to smooth over the crisis. Aware that Poincaré, the pro-Turkish Prime Minister of France, would be incensed by the communiqué he rapidly departed for Paris to placate him. Arriving on 20 Sept. he found Poincaré had already instructed the French detachment at Canakkale to withdraw and that he was more deeply hurt by the British action than Curzon had anticipated. After a series of angry meetings an agreement was made to come to an armistice with the Turks.
48 NZFL, No 16, 18 Oct 1922, 4.
49 Ibid, 27; ibid, No. 17, 25 Oct 1922, 22; ibid, No 18, 1 Nov 1922, 4.
‘The Crisis in the East,’ NZFL, cartoon, 20 September 1922, 3. Turkish nationalists are clearly shown as the culprits for the burning of Smyrna.

In November 1922, the New Zealand Freelance continued to attack Turkey with by-lines like ‘The greedy Turk, his swollen head,’ above a story condemning Turkish success in Greece. There was intense criticism of the Kemalites’ desire to establish their state with a clean break from the past. Stories included the torching of Smyrna (Izmir) where British troops and the flagship Iron Duke arrived to restore order, and the arrival of British sailors in Chanak (Çanakkale) for defence of the territory from attack by Turkish nationalists. The mid-November news pushed the anti-Turk feeling further by referring to the rapturous reception the Americans gave to the news that the Anzacs were to send a contingent to Turkey in support of

---

50 NZFL 23\textsuperscript{rd} year, No 20, 15 Nov. 1922, 4, 23.
Britain’s stand.\textsuperscript{52} New Zealand interest in the matter continued into 1923 and included reference to the trials of Greek cabinet ministers and the flight of the ex-Sultan of Turkey to Malta aboard a British warship.\textsuperscript{53} There were still mixed messages: by November 1922, the Turks regained favour in the West and were portrayed with their nationalist leader Kemal as ‘the Turkish hero of the moment.’\textsuperscript{54}

Curiously, we have a brief glimpse of an adversary’s view, that of General Liman von Sanders, Commander-in-Chief of Turkish forces on the Peninsula in 1915, quoted by Sir Ian Hamilton at the Anzac Day luncheon in the Hotel Cecil, London. In an interview responding to claims by Lloyd George, von Sanders told a \textit{Daily Telegraph} correspondent:

> Mr. Lloyd George has said Gallipoli is sacred ground, because it holds more than twenty thousand graves of British warriors, but I say it also holds the graves of sixty thousand Turks who fell in the defence of their own country against invasion.\textsuperscript{55}

Here we can glimpse a soldier perspective, a surprisingly inclusive one, considering how fresh the memories of the Chanak Crisis were. Concerns about the safety of gravesites following the Chanak Crisis were sounded, and about whether local Turks were being obstructive with IWGC personnel needing to travel between cemeteries, and in 1924 whether the reconstruction of Gallipoli cemeteries was being held up by obdurate Ankara authorities who suspected some of the workmen were spying out the land for the Allies.

The Turkish view accords little significance for Anzac Day because in a world of turmoil, the feelings of a group of foreigners making a claim for a small territory in the north-west were largely irrelevant. Their memories of Çanakkale Savaslari were to be postponed to a period when there was time for reflection on what the battles meant in their history. The Anzac view of the other was largely motivated by British imperial and racist attitudes which became particularly obvious at times of tension. The above material conveys an understanding of the distance that had to be bridged between the Turks and the Anzacs for the day to proceed at Gallipoli. It was an historic landscape marred by conflict and statements about possession.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid, No. 20, 15 No. 1922, 31. Nellie Scanlan reporting from Boston, USA, for the \textit{NZFL} under the heading ‘Admiration for Anzacs’ tells of the Boston papers featuring ‘big headlines today announcing the decision of the Anzacs to rush to Britain’s aid in the Turkish trouble. The Americans have tremendous admiration for the Anzacs.’
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid, No 28, 10 Jan. 1923 [wrongly dated, actually No. 29, 17 Jan. 1923.]
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, No 19, 8 Nov. 1922, 4.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid, 26 Apr. 1923, 11.
Foreigners at Anzac Cove for Anzac Day

The first Anzac Day commemorations on Gallipoli were held at the end of World War I hostilities. They were conducted within a framework of the exercise of power – the victorious Allies were in occupation at the time, and the Turks were compelled to accept a foreign ceremony on their soil. Turkey, like Germany, had not been territorially conquered, but she was defeated through her association with that power. British authorities and troops entered and occupied key positions in Turkey in November 1918 and the Ottoman Empire authorities were forced to accept humiliating terms of defeat.

Soon after the surrender of Germany and Turkey, issues arose concerning the care of British and allied graves on Gallipoli. This matter, close to the hearts of Anzacs, dominated thoughts of those who had lost friends and relatives there. The Times headlines screamed reports of desecration and expressed outrage. The British Secretary of War incorrectly reported in December 1918 that graves had been ‘grievously molested and desecrated by the Turks.’ Bruce Scates records C.E.W. Bean’s report of the Australian Historical Mission of January-February 1919 which suggested that while there had been some desecration of gravesites, it had been random and was not sanctioned by the local authorities or the Turkish government.

New Zealand Captain-Chaplain Leslie B. Neale wrote about the Gallipoli situation to The New Zealand Methodist Times on 12 January 1919. He was attached to the New Zealand (Canterbury) Mounted Rifles Brigade in Ismailia and went with them on 29 December 1918 to Gallipoli and stayed briefly. The Graves Registration Unit detail joined their party a few days before Neale wrote his letter. About the rumours of grave desecration he wrote:

56 Times 21 Dec. 1918, 8. The same article reported the work of the Graves’ Registration Unit beginning on the Gallipoli Peninsula on 10 Nov. 1918, the day before the Armistice with Germany.
57 Ibid.
For the sake of those who mourn their loved and lost, I wish to deny most emphatically the current gruesome stories of Turkish desecration. It is perfectly true scarcely a wooden cross of the thousands we erected is to be found, and that partly buried bodies have been exhumed, but this has been the work of ghoulish marauders after loot and not the doings of the fighting Turk. The Turkish soldiers have respected our official cemeteries and in some cases have erected signs, with the words, ‘English burying ground.’

Neale’s observations supported those of Charles Bean. What they reflected was a response to the desperation of families back in New Zealand and Australia keen to hear any snippet of news about Gallipoli. Neale was the same chaplain who in 1916 had urged attendees at the annual Methodist Conference in Auckland to see Anzac Day as a ‘call to prayer.’

On 25 April 1919, *The Times* reported the first Gallipoli commemoration service ‘on the spot where Australians and New Zealanders landed.’ The column was written by an un-named chaplain who conducted the service. The congregation, largely composed of the members of the Graves Registration Unit, gathered on Ari Burnu beach. The service ended with the National Anthem and a photographic session. This event was the first of a procession of Anzac Days held at Gallipoli. There is no report for 1920: not unusual, considering the turmoil in the area caused by the threatened Greek incursion into Anatolia, the revolts against the Ottoman control by the Nationalists and the imposition of military control by British troops based at Chanak Kalesi [Çanakkale]. Scates takes another view – Gallipoli pilgrims’ visits were ‘prohibited with the utmost vigour’ until 1923, by which time the Graves’ Registration Unit had buried the majority of the remains. Despite this, there were visitors, some for Anzac Day ceremonies.
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60 See this thesis Chapter Three.
61 TNA WO/4954 GRU [Graves Registration Unit] Gallipoli, Vol. 6, War Diary entry: 24/4/19 ‘Capt. Bigg-Wither, Revd. Gilbert and Lieut. Norrish went to Anzac for Memorial Service.’ The service was held at Anzac Cove Beach and attended by Lieutenant Cyril Hughes (in charge of B Section ‘Anzac’), Leonard Woolley (a prominent archaeologist who helped Hughes with the survey), Captain Vernon Bigg-Wither (New Zealand GRU representative who controlled administration and logistics at Kilid Bahir), Lieutenant Norrish (83rd Brigade) and Rev. Gilbert (83rd Brigade, mentioned in *Times* report as ‘chaplain’), non-commissioned officers and other ranks, and Greek labourers. I am indebted to Dr Don Mackay for this material.
63 Bruce Scates, *Return to Gallipoli*, 68.
64 *The Times* 1 Nov. 1920, 13; a report by a ‘Special Correspondent’ who relates the construction of a road from ‘Kilid Bahir (overlooking the Narrows), by Anzac Cove, to the left flank of the old British battlefront on the slopes of the Aegean.’ The correspondent describes the Turkish memorial as ‘just one indication of the pride of the Turks in their successful defence of Constantinople. It is a rough rubble and concrete monument which stands about 14 ft. high. Rising from the top are a dozen unexploded shells, of which the bases are set firmly in concrete. One of the Blocks of the monument is faced by a sniper’s steel plate upon which is scratched in Turkish characters a message of victory…They raised one other monument in memory of their dead. It was built of ammunition boxes overlaid with concrete, but the Greeks who are now in occupation have long since levelled it to the ground.’ The
On 25 April 1921, Lt. Gen. Aylmer Hunter-Weston laid wreaths of ‘wild flowers gathered from the land made for ever Britain by the bodies of [British and Empire] heroic dead’ on each of the main Gallipoli Peninsula beaches. In 1922, during the period of Greek control of the area, a notably large ceremony took place at what the correspondent describes as ‘Anzac.’

The description given fits Anzac Cove [Ari Burnu]. He had arrived at Kelia Liman (the GRU encampment to the north of Eceabat) on April 24 and on the following day was able to witness a service conducted by Colonel L.A. Hughes, Chaplain-General to the British Forces in Turkey. It was attended by representatives of the Navy and the Army, members of the Graves Commission, and Greeks in the neighbourhood. He joined with a group from Kelia Liman, and went by horseback cross-country to Shrapnel Valley, reaching Anzac Cove about 10 am. He recounted:

tying our horses to the twisted wreckage of an iron barge, we made for the spot where people had already assembled to do homage to the dead. There were fifty or sixty present there, standing bareheaded on that famous beach, and the altar was placed where soon is to be raised a stone bearing this inscription:

1915 – 1916.

The Australian and New Zealand Army Corps landed near this spot at Dawn on April 25th, 1915.

By now some twenty Greeks had arrived, eager to offer their reverence. The priest of Maidos, cross in hand, stood by the British Padre in front of the improvised altar, and listened intently to the singing of ‘Jesu, Lover of my Soul.’

When the last words of that hymn had lost themselves in the pleasant chanting of the sea every one prayed – felt impelled to pray, there in God’s open ground, the bright sun warming their hearts and the atmosphere of noble deeds thrilling their very souls.

A wreath from the Greek residents of Maidos was laid upon the altar, and the priest sounded the ‘Kyrie Eleison,’ his cross lifted high before him, his bearded face raised to the sky, till he seemed like some old prophet thanking God for the deliverance of Israel. Then the Padre delivered his sermon, short, simple, fitting, and the service ended.

A quaint and surely unique conclusion to this impressive morning was the christening, with water from Anzac Beach, of the son of an Australian who had been present at the landing in 1915.

This is one of the most comprehensive descriptions of an early Gallipoli Anzac Day service, full of emotion and drama because of the unusual setting. The same writer condemned the Turks as

---

65 The Times 26 Apr. 1921, 9.
66 Ibid, 30 May 1922, 17.
‘surely the most untrustworthy [people] on the face of the earth,’ a position vacated by the Greeks in British tradition.67

In a later report, *The Times* correspondent related the start of construction for the New Zealand memorial at Chunuk Bair, where the cemetery contained the graves of 600 soldiers, mostly New Zealanders.68 The impact of the Chunuk Bair area on the writer is similar to that felt today,69 ‘the landscape [has] a striking and tragic effect,’ ‘in simplicity and beauty of design, few areas hallowed by the sacrifice of British soldiers will ever surpass [those] of Gallipoli.’70 A cosmopolitan group visited Gallipoli in June 1922. It included the French National Union of Ex-soldiers led by the Commanding Officer of the French Squadron in the Levant, Admiral Dumesnil, and the French High Commissioner General Pellé. The Japanese High Commissioner, representatives of other Allied Powers and a delegate of the Association of Turkish Graduates of French Universities also attended.71 In 1923, *The Times* reported three separate 25 April commemorative services - one at Suvla Bay, one at ‘Y’ Beach, and the main service on a small plateau above Cape Helles, close to where the British national monument was to be erected. The services were ‘Gallipoli Day’ events rather than for Anzacs. The report recorded high level attendance by British and French officers and the service again conducted by the Principal Chaplain, Rev. L.A. Hughes. The main ceremony ended with the sounding of the ‘Last Post’ and two minutes’ silence.72

There was no ceremony at Anzac Cove, and the above event was one of British and French memory. It does, however, show the degree to which the day became accepted by 1923. For military groups to be allowed access there must have been compliance from Çanakkale regional authorities. Yet, a year later, these angry feelings had subsided and ceremonies were once more possible at Gallipoli. This was near the end of the ‘Turkish National Struggle for Independence’ which had begun in May 1919 and resulted in the founding of the Republic of Turkey on 29
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67 *The Times*, 30 May 1922, 17. The Greeks were in control of Çanakkale until expelled by Turk nationalists in late 1922.
69 G.F. Davis, personal visits to Chunuk Bair, 16 and 25 Apr. 2007.
70 *The Times*, 1 Jun. 1922, 9. He was to extend these noble expressions about Chunuk in the final part, *The Times*, 6 Jun. 1922, 7 where he commented: ‘Asleep and unknown the heroes lie on the crest of Chunuk Bair; on the shrub-covered, treacherous foothills; in gullies twisted and gnarled; wherever a man may rest his head and die – Englishmen, Australians, New Zealanders, Indians: a very noble company.’
72 Ibid, 27 Apr. 1923, 11. In attendance were General Marden, Rear-Admiral Kelly and Commandant Boinet.
October 1923.\textsuperscript{73} That observances were able to proceed in Çanakkale reflects the importance placed on them by British Empire officials and of the compliance of local Greek, and later, Turkish authorities.

By the mid-1920s, pilgrimages to the Gallipoli war graves became regular occurrences. In 1925, the \textit{S.S. Ormonde} called on a three-day visit during which the New Zealand memorial at Chunuk Bair was unveiled.\textsuperscript{74} T.J. Pemberton, a passenger on the \textit{Ormonde}, writing in 1926 included a photographic record of a group of thirty-five Turkish men resting in the grass at their own memorial at The Nek in May 1925.\textsuperscript{75}

\textbf{Plate 10. TURKISH FESTIVAL TO TURKISH SOLDIERS [1925]}
At their monument on the Nek.’ T.J. Pemberton, \textit{Gallipoli Today}, facing page 38

This photographic evidence is important, for it challenges Turkish academic orthodoxy that it was only from 1934 that Turkish citizens, veterans in particular, began pilgrimages to

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{73} A. Mete Tuncoku, ‘The Everlasting Significance of Gallipoli,’ \textit{Gallipoli in Retrospect 90 Years On}, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi and AÇASAM, Çanakkale, 2006, 2.
\textsuperscript{74} Bruce Scates, \textit{Return to Gallipoli}, 69; KCL Hamilton Papers: 15/4/1- 19 Business correspondence, 15/4/6 3 Mar. 1925, Ian Hamilton to Edward Arnold, London. General Ian Hamilton had intended to be part of the party to until advised him of the possibility of adverse Turkish reaction to a visit by him.
\textsuperscript{75} T.J. Pemberton, \textit{Gallipoli To-day}, Ernest Benn, London, 1926, photo opposite 38. The author gives an excellent account of the cemetery and monument building in progress on Gallipoli in the mid-twenties. It is possible that the 1925 Turkish writer quoted by N.A.Banoğlu is in the group photographed by Pemberton.
\end{flushleft}
commemorate their dead on Gallipoli. While this gathering, described by Pemberton as a ‘Turkish festival to Turkish soldiers,’ did not happen on Anzac Day, the number of older men of the age of 1915 veterans dominates the group and strongly suggests that they were gathered in front of the surviving Turkish Nek monument for commemorative purposes. It is reasonable to accept that the gathering might have been broadly interpreted by Pemberton as a ‘festival’ because, in early May 1915, the Turkish defenders held the line above Anzac Cove and defeated the allies in the Battle for Krithia. Pemberton also mentioned the Nek monument in his text:

The Turks were not demonstrative, and nothing could be more modest than this pyramidal block of concrete, surrounded by five live shells, and standing only some fifteen feet in height. Its surface is rough and it is partly formed of snipers’ masks- a strange contrast to the costly and beautiful monuments of the vanquished. The Turks raised no other memorial to their dead. Here and there are to be found Turkish cemeteries, but they are not marked nor intended to be remembered. Doubtless some of our erstwhile enemies have found a resting-place in the Christian burial grounds.

Turkish battlefield monument near Lone Pine, Gallipoli. It had similar design to the Nek monument. This monument fell into disrepair and was dismantled by the IWGC. Kilia Bay Main Information Centre, wall display.
Pemberton’s report was characteristic of a British, contemporary view. He expressed a reluctance to admit that Turkish veterans might have the right to commemorate and remember their lost friends. I have found only one record of a visit by a Turk to the Gallipoli battlefield in this period. The writer comments on the traces of memory for the Allied enemy who lost:

The sea was cheerful as if she did not remember anything; the earth was covered by deep green scrub from one end to the other as if it did not embrace the young bodies of thousands of men...Only the foreign cemeteries were like white flower gardens on the sides of hills close to the sea. The only visible traces are not of those who won but [of] those who were defeated.76

In this short account by N.A. Banoğlu, there is a Turkish view which underscores the difference between the western soldiers’ burial grounds and the barrenness of the cemeteries for the defenders of the homeland. There is a trace, not of bitterness or regret, but of bewilderment about how the vanquished of 1915 seem to have won in death.

In 1926, the Stella d’Italia took 274 members of the St Barnabas Pilgrimage and their boxes of wreaths from Marseilles to Salonika and on to a service at Cape Helles. Some of the pilgrims remained and took the opportunity to visit Çanakkale and Constantinople.77 There were arrangements in place with local authorities for some to visit Suvla Bay and Anzac Cove, but a change of heart by the Çanakkale authorities meant permission was withdrawn.78 In a postscript, The Times ran an item which explained that the Turkish (Ankara) Government felt that the local Çanakkale authorities had misinterpreted the instructions issued to them.79 Visits to Gallipoli waned in 1927, but the S.S. Otranto called into Khelia Bay and Cape Hellas in mid-May and some New Zealanders were engaged around Anzac Day in ex-Turkish territories.80 The New Zealand High Commissioner, Sir James Parr, was reported in the Anzac Day edition of The Times going to Jerusalem to unveil the New Zealand memorial chapel to the men from the Dominion who fought in Palestine and the Sinai in the war.81 In 1928, the Stella d’Italia returned

77 The Times, 26 Aug. 1926, 13; ibid, 13 Sept. 1926, 14.
80 JOL ADCC Cuttings 1927, ‘Programme for S.S. Otranto 13 and 15 May 1927,’; Letter, A.B. Proudheath to Captain Secretary Pike, 4 Nov. 1927 describing the visit and provision of ‘50 to 60 carts for transport...’ by the local Turks; Also a letter Rev. James E. Cresswell, Brisbane to Pike, referring to some Gallipoli photographs.
81 The Times, 25 Apr. 1927, 16. This ceremony was to follow the unveiling of the general memorial by Field-Marshal Lord Allenby to all British and Allied troops who fought in the area. The chapel, sited on the slopes of the
with 274 pilgrims to Gallipoli under the auspices of the Saint Barnabas’ pilgrimage scheme organised by the Rev. M. Mullineux. The newspaper correspondent’s report carried fulsome praise for the kindnesses shown the pilgrims by the Turks: ‘Everyone, from the highest official to the lowest peasant, did all he could to aid the pilgrims. The permission to land at Anzac in small boats was especially appreciated by the many aged women taking part in the pilgrimage.’ Here we see a mention of the process of ageing. In this case it is of parents of the dead soldiers, a matter reflected in the number of elderly women.

A gesture by the British government indicated gratitude for the permission given to Gallipoli pilgrimages. It marked a change in the current landscape. In May 1932, Sir George Clerk, British Ambassador to the Government of Turkey, presented the two-volume official British history of the Gallipoli campaign to ‘the Ghazi, Mustapha Kemal.’ The author of the history, Brigadier-General C.F. Aspinall-Oglander, fulsomely praised Mustapha Kemal: ‘Seldom in history can the exertions of a single divisional commander have exercised, on three separate occasions, so profound an influence not only on the course of the battle but perhaps on the fate of a campaign, and even the destiny of a nation.’ It would seem that views of each other were warming. Anzac Day (Gallipoli Day for the veterans of the British 29th Division), was again the occasion when the Duchess of Richmond pilgrims alighted on the Peninsula in 1934. Memories of the original conflict were over-ridden by both time and the overpowering beauty of the landscape. Seventeen years had elapsed and the bitterness of hatred and regret occasioned by leaving dead comrades behind had begun to dull.

Memories were framed within a feeling of spirituality revealed in the landscape of the Peninsula. Today, there is acceptance of the Turks having a right to their own memorials. The description of conciliatory acts and words about brotherhood also set the scene for the political gestures by Mustapha Kemal. A message from him was read aloud to the passengers on this vessel, the Mount of Olives had been allotted by the IWGC. The NZ memorial was the interior mosaic decorations of the chapel which took the form of ‘a characteristic Maori pattern.’ On the panel above the entry door was the phrase ‘From the uttermost ends of the earth,’ below which is carved a NZ tree-fern frond and below the sentence ‘In honour of the members of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force who took part in the operations in Sinai and Palestine, 1916-1918.’ Parr was also to visit cemeteries at Chatby and Hadra in Egypt, Gaza and Beersheba and Ramleh. On the return voyage he was to call and visit NZ soldier graves in Malta. He was to be accompanied by Major-Gen. Sir Edward Chaytor who had commanded the NZ and Australian Mounted Brigade in Palestine.

Mount of Olives had been allotted by the IWGC. The NZ memorial was the interior mosaic decorations of the chapel which took the form of ‘a characteristic Maori pattern.’ On the panel above the entry door was the phrase ‘From the uttermost ends of the earth,’ below which is carved a NZ tree-fern frond and below the sentence ‘In honour of the members of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force who took part in the operations in Sinai and Palestine, 1916-1918.’ Parr was also to visit cemeteries at Chatby and Hadra in Egypt, Gaza and Beersheba and Ramleh. On the return voyage he was to call and visit NZ soldier graves in Malta. He was to be accompanied by Major-Gen. Sir Edward Chaytor who had commanded the NZ and Australian Mounted Brigade in Palestine.

82 The Times, 6 Sept 1928, 11. Lord Stopford of the IWGC and Suvla Bay experience was a pilgrim on this voyage.
83 Ibid; 24 May 1932, 24; ibid, 3 May 1934, 13.
Duchess of Richmond, among whom were members of the IWGC.\textsuperscript{85} In London, The Times ran a short report from its Melbourne correspondent which related Kemal’s response to a Melbourne newspaper’s request for information about Gallipoli graves: ‘The Gallipoli landing and fighting on the Peninsula showed all the world the heroism of all who shed their blood there, and how heartrending for their nations were the losses this struggle caused.’\textsuperscript{86} Interestingly, this newspaper report is congruent with, but not the same as the wording of the well-known message from the Turkish leader. It seems, at first glance, like a brief paraphrase of the original and initiated the discussion below.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{portrait.jpg}
\caption{Portrait of Ghazi Kemal Pasha, about 1925. AWM P04621.002.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{86} The Times, 26 Apr. 1934, 13. ‘The Ghazi’s Message.’
Atatürk’s famous statement to Anzac mothers

The well-known Anzac Cove monolith inscription reads:

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

Atatürk 1934.

The monolith at Anzac Cove, 17 April 2007, photograph G.F. Davis.

Traditional orthodoxy maintains that the now famous and placatory statement which is read on Anzac Day at the Gallipoli Dawn Service, was first written in 1934 in a spontaneous reaction to the pleas of Australian mothers. These pleas were allegedly published in Melbourne newspapers. However, a close examination of the files of the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee correspondence for 1932 and recent discussion by Australian academic Adrian Jones reveal a challenge to that position. G. Gordon of Morven, Western Queensland, wrote to David Garland

---

the Hon. Secretary of the ADCC on 23 May 1932 about events which occurred in an RSL meeting where David Garland and a ‘Mr. Boxer’ had been the main speakers:

A person took exception to the meeting holding a minute’s silence for the Turkish dead. Mr. Boxer was referring to the message of the Turkish Mussolini which was read, and in the manner he referred to the Anzac’s [sic] and suggested that the Chairman hold a minute’s silence as an answer to the way the Anzacs had been spoken of by Mustapha Kemal Pasha. The person I alluded to as [material missing] each of the returned men took exception to it being done…Please do not forget to let us know about the minute’s silence for the Turkish dead.88

There was further correspondence on the matter. David Garland and E.R.B. Pike, Joint Secretaries, replied to Gordon’s letters of the 23 May and 1 July 1932 stating that the matter had been considered in the ‘last meeting of the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee.’89 Tantalisingly, there is material missing but what is clear is that there existed some form of message from Kemal which was welcomed by David Garland. The Joint Secretaries’ response on 11 August 1932 to Gordon read:

The opinion of the Committee is that following upon the reading of the tribute to Australian Soldiers by Kemal Mustapha Pasha from this Committee’s pamphlet, the spontaneous action of the audience was as generous as the tribute paid by Kemal Pasha. Made under these circumstances, it was not out of place. The Committee however feel that it would not be fitting to make it a permanent feature of our observance.

It would have been rewarding to find that the wording of the gracious remarks to Australian soldiers was indeed the basis of those presently attributed to Atatürk. The ‘Committee’s pamphlet’ referred to was the ADCC 1932 booklet which included a tribute entitled ‘Worthy Foemen’ which was ‘transmitted to a special correspondent of the [Brisbane] Daily Mail in response to a request.’90 This establishes clearly that a conciliatory policy between Turks and Anzacs was in Kemal’s mind in 1931.

88 ADCC Minutes and Correspondence 1932 G. Gordon to Honorary Secretary ADCC, 23 May 1932. Clearly stamped ‘RECEIVED 27 May 1932 General Secretary’s Office.’ It is possible that the ‘Mr. Boxer’ referred to was Dr. Ernest Boxer of New Zealand, previously RSA National President. Gordon referred to him as an ‘able speaker…particularly on Anzac matters.’
89 David Garland and E. Pike to G. Gordon, 11 Aug. 1932; Minutes of the meeting of the ADCC 4 Aug. 1932, 6 – the minutes recorded that the action ‘having been done spontaneously could be looked upon as a graceful tribute to a brave enemy, it would, however, be out of place to adopt it permanently.’
90 AWM Anzac Day 1932, Anzac Day Commemoration Committee, Queensland, 1932, 45-47. This was a re-print of a tribute published in the Brisbane Daily Mail, 25 Apr. 1931. It is prefaced: ‘Through the usual diplomatic channels
Mustapha Kemal’s words for Anzac Day 1931 express the ‘deepest respect for the men of Anzac;’ and tender ‘on [his] behalf and on that of the newborn Turkey our reverent tribute to your heroes,’ and ‘on this day, when you pay your annual tribute to [the Anzacs] memory, you can rest assured that they will be in our thoughts as well as our own dead.’ In the closing paragraphs he came near to expressing the ideas of 1934:

Were it possible, I should like one day to join a band of pilgrims from Turkey to Australia to pay on your soil our homage to your dead; but as that is not possible I can assure you that we will always pay our tribute on the soil where the majority of your dead sleep their last sleep on the wind-swept wastes of Gallipoli, ever sacred to the memory of your heroes. Every year since the end of the war our people, who knew the value of the Anzac as a fighter, have paid tribute at the shrines, and some of our former fighters have, in fact, made long pilgrimages from the interior to do so.
It is our hope and belief that the respect we learned to feel for the men of your race in this tragic conflict will pave the way for such an understanding as will render impossible another conflict of this sort. Could your dead speak they would say that they share our hope, and in their name we ask you to do what you can to co-operate with us in ensuring future peace between our respective races.

The words are not the same as the famous message, but the ideas expressed in 1931 are analogous with those of 1934. They also indicate that Turkish pilgrimages had been a continuous feature ‘every year since the end of the war.’ The words indicated the highest level of official sanction for a conciliatory relationship and respect for commemorative gestures. The statement made by Mustapha Kemal,\(^91\) allegedly in 1934, and often a central reading of modern Anzac Day services, occupies a special position in the historical landscape of the twentieth century.

There is little doubt that Atatürk’s statement proved as acceptable to the passengers on the Duchess of Richmond in 1934 as it does today. There is doubt about how widely disseminated the original statement was following its release. Scates cites the reactions of modern visitors to the site of the Anzac monolith and notes the comfort received by this present generation.\(^92\) He relates the difficulty of the generation immediately affected by the conflict to readily accept the olive branch of peace, raised as they were in an age of British imperial fervour and still imbued with bitter memories of loss. He claims, in contrast, that an older sister of an Australian killed at Gallipoli did find comfort in the words.\(^93\) There is an assumption by the present generation, that the words of Atatürk had immediate impact.\(^94\) This was not the case. The effect these words have on travellers to Gallipoli at the end of the twentieth century would be quite different from those who read or heard them just after they were written. Contemporary evidence from newspaper and magazine accounts, apart from records of the Duchess of Richmond pilgrimage where the words were read to passengers, reveal no evidence of their widespread dissemination. Biographical writers Andrew Mango, A. L. Macfie and Lord Kinross do not mention Atatürk’s statement. Neither does it appear referred to in modern scholarship like that of Paul Henze.\(^95\)

---

\(^91\) Mustapha Kemal became Atatürk, or ‘Father of the Turkish nation’ in Nov. 1934. To avoid complication, I will use the honorific from this point.


\(^93\) Scates, 115.

\(^94\) Scates, 187. ‘It must have been, Todd noted, “a great comfort for the grieving families back home.”’ This remark is made within the context of an understanding of what the Turks were doing defending their homeland.

This, of course, raises a question about whether the statement had much immediate impact at all. Today’s Çanakkale historians, however, see it as an issue of great moment. This, perhaps, begins to reveal another facet. Regionalism is strong in Turkey, and issues of great importance in Çanakkale may not resonate nearly as much in Istanbul and Ankara. It is not within the grasp of this argument to pursue a study of Turkish regional interests, apart from observing that while the celebration of Onsekiz Mart Zaferi ‘Victory Week’ seems strong in Çanakkale, it was not well known in Istanbul. The same is possible for both Atatürk’s 1934 statement and Anzac Day. However, at face value, the words on the monolith are comforting. They offer to all today both a rationale for the generous attitude of Turks to Anzacs but also point to the clear directions that Atatürk was setting for his country following the establishment of the republic. However, all may not be as it seems.

The place of Atatürk’s words was discussed recently by Australian historian Adrian Jones. His research reveals a discrepancy between the English translation on the monolith at Anzak Koyu (Ari Burnu-Anzac Cove) and translations of a copy of the original letter drafted by Kemal in 1934. Much of the present evocative tug to the heart is found in the words ‘There is no difference between the Johnnies and the Mehmets to us where they lie side by side here in this country of ours.’ The naming of the Anzac enemy as ‘Johnnies’ brings home the terms of familiarity found in the language of 1915 and still resonating in 2000. Jones points to a different, more accurate version:

Over [our Turkish] home flows the blood of these heroes: you lie here a friend in [our] native land. Repose within, at ease and tranquil. Side by side with our Mehmets, you each embrace. Mothers of sons sent to battle from foreign lands far away: wipe away your tears. Your sons are in our hearts. They will sleep within so very calm and in peace. From the moment they gave up their lives in this soil of ours, they became our sons as well.
Does this variation make a difference? Indeed it does: one wonders why a 1980s translator might have cause to alter the 1934 script. The general feeling of well-being and welcome understanding remains in both versions. The Anzac nations have taken to their hearts the appellation found in the term ‘Johnnies’ just as the Turks resonate to ‘Mehmets.’ The rewording is most sympathetic and the language modern, but it is precisely this difference that suggests it was politically motivated. The edge found in articles of possession clearly stated in the original text: ‘Over [our Turkish] home…[our] native land…in this soil of ours…’ becomes softened by ‘the soil of a friendly country… in this country of ours… lying in our bosom…’ Atatürk obviously intended that the allies should be clear that the sovereignty of Turkey was not to be compromised by the existence of the Anzac cemetery site. The tone of sympathy and welcome is present, but some more direct messages have been modified.99

The general direction of the statement, while resonating with late twentieth century Anzacs in particular, perhaps has more significance for the age in which it was written. The 1930s was not only an age of turmoil for Turkey, but the statement was clearly at variance with the attitudes of the period. This was the age of European dictators, and placatory statements to former enemies smacked of weakness. It was a period when Turkey tried to position itself clearly within western modes of modernisation. To offer the olive branch to the very countries that had been responsible for the deaths of so many of its loyal soldiers at Çanakkale would surely have been problematic, even for so strong a leader. Atatürk, although ill, was at the height of his powers when the statement was drafted, and his power was based firmly not only on the modernisation of Turkey but also on a successful defence against the invader at Çanakkale. Perhaps he could afford to be magnanimous.

Why did Atatürk make the statement at all? According to Professor Mete Tunçoku, Atatürk read concerns about the Gallipoli graves expressed in a ‘Readers’ Corner’ column in an unidentified Melbourne newspaper.100 He was deeply moved by questions such as: has my son a grave? Can I

---

99 In 1960, Gallipoli veteran and NSW RSL president Bill Yeo was particularly touched while visiting Lone Pine and heard there ‘a special message from the Turkish Government:

Oh heroes, those who spilt their blood on this land, you are sleeping side-by-side in close embrace with our Mehmets.

Oh mothers of distant lands, who sent their sons to battle here, stop your tears. Your sons are in our bosoms. They are serenely in peace. Having fallen here now, they have become our own sons.’

100 Interview Çanakkale, 21 Apr. 2007; Neither I nor Turkish authority Professor Mete Tunçoku has been unable to locate a Melbourne newspaper request so far. This led me to wonder whether the Brisbane Daily Mail piece ‘in
or a family member lay flowers at the site? Are the graves well cared for? In response he asked his Interior Minister, Şükrü Kaya, to draft a reply. He was not satisfied with this and reacted by composing a note to be spoken to the representatives of the allied nations at Gallipoli. Most of this corresponds with the account by Adrian Jones but he proffers a further explanation of motives for the statement and its impact at the time.\textsuperscript{101} He compares the ebullient attitudes expressed by Atatürk in 1918 with the generosity of spirit shown in 1934, and rationalises the change by relating it to events subsequent to the War of Independence. It took time to appreciate that the defensive war successfully pursued at Ari Burnu and Çonk Bayiri in 1915 ‘laid a course for a new nation to follow.’\textsuperscript{102} Jones points to the experiences of the Çanakkale campaign providing foundation concepts for the new republic. Extending Jones’ argument, it seems that Atatürk realised the significance of the sacrifice by mehmetçik and Anzac alike. Other factors, such as the treatment of Turkey as a vanquished country following World War I, made Atatürk determined to place Turkey in a geo-political framework where any such humiliation could be avoided in the future.

Orthodoxy prevails that it was really only after World War II and with the intervention of the United Nations forces in Korea that a wider recognition developed of the place of Turkey in relation to Western nations.\textsuperscript{103} This pattern of change partially corresponds with Duygu Bazoğlu Sezer’s explanation:

\begin{quote}
For the most part, between 1923 and the end of the Second World War circumstances dictated an isolationist and neutral orientation. The end of the Second World War changed that drastically. Turkey came out of its shell to join the western alliance in order to protect itself against the Soviet threat and to safeguard and further consolidate its westernising, modernising domestic regime.\textsuperscript{104}
\end{quote}

Rather than being ‘isolationist and neutral,’ Turkey, under Atatürk, pursued a direction of establishing friendly contacts with the British\textsuperscript{105} and their Anzac family. While Sezer’s

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Adrian Jones, ‘A Note on Atatürk’s Words About Gallipoli,’ \textit{History Australia}, Volume 2, Number 1, 2004.}
\footnote{Jones, 10-8.}
\footnote{Turkey had the largest national soldier contingent as part of the United Nations’ forces in the conflict.}
\footnote{A clear indication of how far the Turkish government had moved towards rapprochement with her 1915 British Empire enemies was found in 1936. The Turks accepted a request from the British for a royal visit by Edward VIII}
\end{footnotes}
assessment agrees largely with that of Mete Tuncoku, that Turkey ‘came out of its shell’ in reaction to a perceived post-war Soviet threat, she was positioning herself alongside the western alliance well before that time.\textsuperscript{106} Moves in that direction can be seen in the late 1930s and certainly in the Çakmak - Freyberg messages of 1940.

