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ABSTRACT

In both Australia and Turkey, the Gallipoli campaign occupies a privileged role in the definition of national identities. In this thesis, the first comparative study of Australian and Turkish visual representations of Gallipoli, I analyse the formation of mythologies of Gallipoli during the years of their genesis (1915-1924) in the visual cultures of both countries. Drawing on Australian and Turkish archival sources, I examine paintings and drawings of Gallipoli created on the battlefield during the campaign by soldier-artists, as well as those officially commissioned by the Australian and Ottoman governments in the aftermath of the battle. In doing so I challenge the concept of a hegemonic Gallipoli myth by exploring the multiple historical narratives created around the campaign.

A study of Gallipoli affords an opportunity to consider the complex intersection of empires in the twilight of the European imperial age. The principle narratives of Gallipoli that emerge in the contemporary historical record are, however, nationalistic rather than imperial. An intention to identify, disentangle and explore the composite elements that inform the myths about Gallipoli and their formation in the sphere of visual culture underpins the comparative analysis of Turkish and Australian images of Gallipoli that I undertake in this thesis. The case studies that I present examine the role of visual culture in creating historical narratives. In the Australian case, I show that Gallipoli was adopted as a locus for a reconsideration of the history of the newly-federated Australian nation, providing a symbolic point of liminality at which the Australian identity could be distinguished from its British progenitor. In the Ottoman-Turkish case, I address how paintings of Gallipoli were used to support an Ottoman political and cultural project, and to reshape the image of the empire in its final years.

Simultaneously addressing the representation of Gallipoli in both Australian and Turkish history offers an opportunity to understand the mechanisms responsible for the creation of historical narratives. In approaching Gallipoli mythologies, in which the imaging of the enemy forms an important part of the definition of self, such a multivalent comparative reading is particularly useful. It allows an examination of the manner in which existing cultural mythologies and identities may be appropriated, re-contextualised or supplanted in order to articulate new meanings in new contexts. Recognising Gallipoli as a symbolic locus in Australian and Turkish culture thus offers an opportunity to revisit the site of the creation of cultural mythologies, and to challenge the terms on which they were founded.
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AUTHOR’S NOTE

References to Turkish paintings and artists have been made using the modern Latin-Turkish alphabet. Turkish to English translations were made in part by the author and in part with the assistance of research translators Umut Özgüç and Ekin Erbiz. Where reference has been made to institutions that, or individuals who, predated the codification of the modern Turkish language, Ottoman-Turkish transliterations as commonly used by historians of the late Ottoman Empire have been employed.

Though every attempt has been made to locate the paintings and drawings discussed within this thesis, in some cases the circumstances of their production and exhibition has resulted in an incomplete provenance. In such cases these works have been captioned with all available information.
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In 2004 Bob Carr, then Premier of New South Wales, welcomed the Turkish soccer team to Australia by reminding them that the first time that young men from the two countries had met in competition had been during wartime at Gallipoli, rather than on the playing fields of the Sydney Olympic stadium. If he was macabre about the origins of Australian and Turkish cultural relations, he was more sanguine about the future. "The remarkable thing is that today we welcome the Turkish team and the Turkish community as respected friends and honoured guests", he said, "peace and freedom win out in the end". The metaphor of soccer pitch as battlefield is a familiar twenty-first century trope, though the correlation that Carr makes between soccer, war and friendship is less apparent. Nevertheless, the themes coexist happily in the painting Çanakkale'de Savaş Arasında Günlük Hayat (Daily Life in the Trenches in the Middle of the War in Çanakkale, hereafter Daily Life) (c.2002, fig. 1), housed in the Atatürk and the War of Independence Museum, below the mausoleum of Atatürk at Anıtkabir in Ankara. Contrary to its title, this painting speaks less of the daily exigencies of war and more of cultural mythology. Here, the Gallipoli campaign is depicted in a romanticised, almost idyllic manner that views the Australians and Turks in hindsight as comrades. In the right foreground, a Mehmetçik entertains his resting comrades with a saz concert. In the left midground a soldier receives salon treatment from a comrade, and in the background we see Turkish and Australian soldiers contesting an international soccer match, watched eagerly by an audience of armed soldiers.

In Daily Life, the anonymous artist attempts to reconcile the paradox of the Australian and Turkish nations' antagonistic past with the contemporary trope of their cultural friendship. The contradictions of the painting's narrative raise a number of questions. Is this wartime or is it a peaceful encounter? Are these men enemies or friends? The artist equivocates
FIGURE 1: ANON., ÇANAKKALE’DE SAVAŞ ARASINDA GÜN'LÜK HAYAT (DAILY LIFE IN THE TRENCHES IN THE MIDDLE OF THE WAR IN ÇANAKKALE), C.2002, OIL ON CANVAS, ATATÜRK AND THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE MUSEUM, ANKARA.

FIGURE 2: ANON., YUNAN MEZALIMI (THE MASSACRES PERPETRATED BY THE GREEKS), C.2002, OIL ON CANVAS, ATATÜRK AND THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE MUSEUM, ANKARA.
between these themes, leaving this painting an expression of late twentieth-century politics, as well as a memorial to a wartime conflict. Although historically fatuous, *Daily Life* illustrates the remarkable cultural valency that the Gallipoli campaign has acquired and the manner in which the battle has been appropriated through visual culture in order to articulate social, political and nationalistic agendas. The particularity of this sympathetic framing of Australian and Turkish relations at Gallipoli is emphasised by comparison with another painting in the same gallery at Anitkabir, prosaically titled *Yunan Mezalımı (The Massacres Perpetrated by the Greeks)* (c.2002, fig. 2). In this painting of an unspecified incident from the 1919-23 Turkish Independence War, there are no romanticised allusions of cultural friendship. Instead the scene illustrates the murder of innocent villagers by Greek troops in the right foreground and the sexual assault of a woman in the midground, whose blouse is pulled down by a soldier to expose her breasts. Unlike the Australians, the image of the Greeks is not idealised by cultural romanticism.

A study of the Gallipoli campaign — fought in 1915 between the armies and navies of the British and Ottoman Empires, as well as France and its dominions, on the border between Anatolia and continental Europe — affords an opportunity to consider the complex intersection of empires in the twilight of the European imperial age. However, the principle narratives that emerge from the contemporary historical record of Gallipoli are nationalist rather than imperial. The fact that a painting of Gallipoli such as *Daily Life* is located in a museum specifically commemorating the Turkish Independence War — of which the Gallipoli campaign did not form a part — reveals the extent to which Gallipoli has been appropriated in Turkish history as part of a nationalist narrative that culminates in the establishment of the Turkish Republic. This historical positioning is suggested not only by the inclusion of Gallipoli images amongst those of Independence War battles, but by the way in which a visitor is invited to move through the museum. The room in which *Daily Life* is housed is one of many gallery spaces at Anitkabir, accessed sequentially as part of a chronology of the significant battles of the career of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk — divisional commander at Gallipoli, leader of the Turkish armies in the Independence War and revered founder of the Turkish Republic. Before entering the main gallery, the viewer passes through three corridors, the walls of which are adorned by murals. The final two of these murals depict battles from the Independence War, but the first in the series represents Gallipoli. Measuring 38 x 2.8 metres, the *Çanakkale Savaşı Panoramasi* (hereafter *Çanakkale War Panorama*) (2002, fig. 3) is a trompe l’oeil painting on a massive scale. The panorama is a
conflation of scenes from the entirety of the Gallipoli campaign, from the naval battle of 18 March, 1915 to the subsequent land battles, as it moves from left to right down the corridor. Amongst the scenes represented, the image of Atatürk takes pride of place at the zenith of the painting, while other common tropes of Gallipoli mythology, including an image of a Turkish soldier carrying a wounded Australian soldier on his back to safety, are also represented. Significantly, a dramatic stage set extends from the virtual space of the painting into the physical space of the viewer. Faux trenches, replete with barbed wire and wooden palisades, create the illusion that the viewer stands within the battle scene – a fantasy enhanced by an aural track featuring the sounds of artillery and small arms fire that accompanies the viewer as they proceed down the corridor. In its context within the Atatürk and the War of Independence Museum, the Çanakkale War Panorama locates Gallipoli as
the first formative battle leading to the establishment of the Turkish Republic. The requisite movement of visitors past the panorama before they encounter similar Independence War tableaux echoes the chronological subtext of the mural as a component of this narrative of the formation of the Republic.

Visitors to the Australian War Memorial in Canberra encounter an analogous historical reconstruction, in which Gallipoli is located as the opening of a particular national narrative that celebrates, by reference to its military exploits, a point of departure in the history of the Australian nation. Like the Atatürk and the War of Independence Museum in Ankara, the exhibits at the Australian War Memorial follow a chronological path. The foyer to the main gallery, at which one enters, contains a range of military artefacts but is dominated by the exhibition of one of the original landing craft used to transport Australian troops from ship to shore at Gallipoli. This vessel, though no longer a physical transport, is nonetheless a link to the past that provides a fitting allegory for the visitor’s chronological journey through Australia’s military history. After a short walk down a corridor, the first gallery a visitor encounters is one documenting Gallipoli. It contains not only displays of military artefacts ranging from rifles, shells, bayonets, bullets, uniforms and tins, to geographical battlefield dioramas showing the Gallipoli peninsula in great detail, but also oil paintings by war artists that allow the viewer to imaginatively reconstruct the campaign using the vast stimulus material provided for this purpose. As the first major battle in which Australia fought in the First World War, Gallipoli provides a symbolic beginning for an examination of Australian military history, and in the case of the Australian War Memorial, it forms a point of entry to both the museum collection and its record of Australia. However, as a representation of the Australia’s historical contribution to warfare it is an arbitrary one; the gallery detailing Australia’s previous wartime contributions to the Boer War (1899–1902) as well as to British excursions in Sudan (1896-8) is located on a separate floor, separating these colonial-era conflicts from the principle nationalist chronology of the museum.

