NOVA

University of Newcastle Research Online

nova.newcastle.edu.au

Bennett, James "Breaking out of the nationalist/ic paradigm: international screen texts on the 1915 Gallipoli campaign". Originally published in Continuum Vol. 28, Issue 5, p. 640-653 (2014)

Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2014.942023>

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in Continuum on 08/08/2014, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/10304312.2014.942023>

Accessed from: <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.13/1296246>

**‘ “Breaking Out of the Nationalist/ic Paradigm”:
International Screen Texts on the 1915 Gallipoli Campaign’**

When Gallipoli is told as a multiple perspective, transnational story, this can lead various audiences in different nations to a recognition of it as a shared event rather than an exclusive one, as dominates in the Bean/Weir Gallipoli legend (Hillman 2011: 31)

James Bennett

With some notable exceptions, representations— especially popular ones— of the 1915 Gallipoli campaign in the Great War have long been confined to singular national (and nationalistic) interpretations of the campaign that are typically built around the elevation of mythology, national identity and sentiment. Peter Weir’s seminal 1981 feature film, *Gallipoli*, a distillation of the Anzac legend’s essential elements, is arguably the most influential text on this historical turning point for modern generations, overwriting even the iconic texts of Australian war correspondent and later official historian, Charles Bean, whose work was widely disseminated and read by earlier generations. Underpinned by a radical nationalist interpretation of events central to which is the idea of a British betrayal, Weir’s film is a text that reinforced Australian (and deeply entwined Turkish) national mythologies (Damousi 2010: 307-309; Fewster 2003: 11). Moreover it simplified a multifaceted campaign with key international linkages through its exclusive interrogation of the Anglo-Australian imperial relationship at a time of resurgent Australian nationalism.

Former New Zealand diplomat Denis McLean (d. 2011) observed that although Anzac was a shared historical enterprise, with few exceptions it had been commemorated along separate national lines. This is especially true in Australia where the term ‘Anzac’ in contemporary usage is essentially shorthand for all things Australian. (McLean 2003: 97-104). Although far less influential, at almost exactly the same historical moment across the Tasman, novelist and occasional playwright Maurice Shadbolt was exploring the cultural resonances of the Gallipoli campaign for New Zealanders (the other Anzacs) in his dramatic stage play, *Once on Chunuk Bair*. The play was adapted a decade later as a low budget feature film,

Chunuk Bair (Shadbolt 1982; *Chunuk Bair* 1991; Bennett 2012). Radical nationalist interpretations of Australian enmeshment in British wars produced by the post-imperial generation resonated powerfully with the national psyche and this accounts for why the screen restaging of Australian Anzacs at war was both pervasive and enduring (Damousi 2010: 308-309). Although Shadbolt's perspective was similarly inspired by the ideology of filial betrayal, on the other hand his cultural nationalism was galvanised by a search for differentiation from an Australian identity. An ancillary motivation of Shadbolt was to rehabilitate the reputation of Colonel William Malone, leader of the Wellington battalion and one of the few outstanding Allied commanders in the campaign. (Bennett 2012: 57).

The limitations of the nationalist paradigm and the heroic-romantic tradition of war writing have increasingly been challenged in the new millennium by historians and filmmakers (sometimes acting in concert) who have reinterpreted Gallipoli through a more layered and nuanced transnational lens.¹ The epigraph from Roger Hillman's article crystallises the significance of this shift. Two prime examples of such visual texts that embody the work of leading historians in the field are Wain Fimeri's *Revealing Gallipoli* (2005) and Tolga Örnek's *Gallipoli: The Frontline Experience* (2005), each made to mark the ninetieth anniversary of the campaign. A comparative analysis of these two texts highlights the value of the new documentary form as a tool for recovering memory of the campaign outside Australia and for exploring its multiple meanings. This article discusses the transnational production dimensions of both documentaries and their varying inter-cultural reception by considering the distinctive meanings and role in collective memory in turn for a New Zealand, Turkish and Irish audience. This will be done in part by relating the discussion back to Weir's landmark production to highlight elisions, simplifications and the ongoing process of cultural exchange taken up in these texts. The article argues for their potential as an important intervention in the field of Gallipoli studies and indeed education more broadly.

Before turning to these two visual exemplars of the transnational turn it is first useful to briefly review the literature and screen texts that ran in parallel with Weir's *Gallipoli* to

situate that film in its nationalist context. To appreciate the transition to a new nationalism it is also necessary to do some backtracking to understand the shifting sands of Australian attitudes to Britain and empire in the post-war period. Trenchant criticisms of Anzac Day and the imperial rituals embedded in that tradition emerged in the 1960s and became more vocal through the course of the 1970s. Indeed, because of its imperial associations, Anzac Day defied credibility as a medium for the new nationalism, a phenomenon based on a new political, cultural and military self-assurance championed by Labor leader Gough Whitlam (Damousi 2010: 307). A sense of futility about war and disillusionment at the long record of Australian involvement in fighting British wars permeates the texts of the post-war generation. Bill Gammage's seminal 1974 work, *The Broken Years*, a history of Australian soldiers in the First World War based on war diaries and letters, inscribes that interpretation (296 and 309). Gammage's ideas were influential: not only was the book placed on the school curriculum, but as historical adviser to Peter Weir, *Gallipoli* became the book's "cinematic offspring" (Bridge 2012). That film, widely used in education circles in and beyond Australia, has virtually displaced all other textual representations of the campaign, such was the measure of its hypnotic power. It is also noteworthy that Weir's film coincided with the re-publication of Charles Bean's official war histories and growing interest in the lives of the common soldier as evidenced in particular by Albert Facey's best seller, *A Fortunate Life*, adapted in 1985 as a television mini-series from the book by the Nine Network.