**Anzac Day messages: Freyberg and Çakmak**

On Anzac Day 1940 there was a cordial exchange of greetings between Major-General Bernard Freyberg, VC, Commanding the New Zealand Forces in Egypt, and Field-Marshal Fevzi Çakmak, Chief of Turkish General Staff.\textsuperscript{107} This event was of great significance to the Turks, but is largely unknown today. It represents a continuation of official Turkish policy. In a prelude, in February 1940, the Turkish Ambassador to Britain, Dr Tewfik Rüstü Aras, visited the Holy Trinity Church, Eltham, London, and presented the Turkish national flag to be included with the Gallipoli 1915-1916 memorial which commemorates the soldiers of the British 29\textsuperscript{th} Division.\textsuperscript{108} The post-war years, and 1953 in particular, are remembered today as the first significant time of Turk-Anzac rapprochement.\textsuperscript{109} These events modify that position. The exchange must be contextualised within the events of the beginning of World War II and marked a desire to identify Turk forces as belonging to the anti-fascist alliance. The exchange of messages fell between the October 1939 Ankara Pact with Great Britain and France and the June 1941 German–Turkish Friendship and Non-aggression Pact.\textsuperscript{110} The tone of the exchange, particularly from Freyberg, was friendly and fulsome, and compares with a much briefer message from General Blamey, Commander First Australian Corps, to Çakmak reported in the same issue of

to their shores. On 3 Sept. 1936, the Turkish destroyers *Adapepe* and *Kojapepe* met the yacht *Nahlin* off Imbros Island and a message of welcome from President Kemal Ataturk was conveyed to King Edward. After landing, the King went on a ‘pilgrimage in the Suvla and Anzac areas.’ Extensive preparations were made in Constantinople to receive Edward with flags flying, streamers with ‘Welcome, Eduarde Rex,’ and flood-lit minarets. Edward VIII and his entourage spent two days in the city being entertained and on the return overland to London travelled to Vienna in Ataturk’s private train.

\textsuperscript{106} A. Mete Tuncoku, interview, Çanakkale 21 Apr. 2007.

\textsuperscript{107} *The Times*, 26 Apr. 1940, 5; Gürsel Göncü and Şahin Aldoğan, *Çanakkale Muharebe Gezi Rehberi* [Çanakkale Battlefield Guide], MB Yayinevi, Istanbul, 2006, 168-169 describes the memorial to Field Marshal Fevzi Çakmak (1876-1950), the commander of the Turkish Army 5\textsuperscript{th} Corps in the Gallipoli campaign. The memorial near the peak of Achibaba was built in 1941.

\textsuperscript{108} *The Times*, 10 Feb. 1940, 8; The congregation at the ceremony included French representatives, a representative of the High Commissioner for Australia and General Sir Ian Hamilton. Dr Lang, Bishop of Woolwich, dedicated the flag. Dr Aras said the Turkish flag was gifted in memory of the British who fell so heroically at Gallipoli. ‘We find today, with very great pleasure, that the inspiration of historical facts as well as the desires of our peoples have brought about the friendship between the three nations. “Long live Anglo-French-Turkish friendship,” he declared.’ Holy Trinity was the London church where Gallipoli Day services were held for the 29\textsuperscript{th} Division.

\textsuperscript{109} Interviews, Kenan Celik, Sahin Aldogen and Prof. Mete Tunçoku, Apr. 2007.

Freyberg leaned heavily on memory. The allies ‘remember[ed] the strong and tenacious resistance which foiled all efforts to obtain victory [in a campaign which] was a hard and fierce one…marred by no episode of which either side need be ashamed.’ He believed that ‘mutual friendship will continue to increase, and whenever we are called on to undertake active warfare we can hope for no better fortune than to have your Army beside us.’ Çakmak replied warmly to Freyberg. He recalled the anniversary and viewed the original conflict as one where ‘two opposing Armies fought for long months imbued with a sense of mutual respect and consideration never deterred by weakness, and each was loyal to those traditions of honour and chivalry which form part of true manliness.’ He reiterated that the Turks who fought at Gallipoli respected the New Zealand troops and the episodes they encountered bound each nation with ‘strong ties of mutual respect and appreciation.’

This demonstrates the ability not just to invoke personal and public memories but also to provide a path for the direction of policy. It could scarcely have been conceived at the time of Gallipoli, and still less in the 1920s that such an accord was possible. It could be argued that the current landscape of war determined expressions of mutual respect. However, the writers were two career soldiers, not politicians or diplomats attempting to smooth over the difficulties of a turbulent past relationship. There is little doubt, however, that the political leaders of both countries were aware of the messages. There seems a genuine expression of affection, guided by the forces of memory. How strangely and surprisingly different it is from the bitter memories of both nations immediately after the Dardanelles campaign.

**Conclusion**

The dominant influential factor in the history of the Turkish relationship with Anzac Day until 1945 is that of forces in the current historical landscape. Memory matters, particularly for Turkish veterans, were played out in an often oppressive landscape. For the Turks, through the whole period, there was a sense of bewilderment about foreigners who insisted on access to their territory at Gallipoli. Despite from 1922 onwards, being in possession of the land, the new Republic found itself dancing to the tune of the British based IWGC over the Gallipoli graves’ issues. Pressures came on the Turks to comply with post-war treaties, or react to allies’ demands during and following the Chanak Crisis, and eventually to agree to declare the Gallipoli Battlefield Graves’ site as a gift in perpetuity to the allies. These were reflections of the shifting

---

111 *The Times*, 26 Apr. 1940, 8.
currents of opinion. In that period and under duress, it was difficult for the Turkish people to reciprocate and claim a place for the recognition of their own dead. It was in that sense a period of great ambivalence, where Turkish memory was repressed while that of the Anzacs was not.

After 1934, the limited dissemination of Atatürk’s generous statement functioned as a factor creating a situation whereby the Anzac soldiers could be honoured and their graves made more accessible. However, this situation swiftly changed with the 1936 Montreux Convention which militarised the area of Çanakkale and once again prevented the local observation of Anzac Day. International relations prevailed above considerations for commemorations by foreigners on Turkish soil. Atatürk’s words, notwithstanding their limited press, reclaimed space and proclaimed Turkish sovereignty. The land in which dead Anzac bodies lay was ‘the soil of a friendly country’ and in a stretch of management he claimed Anzacs to be Turkish ‘sons as well.’ There are elements here relating to Derrida’s notions of fidelity extended to foreigners. Memories had changed over time by 1934, and much of the bitterness created by conflict and resultant casualties had abated. The statement can also be seen as fitting with Jay Winter’s universal language of mourning.

The Fevzi Çakmak–Bernard Freyberg Anzac Day 1940 exchange was a continuation of the directions established by Atatürk in 1934. Here, the prevailing historical landscape dictated a recall of memory for both Anzacs and Turks. The Ankara and German–Turkish Friendship pacts indicated a wish by Turkey to proceed along the path of westernisation without being embroiled in conflict. The government of President İsmet (İnönü) which succeeded that of Atatürk and his Prime Ministers Celal Bayar (November 1937-January 1939) and Refik Saydam (January 1939–July 1942) obviously saw the advantages of remaining in contact with Anzac military leaders.¹ This direction of policy was continued into the age of the new order following World War II and established a platform for further exchanges and a deepening of the Turk–Anzac relationship, particularly evident on Anzac Day.

¹ Heper, Historical Dictionary of Turkey, 220.
Chapter Six – Anzac Days 1946 - 2000 and a ‘parting of the ways?’

In 2007, sociologist Peter Beilharz suggested that following World War II there was a ‘parting of the ways’ between New Zealand and Australia. He argued that ‘The trans-Tasman world used to be one story, or at least two stories that were interconnected’ before the schism. As Anzac Day reflects both unities and divisions between the two societies, his notion is worth testing. The chapter examines whether the two nations had radically different interpretations of Anzac Day. In order to make the comparison clear, Anzac Day issues in both New Zealand and Australia are discussed. Immediate post-war national positions show evidence of different attitudes to Anzac Day. In New Zealand a more cautious approach was voiced by returning servicemen – an approach based on the memories of the dashed expectations of the previous generation.

The role of the New Zealand Maori in wartime could not be ignored. Maori were represented on Anzac Day, in New Zealand and overseas. The chapter makes clear that following World War II, holding the efforts of Maori soldiers in high regard was desired. Such could never be the case for Aboriginal Australians and Torres Strait Islanders. Their stories would not publicly surface until the 1990s, and with a few exceptions they would not participate in Anzac Day parades until then. On the other hand, Anzac Day was being observed internationally and becoming much more inclusive – reflecting different nations’ experiences in World War II, and most notably for this study, Turkey. Representatives of world war women’s units, WAACs, WAAFs and WRENS, attended.

Did Anzac Day undergo a period of decline in the 1960s and early 1970s? This thesis uncovers nuances in this orthodoxy. Unlike Stephen Clarke’s position which sees the sharp decline from a ‘holy day’ and the 1968-1973 protests of the Vietnam War, or Janice Pavils’ prediction of steady decline from World War II until the early 1980s, this thesis argues for a dip in public attachment in the years 1973 to 1975, then reinstatement and increased public popularity. This thesis assesses the effects of the New Zealand anti-war protests, the Progressive Youth Movement, Australian city protests and arrests, the women’s anti-rape protests of the early 1980s.

---

The end of the chapter surveys the period 1980 to 2000. It was one of rising public interest in Anzac Day for both trans-Tasman nations. The focus for the day swung inexorably towards the day in Turkey. With the advent of international migration, back-packing, and the impact of the visual media, particularly television, there was a great revival of interest in Anzac Day at Gallipoli. There, however, contention grew over management issues. These reflected matters of possession in which Turkey and its plans for a Gallipoli Peace Park had to be considered. State investment in the Gallipoli site became a central issue. At the same time that Gallipoli became a space to wander in on Anzac Day, other memories were rekindled – those of Passchendaele, Monte Cassino, El Alamein, Kokoda, and Vietnam.

‘Parting of the ways…’

Beilhartz argues that by 1947 there were ‘two [national] stories [which were]… mutually exclusive - these [were] two distinct worlds, two different cultures.’ He holds that this schism lasted until recently, an argument rebutted by Australian historian Stuart Macintyre and New Zealand historian Philippa Mein Smith. Macintyre looks to a ‘newer horizon, modernity, beyond capitalism,’ and Mein Smith’s work, built on family biography and the Tasman World Marsden project, evokes transnationalism gathering in both New Zealand and Australia. This Anzac Day study also does not distinguish two different worlds nearly so clearly. One could argue a case for separate approaches over ownership of the Anzac myth, the basis of many statements on Anzac Day. The firm attachment of Australian identity to the Gallipoli landing, the Anzac myth and Anzac Day as their day, has been a catch-cry since its 1916 inception. Since World War II, however, factors arose which revealed nuances in national directions and meanings over Anzac Day, but not amounting to schism.

Post-war statements revealed some differences in approaches to Anzac Day. Australian Prime Minister John Curtin’s Anzac Day 1945 broadcast on ABC radio broadly stated: ‘Anzac Day is an anniversary that breathed the very soul of freedom.’ A different and more complex interpretation was given the Anzac Day address a year later in the Dunedin Town Hall by

---

3 Ibid.
5 Discussed in Chapters Two and Four.
6 *The Times*, 25 Apr. 1945, 3.
Lieutenant J.M. Fraser, RNZNVR. He commented circumspectly on feelings that were held by many returned servicemen:

The speeches and promises had to those of us whose fathers served in the last war, a very familiar ring. ‘A war to end wars, a war safe for democracy, freedom from want and fear, a brave new world’. That’s what they all said, that’s what they promised but they said all and promised all that to our fathers in the last war and what happened? A few years of mad, irresponsible gaiety followed by a time of grinding and soul destroying Depression and then war again.

His talk reflected soldier cynicism about promises made in return for service, domestic indifference to veterans, the possibilities for leadership by his generation: ‘On this the first peace Anzac Day this day of solemn commemoration I make this appeal. I appeal to those of the older generation to grant the youth its share, the share for which it has fought so hard.’ There was no broad brush promoting freedom here; more of a realistic awareness of what had happened and a guarded approach to the future.

The freshest memories of conflict were of Western Desert, Italian and Pacific places rather than Samoa, Gallipoli and the Western Front. Returning World War II servicemen expected respect for their service. World War I had failed to bring about a world where the cost of sacrifice would be balanced by social improvement. Greater realism about death, wounding and illness became evident after World War II. This impacted on Anzac Day which suffered a slight dip in attendances in New Zealand, from late in World War II until 1950. This dip reflects a rejection of old values, and a break with Victorian continuities. Lower attendances marked immediate post-war Anzac Days and continued until RSAs were re-invigorated by the new blood from World War II ex-servicemen in the early 1950s. The same dip in participation was not reflected in Australia, but the was questioning the about the meaning and style of the day. The Brisbane Courier-Mail recorded parades which reflected the moment with US servicemen, soldiers of the

---

7 Dunedin Evening Star, 27 Apr. 1946.
8 NZFL coverage of Anzac Day events lessened between 1946 and 1949; ibid, 46th year, No. 44, 1 May 1946, 30-31 photographs showing moderately large crowds in main city centres, little commentary; Ibid, 47th year, No. 45, 7 May 1947, 4 little editorial comment and few illustrations; Ibid, 48th year, No. 45, 5 May 1948, 26-27 photographs of AIF and RSL representatives in Auckland and Dunedin, little commentary; Ibid, 49th year, No. 44, 2, 23, moderate crowds shown; ibid, 49th year, No. 47, 25 May 1949, 16-17 ‘A Pilgrimage to Cassino’ by Ralph Clayton, which pointed out the beginnings of pilgrimages to the Italian battle-site; ibid, 50th year, No. 44, 3 May 1950, 26-27, photographs showing significant increases in crowds in all centres.
9 This argument accords with Jay Winter’s analysis, which rejects the thesis that the First World War saw the end of Victorian continuities.
Netherlands East Indies, Japanese ‘hell-ship survivors,’ and World War I veterans marching.\textsuperscript{10} Recall was evident in the publication of a photograph of the First Anzac Day parade through Queen Street in Brisbane in 1917, led by Light Horse reinforcements.\textsuperscript{11} While parades reflected public enthusiasm for display there were still serious questions raised. Concerns about the style of the day was shown in story titles like ‘Must Not Be “Morbid Day,”’\textsuperscript{12} or ‘Why we are free?’ which discusses celebration which avoids glorification of war, and the ‘proud and also sad’ memories.\textsuperscript{13}

Nonetheless, it was common for Australian service clubs’ spokesmen and overseas national representatives alike to reiterate the attachment of Gallipoli to Anzac, and of Anzac Day to national identity.\textsuperscript{14} In 1949, the Rt. Hon. F.M. Forde, High Commissioner for Australia to Canada, made references to John Masefield’s comment on ‘the finest body of young men ever brought together in modern times’ and moved to a classical reference: ‘At that moment, when the sun rose over the ridge of Gaba Tepe and the hills behind Troy, Australia came of age; her consciousness of nationality was born.’ For Australia, Gallipoli and the landing day (often referred to in capitals) represented a defining moment, the moment of birth. The 1938 Anzac Day marked the end of the sesquicentennial celebrations in Sydney fittingly. Reflecting on those celebrations in 1987 Gavin Soutar concluded that Anzac Day, not Australia Day, should be the national festival.\textsuperscript{15} The New Zealand High Commissioner, Hon. James Thorn, at the same meeting in Ottawa, claimed however:

We New Zealanders, in company with our Australian comrades, remember that occasion with sorrow and yet with pride - sorrow for the many gallant men who died, and pride for the undying example of heroism and self-sacrifice which they gave. The name of ANZAC, which we honour in company with our fellow citizens at home, represents a chapter in the annals of our young nation’s history which will never be forgotten.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{10}Brisbane \textit{Courier Mail}, 26 Apr. 1945, 3.  
\textsuperscript{11}Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{12}Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{13}Ibid, 25 Apr. 1950, 2.  
\textsuperscript{14}The legend of World War I creating national identity carried great momentum. Maggie Barry ‘At peace with the past,’ \textit{NZ Listener}, Vol. 208, No. 3494, 28 Apr.-4 May 2007 in response to a question about New Zealand’s national identity stated: ‘people know the legend that World War I created our national identity.’  
\textsuperscript{15}Gavin Souter, ‘Skeleton at the Feast’, Bill Gammage and Peter Spearritt (eds.), \textit{Australians - 1938}, Fairfax, Syme & Weldon Associates, Broadway, NSW, 1987, 14, 27. These celebrations were also to mark the end of the sesquicentennial which had begun on 26 Jan. with ‘Australia Day,’ ‘Anniversary Day,’ or ‘Foundation Day’ as it was known in different states. Soutar’s observation reflected the times in which he wrote.  
The comparison between the Australian and New Zealand view is self-evident: the New Zealand interpretation stresses memory of sorrow with a tinge of pride, and the whole representing a more loosely-defined marker in New Zealand’s history. This is a critical point of difference. Forde’s speech seems exclusive, while Thorn sees the boundaries as more flexible and trans-Tasman, if not trans-national. These viewpoints on Anzac Day continued to be expressed throughout the remainder of the century. They were, and still are signposts of the way New Zealanders and Australians differently interpret the significance of Anzac Day.

While there were different viewpoints, trans-Tasman meetings of minds on Anzac Day were evident after the war. Joint returned services’ activities between the two nations, were re-established following World War II. In 1946, New Zealanders marched in Adelaide and in a reciprocal gesture, were placed at the head of the parade. Pre-war gestures, such as ship visits and RSA/RSL exchanges were re-established in 1948, the year of the Morshead Mission to Gallipoli. The Australian warships HMAS Australia and HMAS Bataan called into Wellington Harbour in March. Following their visit, AIF and RSL representatives visited Auckland and Wellington and took leading roles in the Anzac Day ceremonies. In April 1949, when public attention was directed to the Commonwealth Premiers’ Conference in London, there was a report of a lower level event: ‘Trans-Tasman links’ were underpinned in the ‘Narrabeen Veterans’ Home a Model for New Zealand.’ This Australian residential soldier’s home had been visited by the New Zealand Governor-General Sir Bernard Freyberg and the Mayor of Dunedin, Sir Donald Cameron.

Nineteen-fifty was a notable year, and marked the end of a period of adjustment from World War II. Larger crowds attended Anzac Day ceremonies in the main centres in New Zealand, and

---

18 *NZFL*, 37th year, No 40, 7 Apr. 1937. In 1937, the coronation year of George VI, HMAS Canberra flagship of the Australian squadron, called into Wellington in early Apr..
19 *NZFL*, 38th year, No 38, 23 Mar. 1938, 29 Report by the *NZFL* Sydney correspondent that NZ would be well represented at the Anzac Day Mar. in Sydney. The chartered ships Maungamui carrying 700, and the Monowai with 650 will arrive 23 Apr. after the Avatea which some travelled on. The New Zealanders were to be led by Sir Andrew Russell. It was expected that 2,000 New Zealanders would attend and with the 30,000 ex-servicemen from out of state, and the 20,000 in the Sydney contingent it would be the largest gathering of its kind ever. Included in the contingent were a body of ex-Great War nursing sisters; Ibid, 38th year, No 43, 27; Ibid, Apr. 1938, 3; Ibid, 38th year, No 44, 4 May 1938, 5; for the 1948 Morshead Mission, see Chapter Seven of this thesis.
21 Ibid, No. 44, 5 May 1948, 26-27.
twenty-eight Australian servicemen visited New Zealand. They were distributed among the four main centres to take part in the ceremonies. The NZFL reported the events in a ‘Transtasman smiles’ story. However, Australia and New Zealand did drift apart in their recognition of their indigenous populations’ wartime participation. The efforts of the 28th Maori Battalion placed them on a pedestal that could not be locally ignored. On Anzac Day 1950, the Tehokowhitia-tu-arch at the entrance to the bridge at Whakarewarewa in Rotorua was unveiled. It was a ‘memorial to the Maori dead of World War One and World War Two’

There were no civic memorials to Australian Aboriginals’ World War I or II sacrifice in the 1950s, or indeed until 1980. There were 2589 Maori casualties of whom 642 had died in World War II, from a population of approximately 100,000 Maori in 1939; and about 3000 Australian Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders who served in World War II from a total indigenous population of about 76,000. Comparative figures are difficult to obtain, and David Horton suggests that more than the recognised 289 Aboriginal men from New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria went with the AIF in World War I. The total number in this group takes no account of aboriginals who claimed to be Maoris. Ken Inglis claims: ‘Nor could Australia have anything like the Maori Battalion Hall in Palmerston North, for there had been no Aboriginal battalion.’ The process of Aboriginal memorialisation reflected the contested place of Aborigines in [white] Australian society.

What is obvious is that indigenous people of both New Zealand and Australia participated in both World Wars, but the few war memorials to Aboriginal Australians appeared

---
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25 Ibid, No. 44, 3 May 1950, 30. It was unveiled by Hon W.H. Fortune, Minister without Portfolio.
26 K.S. Inglis, Sacred Places, 21, ‘Monuments missing from a [physical] landscape can be as significant as those erected…pillars and inscriptions were not in their culture.’; ibid, 188-189, 216, 374. He refers to the infrequent inscription of an aboriginal name, often anglicised, appearing on a town memorial; ibid, 457-458 ‘on war memorials: after 1945, as nearly always after 1918, any Aboriginal name on a pedestal could be identified only by somebody who was looking for it. Inglis relates the story of Farrier Quarter-Master Sergeant George Kennedy - the most highly ranked Aboriginal soldier of World War I’; ibid, 446. He also cites the few memorials to Matthias Ulungara at Melville Island erected 1980 and Thornbury, Melbourne wooden cross, erected Anzac Day 1987; ibid, 447. Burleigh Heads Yugabeh Aboriginal War Memorial in 1991.
27 Michael King, New Zealanders at War, Heinemann, Auckland, 1981, 167ff. In World War I, New Zealand recruited 19.35% of its eligible manpower, sent overseas more than 100,000 of whom 17,000 were killed and 41,000 wounded, ‘This casualty rate in proportion to population was the highest in the Empire.’; ibid, 265. 194,000 men went into the armed forces in World War II, about 105,000 served abroad, and 11,625 were killed, “the casualties on a per capita basis were the highest of any allied country except Russia”; John Crawford (ed.), Kia Kaha: New Zealand in the Second World War, Oxford UP, South Melbourne, 2002, 248. Maori suffered 2,589 casualties, of whom 642 died.
28 David Horton (ed.), The Encyclopaedia of Aboriginal Australia: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander History, Society and Culture, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Canberra, 1994, Vol. 1, 56 -57; For a more detailed account see Robert Hall, The Black Diggers: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the Second World War, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Canberra ACT, 1989, 189. Hall suggests 300-400 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were in the AIF in World War I.
29 Ibid, 56.
only after 1980. The Australian public rarely saw reports like those about Torres Straits’ Islander Apple Thaiday or the well-known Thursday Islander Charles Mene, M.M.  

In Brisbane on Anzac Day 1950, there were large crowds. People squeezed in to get a place near the Shrine of Remembrance, and local news headline shouted ‘Brisbane Celebrates Anzac’, but the same page carried warnings from Raymond Huish reflecting rejection of any appeasement in the current Cold War landscape. Once established, the pattern of post-war trans-Tasman veteran exchanges continued. In 1951, following the visit of 49 New Zealanders to Australian state capitals, the NZFL ‘Lancings’ editorial writer appealed for the ‘Wider Anzac’ arguing that the men who fought in the past war had brought ‘the two British countries closer together for mutual welfare.’ It would appear that ‘parting of the ways’ is not that evident. Shared Anzac Day activities continued and became a major feature of trans-Tasman Anzac Days in the 1950s.

Internationalising Anzac Day

From 1946 onwards, Anzac Day came to be observed more widely. World War II had traversed the globe in a way not seen in World War I. London’s dominance faded, reflecting the declining state of the British Empire and Commonwealth. Activities took place in locations previously peripheral on Anzac Day: Washington, Tokyo, Bangkok, and in other more extraordinary places, such as in Antarctic stations. As Anzac Day became ‘internationalised,’ its meanings and relevance for Anzacs themselves began to be scrutinised intensely. In 1946 London was the centre of the British Commonwealth attention because of the 8 June post-war ‘Victory March.’ On Anzac Day preparations were being made for the attendance of New Zealand and Australian servicemen and servicewomen participating in the march. Representatives included servicewomen from the Army Nursing Service, WAACs, WAAFs and Wrens.

In the coronation year, 1953, Elizabeth II sent out her first Anzac Day message, which was one of thankful remembrance of the debt owed for those Australians and New Zealanders who had

---

32 Brisbane Courier – Mail, 26 Apr. 1950, 3 ‘‘No More Munichs,” Says Diggers’ Leader.’
33 NZFL, 51st year, No. 44, 2 May 1951, 26; 52nd year, No. 43, 23 Apr. 1952, 30; No. 44 30 Apr. 1952, 20; No. 45, 7 May 1952, 28-29. Beilharz’s view of separate narratives is, nevertheless, supported by the arguments of Stephen Clarke’s conclusion: ‘[in 1990] Anzac Day was still a New Zealand reading of the New Zealand experience, a story that told themselves about themselves.’ It is fickle to take the argument far, for Clarke’s analysis is not comparative.
34 NZFL, 51st year, No. 44, 2 May 1951, 26.
36 NZFL, 46th year, No 43, 24 Apr. 1946, 33; No 44, 1 May 1946, 27.
fallen in battle. The Crown saw Australian and New Zealand troops as one, as Anzacs, and addressed them accordingly. In 1961, the Queen’s message made this perception clear by addressing the peoples of Australia and New Zealand in ‘remembrance of all those…who laid down their lives in the cause for freedom.’ For her, a young monarch, the central issue of the day was memory. That year, Anzac Day was commemorated in Tokyo, and at the British Commonwealth War Cemetery in Hodogaya, near Yokohama, also New York, Ottawa, Montreal, Vancouver and Winnipeg. In 1962, commemorations were held at Kranji War Cemetery in Singapore, Edinburgh, Walton-on-Thames and Malta. Earlier events on Malta included the visits of notables, like Earl Mountbatten in 1954, who had officiated at Anzac Day, taking the salute and being honoured with a fly-past. The island’s observance was organised by a local dignitary, Mrs Mabel Strickland. An interesting feature of the 1962 Malta observance was the presence of representatives of the Turkish Navy who laid wreaths.

In London, the centre of the Commonwealth, Anzac Day was increasingly accessible to a greater range of wartime representatives. The 1962 Anzac Day ceremony at the Cenotaph included a

---


38 ANZ ABHS Acc W4627, 29/1/10 Pt 4, Anzac Day observance 1/5/60-1/12/68, 23 Apr. 1961 (PM 29/1/10), message from Her Majesty the Queen to the Governor-General of New Zealand.


40 Ibid, 2 May 1962, High Commissioner Ottawa to Secretary Foreign Affairs, Wellington; 3 May 1961 (PM 29/1/10). The NZ Consulate General in New York recorded the proceedings of the Anzac Day observance where an American version of the ‘Last Post’ and ‘Reveille’ were played, prompting the Consul General to request the British version.

41 Ibid, Correspondence G. L. Keeble, Assistant Public Relations Officer, NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Professor O. L. Thomas, Valetta, Malta, 1962-1964. That year officials in the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs became belatedly aware of Anzac Day ceremonies in Malta run by an ‘Anzac Day Commemoration Committee’ which had been in existence ‘since 1932’;


42 There had been notable and well-publicised events at Malta on Anzac Day. The Anzac Day service at the Malta War Memorial in 1954 was a notable occasion due to the presence of both 14 Squadron RNZAF and 78 Fighter Wing RAAF, units deployed in the Mediterranean. The Admiral, Earl Mountbatten of Burma, laid the wreath honouring members of the Australasian forces in both world wars who served or died on the island. Breaking with New Zealand and Australian practices, the unveiling of the Malta War Memorial in 1937 led to a combining of sectarian services which had been held since the end of World War I. They were held at this new location until 1977. Since 1979, an ecumenical service has been held at the Pietà Military Cemetery as it contains the highest number of Anzac graves on the island. A Dawn Service was instituted in 1972.

43 ANZ ABHS Acc W4627, 29/1/10 Pt 4, Anzac Day observance 1/5/60-1/12/68. Correspondence G.L. Keeble, Assistant Public Relations Officer, NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Professor O.L. Thomas, Valetta, Malta, 1962-1964.
large contingent of Anzacs as well as others in the official wreath-laying arrangements. Noteworthy also was the number of wreaths laid on behalf of women’s organisations. The grip of the old Empire was loosening, but Anzac Day was still a signal one on the calendar of the military, women’s and government representatives in Britain. Janice Pavils identified a ‘widening of the ranks’. Analysing the situation in Adelaide on Anzac Day, Pavils accounted for groups of Old Contemptibles and British Imperials, Canadians and New Zealanders, to whom groups like French, American, Greek, Polish and Serbian representatives were added by 1955, and who were joined by Guards’ Regiments, Maltese, Korean War and Malayan Emergency veterans by 1966. Wherever New Zealand and Australian military units were dispersed, Anzac Day ceremonies became a priority. The military were the principal carriers of Anzac Day. An example of this is found in the correspondence of Quarter-Master Donald Mcfarlane, stationed in Malaya, where an example of joint commemorations, including a major role for a New Zealand Maori, was described.

In 1964, Mcfarlane, wrote to his parents about Anzac Day, Malayan Emergency style. He described joining the Australian lines and singing the well-known hymns ‘Eternal Father, strong to save’ and ‘O God, our help in ages past’ which was led by the New Zealand Maori padre ‘Wakahua [sic] Vercoe.’ Wreaths were laid by British, Australians, Australian Red Cross and New Zealand units stationed there. He remembered the salute at the 7.30 a.m. company parade taken by the Australian Brigadier and marching off to the sounds of the combined Australian and New Zealand bands. After lunch activities included a tug of war between the Aussies and the Kiwis, mostly Maori. It was won by the Aussies, Mcfarlane reluctantly reported. His memories were detailed, and specific about some of the Australian-New Zealand differences: he appreciated the strong singing of Maori army Chaplain Vercoe.

---

44 Ibid; included were the Governments and peoples of Australia and New Zealand, the British Commonwealth Ex-Services League, the NZRSA, the RSSILA, the 29th Division Association, the Australian and New Zealand Forces, the Association Nationale d’Aïenti Combatants des Dardanelles, London Legacy, the Anzac Fellowship of Women (UK branch), the Widows and Widowed Mothers’ Assoc, the Victoria League, the Anzac Fellowship of Women (Sydney Branch), the Widows’ Guild of Australia, the Australian Ex-services Association, 458 RAAF Squadron Association, the Australian Army Nursing Service, the Governments and peoples of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania, the Royal Navy, the British Army, the Air Council and Royal Air Force, the Indian Army, the French Armed Forces, the Pakistan Army, the British Legion and the Merchant Navy.

45 Janis Pavils, Anzac Day: Chapter Five, ‘Widening The Ranks,’ 77-98 which refers to expansion of parade Mar.ers by non-traditional groups other than British Imperials, Canadians, Australians and New Zealanders.


47 Mcfarlane wrote military chaplain Vercoe’s first name as Wakahuia, rather than the correct Whakahuihui. Vercoe was Anglican Archbishop of New Zealand before his death in Sept. 2007, aged 79.
The Queen’s Message on the day acted as a unifying factor, reminding her Commonwealth subjects that the matter was not a dead letter, but indeed acknowledged at the highest level as the source of freedoms enjoyed by all. In this post-war period, this message was given added force by actions, often on Anzac Day, such as the dedication of memorial windows and the presentation of regimental colours and other flags. Other days incorporated ritualised elements of Anzac Day, such as those on the anniversary of the sailing of the Main Body from New Zealand on 16 October 1914. This was celebrated in Auckland on 16-18 October 1964, and formed a prelude to the 50th anniversary of the Gallipoli landings. The commemorative events were modelled on Anzac Day: the 11 a.m. parade, reunion dinner in the Town Hall, Past Post sounding, Binyon’s Ode, Reveille, and a church service with most of the liturgical elements of the Anzac Day dawn service and civic ceremony.

Internationalising of Anzac Day proceeded throughout the 1960s so that by 1972 not only were well-known foreign centres like Le Quesnoy and Longueval recorded, but also Köln Südfriedhof (Southern Cologne cemetery), Bourail and Nessdiou in New Caledonia, Kapyong (Seoul, South Korea), Jakarta, Kranji cemetery in Singapore, Tokyo and Gaza were included. While in the cases of Kapyong and Köln the ceremonies were based around ambassadorial representation, those of Le Quesnoy, Longueval and the New Caledonian services were undertaken with greater input from returned servicemen and local civic authorities. These groups became more aware of the heritage values inherent in their local day. Veterans and a few backpackers attended these ceremonies. This last group heralded a class which came to dominate the Anzac Day landscape.

48 AWMML U27(6) Pamphlet for the RNZAF National Memorial Windows dedicated to New Zealanders who died in the service of Air Forces of the Commonwealth during WWII. They were to be installed in the Anglican cathedral, which was under construction in Wellington.
49 Ibid, Box 1 Ephemera Collection, Title: Army-Air Force [ephemera], Envelope 1. At the 11 a.m. Auckland War Memorial service flags of the Royal Navy, RNZNVR, Merchant Navy, Imperial Army, AIF and NZEF were lowered and presented to representatives of six Auckland schools.
51 Ibid, Box 1 Ephemera Collection, Title: Army-Air Force [ephemera], Envelope 1. There were other services as well in the 1960s: 1965 the Battle of Britain Wreath Laying Party featured 14 official wreaths which included the Home Servicemen’s Association and the ‘Gold Star Mothers Club.’ Also in that year there was the 23rd Anniversary of the Battle of the Coral Sea at the Cenotaph in the Auckland Domain at 10 am on 20 May 1965.
52 ANZ ABHS Acc W4627, 29/10 Pt 4, Anzac Day observance 1/5-60–1/12/68; ANZ ABFK 7494 Acc W4948, Record 71, 35/1/2 1, Ceremonials and Celebrations, Jun. 1964–Jan. 1973; ODT, 26 Apr. 1965, 3 for Kranji-Singapore, Tokyo, and the Christian Cemetery in Jakarta.
Domestic decline and anti-Vietnam War protests – a ‘nadir’ for Anzac Day?

In 1960, Australian respected academic and social commentator, Professor Charles Manning Clark challenged the current pessimism of the age, which he saw evident in the loss of forces for enlightenment, and in the decline of Christianity.\(^{53}\) He felt this loss caused the Australians to behave like people who had lost their way. But despite the darkness in his view he saw hope in the formation of movements like ‘Ban the Bomb’ which drew people from different creeds and backgrounds and which had begun with protest against the possibility of total annihilation and changed to a movement to end war.’ The signs of loss of direction, recognised by Manning Clark for Australia, were just as relevant for New Zealand in the 1960s. The ‘Ban the Bomb’ movement provided a template for anti-Vietnam protest action.

Manning Clark’s analysis of the loss of traction by the forces of enlightenment, in this case the difficulty in obtaining volunteers for speaking at public ceremonies, was reflected by the Hon. Secretary Albert ‘Skip’ Rees in his 1970 annual report for the ADCC. ‘During 1960 - 1970 we have had real problems. Time has intervened, enthusiasm has gone, and volunteers are very few indeed.\(^{54}\) The matter was considered serious enough for a sub-committee to be suggested to help find suitable speakers, and for prepared talks to be compiled. Rees felt despite that, much depended on the quality of the speaker to convey the central message of the day.\(^{55}\) Queensland Premier, Joh Bjelke-Petersen, who had chaired the annual meeting of the ADCC, reacted to being told that some speakers thought many students were unaware of the derivation of the term ‘Anzac.’ Petersen viewed the situation seriously and took the matter up with Hon. A.R. Fletcher, Queensland Minister for Education.

It is important to trace the events in Anzac Day and the developments for the day in this period. The belief that the Vietnam War spelled the ‘nadir’ of Anzac Day is widespread. However, an examination of what actually happened dispels this notion, and replaces it with a conviction that it was public discussion of the day’s significance to the nation and its central meanings which were the principal results, rather than it being the lowest point of public response for the day.


\(^{55}\) JOL, OHMA/1/7, Folder 8, 1970-72. Minutes of the 56th annual meeting of the ADCC, 29 Mar. 1971, 3.
Indeed, soon after the ending of the Vietnam War, public attendance on the day lifted significantly, beginning a trend which continued to the end of the century and beyond.