A visit to either the Atatürk and the War of Independence Museum or the Australian War Memorial situates the experience of the visitor within a particular historical teleology and raises their consciousness to the role of visual culture in the recording and presentation of this narrative. It draws the viewer’s attention to how varying cultural texts – be they literary documents, battlefield diaries, commissioned paintings, military artefacts or other cultural ephemera – must be read in conjunction in order to understand composite meanings, and to the manner in which the viewer’s response to these texts assists in the preservation of
these messages. Walking alongside the faux trenches of the Çanakkale War Panorama encourages the viewer to imaginatively reconstruct the experience of the Gallipoli campaign. However, it also affords an opportunity to question. That the viewer’s participation is essential to the presentation and maintenance of the chronology suggests that the cultural meanings surrounding the Gallipoli campaign are subject to numerous interests and influences that may vary with context and epoch.

Atatürk’s remarkable 1934 missive to Australian mothers and the Australian soldiers who died at Gallipoli provides an example of how such competing interests inform Gallipoli mythologies. In it, he embraced the conflict in order to extend a gesture of cultural friendship – one that has had remarkably enduring cultural valency in Australia and Turkey. “Those heroes that shed their blood and lost their lives”, began Atatürk:

You are now living 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 faraway 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.5

By entreating the dead soldiers’ mothers to consider their sons the sons of Turkey, Atatürk skilfully reclaimed the image of the enemy as an essential component of the definition of Turkish identity. The popularity of this framing of Gallipoli is demonstrated by the unlikely friendships represented in Daily Life and the Çanakkale War Panorama. The symbolism of these artworks reveals the difficulty in disentangling this contemporary mythology from the historical context of its formation. However, though it is a difficult task, it is possible to isolate and analyse the many facets of Gallipoli mythologies. For example, it has been argued by contemporary historians that Atatürk’s 1934 speech had subtextual political implications. Mete Tuncoku argues for instance that Atatürk made these remarks in response to a desire to repatriate Australian war graves and that they were made at a suitable time coinciding with the period after the tenth anniversary of the Republic. As such, by embracing the emerging mythology of friendship from war at Gallipoli, Atatürk was able to shore up the prestige and identity of the young Turkish nation.6 Adrian Jones suggests that Atatürk’s view of the campaign and the relationship between friend and foe changed in accordance with the shifting political prospects of the nascent Turkish Republic and the leader’s desire to safeguard the political interests of the nation.7 Furthermore, at the 2009
Second International Gallipoli Symposium: Gallipoli and National Imagination, Peter Stanley, building upon Jones’ hypothesis, argued that the popularity of Atatürk’s speech has led to the distortion of the historiography of the campaign in contemporary histories.⁸

An intention to identify, disentangle and explore the composite elements that influence Gallipoli mythologies and their formation in the sphere of visual culture underpins the comparative analysis of Turkish and Australian images of Gallipoli that I undertake in this study.⁹ In studies of imperial, colonial and national histories it is a common trope to examine the development of one nation’s identity by reference to the influence of another’s.¹⁰ Extending this methodology, recent studies by Tim Barringer and Geoff Quilley, and Jocelyn Hackforth-Jones and Mary Roberts have demonstrated that the processes by which imperial identities were formed and projected were complex and contested at both the centre as well as periphery of empires.¹¹ Other studies have examined the relationship between war and visual culture in two empires during the same epoch,¹² and the correlation between the representation of war and shifts in technology and society.¹³ In this study I expand upon this historical discourse by addressing the way in which the shared experience of a wartime event can be simultaneously appropriated by two national or imperial identities in order to articulate different cultural and political messages. In the case of the battles that took place on the Gallipoli peninsula and their subsequent representations in Australia and Turkey, in which the imaging of the enemy forms an important part of the definition of self, such a multivalent comparative reading is particularly useful.

The necessity for such an approach is suggested by the variance in the naming and remembrance of the campaign between Australia and Turkey. In Australian culture, the Gallipoli campaign is remembered on 25 April, the date of the landing of Allied troops on the Gallipoli peninsula. By contrast, in Turkey the campaign is referred to as Çanakkale Savaşı (the Çanakkale War), after the Anatolian town which commands the Dardanelles, and is commemorated on 18 March – the date of the Ottoman naval victory which forced the British military hierarchy to commit to an expanded land campaign. In public remembrance of Gallipoli, one nation marks the date of a significant tactical victory over a technologically superior imperial enemy, while the other venerates the beginning of an ultimately unsuccessful campaign that symbolises the transition from colony to nation. Such a variance should not go unnoticed, but many histories of the Gallipoli conflate the significance of the two commemorations, suggesting the need for greater clarity in the historiography of the campaign. Simultaneously addressing the function of Gallipoli mythologies in both
Australian and Turkish visual culture offers an opportunity to understand the mechanisms responsible for the creation of historical narratives. In addition, it allows an examination of the manner in which existing cultural mythologies and identities may be appropriated, re-contextualised or supplanted in order to articulate new meanings.\textsuperscript{14}

The case studies that I present in this thesis explore the formation of Gallipoli mythologies during the years of their genesis (1915-1924) in visual culture.\textsuperscript{15} Doing so reveals an important paradox that forms a major concern of this study – that Australian and Turkish national identities were purportedly born from a campaign in which both sides were engaged in an imperial war. In Turkish rhetoric of the Republican era, Gallipoli is a site for change and transition from Ottoman Empire to Turkish Republic. However, this positioning of Gallipoli as a Republican prolepsis is an historical anachronism. For the Ottoman Empire, the First World War became a struggle to maintain control its territories, and was the culmination of a prolonged period of political, military and social encroachment by European powers on its borders and possessions. Though the First World War was a necessary (but not sufficient) factor in the ferment of the subsequent Turkish Independence War of 1919-23, the proximity of the two conflicts and the success of Atatürk as a military commander at Gallipoli – at which it is commonly argued that the military acumen that he used to win the Independence War was revealed – has resulted in the specific conflation of the Gallipoli campaign with the narrative of the Independence War. As a result, a proto-Republican Turkish nationalism is commonly attributed to the conflict in Australian and Turkish histories. This is in spite of the fact that the campaign took place in the opening stages of the Ottoman Empire’s engagement in the First World War, and that there is no direct tactical correlation between the Ottoman victory at Gallipoli in 1915 and Atatürk’s subsequent defeat of the Greek armies in 1923.

In considering the place of Gallipoli paintings in Turkish art history, though I gesture towards later, Republican-era representations of Gallipoli in this dissertation, I limit my analysis to Ottoman-era paintings created in the period 1915-1918, considering the artworks strictly within the social and political context of their production.\textsuperscript{16} Doing so avoids an anachronistic reading of early twentieth-century Ottoman-Turkish culture and allows a consideration of the relationship of Gallipoli to contemporaneous social and political discourses. In the context of the late Ottoman Empire, Gallipoli was mobilised in order to redefine an Ottoman imperial image. Paintings of Gallipoli formed a major component of an exhibition held in Vienna in 1918 that was designed to redress negative images of the Empire in
Europe. Gallipoli paintings were specially commissioned, and a studio designed for the production of these paintings was established in Istanbul. The Vienna exhibition was simultaneously the last major Ottoman cultural exhibition and the first international exhibition of modern Turkish painting. An examination of its Gallipoli paintings thus provides an insight into the Ottoman Empire's self image.

In Australian representations of Gallipoli, the image of the Anzac soldier in a campaign commonly construed as a 'baptism of fire' was taken as evidence for the emergence of an Australian national 'type'. The Anzac soldier became an avatar whose character traits purportedly reflected that of his nation; he was born of the bush, egalitarian, brave, worldly, and his social relationships regulated by a strong sense of mateship. Guided by the reportage and later historical chronology of Charles Bean – Australia's official historian of the First World War – the Gallipoli campaign was framed as a locus for a reconsideration of the history of the newly-federated Australian nation; it provided a symbolic point of liminality at which the Australian identity could be distinguished from its British progenitor. However, this framing of the Australian soldier at Gallipoli is somewhat paradoxical. Though required to function as a symbol for Australian cultural autonomy, the conflict in which he was engaged was one of imperial duty rather than national exigency. Though Australia had federated in 1901, in 1914 the Australian nation had no right to declare war independently of Britain, whose decision to enter the war compulsorily required Australia to do the same – an imperial bond that was echoed culturally by the fact that in the early twentieth century a significant proportion of the Australian population identified themselves as British. In addition, though the campaign was a defeat for the Anzac forces, it is celebrated as a triumph of the Australian national character. Positioning Gallipoli as a site for the birth of the modern Australian nation that symbolically affirms the act of federation was therefore a difficult task; it required both the modification and representation of pre-existing icons of Australian culture as well as a degree of disconnection from its colonial history.