That the Anzac Legend was central to Australian national identity by the 1980s is evidenced by the plethora of texts that emerged in print and on screen. Influential films and television mini-series— in particular *Gallipoli*, *The Anzacs* (1985) and *The Lighthorsemen* (1987)— played a major role in popularising a nationalistic focus one of whose foundation stones was an unfavourable depiction of the British— usually the officer class— and their comparison with superior Australians (Reynaud 2007: 248-249). In a rare departure from this 'anti-British patriotism' in the 1980s the ABC's *Four Corners*, led by iconoclast reporter Chris Masters, produced the insightful *Gallipoli: The Fatal Shore* (*Gallipoli* 1988). Masters was

synonymous with Four Corners, an investigative journalism show that began to adopt a 'documentary sensibility' (Fitzsimons, Laughren and Williamson 2011: 162). This *Gallipoli* situated itself as one that 'recreates for the viewer a greater understanding of the tragedy and the complex truth behind the war' (*Gallipoli* 1988). Its perspective is drawn from the testimony of Australian, New Zealand, British and Turkish veterans and features interviews with historians and other expert talking heads from several participant nations. The Four Corners *Gallipoli*—winner of the 1988 UN Media Peace Award—in effect destabilises the exclusive focus of the nationalist paradigm and anticipates the emergence of the transnational turn. At ten year intervals Four Corners returned to the theme of war and national identity. In 2008 Masters' swansong report for the ABC's flagship current affairs program featured a debate mostly between British, Australian and Canadian historians that juxtaposed national and international approaches to thinking about the war and the legacy of its memory ('The Great History War' 2008).

The early work of Four Corners in 1988 on the theme of war, memory and identity foreshadowed the emergence of two very significant productions in 2005, Tolga Örnek's *Gallipoli* and Wain Fimeri's *Revealing Gallipoli*. In the intervening period the documentary project in Australia had, by necessity, evolved. In part this reflected changes in 'technologies, industry and institutional practices', but also significant was a new civic engagement in which documentary developed a social and educational role 'through a configuration of filmmakers, educators, broadcasters and government agencies'. One concrete outcome of this new engagement was the production of study guides by the Australian Teachers of Media (ATOM) for the Film Finance Corporation (Fitzsimons, Laughren and Williamson 2011: 212-213). *Revealing Gallipoli* was one of the beneficiaries of this initiative. Whilst each documentary is distinctive in its approach and aesthetic, the commonalities are perhaps more striking: devoid of jingoism and sentimentalism, both reflect a growing body of revisionist transnational historical scholarship on the campaign; their anti-war tone is unmistakeable; and their emphasis is on the universal experience of war,

supported by the unvarnished words of the common man revealed through letters and diaries. Simply put, they make a compelling case for rethinking the campaign and what it meant to all of the major combatants. To this end *Revealing Gallipoli* makes a particularly important contribution to revised understandings of the campaign by providing a space for Ireland's submerged role in the conflict, a profoundly contested memory, to be discussed and re-remembered. In both documentaries the viewer is offered tools to re-negotiate their exclusive national alignments via the filmmakers' re-presentation of the campaign through a more holistic prism.

The production of these two screen texts was the outcome of extensive international collaboration between historians, researchers, film and television production crews. In the words of its producer, Hamdi Döker, *Gallipoli: The Frontline Experience* is a documentary 'without any borders' (*Gallipoli* 2005. Special DVD Feature Behind the Scenes: 'The Making of'). The same might equally be said of director Wain Fimeri's production, *Revealing Gallipoli*, made for the small screen. The complexity of this revisionist project is highlighted in particular by Melbourne-based Fimeri's documentary which involved the complex interweaving of multiple versions using different historian presenters, several languages and various production formats, reflecting the different tastes and requirements of broadcasters overseas who became partners in the project. December Films made 13 versions in three languages (English, Welsh and Turkish) in the first half of 2005, with the Welsh and New Zealanders using their own presenters. The format also differed across broadcasters with ABC TV in Australia requiring a single 90 minute documentary while other national broadcasters were delivered two one-hour episodes (146).

Inclusion and exclusion is a theme that has long characterised representations of Gallipoli on the page and screen. The Turkish-flavoured *Gallipoli*, written and directed by Tolga Örnek, was made as a feature length documentary by Ekip Film, a specialist in the production of international documentaries. Four institutions are acknowledged as critical to the success of the project: the Australian War Memorial; the Imperial War Museum in Britain;

