

**Anglican Pacifist Fellowship Presentation, 10 October 2009
St. John's Theological College, Auckland.**

'Twentieth century Anzac Day meanings seen through the lenses of landscape, memory and fidelity.'

This paper will explain the transfer of anthropological connotations of landscape to the history of Anzac Day, raise questions about which memories prevailed on the day and which memories were suppressed, and look briefly at the application of Derrida's notions of fidelity to participants in the day. There will be emphasis on the role of the Turkish people and their interpretation of Anzac Day.

INTRODUCTION

First of all, it is an honour for this recent history post-graduate scholar to be able to represent Professor Kevin Clements and be allowed to share some of my own thoughts. It seems appropriate that this seminar is on the brink of 'The International Week of Prayer for World Peace.' On behalf of Kevin, I should say that the Dunedin-based National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies has got off to a great start. The National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (NCPACS) was established with a \$1.25m donation from the Aotearoa New Zealand Peace and Conflict Studies Centre Trust. The Trust's gift was granted through Otago University's Leading Thinkers Initiative and was matched by the Government under the Partnerships for Excellence scheme - lifting the total to \$2.5m.

The NCPACS is New Zealand's first Centre to combine global cross-disciplinary expertise on the issues of development, peace building and conflict transformation. It offers postgraduate programs at the Masters and PhD level, conducts high level research on the causes of violent conflict and conditions for sustainable peace, and provides training, evaluation expertise, and expert advice to government and non-governmental organizations engaged in peacebuilding and humanitarian intervention. It is a theory, research and practice centre, located within the Division of Humanities.

The aims of the Centre are to:

- Build understandings of peace and conflict grounded in the experiences of people, places and history; and in ways that respect

customary and local requirements for sovereignty, development, legitimate governance and wellbeing.

- Learn from dialogue, theoretical insight, international research and practical experience, including Aotearoa/ New Zealand's own experiences of Treaty partnership and engagement in international peacebuilding.
- Deliver high quality postgraduate programs at the Masters and PhD level.
- Conduct research on the causes of intrastate and international armed conflict; security, conflict resolution and post -conflict peacebuilding with special reference to the Asia-Pacific region.
- Provide expert advice and advanced level short courses and training for government and non-government organisations engaged in conflict resolution, peacebuilding, development, humanitarian intervention, and policy making around the role of justice and good governance in sustainable peace.
- Engage in practical projects that build local capacities for sustainable development, community engagement, governance and conflict transformation in the Asia-Pacific region, and in Aotearoa/ New Zealand's own contexts.
- Facilitate evaluations and impact assessments of practical projects in the field.
- Advance the understanding and knowledge of conflict resolution processes by conducting state-of-the-art training in negotiation, mediation, and cross-cultural conflict resolution.

To reach these aims, NCPACS has a multidisciplinary faculty, research associates, visiting scholars and partner organisations from around the globe. Led by Professor Kevin Clements this Faculty has a world class reputation in the field. The first level 4 (Honours) papers will be taught in Semester I, 2010. I have an outline of the papers offered with me. (The copy was left with Chris Barfoot).

To the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship my thanks for taking up an offer to speak about commemoration and peace issues and to those of you attending, I hope that this material does not disappoint.

When preparing for this talk and thinking on the title, itself an extension to post-thesis discussions between myself and Professor Kevin Clements, I was reminded of ‘The Ultimate Question’ in the 1980s TV adaptation of Adam’s *The Hitch-hikers’ Guide to the Galaxy*. It seemed about as difficult to bridge the span of landscape, memory, and fidelity in a survey of Anzac Days as it was for the supercomputer, ‘Deep Thought’ to fathom the “Answer to the Ultimate Question of Life, the Universe, and Everything,” or indeed to provide the question! Central to my study was the question how was it that Anzac Day, the anniversary of the landing of New Zealand, Australian and many other British Empire troops and their French allies on the shores of Gallipoli on 25 April 1915, came to be a particular focus of societal and personal memory over the remainder of the twentieth century? It must be said that the factors: landscape, memory, and fidelity each deserve a lecture or perhaps a series, but today I will comment generally and at the end invite questions and comments.