In the first three chapters of this study I focus on the formation of Australian Gallipoli mythologies and in the final two I address Turkish paintings of Gallipoli within the context of the late Ottoman Empire. Disentangling Gallipoli mythologies in these multiple contexts reveals a dialogue between numerous voices in the creation of historical narratives. In Chapters One and Four I reveal the principle influences on the emergence of nascent Gallipoli mythologies by examining the creation of state-endorsed historical narratives through official art projects such as that of the Australian Official War Art Scheme and the
Ottoman Şişli Studio and Vienna Exhibition project. However I also address tensions in the emerging mythologies in both Australian and Turkish visual culture by pursuing the counter-narratives that emerged in contrast to those sanctioned forms. In Chapters Two and Three I focus on the image of the Anzac soldier as an Australian cultural avatar, demonstrating that, though official war art was instrumental in creating a pervasive image of the Australian soldier as a national type, this image was contested in its formation by the artworks of Australian soldier-artists. Similarly in Chapter Five, I analyse artworks by Turkish modernist artists that reflect the chaotic and transitional nature of Ottoman Turkish society in the early twentieth century. In doing so, I widen the scope of studies of Gallipoli to consider discourses of modernity in the late Ottoman Empire. Pursuing these multiple voices demonstrates that representations of the campaign in visual culture do not articulate a homogenous myth, but rather a series of cultural mythologies that are contested and challenged.

RE-PRESENTING AUSTRALIAN HISTORY

I begin this study by identifying the emergence of a nationalistic narrative from Australia's participation in an imperial war. In Chapter One: Framing History: George Lambert, Charles Bean and the mythologising of Gallipoli, I explore the paradox of the frequently-espoused notion that Australia's national identity was revealed at Gallipoli as one culturally affiliated to, but nationally distinct from its colonial roots in the British Empire. Charles Bean, who compiled the official record of Australia's participation in the First World War, was keen to present Gallipoli as a point of departure in Australian history that signalled the affirmation of an independent national character. Contemporaneous commentators were similarly interested in identifying Gallipoli as a fulcrum in Australian history between a colonial past and a national present – as the moment at which the newly-federated Australian nation became an active participant in an international realpolitik and was thus admitted to the fraternity of the world's great nations. Such a positioning of the Gallipoli campaign required both the emancipation of Australian history from certain stigmas of British colonialism and the attachment of Australia's new national identity to a worldwide historical discourse.
This formative process is the focus of Chapter One, in which I argue that George Lambert, Australia's official Gallipoli artist, achieved this by mobilising the pre-existing metaphor of the Australian landscape as a mythological space and transferring its tropes onto the wartime landscape of the Gallipoli peninsula. In conjunction with Bean's wartime reportage, Lambert framed the image of the Anzac soldier at Gallipoli as a representative of the Australian type—an avatar who was imbued with the characteristics of mythological figures from Australia's history, but who was free to act as a representative of the federated nation. In his *Across the black soil plains* (1899), Lambert had cultivated the idea of the Australian landscape as a historical tableau upon which the Australian national character was formed. The particular representative of this quintessentially Australian space was the bushman, whose character, drawn from the harshness of the Australian landscape, was positioned in popular culture pre-federation as an Australian cultural representative. In his two great Gallipoli paintings, *Anzac, the landing* (1920-22) and *The charge of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade at the Nek, 7 August 1915* (1924), Lambert analogously positioned the Gallipoli landscape as a test of nation. Drawing associations between the Turkish landscape and the mythological battles of the Dardanelles' history, Lambert was simultaneously able to insert the formative history of modern Australia into the genealogy of other great nations. In so doing he similarly transposed the characteristics of the Australian bushman onto the Anzac soldier, allowing the military figure to embody a pre-existing cultural identity.

In addition, Chapter One examines the intersection between written and visual texts in the presentation of history. No examination of the cultural significance of Gallipoli can proceed without an understanding of Charles Bean's historical vision. Appointed Australia's official correspondent to the Australian Imperial Force (hereafter A.I.F.), Bean recorded Australia's wartime engagements from the battlefields of Europe and the Near East, and between 1921 and 1942 he published the twelve volume *Official history of Australia in the war of 1914-1918* (hereafter *Official history*). After the war he played an instrumental role in the establishment of the Australian War Memorial. Bean's writing framed Gallipoli as a testing ground for the character of the Australian nation, using the actions and identity of the Australian soldier as a litmus test for the emergence of a distinctive Australian national type. In his wartime reportage and in the writing of his *Official history*, Bean relied upon a scrupulous empirical methodology that lent his writing historical credibility. The intricate details of Bean's reportage not only displayed his professional acumen, but allowed his readers the ability to imagine themselves as participants by proxy in the events that he described. This literary strategy enabled Bean's key historical messages to be re-enacted...
indefinitely in the minds of future generations of readers, even as it granted the text factual veracity. In Chapter One I read Lambert's Gallipoli paintings with a consciousness of their relation to Bean's wartime writing. I argue that Lambert's painterly and preparatory technique mimicked Bean's historical methodology. Lambert was chosen not only for his technical capabilities, but for his penchant for detailed pictorial research and empirical details; a sensibility that granted Lambert's paintings a similar historical plausibility. By focusing on details such as the unique character of the Australian uniform, he was able to imbue his paintings with symbolism and mark Gallipoli as a particularly Australian tragedy.

This relationship between visual and literary cultures in the framing of history is a chief concern of this study and in the following chapters I apply a critical reading to visual representations of Gallipoli as historical texts capable of forming meaning. Since the publication of Bean's *Official history*, numerous Australian histories of the Gallipoli campaign have been written that, using the scrupulous attention to primary sources that was the hallmark of Bean's historical methodology, expand upon the scope and complexity of Bean's original study. However, from the second half of the twentieth century, Bean's framing of the Gallipoli campaign has been challenged by historians attempting to understand the transmission of wartime mythologies. In addition to the scores of Australian military histories that examine Gallipoli, historians such as Bruce Kapferer, Jenny Mcleod, Gavin Souter and Richard White have considered the place and meaning of Gallipoli in wider social narratives within Australian history. The deconstruction of Gallipoli mythology has been approached through two main strategies: firstly, through a critical re-evaluation of Bean's literary method and historical fidelity; secondly by an examination of the institutional processes involved in the creation of the Gallipoli legend. In addition, recent research has stressed the interplay of institutional and non-institutional cultures – for example, the interplay between the 'digger' culture of the soldiers themselves and public histories of the event – in the creation of Gallipoli mythology. In art history, scholars have begun to place Australia's wartime art within wider discourses of cultural history. For instance, Betty Churcher and Scott Bevan have examined the stylistic development of war art in the twentieth century, and Catherine Speck has approached the genre by examining previously excluded female artistic responses to the wartime experience. Nevertheless, although the Official War Art Scheme was instrumental in transmitting the myth of Gallipoli, the art of Australia's official war artists has received surprisingly little attention in revisionist histories of the Gallipoli campaign.
The lack of critical analyses of Gallipoli images belies the formative role that Australian artists played in codifying Australia’s war record. Crucially, the impetus for the establishment of the Official War Art Scheme came from a letter written by artist Will Dyson on 23 August, 1916 to the Australian High Commission in London, and not from the military hierarchy. In his letter, Dyson wrote that:

I write to suggest that it would be of interest to the people of today and in the future to see sketches illustrating the relationship of Australians to the war and interpreting the feelings and character of the Australian troops in France and the feelings of the French towards them. As this could only be fittingly done by an Australian artist I wish to express my willingness to go to France with this end in view, my work while there to be the property of the Australian Government.

In December 1916 Dyson was the first of the Australian artists to be officially appointed to record the war under what would become the War Art Scheme. Initially the Australian High Commission in London was responsible for the collection of the sketches and paintings produced by official artists, but in September 1917 these responsibilities were transferred to the newly-established War Records Section, under the direction of then Lieutenant Treloar, which had been responsible for the collation of records such as maps, diaries and wartime correspondence.

After Dyson’s appointment H. Septimus Power and Fred List were commissioned as official artists, and were eventually joined by George Bell, Charles Bryant, A. Henry Fullwood, George Lambert, John Longstaff, James Quinn and Arthur Streeton. These artists comprised Australia’s official First World War artists. With the exception of Lambert, who was commissioned as a Captain, these official artists were given the rank of lieutenant, paid two pounds per day (though Dyson remained on his original pay of one pound) and tasked with producing at least 25 sketches that would become the property of the government. When the artists returned to England from the field, their sketches were inspected by a committee consisting of Bean, another artist and two Commonwealth representatives. From the sketches produced by these artists, the committee judged what larger paintings could be produced and then commissioned the artists based on their judgement. Towards the end of the war, a number of artists were appointed from the ranks of the A.I.F.: James Scott, Frank Crozier, George Benson, Will Longstaff and Louis McCubbin. These artists were classified as camouflage officers and attached to the headquarters of various A.I.F. divisions. However, a
number of artworks recording the war by Australian artists were produced prior to the establishment of the Official War Art Scheme that complicate the genealogy of the establishment of this scheme. Significantly, Speck records that in 1915, an Australian woman recorded as “Miss Haddon” was commissioned to paint a picture for the Commonwealth of the Australian camps at Mena in Egypt. Though it is not known what happened to this painting, Speck notes that this commission, given to a female Australian artist in Egypt, likely constituted the first official Australian war art.