the New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage; and the Çanakkale Naval Museum. Several Australians acted as historical consultants, but two are cited for special acknowledgment: Ashley Ekins, principal historical adviser; and Brad Manera who was permanently on set (Örnek and Toker 2006: Introduction). The producers succeeded in gaining a theatrical release in a number of countries including Australia. Two versions were made, one in English narrated by eminent international actors, Jeremy Irons and Sam Neill, who are very familiar to an Anglophone audience, and a Turkish language version. Fimeri's *Revealing Gallipoli* was instead made for the small screen using historian-presenters and designed as an international production that involved collaboration between December Films and ABC TV as well as multiple partner broadcasters overseas: Turkish Radio and Television, Television New Zealand, SC4 International in Wales and RTÉ in Ireland. The BBC did not in the end sign on as a collaborating broadcaster with a resulting shift in focus to the (usually submerged) Irish role in the overall British operation. And as in virtually all visual texts on the campaign the French role (other than a cursory mention for their part in the amphibious invasion and the disastrous naval assault that prefigured it) is once again all but occluded (Stanley 2011: 144 and 147). As recounted by Peter Stanley, Fimeri's rationale for this decision was entirely pragmatic, that is, "[h]istory is written in television by those that pay for it" (147). Örnek's film on the other hand does not draw the viewer's attention to the Irish role in British operations, although one of the biographical portraits it presents is of Guy Nightingale, a British regular officer in the Royal Munster Fusiliers. Although Örnek's *Gallipoli* is a less significant departure from the traditional expository documentary mode, both make use of highly innovative visual techniques. In part this was a response to the absence of moving images of the campaign accessible to the directors: a mere eight minutes of film taken by British war correspondent, Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, is all that remains. Örnek believes that Ashmead-Bartlett recorded much more than this but that the remaining film simply did not survive (*Gallipoli*. 2005: DVD feature: Audio commentary with Tolga Örnek). This has some obvious effects on the way the story is presented visually in both documentaries including a greater emphasis than is often the case in twentieth century

history on photographs, the use of dramatic re-enactment to fill the gap on screen and the dynamic interrelationship of both. Cutting edge technology and painstaking attention to detail were critical to the overall effect. As Örnek has explained, new photographic animation transformed two dimensional photos into 3D images and they in turn were a critical structuring device for the director to transition into dramatic sequences that integrated images very closely with the historical context. This technique assisted in transporting the audience into the trenches and providing them with a soldier's-eye experience. Örnek conceptualises his approach as a docu-drama², that is, one that blends the dramatic device of performance with traditional elements of non-fiction systems of representation (*Gallipoli* 2005. Audio commentary). This blended method is now widely evident in the production of new hybrid forms of documentary that destabilise the boundaries between drama and non-fiction by seeking to maximise audience engagement. Örnek's technique made use of colour film in staging his re-enactments, employing the Australian Brad Manera to supervise the historicity of sets; Fimeri, on the other hand, demarcated contemporary landscapes inhabited by his historian-presenters from historical scenes by re-using grainy black and white sequences produced by earlier filmmakers. Apart from the disclaimer embedded in an intertitle at the beginning of the production, viz. 'only one roll of film is known to have been made at Gallipoli. Portions of this program have been recreated' (*Revealing Gallipoli* 2005), the viewer is able to deduce from camera positions and angles that despite its gritty realism they are not watching archival footage.

The narrative structure of each documentary is anchored around mini-biographies of selected men from several participant nations supported by archival images and apposite quotations from their letters and diaries. In both cases the producers are careful not to overwhelm the audience with factual information about the campaign (*Gallipoli* 2005. Audio commentary). Rather, they intercut a concise overarching account of strategy and the High Command on each side of the battle lines with thumbnail sketches, in the process providing sufficient contextual information for the viewer to relate semi-biographical portraits to the

wider operational context. In some cases the subjects exemplify a point that the filmmaker is attempting to convey to his audience. The two Australian brothers Oliver and Joe Cumberland, for instance, are emblematic in Örnek's *Gallipoli* of many men who saw the campaign— indeed the entire war— as a sense of adventure. This sits in stark contrast with the underlying argument about the utter futility of the campaign and the sheer destructiveness of war. A similar message is conveyed through the personal narrative of British regular officer Major Guy Nightingale of the Royal Munster Fusiliers who survived the entire campaign intact only to fatally shoot himself with his service revolver on the twentieth anniversary of the Gallipoli landings (Jeffery 2004:172). Such a tragic subject is a salutary reminder that the scars of war haunt the participants, those close to them and ultimately the society which they inhabit long after the last shot is fired. This approach effectively reconfigures war in its broader societal context in line with the objectives of the new military history (see Bourke 2006).

Other mini-biographies in each documentary have much to reveal about aspects of the campaign that have sometimes been overlooked. They include: in *Gallipoli* the revealing thoughts of New Zealand doctor, Perceval Fenwick, and Turkish career officer, Selahattin Adil; and in *Revealing Gallipoli* the surprising role of Dacre Stoker, the Irishman in command of the Australian submarine *AE2*, along with 16 year old Turkish soldier, Adil Shahin. Shahin is also presented briefly much later in life as a veteran in a recorded interview at the end of the documentary. Örnek has explained that the names given at the end of each diary or letter extract that is read out in *Gallipoli* means that the narrator could have been referring to any soldier. The director took this approach so the audience could look at all the soldiers as *people*, not as Aussies, Turks or any other defined national identity, because nationality is *not* ultimately their most important characteristic (*Gallipoli* 2005. Audio commentary). Along with other devices including the concealment of faces and, by implication, national identities in dramatic sequences, this technique supports the presentation of Gallipoli as a shared, transnational story. (Hillman 2011: 34). Roger Hillman highlights the value of this approach in

his article focused on two key texts that embed a transnational perspective on the campaign: Örnek's *Gallipoli* and Louis de Bernière's novel, *Birds without Wings* (2004).