To start, I should broadly clarify the way I interpreted ‘landscape,’ ‘memory,’ and ‘fidelity’ as tools in a historical study of the meanings and transitions of Anzac Day. Landscape was a device I borrowed from anthropology because it was in that discipline that I found the greatest advances made with the concept in the last twenty years. There is a useful relationship between the work of historians and anthropologists when dealing with ‘landscapes.’ While a territory which a society occupies or perceives, is the landscape for anthropologists; historical events and characters occupying that ‘landscape’ in time are central for the historian. However, issues which are central to anthropology, are no less so to history. Memory I took to be both individual memories and community-institutional memory as demonstrated in what communities read in newspapers and journals. Archived documents relating to Anzac Day showed memories were supported and sometimes challenged by official-institutional memories. Fidelity followed the definitions outlined by the French post-modern philosopher Jacques Derrida and greatly accounted for the ritual and maintenance of Anzac Day. Much of the thinking in the development of the thesis was related directly to this factor, which will be reflected in this talk. Also, this notion of fidelity was given special pathos through the absence of the bodies of soldiers who fought in wars involving New Zealand and Australia to the time of the Vietnam Conflict. This last factor accounts for the great amount of monument building in British Empire and Commonwealth territories in the twentieth century.

LANDSCAPE

When I began my research by reading some recommended theorists in the area of landscape and memory a persistent image stuck which pictured these principal factors as conjoining or overlapping circles as in Venn diagrams. Moreover, I thought of them as constantly transient, changing over time. Simply put, some features of landscape such as naming or management of a particular landscape (broadly territory/item/process) did not collectively come into play or operate with equal force to help institute or maintain a particular memory. 'Memory' itself seemed a fickle entity. It is ontologically fluid; that is not only are basic meanings distorted over time, but also individual memories are subject to forgetting. Different factors came into play with time: memory is composed of discrete memories (these are often different interpretations of the same event). Also, any particular memory was frequently a blend of private, community, and institutional memories. Private memories were often submerged by stronger forces. The fluctuating landscapes and memories led me to a diagrammatic conception of the growth of attitudes towards death, mourning practices and commemorations. This rough model led to some discoveries but some unresolved questions, such as what accounted for the sudden growth in interest in Anzac Day after 1980? Moreover, was this related to a concurrent relaxation of attitudes towards death generally? Had some important features in the Australasian cultural landscape altered so significantly that the apparent post WWI attitude of death denial had been swept aside, and with it reluctance to hear soldier stories from the two world wars? Or were there other factors at work, such as: recognising that veterans were ageing and disappearing; the pervasiveness of TV and film programmes showing war; and different governments' intervention to retain veterans' memories as part of a growing affirmation of national identity? However, I get ahead of myself, and should explain some of the particulars of landscape and memory which I used.

American anthropologists Thomas Greider and Lorraine Garkovich, wrote 'Landscapes: The Social Construction of Nature and the Environment', in *Rural Sociology*, in Spring 1994, and Eric Hirsch and Michael O'Hanlon (eds.), *The Anthropology of Landscape; Perspectives on Place and Space*. Clarendon Press, in 1987. Each volume provided grist to the mill of my thinking. Some of their discussions included: conferring and negotiating meanings, naming, ownership, and impression management – the last generally being the exercise and maintenance of power. Their material made sense of the happenings on Gallipoli in 1915, and provided a rationale for the perpetuation of the Gallipoli theme in later Anzac Day commemorations.

Usefully, the notion of ‘cultural landscape’ as a process, promoted by Hirsch and O’Hanlon, seemed to explain the subsequent actions of Anzac and Turkish veterans each seeking their own meanings for physical landmarks or battle sites on the Gallipoli Peninsula. For British, colonial and allied participants in the conflict, there were ‘here and there’ aspects to public and soldier memory with the former prevailing by the 1920s. The immediate soldier memories - of dirt, heat, flies, dysentery and fear - were buried by the selective and seductive public memory of bravery, derring-do action, mateship promulgated by the agency of the press despatches and associated with particular places and battles – Anzac landing, the Nek, Chunuk Bair, Shrapnel Gully, the tennis court. But these public memories were second-hand imaginings for the home or domestic audience, fleshed out by the writings of Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, Charles Bean, Keith Murdoch and New Zealander Malcolm Ross.

We have to be careful handling the term ‘landscape’ and qualify its use within a given context. When gritty issues of human contestation over territory or the significance of particular objects are being discussed, the broad and anthropological term ‘landscape’ applies. However, when historians are discussing the impact of current historical world events on the perceptions of Anzac Day, then it must be interpreted differently, and worded as ‘the current historical landscape.’ Anthropological/historical meanings merge in the forces of ‘landscape’ on Anzac Day. For example, today the management of Anzac Days at Gallipoli is a result of contestation and diplomatic agreement between Australia and New Zealand over control of the day in a particular year; even numbered years to be administered by the officials of the Australian Government – the Dept of Veterans’ Affairs and the Office of the Australian War Graves Commission. So all those facets of management, vital to anthropology are also given substance in current events.