Though Bean’s historical vision found great resonance in Lambert’s official war art, there was a great deal of mutability in the initial formation of Anzac mythologies and the definition of the soldiering identities that informed them – a mutability encouraged by the tension between the vision of Australia’s official war historian and war artists, and the textual and visual representations created by the soldiers themselves. Though there is often assumed to be a hegemonic Gallipoli myth in Australian society, the public remembrance of Gallipoli is in fact a set of negotiated legends through which a public, national identity is articulated by reference to the lived experience of individual Australian soldiers. A principle concern of this study is the identification of the multiple voices that influenced the establishment of Gallipoli mythologies. Graham Seal provides a useful framework for my consideration of the interaction of public remembrance and private experience in the creation of Gallipoli mythologies by separating them into their constituent parts. Seal terms the Anzac myth as a created vision that lies at the core of Australian national identity. Though he acknowledges the largely hegemonic functioning of the Anzac myth in Australian society, he divides it into two spheres: the ‘digger tradition’ and the ‘Anzac tradition’.

The digger tradition is defined as the sub-culture and folklore of the common Australian soldier; a private, informal and unofficial culture that includes methods of self-expression encompassing language, narrative, poetry, song, and inter-group ideologies. Seal’s definition of the digger tradition relies upon two complementary characteristics; firstly, that this identity – characterised by a strict in-group egalitarianism – belongs to a private culture unique to Australian soldiers and secondly, that as a result of this in-group dynamic, the digger culture was avowedly anti-authoritarian. This identification of the Anzac identity seems at odds with its representation in Australian history and within Australian society, in which Gallipoli has been appropriated as a symbol of national unity. As such, Seal identifies a second component of the Anzac myth that functions in the public sphere in opposition to, but alongside the digger tradition. Termed the ‘Anzac tradition’, it
encapsulates the mechanisms by which the digger mythology is appropriated for the public sphere. Seal explains the Anzac tradition as the formalisation and commemoration of the digger culture within Australian institutions, a process that requires a homogenisation of the private culture so as to transform a private, exclusive culture into a public and inclusive one.\textsuperscript{32}

More research is required into the functioning of the apparatus of the Anzac tradition at the point at which public and private cultures intersect. One such example of public and private cultural intersection is The Anzac Book, which is the subject of Chapter Two: Reading Between the Lines: The Anzac Book: Australian images from the trenches of Gallipoli. This book was a trench publication produced almost entirely on the Gallipoli battlefields during the campaign from works submitted by Anzac and British soldiers, comprised of prose, poetry, limericks, jokes, photographs, sketches, paintings and other forms of literary and visual articles. Printed in London in 1916 and then marketed on the battlefields of Europe as well as the Australian home front, The Anzac Book purported to offer a privileged view of the experience of soldiering at Gallipoli to a wide public. An analysis of the ways in which the contributions were selected and prepared for public dissemination reveals the role of this publication in creating and projecting a mediated vision of the Gallipoli campaign. In Chapter Two I complicate our understanding of Gallipoli mythologies by exploring representations of the campaign as mediated images subject to numerous competing interests.

Though it was produced on the battlefield, The Anzac Book, whose chief influence was its editor Charles Bean, was not a simple survey of the culture of Anzac soldiers at Gallipoli. Like other trench publications, though the material was supplied by soldiers, it was subject to the vetting and motivations of the military hierarchy, Bean’s personal historical vision, and the tastes of the demographic to which the publication was aimed. Lieutenant-General Birdwood’s introduction to The Anzac Book hints at this tension between institution and experience in the formation of the Australian soldiering identity, raising important questions regarding the creation and custodianship of the Anzac identity.\textsuperscript{33}

It may be of interest to readers to hear the origin of the word "Anzac". When I took over the command of the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps in Egypt a year ago, I was asked to select a telegraphic code address for my Army Corps, and then adopted the word "Anzac". Later on, when we had effected our landing here in April last, I was asked by General
Headquarters to suggest a name for the beach where we had made good our first precarious footing, and then asked that this might be recorded as “Anzac Cove” – a name which the bravery of our men has now made historical, while it will remain a geographical landmark for all time. 34

Birdwood reserves a privileged place for himself and the military hierarchy in the creation of the Anzac culture, but also claims a common ground with the Australian soldiers by referring to Anzac Cove as “our little township”. 35 Continuing with an invocation to potential critics of the work to “perhaps remember the circumstances under which the contributions have been prepared, in small dug-outs with shells and bullets frequently whistling overhead”, he makes little distinction between the experience of the common soldier and that of the military hierarchy. 36 In Birdwood’s introduction, the elements of public mythology and private experience are inextricable from one another. The images contained in The Anzac Book, though created by participants during the conflict, are similarly inextricable from their context as a publication with a worldwide distribution.

David Kent has analysed The Anzac Book with relation to Bean’s motivations, arguing that certain battlefield experiences were excised from the publication in order to frame the experience of Gallipoli and the culture of the Australian soldiers along the lines of Bean’s own historical vision. 37 Kent’s analysis, though groundbreaking, is limited to literary submissions and, crucially, he does not address the role of visual images contained in The Anzac Book as multivalent texts in the creation and transmission of identity. Through an examination of these visual images, which have been heretofore overlooked by Australian historians, in Chapter Two I assess the function of battlefield representations of Gallipoli in the creation and public projection of Gallipoli mythologies. In doing so I firstly evaluate the circumstances of the production of The Anzac Book in relation to Bean’s other wartime publications, arguing that in lieu of the detailed primary records of Gallipoli necessary for Bean to produce a full account in his Official history, The Anzac Book acted as a de facto literary and visual vehicle for the projection of Bean’s vision of Gallipoli, unfettered by the strictures of empirical historical reportage. Secondly, through a comparison between the visual images published in The Anzac Book and those that were rejected and yet which remain in the archives of the Australian War Memorial, I address the tensions between the public image of the Anzac and the wartime experiences of the soldiers themselves. Rather than attempting to recover the composite elements of the image of the Anzac soldier, in
Chapter Two I examine the intersection of private experience and public identity projection in the initial formation of Gallipoli mythologies.

This variance between the public expectations of the soldiering culture and the experience of war is the subject of Chapter Three: Broken Body, Broken Mind Broken Men: The Gallipoli drawings of Ellis Silas. In this chapter I challenge commonly-held conceptions of Australian military masculinity to include voices and experiences previously excised in public veneration. The image of the Anzac soldier, encouraged by Bean’s identification of him as a cultural avatar, was informed by a specific vision of masculinity that allied physical strength to a redoubtable psychological character. According to Bean, for the Australian soldier, life was very dear, but “was not worth living unless they could be true to the idea of Australian manhood”. 38 Though this character was codified in Australian mythology only after the war, so pervasive was this image that during the formative years of the Anzac culture an expectation arose that men enlisting as Australian soldiers would undergo a personal transformation, a fact suggested by Alistair Thomson’s interview with an Anzac veteran, Bill Langham. Langham’s self-identification and behaviour during his wartime service was informed by his belief in a code of acceptable masculine behaviour. He believed that Anzac soldiers were ordinary men; “until you got into action. And then [...] he proved what a good soldier he was”, with “lots of guts”. 39 This physical and psychological transformation was one necessary for acceptance into the in-group culture of the Australian soldier. As Katherine Agostino and other contemporary military historians who have analysed the construction of Australian military masculinity and femininity have suggested, this conception of Australian manhood is often represented as a hegemonic type. 40 However, the exclusive association between Australian national identity and this reductive view of masculinity needs to be challenged. 41

In Chapter Three I contribute to this reassessment by examining the heretofore overlooked works of Ellis Silas, an English-Australian soldier-artist who fought at Gallipoli in the Anzac forces. Silas was the antithesis of the stereotypical image of the redoubtable Anzac soldier. Though he volunteered for the A.I.F. as an English expatriate whilst working as an artist in Western Australia in the pre-war years, Silas had serious misgivings over his ability to fit in to the soldiering culture. During his military training he deserted, returning later reluctantly, though voluntarily, only to be denied reenlistment on the basis that he failed to meet the required physical standard. Though he eventually managed to reenlist as a signaller, and landed on the Gallipoli peninsula on the first day of the conflict, Silas maintained persistent
doubts about his ability, in spite of being mentioned in dispatches for his bravery on the battlefield. In contrast to Bill Langham’s description of the behaviour of Anzac soldiers in battle, at Anzac Cove Silas questioned whether he had the mettle to survive a bayonet charge, and openly doubted whether he would be able to shoot an enemy. After several months of fighting on the peninsula, he was evacuated to Alexandria, suffering neurasthenia. In traditional conceptions of masculinity, sacrifice for nation was an integral part of Australia’s Gallipoli myth and it was how the myth-makers dealt with this loss that determined its nature. The establishment and subsequent destruction of the image of the male body act symbiotically and simultaneously in the construction of national identity; one creates a national image worthy of aspiring to, the other vindicates subscription to it. However, as Silas was a casualty of mental illness – an injury then not considered an ‘honourable’ physical wound – his experience was one excised from traditional accounts of military bravery. In Chapter Three I counter this reductive characterisation, using recent research into the psychological character of Anzac soldiers conducted by Michael Tyquin.42

During his wartime service Silas kept a battlefield diary and made sketches, which he incorporated into a book entitled Crusading at Anzac, which was published in London in 1916.43 Silas’ rapid and chaotic battlefield sketches possess an immediacy that encourages them to be read as documentary texts. However, Silas’ works have heretofore been reduced to historical anecdote in Australian art history. Though he has been recognized in two recent historical texts, neither have considered the importance of his artworks in the shaping of Australian mythology. In Betty Churcher’s The Art of War, Silas’ works appear only anecdotally, his artistic ability reduced to that of a “lesser soldier artist”.44 In Tolga Örnek’s film Gelibolu, although the issue of Silas’ psychological experience is addressed, his artworks are not considered as documentary texts.45 In Chapter Three I fill this gap in the literature by examining Silas’ artworks as autobiographical objects, arguing for a recognition of his experience of Gallipoli in the pantheon of the Anzac identity. Through a close reading of the difference between his diary text and the captions in Crusading at Anzac, I examine the tensions between Silas’ personal experience, and variances in his public expression of it. In doing so I reveal the formation of the Anzac myth and the identity of the Australian soldier as a complex culture that admits multiple voices and influences.