While each filmmaker employs different techniques, both Örnek and Fimeri were determined to address the conflict from 'all sides'. It is a message that is even conveyed on the front cover of the *Gallipoli* DVD (*Gallipoli* 2005. Audio commentary). This way of thinking goes to the very heart of historical *perspective*, a key methodology in the new Australian national History curriculum for schools yet one that is seldom addressed adequately in traditional historical accounts of the campaign that accentuate national viewpoints. Here, Fimeri's innovative technique in the deployment of his historian-presenters on set merits discussion. Whereas Örnek's project is anchored by the unseen narrator's voice and studio-bound expert talking heads, so characteristic of the expository documentary mode, Fimeri instead deploys his three experts not as interviewees but as presenters located in contemporary landscapes in the mode of reporters addressing the audience from the scene of the historical battle. In a carefully choreographed performance, the three historian-presenters cross paths with each other on set and the camera transitions from one to the other in their speaking roles, reflecting the importance of perspective and its ever shifting nature in this complex campaign. The constantly changing perspective has the effect of subverting traditional expectations of *whose* voice we will hear and how perspective is contingent. Each of the presenters is a skilled performer before the camera and the combined impact of semiotics, voice and accent contributes to the affective power of *Revealing Gallipoli*. As the noted and seasoned TV historian, Simon Schama, once observed, television forces the historian to re-make his or her craft (Schama 2003: 21); an adjustment process that Peter Stanley, one of the three presenters in the Australian version of *Revealing Gallipoli*, has commented on elsewhere (Stanley 2011: 145). This more dynamic technique of utilising historians on screen is calculated to hold an audience as it responds to the contemporary demand of viewers to have a more direct relationship to the

source of expert knowledge and to be more actively engaged in the program's content (de Groot 2008: 114).

Traditional representations of the Gallipoli campaign have focused largely or even exclusively on the amphibious invasion of the peninsula on 25 April 1915. In particular, the landings at Anzac Cove by Australian and New Zealand forces have so dominated these accounts that one could be forgiven for thinking that nobody else on the allied side was present except perhaps for some hapless British generals. That exclusive focus is overturned and is treated in a much broader and more intelligible context in *Revealing Gallipoli*. After establishing the Allied plan for landing ground troops at S, V, W, X and Y beaches (all at Cape Helles) and Z beach (Anzac) using digitally enhanced maps, Fimeri then presents a beach-by-beach view. The narrative is aided by deliberately distorted and disorienting camerawork at given moments to underscore his point about the ubiquity of confusion, disarray, poor planning and mismanagement that were so characteristic of the landings and, indeed, the entire Allied campaign. Choreographing of historian-presenters by Fimeri at Y Beach is memorable and deserves to be recounted here. The Irish historian and engaging raconteur, Keith Jeffery, is standing on Y Beach and his first statement to camera sums up this particular landing – unexpectedly – not as a slaughter but as ‘a farce’. He quotes a line of poetry from Major Jack Churchill, Winston’s brother: ‘to call this thing a beach is stiff, it’s nothing but a bloody cliff’. Suddenly the camera tracks Peter Stanley walking on the cliff face above the beach where Jeffery is standing.

Stanley to camera: ‘Colonel Godfrey Matthews, Plymouth Marines, believes *he* is in charge of the landing.’

The camera zooms back to Jeffery in distorted mode with appropriate sound effects and the camera oscillates between them in the following scenes as the muddle and confusion is compounded.

Jeffery to camera: ‘Colonel Archibald Coe of the Scottish Borderers believes *he* is in charge.’

Stanley to camera: ‘Matthews was present at the briefing for the landings. Coe wasn’t.’

Jeffery to camera: 'but Coe's men land first. Matthews' men are in support.'

Savaş Karakaş to camera: (the Turkish presenter, a well-known personality on Turkish television and grandson of a veteran, is standing on higher ground, reflecting the relative position of Ottoman Turkish troops on the day of the landings and through the campaign)

'British commanders argue about the rightful command of the landing.... They are not aware that only 1000 Turkish defenders were in the area at that time. There were 2000 invaders....' (*Revealing Gallipoli* 2005).

In each case Fimeri and Örnek offer a superior contextualisation of the amphibious invasion of 25 April by exploring the back story. This approach is rendered more meaningful by taking the Ottoman experience into account. Historical studies of the campaign did not consult Ottoman (or German) archival sources before Canadian historian Tim Travers' study, *Gallipoli 1915* (Travers 2001). Despite this advance, accessing the Turkish common man's voice was still problematic as literacy rates in the Ottoman army were historically very low (Fewster 2003: 99). The role of Karakaş in *Revealing Gallipoli* is therefore significant in foregrounding that perspective. The real back story to the campaign began with decisions made by the British War Cabinet and its desultory drift into the disastrous side show that would be Gallipoli. Karakaş is employed to very good effect in the early scenes of the documentary by drawing the audience's attention to Churchill's confiscation of two warships under construction for the Ottoman Empire, paid for by the latter through public subscription. This serious British miscalculation put the Ottoman Turks off side and would ultimately drive them into an alliance with Germany. Here, then, is a truth that opposes contemporary British propaganda that the Turks were mere hapless victims of German trickery— a perspective that is inscribed in Charles Chauvel's 1940 feature film, *Forty Thousand Horsemen* on the Australian Light Horse in the Palestine campaign (Gnida and Simpson 2009: 98; Fewster 2003: 42-43). The ill-fated Allied bombardment of Ottoman shore positions in the Dardanelles in March 1915, an assault whose dismal failure prefigured the later call for the 25 April landings, is also often elided in representations of the campaign. Here again we see Karakaş articulating an Ottoman perspective via the following points: a consistent failure by

the British to rate their opponent seriously (in line with racial thinking of the day); the vital activities of the small Ottoman mine layer, the *Nusret*; and a fresh emphasis in narration of the naval bombardment from the perspective of Ottoman gun emplacements on shore rather than coming exclusively from Allied naval commanders and political leaders (*Revealing Gallipoli* 2005). Whereas 18 March is a date that highlights Allied amnesia about an unpalatable and humiliating repulse, conversely— as soon becomes evident to any visitor to the port town of Çanakkale on the southern coast of the Dardanelles— this is a date etched in Turkish consciousness.