Anzac Day in the period 1960-1985 began benignly. There were calls for change to the day and an acceptance that the afternoon ought to be liberalised to allow sports. In both Australia and New Zealand, citizens saw Anzac Day as a day of rest and relaxation, rather less ‘sacred’ than it had been in the immediate post-war years. It was a year heralding change. Brisbane news reported that ‘More World War I Diggers than ever failed to appear,’ but that ‘sprightly, younger World War II veterans had more than made up the gap.’ New Zealand newspapers called for a review of the day. In 1962, in a prophetic gesture, Hutt Valley RSA called for ‘a SUNDAYIZED morning and a SATURDAYIZED afternoon.’ Civic leaders, such as C.R. McLean, a Gallipoli veteran and first secretary of the Dunedin branch RSA, guest speaker at the Town Hall service in 1965, saw the waning of the day associated with the decline in numbers of returned service personnel attending. He urged youth to take a greater part. He admitted that the day was regarded ‘as little more than a holiday,’ and that there was ‘desirability in some form of change in the form of observance.’ He also hoped that older organisations like the RSA might coordinate activities with voluntary youth agencies, like the Otago Youth Council. He hoped that the spirit of Anzac Day would not be lost, but admitted that as time went on memory of the past would fade. McLean’s stance was liberal if resigned in tone, compared with later strident calls which questioned the existence of the day.

On Anzac Day 1966, Queensland had its first ‘half-day.’ Melbourne faced a dispute caused by the Youth Campaign against Conscription (YCC) attempting to lay wreaths at the Shrine of Remembrance against the directive of Shrine trustee, Deputy-Chairman Colonel A.N. Kemsley. He considered the offending wreaths ‘sacrilege.’ Meanwhile, an Australian task force of 1300 soldiers bound for Vietnam marched through Sydney in the biggest army parade since the Korean War. Many of the marchers were twenty-year olds called up for two years army service under the Compulsory Selective Conscription Act. ‘Thousands of people crowding city streets

---

56 Brisbane Courier Mail, 26 Apr. 1961, 1; ‘Younger Men Fill the Gap.’
58 ODT, 26 Apr. 1965, 5.
59 Brisbane Courier-Mail, 25 Apr. 1966, 1; ‘A ‘half-day’ for Anzac.’
60 Ibid, 26 Apr. 1966, 1. Similar instructions were given to the organisers of the Save Our Sons Movement.
watched the hour-long march in almost total silence.61 For the soldiers involved this would have created a first public memory, made indelible by later perceptions of the public reception upon their return. In Dunedin, the local paper reported a well-attended gathering arranged by the Dunedin Committee on Vietnam: ‘A public discussion on the ethical questions involved in New Zealand’s military commitment in South Vietnam.’62 Attendance by well-known church figures indicated a serious and broad-based ethical questioning of the war. The official stand was not aided by reactions of the commander of the New Zealand Artillery battery in South Vietnam, Major D.R. Kenning, who stated anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in New Zealand were regarded by his men as ‘foolish’ and that protesters acted ‘like childish idiots.’63

On 14 October 1966 the New Zealand Governor-General assented to the Anzac Day Bill, ratifying the version of Anzac Day which had been gaining credibility in the community. The Australian situation regarding ‘Sundayizing’ or sacralising the observance of Anzac Day was similar. There had been a great deal of trans-Tasman correspondence about this issue as well as regular reciprocity of RSA and RSL visiting members for Anzac Day.64 The New Zealand situation mirrored what had already taken place in most Australian states where Anzac Day morning was like a Sunday, with leisure activities in the afternoon. Discussions on Anzac Day’s place vis-à-vis other flag days spilled over into the playgrounds of schools. The Department of

61 ODT, 22 Apr. 1966, 6.
62 ODT, 23 Apr. 1966, 25. The discussion panel was chaired by Professor Philip Smithells, University of Otago (a member of Dunedin Society of Friends), and included Rev. L S Armstrong, Baptist minister, James K Baxter, lay member of the Roman Catholic church and better known as a national poet, Rev. Dr. Ian Breward, Presbyterian Church (later Moderator), Rev. Allan Handyside, Methodist Church, Archdeacon D.S. Millar, Vicar-General, Anglican Church. This combination of recognised intellectual and spiritual leaders in a public forum was a challenge to the government and its commitment in Vietnam.
63 ODT, 23 Apr. 1966, 1; 27 Apr. 1966, 28. Letters to the editor – ‘War in Vietnam’ signed ‘Nothing to cheer about,’ challenging the report that Sydney crowds remained silent for the procession of the new Australian task force men, as the radio newscast gave a very different impression. Lindsay G. Wright attacked the stand of Major Kenning, who he thought was aligning himself with US policy.
64 ANZ ABFK 7494 Acc W4948, Record 71, 35/1/2 1, Ceremonials and Celebrations, Jun. 1964 - Jan. 1973, 3 Jun. 1966 report of decisions about Anzac Day regulations from the Cabinet meeting 30 May 1966 set out in a letter to Mitchell, President NZRSA showed that Cabinet had examined the wishes of the NZRSA 1965 Conference Resolution and the legislation of some Australian states before concluding: Anzac Day would continue to be observed on Apr. 25 each year, and not to transfer it to a Monday when the 25th was a Sunday. Where it was not on a Sunday, it would ‘in future be observed up to 1 p.m. in its present form.’ The Government turned down the proposal to set up an Anzac Day trust to issue licences for activities after 1p.m. and distribute revenue from the issue of the licences because of difficulties in administering and monitoring such a scheme. ‘It is the Government’s view that, from 1 p.m. onwards, Anzac Day should be treated in all respects as if it were a normal Saturday afternoon.’ The letter makes it clear that the Australian situation in regard to revenue from licences was different because there was a clear acceptance of the need for financial support for ex-servicemen and their dependants. Besides which, the N.Z. Lotteries Board distributed about £1.25 million to organisations active in welfare, medical and scientific research, recreation and the arts. Kept back for future discussion with the Executive of the NZRSA at the recommendation of the Department of Labour was the contentious issue of awards and industrial agreements as they related to Anzac Day.
Education discussed the place of each of Commonwealth Day, Trafalgar Day and Queen’s Birthday.65

Senior New Zealand Defence Force personnel initially held in-house discussions, and then engaged the executive of the RSA about flagging attendances and the growing problem of compelling military service personnel to participate in civic services. They expressed concerns about: ‘degeneration into a holiday or “Saturday,” [loss] of appeal with the general public (especially the youth)...the importance of the participation of the Services’ and the problem of compulsion of service personnel when the Minister of Defence had left discretion about participation in the hands of local units.66 These conversations merged over the years 1966 – 1967 and included Cabinet discussions on the Australian states’ situations on making Anzac Day afternoon a ‘Saturday,’ not transferring the holiday to a Monday when Anzac Day occurred on a Sunday, matters related to funding, particularly the establishment of Trust Boards to control funding of Anzac Day activities and disbursement of funds from public appeals, as those for Poppy Day.67 This last issue of funding reached the highest political levels and caused senior Crown Ministers to take up regional responsibilities in matter.68 While vital for the maintenance of Anzac Day, these matters were over-ridden in the furore which broke out over protests against the Vietnam conflict.

The Vietnam War was not the first war against which there were protests. It was, however, the first where considerable numbers of young people refused their support and which caused

---

65 ANZ ABDU Acc W3570 Box 243 12/9, Anzac Day 1921-1987. The Taranaki Education Board file 12/9 General Series, Patriotic and National Observances, Two newspaper cuttings of 22 Aug. 1966, report that the days on which schools in the Wellington Education Board area would honour the flag would be reduced to Waitangi Day, Anzac Day, Queen’s Birthday, and United Nations Day. ‘Schools will be allowed to develop their own ceremony. Parents who wished to have their children exempted from the ceremonies should be permitted to do so’; ANZ ABDU Acc W3570 Box 243 12/9 Anzac Day 1921–1987. The Taranaki Education Board file 12/9 General Series, Patriotic and National Observances: C.P. Brice for the Director-General of Education, 18 May 1984, Circular 1984/28 to all controlling authorities of schools. ‘23. Flying the Flag – Members to discuss whether the Board should set an example to its schools by flying the New Zealand flag. Decision: that the Board set an example to schools by flying the New Zealand flag.’;18 May 1984 to 16 Dec. 1985 Order in Council by the Governor-General revoking the Ceremony of Honouring the Flag Regulations 1941.


67 Ibid, 3 Jun. 1966, Minister of Internal Affairs to Dominion President, NZRSA, Wellington, in 35/1/2 (CM66/19/33) Perry, Secretary Cabinet to Minister Internal Affairs.

protests world-wide. The protests of this period on Anzac Day show some uniformity. All were resistant to force, whether it was moral suasion or military power. They also reflected a massive shift in western world morality and the accepted age of maturation. The previous ten years had seen the ‘baby-boomers’ come into their twenties. Many of this new and more permissive generation were at the age of military service, but few were involved in it. In their eyes, the older generation had not prevented the bloodshed of the Vietnam War. Many felt their destinies were being blocked by those who were most represented at Anzac Day - leaders in civic affairs: the police, the RSA (or RSL), and the ever-present military. For the protesters, the day in their minds was neither sacred nor profane, as this was irrelevant to many of them. Consequently, the discussions carried on at the highest levels of state in both countries over problems facing Anzac Day meant little. For protesters, the day was a forum to promote the cause, to protest against war.

In New Zealand and Australia, anti-Vietnam war campaigners recognised Anzac Day as an appropriate day for protest. Protest groups and their members saw it as a powerful forum from which to promote their message. The day was better than any other possible day for protest: Remembrance (or Armistice) Day seemed to have lost its meaning with the onset of the Vietnam War. The Vietnam conflict eventually led to questioning the validity of all wars, past and present. Anzac Day represented war service undertaken by those ‘who at any time have given their lives for New Zealand and the British Empire or Commonwealth of Nations.’ This idea included Vietnam, a point not lost on either the protesters or their RSA opponents. Understood by the RSA (and RSL), but not accepted, was the idea that the protesters wished to include all dead in Vietnam, including civilians and the Viet Cong. This was a step too far for many and became the centre of conflict.

Nineteen sixty-seven was a year with widespread and publicised protest activity in New Zealand. Current world uncertainties were reflected on the day in New Zealand. Headlines included activities of the London Committee of 100 and their planned impersonation of the monarch and British Prime Minister, and in New York reported cases of draft card burnings and FBI

---

69 Their heroes were not Gallipoli veterans and their memories but rock’n’roll and the Beatles. Anti-Vietnam protest singers such as Joan Baez, Pete Seeger, and Bob Dylan made their mark on the opinions of the young. New Zealanders soon learned of the activities of groups like ‘The Resistance’ whose aim was to support US draft dodgers and create a forceful counter-culture. In New Zealand, there were reflections of ‘foreign elements’ - younger citizens expressed opinions more freely and were determined to participate in decision making.

70 *New Zealand Statutes*, 1966, No. 44, s.2.
investigations. Washington Conference disagreements on ending the war in Vietnam stimulated public discussions. The same schisms were being reflected around Anzac Day in New Zealand and Australia.

On the eve of Anzac Day 1967, Dunedin pacifist P. McLachlan pleaded a case for the rejection of war, claiming that democracy is made into an excuse to wage war: ‘we are obsessed with instruments of destruction,’ he said. He felt the only way Anzac could be honoured was ‘at the cenotaph, never to cease in our efforts to help win for mankind freedom from war.’ RSA representatives were keen to express the success of the new-style day. Nevertheless, contrary notes came from an unexpected source. World War II hero, Rev. Keith Elliott, VC, addressed a gathering of about a thousand in the Dunedin Town Hall service. He regretted that Anzac Day was losing its attraction, fewer people ‘heed their country’s pledge to remember those who had paid the supreme sacrifice for justice and peace in the wars of this century. Newspapers kept reminding people of those who were dying in Vietnam, but those who had died in previous wars were in danger of being forgotten.’ His views were widely reported.

At the Wellington Citizen’s Memorial in 1967, Victoria University junior lecturers and students repeatedly attempted to lay a wreath with a card carrying the words ‘To the dead and dying on all sides in Vietnam. Must their blood pay the price of our mistakes?’ Two people were arrested, and charged and convicted with disorderly behaviour and breaching the peace. In the ensuing appeal case, the judgement by Chief Justice, Sir Richard Wild, that any wreath-laying which was...
unconventional could be deemed disorderly, so provided a bench-mark ruling. This set a frame for future legal disputes on Anzac Day and it appeared to validate the conservative stand of many ex-veterans who abhorred the protests. The next year, 1968, the focus of attention in New Zealand moved to Christchurch.

Activities in Christchurch sounded a more disturbing note, mirroring those of 1967 in Wellington. Again, the wording on a wreath placed by two youths, directed attention to ‘the Dead and Dying in Vietnam’ after the mid-morning service. Local police, responding to RSA requests, removed the wreath. The wreath was returned 30 minutes later without its card. Letters to the Christchurch *Press* voiced evenly divided public reaction to these events.  

Also, the Auckland Cenotaph and War Memorial Museum were sprayed with graffiti early on Anzac Day. Swastikas, painted in black could be seen on the museum walls by the attending crowd and the 2,500 veterans who stood in remembrance of the fallen. The hurt caused by this action could not have been missed.

Events on the world stage on or near Anzac Day also could not be ignored. They formed the ever-moving currents of opinion which provided the background for the day in New Zealand and Australia. Local papers reported in detail on these persuasive matters. Arnold Toynbee, in the newspaper article, ‘The Stake in Vietnam,’ surveyed the patterns of civilisation and colonialism and expressed pleasure at a world pulling back from the brink of mutually assured destruction.  

There was coverage of an act of defiance towards the US military. Marine Corporal Mary Elizabeth Burns was court-martialed, and found guilty for refusing to wear her uniform and failing to report to a non-commissioned officers’ school. She stated that she opposed all war and killing. Her example shows the depth of non-compliance reached in US society over the Vietnam War. In Whitehall, a scuffle between ex-servicemen and anti-Vietnam protesters broke out - a portent of what was to happen in Australasia. A banner held up in London read: ‘Vietnam
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77 *ODT* 27 Apr. 1968, 18.
78 *ODT* 23 Apr. 1968, 4; Toynbee predicted the rise of communism in South Vietnam and the withdrawal of US troops. Proposed talks between the North Vietnamese and the US governments led him to surmise what the stakes might be; ibid, 23 Apr. 1968, 6, ‘Britain must be mad.’ Enoch Powell was being both vilified and praised for his speech recommending a halt to migration by coloured people.
79 *ODT* 20 Apr. 1968, 10.
Explodes Anzac Myth’ and nine people were arrested. These matters provided support for those radicals who were planning local protests on Anzac Day.

On Anzac Day 1968, the Governor-General, Sir Arthur Porritt, speaking at the Auckland Anzac Day service, called for the end of wars. He recommended a redistribution of resources to help the starving in the world through a positive, purposeful approach that would vindicate and justify the sacrifice of those commemorated. He directed thoughts to international bodies whose intentions and efforts were ‘to banish the bogey of war.’ His speech foreshadowed the style of speeches to be heard much later, in the age of New Zealand involvement in world peace-keeping from 1990. His broad views were challenged by other newspaper stories relating to specific memories of New Zealand’s military past. The RSA’s satisfaction with the new model of Anzac Day as it had developed by 1968 was well expressed in a Sid Scales cartoon, showing the old diggers proudly handing the mantle to the new sportsman variety.

In Sydney on 26 April 1968 the 7th Battalion, RAR, were welcomed home by a crowd estimated to number 250,000, and the Prime Minister, John Gorton, took the salute. This indicated a change of mood from when the Australian soldiers departed Sydney in 1966. It contradicts the orthodoxy that Australian Vietnam ex-servicemen were shunned and never given a public reception. In Sydney, Anzac Day 1968 was used much in the same sense it had been for servicemen returning from Europe and the Pacific theatres of war in 1944-1945, to express thanks for a safe return, and gratitude for service to the nation.

---

80 Stephen Clarke, ‘The One Day,’ 102.
81 ODT 26 Apr. 1968, 5; 26 Apr. 1968, 11; this position was also reflected in the address of Stipendiary Magistrate T.A. Ross, speaking in Oamaru of what he saw as a ‘realistic view’ of New Zealand’s foreign affairs’ situation.
82 ODT 20 Apr. 1968, 5. The Deputy Prime Minister, Rt. Hon. Jack Marshall, attended the unveiling of the Desert Mounted Corps memorial in Canberra’s Anzac Parade. It is a replica of that erected in Port Said in 1932, destroyed by the Egyptians in 1956. Marshall said the memorial was an embodiment of the deep relationship between Australia and New Zealand; ibid, 26 Apr. 1968, 3. Marshall promoted an idea of a replicated memorial of the new Anzac Memorial in Canberra, to be placed in Wellington; ibid, 24 Apr. 1968, 4. ‘Service to Remember in the Desert,’ the memory of an Anzac Day service at Mersa Matruh. The writer, Rev. Richard Lloyd, was senior chaplain to the forces, Western Desert, and wrote of how heartening it was for the New Zealanders to join the British forces already there. He cites the Kiwis reference to ‘Home’ and his knowledge of their exploits in the previous war at Gallipoli and in the Sinai Peninsula. He states about the moving service: ‘For the first time, I realised what the spirit of the old British Empire meant, and perhaps perceived that blood was still thicker than water – or oil! Among my most treasured possessions is the service sheet, for that Anzac Day Dawn Parade. For, at the close of the service, several New Zealanders autographed my copy.’ At the end of the story he lists the names of the thirty-six men who signed his service sheet; ODT 23 Apr. 1968, 14 The Dunedin Jockey Club’s Anzac Day meeting - A local jockey club named races after World War II features - Services’ Handicap, Achilles Handicap and a Spitfire Handicap.
83 ODT 26 Apr. 1968, 4.
84 ODT 27 Apr. 1968, 18; ibid, 22 Apr. 1966, 6.
85 A statement heard frequently by this writer in the research period 2005-2008.
The Vietnam War stimulated deep uncertainties, which were reflected in actions and statements at all levels of society. For many New Zealanders, the position of the representatives of Communist countries was ambiguous. Wartime allies represented by the Soviet, Polish and Czech diplomatic legations declined an invitation to Wellington’s citizen’s service in 1969.\textsuperscript{86} The Governor-General, Sir Arthur Porritt, speaking in Auckland, and reported in a newspaper story called ‘Anzac Holiday Need Doubted,’ and touched a raw nerve when he stated: ‘The value of Anzac Day was as a personal remembrance and intimate recollection that could perhaps best be nurtured alone or with friends in a religious service.’\textsuperscript{87} The newspaper subediting gave the story a slant towards doubting the need for a national holiday. Porritt was probably thinking of his own war memories and voicing the difficulty, like Derrida, of mourning and remembering \textit{en masse}. In response, the RSA Dominion President, Sir Hamilton Mitchell, denied the need for any

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} \textit{ODT}, 24 Apr. 1969, 1; 28 Apr. 1969, 1. In Dunedin the First Secretary to the Soviet legation Ivan Onischchenko, the second ranked Russian official in New Zealand, marched with ex-servicemen and attended the Town Hall service. His presence was reported as ‘a surprise.’
\item \textsuperscript{87} \textit{ODT}, 26 Apr. 1969, 1. ‘Anzac Holiday Need Doubted.’
\end{itemize}
change to the day; he felt there had been significant recent changes to the format of Anzac Day, so the RSA could not concede the need for more.

The eve of 1969 New Zealand Anzac Day saw an explosion which brought down the Waitangi flagpole. Anzac Day was being used as a platform to launch unrelated issues. The news reflected a pot-pourri of issues. Local television advertised *The Man Who Never Was*, and Dunedin radio broadcast a live Dawn Service, ‘Songs They Sang Through Two World Wars,’ and a live broadcast of the 11 a.m. Citizen’s Service. Reports for the day carried excerpts from the Porritt speech, and commentary on the presence of Yugoslavian delegates’ participation in Wellington. More telling was a report which highlighted the opinion of Robert Duffield, foreign editor of *The Australian*, under the heading ‘The Shaky and Forgotten Isles.’ This provocative but tongue-in-cheek Anzac Day piece, criticised New Zealand’s independent stance, and expressed the notion that if it was to sink below the Tasman Sea ‘nobody would care very much.’ Locally, the day was used to remember the part played by servicemen and women from the South African War forwards, record the participation of Gallipoli and other veterans, estimate numbers attending the parades, rededicate school arches, dedicate standards, report the attendance of the few remaining South African War veterans, and record encouragement given to the youth who attended.

April 1970 was the month when President Nixon announced the withdrawal of 150,000 US troops from Vietnam, and the Australians brought 900 soldiers home. But Prime Minister Keith

---

88 *ODT* 24 Apr. 1969, 8. By association, the act seemed to be connected to Anzac Day, but more likely was a land or sovereignty protest by local Maori.
89 Ibid, 19.
90 *ODT* 26 Apr. 1969, 1. Nevertheless, most of the eastern bloc communist nations were not represented and did not place wreaths.
91 *The Australian*, 25 Apr. 1969, quoted in *ODT* 26 Apr. 1969, 3. Robert Duffield recalled the connections based on the Anzac legend, and the offer of federal status of 1900. While he conceded integrity to the New Zealand stand, he belittled its military preparedness. In many ways, he echoed the well-known attitude of superiority. He allowed New Zealanders dispensability, calmness, idealism, and a ‘terrier role’ in foreign affairs, forever to be doomed as the junior partner. This analysis epitomised a long-held majority Australian view of New Zealand. Anzac Day was used less to evoke memories of soldierly mateship as to berate the smaller partner for having independence.
92 *ODT* 26 Apr. 1969, 5; recorded also is that Akif Keskin (1923 -) laid a wreath on behalf of the Republic of Turkey at the Dunedin Cenotaph. See Turkey and Anzac Day, 1946-2000.
93 Ibid, 8. North-East Valley War Memorial Arch.
94 Ibid, 11. A report of the shortening and repair of the Waitangi Treaty House flagpole, previously shattered by explosion; ibid. NZRSA standard dedicated in Mosgiel.
95 Ibid, 11 (sic). Attendance of J.A. Gilchrist (90) and F. W. Deem (93) at the Oamaru Anzac Day parade.
96 Ibid, the presence of ‘several youth groups’ in country Balclutha and the participation of the Balclutha Junior Brass Band.
Holyoake intimated that there would be no reduction for New Zealand. 98 There was concern about the activities of the Progressive Youth Movement (PYM) whose objective was to use the Day to lay wreaths to all the dead and dying in Vietnam. 99 This protest group, one of the most prominent anti-Vietnam groups, provided the greatest challenge to the conservative stand of the RSA. In matters of memory, the actions of PYM and associated groups indicated little consideration for the past. Their focus was the present and the future. The RSA symbolised for them the forces of the past which deserved challenging and overturning. Anzac Day was a convenient platform. For the old guard of ex-service personnel, the protesters’ lack of respect for the day confronted their interpretation of what the day meant. Most seriously, it belittled their own service record and blackened the memories of those comrades who did not return. The anti-Vietnam War protests more than trivialised the dignity of the occasion. They challenged its core belief of respect for past sacrifice.

On the day, the pattern which had developed over the previous four years became clearer. Protest activities were not recorded in country towns, indeed, attendances and interest appeared to be on the rise. 100 Cities, in particular Christchurch, were the focus of protest. In Wellington the Governor-General, Sir Arthur Porritt, once again challenged the use of military force as a means of providing solutions to the world’s problems. 101 PYM supporters laid wreaths in Wellington and Dunedin, unhindered. The universalisation of the day proceeded with ceremonies in diverse, even unusual places: Phuoc Tuy, South Vietnam, Istanbul, and at Casey in Antarctica. 102

In 1970 PYM forewarned the Auckland city fathers of Anzac Day action and they in turn were threatened by the ‘vigilante response’ of the Government Whip, A.E. Allen, MP for Franklin. Despite this, the outcome was peaceable. Such was not the case, however, for Christchurch. The local mayor and World War II ex-serviceman, A.R. (Ron) Guthrey removed the large card which read ‘To the victims of fascism in Vietnam,’ and also the flowers placed by three PYM members. Later in the day another attempt by PYM members to lay a placard was thwarted by returned
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100 *ODT* 27 Apr. 1970, 16 Oamaru reports much more interest in dawn parades, and Alexandra and Balclutha register larger attendances.
101 Ibid, 1. Governor-General Sir Arthur Porritt was consistent in his stand for peace. As a surgeon, he could not expect less, but this stand from a respected ex-servicemen and political figure concerned the RSA.
102 Casey is an Australian Antarctic base in the Windmill Islands at 66° 30’ S, 16° 943’ E., where thirteen Australian ex-servicemen staged an Anzac Day march.
servicemen and the police. Guthrey’s inflammatory statements about protesters being ‘long-haired louts’ who should not be allowed to insult the war dead set the scene for confrontation.\textsuperscript{103} The antagonism did not end.

In 1971 and 1972, Christchurch was again the New Zealand focal point for anti-war Anzac Day protests. In 1971, the public had a prelude of the events with the dispute between David Caygill, Canterbury Students’ Association President, and Brigadier J.T. Burrows, representing the ex-service personnel point of view.\textsuperscript{104} Central was the wording of the message on the students’ card: ‘The University of Canterbury Students’ Association regrets the long history of human suffering caused by war as an instrument of national policy, and expresses its great concern at the continuance of the war in Indochina.’\textsuperscript{105} This, Brigadier Burrows challenged, could better read: ‘The University of Canterbury Students’ Association offers this wreath in grateful memory of those men and women who lost their lives in the service of New Zealand and whose sacrifices made it possible for us to enjoy, unfettered, the privileges of university education in a free country.’ Here we see an insoluble polarity. While the students’ wording challenges war as national policy and consequently questions sacrifice, Burrows’ amended copy had an unnecessary barb in the tail which students found unacceptable. The events of Anzac Day in Christchurch were predictable; a placard with a picture of the My Lai massacre was destroyed, crosses planted in the ground to represent the 35 New Zealand servicemen who had died in the conflict were pulled up, and the banner front-page headline read ‘Mayor, Servicemen In Clash With PYM.’\textsuperscript{106}

What happened in Christchurch was much more extreme than in any other city or town in New Zealand. There were other protests, but they were relatively insignificant. In Auckland, assurances had been given in 1971 by the PYM and the Peace in Vietnam group that the RSA services at the Cenotaph would not be disrupted.\textsuperscript{107} In Oamaru, an RSA member removed a rough wooden cross with an attached notice deploring war from the war memorial.\textsuperscript{108} While the main service in Auckland was not interrupted, a crowd of protesters led by PYM members later

\textsuperscript{103} ODT 27 Apr. 1970, 5.
\textsuperscript{104} Caygill went on in the 1980s to become a Government cabinet minister.
\textsuperscript{105} ODT 21 Apr. 1971, 5; ibid, 22 Apr. 1971, 3.
\textsuperscript{106} ODT 26 Apr. 1971, 1.
\textsuperscript{107} ODT 23 Apr. 1971, 5 guests at the service were to include Princess Alexandra, Angus Ogilvy (her husband) and General C.T. Westphal, a staff officer in Rommel’s Afrika Corps.
\textsuperscript{108} ODT 26 Apr. 1971, 1.
held a second wreath-laying. In Auckland’s Albert Park a wreath in the form of paper flowers representing the Vietnamese flag, carried a card accusing ‘the United States, Australia and New Zealand’ of fascism.\textsuperscript{109}

Conflict flared up again in 1972. The new Christchurch mayor, N.G. Pickering, controversially announced that he would boycott the citizen’s memorial service. He thought the proposed RSA picket planned round the Cathedral Square War Memorial would exclude citizen wreath-layers who were not protesters.\textsuperscript{110} Ensuing publicity merely inflamed already hardened opinions. The picket line, on the day, formed a barrier which protesters felt had to be broken. Youths attempted to break the line to place wreaths after the quietness of the service. A uniformed soldier smashed the planted crosses with his boots, and a public slanging-match ensued for an hour after the service finished. These unseemly actions marred any chances of respectful commemoration of the dead.\textsuperscript{111}

Elsewhere in New Zealand, protests were generally tolerated. Arrangements made well in advance in Wellington alerted the public that there would be a contingent of Victoria University students marching in the parade behind the servicemen, and there were to be two wreaths laid by them.\textsuperscript{112} In Dunedin, local students laid a wreath ‘To the Victims of War and Aggression,’ and were invited to participate in a forum run by a youth association in the grounds of a main-line church.\textsuperscript{113} Speakers were invited from the RSA, the Committee on Vietnam and the Organisation to Halt Military Service (OHMS).\textsuperscript{114} News from the rest of the country indicated that the day was held in most places without protest or loss of momentum.

Apart from the matter of scale, the Australian situation in 1972 was little different from that of New Zealand. \textit{The Times} reported that in Canberra Vietnam veterans were given a place of honour in the parade for which Governor-General Paul Hasluck took the salute.\textsuperscript{115} Today, there

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid, 3.
\textsuperscript{110} \textit{ODT} 24 Apr. 1972, 11.
\textsuperscript{111} \textit{ODT} 27 Apr. 1972, 4; letter to the editor from ‘2390258 (RAF)’ abhorred the actions by ex-servicemen in Christchurch ‘Their actions brought discredit to all ex-servicemen …’
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{ODT} 20 Apr. 1972, 12.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid, 12.
\textsuperscript{114} \textit{ODT} 22 Apr. 1972, 3, Otago Youth Forum initiative to hold an Anzac Day forum to discuss war in the grounds of First Church Presbyterian at 2pm on Anzac Day.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{The} (London) \textit{Times}, 26 Apr. 1972, 7; Brisbane \textit{Courier-Mail}, 24 Apr. 1972, 3 Plans for the parade, ‘March honours for Vietnam Veterans.’ This evidence challenges the non-recognition of Vietnam veterans to some degree. It is not the same as having an end of war dedicated parade as had happened previously.
is little memory of this event.116 *The Times* correspondent observed ‘Anzac Day remains Australia’s true National Day despite the resistance of a very small minority and the tendency of some politicians to exploit it.’ He referred to the young men at the National War Memorial in Canberra holding placards reading ‘Sink a beer for the Vietcong’ and a flare attached to a time device which destroyed four wreaths at the Cenotaph in Martin Place, Sydney.117 In Brisbane, Vietnam War returnees were featured in the Anzac Day parade.118 In Perth, there was an alternative memorial dawn service held by the Ex-Servicemen’s Human Rights association with its own folk singers and addresses by a Labour senator and two clergymen. Ralph Hunt, Minister for the Interior, spoke out against ‘moratorium marchers, draft dodgers and rabble rousers in our institutions of higher learning, within the Communist Party of Australia.’119 Most notable of the protesters was draft resister Michael Matteson, who was freed from handcuffs by students at Sydney University.120

Stephen Clarke contextualises the actions of New Zealand anti-Vietnam protesters within the frame provided by the laying of a wreath. He cites Maclean and Phillips’ position that wreaths are instant, personal, and temporary memorials reflecting feelings of a particular moment. Wreaths and placards were used by fringe groups to make their views known.121 Clarke argued that the sailing of the ketch *Greenpeace III* for the French nuclear testing ground on Mururoa Atoll, and the withdrawal of troops from Vietnam marked the end of protest in New Zealand.122 Was this the case? Almost, but not entirely. In 1973, a man was arrested in Palmerston North, and a wreath with the words on the card: ‘For the dead and dying in the struggle against imperialism. Victory shall be theirs,’ was rejected by the Wellington branch of the RSA.123 In 1974, two protesters laid a wreath in Auckland, after the main civic ceremony, reading: ‘To the

---

118 JOL, OHMA/1/7, Folder 8, 1970-72. Minutes of the 57th annual meeting of the ADCC, 13 Apr. 1972, General Business, unpaged.
120 Brisbane *Courier-Mail*, 25 Apr. 1972, 1, 3.
122 ODT 27 Apr. 1972, 5; Stephen Clarke, ‘The One Day,’ 120. Clarke attributes the ‘end of protests at Anzac Day throughout New Zealand, and particularly Christchurch [owed] more to the fact that New Zealand no longer had a military presence in Vietnam.’
Innocent. These were minor affrays compared with what had happened in Christchurch in 1972. Mclean and Phillips make a significant claim with: ‘Such incidents [as in Christchurch in 1972] created an awareness that war memorials were public property, rather than exclusive shrines of the RSA. With hindsight, the Vietnam wreath-laying controversy marked the end of the RSA’s dominance of the day.’ Floating this interpretation needs caution. Neither the RSA nor the Australian RSL had exclusive or legal ownership of war memorials. They had always been civic property. On Anzac Day, returned services’ organisations dominated that physical landscape, with assistance of local and national military personnel, and the assent of civic authorities. What is evident is that the RSA found itself acting defensively to protect what it had always assumed was its to control.

Public discussions constituted the major reaction to all these activities. These were held before, on, and following the day. A wide variety of opinions were expressed; rather few about whether the day should or could continue, and many more about what it meant. Efforts by protesters to lay wreaths initiated a discussion about whether they should be allowed, and a broader discussion about what constituted a proper wreath and card or placard. More importantly, the central question of war as national policy drew the discussion down paths that New Zealand and Australia were to be seen pursuing by 2000. While the RSA members saw themselves as the keepers of the day, the period of protest raised the questions about whether a contingent of ever-elderly ex-servicemen (and ex-servicewomen) could continue in that role, or whether civic authorities and the state might have to step into the breach. Leading retired military figures like Brigadier Burrows might see the role of the RSA as moral guardians of a vacillating state, but state leaders like Sir Arthur Porritt wished to move to a position where wars were a thing of the past. This position, which proponents of the RSA interpreted as ‘pacifist,’ was supported by speakers in the 1972 Otago Youth Forum. Views were in agreement on the withdrawal of New Zealand soldiers from Vietnam.

125 Maclean and Phillips, The Sorrow and the Pride, 162.
126 This matter was the same as that which had engaged Canon David Garland and the ADCC in the 1930s.
128 ODT 26 Apr. 1972, 5. Allan Shackleton, self-confessed ‘World One Digger,’ argued against pacifism but saw the need for wide-spread Christianity; Professor L.O. Jones described the Quaker movement; John Howell of the Otago University Students’ Association warned of the destructive nature of the atomic age, and two other speakers outlined the aggressive nature of mankind.
It was natural that the public discussions should take a more serious turn. One of the results of the social upheaval during the Vietnam War was a realisation in New Zealand and Australia that the protests were ‘generational.’ Sir Thaddeus McCarthy, guest speaker in the Dunedin Dawn Service, forecast that the form of Anzac Day would not last. Generational movement was the basis of his remarks. He claimed more than fifty percent of New Zealanders alive in 1972 had not been born at the start of World War II, and that the younger generation would not have the same emotional attachment to Anzac Day because of lack of war experience. Motivated by the uncertainties linked to strong feelings generated in the years 1970 and 1971 and by the 1972 incidents in Christchurch, the New Zealand National Council of Churches Church and Society Commission heard submissions on the meaning and relevance of Anzac Day. The hope of the Commission was to arrive at decisions that would ‘make the observance of Anzac Day as meaningful to the younger generation as it [was] to the older, and that the governing factors [would] be tolerance and co-operation.’

Their findings were published, and represented diverse viewpoints. The composition of the Commission was remarkably catholic. Under the guidance of the respected Ombudsman, Sir Guy Powles, the list of participants included: representatives of the RSA, the Students’ Unions and youth organisations, main-line churches, local government, central government, and others from teacher organisations, the New Zealand Peace Council and the Secretary of the Church and Society commission, the writer of the background paper for the Commission’s deliberations and a war widow.

Rosslyn J. Noonan, who later became New Zealand’s Chief Human Rights Commissioner, presented the thirteen-page background paper which detailed the institutions, changes and meanings of the day. Her conclusions traced the ‘definite polarisation of opinion’ between the ‘traditional view [of] remembrance…essentially looking back to the sacrifices of war, a comradeship in shared dangers and a unity in a common purpose,’ and ‘the contemporary situation [which sought] to draw attention to the problem of war as such, and to work towards an acceptable alternative to war as an instrument of international policy.’ She felt that the greater danger to Anzac Day may have been ‘The apathy of those New Zealanders not committed either
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129 ODT 26 Apr. 1972, 3.
131 Ibid, 4.
132 Rosslyn Noonan was appointed to this position in May 2001, for a tenure of five years which was extended a further five years from 1 Jul. 2006. Her University of Auckland MA thesis was ‘The Riots of 1932: A Study of Social Conditions in Auckland, Wellington and Dunedin,’ 1969.
133 National Council of Churches, Consultation, 18. Her background paper was dated in April 1972.
way, who just don’t care.\textsuperscript{134} In the analysis made by Noonan the polarisation underscored by her has bias. Her ‘traditional view’ seems sympathetic to veterans, and lacks comprehension of what the day meant to the broader community. It is just not sufficiently comprehensive. War widows could perhaps see themselves gathered within this interpretation, but only at a stretch. Other civilians, without direct war experience would have greater difficulty. On the other end of the spectrum, she takes a broad view, based on the most recent types of protest, more anti-war than anti-Vietnam War. In this sense she engaged with the ideas of a wide group who focussed on protest because they were generally angry with the times. They wanted to share power in a rapidly changing world, and their aim was less altruistic than Noonan allowed them. Nevertheless, her analysis was clear, and reflected views expressed in the consultation.