As the title of this thesis attests, I am conscious of the fact that the Australian national image explored herein is an exclusively masculine one. My focus on the representation of masculine subjects is the result of a number of factors: the lack of female appointees to the
Official War Art Scheme during the First World War; the fact that many of those who represented Gallipoli were soldiers engaged in the campaign; and the fact that much of Australia's historical remembrance of the Gallipoli campaign is owed to Bean's *Official history*, which focused specifically on battlefield actions to the detriment of an understanding of the home front response to war. As Catherine Speck argues, the selection of male official artists "placed a seal of legitimacy on the male artists' perspective on war and women artists were officially excluded from recording one of the key experiences of the early twentieth century". This was in spite of the fact that there were numerous Australian women in Europe during the First World War who could have fulfilled those roles. Similarly, Rose Lucas argues that the domain of the battlefield and the representations of the soldier enshrine a particularly patriarchal nationalism that presents the primacy of the male soldier in processes of social structuring. The work of feminist historians such as Speck and Lucas in widening the lens of Australia's war history to consider gendered responses has been complemented by recent histories that challenge hegemonic conceptions of masculine military cultures. In exploring the artworks and wartime experience of Ellis Silas, which form a counter narrative to popular conceptions of the Anzac identity, my study complements this emerging historiographical discourse.

Though the Australian soldier has become a symbol for the character of the nation in Australian national consciousness, the adoption of the Anzac as an avatar was not necessarily a self-evident one. Ross, for example, observes that in Australian history it is strange that a military figure should have become the hero of a country without a military tradition. The discovery of the Australian avatar from within the military was problematic as the Australian type espoused in public rhetoric and popular culture drew its character in opposition to conventional institution: egalitarianism, pragmatism, meritocracy and adaptability were all said to be marks of the Australian character. Locating the Anzac — with his amateur, anti-institutional persona — as an exemplar of a unified national character was thus an uneasy fit.

A further problem for presenting the Australian soldier as a national avatar was that before Australia's participation at Gallipoli, the Australian soldier did not possess a unified visual identity, nor did he embody the ideals of mateship, egalitarianism and compassion that were to later underpin his image. Traditionally, the image of the soldier occupied a contested space in colonial Australian society. As Stanley has suggested, in the early years of Australia's foundation, soldiers were often regarded as the antithesis of the colonial
Furthermore, the character of Australian soldiering men was tarnished during Australia's participation in the Boer war. In addition, as Marilyn Lake has shown, Australian soldiers were involved in frequent civil disturbance on the home-front in 1915-16. In spite of clichés identifying the Australian soldier as the epitome of egalitarianism, mateship and freedom, the soldiering culture had been appropriated by both political right and left, alternately as a symbol of trade unionism or conservative nationalism, depending on the social milieu of the time. The symbolism of the landscape of the Gallipoli peninsula, the military outcome of the Gallipoli campaign and the tradition of the Australian military figure did not immediately lend themselves to the articulation of a nationalistic Australian narrative. In Chapters One through Three, by examining the process by which the Anzac soldier at Gallipoli was somewhat surprisingly framed as an Australian avatar who symbolised the emergence of a distinct Australian national identity, I draw attention to the manner in which visual representations function in conjunction with other cultural texts in order to reposition and re-imagine cultural identities. In doing so I explore how visual culture not only projects, but plays an essential role in the formation of cultural meaning.

ÇANAKKALE SAVAŞI: A TRANSITIONAL MYTH

Having explored the role of visual culture in creating Australian Gallipoli mythologies, in Chapters Four and Five I turn to the manner in which Gallipoli was adopted as a thematic locus in the final years of the Ottoman Empire. My study is the first comparative analysis of Turkish Gallipoli paintings and Australian representations of Gallipoli. In spite of the importance of Gallipoli to Australian history, few Australian historians have attempted a consideration of the Turkish experience of the conflict in general, or the complex effects of the aftermath of the campaign upon Ottoman society. Harvey Broadbent and Kevin Fewster, Vecihi Başaran and Henuz Başaran deserve credit for widening the scope of Australian histories to consider the campaign from a Turkish perspective. However, no commensurate attempt to consider the significance of the visual culture of the Gallipoli campaign in Turkish history exists in Australian literature. The particular paucity of Australian scholarship on Turkish artists who painted Gallipoli is revealed by Jill Hamilton in her book From Gallipoli to Gaza: The Desert Poets of World War One. Hamilton includes a number of Turkish paintings as illustrative plates in accompaniment to the wartime poems that are her focus. Commenting on İbrahim Çalli’s Wounded Soldier (1917), she writes that:
Few war paintings manage to convey the feeling of pain and misery as this one by Ali Cemal Benim [sic.], 'Injured Soldier'. But this oil, like the others by the Turkish artists, even though they have been hanging in the Military Museum and other galleries in Istanbul for over 80 years, have so far been unacknowledged by Western historians.\(^{17}\)

Hamilton makes the important point that these images deserve consideration by Western historians. However, in doing so, she misattributes a painting by İbrahim Çalli to Ali Cemal Benim, an act that ironically corroborates her assertion.

Neither Australian nor Turkish histories have comprehensively considered the significance of Gallipoli to the complex narratives of societal modernisation, pan-Ottomanism and the rise of an Ottoman-Turkish nationalism in the late Ottoman period, preferring instead to read the military victory at Gallipoli as an anacrusis to the 1919-23 Independence War and a prolepsis for the formation of the Turkish republic. As M. Şükür Hanioğlu argues, the rise of nation states as a result of the decline of the Ottoman Empire has resulted in such an anachronistic repositioning of late Ottoman history:

> The usual failure to take account of historical contingency has been reinforced by prevalent nationalist narratives in the Ottoman successor states, producing a conception of late Ottoman history that is exceedingly teleological. It is often assumed that the emergence of the Republic of Turkey in Anatolia, and of the neighboring nation-states in the surrounding territories of the disintegrated Ottoman polity, was the inevitable and predictable result of the decline of a sprawling multinational empire.\(^{58}\)

The familiar reading of Gallipoli as a simple prolepsis to the foundation of the Turkish Republic subscribes to the mechanism of historical distortion which Hanioğlu describes; “it distorts key historical processes by pulling them out of their historical context and placing them in a contrived chain of events leading up to the familiar post-imperial world.”\(^{59}\)

In the Turkish Gallipoli myth of the late twentieth century, a complex set of relationships was created between the Ottoman past and Turkish future. At the beginning of *Chapter Four: Battles Between Borders: The Şişli Studio and Vienna Exhibition*, I explore the reductive manner in which both contemporary Australian and Turkish historians attribute a proto-Republicanism to the history of the Gallipoli campaign. In illustration of this anachronistic
positioning, in Chapter Four I also briefly consider the function of paintings of Atatürk at Gallipoli in contemporary, Republican-era Turkish paintings, arguing that in them the leader is attributed a power analogous to that of the sultans which he replaced, and positioned as the saviour of a unified Turkish homeland of which the viewer is a protected member. A telling example of this anachronistic historiography was made at a conference to mark the 85th anniversary of the campaign by the Australian journalist and historian Les Carlyon, who questioned whether the Turkish Republic was born at Ankara in 1923, or on the shores of Gallipoli in 1915. This unhelpful conflation of historical narratives amalgamates the Turkish experience of Gallipoli with elements of the Australian Gallipoli myth in which Gallipoli functions as a transitional point between colony and nation.

Though it is a mistake to read the Gallipoli campaign in Turkish history simplistically as a fulcrum between Empire and Republic, it is important to consider Gallipoli as an historical locus in the era of late Ottoman modernisation. The Gallipoli campaign, as a point of contest against European powers, found a symbolic resonance with the transitional phase through which the Ottoman Empire was passing in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. During this period the Empire fought for international political relevancy and to maintain control of its territories in the face of increasing economic and military pressure from European powers including England, France, Germany and Russia. During the late nineteenth century, the borders of the Ottoman Empire were challenged by European territorial ambitions. In the 1880s, European nations became increasingly concerned with ‘the Eastern Question’. The term applied to the chaotic conditions within, and the decline of, the Ottoman Empire that occurred with increasing rapidity throughout the nineteenth century. For example, in 1829 the Treaty of Adrianople acknowledged Greek independence and gave Russia control of the mouth of the Danube River. France gained control of Algeria in 1830 then Tunisia in 1881. Great Britain gained Cyprus in 1878 and Egypt in 1882. By 1880 the Empire was on the brink of bankruptcy and many areas of Turkish finance came under increasing foreign supervision. It was this economic and territorial decrepitude that led Turkey to be termed the ‘sick man of Europe’.