Both directors are interested in stripping bare the mythology on both sides in order to emphasise some blunt truths. In so doing the emphasis shifts away from the traditional narrative of 'Anzac achievement' to discussion of the appalling waste and carnage, misguided direction and truly horrifying conditions that men endured throughout the campaign. (Stanley 2011: 144). That quest is of course dependent on the pragmatics of international filmmaking and they have some clear limits in *Revealing Gallipoli*, as Stanley himself reveals about the making of the feature (146-147). Örnek is on the record that he wanted to emphasise aspects of everyday life that contribute to a greater appreciation of the degrading conditions experienced by men on both sides of the trenches (*Gallipoli* 2005. Audio commentary). The spread of disease and its enormous impact is a key method of conveying this atmosphere, and is realised with explicit and startling impact in his recreation of swarms of flies— specially imported for the purpose— that relentlessly infest the men's food and act as a critical transmitter of disease. Expert talking head Peter Hart— a British military historian— was encouraged by Örnek to be as explicit as possible in relating the effects of dysentery and other diseases: some men, he points out, were so enfeebled by sickness that they fell and drowned in their own excrement (*Gallipoli* 2005. Audio commentary; Fewster 2003: 83 and 94). Such directness is a deliberate strategy to undercut the message that war is in any way acceptable. It stands in stark opposition to an earlier heroic-romantic narrative tradition of war writing that was especially pronounced in Australia (See, e.g., Gerster [1987]

on this subject). Örnek also addresses events on the peninsula that were not part of formal combat and that have continued to be suppressed in many narratives of the campaign. Audiences for the documentaries would, for example, be largely unaware that men continued to die after the worst of the fighting, first at the hand of savage bush fires while others later drowned when the peninsula flooded.

Örnek's feature found fertile ground among international audiences— especially in Australia and Turkey. Film studies scholar Catherine Simpson has observed that the film reinforces the existing process of cultural exchange between the two countries— and others, notably New Zealand (Simpson 2007a: 89). Örnek was interviewed by journalists in Australia on more than sixty occasions and on two prominent ABC TV shows, attesting to the strong appeal of his work (87). Örnek himself was made an OA— a rare honour for a young foreign filmmaker (Stanley 2011: 146). There was no Australian funding for the production, but significant in kind support especially from the Australian War Memorial, and Australian involvement as historical advisers, notably Brad Manera, permanent adviser on set to advise on the historicity of props (Simpson 2007b: 92-93). Simpson observes that the documentary can appeal to a 'specifically Australian [or New Zealand or even Turkish] audience at the level of text, production, or at the point of reception' (Simpson 2007a: 89) and Örnek achieves this through deliberate deployment of a counter-narrative to dominant Turkish nationalist discourses that emphasise the role of President Atatürk, founder of the modern Turkish republic, in nation building. In the Gallipoli campaign Colonel Mustafa Kemal (later Atatürk) and the success of his leadership as a factor in the campaign is an issue addressed by both Fimeri and Örnek. However, Örnek refused to heel to the Turkish government and Turkish nationalists who made their strong displeasure known at exclusion of Atatürk's 1934 poem (which has far less to do with any special Turkish-Australian relationship than it does with Turkey's foundation as a modern nation state) and at the extent of coverage given to the invaders (*The Age*, 16 April, 2005; Stanley 2011: 147). In fact, Örnek's decision reflects the necessary pragmatism of the film maker whose choices are dictated in part by the

availability of evidentiary material that includes written fragments as much as images– and there was relatively little of the former from the Turkish side that he could draw on. This sits in contrast with Fimeri's text which includes the Atatürk poem and leads Peter Stanley to speculate that this was perhaps one of the necessary compromises that had to be struck to gain Turkish cooperation in the production process (Stanley 2011: 147). Notwithstanding Örnek's critics, *Gallipoli* quickly became the most successful documentary film ever at the Turkish box office at a time when documentary filmmaking there was undergoing a renaissance as a vehicle for exploring their history and identity (Simpson 2007b: 92 and 94).

The command structure of allied forces in the campaign included a combined New Zealand-Australian Division yet the role of New Zealand Anzacs in many popular representations of the conflict– including Peter Weir's film– has too often been submerged and is therefore in need of excavation by historians and documentarians alike. The revival of Anzac Day in New Zealand in recent times parallels trends in Australian society; at the same time, public memory of the war has varied from Australia in several ways. Keith Jeffery, the Irish historian and presenter in *Revealing Gallipoli*, notes in *Ireland and the Great War* that it suited Peter Weir for both dramatic and ideological reasons to airbrush out the 10th Irish Division in the infamous Suvla Bay landings of August 1915 (Jeffery 2000: 37-38). The same might also be said of Weir's occlusion of the New Zealanders on Chunuk Bair– a vital moment in the August offensive when Anzac efforts were coordinated (see, e.g., Bennett 2012). In *Revealing Gallipoli*, Wain Fimeri recontextualises this seminal moment by intercutting material from a range of sites and perspectives in the battle for the Sari Bair range, thereby reconfiguring the familiar scenes depicted at the Nek in Weir's film into an organic and more intelligible whole. Military historian, Chris Pugsley, and writer, Maurice Shadbolt, played a significant part in raising the awareness of a New Zealand audience to the role of Colonel William Malone, a devout Catholic of Anglo-Irish extraction. Malone was widely considered to be one of the very few successful Allied leaders in the campaign (Shadbolt 1988; Pugsley 1984). But his name had been effectively blackened for 90 years by