The progress of discussions is contained in the six pages of ‘Aide Memoire (A summary of views expressed at the Wellington Consultation).’\textsuperscript{135} There was a consensus for seeing Anzac Day as a day of commemoration, not of wars but ‘of men and women who had served in wars and of those who at any time had given their lives for their country.’\textsuperscript{136} Points were made about the difficulty of separating glorification of war from the services, the problem of ‘Sundayising’ the morning when the day was not a Sunday, or recognising the place of any other than a religious form of commemoration, and whether the commemorations ought to be a civic responsibility rather than the RSA’s. There was general agreement that the two other ‘constant factors’ in Anzac Day besides commemoration were co-operation and rededication. This engendered discussion about the place of representatives of former enemies, recognising current policy of the RSA in welcoming German veterans and serving soldiers. There was discussion of Anzac Day as a national day, but it was agreed that following the Australian model, and because of the ‘different sense’ the day had from traditional national days, Anzac Day should be seen differently. The consultation ended amicably with agreement on the need for ‘broadening the scope of the observance’ and ‘allowing flexibility to each community to make the observance more meaningful to the younger generation’ in a spirit of ‘tolerance and co-operation.’\textsuperscript{137} These were noble conclusions, but how effective was the Consultation in ameliorating the difficulties of the day for 1973?

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid, 18.
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid. An interesting title, which recognised the difficulties of transcribing what must have been lively dialogue, and with a tinge of Derrida. The participants’ views were unattributed, 22-27.
\textsuperscript{136} Ibid, 23.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid, 27.
The Consultation and its paper were important at the time rather than influential for the future. Noonan’s background paper and the Consultation recorded the history of the day, what it meant to various groups, and reconfirmed its central tenets. This last was the most important outcome. But the process did not lead to changes; partially because the final recommendations were couched in very moderate terms.\(^{138}\) Importantly, the Consultation, premised on the disruption caused to Anzac Day between 1970 and 1972 was deprived of momentum by the withdrawal of New Zealand forces from Vietnam, along with those of other coalition partners. It was much more this act, rather than the deliberations of the Commission which led to quiet observance of the day in 1973. The Consultation was at a watershed in the development of the day, but not the cause of it.\(^{139}\) In contrast, there appears to be no equivalent examination by the Australian churches or state governments of the period about the status of Anzac Day. This point alone underpins the faith Australians placed in the day, even in the most distracting of circumstances.


\(^{138}\) In comparison with Professor Lloyd Geering’s 1967 trial on charges of heresy by the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand or the 1974 trial on charges of treason by the New Zealand Government against Dr William Sutch, the Consultation on the Observance of Anzac Day had less on-going influence on public opinion.

\(^{139}\) Stephen Clarke, ‘The One Day,’ 120, ‘The end of protests at Anzac Day services throughout New Zealand, and particularly Christchurch, undoubtedly owed something to the Consultation…but perhaps more to the fact that New Zealand no longer had a military presence in Vietnam.’ I concur with this opinion.
In 1973, a republished Sid Scales’ cartoon questioned the meaning of Easter. Because of its pervasive symbolism and closeness to Anzac Day in that year, it queried understandings of Anzac Day. Newspaper and television coverage indicates little interest by the media in Anzac Day, and in Dunedin, New Zealand, only 400 attended the Dawn service. In retrospect, this low point was transitory, even if at the time it seemed part of a downward trend. The next year showed the glimmers of recovery. Already, uncertainty had flooded the current historical landscape with the revelation of the Watergate scandal which questioned the motives of all political directives. Anzac Day was observed ‘quietly’ in most centres, a euphemism for a generally poor civic attendance at ceremonies. Second World War memories featured in the Brisbane news and the 9th Royal Australian Regiment, fresh from Vietnam were in the parade for the first time. Following the day, attention was captured by a trivial story about a young woman who had become locked into the Australian War Memorial. More seriously, the Queensland RSL was considering how to handle the decline in numbers of marchers and observers. From a high point of 6500 marchers in the previous 15 years, there were only 3376 in 1974. From a peak of 80,000 spectators in 1955 there were about 10,000 in 1973. RSL officials were considering restricting the observances to a commemoration at the Shrine.

The next year, 1974, had the lowest coverage of any year in the ODT. The year brought recognition of consequences of Vietnam War involvement. April was dominated by the news of the 20 year sentence for United States forces Lieutenant William Calley for his part in the infamous My Lai massacre. There were efforts to re-name New Zealand Day as ‘Waitangi Day,’ with no mention of Anzac Day in the discussion, while across the Tasman ‘God Save the Queen’ was debated as the anthem for Anzac Day. In New South Wales and Victoria ‘Advance Australia Fair’ was heard for the first time on Anzac Day.
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141 ODT 26 Apr. 1974, 5; ibid, 24 Apr. 1974, twenty-seven television listings showed the long-running Australian programme ‘Family at War’ but that serial could not qualify as a specifically Anzac Day programme.
143 ODT 26 Apr. 1973, 5, Wellington report covering most main centres.
144 Brisbane Courier-Mail, 21 Apr. 1973, 13; ‘Fear in the Ghetto,’; ibid, 24 Apr. 1973, 2, ‘Governor will take the Anzac salute.’
146 ODT 18 Apr. 1974, 7.
147 ODT 22 Apr. 1974, 11.
148 ODT 23 Apr. 1974, 4; Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania were to retain ‘God Save the Queen’; South Australia had made no decision by the time of print.
Anti-Vietnam War protests in Australia were similar in pattern to those in New Zealand, but were different in scale and involved a greater infrastructure. They had begun earlier and by 1965 protests were coordinated and seen on the streets of major cities. Protesters used the platform of Anzac Day and had mixed motives: opposition to the war, equal rights for women, racial equality and protection for the environment were all factors bringing people out into the street to oppose the positions taken by the national and state governments. High profile church and secular leaders, like the Rev. Allan Walker of the Sydney Methodist Mission, Morris West, influential Roman Catholic writer, and Dr. Jim Cairns of the Labor Opposition, all publicly expressed opposition to Australian troops despatched to support a corrupt and unpopular dictatorship.149

The horrors of war, as illustrated by the constant television coverage, made many Australians uncomfortable with its process. Violent images, some of which became the symbols of the American and hence official Australian position had a cumulative effect. Most telling were the images of Saigon’s chief of police executing a suspected Vietcong in the street, the napalm bombing of villages, Vietnamese girl Kim Phúc running from napalm fire-bombing,150 and the results of the Mai Lai massacre in 1968. This last matter tipped the tide of popular opinion in Australia. Not only was it intolerable to send Australian men to the war, but the war, and American-Australian involvement in South East Asia were widely seen as increasingly unacceptable.

In 1975, if there is a corollary through attachment to the Vietnam War, one might expect a deep trough for Anzac Day in New Zealand, as this was the year of Vietcong success and the fall of Saigon.151 Under pressure from the USA, President Nguyen Van Thieu was forced to resign just prior to Anzac Day.152 The last New Zealand Gallipoli Veteran’s Association national meeting took place in Auckland - age had caught up with the men.153 The day had a mixed reception,

---

149 This could be a dangerous stand, for Australian Labor Party leader Arthur Calwell was shot but lived after attending an Anti-Vietnam rally in Sydney. Jim Cairns was the organiser of the May 1970 Vietnam Moratorium which saw 70,000 Mar. in Melbourne and 20,000 in Sydney.

150 Kim Phúc, Love (Prologue), Hachette Livre, Auckland, 2007. This book contains a prologue by the Vietnamese-Canadian woman who was badly burned in a US co-ordinated firebomb attack. Phan Thi Kim Phuc of Huynh Cong Ut was badly burned by napalm on 8 Jun. 1972 and her photograph taken by Nick Ut was published in Life magazine and made a deep impression on Western public opinion.

151 ODT 24 Apr. 1975, 1; pictures of Roman Catholic nuns fleeing Vietnam and arriving in New Zealand.

152 ODT 22 Apr. 1975, 1.

153 ODT 23 Apr. 1975, 5.
much of that was due to inclement weather. Rain forced the cancellation of the Auckland Dawn ceremony, despite the attendance of 400 veterans.\textsuperscript{154}

Conversely, Wanganui had a good turnout despite the rain, and in Dunedin, large numbers were reported at the Cenotaph Dawn Service.\textsuperscript{155} Other war-related stories prevailed: the greater attendance each year at Cannock Chase in UK,\textsuperscript{156} and human interest ‘Weekend Magazine’ articles about Simpson and his donkey, and Japanese Lieutenant Hiro Inoda who had survived 30 years hiding in the Philippines forests.\textsuperscript{157} There were photos of Otago country districts and their Anzac Day ceremonies.\textsuperscript{158} The coverage indicates renewed interest in the day, domestically and abroad. Despite this change, some commentators were still catching up. Columnist John Parker of Wellington and the well-known cartoonist Nevile Lodge poked fun at some of the icons of

\textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 1975, 5.
\textsuperscript{155} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{156} \textit{ODT} 22 Apr. 1975, 6. In 1973, the West Midlands Military Historical Society revived the ceremony and 300 people attended. Numbers had grown to a thousand in 1975.
\textsuperscript{157} \textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 1975, 17, ‘Weekend Magazine.’
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid, 11, Central Otago edition.
Anzac Day – the old photographs of Egypt, and old mates, and memorabilia, all of which is in stark contrast with a down-at-heel male obsessed with the racing pages on the day of all days.

In 1976, Anzac Day services in the Otago town and country districts were described generally as ‘well attended.’\textsuperscript{159} In Oamaru, World War II flying ace Wing Commander J.M. Checketts observed unlike the title of John North’s book, \textit{Gallipoli: the Fading Vision} ‘Anzac Day was not a fading vision.’\textsuperscript{160} Memories were being revived: New Zealander Jack Hinton, V.C., met the Queen in London at the bi-annual meeting of the Victoria and George Cross Association.\textsuperscript{161} National television offered the ‘Seven Days’ current affairs programme with an interview shown on Anzac Day evening of South Vietnamese ex-President Air-Vice Marshal Ky.\textsuperscript{162} Newspaper coverage in stories and photographic coverage of ceremonies, while not of the scale of ten years before, showed a significant increase in interest from the previous two years.\textsuperscript{163} This progress continued.

The dip of the post-Vietnam War period was over. In 1977, the RSA broadened its membership,\textsuperscript{164} and the day was welcomed by a display of World War I souvenirs.\textsuperscript{165} National radio ran a competition entitled ‘Stories for Anzac Day,’ and received 500 stories of which just over half were from women writers.\textsuperscript{166} This is a remarkable response for a day which was supposed to have lost traction. A well-researched story in the ‘Weekend Magazine’ featured the Australian War Memorial in Canberra, indicated local interest in Australian memories.\textsuperscript{167} Generous coverage of the Dunedin Anzac Day services appeared.

\textsuperscript{159} \textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 1976, 5; ibid, 26 Apr. 1976, 16 photographs of the public show a greater crowd at the Cenotaph Dawn service; ibid, 26 Apr. 1976, 16 (Country edition), describe Oamaru as having ‘a small turnout of townspeople.’


\textsuperscript{161} \textit{ODT} 24 Apr. 1976, 16.

\textsuperscript{162} Ibid, 35.

\textsuperscript{163} \textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 1976, 1, 5, 8, 16.

\textsuperscript{164} \textit{ODT} 21 Apr. 1977, 10, there was a motion to the annual meeting of the National Executive Council to accept anyone with six months continuous membership of the New Zealand defence forces in peacetime, or anyone with peacetime service under three years from overseas as an ally of New Zealand, even including those not naturalised New Zealanders.

\textsuperscript{165} \textit{ODT} 23 Apr. 1977, 5, a cloth embroidered by New Zealand soldiers in World War I at Mount Felix Hospital at Walton-on-Thames, recently sent from a lady in Surrey to Dunedin RSA to find out information about the names of soldiers embroidered on it.

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid, 20, ‘Radio by Prospero;’ 23; ibid, 39. There was little advertised television coverage other then the national channel TV One showing the programme, ‘Warship: One of those days.’

\textsuperscript{167} \textit{ODT} 23 Apr. 1977, 19, ‘Australia’s Memorial Shrine.’
An overseas news piece combined elements of both memory and racial inclusion. A photograph showed a Maori woman, Mrs J.C. Windsor, placing a posy at the New Zealand War Memorial at Cannock, UK. The military cemetery contains the graves of the 74 Anzac troops who died in the influenza epidemic of 1918. Windsor is shown in traditional Maori regalia, wearing a ǹī pare (headband) and korowai (cloth-tasselled cloak). The pattern of Anzac Days at Cannock Chase went against the trends in New Zealand. There was no post-Vietnam low point here. The remarkable growth in popularity of Cannock Chase Anzac Days from 1973 challenged the notion of the day fading away. In this small rural Midlands town, the local people wished to honour the memories of those soldiers who had died in their district. They were led in this endeavour by a small committee of elderly women and a few remaining World War I veterans. 168

Dunedin newspaper reports for 1978 show a steady growth of interest in matters related to Anzac Day. Memories were recalled for POWs by the release of Fred Stuckey’s book, Sometimes Free, just before Anzac Day. 169 Despite the ending of the national Gallipoli Veterans’ Association, 33 Gallipoli veterans held a dinner at the Dunedin RSA clubrooms;170 and J.C. McPherson of Arrowtown in country Otago, a veteran of two world wars, was pictured showing his medals to comrades in arms.171 The most revealing evidence was the extent of Anzac Day coverage given which was fuller than any of the previous four years. The ODT feature page report covered diverse places and issues. 172 There was a crowd of over 1,000 at Dunedin’s Dawn Service; New Zealanders were at Le Quesnoy and the London Cenotaph service; the Citizen’s Service in First Church, Presbyterian, Dunedin was reported; 101 Australian RSL members who had come to New Zealand for Anzac Day, of whom 12 were in Dunedin; the address by Charles Upham, V.C. and bar, in Christchurch and the Queen’s message was published; the Canberra main ceremony with 11,000 (including a large contingent of Vietnam veterans in the parade) and the Canberra Dawn Ceremony with 3,000 were reported; and finally the Cannock Chase ceremony UK where

168 ODT 27 Apr. 1977, 6. Cannock Chase, Brocton War Memorial, Staffordshire, was unveiled in 1923. There are 73 New Zealand soldiers and one Australian buried there. The ceremony had been held each year from 1919 until 1953. In 1964, the site was chosen as the Deutscher Soldatenfriedhof – the cemetery for all German servicemen who died in the UK in both world wars.

169 ODT 20 Apr. 1978, 3, J.E.F. Stuckey, Sometimes Free, Ashhurst, New Zealand, 1977, POW experiences for four and a half years. He was a POW in Stalag 383, in 1944 and took photographs but did not record the Anzac Day activities.


171 ODT 26 Apr. 1978, 1.

172 Ibid, 5.
a record crowd 7,000 attended was covered.\textsuperscript{173} This was a very full report, reflecting similar interest elsewhere in New Zealand and Australia.

Anzac Day 1978 saw the first recorded New Zealand incident involving the Women’s Action Group who protested at the 11 a.m. Citizens’ Service at the Auckland Cenotaph. Members of the group, who wore black dresses and veils, laid a wreath. The card on the wreath read: ‘We remember all the forgotten women: All those who died in battle, those raped and mutilated, our sisters who have had their lives destroyed by wars of this century.’ The card was removed from the wreath by a police constable, who later tried to wrest a camera from Kirsten Warner, a journalist who had recorded the incidents. The headline read: ‘Auckland Police Apologise Over Incident At Cenotaph.’ Auckland Police Commissioner, J.W. Overton, issued an apology for any offence caused by the actions of his officers. He supported the right of the press to record such scenes. Warner intended to follow the matter through with written complaints to the Police Commissioner and information to the Northern Journalists’ Union.\textsuperscript{174} Here we see a range of matters. The symbolically powerful dress and actions of the women protesters evoked memory of widows’ weeds of the 1920s and 1930s. The message on the card drew attention to the forgotten generations of women in war. The words ‘those raped and mutilated’ raised a level of realism usually avoided on Anzac Day. Was Anzac Day comprehensive enough to include these new realisms and images from the post-Vietnam period? The handling of the matter by Police Commissioner Overton indicated a change in direction towards a new tolerance, and a warning to zealous officers to keep within the law. There were conflicting reports from overseas: Felicity Walker-Watson from Paris wrote to the editor expressing her delight with the care given to the CWGC cemetery in Istanbul,\textsuperscript{175} but protests over war issues were current elsewhere: vandals painted graffiti in soldiers’ cemeteries in Rome, and CWGC headstones in the UK were broken.\textsuperscript{176}

The period 1979 to 1984 continued with news reporting on Anzac Days reflecting a pattern of greater public acceptance. Memory was consistently recalled by both Anzac Day speakers and

\textsuperscript{173} Ibid. Despite near frost conditions in Canberra, the reporter commented on the large turnout for the Canberra Dawn service. It seemed that despite present dim memories, Canberra RSL organisers ensured a well-recognised place for Vietnam veterans.

\textsuperscript{174} ODT 27 Apr. 1978, 5.

\textsuperscript{175} The Times, 28 Oct. 1978, 13.

\textsuperscript{176} The Times, 11 Nov. 1976, 19. The report also mentioned Remembrance Sunday and the exhibition of the work of the IWGC open till 18 Nov. in the Chapter House of Westminster Cathedral.
radio and television coverage. Examples of this were the 1979 radio broadcast of *Down the Long, Long Trail*, an anthology of written memories, diary extracts, speeches and songs marking the 60th anniversary of Armistice Day in November 1978. In 1981, national television showed a nostalgic glimpse with Vera Lynn. In 1981, national radio ran the Vincent O’Sullivan play *Forget About Homer*, a story about a classics scholar who was a Gallipoli soldier.179 The same listed the radio programme ‘Grassroots of War,’ with Michael King, New Zealand historian, commenting on material from his book *New Zealanders at War*.180 This was also the year of Peter Weir’s film, *Gallipoli*, which did so much to cement Australians’ belief that the events on Gallipoli were theirs.181 While there was no immediate adverse reaction in New Zealand, because many on the eastern side of the Tasman identified with the characters in the film, in Britain a controversy erupted in the newspapers. From mildly favourable reviews in early December 1981 following the film’s release, comment soon became adverse and defensive.182 Not withstanding the mixed reception in Britain, the film attracted a great following in Australia and New Zealand, and inadvertently did much to promote the advance of Anzac Day in memory. In 1983, Television New Zealand broadcast its own compilation ‘Anzac - the New Zealand story,’ in *Casualties of Peace*,183 but this was not part of a consistent policy, for in 1984 the best that could be managed was a re-run of the 1969 movie *Battle of Britain*.184

Events on the day in the years 1979 to 1984 reflected much of the recent past. Crosses were now placed by the RSA in some centres as opposed to being placed by protesters. A ‘melee’ occurred in Auckland when Maori protesters claimed space for those Maori who had died in

177 *ODT* 21 Apr. 1979, ‘Anzac Memories’ by ‘Prospero’ was repeated as an Anzac Day feature.
178 Ibid; NZTV Two ran a Vera Lynn hour-long special, ‘Songs from the War.’
180 Ibid, Michael King’s book was published in 1981.
182 *The Times*, 4 Dec. 1981, 11, Geoff Brown reviewed the film setting among the previous works of Weir - *The Cars That Ate Paris* (1974) [not to mention *Picnic at Hanging Rock* (1975)] and *The Last Wave* (1977); ibid, 11 Dec. 1981, 15, David Robinson, perhaps sensing the impending furor, praised the direction for its ‘national subject uncompromisingly treated,’; ibid, 18 Dec. 1981, 12, Churchill historian, Sir Martin Gilbert tackled the film on its skewed interpretation, particularly the omission of the British role on the Peninsula, and dependence on the Murdoch letter. He does end with the central truth exposed by the film: ‘In all, in less than eight weeks, 34,000 British and Empire troops and 10,000 French troops had been killed. The Turks had lost more than 80,000 men. Since then, only decaying trenches and beautifully tended war graves attest on the peninsula itself to the cruel event, of which this film is a poignant reminder.’; ibid, 19 Dec. 1981, 7. Robert Rhodes James criticised the film for its historical inaccuracies, and recommended a reading of C.E.W. Bean’s ‘absolutely accurate’ material, and directed his most acerbic comments for the decision ‘to blame the British for the sacrifice of the Australian Light Horse, in defiance of all the facts, [which] was a commercial one.’
183 *ODT* 23 Apr. 1983, 22.
185 *ODT* 20 Apr. 1979, 3. RSA intimation of the Dunedin Dawn ceremony at the Cenotaph.
‘capitalist wars,’ and some gave a black power salute,\textsuperscript{186} while Maori ex-servicemen met after the morning services at a local marae to discuss issues of the future.\textsuperscript{187} Similar stories on behalf of Australian Aboriginals were still largely missing. Their time for general recognition on Anzac Day had to wait almost twenty years.\textsuperscript{188}

In this period of transition and increasing traction for Anzac Day, there were some interesting events related to indigenous people. Maori had a close association with the World Wars, and were particularly renowned for the effort of the 28\textsuperscript{th} Maori Battalion in World War II. The Auckland incidents in 1979 appear out of step with other events traditionally involving Maori on Anzac Day, and were related to the resurgence of urban Maori, particularly in Auckland. In a contrasting action, on Wednesday 16 April 1980, in the English village of Oddington in Oxfordshire, a Maori ceremony of dedication was held as a memorial to Maggie Papakura, a well-known Whakarewarewa guide and Oxford scholar.\textsuperscript{189} The ceremony, given in Maori with an English translation, was attended by Les Gandar, the New Zealand High Commissioner in London, who addressed the gathering in Maori. A memorial plaque to Papakura, engraved in both languages was unveiled by her grand-daughter, Barbara Dennan, who donated a \textit{korowai} – a feather cloak from the Arawa tribe. In the nearby local church is a plaque previously donated by Papakura in honour of Maori soldiers killed in World War I. This story adds to that of 1977 of Mrs J. C. Windsor at Cannock Chase, and reinforces the idea that New Zealand Maori could cross boundaries on Anzac Days.

This act was significant, because it occurred at a transition period where intergenerational and inter-racial relationships come into focus. It coincided with that point of awareness that the original diggers were passing and their memories might be lost. This was also the time when Gallipoli veterans decided that annual meetings were to cease.\textsuperscript{190} This action helped promote

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{186} ODT 26 Apr. 1979, 5, Wellington (PA) report.
  \item \textsuperscript{187} ODT 26 Apr. 1980, 5, meeting of Maori veterans at Araiteuru marae, Shetland Street, Dunedin.
  \item \textsuperscript{188} Denis McLean, ‘Australia and New Zealand: two hearts not beating as one,’ \textit{New Zealand International Review}, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, Jan-Feb 2001, 2-6. McLean points out some essential differences between Australian aboriginal and New Zealand Maori; Gillian Cowlishaw ‘On “Getting It Wrong”: Collateral Damage in the History Wars,’ \textit{Australian Historical Studies}, No. 127, Apr. 2006, 181-202. This article looks at the position of Australian ‘new history’ in the light of changes in aboriginal histories exposed since 1980. Of particular interest are the changes in indigenous discourses which have occurred with modernisation. While not mentioning Anzac Day, the material provides background rationalisations to the absence of Aboriginal and Torres Straits veterans in Anzac Day observances.
  \item \textsuperscript{189} ODT 19 Apr. 1980, 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{190} ODT 30 Apr. 1984, 5.
\end{itemize}
public and state realisation that the rapidly reducing number of surviving World War I veterans were increasingly subject to frailty and death. Their World War II comrades were also ageing, most in their late fifties to late sixties. One consequence was the growth of greater interest by their children’s and grandchildren’s generations. The interest was reciprocal: many diggers felt the time was right to give public utterance to their experiences. Newspaper columns reflected this growth and published increasing numbers of feature articles around Anzac Day.\textsuperscript{191} By the mid-eighties it was obvious that public interest in Anzac Day was growing, deepened by the stories which gave it renewed substance.

Meanwhile, overseas cemeteries were again being vandalised,\textsuperscript{192} and women protesting against rape in war were arrested in Canberra.\textsuperscript{193} In Dunedin, a local Turkish man’s contribution to the day was recognised.\textsuperscript{194} In Australia, more than 100,000 people attended the parades in 1983, but two World War I veterans died and of about 400 women protesters, 166 were arrested and charged.\textsuperscript{195} These disruptions continued into 1984, and Melbourne police arrested seventeen ‘militant feminists’ protesting against rape in war.\textsuperscript{196} More significantly, and a reflection on the day, the same \textit{ODT} report has coverage in Melbourne of ‘the Anti-Anzac Day Collective’s call for the abolition of Anzac Day and its replacement with a public holiday on International Women’s Day.’\textsuperscript{197} In other centres, such as Sydney, Brisbane, and Perth, there were protests.\textsuperscript{198}

In 1985, there were no incidents from Australia reported in New Zealand papers, but in 1986, in


\textsuperscript{192} \textit{The Times}, 24 May 1980, 15. Letter of protest to the editor entitled ‘Insult to the dead’ by Mavis Gallant of Paris; ibid, 31 May 1980, 13. A response about the desecration of the headstones of Jewish Canadian soldiers graves in Bretteville-sur-Laize in the war cemetery in Normandy written by Alistair Laing, Deputy Director-General, Commonwealth War Graves Commission, Maidenhead, UK.

\textsuperscript{193} \textit{ODT} 27 Apr. 1981, 7; Brisbane \textit{Courier-Mail}, 26 Apr. 1981, 1, ‘50 Anzac day arrests in Canberra.’

\textsuperscript{194} \textit{ODT} 23 Apr. 1982, 1 front-page article on Akif Keskin, restaurateur, who returned on an Anzac Day visit to Dunedin. He was ‘responsible for the first Anzac Day service to be held in Los Angeles three years ago…’

\textsuperscript{195} \textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 1983, 5, in Sydney, 159 women from the Women Against Rape Collective were arrested as they attempted to join the Mar..

\textsuperscript{196} \textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 1984, 1; Brisbane \textit{Courier-Mail}, 26 Apr. 1984, 2, ‘17 feminists arrested.’

\textsuperscript{197} \textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 1984, 1.

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid. In Sydney there were ‘several hundred women dressed in black who linked arms and stood at the steps of the War Memorial in Hyde Park.’ In Brisbane, a small group of women placed black wreaths, and in Perth the Tobruk War Memorial was defaced and there were scuffles during the ceremony at Kings’ Park.
Sydney Anzac Day marchers were flour-bombed. There is more than a difference of scale between New Zealand and Australia. In Sydney, more than 25,000 ex-servicemen and women of the two world wars, Korea and Vietnam marched in a three-hour procession to Hyde Park, led by a few surviving Gallipoli veterans riding in open vehicles. New Zealand protests for the post-Vietnam period appear intermittent compared with those in Australia. There was no cross fertilisation of ideas or leadership in the protests. This supports Beilharz’s notion of separation, but limited to the matter of protests on Anzac Day rather than the observance of the day itself.

Powerful external forces motivated interest in war experiences. In New Zealand and Australia there was a tremendous growth of interest in genealogy. Clubs sprang up in town and country centres, and the national societies of both countries struggled to develop a sufficient infrastructure to cope with the demands. Genealogists sought access to the stories of their older relatives, particularly those who were service personnel in the World Wars. Television documentaries also shed light on the past and cast older generations’ histories in a more heroic light. Many soldier stories coming to light revealed the enduring pull of Gallipoli. It is not coincidental that Gallipoli stories became more desirable in the mid-eighties. Increasing media coverage itself raised interest in material based on the Gallipoli experience.

During the mid-eighties New Zealand, much later than Australia, began to more frequent displays of nationalism. Here, Beilharz’s notion of the two nations following different national paths, or developing ‘separate stories’ might well be valid. What emanated from World War I was ‘soldier nationalism’ which did not gain traction among the general public, at least in New Zealand. When, in the 1930s, Australians promoted Gallipoli events as the forge of nationality, New Zealanders were still firmly attached to Britain, and remained that way until after that nation joined the European Economic Community. It is accepted that Australia ‘felt comfortable in its own skin’ in the last half of the twentieth century. New Zealand, on the other hand, had issues to contend with that were not Australia’s. Economically, New Zealand was dependent on trade with the UK until 1970. On Anzac Day with its intimate connection to defence issues, New Zealanders were undecided until the mid-eighties about directions. The New Zealand

---

201 The author was the chairman of Dunedin group of the New Zealand Society of Genealogists through the 1980s, and an early member of the national Society. Local monthly meetings often exceeded 120, having grown from 45 in the late 1970s; ODT 28 Apr. 1986, 20, a report on the need for transcription of soldiers’ stories.
government anti-nuclear stand of 1984, led by Prime Minister David Lange, encouraged public realisation that the future might not be with Europe, or the US, but more towards the Pacific and Asia.  

It was in this ferment of the mid–eighties that there can be seen the changes and forces that created Anzac Day developments. From 1985 onwards, there is clearly enthusiasm to record soldiers’ experiences, and to include those of women. From this juncture, Turkish stories begin to be related more frequently, though those which appear in the New Zealand and Australian media were not necessarily Turkish-based, but were about the Turks for Australasian consumption.

For Australians in the late 1980s, Anzac Day had memories different from New Zealand. In 1986 there was high public interest in the Dawn services which ‘were attended by tens of thousands of ex-servicemen and women,’ and in Sydney the 20,000 strong three-hour march was led by a few surviving Gallipoli veterans transported in open cars. Stephen Taylor, *The Times* correspondent in Sydney, recorded an RSL spokesman who assessed that the presence of so many young people guaranteed the perpetuation of Anzac Day. On Anzac Day 1987, veterans of the Vietnam War led the Sydney parade of 20,000 marchers. For the next 3 October there was planned the first official welcome home parade, more than a decade after the fall of Saigon. The long-awaited expectation of public recognition for the Vietnam veterans stirred deep emotions in Australia. Mr Humphreys, Federal Minister for Veterans’ Affairs proposed to the 72nd national RSL congress that as the arrival of the first fleet in 1788 was irrelevant to most Australians, that Anzac Day could be Australia Day. The successful sinking of a cruiser by the Australian

---


205 Ibid.


submarine *AE2* in the Dardanelles campaign prefaced the first publication of parts of a pencil-written diary by Private Geoff Wood of the 5th Field Ambulance, AIF, who landed at Gallipoli on 21 August 1915 and withdrew on 19 December. In 1988, the Bicentenary drew greater attention to the position of Anzac Day in relationship to Australia Day. The qualities which were associated with Anzac Day and the Anzac legend were recognised as essential to keep stability within the changing Australian society. Chris Masters, Channel Ten network renowned current affairs commentator, had been to Gallipoli in 1987 and later commented on the subdued mood of the visitors from Australia and New Zealand. He defined Chunuk Bair as ‘the scene of the greatest Allied disaster,’ and also focused attention on New Zealand’s part on 8-10 August 1915. His trip and reference to it a year later drew the Australian public’s attention to Gallipoli which he defined as: ‘a piece of ground in Europe that we can relate to; a rare space in European history we can safely wander in.’

**Gallipoli, a ‘space to wander in,’ 1985 - 2000**

Renewed enthusiasm for Anzac Day commemorations from the mid-1980s was reflected at Gallipoli. Arthur Gietzelt, the Australian Minister of Veterans’ Affairs, at Anzac Cove for the Dawn ceremony said the fighting had been instrumental in the emergence of a consciousness for national sovereignty for all three peoples. It had given rise to a resolve to control destinies and determine roles in international affairs. The ceremony at Anzac Cove was attended by eight surviving Australian veterans and three Turks. Rasit Gurdilek, the correspondent, placed the beginnings of the close friendship of Turks, Australians and New Zealanders in ‘Memories of bitter fighting.’ Abdullah Tenekeçi, the Turkish Minister representing the Government of the Republic, noted that the first contact led to ‘a lasting friendship which he hoped would set an example for others.’ In the same feature, Henry Stanhope, under the heading, ‘Courage that Forged National Identity’ presented a story on aspects of the Gallipoli campaign which he sees as ‘Far from succeeding [but teaching] lessons…the hard way, [with a] final evacuation [which] was brilliant and the heroic role played by Australian and New Zealand troops helped forge their national identities.’

---

208 *SMH*, 23 Apr. 1988, 68.
210 *SMH*, 25 Apr. 1988, 3, ‘Masters debunks the Anzac legend’, by Robin Oliver. Chris Masters challenged some fondly held ideas: that the Anzacs failed at the first landing because they were set down in the wrong place; that British officers were to blame for Australian deaths in the battle of the Nek; and that the Australians who enlisted were prime examples of Aussie manhood.
211 *The Times*, 26 Apr. 1985, 7, Rasit Gurdilek, Ankara correspondent for *The Times*. 
In 1990 the Australian frigate HMAS *Sydney*, landing ship HMAS *Tobruk* and submarine HMAS *Oxley* and their crews attended the 75th anniversary ceremonies at Gallipoli. They were joined by fifty-eight World War I veterans, aged from 92 to 103.\textsuperscript{212} Prime Minister Bob Hawke, Opposition leader John Hewson, and the recently appointed Transport and Communications Minister, Kim Beazley attended. They met the British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, while in Turkey.\textsuperscript{213} The high-level entourage from Australia indicated a serious national intent towards furthering Anzac Day in Gallipoli. Peter Robinson, *The Sun-Herald* columnist, sounded a discord when he suggested that the ‘rash of bad taste…inflated anniversaries’ was triggered by the deeper significance of Anzac Day which appealed to many ‘old Australians’ who did not like what they saw in the new, multicultural Australia and who ‘cling with increasing tenacity to the most respectable symbol of their concern they can find: Anzac Day.’ Robinson further argued that Anzac Day embodied the survival of ‘ideals, hopes and connections that [had] elsewhere disappeared.’ He expressed the fear that a hyped-up Anzac Day might become a symbol of ‘confused identity and national disarray.’\textsuperscript{214} Robinson, writing at a point of growth in public affection of Anzac Day, might be forgiven for his generational remarks, but the piece reveals a limited viewpoint which lacked acknowledgement of the adaptable properties of the day. This last matter is crucial and goes some distance to explaining the survival of Anzac day through the century.

New Zealand’s high-level involvement at Gallipoli followed Australia’s: in early April 1996, Peter Tapsell, Speaker of the New Zealand House of Representatives, led a Parliamentary delegation to Ankara and Gallipoli.\textsuperscript{215} They were hosted by Çanakkale Governor Husnu Tuglu, and received considerable attention by Turkish and New Zealand media.\textsuperscript{216} Philip Burdon, New Zealand Trade Negotiations Minister, reported extensively on the success of the visit. In a national radio interview he observed the large turnout of young people (estimated by him to be

\textsuperscript{214} Ibid, 31.
\textsuperscript{215} MFAT File 58/274/2 Vol. 1. (Confidential) New Zealand External Relations with Turkey: Anzac Day Commemorations, 1 Jan 1996-30 Nov. 1997, 24 Jan. 1996 58/274/1 Ankara C00883 to Defence Wellington, the popular New Zealand Army musical band detachment, led by Colonel Warren Whiting, was unable to attend Gallipoli commemorations as they had in 1994 and 1995.
\textsuperscript{216} Ibid. 9 Apr. 1996 Ankara C01005 report to Wellington on the visit of NZ Parliamentary Speaker Hon. Peter Tapsell and a delegation of Parliamentarians.
ninety percent of the nearly 2000 at the Dawn Service) at Gallipoli. He explained that it was part of the European tour of travelling New Zealanders, and symbolic as representing the ‘birthplace of the creation of New Zealand’s unique…sense of identity.’ In this matter he was echoing much that was and still is written and spoken about the histories of both Australia and New Zealand. When questioned about Waitangi Day as a possible national day he suggested that Anzac Day ‘transcends all the other…influences that tend to flow across any other day in the national calendar.’ His written report amplified some of the issues touched on in the radio interview. He stated that the day was of great significance in the New Zealand psyche and he predicted that it would assume even greater future significance. He recommended more funding, and when possible ministerial representation, and described the elaborate ceremonies at the Turkish Martyrs’ Memorial, the extensive Turkish media coverage, and the 1500 at the New Zealand Memorial Service at Chunuk Bair. He drew attention to the essential centrality of Gallipoli on Anzac Day:

Finally, I have to say it is difficult to capture just how deeply emotional and significant the Gallipoli commemorations are for a New Zealander. They must surely be the most poignant ANZAC Day event to be held anywhere outside New Zealand and Australia. At the Dawn Service, as night moves into day, one cannot be a New Zealander and remain unmoved by the meaning of the moment, the realisation of what those Kiwi soldiers endured for us and the incredibly high price they paid.