As such, as Selim Deringil suggests, in the period leading up to the First World War the Ottoman Empire was engaged in a struggle for legitimacy which necessitated the maintenance of the Sultan’s power within the empire, as well as a projection of the stability of the Empire to its allies and antagonists in Europe. The Ottoman Government responded to this challenge through a concerted program of state-wide modernisation and reform that
sought to restructure bureaucratic procedure, modernise the army and navy, improve communication systems throughout the Empire, reform educational practices and adopt modern industrial processes. This period of modernisation had its roots in the eighteenth century, but gathered impetus with the Gülhane edict in 1839 which began an era of state-wide reform termed the Tanzimat, which was matched by an increasing engagement between the Ottoman Government and those of European nations. In the nineteenth century, many of the industrial, military and pedagogical techniques implemented were sourced from European practices. The Ottoman Government sent military personnel, engineers, academics, artists and writers to train in leading European institutions, who brought back with them the modern technologies that were used to reshape Ottoman society. However, increased cultural engagement with Europe brought with it increased political friction. During this period European governments began to take greater economic stakes in the infrastructure of the Ottoman Empire, a fact that, when combined with the shifting military ties forged with numerous European nations, led to increased tensions between European and Ottoman imperial interests. Questions surrounding the strength of the Ottoman polity persisted until the conclusion of the First World War. Though the Ottoman Empire entered the First World War allied with Germany and Austria, its relationship with both European powers was relatively fragile and the capability of the Ottoman military was viewed pessimistically by its European allies. In this context the Ottoman victory over the British and French forces at Gallipoli, an enemy both militarily superior and politically stronger, offered a unique propaganda opportunity to address persistent questions over the survival of the Ottoman Empire.

In Chapter Four I address the manner in which Gallipoli was mobilised as cultural propaganda in Ottoman-Turkish painting through an exhibition held in Vienna in 1918 that was part of a political strategy to legitimise the image of the Ottoman Empire. A consideration of such a form of cultural exchange between Europe and the Ottoman Empire necessarily requires an understanding of the manner in which cultural and political power was maintained in cultural discourse between Europe and the Near East. Since the publication of Edward Said's Orientalism in 1978, analyses of the ebb and flow of cultural power between Europe and the Ottoman Empire have been largely understood as a process by which European conceptions dominated the definition of both European and Ottoman identities; within this discursive construct Europe was modern, rational and progressive; the Ottoman Empire timeless, unindustrious and lascivious. In visual culture, the propagation and popularity of European artistic stereotypes of the Orient gave rise to a self-legitimising
fantasy manufactured in the imaginations of European artists. As Roger Benjamin remarks, in the nineteenth century, Orientalism was "a one-way journey, a stream of visions frozen by European travellers and carted home for consumption".64

However a major criticism levelled at Said's Orientalist model is that he did not give adequate consideration to the methods by which artists from the Near East participated in a cross-cultural exchange with European imperial powers. Recent research has shifted the conception of the Orientalist discourse from the image of the Ottoman Empire as a hegemonic fantasy space to a culturally contested zone.65 One of the main ways of redressing the cultural imbalance was through the adoption of European art forms, which allowed indigenous artists the opportunity to rebut European stereotypes in the same visual language in which the fallacies were created. This allowed the presentation of ideas and motifs to European viewers in a form they were accustomed to viewing. As Benjamin suggests, "for an indigenous person to stand behind the camera or the easel was clearly an act with potential for redressing... the superficialities and prejudices that informed the typical Orientalist picture".66 Contemporary approaches to the cross-cultural exchange between European and Near Eastern nations have emphasised the movement of artists and techniques between cultural borders. As Hackforth-Jones and Roberts argue, Eastern cultures responded to the Orientalist discourse by translating Western visual languages to express modernising indigenous voices.67 As such, they argue that the borders between cultures should not be categorised simply as "sites of antagonism and constraint, but sites of transformation and innovation where resistant indigenous perspectives emerged".68

Such sites engendered a cross-pollination of themes and techniques that gave rise to new meanings in new contexts. I argue that the Vienna Exhibition, which is the main subject of Chapter Four, is one such site of transformation and innovation. The Vienna Exhibition occupies a prominent role in the histories of both Ottoman-Turkish cultural modernisation and in the formation of Gallipoli mythologies. Comprising a collection of paintings and drawings produced by major contemporary Ottoman-Turkish artists – including Mehmet Ruhhi, Ali Cemal Benim, Namik Ismail, Ibrahim Çalış, Hikmet Onat, Sami Yetik and Ali Sami Boyar – it was simultaneously the last Ottoman imperial cultural project and the first international exhibition of modern Turkish painting. A wartime exhibition, it was conceived of by Celal Esad Arseven, a prominent historian and local politician, and Şeyfi Paşa, an Ottoman military intelligence officer, as cultural propaganda directed at an audience comprised of the Ottoman Empire's allies and designed to refute a negative image of the
Ottoman Empire in the closing stages of the First World War. Though the exhibition included various images illustrating contemporary Ottoman life and culture, its main focus was a series of military paintings that centred on the Turkish victory at Gallipoli. The Ottoman Government had previously attempted to create propaganda material that venerated the Gallipoli campaign, however it had achieved little success in mobilising artists to create visual representations of the conflict. The Ottoman military hierarchy had organised a tour of the Gallipoli battlefields for artists and writers that took place during the conflict — in which the painters İbrahim Çalli and Nazmi Ziya took part — though few literary or artistic pieces resulted from it. The Vienna Exhibition was specifically designed to remedy this lack of propaganda material. As few Turkish First World War military paintings then existed, the Ottoman Government established a purpose-built studio in the Şişli district of Istanbul, which they furnished with military equipment and faux trenches, and for which figural models were provided. At this studio the participating artists produced a staged view of Gallipoli in support of the political aims of the Ottoman Government.

It is significant that the artists selected to paint these Gallipoli paintings for the exhibition all belonged to a generation of Turkish painters — named the ‘Generation of 1914’ for their influence during the war years — who trained in France as part of the Ottoman Government’s modernisation program. As a result, the paintings included in the exhibition were heavily influenced by the European visual techniques that they were schooled in. Though these artists used European-influenced techniques, they did not merely re-present familiar themes and imagery from the schools of their influence. Instead, they adopted Western visual techniques to describe specific themes in Ottoman-Turkish history, which allowed them to deliver new cultural messages to a European audience in familiar visual language. This tactic was remarked upon by Austrian reviewers of the exhibition, who were surprised in the first instance to see Turkish paintings in Europe, and further by their collation of both European and Ottoman forms and themes. Speaking of the painter Namik İsmail, they identified the character of the modern Turkish artist as partly European and partly Oriental — an allusion that symbolises similar shifts in Ottoman-Turkish society.

In Chapter Four I examine the establishment of the Şişli Studio and Vienna exhibition and assesses its significance to social movements in the late Ottoman era. Though an important catalogue and survey of the works of the Vienna exhibition has been produced by the Turkish art historian Ahmet Kamil Gören, little in-depth visual analysis of the Gallipoli paintings included in the exhibition has been attempted; nor have the aims of the exhibition
been placed in the context of Ottoman revivalist strategies. In Chapter Four I consider the production of the Vienna Exhibition in relation to contemporary Ottoman political discourse. In doing so I compare the aims and character of the exhibition to a similar previous attempt at cultural propaganda – the Abdülhamid II Albums, a photographic collection sent by the sultan to the 1893 Chicago Universal Exposition, whose purpose was to raise the international profile of the Ottoman Empire. I also speculate as to the political motivations behind the particular choice of exhibition venue, arguing that the Vienna Exhibition was aimed at the Ottoman Empire’s European allies, amongst whom a growing discontent at the military alliance was forming. Through a visual analysis of several of the works of the Vienna Exhibition, I identify the main themes of the collection and demonstrate how Gallipoli was mobilised in the late Ottoman era in order to support an Ottoman imperial political discourse, and not as a prolepsis for the modern Turkish Republic.

I thus introduce Turkish paintings of Gallipoli to Australian history as texts that complicate the contemporary historiography of the Gallipoli campaign by considering Gallipoli within the context of Ottoman historical narratives. A comparative analysis between the mobilisation of Gallipoli in Australian and Turkish visual culture reveals that the representations of the campaign have been used to support contrasting social and political projects. It is important to note that though the contemporary Gallipoli myth appears to possess a hegemonic authority, at its inception its themes and meanings were yet to be codified and were subject to social and political influence, as well as the personal motivations of the artist. In Chapter Five: Resiting Çanakkale: Contested Narratives of Gallipoli I explore the mutability of Gallipoli mythologies in Turkish painting, demonstrating that as major themes began to emerge, so did internal counter-narratives that complicated them. Through a detailed visual analysis of the Gallipoli paintings of Mehmet Ruhi and İbrahim Çallı, I examine two alternative historical narratives into which Ottoman-Turkish artists inserted Gallipoli. Firstly, I consider the identity of Ruhi and Çallı as artists who traversed cultures as well as epochs. Ruhi and Çallı were both pivotal members of the Generation of 1914. Like other young artists of their generation, after initial training in Turkish institutions, they were sent to Paris to study in the atelier of Fernand Cormon. As such, they were the product of the Ottoman Government’s strategy of cultural modernisation. In considering Ruhi and Çallı as cross-cultural artists, I employ Alistair Wright’s conception of them as ‘artists of the interstices’, who borrowed European forms in order to articulate an indigenous identity.
In Ruhi’s case, through an analysis of his Gallipoli painting *Triptik* (hereafter *Triptych*) (1917), I demonstrate how the artist paradoxically adopted European pictorial techniques and narrative strategies in order to frame the Gallipoli campaign as both a defence of an Ottoman-Turkish cultural identity as well as a mythological site at which a dormant traditional identity is revived. The compositional form of *Triptych*, as the name suggests, was appropriated from its traditional function as a Christian alterpiece and recontextualised by the artist in order to present an episodic narrative that spans three temporal moments. However, Ruhi borrows more than a European compositional device. Adopting John Mackenzie’s study of the framework of nineteenth-century heroic imperial myths, I argue that the narrative strategy that Ruhi employs in *Triptych* mirrors that of other cultural and political mythologies. Mackenzie argues that certain imperial mythologies possess three narrative phases – departure, journey and return – through which a hero representing the empire must pass. The hero’s journey, which is characterised by the overcoming of some form of test, symbolically functions as a synecdoche for the character of society as a whole. I argue that Ruhi’s episodic representation lies within this narrative tradition, and that through this device the artist is able to advocate for the continued cultural and political survival of the Ottoman Empire. An acknowledgement of the complex cultural influences of Ruhi’s painting allows further cultural comparisons to be made. In particular, I identify parallels between Ruhi’s vision and that of contemporary Australian artists and writers such as George Coates and Leon Gellert, who similarly framed the actions of the Anzac soldier at Gallipoli as a test of character that vindicated nation. Furthermore, I demonstrate that the spiritual defence that Ruhi champions reflected a similar contemporaneous positioning of Gallipoli as an Islamic cultural defence by linking the narrative that Ruhi creates in his painting with the poetic imagery of the most famous Turkish Gallipoli poet Mehmet Akif Ersoy.