MEMORY

‘Memory’ followed the model of the school of memory currently led by Jay Winter and demonstrated in his famous *Sites of memory, sites of mourning: The Great War in European cultural history*. His model of memory accepts that the Great War was a cataclysmic event that promoted deeply felt community based memories.

These memories were revealed in many ways: in family circles, séances, religious worship, founding organisations of all sorts (ex-servicemen’s,

universities, widows), all of which provided what Jay Winter called ‘fictive kinship.’ Memories were also preserved in community memorials. Notable British writer Alan Borg 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.”¹ In many cases, WWI memorials were incomplete by the start of WWII: a prime example being the AWM which opened in 1941. Both Jay Winter and colleague Paul Keegan (*The First World War*) express the notion that the Great War was not the break or schism which launched modernity, but rather a continuation of previous nineteenth century trends. At a more personal level, individual concerns were voiced in the establishment of the Brisbane-based Anzac Day Commemoration Committee and its immediate concern for the state of Gallipoli graves.

What did this mean for Anzac Day? Anzac Day public commemorations seemed a continuation of previous Victorian trends for mass public recognition of military service. They continued into the 1920s in the graveside service form, the ‘Boxer Service’ named after Captain Dr Ernest Boxer of Hastings who as the RSA national President ratified the more uniform and sombre service, leading to Anzac Day being described as ‘the most sacred day in the New Zealand calendar.’ Similar patterns emerged in Australia, where observances guided by the suggestions promoted by Canon David Garland and the Anzac Day Commemoration Committee of Brisbane were held. ANU historian Pat Jalland recently argued that the twentieth century was marked by a major schism caused by the cataclysmic events of WWI and that the long era of ‘death denial’ quashed revelation about matters of death until 1975. The procession of Anzac Day and its annual public events seemed to challenge the universal application of that theory. I agree with Jay Winter and Paul Keegan that WWII appears a more evident ‘launch point’ into modernity. Changes appear for Anzac Day that led to the inclusion of women and a vast array of minorities, partially because it was more truly a ‘World War.’ It also marked the transition into a post-colonial age and a ‘New Era’ that attempted to face world conflicts with multi-national solutions.

One of my chief concerns while undertaking the thesis was the dominance of western, nationalist and masculine-soldierly memory in the matter of Anzac

¹ Alan Borg *War Memorials – from Antiquity to the Present*, Leo Cooper, London, UK 1991, ix.

Day. Up to 2000, the cut-off point of my work, important voices had been ignored. Even now, the most publicly accessible literature which describes Anzac Day itself, is found as an afterthought or epilogue in masculine military books on the Gallipoli campaign. I have been roundly admonished by a publisher with the assurance that military works sell, others (possibly those on commemoration don't). This begs the question, what do we remember, and what as a society do we want future generations to remember about us? Are conflicts, which spawned perceived heroes, and villains all that is important in Australasian society? Or were there other things, equally important, going on in wartime and peacetime society but never mentioned?

It also seemed curious to me that despite the amount of western attention on Gallipoli Australasians knew very little about the Turkish view of the battle for Gallipoli. They call it "Canakkale Savaşları" (the Canakkale Battles) and the memory of which they honour with Onsekiz Mart Zaferi – 18 March Victory – a celebration which flows through the Turkish calendar from March to December. The Turkish people's memories were neglected for a number of reasons: Arabic Turkish script, along with many of the principal institutions of the Ottoman era including Sharia courts, was abandoned in the period of rapid modernisation in the early and mid 1920s. Very few modern scholars can read Arabic Turkish, although recently significant inroads have been made into translating the records held in Ankara. The period was one of great turmoil, with more than 80% of its population moving in the period 1916–1925. Few Turks left written records, as the literacy level was very low. This fact alone accounts for the great discrepancy between the written material left by the Turks and that of the Anzacs, the latter alone is a treasure trove in the AWM and other archives. Other factors have intervened – it was only from the mid 1980s that the Turkish Government began to positively affirm the place of the Canakkale Savaşları in the building of the Republic. To understand this we must recognise that within Turkey, Canakkale was a backwater removed from the centres of power of Istanbul and Ankara. Even in 2000, the publication of Martin Gilbert's *The Straits of War: Gallipoli Remembered*, which contains contributions from many western notables has only one from a Turkish author. Osman Olcay, a diplomat for Turkey in the second half of the twentieth century.