This oft-repeated emotional response, was echoed in an Evening Post article ‘Reflecting the awful truth,’ by Matt Dickson, who urged ‘that every New Zealander should go there at least once.’ That compelling ‘awful truth’ impelled many visitors, including New Zealand Maori, to make the journey. Joe Pere, a Waipero Bay, North Island Maori historian, visited Gallipoli and returned home with soil collected from Chunuk Bair, which he placed on the grave of his great-grandmother, Ngarangi Tautuhi Maraki. She was the mother of an Anzac Maori soldier, Tutui Maraki, who died on Chunuk Bair. Maraki’s grandson, Pere, read the 1985 version of Atatürk’s words and the voice-over narration stated:

---

220 Channel 7 New Zealand Views: Doco of the Week, The Last of the Anzacs, Ninox Films Ltd 1998, Anna Cotrell (Director), shown 23 Apr. 2008. Maraki died in the 8 Aug. 1915 attack on Chunuk Bair. For New Zealand Maori, soil, or whenua, has deep cultural significance.
For the grandson, Joe Pere, it was a life-long ambition to touch the soil where his grandfather fell. Pere said: I particularly wanted to go to Turkey because I wanted to find out where my grandfather was buried. While I was there, at Chunuk Bair…I picked up some of the soil…so I put the soil in a bag and brought it home… I’m just transferring what I consider his spirit…wairua to be here with Mum.

There are matters here which are important for both New Zealand Maori: issues of sacred soil, *mana*, *wairua* and *whenua*. There is a singular act of possession seen in this event. Turkish soil represents memory of the spirits of the dead in a land half a world away.

Issues of management of the Gallipoli site became important in the 1990s. The increasing popularity of Anzac Day at Gallipoli had an unfortunate outcome: it led to competition between Australia and New Zealand for control of the activities on the day. This took various forms: concerns were expressed from 1996 about a planned Turkish Peace Park which incorporated the Commonwealth War Graves Cemetery areas and Anzac Cove. Sensitivity was expressed about advice given to the Turkish government, over whether wattle, kowhai and olive trees ought to be planted at or near Ari Burnu, and the difficult issue of resiting the dawn service commemorations from Ari Burnu to Outpost No. 2 cemetery (the North Beach) site. This last matter, considered urgent because of the increasing numbers of pilgrims each year, dragged on to 1999, and fuelled disharmony at the highest levels. The principal concern was over the protection of the Ari Burnu site. The Australian government was aware of the RSL’s resistance to resiting from Ari Burnu because it was the sacred place of veterans’ memories. The Australian foreign affairs and OAWGC officials were also sensitive to the damage done to the headstones and the problems caused by crowds standing in the gravesite area. The year was election year, and it brought pressures from the influential veterans’ lobby. A report by the New Zealand embassy

---

221 *Mana* is standing or position in the community, *wairua* relates to matters of the spirit, *whenua* is a word combining land and soil with the spirits of the living and the dead. Some of these matters relate closely to cultural values followed by Turkish people.


225 Ibid, 16 Feb. 1998, 58/274/2, Steve Gower AO, Director, AWM to H.E. Ian Forsyth, Australian Embassy, Turkey. Gower, an influential Director of the AWM reported in early Feb. 1998 that: ‘Many Australians…will be disappointed with this decision if the relocation proceeds.’ He felt that the Ari Burnu site was ‘perfectly located to
officials in Ankara pointed out the increase in numbers: ‘commemorations on the Gallipoli Peninsula were once again a high profile and moving public event. Attendance was up on last year with the presence of large numbers of young Australians and New Zealanders once more very noticeable.’ The report discussed briefly the significant involvement of the Turkish Government, military and local authorities in Canakkale. 5000 to 6000 people attended the Dawn Service at Anzac Cove. Special Gallipoli tours had been organised from London and there was a ‘multitude of backpackers.’ For the [Ankara] Embassy, Gallipoli ‘remains the high profile annual event.’

In mid-1998, in order to progress the transfer of the Dawn service from Ari Burnu, Gary Beck, head of the Office of Commonwealth War Graves’ Commission, presented a well-considered paper, which became a key policy document. Within two months, the Australian Prime Minister’s Department issued ‘Honouring Australia’s Veterans,’ a paper proposing that a new memorial park should be built at Gallipoli. While the basic parameters of this paper seemed acceptable when it was proposed, from September 1998 to February 1999 difficulties arose over how the planned developments associated with moving the venue might impact on the successful Norwegian design for the Gallipoli Peace Park. The impact of the proposals for a new Anzac
Commemorative site within the development of the Gallipoli Peace Park proposals was not lost on Australian Government officials.\(^{230}\) There was a clear understanding that any new site must be of equal historical significance with the Ari Burnu site, to ensure that the Dawn service at Gallipoli continued to have meaning.\(^{231}\) The official diplomatic reports confirmed the final Ari Burnu site commemoration as ‘moving and memorable.’\(^{232}\) A large crowd of 3000 attended the Chunuk Bair service where Binyon’s *Ode* was delivered in English and Maori, as was the New Zealand national anthem.

Contestation marred the 1999 Gallipoli ceremony. It was outlined in the *Australian* and headlined ‘Turkish media sour last cove service.’ This story related the adverse reaction of some Turkish media to a slow handclap by some Australians. The Turkish reporters and photographers had been instructed to leave the media area site. ‘This is supposed to be a sombre experience,’ said Clare Mahoney, of Melbourne. ‘They are just not showing any respect to the dead. They just want to get their story and their shots.’\(^{233}\) The headline in the *Australian* and story showed little empathy with the Turkish position.

New divisions arose between the nations involved in planning the millennium year events. The Australian architectural firm’s plans for the new dawn site did not fit well with the minimalist and natural parameters required by Professor Bademli, the Turkish adviser to the Peace Park proposal.\(^{234}\) In addition, Turkish Ambassador Metin Coker was planning a multi-national concert with musicians from Turkey, Australia, New Zealand and the UK. He had also booked the Turkish Presidential Symphony Orchestra.\(^{235}\) In October 1999 there was a high-level meeting between Australia, New Zealand and Turkey which covered the planning needed for the most significant year. The agenda spelled out the comprehensive preparation: the site, international nature of events, the attendance of the Turkish Prime Minister, ministerial involvement,

\(^{230}\) MFAT File 58/274/2 Vol 7. (Confidential) New Zealand External Relations with Turkey: 1 Apr. 1999-30 Sept 1999, 13 Apr. 1999 58/274/2; Ian Kennedy to Laurie Markes – the draft Prologue for the 1999 Gallipoli Dawn Service to be read by Ms Teresa Gambaro, Federal MP for Petrie.

\(^{231}\) Ibid, 58/274/2 RNZ ‘Morning Report’ 8-9am, Monday 26 Apr. 1999. Lockwood Smith, New Zealand Minister for International Trade, was fully aware that his attendance at the 1999 Anzac Day Dawn Service would be the last at that site and the next year it would be below the ‘Sphinx.’ His memories took in the Dawn Service, and included the first Turkish service, the French memorial service, the Helles British service, the Australian Lone Pine service, the Turkish 57th regiment service, finally the Chunuk [sic] Bair service

\(^{232}\) Ibid. 27 Apr. 1999 58/274/2 Ankara C02018 to Wellington.

\(^{233}\) Ibid. 26 Apr. 1999 58/274/2 (unclassified file).

\(^{234}\) Ibid. 24 May 1999 58/274/2 NZ High Commission London to Secretary, MFAT, Wellington.

\(^{235}\) Ibid. 4 Aug. 1999 58/274/2 Ankara C02107 to Wellington.
programmes, protocols and security, transport, accommodation, etc. The minutes show awareness of care of graves, the relationship with the ANZAC Park, and care in the delicate relations between Australia, New Zealand and Turkey.\textsuperscript{236} The year 2000 was a year nominated for New Zealand government organisation, and there was concern about how far ahead Australia was with plans for the event.\textsuperscript{237} Another major planning meeting, held in Adelaide, saw Australia well ahead with planning, and New Zealand’s desire to be more involved.\textsuperscript{238} It remained to be seen whether the services in the place of origin of Anzac Day on the millennium would reflect concord or conflict.

The 2000 Anzac Day Dawn Service at Gallipoli revealed an integration of directions. Helen Clark, Prime Minister of New Zealand and John Howard, her counterpart for Australia, took part in the dedication of the Anzac Commemorative site at North Beach.\textsuperscript{239} Clarke and Howard jointly placed wreaths. Clarke proclaimed how Gallipoli ‘shaped our nation,’\textsuperscript{240} and Howard came with Australians to ‘stand on soil wet with the lives our kin.’ An Aboriginal didgeridoo played by Robert Slocklee sounded, and New Zealand Corporal Una Tarau gave the \textit{karanga}, the call of welcome.\textsuperscript{241} It was not just ownership of the site claimed on Turkish soil, but new notes and a stronger, state-supported recall of the past. The Gallipoli services had come of age and were clearly visible for both those who attended in person and also those at home, via satellite-linked television transmission.

In New Zealand, there was more extensive local newspaper coverage given to 2000 Anzac Day at Gallipoli and related matters than at any time in the previous 50 years. In a story about Helen

\textsuperscript{237} Ibid. MFAT reports, by Dec. 1999, it was obvious that one leading planner for the event, Air Vice-Marshal Gary Beck, had become impatient with what he perceived as New Zealand slowness in planning and had departed for Turkey and engaged there with his own agenda.
\textsuperscript{239} \textit{Wartime} – Official Magazine of the Australian War Memorial, Issue 11 Spring 2000, Nuance Multimedia Australia Pty, Vic. 3205.
\textsuperscript{240} This view is still current among media commentators. The New Zealand Maori Television programme, \textit{A tatou taonga}, re-screened 17 Jul. 2008, showed respected broadcaster Judy Bailey at Gallipoli for Anzac ceremonies in late Apr. remarking, ‘Gallipoli is where we discovered our nationhood’; \textit{ODT}, 22 Apr. 2000, 3. Information from the Turkish Foreign Ministry indicated that Clark had arrived by 22 April for talks with Turkish President Suleyman Demirel, Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit and Minister of Culture Istemihan Talay to discuss bilateral relations and international issues. The same despatch conveyed that Clark’s pleasure representing New Zealand at the first Anzac ceremony in the Peace Park, built by the Turkish Government.
\textsuperscript{241} \textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 2000, 4; Janice Pavils, ‘Anzac Culture, 358.
Clark’s great-uncle, killed at Gallipoli, the number of Turkish casualties was given.\textsuperscript{242} In the pre-Anzac Day edition the \textit{ODT} covered in greater detail the relationship of New Zealand with Turkey; the high-level meeting with the Turkish leaders; sensitive issues like the treatment of the Kurd rebel groups; matters related to Turkey joining the European Union; trade barriers and reforming the Turkish postal system.\textsuperscript{243} This was remarkably in-depth coverage for its readers and indicated growing interest. Again, for the first time, there seems deliberate mention of the Turks in the NZPA report on the event – ‘thousands of Australian, New Zealand and Turkish tourists gathered at Anzac Cove at dawn’; ‘people stood in the hills looking down on Anzac Cove as the Turks must have 85 years ago…’; ‘The flags of Australia, Turkey and New Zealand flew at half mast.’\textsuperscript{244} A subsequent story gave Clark’s personal reaction - that Gallipoli ‘broke our hearts…’ and ‘caused us to re-examine who and what we were [as a people or nation].’ She attributed to Kemal Atatürk a generosity of spirit in accepting those Anzacs who had fallen as ‘sons of Turkey.’\textsuperscript{245} She described Turkish soldiers as having ‘steadfast courage’ and former enemies as ‘present friends.’ Developing the theme, she felt herself in ‘a place of peace and of inspiration to further [sic] generations.’\textsuperscript{246} This was more than likely written for the New Zealand Prime Minister, and conflates personal inclination with public policy in an unmistakable manner.

By 2000, the Gallipoli awakening stimulated revivals of other war memories. Books were printed, re-printed or being prepared on soldier experiences elsewhere: Kokoda, Monte Cassino, El Alamein, Passchendaele, and Vietnam.\textsuperscript{247} The millennium commemoration also gave a new

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{242} \textit{ODT}, 22 Apr. 2000, 44.
  \item \textsuperscript{243} \textit{ODT}, 24 Apr. 2000 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{244} \textit{ODT}, 26 Apr. 2000, 4, ‘Anzac memorial uncovered at Gallipoli.’
  \item \textsuperscript{245} Ibid, ‘National identity shaped by Gallipoli campaign, Clark says.’
  \item \textsuperscript{246} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
world-wide focus to Anzac Day. ‘World News’ showed Warrant Officer B.J. Smith of the New Zealand Army and Brigadier Duncan Lewis of the Australian Army together laying a wreath at the New Zealand base at Suai, East Timor, near the border with West Timor. Peacekeeping in a new battleground created a new landscape bringing other memories to Anzac Day.

The New Zealand Government was belatedly considering the re-internment of the Unknown Warrior’s remains, an act which did not come about until Armistice Day, 11 November 2004.\(^{249}\)

The Australian government had established the Tomb of the Unknown Australian Soldier in the Australian War Memorial, Canberra on Armistice Day 1993. In Sydney, on Anzac Day 2000, the Premier of New South Wales unveiled a sculpture of a Digger at the western end of Sydney’s Anzac Bridge. The sculptor was a New Zealander from Dunedin, Alan Somerville. On Sunday, 27 April 2008, that statue gained a New Zealand mate, the sculpture of Anzac complete with traditional Kiwi lemon-squeezer hat and complete with a jar of Gallipoli sand in the plinth.\(^{250}\)

### Conclusion

The end of World War II brought new beginnings for Anzac Day. The contemporary and victorious historical landscape introduced a greater range of participants, not just from the British Empire countries, but also including global allies, the USA and, briefly, the USSR. While Peter Beilharz argues a ‘parting of the ways’, this was only partly reflected in the changes in Anzac Day during the period to 2000.

While there were national differences of views found in pronouncements on Anzac Day, most of the time there was great uniformity. Not only were veteran exchanges between the trans-Tasman partners revived as soon as the war ended, but both countries included the large range of representatives from nations who were World War II allies. Anzac Day was now more inclusive, with the general exception of Australian Aboriginals and Torres Straits Islanders. In addition, Anzac Day observances were held in places as far removed as San Francisco, Yokohama War Cemetery at Hodogaya, and Valetta, Malta. Here we see Anzac Day landscapes transferred to foreign locations. Meanings that once belonged almost exclusively to London, towns in Australasia and Gallipoli, were globalised, especially after World War II.

---


Did the day lose traction in the 1960s and 1970s? Undoubtedly so – but not as much as orthodox opinion suggests, and also not for the usually accepted reasons. The introduction of a Sundayised morning and Saturdayised afternoon in the mid-sixties for both Anzac nations brought popularity to the day. In comparison the Vietnam War protests appeared as a reversal. The war itself did not cause a low point in public attention, though it accentuated a fluctuating trend. The downturn was more apparent than substantial, and was most apparent following the war, when the height of protest activity had past. Anzac Day, still with its essential commemorative meaning embedded, was exclusively defined by protesters as a political platform. The Vietnam War did not spell the end of Anzac Day yet the memories of Vietnam veterans who took part in its parades were lost. Immediately following the Vietnam War there was a resurgence of interest in Anzac Day, although the day was still used until the mid-eighties as an arena for protests by women and Maori. The impact of current events dominated the memories. The dominant outcome of the protests was public debate. It seemed at the time natural to link Anzac Day and what it meant with societal conflict, and further to see what it represented as being the target of attack. Cartoons suggesting that society had lost its directions reflected Professor Manning Clark’s 1960 statements about a secularised society adrift. This notion was equally applicable to both trans-Tasman nations.

By 1977 there was renewed vigour in Anzac Day. Memory began to predominate. This did not mean a total cessation of protest activity on the day. In both Australia and New Zealand, the day was still used by women’s groups protesting about rape in war. In this period that Gallipoli memories were vitally revived by the distribution of Peter Weir’s film. It was timely, coinciding with the increasing valuation of veteran’s memories and the return to Gallipoli. It was not veterans who were visitors this time but a new generation of Anzac pilgrims whose journey began to invest Gallipoli with the accolade of a shrine. By 2000, Anzac Day at Gallipoli portrayed a blending, rather than a parting of the ways. Contestation was sublimated by the need for harmony on the national stage.
Chapter Seven – Turkey and Anzac Day 1946 - 2000

Recovering memory and reclaiming the landscape.

İstiklal Marşı (Independence March, 1921).

Fear not, the crimson flag, waving in these dawns will never fade
Before the last hearth that is burning in my nation vanishes
That is my nation’s star, it will shine;
That is mine, it belongs solely to my nation.

Oh, coy crescent do not frown for I am ready to sacrifice myself for you!
Please smile on my heroic nation – why that anger, why that rage?
If you frown, our blood shed for you will not be worthy.
Freedom is the right of my nation who worships God and seeks what is right.

Mehmet Akif Ersoy¹

Chapter Seven examines the role of Turkey in Anzac Day from 1946 to 2000. It will discuss the place of significant Anzac Day-related events in order to assess their place in Turkish national awareness. Among the events are significant memory pieces for the Turks. The Morshead Mission of 1948 both revived old and generated new memories. Turkish attitudes were subjected to forces in the current historical landscape. The entry into NATO in 1953 was most significant, but the accord which that event accrued was offset by the disturbances just over a decade later caused by the Cyprus Crisis. Meanwhile, other Anzac Day events moved through the changing historical landscape: military officers were dispersed around the world to represent the Republic on Anzac Day; memorials were constructed to the Turkish dead on Gallipoli in 1953-54, and again from 1973 onwards. The newly-declared ‘Gelibolu Peninsula Historical National Park’ [HNP] was established in 1973. In retrospect, it was a year of re-awakening. Interest from foreigners visiting the Gallipoli Peninsula was evident from 1980, and in 1985 Turkey, Australia and New Zealand agreed on reciprocal monument-building recognising in their territory the sacrifice made by the others. Anzak Koyu (Anzac Cove) was officially adopted by the Turkish authorities and the widely-recognised monolith with Kemal Atatürk’s 1934 (reset in 1985)

---

¹ İstiklal Marşı or Independence March was composed by the Turkish national poet Mehmet Akif Ersoy in 1920 while the War of Independence was occurring. It was accepted on 12 Mar. 1921 by the Turkish Parliament as its national anthem. It was set to the music presently known in 1930 by Zeki Ungor. It confirms the high place of the soldierly ethic in that nation; Turkish flag – www.commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Image;Turkish-flag.svg Accessed 10 Dec. 2008.
statement was built and dedicated. In the same year, the Turkish memorial in Canberra was opened, alongside Anzac Parade, and in 1990 the Wellington Atatürk memorial was unveiled. From 1990, the participation of national representatives at the Gallipoli Anzac Day observances has been a marked feature. The Gallipoli Anzac Day story had come full circle; from war to peace to memory. Gallipoli was now a shrine to memories of war rather than the battlefield of war.

Throughout the late twentieth century Turkish military and Anzac ex-service organisations were the dominating agents for management of Anzac Day in Turkey. The first post World War II Anzac Day commemoration was that of the Australian and New Zealand Delegation and IWGC Commissioner and Representatives to Gallipoli on Anzac Day 1948.\(^2\)

**The Morshead Mission, 1948**

The first allied post-World War II visit to Gallipoli on Anzac Day was that of the military delegation led by Lieutenant-General Sir Leslie Morshead and Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur Longmore.\(^3\) Anzacs in the mission led by Morshead travelled from Sydney via Ankara to the Anzac Day dawn service at Gallipoli, and then on to the unveiling ceremony for the Australian Memorial at Tobruk, the main destination for the enterprise. The delegation included the Australians and a small New Zealand group, comprising Cyril Bassett, V.C., Brigadier General G.B. Parkinson, Major C. Cameron and Captain E. Webber.\(^4\) Despite difficulties in making the arrangements in time, the trip was judged a tremendous success.\(^5\) Longmore’s official IWGC report lavished praise on the Turks, with special mention of the help from the Çanakkale military authorities. He was not only impressed with the efficient organisation, but was taken with the

---

\(^2\) AWM 27, 670/1, Visit Australian and New Zealand Delegation and IWGC Commissioner and Representatives to Gallipoli, Anzac Day, 1948.


\(^4\) Morshead, Brigadier A.E. Brown, Brigadier F.A. Burrows, Chaplain O. Steel, Captain J.E. McKeddie, Captain E.T.C. Laws, and Frank McKenzie, the official photographer. They were joined in Ankara by Longmore and Colonel E.A. Griffen of the IWGC.

\(^5\) Arrangements were confirmed on 15 Apr. 1948 but with the proviso that all photos must be developed and printed by the Turkish authorities. There were difficulties arranging transport as the Turkish State Lines (Deniz Yolları) only had one small vessel available and it had to return to Istanbul by 6pm on 25th, so it would have to leave Anzac Cove at 5.30am before the ceremonies were completed. There was a mail ship departing 27th from Chanak (Çanakkale) [Message R4700 Istanbul to Foreign Office London].
presence of a Turkish general, and his staff. The latter laid a wreath to fallen Anzacs at Anzac Cove, and the Turkish guard of honour fired a salute. At midday on Anzac Day, the high point of reconciliation was demonstrated in the lavish lunch provided by the Çanakkale military staff, who attended in full uniform.

Tosun Saral, the son of Major-General Ahmet Hulki Saral, Chief of Staff at the Dardanelles’ Fortress, 1947-1949 recorded the event. Saral, as the senior resident officer, organised the programme for the visitors. General Arif Pasha acted as the guide for the visitors. He related that unlike the situation which existed on 18 March 1915, remembered well by the Turks, the British [sic] were now coming as friends and allies. The Anzac story of events on the Peninsula was translated into Turkish and caught the imagination of all present:

one of the British officers began to tell something in great enthusiasm…Here, on this spot a Turkish Battery caused high losses to our men. To stop the battery we fired tons of bombs over them. But alas! After every silence they again began to bomb our fortifications. We couldn’t stop that battery until the end of the campaign…[at this point it was asked who was in charge of the battery]…As the words of the British officer [were] translated into Turkish a hiccough was heard. Everyone [directed] their attention at that person. He was General Arif Tanyeri. The old Pasha was crying. He [wiped] his tears and said “Sir, that was me!”….After these words there was a deep silence [then] everybody began to cry like babies as if they were not soldiers. We embraced each other. Great soldier General Arif Pasha (Artillery 1325-3) rest in peace. There is an eternal peace between Anzacs and Turks.

Different interpretations are possible of this emotion-charged exchange. The story shows mutual respect based on shared wartime experiences. It creates potential for reconciliation through

---

6 TNA Folder FO 371/72548 Foreign Office: Political Departments: General Correspondence from 1906-1966. Anzac Day at Gallipoli, Foreign Office Political Departments: POLITICAL: SOUTHERN (R) Turkey (44), 28 Apr. Report of Sir Arthur Longmore, Imperial War Graves Commissioner, London to Sir David Kelly, HM Ambassador, Ankara—reported on the very successful visit to the Gallipoli War ceremonies and to cemetery sites. The un-named general was Major-General Ahmet Hulki Saral.


8 www.members.virtualtourist.com/m/7d696/1e1cb1/ Accessed 20 May 2008. This site was written by ‘Sirvictor’ [Tosun Saral of Ankara] and begins by briefly mentioning viewing the Gallipoli hills in 1947. The rest of the information about the 1948 Morshead Mission comes from a story about related to him by his father, General A. Hulki Saral (1905-1982), Infantry 1340/7.

9 Ibid.
shared experiences. It is an example of bridging the divide caused by traditional reserve which itself often prevents the honest revelations of emotions.

Longmore’s report records the details of the trip to Anzac Cove, Suvla Bay, Chunuk Bair and Çanakkale. It also mentions important aspects of memory. He stated: ‘It was, undoubtedly, a memorable occasion, and for those present, like Sir Leslie Morshead, who had taken part in the fighting, a most moving one. On return to Çanak [Çanakkale] the whole party was entertained by the Governor and the Corps Commander. In fact, the hospitality offered was almost embarrassing.’ The report concludes: ‘The friendliness of the Turks, whether Governors or military officers, has been most noticeable and this aspect no doubt will leave a lasting impression on all members of the party on return to their respective countries.’ 10 A cine-camera film, which the visiting party was keen to view, was made by the Turks of the visit. 11 TNA records do not show whether this objective was ever achieved.

It is evident that at the highest Turkish political and military levels there was a belief to engage with the foreign visitors and fulfil their wishes. 12 The memories of the party that fought on Gallipoli in 1915 faced adjustment in the light of their 1948 experiences. The Morshead Mission and the Chunuk Bair Anzac Day luncheon should be seen in the wider context of the contemporary Cold War atmosphere. It suited Turkey to be firmly aligned with the West. Anzac Day in Turkey was a vehicle for memory revision and military realignment. This action took the cordial and public 1940 correspondence of Çakmak and Freyberg one step further. In an important political gesture, there was public affirmation of forgiveness for the deeds of the past at the very place where they had occurred. This 1948 Anzac Day event signalled Turkey’s wish to be seen aligned with the victorious allies, and distanced from her old 1914-1918 ally, Germany.

The agency of the Turkish military

Good relations revived by the 1948 Morshead Mission were maintained five years later in Turkish government policies which involved military personnel in new ventures. In 1952, Turkey was admitted into NATO.\textsuperscript{13} Joining NATO was both eagerly sought and most significant. It complemented the role that Turkey played with other anti-communist nations in the Korean War.\textsuperscript{14} Ferenc Vali highlights the connection that Turkey made with joining NATO. It created ‘a continuous and spontaneous exchange of views between Turkey and her collective allies. The value of such diplomatic contacts in political, economic, and cultural relations is inestimable; more than anything else, it has enabled Turkey to establish herself as a ‘European’ power.’\textsuperscript{15} Because of the intimate contacts between the political and military wings of the Turkish government, ‘military’ ought to be added to ‘political, economic and cultural relations.’

On Onsekiz Mart 1952, the Turks held their own (barely-documented) first post-war pilgrimage to Gallipoli and invited British and French ex-servicemen living in Turkey to participate. About 400 Turks of all ages gathered and were accompanied by local expatriate British and French.\textsuperscript{16} This significant event is now shrouded by larger, tumultuous events. It provides an example of forgetting through marginalisation. It was simply swamped by the larger events: Turkey successfully joining NATO and the building programme for the nation’s largest war memorial. In 1952, the Australian forces in Korea, commanded by Lt. General William Bridgeford, hosted both New Zealand and Turkish troops for Anzac Day.\textsuperscript{17} The participation of the Turkish armed forces in the UN force in Korea paved the way for visits by Turkish servicemen to Anzac Day observances world-wide by 1953.

\textsuperscript{13} Yücel Bozdağlioğlu, \textit{Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach}, Routledge, New York, 2003, 58, 60. Turkey first applied for membership of NATO in May 1950 and was rejected by the USA and Great Britain, but made a second application on 11 Aug. 1950 and was accepted, along with Greece, on 18 Feb. 1952.
\textsuperscript{14} In Oct. 1950 Turkey sent its first contingent of 4500 troops to the Korean War without its Parliament’s approval. In the course of the war, it sent more troops than any other nation.
\textsuperscript{15} Ferenc Vali, \textit{Bridge Across the Bosphorus}, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1971, 124-125; \textit{The Times}, 13 Sept. 1963, 7. A report on the remarkable consistency of Turkish policy in a report on the formal establishment of Turkey’s link with the European Economic Community. The signing of the documents were in the Grand National Assembly building in Ankara, 12 Sept. For the Turkish people this act symbolised finality in Atatürk’s attachment of the nation to Europe.
\textsuperscript{16} TNA: WK 1851/5 reports in correspondence N.J.A. Cheetham, FO London to F.C. Sillar IWGC Buckinghamshire, 9 Mar. 1953. I have found no other references to this event in Turkish or British records. Professor Mete Tuncoku email to G. Davis 6 Oct. 2008, admitted that Turkish researchers have found no record of this event.
\textsuperscript{17} Brisbane \textit{Courier-Mail}, 26 Apr. 1953, 3, London 25 Apr. AAP story ‘Turks As Guests.’
In retrospect, Turkish people recognise 1953 as a most significant year because that was when the Turkish government made its most tangible overtures to the west. Before 1953, Turkey hosted foreign visitors on Anzac Day, but from 1953, the Turkish government sent representatives overseas to attend the ceremonies. The flag of the republic was being held high abroad. In Malta, military contingents on their way to Princess Elizabeth’s coronation from Australia and New Zealand were joined by Rear-Admiral Refet Arnom of the Turkish Navy. He laid a wreath which carried the words: ‘From Turks to Anzacs.’ On Anzac Day in Korea in 1953, the contingent of the 2nd and 3rd Battalions of the Royal Australian Regiment, the Royal New Zealand Artillery, the 1st Battalion of the Royal Fusiliers, and the 1st Battalion of the Duke of Wellington Regiment all took part in the ceremonies. Brigadier J.G.M. Wilton and the commander of the Turkish contingent in Korea, Brigadier General Siri Acar, together officiated at the parade. The senior officers extended the gestures of the previous year. This is different from 1948, because these acts were performed in front of personnel from their countries’ units. Similar events also happened in other parts of the world. In Adelaide, during one of Australia’s most popular Anzac Days, the new Governor Sir Robert George took the salute and he was accompanied on the dais by a Turkish officer from Korea. In Brisbane, the local paper carried a detailed story on the visit of Colonel Danis Carabelen and Captain Nigati Attila who were hosted by RSL state president Raymond Huish.

All was seemingly cordial, but commemorative acts caused feelings of profound unease in some quarters. There was disquiet, particularly in Britain, over the desire of the Turks to commemorate their own dead on Gallipoli. Central was the issue of ownership of the part of the Gallipoli Peninsula which had been designated the Anzac Battlefields’ Cemetery site.

---

19 NZFL, 53rd year, No. 47, 20 May 1953, 23.
21 The Times, 27 Apr. 1953, 5.
22 Brisbane Courier-Mail, 24 Apr. 1953, 6.
Çanakkale Şehitler Abidesi – a memorial to self

Following World War II the Turks regretted that they had few monuments of their own to the nation-building epic, the Çanakkale Battles of 1915. In 2006, the Turkish Ministry of Environment and Forestry, within whose control the Gallipoli sites fall, admitted ‘important [monument-building] activity did not take place until as late as [the] 1940s. Other than a few modest monuments and single martyr cemeteries made during and right after the [1915] battles [sic]. In [the] 1940s [the] Nuri Yamut Monuments [were built].’

In 1953, the Turks decided to erect a major memorial to their own dead on the Gallipoli Peninsula. The British community in Turkey supported the project. By 17 April the project was advanced to the point of laying a foundation stone, and had been visited by hundreds of Turkish visitors who also viewed the British Hellas Memorial and other Turkish cemeteries. F.C. Sillar, IWGC Secretary, expressed concern over ‘the erection of some great memorial to the Turkish dead’ and stated ‘that it might spoil the existing Commonwealth memorials, if it were in close juxtaposition.’ Sillar raised the matter of IWGC rights in Gallipoli that were originally prescribed under the Treaty of Lausanne and expressed surprise that members of the Istanbul British community had made donations to the project. He also voiced the opinion that the Australians might object – ‘they might have strong views as to its location if it were to dominate any of the Commission’s cemeteries and memorials.’ The correspondence between Sillar and the British Foreign Office flowed fast. Sillar believed that the Treaty of Lausanne granted that the areas of the allied cemeteries on Gallipoli, and particularly the Anzac area, which he described

---

23 T.R. [Republic of Turkey] Ministry of Environment and Forestry General Directorate of Nature Protection and National Parks, Gelibolu Peninsula Historical National Park, TRMEF, Ankara 2005, 20. There is difficulty in the English translation throughout the work. The Nuri Yamut Monument was commissioned by General Nuri Yamut Pasha. It was built in 1943 to the memory of the 10,000 Turkish soldiers who were killed around Zıtindere (Gulley Ravine). The General sold his home in Istanbul to fund the building; www.canakkale.gov.tr/eng_monuments.htm for this and other Turkish commemoration sites.

24 TNA File FO 371/107591. Proposal to build a Turkish war memorial at Gallipoli; TNA WK1851/2 Ankara radio report, 7 Jan 1953. Ankara Radio reported in early Jan. that 2,450 Turkish pounds had been raised from the British community in Turkey for the building of a Turkish memorial at Canakkale.

25 TNA File FO 369/5101 Imperial War Graves Commission 1955. Maintenance of European Graves in certain Foreign Countries: 36th Annual report of the Imperial War Graves Commission 1 Apr. 1954 to 31 Mar. 1955, 19-20. The importance of this act was that, for allied visitors, it threatened to impinge on that sacred landscape from which Anzac Day or indeed British Gallipoli Day had been conceived. Moreover, the symbolism of a large, dominant Turkish memorial, visible for miles on Anzac Day, might dent the notions of ownership of sacred gravesites so precious to the Anzac community.

26 TNA WK 1851/5 reports in correspondence F.C. Sillar IWGC Buckinghamshire to N.J.A. Cheetham FO London 27 Feb 1953.

27 Ibid, reports in correspondence Cheetham to Sillar, 9 Mar. 1953; TNA WK 1851/6 Sillar to Cheetham 27 Mar. 1953.
proprietarily as ‘an area of a mile wide and 2 miles in depth…specifically allocated under the
treaty, exclusively for the use of the British Empire.’ He added that the cemeteries area was
‘particularly near to the hearts of the members of the Commission, representing as they do
relatives in many parts of the Commonwealth.’

The contentious matter of ownership of the
Anzac Battlefields site relates to the thesis, but it has been well covered by previous
researchers.

British government officials brought realism to the dialogue with the entrance of the political
heavyweights, J.L.B. Titchener, British Ambassador in Ankara, and A.C. Maby, of the Foreign
Office, London. Titchener was quite clear that the Turks had every right to erect a monument to
their own war dead, and that provisions in the Treaty of Lausanne offered no restrictions. He
further intimated that the Turks had raised half a million lire and were planning to lay the
foundation stone for the memorial on Anzac Day 1953. In fact, the stone was laid on 17 April and
‘hundreds of Turkish pilgrims’ visited the Hellas memorial and cemeteries in the vicinity.

Leslie Pott, British Consul-General, Istanbul felt that the Turks had:

been influenced in their decision by our [British] cemeteries and monument, which
for many years now have not failed to impress visitors to the Dardanelles, both
Turkish and non-Turkish. In fact, the Turks may be said to have used our
cemeteries as their own ‘show-pieces.’ The present small Turkish monument at the
Nek’, in the Anzac perimeter, Millington thinks, is not considered impressive
enough for a country which has progressed so much in recent years.

While the matter of building a Turkish memorial had the potential to pose a block to the
reinstitution of Anzac Days on the Peninsula, anxiety about the issue waned as suddenly as it had
arisen. In fact, between early July and September 1953, the Peninsula was invaded by visitors,
both Turkish and foreign. Following her duties during the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, the

---

29 Don Mackay, ‘Sépulture Perpétuelle’ 199-243.
30 TNA WK 1851/7, Titchener British Embassy to Maby FO London, 7 Apr. 1953. His general stance echoed N.J.A.
(John) Cheetham’s responses to Sillar.
31 TNA File FO 369/5101 IWGC 1955. Maintenance of European Graves in certain Foreign Countries: 36th Annual
32 Captain Tasman Millington, the curator for the IWGC on Gallipoli.
1953. The issue of Turkish visitors to the British memorial at Hellas and to the Gallipoli Peninsula in general is of
interest. It raised fears of challenges to the memories of the British 29th Division, and the Anzacs. Perhaps, more
significantly, it pointed to a vested interest by Turks in the area, and to how early that interest was first demonstrated;
There is valuable discussion on the Turkish monument at the Nek in Don Mackay, ‘Sépulture Perpétuelle’ 83-85, and
photograph, following 84.
New Zealand Dido class cruiser *HMNZS Black Prince* called at Anzac Cove. Many of the New Zealand crew made their way to the heights of Chunuk Bair to take part in a combined British – New Zealand – Turkish ceremony. The commander of the *HMNZS Black Prince* laid a wreath to the Turk forces at their memorial at the Nek. This was an important forerunner to today’s Anzac Day Chunuk Bair services.