his superiors until the publication of his war diaries (Crawford 2005) and a ceremony led by then New Zealand Prime Minister, Helen Clark, to honour the man for his outstanding service. *Revealing Gallipoli* was released in the same year as these developments and it emphasises the important role played by Malone and his Wellington Battalion that was synchronised with the Australian feint at the Nek, immortalised in Weir's film. Until more recently, Malone's role in this moment had been widely misunderstood: little surprise then that the opportunity to explicate this important national moment using a New Zealand presenter (Peter Elliott) in a version that incorporated more New Zealand material had appeal to a Kiwi audience.

Tolga Örneş's handling of the August offensive is a useful insight into the director's thinking and offers an interesting counterpoint to Fimeri's multifaceted approach. Rather than re-perform Weir's unforgettable scenes of wave after wave of men from the 10th Light Horse Regiment going over the top to their futile and (for the audience) emotionally draining slaughter, Örneş gave thought instead to how he could visually represent this scene in a different way (*Gallipoli* 2005. Audio commentary). In the end he opts for a haunting absence overlaid by the emotion of the narrator's voice— a technique that recalls the emptiness of the screen at critical moments used to such powerful effect by iconic television historian Simon Schama in his *A History of Britain* (*A History of Britain* 2002).

Memory and commemorative culture of the First World War has been one of the most complex of all phenomena bedevilling modern Ireland. Most representations of the First World War— even Örneş's— tend to focus on the collective British experience, obscuring the distinctive Irish contribution. This submersion of Ireland within a collective political entity was much less contentious in the early phases of the war when there was relative unity on the home front, but it became an issue whose complexion would change profoundly and permanently from the moment of the Easter Rising in 1916. The foregrounding of Ireland's role in the campaign at the same time as downplaying that of the British in Fimeri's documentary has much to do with the vagaries of television production and the search for

international partners. That is, the BBC did not sign up for the joint venture but RTÉ in Ireland did. (Stanley 2011: 146-147). John Horne, Philip Orr, Keith Jeffery and others have explored the role of the First World War in transforming the national and political landscape of modern Ireland and it is beyond the scope of this article to recapitulate that history in detail (Horne 2008; Orr 2006; Jeffery 2000). It is, however, pertinent to this discussion to note that more than 50,000 volunteers— a majority of them Catholic— had come forward in the north and south of Ireland by February 1915. (Horne 2008: 46). John Redmond, leader of the Irish Nationalist Party whose ultimate political objective was Home Rule, believed that Irish war service would demonstrate his people's dependability and at the same time reassure Ulster Unionists who remained suspicious. (Loughlin 2002:134) The young aspiring Nationalist poet, Francis Ledwidge, is emblematic of that political position. His personal story— based on rich diary sources— is a key resource in *Revealing Gallipoli* for introducing Irish perspectives to the Gallipoli campaign (Orr 2008: 67). Ledwidge was at once a Volunteer, a British soldier and an Irish nationalist, and he did not see that dual identity in conflict when he signed up (Boyce 2002: 207). But when tensions boiled over in the Easter Rising of 1916, support for the British war effort among Nationalists on the home front began to dissolve at the same time as Unionists read their war effort (symbolised by the Battle of the Somme later that year) as a solemn blood sacrifice that marked out a distinctive political destiny linked to the United Kingdom (Fraser 1993: 5; Boyce 2002: 213).

Herein lay the seeds of the battle for memory in Ireland which has induced long (but not continuous) periods of national amnesia over Irish participation. More recent historical scholarship has begun to reflect on the profound impact of the war on every aspect of Irish life, including the work of historian Keith Jeffery whose illuminating and balanced treatment of Ireland's war and its contested meanings have been widely praised. In *Revealing Gallipoli* Jeffery explores the 'romantic disappointments' of Ledwidge's life and the political backdrop to his service on the peninsula (Orr 2008: 67). Although many Irish troops served in non-Irish military regiments in the campaign, Jeffery's focus is squarely on the 10th Irish Division — 'the most profoundly forgotten' among 'all the amnesiac aspects of Ireland's engagement with

the Great War' (Jeffery 2000: 38). As discussed above, the 10th figured prominently in the controversial Suvla Bay landings in early August 1915. Contrary to popular mythology perpetuated by Weir's film, troops landing at Suvla Bay also paid a high price. The 10th Irish Division, for example, sustained close to a 50 per cent casualty rate among the ranks of its 17,000 men over eight weeks. (Orr 2008: 70) In a memorable address to camera Jeffery foregrounds the Nationalist perspective of the war by introducing the political context of 1916 and the Easter Rising. To convey this idea he recites key lines from the famous modern 'rebel' song, 'The Foggy Dew' written by Father Charles O'Neill, a parish priest from Ulster:

Right proudly high over Dublin town they hung out the flag
of war.
'Twas better to die 'neath an Irish sky than at Suvla or Sed al
Bar [V Beach] ...' (see Jeffery 2008: 271)