Though Ruhi’s *Triptych* describes a propagandistic state mythology, the Gallipoli paintings of İbrahim Çalli cannot easily be admitted to an ideological narrative. Unlike Ruhi, Çalli witnessed the fighting at Gallipoli firsthand, as part of the 1915 tour of the peninsula of artists and writers organised by the Ottoman General Staff. Çalli used his knowledge to present a view of Gallipoli in which the viewer is provided a privileged space amongst the action. In the first detailed analysis of Çalli’s painting *Siperde/Gece Baskını* (hereafter *Night Raid*) (1917), which depicts hand to hand combat in the trenches at Gallipoli, I demonstrate how the artist’s modernist technique creates a sense of immediacy and terror that mimics Turkish written accounts of the experience of modern trench warfare at Gallipoli.
Night Raid is unique amongst official, commissioned Turkish and Australian paintings of Gallipoli for its frank representation of physical and psychological horror. In it, Çalli removes heroic symbolism by dehumanising both the Turkish soldiers and their enemies. By restricting the colour palette and simplifying human forms, Çalli does not allow the viewer to read either side as morally superior. I argue that, though Çalli’s painting does not resonate with other Turkish paintings of the period, the nihilism of Night Raid can be reconciled by the viewer through a synchronous reading with other lived accounts of the conflict. In my analysis I read Night Raid against the Gallipoli diary of Lt. Mehmet Fasih, a young soldier who participated in the Gallipoli campaign and later in the War of Independence. Like Çalli, Fasih’s account of war eschews heroic rhetoric. In his diary, he is candid about the dehumanising effect of his wartime experience on his body and mind. Fasih’s written account details horrific scenes in which the dismembered bodies of former friends are discovered, yet it is delivered with an artistic sensibility that reveals Fasih’s intention to record the conflict for posterity. Reading Night Raid alongside Fasih’s text allows it to be understood as a biographical account of the horrific experience of trench warfare.

My analysis of Night Raid in conjunction with a complementary literary account highlights the value of a multivalent reading of cultural texts to the process of elucidating meaning. A similar methodology underscores my approach to the case studies that follow. The comparative analysis that frames this study of visual culture encourages the Gallipoli conflict to be read as a point of intersection. Any military battle is, of course, a physical point of intersection at which armies and ideologies are put into hostile apposition. However, a comparative examination of the social and historical influences that informed the recording of this conflict widens the locus of its intersection to consider not only the clash between enemies on the battlefield, but also the tensions between competing cultural identities, nationalities, political motivations, empires, epochs and territorial and historical borders. Australian histories of Gallipoli read in isolation evince a nationalistic narrative that arbitrarily marks the birth of a nation. However, when read alongside contemporaneous Turkish histories of the campaign, which adopt it as part of a larger cultural conflict between empires, the Australian narrative is placed in context as one of a range of competing political, social and historical narratives. Reading Australian and Turkish visual histories together allows for a nuanced understanding of the significance of Gallipoli mythologies that challenges hegemonic conceptions of national identities as fixed and uncontestable. Disentangling the multiple meanings of paintings and drawings of Gallipoli allows one to
observe the mechanics through which historical facts are represented in order to create ideologies, and to recognise the process of identity formation as one that is not only constantly evolving, but that admits multiple narratives in its construction. Analysing Gallipoli as a symbolic locus in Australian and Turkish culture thus offers an opportunity to revisit the site of the creation of Gallipoli mythologies, and to challenge the terms on which they were founded.
Notes for Introduction


2 In Turkish history, the Gallipoli campaign is referred to as the Çanakkale Savaşı (the Çanakkale War), after the eponymous city on the Anatolian side of the Dardanelles opposite which the naval battle of 18 March, 1915 was fought and near which the land campaign took place.

3 The term Mehmetçik describes a Turkish soldier but carries with it a cultural symbolism analogous to that of the Australian ‘Johnny’ or British ‘Tommy’ as a descriptor of the common soldier in folklore. I use the term here as it is used in the caption to the painting in the museum’s catalogue. See T.C. Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, Atatürk ve Kurtuluş Savaşları Müzesi, Collection Catalogue, Ankara: T.C. Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, c.2002, 103.

4 Interestingly, though the soldier having his hair cut appears to be wearing a Turkish uniform, in the collection catalogue produced by the Atatürk and the War of Independence Museum, he is identified as “Anzac prisoners (sic) having a haircut”. This raises a number of interesting possibilities as to whether the Museum intended the figure to be read as an Australian, or whether it is a misreading conditioned by the culture of camaraderie as projected in the painting. See T.C. Genelkurmay Başkanlığı, Atatürk ve Kurtuluş Savaşları Müzesi, 103.


9 In this study I use the term ‘Gallipoli mythologies’ not to signify historical falsehoods in which facts are invented and distorted, but in reference to the manner in which historical facts are recorded and subsequently re-presented in order to articulate particular meanings. My understanding of historical mythology in this case is borrowed from Jane Ross, according to whom military mythologies in particular are formed as both a distillation of cultural character as well as a moral exemplar for future generations. See Jane Ross, The Myth of the Digger: The Australian Soldier in Two World Wars, Sydney: Hale & Ironmonger, 1985, 12. Similarly, Jenny Mcleod defines the historical ‘myth’ as “a term to identify the simplified, dramatised story that has evolved in our society to contain the meanings of the war that we can tolerate, and so make sense of its incoherence and contradictions”. See Jenny Mcleod, Reconsidering Gallipoli, Manchester and NY: Manchester University Press, 2004, 2; and also Samuel Hynes, “Personal Narratives and Commemoration”, Jay M. Winter, and Emmanuel Swan (eds.), War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 207.


13 See Antonio Monegal and Francesc Torres (eds.), At War, Barcelona: Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, 2004.

14 My understanding of nationhood follows Richard White's conception of national identity as a conscious construct that can admit multiple identities at different times within a nation's history. Speaking particularly of Australian history, White notes that "a national identity is an invention. There is no point asking whether one version of this essential Australia is truer than another because they are all intellectual constructs, neat, tidy, comprehensible – and necessarily false". See Richard White, Inventing Australia, Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1981, viii. This understanding of the multivalency of national identity has been introduced by late twentieth century Australian scholarship seeking to challenge the notion that Australia ever possessed a hegemonic national character. See for instance Wayne Hudson and Geoffrey Bolton (eds.), Creating Australia: Changing Australian History, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1997. White's definition resonates with Benedict Anderson's study of nationalisms in his Imagined Communities, in which Anderson defines nations as imagined entities in which an image of communion is maintained throughout its members in spite of the fact that in no practical sense could a unified social cohesion be expected between them. See Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities, London and New York: Verso, rev. edition, 2006, 6.

15 For the major case studies that this thesis presents I have limited my selection of artists to those who either witnessed the Gallipoli campaign as soldiers, or those who were commissioned in some form by the Australian or Ottoman governments to create representations of the Gallipoli in the immediate aftermath of the campaign. The timeline of the major paintings discussed herewith finds a natural terminus with the completion in 1924 of George Lambert's major Gallipoli commissions, the last of which being The charge of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade at the Nek, 7 August 1915. Lambert's Gallipoli paintings, though completed nearly a decade after the conflict, were commissioned during his wartime service and the foundations for them were laid during his 1919 trip to the Gallipoli peninsula with Charles Bean. I ignore later twentieth and twenty-first century Australian representations of Gallipoli, the most notable exclusion is Sidney Nolan's vast and significant Gallipoli series. See Australian War Memorial, Sidney Nolan: the Gallipoli series, exh. cat., Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 2009. In focusing my attention directly on representations of Gallipoli in particular, I also exclude detailed discussion of other Australian artists who depicted the First World War such as Will Dyson, Arthur Streeton, Will Longstaff, H. Septimus Power and Norman and Daryl Lindsay, amongst others, whose contribution to the record of Australia's wartime experience, though important, remains outside the thematic scope of this study.