In August, the ceremonies were even more splendid. From 10-12 August there was another important Turkish Ex-Servicemen’s pilgrimage to the Dardanelles, the high point of which was an impressive ceremony at the site of the new Turkish memorial. A large party of local students accompanied the military and ex-service representatives. In September, Ambassador Sir Knox Helm and his family visited the Dardanelles for five days. His comprehensive report touched on sensitive matters. Some are encountered today: the difficulties in getting to Gallipoli; dealing with Turkish officialdom; petty officialdom faced by Tasman Millington, the Australian manager of the IWGC over travel between cemeteries (making it necessary to approach Cevat Açıkalyon, Turkey’s Secretary-General, Foreign Affairs); the presence of Turkish military near Anzac Cove; and the debt owed to the IWGC for the care of cemeteries and linking paths. These matters go to the heart of Anzac issues about care of the Gallipoli graves, access to them and ownership of the land. Despite inconveniences, Ambassador Helm was deeply moved by the visit: ‘I came across the names of fellows with whom I had been at school…It was all so beautifully peaceful and I will never forget our visit at sunset to… Shrapnel Valley [Gulley] a few yards from the

34 TNA WK 1851/27, (1853/29/53) Sir Knox Helm, British Embassy, Ankara, to Sir George Young FO London, 30 Nov. 1953, Sir Knox Helm, recently appointed British Ambassador, wrote: ‘There was a ceremony at the New Zealand memorial in July [1953] when HMNZS Black Prince anchored off the Peninsula on its way back from the Istanbul visit, and several hundreds of the crew went ashore. The Turks even sent detachments, and Major Tasman Millington made all the arrangements in conjunction with the Turks.’


36 TNA WK 1851/13, (1855/42/53). Leslie Pott, British Consulate-General, Istanbul, to Marquis of Salisbury, FO London, 18 Aug. 1953. The memorial was the Çanakkale Martyrs’ Memorial, Çanakkale Şehitler Abidesi, two km from Morto Bay. The British consulate reporter described the occasion as ‘the 38th anniversary of what the Turks celebrate as their victory of Anfarta, or Suvla Bay.’ He observed that among the 450 who attended (much the same number as in 1952), many were younger. His report stresses the commemorative nature of the event, and the hope was expressed that in 1954 the event might be of even greater scale and include representatives from Australia and New Zealand.

37 TNA WK 1851/15 A.C. Maby FO to F.B. Cooper, Australia House London. The matter of requests from the Turkish First Army for representation from the Anzac nations was reiterated.


beach at Anzac Cove.40 During these visits, the work of memorial building for the Turks was continuing. British observers expressed doubt that the enterprise might not be finished for some time.41 In the event, the Çanakkale Martyrs’ Memorial (Çanakkale Şehitler Abidesi) on Eskihisarlik (Old Fortress) Point, designed by Turkish architects Feridun Kip, Doğan Erginbaş and İsmail Utkular, was officially opened in 1960 (and modified in 2004).42

Çanakkale Martyrs’ Memorial (Çanakkale Şehitler Abidesi) on Eskihisarlik (Old Fortress Point). Photograph looking towards the north-east with a background of the hills behind Çanakkale across the Straits. G.F. Davis photograph, 21 April 2007.

The building of this significant monument was as important for Turkish memory as the Australian War Memorial in Canberra was for Australians, or the national War Memorial and Carillon was for New Zealanders. Moreover, the striking physical presence of this monument stirred, and continues to move Anzacs and Turks alike despite the reservations expressed in the 1950s by representatives of the IWGC.

41 Sir Knox Helm, British Embassy, Ankara, to Sir George Young FO London, WK 1851/27 (1853/29/53), 30 Nov. 1953 expressed doubt that it would be ready, even in 1954.
42 Göncü and Aldoğan, Çanakkale Muharebe, 175.
Plans were made for a 1954 tour of Turkish soldiers through New Zealand to involve them on Anzac Day. The New Zealand Government made arrangements for a party to come as its guests, instructing various departments by Cabinet directive. This was evidence of awareness of a change in policy by Turkey encouraging its representation in western nations. Although invited in October 1953, it was not until March 1954 that the Turkish Government replied, and acceptance was cabled via the New Zealand High Commissioner in London. The party of four Turkish officers went on a whistle-stop tour from Auckland to Wellington to Invercargill and returning to Wellington with 11 stops for ceremonies. In Wellington, on Anzac Day, the Turkish Delegation provided five official wreaths. The whole event was judged an enormous success: it received extensive newspaper coverage. The *New Zealand Herald* on 27 April headlined a story ‘Turkish Officers Become Anzacs,’ and detailed the welcome given in Auckland by the Returned Services’ Association and the Gallipoli Association. The president of the Gallipoli Association, J. H. West told the Turkish officers that they could call themselves ‘Anzacs and Diggers.’

There were some deeply moving moments: in Dunedin the presentation of a Turkish flag taken on Gallipoli by New Zealanders, and the tour was marked by a mutual exchange of stories based on Gallipoli memories. The Turkish officers tried to explain the position of Onsekiz Mart as their victory day. The report in a Dunedin newspaper was convoluted, indicating that the

---

43 ANZ IA 1 W2578, 152/1200. Turkish Delegation, Anzac Day, 1953, 6 Oct. 1953, C.M. (53) 50. Anzac Day 1954 visit of Turkish Delegation. Reports Cabinet decision of 5 Oct. 1953, C.P.(53)1025, which directed that ‘an invitation be extended to the Turkish Government to send a party of four from the Turkish Forces stationed in Korea to participate in the Anzac Day ceremonies in New Zealand in 1954’, and further that the members of the delegation would be guests of the Government during their stay.

44 ANZ AAYT 8490 NI 22/9/5 Part 2. Ceremonials Anzac Day 1929-1952, 6 Oct. 1953. Visit of Turkish Delegation 1954. Foss Shanahan Cabinet Secretary to Secretary Ministry of Defence ‘cabinet considered the matter and ‘directed that an invitation be extended to the Turkish Government to send a party of four from the Turkish Forces stationed in Korea to participate in Anzac Day ceremonies in New Zealand in 1954. Cabinet decided that the members of the delegation would be treated as guests of the Government during their stay in New Zealand.’

45 ANZ IA 152/1200, Shanahan to Chief of General Staff, cc. Ministry of Defence, Secretary Internal Affairs, 12 Mar. 1954. Of the party of four, Colonel Cemal Madanoglu and Captain Orhan Ayddmir needed a translator, while Major Halim Kural and Captain Sinasi Capar could understand English. The party was to arrive by TEAL (Tasman Empire Airways Limited) at Auckland 22 Apr., departing from Wellington Friday 30 Apr.; Albert Szaszy, a 29 year old Hungarian, was chosen from the panel of translators in the Department of Internal Affairs.

46 *New Zealand Herald*, 27 Apr. 1954, ANZ IA 1 Acc W2578, 152/1200 cutting.

47 Other examples: ANZ IA 1 Acc W2578, 152/1200. Colonel Cemal Madanoglu to anonymous letter writer, unattributed clipping, Madanoglu’s responses to an anonymous letters writer admitting being emotionally moved when visiting Australian graves at Gallipoli; ANZ IA 1 Acc W2578, 152/1200 cutting *Weekly News*, 5 May 1954, photographs of the group paying tribute at the Cenotaph for Auckland’s Anzac Day; ANZ IA 1 Acc W2578, 152/1200 cutting *NZFL*, 5 May 1954; meeting New Zealand Victoria Cross winners, C.R.G. Bassett and J. Crichton, and laying wreaths at the cenotaphs in all towns they visited.


reporter had difficulty understanding the dates and the meaning for the Turks.\textsuperscript{50} In Wellington
when the delegation visited the local branch of the Gallipoli Association the toast was curiously,
‘The Turkish Empire.’\textsuperscript{51} When the Turkish officers visited the country town of Dannevirke, the
story of a pay-book retrieved from the body of a dead Turkish soldier at Gallipoli was related by
New Zealand historian, W.H. Oliver.\textsuperscript{52} Some of the papers carried in-depth coverage of the event
and its meaning. The Turkish delegation leader cabled from Sydney a message of appreciation:
‘Your hospitality shown us deeply appreciated we shall never forget green New Zealand God
bless you.’\textsuperscript{53} The successful visit generated much newspaper comment nationally.\textsuperscript{54}

A year later, the fortieth anniversary of the landing, had added significance for the Turkish people
because it was the year of the unveiling of the new Turkish Martyrs’ Memorial.\textsuperscript{55} The Turks had
invited Anzac friends for what was described as a ‘Generals’ Pilgrimage.’ It was their plan that a
small group would travel from unveiling the new Turkish memorial at Gallipoli to Ankara after
Anzac Day. The Australians saw this differently, and advertised the venture as the
‘Commemorative World Tour, 1955.’\textsuperscript{56} \textit{The Times} confidently stated that the 40\textsuperscript{th}
anniversary was to be ‘marked by the arrival of Australian and New Zealand pilgrims to revive old
memories.’\textsuperscript{57} In the event, no New Zealanders participated because of the National Government’s
unwillingness to waive currency restrictions.\textsuperscript{58} Nevertheless, the trip was judged a great success.
The Turkish General Staff, led by General Karabelen welcomed the Anzac Australian and British
pilgrims when they landed at Eceabat, and accompanied them to cemeteries and battlefields on
the Peninsula, engaging in the ceremonies.\textsuperscript{59} On their arrival in Istanbul, they were received with
full military honours at the Dolmabache Pier. After luncheon provided by the Turkish First
Army, a delegation of Anzacs placed a wreath on the nearby monument to the Turkish Republic

\textsuperscript{50} ANZ IA 1 Acc W2578, 152/1200 cutting, Dunedin \textit{Evening Star}, 27 Apr. 1954. The report stated: ‘There was an
equivalent of Anzac Day in Turkey to honour the Turkish dead in the battle for Gallipoli. This was held on April 19.
One month before that the day was set aside as a ‘victory day,’ commemorating the Turkish victory over British and
French naval units.’
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid, Manawatu \textit{Evening News}, 26 Apr. 1954.
\textsuperscript{53} ANZ 152/1200, 11 May 1954, E.D. McCabe General Secretary NZRSA to Rt. Hon. P.M., Wellington.
\textsuperscript{54} ANZ IA 1 Acc W2578, 152/1200 cuttings. Wellington \textit{Evening News}, 24 Apr. 1954; Christchurch \textit{Star-Sun} 24 Apr.
\textsuperscript{55} Çanakkale Şehitler Abidesi (Çanakkale Martyrs’ Memorial at Old Fortress Point).
\textsuperscript{56} NAA, A5954/69-1507/7, Anzac Day Pilgrimage to Gallipoli, 1955.
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{The Times}, 26 Apr. 1955, 15.
\textsuperscript{58} NAA, A5954/69-1507/7 Australian External Affairs to Australian High Commission, London, 21 Mar. 1955.
\textsuperscript{59} \textit{The Times}, 26 Apr. 1955, 15.
Sir George Holland, RSL national President and leader of the pilgrims with a delegation of ten flew to Ankara, where they stayed for two days as the guests of the Turkish General Staff.60

Those who remained behind in Istanbul were accorded guest privileges and requested by the Turkish Minister of National Defence, Edhem Menderes, to remain an extra day to observe military manoeuvres. The trip was made poignant by the Turkish military gift of a vase made of clay from the Gallipoli battlefields to representatives of the Anzacs. The visit to the various cemeteries and hills overlooking Suvla Bay and Anzac Beach was full of memories, and many recognised the spots where they had been wounded. Many Turkish officers who fought were present, and there was opportunity for the exchange of reminiscences.61

There were local instances of the generally good relations between Turks and Anzacs. Dr Ismet Eryetishir, while studying at the Otago Medical School, New Zealand, attended the 1957 Dunedin Anzac Day dawn ceremony.62 In 1959, Akif Keskin, the proprietor of the Dunedin Istanbul restaurant, and a Bosnian, Adem Ferhatovich, attended the ceremony and laid a wreath on behalf of the Turkish community. This was the beginning of 17 years of association by Keskin with Dunedin Anzac Day and the local RSA.63 Each year until departing for overseas in 1976, Keskin provided a special Turkish lunch for Gallipoli veterans and officials of the Dunedin RSA and Gallipoli Veterans’ Association. In 1965, he accompanied the veterans on the 50th anniversary tour to Gallipoli. He returned for a brief visit in 1982, and made a point of visiting his surviving RSA friends.64

The cordial relations between Turkish and Anzac veterans can only be appreciated when seen within the changing international currents affecting Turkey. The outburst of official Turkish Anzac Day and allied activity in the mid-1950s was the outcome of political motivation. The Turkish government had successfully realised realignment with the aid of western agencies. The Truman Doctrine of 1947, membership of the OECD in 1948 and the Council of Europe in 1949, and admission to NATO in 1952 had all played a part in fulfilling the Turkish government’s

60 NAA A1200, L34134, 1960. Sir George Holland, national President of the RSL, photograph; see Chapter One for Paul Holland with his grandfather’s photograph.
61 The Times, 28 Apr. 1955, 10.
64 This writer had the privilege of meeting and talking with Akif Keskin in 1973 at his home at ‘Salisbury,’ North Taieri, Dunedin; ODT 23 Apr. 1982, 1. The last record of attendance by Akif Keskin was when he visited Dunedin in 1982.
policies and in doing so provided a platform from which Turkey could more fully engage with the Anzacs and the British over matters of sacrifice and commemoration. Old enmities could be publicly set aside and these reciprocal gestures of the mid-1950s were analogous with the general Turkish desire to seek protection through an alignment with the West from perceived Soviet threats. For western nations, particularly the USA, Turkey’s security had two functions: to protect the post-war European Recovery Plan by ensuring the continued flow of Middle East oil, and as a buffer state preventing Soviet expansion towards the Mediterranean. Also, for Europe, Turkey was the key bridge to communication with Middle Eastern Islamic states. Within this framework Anzac Days in Gallipoli or Australasia (involving Turk nationals) were small but by no means unimportant fragments. They were symbolic of a larger picture dominated by powerful western forces keen to see the small pieces, like Anzac Day, played out. Anzac commemorations became a platform for the celebration of friendship and alliance.

A severe dent to Turkish relations with the West came with the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962-1963. Placing Jupiter missiles on Turkey’s soil provided security against the depredations of its old enemy, Russia. Unlike some European nations, who rejected the placing of American missiles in their territories, Turkey found comfort in them. In another way this confirmed confidence in the Turks as reliable guardians of nuclear equipment. When the United States agreed to remove the missiles on Turkish soil in exchange for a promise by the Soviet Union to not install missiles in Cuba, the Turks were dismayed and many questioned the value of aligning with the West.65 Bruce Kuniholm wrote that it was important for the Turks to participate in the process and share control [of the displacement of NATO missiles]. He maintained ‘The Turks saw the Jupiters as symbols of the alliance’s determination to use atomic weapons against a Soviet attack on Turkey.’66 The fallout from this event was still being felt when a crisis broke over events in Cyprus. A constitutional breakdown had occurred in the new Republic of Cyprus, a country with a majority Greek Cypriot population. There had been a long background of

65 Yüsel Bozdağoğlu, Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity – a Constructivist Approach, Routledge, New York, 2003, 61-67. There were calls within Turkey following this crisis for a revision of foreign policy towards the West, seeking a non-aligned status. By 1965, conflicts about the future of Cyprus turned the always troubled relationship with Greece sour. This seriously impacted on Turkish – NATO - Western European relations. The Cyprus troubles spilled over into the 1970s and erupted again, this time more seriously, just prior to the 1975 Gallipoli Pilgrimage. This second Cyprus crisis led Turkey to intervene on the island, and the adverse reaction by the western powers created a backwash in Turkey, which made political leaders temporarily seek détente with the Soviets.
conflict between the forces for enosis which called for union with Greece and those for taksim which fought for partition of the Turkish part of the island. Following breakdown of talks and outbreak open conflict a United Nations Peacekeeping Force was sent to Cyprus. Turkey’s involvement in this matter continued until 1967 when tensions on the island subsided.67

On the fiftieth anniversary of the Canakkale battles, significant for both Anzac Day and Onsekiz Mart, there were many reports of the Anzac veteran’s pilgrimage to Gallipoli. There was, however, little recognition of the Turkish role. In Turkish news reports and written material currently available in English there are few references to this important anniversary. The 1965 Jubilee Pilgrimage to Gallipoli was much anticipated by the Anzac nations. It was timely, as it occurred at that cusp in age when most veterans who went were healthy enough, before being touched by age-related disabilities or death. As most of the 30 Turkish veterans who attended and the party of original Anzac veterans were in their seventies, the statement recognises a degree of finality.68 For most, it would be their last pilgrimage. The Pilgrimage was not an unqualified success. Both New Zealand historian Mackay and Australian academic, Bruce Scates, list the difficulties that arose.69 Mackay cited reports of ‘organisational shambles [which] merely indicated hostility towards the much-maligned leader, Sir Raymond Huish.’70 He also compares the more perfunctory proceedings for the Australians with the more inclusive and imposing New Zealand ceremony for the eighty Kiwi visitors on top of Chunuk Bair where Pirimi Perarika Tahiwi led a powhiri in which women sang a waiata of lament.71 He also referred to the

---

67 Yüsel Bozdağlioğlu, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity – a Constructivist Approach*, Routledge, New York, 2003, 63. The United States’ position was spelled out by President Johnson, who warned of the expected step of Soviet intervention if Turkey sent forces to Cyprus. If that occurred then Turkey could not expect the support of NATO allies.

68 NAA 463/63, 1965/2297 Part 2, Anzac Jubilee Pilgrimage to Gallipoli. Two Australians died in Athens on the return trip home.

69 Bruce Scates, *Return to Gallipoli*, 125-129. Huish was the National President of the RSL, the same man who engineered the RSL capture of initiatives in the ADCC in 1934-1937.


71 Mackay, 305; *ODT*, 28 Apr. 1965, 6 reports that Tahiwi carried a ‘sacred greenstone mere lent by the Dominion Museum, Wellington, marched to the wreaths and laid the sacred heirloom for a brief moment on the flowers at the base of the obelisk. New Zealand women…sang a Maori lament that begins: ‘Oftimes beloved, your spirit visits me in my dreams, and embraces me fondly.’ The lovely air, quietly sung, was carried on the wind away beyond the hushed pilgrims’; KMA[Un-accessioned] Collection of Sister Mabel Crooks, RV 55, Box 36, B/AJ. New Zealanders visit Gallipoli on 50th anniversary of the Landing. The 1965 Gallipoli pilgrimage material was donated by the one woman [veteran] who went. Her descriptions of the events are detailed and useful. Also included was a datasheet on 16/304 Captain Pirimi Tahiwi; Philippa Mein Smith, *A Concise History of New Zealand*, 132, has a small photograph of Captain Tahiwi at Sling Camp in Jul. 1916. At KMA in November 2007 there was a table stand document titled ‘Gallipoli Stories,’ which carried a biography and photograph of Captain Tahiwi.
difficulties caused to making plans by the arrival of a new Turkish government in February 1965. Mackay comments on the unwanted consequences of an attempt by a Turkish film crew to shoot a re-enactment of part of the campaign. What he found disturbing was the digging and reconstruction in some of the trenches, not to mention the ‘newly bulldozed road across Anzac Cove.’ A strange atmosphere of exclusion was felt at other places on Gallipoli. At Helles, eighteen Britons, gathered to commemorate Gallipoli Day, held a quiet ceremony without a single Turk representative present.

Scates, representing an Australian view, sees the matter differently. Many, despite the pledge by the Commonwealth Government to subsidise the fare, found the £800 unaffordable. Some diggers found it hard to identify the localities ‘Erosion had blunted the nose of the Sphinx…’ forests had been planted, the Anzac Cove shoreline had been cut away, park-like and peaceful cemeteries had replaced war fields, and this landscape had been largely ‘cleansed of war.’ Scates observes that ‘their Gallipoli’ had all but vanished. He has little to say about the Turks apart from stating that they had planted forests and driven access roads to many of the cemeteries. In some places entire skeletons, ‘probably Turkish,’ were found. The welcoming party of assembled Turks were back from the shoreline. Confusion arose when a local photographer asked veterans to kiss one another (a well-accepted practice in Turkey but relatively unknown to 1965 Anzacs), and the fact that the Turks cheered when the pilgrims departed.

At a time when debates in Australia, and to a lesser extent in New Zealand, on Anzac Day reflected uncertainties generated by the Vietnam conflict, both countries’ regional newspapers reported the 1965 pilgrimage with headlines like ‘Pilgrims back at Lone Pine.’ The pilgrims were met by former enemies and distributed gifts, and exchanged ‘handshakes, hugs and kisses.’

Major-General Yusef Algenup, commander of the Turkish Second Army Corps received the

---

72 Mackay, 309.
73 Otago Daily Times, 27 Apr. 1965, 1: ‘Snubbed by Turks.’
74 Scates, 125.
75 Scates, 127.
76 Scates, 128.
77 Scates, 127; Archives New Zealand ABHS 950, Acc W4627, Box 1040, 29/1/10 Pt 4, Anzac Day observance 1/5/60 – 1/12/68. 11 May 1965 Ambassador Tokyo to Secretary External Affairs, Wellington, service at Australian Embassy, followed by short ceremony at Hodogaya, later screening of new Australian Film ‘ANZAC: A Nation’s Heritage,’ commemorating the 50th.
78 Sydney Morning Herald, 17 Apr. 1965, AWM Anzac Day Cuttings Box, 1965-1966. The morning paper ran a large headline ‘Can Anzac Day Survive?’ which prefaced a full-page discussion based on a survey of 4 respondents: an RSL leader, an ex-POW alderman, a headmistress and a university student.
leaders of the pilgrimage party. A translation of Atatürk’s 1934 statement was read to the pilgrims just before they boarded their buses at the Turkish Martyrs Memorial, to depart for Gallipoli. This action contrasts markedly with the analysis of the meanings and future of the day found at the centre of Anzac Day commemorations in Australia and New Zealand.

A slightly more benign but brief view of the 1965 events in Turkey was carried to the British public by The Times. The dearth of coverage for the 50th anniversary illuminates the decline in interest in the whole affair. On the other side of the world, despite difficulties for the aged Anzac travellers, the pilgrimage was a success. New Zealand papers trumpeted front page headlines of ‘Old Enemies Meet On Anzac Beach.’ It seems that Turkish preparations for the event had been last-minute: Turkish Army engineers had ‘sweated to complete the first passable dirt road into Anzac.’ More telling was the surprise expressed by Colonel Muammed [sic] Ozansay that the veterans had come so far, since from the Turkish point of view ‘it [Gallipoli] was a small victory.’ This was a rare glimpse of Turkish bafflement that the Anzacs would commemorate what was a sad defeat for them and a victory for the Turks. The present Turkish position is, however, that the Battle for Çanakkale was a most significant victory in the process of Turkish nation-building. Ozansay’s remark long preceded the much more assertive 1980 - 1990s period of debate over Turkey’s identity, particularly western-ness, which revived memories and re-interpreted her war victory in the process.

Retired Turkish General S. Selisik’s words were reported. He greeted the Anzacs as ‘gallant enemies,’ and welcomed them as ‘close friends and dear guests’ who were remembered as ‘faithful and loyal people to their countries.’ Memory was the predominant factor in the experience and it was supported by General Selisik’s address: ‘Today we pray for and cherish the memories of those who died in this campaign. May their souls rest in peace. We shall always

80 Ibid. The translation was closer to the Artuç version than the 1985 Anzac Cove monolith version.
81 The Times, 26 Apr. 1965, 8 the report covered the welcome, the re-enacted Dawn Landing by fifty Anzacs from the vessel Karadeniz, the Cape Helles disappointment with no Turkish representatives attending, the attendance by representatives of Canada, France and Germany, serviced in Whitehall and Bury, and a well-illustrated photographic display; KCL Hamilton papers: 7/9/21 30 Sept 1965, Return to Gallipoli BBC documentary on the veterans’ return in May 1965.
82 ODT, Monday, 26 Apr. 1965, 1; ODT, 28 Apr. 1965, 6, however, reveals conflicting reports of the visit to Gallipoli by the veterans and their supporters. The report headlined the complaints about the poor organisation of the trip, the comments by two VC winners describing the affair as ‘a shambles’ and the response by A.J. Lee, the Federal President of the RSL. At the end of the column was a positive report on the Chunuk Bair service where Piripi Tahiwi represented New Zealand Maori.
83 ODT, Monday, 26 Apr. 1965, 1.
cherish their bravery. I salute you on this memorable morning.’ The words encompassed the living and the dead.

Although this event was not reciprocated by Anzacs attending Onsekiz Mart celebrations, nor by further Australian or New Zealand government support for Turkish attendances at Anzac Day, the Turkish Government sent its nationals abroad to represent it at Anzac Day ceremonies. In 1964, the New Zealand Gallipoli Association made preparations for Turks to attend the fiftieth Anniversary celebrations to be held in Rotorua in 1965. The Holyoake Government was unwilling, however, to contribute to the enterprise. Despite the fact that appeals were made by the Gallipoli Association for Government help with organisation and finance, and that declarations of provisional understandings had existed with the Turkish authorities for some time, appeals were rejected. Prime Minister Holyoake did leave the door open for limited financial assistance, but only if the Turkish Government was prepared to help. His negative responses followed advice from J.D.L. Richards, the Secretary of External Affairs. Richards (who disagreed with the Turks visiting) was well aware of the Australian government’s opinion of the trip. The Australians would not place any impediment on the three-man Turk delegation visiting New Zealand, as long as they left after Australia’s Anzac Day. While diplomatic assistance might be offered by the Australian Government to aid the Turks to travel, financial assistance would not.

In the late 1960s Turkish immigrants began arriving to Australia in increasing numbers and began to integrate with Australian society. Conservative forces within the RSL state organisations resisted moves for Turks to take part in Anzac Day parades, but there were isolated cases of inclusion, to the point where some ex-Turkish Gallipoli veterans were not only included
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84 Ibid.
85 Ibid, 3. Simultaneously, Anzac Day was being commemorated internationally. News reports of it include accounts of ceremonies being held in Singapore, Tokyo and Jakarta.
88 Ibid, 26 Nov. 1964 PM. Holyoake to Secretary Gallipoli Association.
90 ANZ ABHS 950, Acc W4627, Box 1040, 29/1/10 Pt 4. Anzac Day observance 1/5/60-1/12/68. Restricted file: 10 Nov 1964 report from G.K. Ansell, High Commissioner, Canberra to New Zealand Secretary External Affairs; 4 Dec 1964 J.D.L. Richards Secretary of External Affairs to New Zealand High Commissioner Canberra regarding the possible visit of a Turkish party in 1965. Citing this material requires written assent - NZMFAT, Wellington.
91 Turkish Daily News, Istanbul, 17 Sept. 1998; feature topic, ‘Marking 30th anniversaries – Turkey’s and Australia’s good relations,’ which cites 40,000 Turkish citizens migrating to Australia since arrivals were allowed in 1968. (In 1999, there were about 100,000 people of Turkish heritage in Australia, some of the third generation).
in the parade, but were even made honorary members of local RSL or Gallipoli Legion Clubs.\textsuperscript{92}
This is the vanguard of a greater change which became more evident in Australia by the 1980s.

The mixed reception in the West to things Turkish continued in the early 1970s. In October 1971, HM Queen Elizabeth II was the second British monarch to visit Gallipoli memorials. She laid wreaths indicating ‘a lasting respect’ between Britain and Turkey.\textsuperscript{93} At the Atatürk Memorial a royal wreath of red and white carnations was laid – Turkey’s national colours.\textsuperscript{94} However, within a space of a few months any residual goodwill was dashed. \textit{The Times} headline blasted forth ‘Echoes of Gallipoli awakened by Davey case,’\textsuperscript{95} unfortunately conjoining the Gallipoli conflict and all its memories with a criminal trial caused by a British 14-year-old convicted of trading in hashish. \textit{The Times} correspondent in Istanbul, Eric Marsden, reflected on the British criticisms reacting to the punitive gaol sentence of a juvenile British subject by a Turkish court. The Turkish Prime Minister cancelled his planned visit to Britain. Spokesmen for the Republican People’s Party bluntly attributed the British reaction to the Turkish victory at Gallipoli in 1915: ‘They can never forget it.’\textsuperscript{96} Such incidents highlighted both the fragility of Turkey’s relationship with the West and the changeable atmosphere within which Gallipoli Anzac Days occurred.

In 1973, the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Forestry declared the Anzac area as part of the Historical National Park.\textsuperscript{97} The declaration of the Peninsula as the ‘Gelibolu Peninsula Historical National Park’ [HNP] raised interest in the area and resulted in the 1980s in the Turks building more than twenty monuments within the HNP.\textsuperscript{98} This is placed in context when it is realised that the Turkish war dead on the Peninsula numbered over 82,000, and are commemorated in 55 cemeteries and monuments. The allies lost just over 42,000 and have 36 cemeteries and monuments.

\textsuperscript{92} AWM Anzac Day Souvenirs, Collection RC00069, Subseries: Celebrations-concerts and dinners, 1916-1992, 1916-1918, 1/1/1; \textit{The Gallipoli Legion Gazette} Vol. 6, No 5. May 1965. Published by the Gallipoli Legion Club, Sydney 1965, 10-11 (photograph), records the presence of ‘respected Turkish honorary member – our Turkish Delight – Ali Reschad.’
\textsuperscript{93} \textit{The Times}, 23 Oct. 1971, 3. Her wreaths encompassed all the national adversaries in the campaign; Ibid, 4 Sept. 1936, 12, for the visit of Edward VIII.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid, 23 Oct. 1971, 3.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid, 7 Mar. 1972, 6.
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid, 7 Mar. 1972, 6. Report of the reaction by Turhan Özguner, Republican Peoples’ Party [Atatürk’s original party]. \textit{The Times}’ columnist thought the British news media ‘treated the case in an undesirable way and had carried immoderate reports which offended Turks.’
\textsuperscript{98} Ibid, 20.
In 1974, there was a further setback in relations with the west as a result of Turkey’s military intervention in Cyprus. This act was in response to the Athens-inspired coup in which the relatively moderate Archbishop Makarios was ousted by Colonel Grivas and his National Organisation of Cypriot Fighters [EOKA-B]. 99 This latter group established the ‘Hellenic republic of Cyprus’ and was bent on union with Greece. Following a Turkish reprisal in August, the USA embargoed transfers of military equipment to Turkey (effective February 1975). This was reciprocated by the Turks refusing to accept any more American military installations in Turkey (effective July 1975). 100 It was in this atmosphere of international tension that the 1975 pilgrimage proceeded. A world away, in New Zealand and Australia, while Anzac Day suffered a dip in public awareness, there were reports on Anzac Day abroad. In Dunedin, on the 60th anniversary of the Gallipoli landing a local report read: ‘Dardanelles - A group of some 70 Australian and New Zealand war veterans crossed the chilly Dardanelles at dawn yesterday to pay homage to those who died in the abortive campaign of 1915.’ 101

The Turkish Ambassador in London, Turget Memencioğlu, laid a wreath at the annual ceremony at the London Cenotaph in 1975. 102 This was the first time that a Turkish national had taken part in the London service. Other Anzac Day services were held ‘in a number of other European centres.’ 103 A testament to the loss of traction for Anzac Day in Turkey comes from the fact that neither Stephen Clarke in 1994 nor Bruce Scates in 2006 mentioned the 1975 pilgrimage. 104 However, within a few years the landscape of current opinion changed and commemorations were revived.

A decade later, the 70th year Pilgrimage took place in a current of an international revival of interest in war graves and commemorative issues. The 1981 Peter Weir film Gallipoli aroused deep and lasting interest. Radio and television in New Zealand and Australia broadcast live Dawn Parades and morning services. Evening programmes evoked memories of special feats associated

101 ODT, 26 Apr. 1975, 5, the ‘Weekend Magazine’ carries the story of ‘Gallipoli’s Simpson and his donkey.’ There is no mention of the Turkish contribution.
102 ODT, 23 Apr. 1975, 7.
103 Ibid.
104 Stephen Clarke, ‘The One Day of the Year’; Bruce Scates, Return to Gallipoli.
with war.\textsuperscript{105} On this 10\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War, other memories not specifically related to Anzac Day predominated. Headlines drew attention to powerful and revived images of the Vietnam War with ‘Anger, bitterness at My Lai.’\textsuperscript{106}

The 1985 Gallipoli ceremony, at the re-named Anzac Cove, was attended by eight Australian veterans and three Turks who had survived the battles. The Turkish Government was represented by Abdullah Tenekeci. He noted that the 1915 contact had given rise to ‘a lasting friendship’ which he hoped would encourage other nations in conflict. One of the Turkish survivors, Adil Sahin, recalled memories of the sky being lit by exploding shells with the approach of the allied fleet. He also remembered ‘Turks had thrown raisins and fruits to the Anzac trenches and [had] received cigarettes and biscuits in return.’\textsuperscript{107} Peter Liddel’s \textit{Gallipoli 1915: Pens, pencils and cameras at war} evoked a more dramatic memory: he cited New Zealand soldier Cecil Malthus who had written about Quinn’s Post at Gallipoli where adversaries seven yards apart hurled bombs at each other: ‘To lie cowering in the darkness of this cramped and evil-smelling pit and watch a big bomb spluttering among the corpses…waiting for the burst, was an experience no man could endure unmoved.’\textsuperscript{108} These contrary meanings reflected different epistemologies. For the Turks, Gallipoli provided a bridge to modernity and the West. For old Anzac soldiers it signified mateship and service to a changing and shrinking imperial world.

**Reciprocal monuments**

In 1985, the Turkish Government commissioned and built the Anzac Cove monolith to all the victims of the Gallipoli campaign. It is inscribed with the skilful reworking of Atatürk’s 1934 message, as discussed earlier. In 1984, the Australian government had approached the Turkish government with a proposal to rename Ari Burnu ‘Anzac Cove,’ in memory of the Australian and New Zealand troops who had died there. The agreement reached included mutual monument building in each nation’s territory. Monument building has elements of naming. It confirms that

\begin{footnotes}
\item[105] \textit{ODT}, 24 Apr. 1985, 25, TVNZ and Radio Programmes: TVOne 6.30 a.m. Anzac Day Dawn Parade, TV Two 12 noon, Lancaster; Radio programmes 4YA 5.30 a.m. Anzac Morning, 6.33 a.m. Anzac Dawn Service, 11.30 a.m. Songs for Anzac Day, 4YC 12.30 p.m. War Requiem. Two days before Anzac Day TV Two in the ‘Tuesday Documentary’ filmed \textit{Soldiers’ Fortune}, about the difficulties New Zealand soldiers had with resettlement into civilian life.
\item[106] \textit{ODT} Weekend Magazine, 27 Apr. 1985, 15. A Brian Williams story of the massacre on 16 Mar. 1968, the establishment of the museum at Son Tinh and visits to the site by 500,000 people since the end of the Vietnam War in April 1975.
\item[107] \textit{The Times}, 26 Apr. 1985, 7, Rasit Gurdilek, ‘Pilgrimage by Australian and Turkish survivors.’
\end{footnotes}
a territory, at least for the life of the monument, was dedicated to those named on it. It is also exclusive. Unless the words on or design of the monument include others, it becomes particular to those named. Elements of possession and exclusion are to be found in the debate over the construction of the Wellington Atatürk monument at Tarakina Bay.

The Wellington Atatürk monument was unveiled on Anzac Day 1990. Maclean and Phillips describe the circumstances and the conflicts surrounding the building of the Wellington Atatürk memorial. Some other points are worth noting. The monument, in the shape of the Turkish crescent, marked a new direction for the Wellington landscape. In plan view, it represents the Turkish flag. Therefore, it is a point of reference for Turks to their national anthem, ‘İstiklal Marşı’ (Independence March). This matter is not recognised by the Australasian public. Maclean and Phillips controversially claim its construction was ‘an act of atonement for our invasion of another country.’ This is not an acceptable rationalisation. The word ‘atonement’ indicates an act of apology. Given the place of New Zealand in the British Empire in 1915, and the understandings of that era, and the much later building of the memorial it more likely was an act of mutual understanding - more holding out the olive branch than seeking forgiveness for past errors. The monument makes a contrast with older monuments to ‘Our Glorious Dead,’ or Anzac soldiers’ ‘Heroic Sacrifice.’ This monument is both outward and forward looking, and a recall of memory; it establishes a new direction. Memory is not disregarded, for Atatürk’s well-known words (1985 version) are inscribed on the sloped brown marble above the Turkish national star on the base.

As with most memorials there was considerable controversy both over its construction and the site on which it was placed. Because the site, Tarakina Bay, was the location of an old Maori pa of the Ngai Tara chief, Tutere Moana, the Wellington Maori Council objected. Wellington’s Greeks and Cypriots objected on the basis of Turk incursion into Cyprus in 1974, and subsequent occupation despite a UN demand to withdraw. The memorial was unveiled by Lutfullah
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111 See footnote 1 of this chapter and references to the flag.

112 Ibid, 167.

113 The Atatürk memorial had ‘Turks Out’ written in the wet concrete of the base - a clear reference to the occupation of Cyprus, Maclean and Phillips, 166; ODT, 24 Apr. 1990, 4; John Armstrong details the debate between the Wellington Greek Cypriot community and the Turkish representatives. The amity between Turk and Anzac was not
Kayalar, Turkish Minister of Agriculture. What is equally important is the matter of reciprocity. The memorial was a distinct and unique response to the two gestures by the Turkish Ministry of Forests: honouring the Anzacs by renaming Ari Burnu as Anzac Cove; and the building of the monolith at Anzac Cove with the placatory words of Atatürk (1985 version). This sense of reciprocity survived its critics and continued as evidenced by actions five years later.