Memory of the war within Ireland and between the two Irelands was a significant issue of division until very recently. It is this profoundly contested memory of Irish participation and the receptive mood of new generations to its re-remembering at a time of renewed political harmony that created the right conditions for RTÉ to engage with the project. The view that the Great War had essentially been a futile sacrifice of Irish lives was one that became widely entrenched from the Second World War and was later accentuated by the ongoing troubles that arose from the failure to find a permanent political solution. Republicans sought to put as much distance between the Great War and contemporary Ireland as possible and in this view only the Easter Rising could atone for the legacy of support for the British war effort as the 'Foggy Dew' verse suggests. (Jeffery 2008: 271-272) The correlation of the 1916 Rising with the First World War has been rendered possible politically by the peace process in Ireland, beginning with the Belfast Agreement of 1998. In fact, the political consensus in Ireland generated by the Agreement is unparalleled in modern Irish history since the opening months of the First World War. Jeffery points to recent commemorative examples in the history of the Irish Republic such as 2006 when the government agreed to commemorate the 90th anniversaries of both the Rising and the Battle

of the Somme (Jeffery 2008: 273; 2000: 2-3). More recently, the continuing reconciliation process within and between the Irelands has seen the Irish President, Mary McAleese, visit a number of important battlefields of the First World War including Gallipoli to commemorate Irish war dead (*Irish Examiner*, 24 March 2010). In a spirit of continuing rapprochement across the Irish Sea, in 2013 Irish Prime Minister Enda Kenny joined the British leader David Cameron on a visit to memorial and grave sites in Flanders (BBC World News online 19 December 2013). Given this significant shift in Irish responses to the war it is unsurprising that December Films found a ready broadcast partner in RTÉ, which commissioned *Revealing Gallipoli* in a format that included more Irish material as part of its 'Hidden History' strand for 2004 (RTÉ Annual Report 2004: 4). This is but one example of a wider initiative by RTÉ to massively expand its budget on history programming (*Irish Times*, 10 August, 2005), tapping into the *Zeitgeist* in Ireland and beyond that yearns for narrative and recovery of identity through factual programmes.

In conclusion, Gallipoli and Anzac is a foundation narrative that is woven into the cultural fabric of the Australian nation and has been invested with enormous cultural and political significance especially since its renaissance in the 1980s. But this is much more than a national story. Here the challenge for both professional, and indeed, public historians including documentary filmmakers lies in gaining critical distance, and trying to approach the issue in fresh ways that can broaden our perspective and gradually shift understandings. Örnek and Fimeri's 'borderless' productions are companion resources that allow audiences to gain a shared understanding of a campaign with critical consequences for many of the combatant nations; they focus on the lives of ordinary men and are told in an affective and very humanist way. That they emerged at a critical juncture in the re-remembering of Gallipoli and its wider significance in the context of the First World War has assisted their reception, appealing to multiple international markets. While a documentarian retains ultimate control in the shaping of a screen text, in many respects these two productions provide a model for the possibilities of collaboration between the film-maker and the

historian. Making use of different techniques, *Revealing Gallipoli* and *Gallipoli: The Frontline Experience* mirror some of the key ideas embedded in the revisionist transnational historical scholarship of Gallipoli studies produced by many of the participant historians themselves. They function as prime examples of the expanding genre of hybridised documentary—innovative, intertextual and multilayered—whose aesthetic can at once engage generalist audiences and function as an educational tool to promote a more holistic appreciation of wartime heritage in and between the combatant nations.

References

1. *A History of Britain*. 2002. DVD. Written and presented by Simon Schama. London: BBC Worldwide.
2. Bennett, James. 2012. 'Man Alone and Men Together: Maurice Shadbolt, William Malone and Chunuk Bair', *Journal of New Zealand Studies*, 13: 46-61.
3. Bourke, Joanna. 2006. "New Military History" in *Palgrave Advances in Modern Military History*, eds. Matthew Hughes and William J. Philpott. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
4. Boyce, D.G. 2002. "'That Party Politics Should Divide Our Tents': Nationalism, Unionism and the First World War" In *Ireland and the Great War: 'A War to Unite Us All?'*, edited by Adrian Gregory and Senia Pašeta, 190-216. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
5. Bridge, Carl. 2012 (on line edition). 'Anzac Day' In *Oxford Companion to Australian Military History*, edited by Peter Dennis, Jeffrey Grey, Ewan Morris, Robin Prior, and Jean Bou. Melbourne: OUP.
6. Broadbent, Harvey. 2005. *Gallipoli: The Fatal Shore*. New York. Viking.
7. *Chunuk Bair*. 1991. DVD. Directed by Dale Bradley. Auckland. Arkles Entertainment.
8. Crawford, John. ed. 2005. *No Better Death: The Great War Diaries and Letters of William G. Malone*. Auckland. Reed Books.
9. Damousi, Joy. 2010. 'War and Commemoration: "the Responsibility of Empire"': In *Australia's Empire*, edited by Deryck M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward, 288-311. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. de Groot, Jerome. 2008. *Consuming History: Historians and Heritage in Contemporary Popular Culture*, Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis.
11. Fewster, Kevin, Hatice Hürmüz Başarın and Vecihi Başarın. 2003 [first published 1985] *Gallipoli: The Turkish Story*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