The truth about the real feelings towards war and its aftermath was often expressed most appropriately, not in the memoirs of generals but in the records of the citizen soldier. There is great overlap in the treasured

memories left by some individuals in the campaign, no matter which side they were on. Perhaps we can sense this common humanity of 1915 in a rare contemporary Turkish letter. This document became the post-script to Tolga Ornek's 2005 film, *Gallipoli: The Front-line Experience*. Film-goers deemed the film a memorable and different experience and the last scene moving:

Letter of Mehmet Tevik (V.O.)

Monday, May 31st, 1915

Ariburnu

Source of my being, the guiding lights of my life,
To my beloved father and mother,
Dearest Father, Dearest Mother,

During the first terrible battle I fought at Ariburnu, a bullet grazed my right side and passed through my trousers. God be praised, I was spared. But I do not hope to survive future battles in which I will fight. I am writing these lines so you will have something to remember me by.

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. So, I know I cannot ask for anything more than what is possible. To ask would be quite in vain. Please give the enclosed letter addressed to my wife into her own hands. She will be devastated, so please do what you can to console her grief. Naturally she will weep and mourn; comfort her.

Dear father and mother, unintentionally I might have failed in many of my duties towards you and upset you with my mistakes. Please forgive me. My dear sister, Lütfiye, you know that I have loved you very much. I wish I could have done everything I could for you. Maybe I have failed in my duties towards you. Please forgive me. It was the will of divine destiny. Bid me farewell and pray for my soul...

O relatives, beloved friends and comrades, farewell to you all. All of you please bid me farewell and pray for my soul. I will pray for yours. Farewell, I entrust and consign you all to God. Beloved father and dearest mother, I eternally entrust you to God. Farewell.

Your son Mehmet Tevfik.

Unsurprisingly, this letter is close in subject and tone to the numerous and affectionate letters of Colonel William Malone, the commander of the Wellingtons on Chunuk Bair in 1915 to his wife at home in Taranaki. His letters conveyed much more about the disposition and movements of allied and Turkish troops, despite censorship. (Mind you he was probably the brigades censor). What does this tell us? It uncovers the deepest levels of relationship and relates to those matters of focal importance: consideration, respect, obligations and memory.

What do we remember, and why were some memories relegated? The letters of Tevik and Malone recognise a common humanity, often overridden by contemporary political events but hard to challenge when viewed later.

FIDELITY

This was a principal idea for me: this, in the sense that the home community comprising both returnees from the services and the domestic community wanted to retain faith with those who had died. The idea seemed to provide a more than adequate motivation for the institution and maintenance of Anzac Days, here and overseas. But it also posed problems.

What about the matter of those ex-service personnel who did not attend? Anzac Day non-attendance deeply concerned territorial Australian Imperial Forces Captain George Ramsay of Parramatta, NSW who wrote a letter in 1932 to his superior Gallighan discussing the disappointing turnout of original Anzacs. Ramsay was the organiser of some of the most spectacular tattoos for Sydney's Anzac Day 1932-36. He later went on to be a second in command of one of the few AIF units fighting the Japanese in Malaya and was a senior Australian officer in two Japanese POW camps. He questioned the "loyalty" of the non-attendees and wondered what could be done to remedy the issue. He felt that men who did not attend were dishonouring the memory of their dead comrades.

Central then to both attendees and non-attendees was the matter of fidelity. My uncle, Trooper Jim Blank of Tokorima felt he could not face the organised bustle and what he called the “booze-up” of Anzac Day before 1955 while properly respecting the memory of his friends. Lt Col Ramsay felt non-attendees lacked respect and proper fidelity. *What then is it?* 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.² At the centre of Derrida’s observation is the need of all humans to mark the death with a process of fulfilling responsibility to the dead.³ 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.’⁴ 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 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.’⁵ Some of you may feel a Eucharistic twinge here!

Fidelity, which travels hand in hand with memory, is central for Derrida on the death of his friends. Without it there is no truth. This idea prevails on Anzac Day encapsulated in the intonation of ‘Lest we forget’ and ‘We will remember them.’ The words reveal 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 broader questions. Did the original Anzacs stand and die for a common cause? Are the reasons for their sacrifice applicable today? What happens if we now have different values – does Anzac Day represent our present values or those of the original Anzacs?