**Anzac Day at Gallipoli in the 1990s**

NATO ally Turkey was now described as ‘one of the great powers on the international stage,’ whose ‘proud traditions and...inherent fighting capabilities [were] able to be marshalled by any competent commander.’ Politically, the presence of heads of state and world–wide satellite coverage at Gallipoli pointed to a significant change in the meaning of Anzac Day. From this point, it would be obligatory to consider the part played in the development of the day by the Turkish people. In a similar act of recognition, the first *International Symposium on the Battles of Çanakkale* was held in Ankara in March 1990.

On the 75th anniversary of the landings, international focus on Anzac Day activities had shifted to Gallipoli. Prime Minister Bob Hawke led the Australian party, while the New Zealand Government delegation was led by Head of State, Governor-General Sir Paul Reeves. The New Zealand Chief of Defence Staff accompanied by 50 service personnel formed a guard of honour at the ceremonies. The RSA canvassed its membership for applicants to attend, with ‘on land’ costs paid by the successful attendees (with the proviso that the NZ Government would meet the travel costs of the three World War I veterans). In the event, 97-year-old Fred Rogers of Invercargill was the only original Anzac in the New Zealand delegation to attend.

felt by the Wellington Greek-Cypriot community: their memories were too recent. Headlines in New Zealand newspapers carried headlines: ‘Secrecy on unveiling of Atatürk Memorial.’


115 *ODT*, 26 Apr. 1990, 8.

116 Mark Baker, ‘Gallipoli: from horror to national dazzle,’ *The Age* [Melbourne], 19 Feb. 2005. [www.theage.com.au](http://www.theage.com.au) Accessed 28 Nov. 2007. In 2002, Turkish Consul-General Hasan Asan marched with the members of the Melbourne Turkish contingent and Victorian State Premier, Steve Bracks, and other dignitaries stood in their honour. Since 1996, Turkish army veterans have had their own RSL sub-branch, and every year led a Turkish contingent in that city’s Anzac Day parade. This reveals a great change in the Australian landscape, one in which the memories of the Turkish defenders can be recognised on Anzac Day.

117 *International Symposium on the Battles of Çanakkale*, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, 8-9 Mar. 1990. The organiser was Dr Ahmet Mete Tunçoku, a leading international scholar of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.
For the first time, heralding a new age, live television coverage broadcast the Dawn Service from Anzac Cove. The images were fuzzy, and the sound quality poor, but most New Zealanders and Australians saw the impact of Anzac Day as it happened in the place of its conception.\footnote{ODT 24 Apr. 1990, 27: TVNZ One 2.15 p.m. : ‘Gallipoli 1990 Dawn Service: A joint New Zealand/Australian dawn service live by satellite from Gallipoli to mark the 75th anniversary…Commentator: [General] Sir Leonard Thornton.’ At 10.45 pm the same station beamed by satellite the Chunuk Bair service. NZTV Two at 8.30pm played the Peter Weir film \textit{Gallipoli}; \textit{ODT} 26 Apr. 1990, 1, report on the Anzac Cove service where about 10,000 attended.} This was a powerful, influential and moving moment in the history of Anzac Days. Later in the morning, the official commemorative ceremony was held at the Çanakkale Martyrs’ Memorial for Turkish war dead at Eskai Hissarlik. Turkish President Halil Turgut Özal gave the welcoming address, which was responded to by the New Zealand Maori Governor General, Sir Paul Reeves, the highest ranking Anzac official present. Sir Paul dwelt on the place of Gallipoli as ‘a milestone along the unending road that leads towards a New Zealand identity or nationhood.’\footnote{Halil Turgut Özal was the eighth President of the Republic of Turkey, 9 Nov. 1989 to his death in office, 17 Apr. 1993; \textit{Turkish Daily News},[Istanbul], 17 Sept. 1998, ‘Marking 30th anniversaries–Turkey’s and Australia’s good relations.’ www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/archives; \textit{ODT} 22 Apr. 1993, 8; editorial on the sudden death of President Turgut Özal. He visited New Zealand in 1991 with a party of 100 and was the first Turkish leader to come to New Zealand. In 1991, Özal was honoured during a State visit to Australia with the Order of Australia; \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 26 Apr. 1990, 2.} The sole New Zealand Anzac present, 97 year-old Fred Rogers, who ‘capture[d] the heart of the nation, received a 1990 Commemorative Medal and in response directed attention to the Turkish people whom he said helped in no mean way to make the memorial service such a success. He wore a tie displaying the Turkish emblems of star and crescent, and spoke movingly of his respect for the Turkish people.\footnote{Invercargill \textit{Southland Times}, 23 Apr. 1990, 4; \textit{ODT}, 27 Apr. 1990, 7.} By doing so, he drew local Çanakkale and world attention to the Anzac debt to the Turks for hosting Anzac Day services. On the world stage, this was an act of inclusion which confirmed the centrality of Turkish memory. He also referred to the ‘loved ones’ - his mate Alec Black whom he buried at Anzac Cove on the day of the landing, and to finding Alec’s name on the plaque of the New Zealand Memorial at Chunuk Bair. His name and Alec’s are reference points in personal and national memory found in the location of a friendly country. The location of the once disputed Turkish memorial, was transformed to a universal commemorative place. Turkish and Anzac memories coalesced.

Turkish academic, Ahmet Mete Tunçoku was present at Anzac Cove at the 1990 dawn service, and saw events from a different perspective. He recalled:
I was deeply touched when I observed the excitement and tearful eyes of those old soldiers landing in boats on the coast of Gallipoli before dawn just as it had been 75 years ago. But, this time, they were greeted by their Turkish friends with embraces and gifts and flowers. It was an unforgettable scene for all of us…

[A] pall of melancholy and sorrow hung over everything. Interestingly enough, there was no enmity or anger…You could have thought they were old friends who had just met after a very long time…

On that day, I met a very old Turkish veteran and an Anzac veteran standing side by side. The Turkish veteran was trying to stand up straight with the help of his walking stick. The old Anzac was looking round with tears in his eyes. Surely, both of them were thinking of the terrible days of the war and of the friends they had lost. At one moment, I saw the Turkish veteran gently putting his conspicuously veined big boned hand on the shoulder of the Anzac who, weeping silently, watched the hills and slopes. I remained speechless and rooted to the spot… This scene was the obvious expression of the meaning of the Çanakkale battles. Evidently, the veteran was trying to tell his friend through that touch, what he was unable to put into words.

This personal Turkish view strips away the panoply of state and draws closer to the personal memories of death, mourning and commemorative matters. It is a simple anecdote, and as with Anzac Fred Roger’s recall of his lost mate Alec Black, the deepest currents of Anzac Day commemoration are exposed. Both of these examples clearly illustrate the deepest and most enduring current of commemoration. They both demonstrate the essential bond of universal fidelity which is at the heart of Anzac Day observances.

From the mid-1990s Anzac Day broadly encompassed meanings about reconciliation. Indeed, each year signalled a greater awareness of and involvement by Turkey in Anzac Day. Each year saw great increases in numbers visiting Gallipoli, and not just for Anzac Day. Despite tremors in the relationship with the West a cordial and high-level relationship was maintained, with activities timed to coincide with Anzac Day. In April 1996 a New Zealand Parliamentary delegation visited Ankara. The delegation was accorded full guest status and called on...
President Demirel and Prime Minister Mesut Yılmaz. They were taken to Gallipoli and hosted by Governor Husnu Tuglu. The visit raised New Zealand’s profile and coincided with the formation of the new coalition government in Turkey. A reciprocal invitation to the Turkish Speaker, Mustafa Kalemi was made to visit New Zealand, a New Zealand Friendship Group was established in the Turkish Parliament, and the event caught media attention. New Zealand Minister of Agriculture Philip Burdon’s report on 1996 Gallipoli Anzac Day recommended greater ministerial involvement because of the increased response of the Turkish Government. He wrote:

the ceremony at the Turkish National Monument at Cape Helles was a much grander event than previously, lasting well over an hour with a full military salute, national anthems and a large turnout of local dignitaries. The Turkish Government has also lifted its representation: this year it was the new Governor of Canakkale Province. There was extensive coverage in the local media of the various commemorations. The Turkish authorities included a separate ceremony for the 57th Regiment (Ataturk’s own regiment) that was annihilated in the fighting, and I sense this may now be permanently on the Gallipoli commemoration agenda.\textsuperscript{124}

Peter Tapsell, Speaker of the New Zealand House of Representatives suggested that Kenan Celik, a lecturer at 18 March University Canakkale, be sponsored to visit New Zealand.\textsuperscript{125} In August and September 1996 initiatives were discussed of the possibility of a visit to Turkey by the Governor-General of New Zealand as Head of State. A month later, discussions were held regarding the matter of President Suleyman Demirel’s desire to see the Gallipoli Peninsula declared a World Peace Park.\textsuperscript{126} In that year also, Turkish army veterans began their own RSL sub-branch in Melbourne and lead a Turkish contingent in the Anzac Day parade.\textsuperscript{127} In early 1997, the New Zealand Government was discussing a joint production with Turkey of a 1998 commemorative Anzac stamp. This reached a satisfactory resolution in April 1998, with the joint issue of two commemorative stamps.\textsuperscript{128} New Zealanders were involved in the judging of the

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid, Ankara C01031/ANK to Wellington; Philip Burdon’s Report on 1996 Gallipoli Celebrations.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid, 12 Jun. 1996; Peter Tapsell, Speaker of the New Zealand House of Representatives to John Crawford Defence HQ Wellington. There was an encouraging response with the only difficulty being raising funds for Celik’s trip and stay. This was overcome by the Trustees of the QE II Military Museum in Waiouru being prepared to act as the ‘sponsoring body’ for the venture. Unfortunately, Tapsell was not able to see the project to fruition, being defeated in the October election. Celik was interviewed by this writer on 17 Apr. 2007 in Eceabat.
\textsuperscript{127} The Age, Melbourne, 19 Feb. 2005, ‘Gallipoli: from horror to dazzle,’ by Mark Baker.
\textsuperscript{128} MFAT File 58/274/2 Vol. 1. (Confidential) New Zealand External Relations with Turkey: Anzac Day Commemorations, 1 Jan 1996-30 Nov 1997: 11 Mar. 1997; Ross Armstrong, Chairman, NZ Post to Hon. Paul East, Minister of Defence, over the possibility of the issue of a jointly produced Turkish-New Zealand stamp to commemorate the 1998 ANZAC anniversary. NZ Post had been supplying postal advisory services to Turkish Post,
Gallipoli Peninsula Peace Park proposal and its international competition.\textsuperscript{129} Plans were made for the New Zealand Governor-General, Sir Michael Hardie-Boys, to visit Turkey. Difficulties were encountered with planning as the trip was planned to mesh with his visit to the European War cemeteries in commemoration with the 80\textsuperscript{th} anniversary.\textsuperscript{130} Much of the period from 1997 until its resolution and opening in 2000 concentrated on the shift of the Gallipoli Dawn ceremony from the overcrowded Ari Burnu site to the new location at North Beach, the present site. The integrity of the Anzac grave sites within the development of the World Peace Park proposals was assured, but damage caused by visitors climbing over or standing on headstones during the Anzac Day Dawn ceremony had occurred.\textsuperscript{131} However, reports in New Zealand media which mentioned Turkish material were sparse.\textsuperscript{132} In late 1997 there was discussion of a ceremonial site just outside Anzac Cove.\textsuperscript{133} In 1998, the Ari Burnu site was shown to be too small when and Armstrong had broached the idea with H.E. Barutcu, Turkish Minister of Post and Telecommunications in October 1996 when he visited Ankara.


\textsuperscript{130} Ibid, 1 Jan 1998, Ankara C01590/ANK to Defence, Wellington, (0/3/1/3). This was the outline of a high level visit by a Head of State with GOG [guest of government] status. Mentions 23 Apr. as a public holiday, ‘Youth Bayram’; MFAT File 58/274/2 Vol 2. (Confidential) New Zealand External Relations with Turkey: 1 Dec 1997–28 Feb 1998, 20 Feb 1998, 58/274/2 Sue Mackwell, Cabinet Office to Hugh Karena MEA on the matter of the ‘RNZAF flight...carrying a piece of stone from Chunuk Bair for mounting in the Wellington Cathedral as a memorial to the ANZAC servicemen who fell on 8 Aug. 1915, particularly the 700 (out of 770) fatalities of the Wellington Battalion.’ 18 Apr. 1998, Ian Kennedy reported that the Turkish approvals had been secured for the replacement of the Gallipoli stone and its transfer to New Zealand, and that thanks were due to Ermisoglu; \textit{ODT}, 27 Apr. 1998, 3, 10. The newspaper estimate of numbers at the Dawn Service at Gallipoli was 7000.


\textsuperscript{132} \textit{ODT}, 26 Apr. 1997, 4. The Turkish Ambassador, Halit Guvener, laid a wreath at Wellington’s Atatürk Memorial.

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid, 1 Nov 1997 Jan Kennedy (MEA); MFAT File 58/274/2 Vol 2. (Confidential) New Zealand External Relations with Turkey: 1 Dec 1997–28 Feb 1998, 5 Dec 1997 Hon. Jack Elder to Min. Defence on proposed change of site for the Dawn Service at Gallipoli: states approximately 4,500 people at the Dawn service at the CWGC cemetery at Ari Burnu. The new site was at Ocean Beach, between Mule Gully and Reserve Gully, near where Walker’s Pier was which acted as a landing and supply point for the ANZACs. By 10 December the venue was set as No 2 Outpost cemetery, about one kilometre north of Ari Burnu.
approximately 6000 Anzacs had attended the Dawn Ceremony. The event was a highlight in the calendar of the New Zealand representatives in Ankara who were eager to help the Turkish Government see it in the same light. By 1998, Turkish–Anzac relationships seemed to be at a high point, as evidenced by a proposed academic exchange between Bilkent University and Victoria University of Wellington.

Nineteen ninety-eight Anzac Day observances were not without contention, however. There were ‘anti-ANZAC’ incidents in an Istanbul nightclub hired by participants in Anzac Day activities which was set on fire, and in Çanakkale a bus had been stopped, and a fight had broken out between young Anzac tourists and Turks after the ceremony. According to local residents, the rowdyism in Çanakkale and at Anzac Cove seems to have been staged for the benefit of local media by students from outside Çanakkale against the wishes of the local people. Turkish memory was recalled in 1998 with the death of the last Turkish Gallipoli veteran, Adil Sahin.

Further afield, some Anzac nationals attending the St Andrew’s (Anglican) Church Anzac Day service in Moscow, expressed disquiet about the reading of Atatürk’s famous message by the Turkish ambassador. The Australian Ambassador, Geoffrey Bentley, and his New Zealand counterpart, John Larkindale fielded complaints about its inclusion within a ‘Christian service.’ Larkindale’s response pointed to the healing nature of inclusion, and the fact that in both Australia and New Zealand commemorations the message was often included. The story, entitled ‘The Wounds of Gallipoli Anzacs storm Moscow’s beaches’, elicited a sharp response by Özdem Sanberk, the Turkish Ambassador in London, reminding the editor of Diplomat magazine that ‘British and ANZAC troops were on Turkish soil as invaders and there are not too many examples in history of an invaded country showing such magnanimity.’ This event and the response of Ambassador Sanberk serve as an example of the tides of opinion, and shades of opinion.
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137 New Zealand Herald, 5 May 1998, clipping in MFAT 58/274/2 vol 5; Local historian of Eceabat, Bill Sellars’ story.
140 Ibid.
interpretation that can surround Anzac Day. The reaction of those attending the Moscow service or those who heard about it are examples of superficial currents, swept by the winds of contemporary opinion about the place of Turkey in the commemorative gestures.

In 1999, swirling winds of change affected preparations for Anzac Day at Gallipoli. New Zealand MFAT issued a travel advisory against non-essential travel to Turkey. Local politics intervened: there was fear that the Kurdish separatist group PKK (the Kurdish Revolutionary Workers Party) considered foreign tourists as targets in its campaign against the Turkish state and its efforts to secure the release of its leader, Abdullah Ocalan. The *Australian* story about the reaction of Turkish media to being asked to move away from obscuring the views of participants at the Gallipoli Dawn Service reflected the events in Moscow the previous year. It was a critical time. For the Turks, there were matters of the Peace Park proposal to be addressed. A particularly sensitive issue was whether the Anzac Battlefield cemeteries’ site should be included in the boundaries of the HNP. President Demeril exercised a personal interest in its development. For the Australians and the New Zealanders, it was important that the new Anzac site at North Beach was completed before the 85th anniversary and visits by national leaders. The final year of the Gallipoli Dawn service was in 1999 at the Ari Burnu site. Ten thousand visitors, Anzacs and locals were recorded as attending. Lockwood Smith, the New Zealand Trade Minister attending, praised the Turkish soldiers ‘who fought with great heroism in the defence of their country.’ In doing so, he foreshadowed the tone of proceedings for 2000.

**Anzac Day and New Millennium Events**

Gallipoli 2000 Anzac Day events and the preparations for them reflect how far Turkey had embraced Anzac Day. In Wellington, Recep Peker, Counsellor at the Turkish Embassy, attended the Anzac Day National Wreathlaying Ceremony and Commemorative Service as Charge
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143 MFAT TUR/NZ/2/1, Vol 1. Anzac Day Commemorations. 58/274/2
144 Ibid, Anzac Day Commemorations, 21 Oct. 1999 memo Laurie Markes, Secretary MFAT to Minister MFAT. This is an excellent summary paper of the situation covering costs, the Australian design for the North Beach site and the involvement of the NZ Ministry of Culture and Heritage; *ODT*, 26 Apr. 1999, 7.
d’Affaires and the ceremony at the Atatürk Memorial. In early 2000, the new North Beach site at Gallipoli was being prepared by Turkish contractors, Nik Insaat. Nevertheless, despite much goodwill, peripheral issues almost upturned planning. The millennium commemorations were briefly threatened by what the Turks viewed as insensitivity – the showing of the film *All the King’s Men*. When it appeared in November 1999 that TVNZ had purchased the film for showing on Anzac Day 2000, there were protests from the Turkish Embassy in Wellington. The Turkish Ambassador to New Zealand, Ahmet Ermisoglu appealed to Roseanne Meo, TVNZ Chairperson, not to show the film. He felt its inaccuracies and a ‘pronounced anti-Turk flavour’ had the potential to ‘create an atmosphere of animosity and bitterness after 85 years of friendship.’ A similar complaint was fielded in Canberra. By December 1999, the issue blew over when MFAT advised the Turkish Embassy of its inability to direct TVNZ under New Zealand legislation. The film was televised and no publicly expressed anti-Turkish feelings ensued. What this event shows is that contact between Turkey and the Anzac nations over Anzac Day matters had developed to the point where Turkish authorities felt they could protest, and have their opinion heard.

The Ankara based *Turkish Daily News* gave space to the events of Çanakkale Anzac Day: it was one Anzac story in a run of Anzac Day stories appearing from 1998. In its 25 April 2000
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147 Ibid, draft minutes of 15 Oct 1999 meeting in the OAWG [Office of Australian War Graves] Meeting Room. Diplomatic documents indicate a much greater level of engagement; there was awareness at the highest of diplomatic levels of many sensitive issues. Documents refer to the care of graves on the Gallipoli Peninsula, contributions to the ANZAC Park, and developing the complex relationship between Australia, New Zealand and Turkey. The new North Beach location 300 metres north of Ari Burnu was also called the ‘Sphinx site’

148 Ibid, 25 Nov. 1999 Ahmet Ermisoglu to Roseanne Meo, Chairperson TVNZ cc. to Rick Ellis, CEO, TV One. Also, 26 Nov 1999, Embassy of Republic of Turkey to NZMFAT requesting MFAT aid to prevent the film screening. Turkish reaction to the film was published in the *Milliyet* newspaper 15 Nov. 1999, where the matter of ‘reopening old wounds’ and ‘hatred towards the Turks’ was discussed. This matter was covered from the British viewpoint and included the objections to the film by Hon. Suleyman Özdem Sanberk, the Turkish Ambassador in Britain, in *The Dominion* 25 Nov. 1999 – reprint article from the *London Daily Telegraph*.

149 Ibid, 26 Nov. 1999 Canberra C10039/CBA reports a complaint from the Turkish Ambassador in Canberra to Alexander Downer in which ‘anti-Turk bias in the State owned media’ was alleged. The DFAT memo suggests the Minister agrees that Gallipoli is important in the bilateral relationship [Australia - Turkey] that the film has attracted some criticism, including from the UK Gallipoli Association, and that it would not be appropriate to intervene in TV programming, and rejected any implication of anti-Turk bias in the ABC about the SBS.


edition, the paper included a story based on a Turkish account of the Gallipoli campaign. Serpil Ural, author of *Candles at Dawn (Safakta Yanan Mumlar)* wove a plot around two teenage girls whose grandfathers were on opposite sides in the 1915 campaign. In the story, she questions traditional concepts of war, enmity, friendship and freedom. This marks the emergence of Turkish literature on the matter of the 1915 battles and Anzac Day issues.

Gallipoli Anzac Day ceremonies in 2000 proceeded with dignity and pomp, once again showing the Turks as gracious hosts. The attendance of the Prime Ministers of New Zealand and Australia at the services and dedication of the North Beach site was gratifying. High level discussions between Turkish President Suleyman Demirel, Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit and Minister of Culture Istemihan Talay had taken place. Prime Minister Clark showed pleasure representing New Zealand at the first Anzac ceremony in the Peace Park, built by the Turkish Government. She described Turkish soldiers as having ‘steadfast courage’ and former enemies as ‘present friends.’ Developing the theme, she felt herself in ‘a place of peace and of inspiration to further [sic] generations.’ Australian Prime Minister, John Howard, visited the Turkish memorial at Anitkabir, Ankara, and wrote a personal message in the inscription book. The message observed that Atatürk had played a special role in Australia’s nation-building process, and that grandsons of the fighters now enjoyed friendly relations. He also referred to the about 100,000 Turk nationals and descendants living in Australia. Gallipoli, once the bridgehead for war, had become the bridgehead for declarations of peace.

**Conclusion**

As in the first part of the century, Turkish memories of Anzac Day and events surrounding them were largely dominated by the fluctuating forces found in contemporary historical landscapes. To a lesser extent, these fluctuations were reflected in Anzac perceptions of what the Gallipoli observance meant to them. There was a general trend from the early 1980s of acceptance by Anzacs that visiting Turkey at the time of the observance was a desirable thing to do, no matter

---

153 *ODT*, 22 Apr. 2000, 3; *ODT*, 24 Apr. 2000, 8. In the meeting with the Turkish leaders, sensitive issues like the treatment of the Kurd rebel groups, matters related to Turkey joining the European Union, trade barriers and reforming the Turkish postal system were covered.
156 Ibid; the report confirmed that Prime Minister John Howard, who had been received by the Turkish President Suleyman Demirel and Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit, attended the Anzac ceremonies at Çanakkale the following day.
what other events were happening in the world. This Anzac trend was followed by an awakening in Turkey, and greater involvement by its government agents and people in the day’s ceremonies at Gallipoli.

The chapter plotted both revived and forgotten Turkish memories. Tosun Saral’s website revealed a personal family memory which told a different story from those of the official British reports for the 1948 Morshead Mission. Other memories, such as those for the 1952 Turkish veterans’ pilgrimage were swept aside in the tumultuous currents of joining NATO. The Çanakkale Şehitler Abedesi addressed Turkish desires for their own memorial but roused some temporary indignation among IWGC officials. This debate refocused attention on that contested physical landscape matter – who owned the land on which Anzac Day observances were held? Despite the buffeting of Turkish-Anzac relations from the Cyprus crises and the Marsden case, Anzac day in Gallipoli survived. After 1985, it thrived. The deepest currents of mutual commemoration were exposed by Mete Tunçoku’s observations and Gallipoli as the millennium dawned had become the overseas shrine for Anzac Day.

Still, in 2000, despite passing skiffs of controversy over ‘anti-Anzac’ incidents in Istanbul and Çanakkale, anti–Atatürk comments in Moscow in 1998, and the furore over Australasian TV screening of the film All the King’s Men in November 1999, the day proceeded with Turkish representation in many centres. Increasing Turkish public interest was reflected in the Istanbul press with the reprinting of Serpil Ural’s Safakta Yana Mumlar which delved into deeply commemorative currents and again linked the Turkish and Anzac stories. What was happening in Gallipoli Anzac Day and Onsekiz Mart Zaferi celebrations and commemorations was not realised fully by the public of Australia and New Zealand until the late 1990s. Up to then, they had played and listened to the same national-based interpretation of the day.

Turkey came increasingly under the influence of westernisation – TV, food, languages, fashions, sports and laws. There has been, correspondingly, a huge growth of western and Turkish-based tourism which has had far-reaching effects in the Istanbul, Cappadocia and Çanakkale regions. Turkish authorities and tourist agencies have unquestionably gained from the influx of Anzac tourists. From the beginning of the second wave pilgrims (non-veteran visitors) in the 1980s, the
agencies and the economy have profited. Rapid growth in visitor numbers has necessitated changes to the infrastructure of the Gallipoli region to accommodate them.\textsuperscript{157}

Have meanings of the day changed through the influence of Turkey? Of course, Turkish and Anzac people appreciate that commemoration is universal. The feelings that Turks express in gratitude for the mehmetçik are little different from those of Anzacs for the Digger. The futility of war death has always been keenly felt at Gallipoli. Visitors to Gallipoli all experience the strange beauty of the physical landscape which drives home deeply the impossibility of rationalising the deaths of Turks and Anzacs. David Suzuki’s ideas about a ‘sacred landscape’ can be applied here. He argues we humans are trying to reconnect with the sensory world in order to achieve greater understanding of the spirit. At Gallipoli, hearing the waves lapping on Anzac Cove, viewing the Aegean panorama from Chunuk Bair and surveying the land from Suvla on the north to the ridges down to Anzac in the west, encourages a spiritual awakening. It is a re-connection with a lost past and sheds a greater comprehension of the relationship of place, events and people. In the latter half of the twentieth century, death and memory issues intersected at Gallipoli. Turks honoured their leaders and their dead heroes on Gallipoli by building memorials both there and elsewhere. Extensive education initiatives involving visits by all Turkish junior high school children to Gallipoli Peninsula were planned. The Turkish martyrs were recognised as agents in creating the modern Turkish state as much as original Anzacs were for their countries. Mutual respect increased the potency of the Anzac–Turkish connection.

Turkey and Anzac Day, as outlined in the issues raised in this chapter, becomes a field of study within an international context. The migration of Turkish people, particularly to Australia, preceded the awakening of the Turkish nation to the advantages of opening Gallipoli as a tourist destination to the West. Within the framework of global geo-politics, the responses of Turkey to Anzac Day issues reflected her drive to be recognised within a Western, European framework. The story of Anzac Day and its continuous connection to Turkey is not just Australasian. Through the agency of the military for most of the twentieth century, it has become a world story, with the Gallipoli shrine at its centre.

\textsuperscript{157} Interview with Dr Ahmet Mete Tuncoku, 23 Apr. 2007.
CONCLUSION

This thesis, ‘Anzac Day meanings and memories: New Zealand, Australian and Turkish perspectives on a day of commemoration in the twentieth century,’ establishes a landscape and memory-based interpretation for the development of Anzac Day. From a distance, the day is an example of the changeable script of memory. What the day meant, and the meanings that were attached to it, altered with time. Moreover, there were differing national perceptions of the day. The thesis provides a different story from the popular heroic and nationalist views of the day. The study revealed trans-national dimensions in the day from its beginning. Full understanding of the topic could not omit the part played by the people of Turkey. How Turkey influenced Anzac Day and allowed it to take the position it holds today is still barely acknowledged. It is generally comprehended that events on Gallipoli started the observance, but not understood that right from the outset that other conflicts of World War I were included. The truism that memory is about remembering and forgetting is apparent.

The figurative image of ocean currents is appropriate. At the deepest level in Anzac Day there is a powerful current which is universal, constant, and crosses national boundaries. It connotes loss and personal commemoration. Its universality draws in those at the margins: women, children and indigenous people. Personal loss impels communities to share by creating social and physical structures to help individuals cope. Within this sharing process Anzac Day began, not spontaneously, but as a structured, if rapid response. Anzac Day observance was swiftly recognised by British Empire authorities and by trans-Tasman national leaders as having great political value. Participating nations placed their own emphases and meanings on the day. In Britain, there was constant interest in 25 April being recognised as ‘Gallipoli Day’ a term which distanced the day from an exclusive Anzac attachment. For the Turkish Republic, permitting Anzac Day to proceed at Gallipoli carried political advantages which aided its recognition as a worthy nation by European powers. At a deeper level, the event signified a commemorative connection comprehended by Mustapha Kemal. At each level, international, national, community or personal, commemoration and identification predominate. Whether one is British, Australian, New Zealander or Turk – from Walton-on-Thames, Melbourne, Mosgiel or Eceabat, the deepest currents still resonate. It is the respect for loss which is recognised and which has the power to draw people to Gallipoli. It recognises that it is death and sacrifice, not national pride which binds the people of the Anzac nations to them and to Çanakkale.
Chapter One set out the theoretical matters of memory, landscape, death and its close relative, mourning, which formed supports for rationalising the changes which occurred in Anzac Day through the twentieth century. The theoretical material was reiterated in discussions on the findings of the working chapters. Issues of memory and current historical landscape prevail throughout the work, but different events and periods have their own combinations and nuances.

Chapter Two argued that the ‘Something Greater Than Victory’ concept was born with the establishment of the Anzac Day-Gallipoli connection. Fidelity to the memories of the Anzac dead on Gallipoli was expressed in an enduring concern for the soldier graves throughout the twentieth century. This issue was in the foreground of Anzac Day considerations. Landscape possession and management issues which arose were foregrounded with the IWGC wariness to the building of the imposing Çanakkale Turkish Martyrs’ Memorial in 1953. Since 1970, the Republic of Turkey government and Çanakkale regional authorities have engaged fully with Turkish gravesites, building memorials to their 80,000 dead.

Historical landscape matters were apparent throughout the century from 1915. From being captured, named and ‘owned’ by the Anzacs, despite the actuality of defeat by December 1915, Gallipoli was transfigured to a place of glory and possession. Memory and loss intersect and there is ownership of a personal and privileged kind – a creation of a special landscape in a socio-cultural context. On a personal level, Gallipoli has come to mean much more than just the Peninsula, the place of a long-past battlefield. Wooden crosses and grave markers became dual references of loss. Their presence signalled the location of the dead. Their loss in the harsh winters of 1916 and 1917 seemed to deeply engrave tragedy. The Chanak crisis of September 1922 inflamed feelings of betrayal for those left alive, and by relatives and friends feeling loss. Concern for the Gallipoli cemeteries, a reflection of the regret felt in leaving the dead ‘over there’ and so betraying them, eventually moderated. Memories faded - the 1965 Anzac Veterans’ Pilgrimage found the physical landscape of Gallipoli, although one of the best preserved of World War I battlefields, was no longer easily recognisable to the men of 1915. Ten years later, to Vietnam War protesters, Gallipoli and all it meant on Anzac Day appeared irrelevant. However, from the mid-1970s Gallipoli became a tourist destination, and a focus of revived memories, both Anzac and Turkish. Changed attitudes brought about by realisation of the universality of commemoration contributed to make Gallipoli by 2000 a shrine on Anzac Day and the ground for memory. There is a lingering spiritual dimension to the place. Records of a
range of observers who have visited the Gallipoli graves show awareness of an indefinable spiritual dimension.

Chapter Three, is headed ‘the crimson rata [of] sacrifice’ - Anzac Days in New Zealand to 1945. This indicates the less ebullient stance New Zealanders showed towards the day. The chapter began a comparison with Australia’s different style of development. The institution of Anzac Day in New Zealand was orchestrated rather than spontaneous. There was a current landscape of intercessory services and acts prior to the 1916 Anzac Day which continued through World War I. This landscape of intercessory actions helped the initiation and maintenance of the day. Landscape management and investment of meaning was clearly evident in the legislation for the day in New Zealand and in Prime Minister William Massey’s message to London. The vital coded telegram with appended notes by James Allen, the Minister of Defence, granting assent for the Westminster Abbey service, and allowing New Zealand troops to participate, also shows the creation of a new historic landscape in a war situation. The relatively unrecognised but public work of Donald Simson, on behalf of returned soldiers, and his participation in the first Wellington community meeting set the stamp of New Zealand returned men on the day. His role again stresses issues of management. The memory of his work and this event was forgotten until after 2000, when the NZRSA posted information about it on its website.

Memorials are found in the city and country physical landscape. Alan Borg’s observation that they represented ‘the biggest communal arts project ever attempted [and] the unprecedented scope of the First World War and its appalling statistics of death … caused the greatest upsurge in memorial building,’\(^1\) applied in New Zealand. The central landscape issue in memorial design and construction was contestation.

Anzac Day in the 1930s reflected a contemporary landscape of imminent war. Increasingly, military displays and reviews were seen on the day. Material objects had the power to evoke memories on the day. An example was the co-production with Australia, of the Anzac 21\(^{st}\) anniversary stamp. The year 1936 marked nearly the end of the post-war monument building phase and witnessed the transfer of landscapes such as that for the commemoration held at the Bubbling Well cemetery in Shanghai to the memory of Dunedin-born Norman Kwong-Tsu. POW
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experiences illustrate the same notion of transfer and fidelity. Anzac Day ceremonies at Stalag 383, Hohenfels, reflected previous war memories and the need to keep the faith with those who lay in Gallipoli, Palestine and France.

The ‘golden wattle [of] glory…’ beginning Chapter Four indicated the more celebratory attitude observed in Australian Anzac Days. The day in Australia was more keenly contested than in New Zealand to 1945. Arguments in this chapter establish that Anzac Day in Australia was also founded on a culture of intercessory commemorative acts. This culture was in tune with the aims of the energetic Canon David Garland. He, more than any other individual, helped the institution of the day in Australia as a national day of commemoration. Contestation was seeded in his efforts, and it came to fruition in a bitter and extended conflict with the representatives of the returned servicemen. Australian national identity aligned easily with Anzac Day and from the 1930s Gallipoli was often described in terms of forging the nation. Whether Anzac Day should be more celebratory or more mournful became another contested issue. Masculine attitudes, so lauded by C.E.W. Bean, helped promote both the myth and a singular style of day. Exclusively masculine management was challenged by Dr Mary Booth and her Anzac Fellowship of Women, who did much to promote the day in Australia and overseas, particularly in London. There is much evidence to support the argument that women had greater participation in the day than is currently accepted.

Chapter Five introduced landscape as the dominant factor in the history of Turkey’s relationship with Anzac Day until 1945. Memory matters were suppressed for Turkish veterans. Through the period, Turkish people experienced a sense of bewilderment about foreigners who demanded access to Gallipoli. From 1923, despite being in possession of the land, the new Republic found itself dancing to the tune of the British based IWGC over Gallipoli graves’ issues. In that period and under duress, it was difficult for the Turkish people to reciprocate and claim a place for the recognition of their own dead. Despite the obvious victory by the Turks of Çanakkale Savaşları 1915, there was no self-definition to be found for their nation at Gallipoli. The 1934 Atatürk declaration signalled the initiation of public recognition in Turkey. It was in that sense a period of great ambivalence, where Turkish memory was repressed, while that of the Anzacs was elevated.
After 1934, the limited dissemination of Atatürk’s generous statement appeared to create a situation whereby the Anzac soldiers could be honoured and their graves made more accessible. Atatürk’s words reclaimed space and proclaimed Turkish sovereignty. The land in which dead Anzac bodies lay was ‘the soil of a friendly country’ and in a stretch of management he claimed Anzacs to be Turkish ‘sons as well.’ There are elements here relating to the universality of Derrida’s notions of fidelity. The immensely evocative statement can also be seen as fitting Jay Winter’s universal language of mourning. It carries the power of a work of art.

The Çakmak-Freyberg exchange on Anzac Day 1940 was a continuation of the directions of Atatürk in 1934. Here, the prevailing wartime landscape provided ground for the recall of memory for both Anzacs and Turks. For Turkey, memories continued to be dominated by issues of contemporary historical landscape. World War II marked a schism, underlined clearly by its successful application to join NATO in February 1952. Nonetheless, modern Turkish memory places more weight on the start given to the Republic at Gallipoli in 1915. This view conflates the 1915 Onsekiz Mart Zaferi with the later role of Mustapha Kemal in establishing the Republic.