12. Fitzsimons, Trish, Pat Laughren and Dugald Williamson. 2011. *Australian Documentary: History, Practices and Genres*, Melbourne: CUP.
13. Fraser, T.G. 1993. 'Men, Women and War' In *Men, Women and War*, edited by T.G. Fraser and Keith Jeffery, 1-12. Dublin: The Lilliput Press.
14. Gerster, Robin. 1987. *Big-Noting: The Heroic War Theme in Australian War Writing*. Melbourne: MUP.
15. *Gallipoli: The Frontline Experience*. 2005. DVD with special feature 'The Making of Gallipoli'. Directed by Tolga Örneke. Sydney: Roadshow Entertainment.
16. *Gallipoli: The Fatal Shore*. 1988. Video. Reporter: Chris Masters. Sydney: ABC Video.
17. *Gallipoli*. 1981. DVD. Directed by Peter Weir. Sydney: 20th Century Fox Home Entertainment.
18. Gnida, Antje and Catherine Simpson. 2009. 'Anzac's "Others": "Cruel Huns" and "Noble Turks"' In *Diasporas of Australian Cinema*, edited by Catherine Simpson, Renata Murawska and Anthony Lambert, 93-102. Bristol: Intellect.
19. Hillman, Roger. 2011. 'A Transnational Gallipoli?' *Australian Humanities Review*, 51: 25-42.
20. Horne, John. 2008. 'Our War, Our History' In *Our War: Ireland and the Great War: The 2008 Thomas Davis Lecture Series*, edited by John Horne, 1-15. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
21. Jeffery, Keith. 2008. 'Echoes of War' In *Our War: Ireland and the Great War: The 2008 Thomas Davis Lecture Series*, edited by John Horne, 261-175. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
22. Jeffery, Keith. 2004. 'Ireland and Gallipoli' In *Gallipoli: Making History*, edited by Jenny Macleod, 98-109. London; New York: Frank Cass.
23. Jeffery, Keith. 2000. *Ireland and the Great War*. Cambridge: CUP.
24. Jeffery, Keith. 1993. 'The Great War in Modern Irish Memory' In *Men, Women and War*, edited by T.G. Fraser and Keith Jeffery, 136-157. Dublin: The Lilliput Press.
25. Loughlin, James. 2002. 'Mobilising the Sacred Dead: Ulster Unionism, the Great War and the Politics of Remembrance' In *Ireland and the Great War: 'A War to Unite Us All?'*, edited by Adrian Gregory and Senia Pašeta, 133-154. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
26. McLean, Denis. 2003. *The Prickly Pair: Making Nationalism in Australia and New Zealand*. Dunedin: Otago University Press.
27. Örneke, Tolga and Feza Toker. 2006. *Gallipoli: The Frontline Experience*, 2nd ed. Sydney: Currency Press.
28. Orr, Philip. 2006. *Field of Bones: An Irish Division at Gallipoli*. Dublin: Lilliput Press.

29. Orr, Philip. 2002. '200,000 Volunteer Soldiers' In *Our War: Ireland and the Great War: The 2008 Thomas Davis Lecture Series*, edited by John Horne, 63-77. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
30. Paget, Derek. 1998. *No Other Way to Tell It: Dramadoc/Docudrama on Television*, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
31. Prior, Robin. 2009. *Gallipoli: The End of the Myth*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
32. Pugsley, Christopher. 1984. *Gallipoli: The New Zealand Story*. Auckland: Hodder & Stoughton.
33. *Revealing Gallipoli*. 2005. DVD. Directed by Wain Fimeri. Melbourne. December Films in association with ABC TV.
34. Reynaud, Daniel. 2007. *Celluloid Anzacs: The Great War through Australian Cinema*. Melbourne: ASP.
35. Schama, Simon. 2003. 'Fine-Cutting Clio', *The Public Historian*, 25 (3): 15-25.
36. Shadbolt, Maurice. 1988. *Voices of Gallipoli*. Auckland: Hodder & Stoughton.
37. Shadbolt, Maurice. 1982. *Once on Chunuk Bair*. Auckland: Hodder & Stoughton.
38. Simpson, Catherine. 2007a. 'Taking the "Nation" Out of Gallipoli', *Metro Magazine*, 153: 86-90.
39. Simpson, Catherine. 2007b. 'Bonds of War: Interview with Tolga Örnek', *Metro Magazine*, 153: 92-95.
40. Stanley, Peter. 2011. 'Revealing Revealing Gallipoli.' In *Making Film and Television Histories: Australia and New Zealand*, edited by James E. Bennett and Rebecca Beirne, 143-148. London and New York: I.B. Tauris.
41. Stanley, Peter. 2005. *Quinn's Post: Anzac, Gallipoli*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
42. 'The Great History War' (Four Corners). 2008. Reporter: Chris Masters. ABC on line. <http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2008/s2411881.htm>
43. Travers, Tim. 2001. *Gallipoli 1915*. Stroud, Glos: History Press.

Notes

¹ See in particular: Tim Travers. 2001. *Gallipoli 1915*, Stroud, Gloucestershire; Harvey Broadbent. 2005. *Gallipoli. The Fatal Shore*, Melbourne; Peter Stanley. 2005. *Quinn's Post, Anzac, Gallipoli*. Sydney; and, Robin Prior. 2009. *Gallipoli: The End of the Myth*, Sydney.

² Strictly speaking, Örnek's approach more closely resembles drama-documentary rather than docu-drama in its form of intertextuality. As Paget argues, the former draws on a real historical event to present an argument whereas docu(mentary)-drama is essentially a fiction that takes on a 'documentary look' and which may reference 'factual or possible situations'. See Derek Paget. 1998. *No Other Way to Tell It: Dramadoc/Docudrama on Television*, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.