² Jacques Derrida (trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas), *The Work of Mourning*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2001.

³ Sorcha Fogarty, ‘The Work of Mourning, (2001),’ *The Literary Encyclopedia*, The Literary Dictionary Company, London, 2004. www.litencyc.com/php/ Accessed 11 Aug 2005.

⁴ 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.’

⁵ *Ibid*, 3.

Soldiers' letters, 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.⁶ 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.⁷ Here, viewers are encouraged to demonstrate empathy. The practice of placing poppies in the grooves between the bronze plaques outside the Shrine of the AWM has been exported to Gallipoli. The individual record, or artefact belonging to a named individual creates a connection. The names are significant – they are read (often aloud) with care.

Derrida thought 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.⁸ 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 the two same impossibilities. Families and organisers of Anzac Day shared the same discussion.⁹ Attendance and participation by ex-servicemen and women in

⁶ AWM research, August 2005, April 2006, November 2007.

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ AWM PR00079 Papers of Col. George F. Ramsay – 1932 notes commenting on the absence of some veterans from the commemorative parades and observances; Lox Kellas, NZRSA Dunedin branch

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.

Does fidelity still provide a rationale for attendance at Anzac Day observances? In a broad sense it does. By this, I do not mean the fidelity of soldierly mateship but rather keeping the faith. A host of people attend Anzac Day at Gallipoli out of respect for the place of the soldier of the Dardanelles-Canakkale campaign, irrespective of nationality. You will find Turkish nationals at Lone Pine and Chunuk Bair (Chonk Bayiri) and the delightfully placed and kept French cemetery at Morto Bay and you will find Anzacs and British or French roaming the numerous Turkish cemeteries like the Hospital cemetery near Krithia (modern Alcitepe).

The future of Anzac Day commemorations:

While it is outside the scope of historians to forecast the future, I wondered what matters of this topic might project beyond today? Perhaps more importantly, what features in these landscapes and memories might be seen more universally as positive tools for peace making? Are there factors or patterns within landscape, memory and fidelity that might act as useful guides encouraging rapport between former enemies? And might the same factors hint at the future trends of Anzac Day?

There certainly have been major changes in landscape since the inception of Anzac Day. Matters such as conferring and negotiating meanings, naming, ownership, and impression management have moved great distances. In 1916 meanings were conferred on the war landscape by Westerners. British and Anzacs alike placed their own meanings on Gallipoli, largely supplanting those held by the Turks. Places like Chonk Bayiri became famous as the highest point reached, Chunuk Bair, Plugge's Plateau and Lone Pine were familiar expressions giving meaning to an otherwise foreign territory. But over the century, Krithia became Alcitepe, (even the older villagers now do not recognise the Greek name), Maidos became Eceabat, Chanak became Çanakkale and Smyrna became Izmir. Furthermore, western visitors to the Dardanelles have increasingly shown a willingness to learn the

President and Fred Daniel, Malaya and Vietnam veteran, Montecillo War Veterans' Home, Dunedin 21 July 2005; Major General W.J. Crews, AO (Retd.), RSL National President, 26 April 2006.

experiences of the 'other side.' Today's youth generally accept that there is worth in accepting that the Turkish story must be known in order to understand what happened to one's Anzac forebears. It is this understanding of the other that has increased the friendship between Turks and Anzacs. What began in enmity has been moderated by growing acceptance and experiences in the others' world. These shared experiences underpin the growing acceptance of each other nations' stories and create a base for personal friendships.

Let us make no mistake about this though. There is another vital force at play here. Historical records going back to the 1920s and 1930s pilgrimages by veterans and their relatives to Gallipoli show a continuous thread of willingness on the part of many Turkish nationals to forgive the invasion of their country and to accept the Anzacs who lie in their soil as theirs. A cynical view is that it suited Turkey politically to forward that policy as part of its initiatives towards the west. It was not until 1952 that Turkey's application to join NATO and be accepted as part of the Western Alliance was successful. So what was happening before that, and indeed why is there consistency to be found in both national and individual approaches by Turks to Anzac Day? From 1931, Mustapha Kemal was thinking about abandoning the policy of indifference towards his former enemies, and this came to fruition in 1934 in an early version of the famous statement attributed to him as found on the stone monolith above Anzac Cove. His policy of rapprochement was forwarded by successors like Inonu and embedded in the policies of the military who saw and still see themselves as the guardians of the Republic. This does not explain however, why, after so many years, almost a century, Turks continue to offer hospitality; particularly it seems, to Kiwis. I believe that the Turkish people see us as kindred spirits: coming to nationhood after being in an Empire; therefore, being young, in a sense; struggling to create conditions of equality of all citizens; of being European yet out of Europe.