Chapter Six introduced Peter Beilharz’s notion of a ‘parting of the ways.’ While there were national differences between New Zealand and Australia of views on Anzac Day, most of the time there was great uniformity expressed. Veteran exchanges between the trans-Tasman partners revived as soon as the war ended, and both countries included the large range of representatives from nations who were World War II allies, including briefly, the USSR. Anzac Day observances were held in places as far removed as San Francisco, Yokohama War Cemetery at Hodogaya, and Valetta, Malta. Here we see Anzac Day landscapes transferred to foreign locations.

Did the day lose traction in the 1960s and 1970s? Undoubtedly, but not as much as orthodoxy suggests, and not for the usually accepted reasons. The introduction of a Sundayised morning and Saturdayised afternoon in the mid-sixties for both Anzac nations brought increased popularity to the day. In comparison the Vietnam War protests appeared as a reversal. The war itself did not cause a nadir, though it was part of a fluctuating trend. Cartoons suggesting that society had lost its directions reflected Professor Manning Clark’s 1960 statements about a secularised society finding itself adrift. This notion was equally applicable to both trans-Tasman nations.
By 1977 there was renewed vigour in Anzac Day in both nations. Memory gained strength. Nevertheless, this did not mean cessation of protest activity on the day. In both Australia and New Zealand, the day was still used by women’s groups protesting about rape in war. In New Zealand, the livening of Maori land interests following the Springbok Tour of 1981 led to Maori protests on the day. It was in this period that Gallipoli memories were revived by the distribution of Peter Weir’s film. Its release coincided with increasing public estimation for veteran’s memories and the return to Gallipoli. It was not veterans who were visitors this time; it was a new generation of Anzac pilgrims whose journey began to invest Gallipoli with the accolade of a shrine. By 2000, Anzac Day at Gallipoli portrayed a blending, rather than a parting of the ways. Contestation was submerged in the need for harmony on the national stage.

During the 1980 and 1990s Anzac Day was touted as the forge of identity in both New Zealand and Australia. In Australia this persisted as a constant clarion call; it was also repeated by New Zealand commentators. The arguments in this thesis support the position that national identity is not irrelevant, but that it may be missing a larger point. The point conveyed by memory is that Anzac Day is about universal respect for sacrifice rather than recognition of national identity. Anzac Day reminds of more than just World War I, which was its foundation.

What about the prevailing notion of ‘death denial.’? This thesis does not rebut its existence, but questions its universal application. The annual, public observance of Anzac Day challenges the ubiquity of death denial. It is difficult to maintain an argument for the universality of death denial and suppressed mourning when Anzac Day speaks otherwise. Annual town and city parades, dawn ceremonies at cenotaphs or monuments, and ceremonies in local churches and halls, all demonstrate the power of individual and public recognition of death and sacrifice. Monument building, floral tributes and personal messages left on the day challenge the notion of an all-pervasive death denial. Was there a causal linkage between abatement of death denial and the 1980s rise of Anzac Day, particularly at Gallipoli? The link is one of coincidence rather than causation. Other factors, such as the surge of interest in genealogy in Australia and New Zealand, awareness by the remaining veterans that their stories were worthwhile, all added to the rise in public appreciation for the day. One of the most powerful motivators to action was the increasing realisation of a significant loss to society. Many of the Gallipoli veterans had died by 1980, and many left no lasting memory of their part in the enterprise. However, the stories of journalists on assignment at Gallipoli for Anzac Day were widely published. Curiosity which developed after
1980 for Gallipoli memory material helped promote the profile of the day coincided with the abatement of death denial.

Chapter Seven argued that between 1946 and 2000 Turkey recovered memories and reclaimed its historic landscape. From 1946 to the mid-1980s, Turkish memories of Anzac Day and events surrounding them were dominated by fluctuating historical landscapes. To a lesser extent, these fluctuations also reflected Anzac perceptions of the Gallipoli observance. Change was evident from the mid-1980s and coincided with an acceptance by Anzacs that visiting Turkey at the time of the observance was a desirable thing to do, no matter what other events were happening in the world. This Anzac trend was followed by an awakening of memory in Turkey, and greater involvement by its government agents and people in the day’s ceremonies at Gallipoli.

The pattern of development of Anzac Day in Turkey in the second half of the century was traced through analysis of significant milestones: the 1948 Morshead Mission which demonstrated the power of the military to sustain institutional memories; the 1952 Turkish veterans’ pilgrimage which illustrates how easily important events can be forgotten, the contestation of landscape in the construction of the Turkish Martyrs’ Memorial at Eskihisarlik from 1953; wider world issues in the landscape of Cyprus crises tensions; the fluidity of landscape and memory matters found in the mutual monument building in 1985-1990; the search for deeper meanings to be found in gestures of respect between old Turkish and Anzac veterans standing side by side on Anzac Cove in 1990; Turkish public interest in the reprinting of Serpil Ural’s *Safakta Yana Mumlar*; and the world-wide interest in the day as a media focus in 2000.

All of these points direct attention to the deeper issues of commemoration. Gallipoli is an entrancing place, and perhaps never more so to Anzaes and Turks as at Anzac Day. It is a rare thing to observe and instantly confers a more enduring meaning. The beauty of its physical landscape stands in total contrast with the horrors of war. It is that tension and the realisations that come with it that make going to Gallipoli compulsive. This truth was as self-evident to veteran diggers and mehmetçiks as it is to modern Turks and Anzacs visiting the site today.²

---
Finally, Anzac Day at Gallipoli in 2000 can be seen as a confluence point. Different interpretations placed on the day by Anzac and Turkish citizens merge and incorporate that deepest and predominant current, commemoration for the sacrifices of the past. The day survives because its essential and universal commemorative meaning remains.

Nature’s annual reminder of war dead – a field of poppies, on the coastal road north of Leven, Fifeshire, Scotland, 7 June 2007. Photograph, G.F. Davis.
This thesis has relevance beyond history. It is well-positioned for peace studies – where particular Anzac Day developments and themes might act as markers for peaceful directions in a world of conflict. Valuable lessons for peace are never more sharply recognised than in the aftermath of war. That Turks and Anzacs reached a point of rapprochement was not just happenstance. The steps between conflict, through negotiation and declaration, to agreement and friendship, provide markers for nations wishing to make that transition. The universality of commemoration, based on a realisation of the futility of national conflict, creates a base people of different nations share. Anzac Day teaches that loss is individual yet international. The importance of the individual cannot be underestimated. Through the efforts of David Garland and Donald Simson and the groups around them Anzac Day became a movement. Human cultural institutions are established and driven by individuals who have the ability to motivate those around them to bring together the needed forces for change in a society. The idea raises wider questions about motivation in human institutions. Were the motives promoting the establishment of Anzac Day solely altruistic? What constitutes reliable evidence for assessing the motives of a party initiating or maintaining a community movement? Did the protection of civic interests of the ADCC by Garland carry within it the potential for conflict, if not its demise? While he could see the need for civic control of Anzac Day as time went by and old diggers died, did he misread the aggressive nature of a world which generates new conflicts and renewed military endeavour in every decade? The thesis clarifies the development not only of a day of commemoration, but contemporary pressures that caused direction in the day.

Anzac Day studies open a discussion about the boundaries between religion and matters of the spirit. This issue is at the heart of Anzac Day practices as seen by visitors or pilgrims who travel to Gallipoli for the observances. At the end of the Dawn Service at Gallipoli visitors are reminded of the ceremonies that follow in the day: the Australian service at Lone Pine, the Turkish Muslim service at the 5th Regiment Cemetery, the New Zealand service at Chunuk Bair. Religious clerics, Christian and Moslem, play their parts on 25 April, and supplement the experience for so many Australian, New Zealand and Turkish people attending. The central reason for most
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160 Ceremonies for the British at the Cape Hellas Monument and the French Monument are generally held in the morning of the 24th. As well there is a two-hour Turkish hosting ceremony at the Mehmetçik Monument, beginning at 9 a.m.
attending is to establish a relationship between themselves and the events which happened on Gallipoli. This is a matter of the spirit. This point was not lost on Tolga Örnek, director of Gallipoli: The Front Line Experience. He recognised the universality which is found in shared commemoration.

This thesis is positioned within the modern memory school and uses various sources to draw tragedy, loss, mourning and suffering back into the centre of Anzac Day studies. It sees memory as best able to scope the changes in the perceptions and changing meanings of Anzac Day. It is also able to extend the boundaries limited by the traditional and nationalist narrative of the day. Turkish perceptions become relevant and have much to offer. This is not a thesis about war, neither does it glamorise or valorise acts of war. It looks at the consequences of war and traverses the boundaries opened by memory between the individual and the community.

Does a commemorative day alter its focus or become redundant when military initiatives are diverted to functions other than defence? If peacekeeping becomes the raison d'etre for military forces, what then happens to a day built on sacrifice during a period when war was an acceptable policy? The anti-Vietnam and general anti-war protests of the 1960s and early 1970s did not dislodge the commemoration of Anzac Day, but the day’s validity was questioned. Is the present trend towards international peacekeeping likely to overturn the day? Probably not. Anzac Day has demonstrated malleability with time and the changing historical landscape. Its portability and relevance at the best and worst of times augurs well for its future. Anzac Day lasts not because it represents New Zealand and Australia, but because it crosses national, race, gender and age boundaries. Not quite a day for all seasons, but very close. The values it disseminates in a commemorative atmosphere of memory are timeless and universal.
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ACC 101/24, Minute Book 20, Vol. 28, 5 Jan 1917-12 Dec 1918.

ACC 275/24, ab-1918, Anzac Day Catering file.

ACC 296/1, Town Clerk’s Letter Book, Nov 1902-July 1919.

ACC 275/24, ag. Item 18/244 Pt 6, Service refusals, Anzac Day.

ACC 288/ 114 Town Clerk’s Letter Book, Jan – March 1917.


ACC 275 / 347 Item 45/51. ‘Anzac Day, 1951.’
**Auckland War Memorial Museum Library Archives, Auckland (AWMML)**

Simson, Donald Petrie, Papers, Folders 1-6.

Ephemera U27 Box 1 Ephemera Collection. Title: Army-Air Force [ephemera], Envelopes 1-2.

U27, (3) envelope 3a. Patriotic Functions, and Envelopes 4-6.

MS 2000/20, Taylor, Deborah Pitts, Diary and Papers 1917-1920.


**Australian War Memorial Archives, Canberra, ACT (AWM)**

AWM Anzac Day Cuttings Box 1, 1916-1925.


AWM Anzac Day Cuttings Box 2, 1926-1927.


AWM Leaflets 1/1/1 – 2/1/1 Folder 1, Series 1: South Africa, 1899-1902, Subseries 4: Associations and Organisations, Patriotic 1/4/02.

AWM FO3547, Interview with Mr Dick Wilcox of Tarnagulla, Victoria.


AWM PR00079, 1, 3-20 of 20, DPI 200, Papers of Col. George Ernest Ramsay, E.D.


AWM - 1 DRL/0240, Diaries of Sergeant A.L. de Vine, 4th Battalion AIF.

AWM PR 01459, Papers of Harold E. Collins [Prospect magazine, April / May Issue 1982].

AWM PR 03065, Papers of Lance Sergeant Ernest Benjamin, 171 A Coy, 19th Battalion, 5th Brigade, AIF.


AWM PR 84/333, Papers of Captain Albert Jacka, 14th Bn A.I.F.,1893 – 1932.

AWM PR 00798, Papers of Lieutenant William Stephen George Foxwell, M.M. 2/7 Battalion.

AWM Collection Record: MALTA0909, MALTA0912.
**Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge, UK (CAC)**

Churchill-Amery papers:
AMEL 1/3/25, Parts 1 to 5, Dardanelles’ Report, May to June 1915.
AMEL 1/3/3, Amery correspondence.
AMEL 1/3/4, August to October 1915, correspondence on the Gallipoli situation.
AMEL 1/3/7, Amery correspondence late 1917.
AMEL 6/3/74, Allen family material over the death of Lieutenant John Allen.
GLLD George Lloyd of Dolobran, 3/2 GLLD 3/7, Gallipoli Photographs.
HRPR 1/3, Anonymous, ‘A Midshipman at the Gallipoli Landing.’
RJHS 3/2, Robert Rhodes James papers; RJHS 3/2c, Robert Rhodes James’ photos.

**Dunedin City Council Archives, Dunedin (DCC)**

DCC TC 33, Finance E1, 3286, 1917, Town Clerk’s Correspondence.
DCC TC 33, E1, 4556, 31 August 1917, telegram G.W. Russell, Minister of Internal Affairs, to the Mayor, Dunedin.
DCC MO 1/2, Mayor’s Letter Book, 19 May 1902-20 Dec 1915.
DCC MO 2/20, Mayor’s Minutes, May 1913-April 1917.
DCC MO 1/3, Mayor’s Letter Book, 2 Dec 1915-2 May 1918.
*City of Dunedin, New Zealand, Departmental Reports for the Year 1916-1917*, John McIndoe, Dunedin, 1917.
DCC Archives, acc 2000/43 Box 90, (DCC City Secretariat, AM 8/1/10 arrangements for the City from 25 April 1987 to 21 August 1989). This is followed by: DCC City Secretariat ADM 23/10, semi-current records 9 Feb 1990 to 15 April 1994. Invitations, wreaths, posy laying, and other details relating to Anzac Day.

**Hocken Library and Archives, University of Otago, Dunedin (HOCK)**

Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives.
MS-0534/013, Papers of Pybus, Thomas Arthur, Rev., Scrapbook III.
AG-036/009, Moray Place Congregational Church: Records, Minutes 1876-1921).
AG-036/031, Moray Place Congregational Church: Records – Annual Reports.
JSwOO, [Otago University] Special Memorial Service In Memory of Fallen Students in Burns Hall, Sunday, July 20, 1919.

AG-116/013, United Congregational Church, Dunedin: Records, Deacons’ Meetings.


NZG - *New Zealand Gazette*, the official publication of the New Zealand Government.

**Imperial War Museum, Lambeth North, London, (IWM)**

P354 Vol 2, AGDT/2, Papers of Captain A.G.D. Twigg, RN.

P158, Papers of Lt. Col. H.V. Gell.


10935/PP/MCR/99, The 1914-1933 Diaries of Commander C.H. Drage, R.N.

**John Oxley Library, State Library of Queensland, Brisbane, (JOL)**

OMHA/1/1 - /1/4, ADCC Minutes and Suggestions, 1916-1922, 1923-1937.

OHMA/1/5-OHMA/1/8, ADCC Minutes; O/S 3556, ADCC Cutting Book, 1923-1928.

OMHA/1/5, Folder 2, ADCC Minutes, Box 3551, ADCC, 17 Feb 1949.

OMHA/3/1, O/S (3550).

OMHA/1/6, (3551), Folders 1 (1950) to 10 (1961).


OHMA /1/8, Miscellaneous papers 1938-1950.


OMHA/3/5, (3560) Volume 5, 1939 -1940.

OMHA/3/5, /5/9 to /5/14, (3561), Vol. 6, correspondence.

OMHA /5/15 (3562), phonograph recordings from WWII.

OHMA /5/17, 3563, miscellaneous materials relating to ADCC in Brisbane.

P355 ANZ C1, Anzac Day Commemoration Committee, Queensland.


RBJ 940.465943 1 ANZ C3, Anzac booklet: *A National Obligation*.

**King’s College, London, Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives (KCL)**

Hamilton Papers:

15/4/1-19, Business correspondence mainly relating to Hamilton’s publications, articles and letters to the press, 1916-1942.

15/4/6 1924, August 11- 1925 Nov 17, 3 March 1925, Ian Hamilton to Arnold of Edward Arnold & Co, London about a scheme he has to make his book *Gallipoli Diary* sell.
15/4/8 1926, Dec 30-1928 Feb 20, letter and cutting from The Morning Post to Hamilton and his reply
reply about the sufferers from the Great War.
15/4/12 1931, Mar 2-1931 Dec 11: Hamilton to P. Holdsworth, NZ Shipping Co Ltd and J. Prebble Orient
Line 9 March 1931, for wreaths to be sent to NZ and Australia for Anzac Day 1931.
for a wreath to go via Rangitata to Wellington in time for Anzac Day.
Hamilton papers 15/4/18, 30 Nov 1937 telegram McIlwraith London Editor Central to Hamilton.
Hamilton papers 15/4/14, 1932 Nov 7-1933 Dec 12: 20 Feb 1933 Hamilton to Holdsworth. 22 March 1935
Cunard Steam Ship Co confirms the free passage of a wreath via the Alaunia for Hamilton to the
Gallipoli Day service at the Cenotaph in Toronto.
7/9/1-23, Hamilton correspondence and articles relating to Gallipoli Campaign deposited 1916-1967.
7/9/1, 16 Jan. 1916, Austro-Turk battery action during the Gallipoli evacuation.
7/9/7, 12 Apr. 1919, letter from C.E.W. Bean including Turkish opinions of the Lone Pine attack.
7/9/10, 1 Jan. 1923, the influence of the German units.
7/9/10, 1 Jan. 1923 article by French General Albert d’Amade on German aspirations and the failure of
18 Mar. 1915 naval attack.
7/9/11, 13 Nov. 1923-10 May 1940 correspondence on films: 1927 Gallipoli, 1934 Tell England, 1934
Forgotten Men.
7/9/14, 1927 translation of ‘The first heroic defence by Turks at Sed-ul-Bahr,’ 12-13 April 1915.
7/9/17, 11 April 1934-12 May 1936 Duchess of Richmond tour 11-22 April 1934 and proposed Lancastria
tour 1936.
7/9/19, 23 April 1939, ‘Gallipoli’ BBC radio documentary.
North papers:
I /3/229, Gullick, Norman-North, copy of Anzac Day number of the Sydney Mail 29 June 1937.
I/3/234, John North to Hadfield, 20 April 1936, congratulating him
on Gallipoli, the Fading Vision.
I/3/333a, North to Lloyd George 13 Dec 1938, ‘The great August attack was lost at Anzac…Birdwood and
his colleagues lost the battle at Anzac.’
I/3/134, North to John Coatman, about Anzac Day 22 April 1936. The need to commemorate Gallipoli.
I/3/25, North to Colonel Allanson, 27 February 1936. Allanson provided North with Gallipoli diaries.
I/3/74c, Lt. Col. Gibson Bishop to North 29 August 1936, the attack on Chunuk Bair.
I/3/102, A.H. Bound, Hon. Sec. Gallipoli Association (Preston) to North 12 May 1936, congratulating him
on Gallipoli, the Fading Vision.
I/4b/63, *Daily Telegraph* 12 May 1932 cutting, ‘Another Look at Gallipoli’ by W.E. Stanton-Hope who accompanied 700 British ex-servicemen on the CPR liner *Duchess of Richmond* in April 1932 visiting the Peninsula. Stanton-Hope was the writer of *Richer Dust* and one of the last officers evacuated in 1916.

I/4b/65, *Daily Telegraph* 22 April 1935, 9, Sir Ian Hamilton, at 82, defended his position from the claim that the evacuation was a terrible mistake.

I/4b/67, *Daily Mirror* 20 April 1934, 12 cutting of a story called ‘Back to Gallipoli’ by Trevor Allen on the *Duchess of Richmond*.

I/4b/68, cutting *Our Empire* April 1951, 22, a photo of Anzac Cove taken by an Anzac in 1915.

I/4b/76, London *The Daily Telegraph*, 26 April, 1932, 16, shows a photo of the Cenotaph for the 17th anniversary of the Gallipoli landing.


I/4b/89, 1936 ‘Gallipoli’ radio talk.

**Kippenberger Military Archive, National Army Museum, Waiouru (KIP)**


1990.188, Newspaper Clippings, Anzac Day-1938 [Sydney].


2006.772, Ephemera, Programme material related to the Diamond Jubilee of Anzac held in Auckland.

1990.190 Ephemeras [sic], Anzac Day 1938, Sydney.


1992.2291, Middle East-Pacific, letters written to Mrs Dolly Blockley of Frankton Junction.


1987.2504, Photograph Album, POW Germany-WWII, 20625 Gunner Robin Henry Gray.


1992.618/1, Collection, *Buckshee* - Pictorial record of the work of the New Zealand YMCA.


Un-accessioned Box 127/RV2452, Anzac Day Sports, Stalag 383 Bavaria, Germany, 25 April 1944.

Unaccessioned, Collection of Sister Mabel Cooks, RV 55, Box 36, B/AJ.


1993.1629, Malaya, 1961-1964 letters of Donald Mcfarlane Quartermaster, 1st Battalion, NZ Regiment and his wife, Norma, in Malaya.


1999.1090, Diary of 17277 Private Ray Rapson, POW in Italy and Germany.

1992.618/2, Collection, Anzac Day 75th Anniversary 1915-1990, Supplement to the *South Eastern District RSL Digest*, Issue No 6, April 1990.


Box 65 (B/BM) RV-1102, Brigadier Frederick Stuart Varnham Collection, 19 Battalion, 2 NZEF.

**Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Wellington (MFAT)**


58/274/2, Vol. 7 (Confidential) New Zealand External Relations with Turkey: 1 Apr 1999-30 Sept 1999.


N.B. Written permission must be obtained from NZMFAT, Wellington before citing material sourced from the above files.

TUR/NZ/2/1, Vol. 1 Anzac Day Commemorations.

TUR/NZ/2/1, Vol. 2 Anzac Day Commemorations.

**National Army Museum, London (NAML)**

NAM 1999-03-44-6 and 7, Papers relating to POW camps in Germany 1939 – 1945, including Anzac Day at Stalag 383, Hohenfels, 25 April 1944.

NAM 2006-12-10-2 and 40, photographs for the London Cenotaph Anzac Day, 1941.

NAM 6707-19-47, Telegram, Lord Birdwood of Anzac to Freyberg, affectionate regards for Anzac Day, 22 April 1940.


**National Library of Australia (NLA)**


**The National Archives, United Kingdom, Kew (TNA)**

Folder FO [Foreign Office] 371/72548 Foreign Office: Political Departments: General Correspondence 1906-1966; Anzac Day at Gallipoli, Foreign Office Political Departments: POLITICAL: SOUTHERN (R) Turkey (44) TNA Kew:

Peter Heydon, Dept External Affairs, Commonwealth of Australia, London to G.W. Furlong FO London, 2 Apr 1948, Report on arrangements for an Australian delegation from Sydney to travel to Anzac Day Dawn Service at Gallipoli, then to an unveiling ceremony for the Australian Memorial at Tobruk.

28 Apr 1948 Report of Sir Arthur Longmore, Imperial War Graves Commissioner, London to Sir David Kelly, HM Ambassador, Ankara-reported successful visit to the Gallipoli War ceremonies and to cemetery sites.

Dominions Office [DO] and Commonwealth Relations Office: Original Correspondence DO 35/1130/ National Days:

The King’s Anzac Day message, 1943-1946.

Message file DO G578/66 5 Aug 1944 – the question of appropriateness of messages from S of S (Secretary of State) and King George VI relating to the impact of Canada’s Dominion Day.

FO G578/66, Sir Eric Machtig to Rt. Hon. Malcolm McDonald MP (PM Canada) 31 May 1945; ‘Anzac Day messages before the war tended to become a rather mechanical operation.’

H532/2, Anzac Day Celebrations: celebration of Gallipoli Day on 25 Apr. Initial messages indicate that Gallipoli Day would be held on 27 Apr 1943 in Britain, but on 25 Apr. in Australia and New Zealand.

H532/27, Cessation of Hostilities in Europe.

H532/57, Victory March 8 June 1946 - Victory celebrations and departure of Dominion Contingents.

H532/12, Empire days - National days. Australia day BBC broadcast 26 Jan 1944, Australia Day.

CAB 79/47/11, War Cabinet and Cabinet: Chiefs of Staff Committee: Item 10. Anzac Day message.

FO 371/95169, Foreign Office: Political departments: General Correspondence 1906-1966, unveiling the Commonwealth War Memorial in Greece, postponement of the ceremony until Anzac Day 1952.


FO 371/107591, WK1851/2, Proposal to build a Turkish war memorial at Gallipoli.
WK 1851/3, F.C. Sillar, IWGC Buckinghamshire to G. C. Kemball FO London 27 Jan 1953, Turkish pilgrimage to the Gallipoli battlefields. Proposals ‘for the erection of some great memorial to the Turkish dead.’

WK 1851/4, Sec. IWGC to FO, 14 Feb 1953, Turkish Ex-Servicemen’s pilgrimage to Gallipoli.

WK 1851/5, F.C. Sillar, IWGC Buckinghamshire to N.J.A. Cheetham, FO London 27 Feb. 1953 on the IWGC coolness over a Turkish memorial.

WK 1851/5, 9 March 1953, Cheetham’s FO response, A.C. Maby FO to J.L.B. Titchener, Ankara, alerting him to the cool stand of the IWGC over the issues of fraternisation and memorial building.

WK 1851/6, 27 March 1953, Sillar to Cheetham clarified the IWGC position on protection of graves.

WK 1851/7, Titchener British Embassy to Maby FO London 7 April 1953, reaction to the IWGC stand on the proposed Turkish monument.


WK 1851/13 (1855/42/53), Leslie Pott British Consulate-General, Istanbul to Marquis of Salisbury, FO, London, 18 August 1953 report on pilgrimage to Dardanelles, 10-12 August 1953 on the ‘38th anniversary of Anfarta, or Suvla Bay.’ Attendance of about 450 Turks and small parties of British and French ex-servicemen.

WK 1851/15, A.C. Maby FO to F. B. Cooper, Australia House, despatches reporting the hope of the Turkish First Army for a substantial contingent in 1954 from Britain, Australia and New Zealand.


WK 1851/22, FO minute by A.C. Maby of a meeting with Sillar and Colonel Griffin (IWGC Chief Administrative Officer for Near East) on Ambassador Sir Knox Helm’s visit to Gallipoli.

WK 1851/27 (1853/29/53), Sir Knox Helm, British Embassy Ankara to Sir George Young, FO London, 30 Nov 1953 restrictions to Millington’s movements.

WO 32/9816, Gallipoli Day Celebrations 1941. Colonel Fitzgerald AG4 to DPS (Director of Personal Services) 1 Apr 1941, suggestion for abandoning Anzac Day.

FO 369/4984, 1 Apr1953 – 31 Mar 1954 IWGC report; General correspondence on whereabouts of war graves of diverse nationalities.

New Zealand Room archives, Dunedin Public Library (DPL)


Templer Study Centre, National Army Museum, London (NAM)


19-6707, Birdwood Diaries Box 2, 1923 to 1949, 1923 ‘8th Anniversary of Anzac Day.’
**Whanganui Regional Museum (WRM)**

World War I Papers, Box 37, Captain Norman Fitzherbert New Zealand Records Section, 3rd Echelon

II. INTERVIEWS

Gurol Baba and Didem Yaman, postgraduate students of Prof. A.Mete Tunçoku, Dunedin, 14 August 2007.
Robert Campbell, Director, R. Campbell & Son, Funeral Directors, Mosgiel, New Zealand, 17 May 2005.
Kenan Celik, AO, Eceabat, 16 Apr 2007.
Major General W.J. Crews, AO (Retd.), RSL National President, 26 Apr 2006.
Dr Ian Frazer, University of Otago Anthropology Department, 1 Aug 2006.
Özge Gürkan, post-graduate student, Onsekiz Mart Universiti, Eceabat, 24 April 2007.
Lox Kellas, NZRSA Dunedin branch President and Fred Daniel, Malaya and Vietnam veteran, Montecillo War Veterans’ Home, Dunedin 21 Jul 2005.
Rev Dr Geoff King, ex-Military Chaplain, Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, Christchurch, 7 Jun 2008.
Dawn Laing and A. Maelyn Wishart, Australian Forces’ widows, Canberra, 2 May 2006.
Dr Chris Pugsley, Eceabat, 24 Apr 2007.
Dr. J. Maxwell Robertson, Dunedin, 4 June 2007.
Professor Ahmet Mete Tunçoku, Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, 21 and 23 April 2007.

III. CORRESPONDENCE

Arthur Burke, Hon. Historian ANZAC Day Commemoration Committee (Qld) Inc, to George Davis 9 Dec 2008.
Rev. Dr John Moses, formerly Head of History, University of Queensland, Adjunct Professor UNE, now residing in Canberra, ACT.
Rev. Dr Geoff King, ex-Chaplain, New Zealand Defence Forces, Presbyterian minister, Christchurch.
Professor Dr Ahmet Tuncoku, Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Republic of Turkey.

IV. DIARIES and PRIVATE PAPERS

Brathwaite, Sergeant Jack Lister, # 4/354, Mounted Signal Troop, New Zealand Engineers, *Gallipoli Diary*, Helen Brathwaite Collection. Jack Brathwaite, of Hastings, New Zealand, was a member of the Main Body troops to Gallipoli, arriving there 12 May 1915.


Oestreicher, Paul, *Memoire* – in preparation, Chapter 5 portion relating to Anzac Day 1947 experiences as a German Jewish schoolboy at King’s High School, Dunedin. Copy with G. Davis.

V. NEWSPAPERS, JOURNALS and MAGAZINES

*The Australian*

*The Canberra Times.*

*The Dominion Post.*

*Otago Daily Times*, 1915-2000. There is difficulty with page numbering in the 1960s and 1970s because of different editions of the paper being issued each day.

*Evening Star*, Dunedin.

*The Press*, Christchurch.

*The Age*, Melbourne.


*Sunday Star Times*, New Zealand 24 Apr 2005, ‘Remember Them.’


*The Daily Telegraph*, Sydney.

*Sydney Morning Herald.*

*The Sun*, Sydney.

*The Methodist Times*, the official organ of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, 1915 – 1918.

*The Outlook, a Christian Weekly for the Home, The Official Organ of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand*, 1914.

*The Evening Post*, Wellington.

*The Southland Times.*

*Touchstone* - Presbyterian and Methodist Churches of New Zealand.

*Turkish Daily News.*

*Wartime* - magazine of the Australian War Memorial.


VI. ADDRESSES


Hart, David M, ‘Anzac Day Commemoration Speech,’ on 29 Apr. 2006, Indianapolis Australian Society,
Indianapolis, courtesy Department of Veterans’ Affairs, Australian Government. Copy held by G. Davis.

Pugsley, Christopher, ‘Anzac - the cost to a Nation,’ on 2 May 2005, University of Otago.

Pugsley, Christopher, ‘Lions and Donkeys: Revisiting National Mythologies of War,’ Open Lecture,
University of Otago, 3 May 2005.

Örnek, Tolga, director of Gallipoli/Gelibolu: The Front Line Experience, Ekip Film Production, Dogus

Don Worster, University of Kansas. ‘Landscapes’ 27 May 2005, History Department, University of Otago.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

I. Books, booklets and pamphlets (organised by country of origin; title styles follow the sources)

New Zealand

Baker, Paul, King and Country Call: New Zealanders, Conscription and the Great War, Auckland


Boyack, Nicolas and Jane Tolerton, In the Shadow of War: New Zealand soldiers talk about World War

Brookes, Barbara, Charlotte Macdonald and Margaret Tennant (eds.), Women in History 2, Bridget

Burton, Ormond E, The Silent Division – New Zealanders at the Front: 1914-1919, Angus and Robertson,
Sydney, 1935.

Callister, Sandy, The Face of War: New Zealand’s Great War Photography, Auckland University Press,
2008.

Church & Society Commission,’ Consultation on Observance of Anzac Day, Wellington, New Zealand,

Crawford, John, Kia Kaha: New Zealand in the Second World War, Oxford University Press, South
Melbourne, 2002.

Crawford, John and Ian McGibbon (eds.), New Zealand’s Great War: New Zealand, the Allies and the First

Crawford, John and Ian McGibbon, (eds.), One Flag, One Queen, One Tongue: New Zealand, the British


Pugsley, Chris, with Laurie Barber, Buddy Mikaere, Nigel Prickett and Rose Young, *Scars on the Heart: Two Centuries of New Zealand at War*, David Bateman, Auckland, 1996.


**Australia**


Mongan, Cheryl and Richard Reid, ‘*We Have Not Forgotten’: Yass and District’s War, 1914-1918*, CPN Publications, Canberra. 1998.


Stephens, Tony and Steven Siewert *The Last Anzacs: Lest We Forget*, Fremantle Arts Centre Press, Fremantle, WA, 1996.


Williams, John F, *Anzacs, the Media and the Great War*, University of New South Wales, Sydney, 1999.


Winter, Denis, *25 April 1915: the inevitable tragedy*, University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, Qld, 1994.


**Turkey**


Ecevit, Bulent, Gallipoli, a poem sheet, written and translated by the author.

Ersoy, Mehmet Akif and Ali Rifat Çagatay, İstiklal Marşı. [Independence March – the national anthem of the Turkish Republic]. 1921.


Heper, Metin, Historical Dictionary of Turkey, The Scarecrow Press, Lanham, Maryland, USA, 2002 edn.


Tuncoku, A. Mete, [ed.], Gallipoli in Retrospect 90 Years On, Atatürk and Gallipoli Campaign Research Center, Çanakkale, 2005.


Yılmaz, Sâmân and Teoman Yılmaz, Gallipoli, S & T Yılmaz, Gelibolu, Turkey, 1990 edition.

Great Britain


Bourke, Joanna, Dismembering the male: men’s bodies, Britain and the Great War, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1996.


Brittain, Vera, *Testament of Youth; An Autobiographical Study of the Years 1900-1925.*


Roche, Michael, ‘Empire, Duty and Land: Soldier Settlement in New Zealand 1915-1924,’ in Proudfoot,
Winter, Jay, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European cultural history*,

**United States of America**

Erickson, Edward J, *Ordered to Die: A History of the Ottoman Army in the First World War,*’
Field, Steven and Keith H. Basso (eds.), *Senses of Place*, School of American Research, Santa Fe,
New Mexico, 1996.
Huizinga, Johan. ‘The task of Cultural History’, in *Men and Ideas: The Middle Ages, The Renaissance*,
Mango, Andrew, Atatürk: *The Biography of the Founder of Modern Turkey*, The Overlock Press,
Mosse, George L, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*, Oxford University Press,


---

**Canada**


---

**Europe**


---

**Other countries**


II. Articles


Clark, Helen, ‘New Zealand Foreign Policy: pushing the big ideas,’ New Zealand International Review, Vol. XXV, No.4, July/August 2000, 2-16.


Ekins, Ashley, ‘The Unknown Australian Soldier: One man we will never know represents the sacrifice of 102,000,’ Wartime, Issue 25, 11-13.


Furby, Paula. ‘Resurrecting a war memorial,’ Journal of the Australian War Memorial, No. 35, Dec 2001, 1-4 to 4-4 [University of Otago InfoTracOneFile].


Hunter, Kathyn, ‘States of mind: remembering the Australian-New Zealand relationship,’ *Journal of the Australian War Memorial*, No. 36, May 2002, 1-7 to 7-7 [University of Otago InfoTracOneFile].


Laugusen, Amanda. ‘Australian First World War ‘slanguage,’ *Journal of the Australian War Memorial*, No. 38, April 2003, 1-10 to 10-10 [University of Otago InfoTracOneFile].


### III. Conference papers

Berkay, Halil (Sabanci University), ‘The Project of Europeanisation in Turkey: Two Hundred Years of Hypocrisy between Turkey and Europe,’ Angelos Giannakopoulos, *Conference Report: The European Perspective of Turkey after the December 2004 Decision*, Galatsarray University, Istanbul, 3-4 June 2005.

Davis, George, ‘Not worlds apart after all: Turkish and Anzac experiences of the other during and after the Dardanelles campaign,’ 28th Irish Conference of Historians Empires and their Contested Pasts, Queen’s University, Belfast, May 2007.


IV. Unpublished and private works
Theses


**Unpublished Papers**


**Private works**

Blank, Jim, *Tales from the King Country Kid*. James Alfred Blank, Trooper in World War II served in Italy.

Copy with G. Davis.


Yayinevi’nin, Damla, *Bir Çanakkale Şehidinin İlk Ve Son Mektubu* [English trans.], a memorial sheet to a Turkish soldier, Hasan Ethem, who died in the Çanakkale Battle, 17 April 1915. Copy with G. Davis.

**Audiotape, Films and Compact Discs**

AWM F00128, *Gallipoli 1921*, b&w, silent, 12 minutes, silent.
AWM F00176 *A H Noad* film, 1920s, b&w, silent, 50 minutes.
AWM F03396 (also F10276) *Gallipoli* veterans reunion in Turkey 1965, b&w, silent, 8 minutes.
AWM F03007 *Return to Anzac*, Gallipoli RSL veterans’ 60th reunion, Crawford Productions, 1975, colour, sound, 28 minutes.
AWM RELA W01096, Mason, Rod (compiler), *Salute to the Aussie Digger*, Australian Army Band, Sydney/Legacy Project, 2004 DVD.
Jackson, Peter [from footage by Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett], *Heroes of Gallipoli*, Weta Digital and AWM Production, 2005.

**Websites**


www.members.virtualtourist.com/m/7d696/1c1cb1/ Accessed 20 May 2008.


www.NZHistory.net.nz - website History Group of the New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage.