There is I think a spiritual direction in all of this. Not only did The Ottoman Empire represent at the time the most powerful political face of Mohammedanism, and its soldiers fought with the cry of Allah, but Turkish Islam has encouraged the imperative of graciously hosting visitors. There are very few instances that I have read or experienced where strangers have been treated badly. The Turkish people today now look on their republic's experiences at Gallipoli as seminal. A commander defending the Anzac sector, Lt Col Mustapha Kemal became the first President of the Republic.

His influence largely pushed Turkey into modernity and closer relationships with the West. Indeed, his initiatives made Westerners welcome with their values. This thrust to accept others within Turkey is seen increasingly in Gallipoli Anzac Day. Today, 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 57th Regiment Cemetery, the New Zealand service at Chunuk Bair.¹⁰ 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 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.

From a broader viewpoint, the most important issue which has affected the meanings of Anzac Day since 1980, has been the emergence of Gallipoli as a universal shrine for the day. World focus through the agency of television now firmly centres on the activities of the day there, complementing local participation here in Australasia. Indeed, the Republic of Turkey's Education Department has made the area one of pilgrimage for all Year 8 and 9 students – in order for them to see the foundation place of the Republic (and perhaps the place of the last successful defence of the Ottoman Empire). The Government of the Republic has been the primary mover in the development of HNP – the Gallipoli Peace Park initiative since the 1980s, and its part has shown the necessity of positive political will for success. This direction can be seen locally in Çannakale - Turkish nationals visited increasingly since the 1980s and much more noticeably since 2000. In fact, one of the unwanted side effects has been the endangering of the battlefield environment through the transit of huge numbers of visitors each year.

What of memory? I commented that memory was ontologically fluid: it changes meanings with the years and the passing of generations. The memories of the World War I generation are only second hand now, and the fragments this generation garners have different meanings in a changed world. Does it matter that the present generation see other meanings on Anzac Day? I think not. The central commemorative meaning will always

¹⁰ 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.

remain. The growth of Gallipoli as a shrine for Anzac Day commemorations has allowed Turkish memories to have a place on Anzac Day. New Zealanders and Australians have broadened the memories of the day away from the Gallipoli story to encompass other conflict areas in which the two countries were involved in the twentieth century. Peacekeeping initiatives have given a different direction to Anzac Day addresses and this seems to appeal to a broader audience. The increasing numbers of family groups participating in the commemorations now experience a much more comprehensive array of ideas and memories than those of fifty years ago.

I wonder, if it is a step too far to propose that common commemorative gestures might hold a key for peace? It seems that in two different world localities I am aware of – Turkey, and Germany–Russia where shared care for war graves has helped peaceful understandings there appears to be a wish to respect and forgive. I became aware of the latter case through a chance meeting in Stockholm in May 2007 with Professor Dieter Landgraf-Dietz, voluntary committee member of the VDK - Volksbund Deutsche Kriegsgräberfürsorge e.V. (German People's Association for the Upkeep of War Graves) i.e. German War Graves Commission with responsibilities in the Eastern sector. The organisation to which he belongs, employs local Russian people and specialists from Germany and Russia to redesign and finance cemeteries, locate and re-inter the Wehrmacht and Russian bodies and establish a continuing care of the cemetery sites. He feels that these actions, of themselves, help encourage conditions for peace.

What then of Anzac Day? The matter of Gallipoli as world shrine if not only a media focus seems to have captured attention, here and in Turkey. In New Zealand and Australia, increasing numbers of people are attending the Dawn Service in particular. Education programmes appear to be increasing (and certainly are strong in Australia and in Turkey) and publications relating to war service and Anzac Day have gained great popularity. This year has seen the publication of Keith Scott's 'Before Anzac, Beyond Armistice: The Men of Central Otago Who Fought in World War I and the Home They Left Behind' published by Activity Press, Auckland. This a well-crafted book in which war stories are told but war is not glorified. I think Anzac Day has developed a meaning that is enduring which has blended into the New Zealand psyche. It shows a respect for the services of past generations without being nationalistic. It has moved beyond the narrow focus of the 1980s and now encompasses others' stories, others' interpretations of our stories.