16 In a discussion of the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic it is necessary to distinguish between the usage of the terms 'Turkey', 'Turk' and 'Turkish' in the imperial and Republican contexts. In the Republican era, these terms are used to describe the Turkish nation – whose borders were defined after the 1919-23 Independence War – and its ethnically Turkish citizens. In the Ottoman imperial era, the terms 'Turk' and 'Turkish' referred to the ethnic group who occupied the dominant positions of power in the Ottoman political system, and their cultural identity, which later informed that of the Turkish Republic. In early twentieth-century political discourse it was common to refer synecdochally to the Turkish people as representative of the Ottoman Empire as a polity, especially in the case of the Ottoman military, which, though comprised of soldiers of the myriad ethnicities of the Ottoman Empire, was principally led by officers of Turkish ethnicity. In referring to 'Turkish' representations of Gallipoli in the Ottoman era, I use the term in reference to their production by ethnically Turkish Ottoman artists, as opposed, for example, the nineteenth-century photographs produced by Ottoman Armenians.

17 Interestingly, in 1965 T. Inglis Moore attempted to examine the social function of 'mateship' not as a mythological ideal, but as a practical code of ethics that informs Australian society, considering the


19 It is not the purpose of this study to provide a factual recount of the military history of the Gallipoli campaign, which has been covered significantly by numerous authors. See for instance Harvey Broadbent, Gallipoli: the Fatal Shore, Sydney: The Helicon Press, 2005; Les Carlyon, Gallipoli, Sydney: Macmillan, 2001; Robert Rhodes James, Gallipoli, London: Pimlico, 1999.


25 Publications on the Australian War Memorial collection have been approached with an intent to catalogue rather than to place the works within a critical reading of Australian history. See for instance John Reid, Australian Artists at War: compiled from the Australian War Memorial Collection, volume I, 1885-1925, Melbourne: Sun Books, 1977; Gavin Fry and Anne Gray, Masterpiece of the Australian War Memorial, Australian War Memorial: Rigby, 1982; Lola Wilkins (ed.), Artists in Action, Australian War Memorial, 2003.

26 Catherine Speck provides a useful summary of the establishment of the Official War Art Scheme; see Speck, Painting Ghosts, 15-23; see also Ronald Monson, A selection of Australian War Memorial Paintings, with the story of the artists, Sydney: Australian Artists Editions, 1976.

27 Will Dyson, Letter to Australian High Commission, 23 August 1916, AWM93, 409/9/14, Australian War Memorial archive.

28 Speck, Painting Ghosts, 19.

29 For example, as A.G. Butler argues, though the term ‘digger’ is commonly used in contemporary histories to describe Anzac soldiers at Gallipoli, the term began to emerge as a self-description within the ranks of the A.I.F only after 1917 and became an acknowledged moniker in public consciousness.
only after the war. Furthermore, the term possesses a contested etymology, with alternative meanings relating to colonial-era gold digging, the digging of trenches during the war, and pioneering. See A.G. Butler, *The Digger: A Study in Democracy*, Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1945.


31 In particular, Seal defines the digger tradition as "...private, exclusive, small-scale/amateur, face-to-face... Informal, unofficial and male-dominated. Specific and easily identified aspects of the tradition are anti-authoritarianism, particularly directed against officers, especially British officers; mateship; irreverence and larrikinism; swaggering arrogance; an aggressively nationalistic and, by later standard, blatantly racist stance; sardonic, even cynical humour; and a nonchalant attitude to death and injury. But embedded within this tradition were contradictory and ambivalent elements usually overlooked – the ‘soft’ emotions and expressions of sentimentality, pity and fear". Ibid., 3.

32 Of the Anzac tradition Seal writes that it is “a complex cultural process and institution involving the formal, official apparatus of Anzac Day, war memorials... the army, the Returned Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Imperial League of Australia (RSSILA)... and ultimately, the politics of nationalist and military pragmatics... This tradition is public, inclusive and, implicitly, authoritarian”. Ibid., 4.

33 Birdwood, a senior British officer, held a unique relationship with the men of Anzac, who held him in high regard. Appointed to the command of the Anzac forces from the period of their training in Egypt in December 1914, throughout the Gallipoli campaign and then in France on the Western front, his First World War career was closely tied to the Australian forces. In 1916 Birdwood commanded I Anzac Corps in France and in 1917 was given command of the Australian Corps which comprised all five divisions of the A.I.F.


35 Interestingly, in his foreword to Ellis Silas’ *Crusading at Anzac*, General Ian Hamilton also claims to have invented the Anzac acronym. Hamilton’s foreword provides further insight into the formation of the Anzac myth, by making a claim over part of the Anzac legend: “As the man who first, seeking to save himself trouble, omitted the five full stops and brazenly coined the word “Anzac”, I am glad to write a line or two in preface to sketches which may help to give currency to that token throughout the realms of glory. Though treating so largely of death, they are life-like; though grim, they do justice also to the gaiety and good humour which never deserted any of our troops in the trenches; though slight, they seem solid and serious enough to such of us as were there. Therefore it is that I wish for these outlines of heroes abiding fame, and hope that many an Australian or New Zealander now unborn will better realise by their aid what a splendid thing it was to have been alive and crusading at Gallipoli in the year of our Lord 1915.” Ian Hamilton, “Foreword”, *Crusading at Anzac anno Domini 1915*, Ellis Silas, London: British-Australasian, 1916, unpaginated.


Such a challenge has begun in Australian literature. See Adrian Howe, “Anzac mythology and the feminist challenge”, *Gender and War: Australians at war in the twentieth century*, 302-9 and also Speck, *Painting Ghosts*, op. cit.


Tolga Örnek (dir.), *Gelibolu*, Ekip Film, 2005.


The British military institution of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries more readily facilitated associations with national ideology. It still resembled a microcosm of the class-based society from which it was born and was seen as an arm of the civilising mission of the British Empire. See John Mackenzie, “Introduction: popular imperialism and the military”, *Popular imperialism and the military 1850-1950*, John Mackenzie (ed.), Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1992, 7. The Australian historical experience however, was not as easily allied with the traditions of military benediction, especially in visual culture. As Gavin Fry and Anne Gray note, there was no Australian aristocracy or military class with war-forged traditions to be perpetuated in art. See Fry and Gray, *Masterpieces of the Australian War Memorial*, 16.


Australian troops suffered a loss of reputation as a result of incidents such as the ‘Breaker’ Morant and Handcock executions, the burning of the South African News Offices in Capetown by unruly Australian troops in 1901, the riot of Morayshire and the defeat of 350 Australian horsemen at Wilmanshirst. See Bill Gammage, “The Crucible: the establishment of the Anzac tradition, 1889-1918”, *Australia: Two centuries of War and Peace*, 146-167.

For example, in January 1916, Anzacs were frequently involved in riots. In one outbreak in Melbourne, Anzacs wielded revolvers and military police responded with batons. Over 100 soldiers and 20 civilians were arrested. See Marilyn Lake, “The Power of Anzac”, *Australia: Two Centuries of War and Peace*, 194-222.
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60 A study of how the image of Atatürk at Gallipoli is used to support the personality cult of the leader in twentieth century political discourse remains an important history yet to be written. Esra Özyürek has laid the methodological foundation for more specialized study of the image of Atatürk and its role in contemporary politics; See Esra Özyürek, Nostalgia for the Modern: State Secularism and Everyday Politics in Turkey, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006. Numerous biographies of the Mustafa Kemal and his politics exist that would support such a study. See in particular Patrick Balfour Kinross, Atatürk: the rebirth of a nation, London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1964; Andrew Mango, Atatürk, London: John Murray, 2001; and Sylvia Kedourie, Turkey before and after Atatürk: internal and external affairs, London and Portland: Frank Cass, 1999.


66 Benjamin, Orientalist Aesthetics, 4.

67 See Hackforth-Jones and Roberts (eds.), Edges of Empire, op. cit.

68 Ibid., 1.


70 See for instance Arnold Holiriege’s review of the exhibition in Wochen-Ausgabe des Berliner Tageblatts, 5 June, 1918.
My main source on the Vienna Exhibition, which includes a complete catalogue of the works and brief biographies on the participating artists is Ahmet Kamil Gören, Türk Resim Sanatında Şişli Atölyesi ve Viyana Sergisi, Istanbul: Resim ve Heykel Müzeleri Derni̇ği, 1997.


On the first anniversary of the Gallipoli landing, Peter Board, then New South Wales Director of Education, remarked that "on 25 April history and Australia's history were fused, and fused at white heat":

Never again can the history of this continent of ours stand detached from World history. Its voice must be heard in the Councils of the Empire, because its men and its women have striven and fought and died in an Empire struggle.¹

In doing so, he affirmed the popular view that the events at Gallipoli had secured a place for the Australian nation on the world stage. Board borrowed his rhetoric from contemporaneous notions of the Gallipoli campaign as a trial by ordeal. Such conceptions framed Australia's actions at Gallipoli as evidence for the emergence of a distinct Australian national identity.² For Board in particular, the landing at Gallipoli validated not only the character of the newly-federated Australian nation, but its national history as well. In his estimation, on 25 April 1915 it was not solely the events of the landing that were fused with world history, but rather the history of the Australian continent in its entirety. However Board's statement contains an inherent paradox, for though he employs the sacrifice of Australian men and women to justify the inclusion of Australia's history amongst those of other world nations, he limits the audience of Australia's newfound voice and influence to merely the "Councils of the [British] Empire". Australia's sacrifice, he suggests, was for the cause of empire. As such, in spite of the rhetoric he employs linking the nation to a widened worldwide discourse, the reward he describes for Australia's contribution is limited to the
boundaries of its imperial affiliation. The Australian national history Board describes is one in medias res.

The paradox of Peter Board's framing of Gallipoli reveals the methodological challenge posed to Australian myth-makers attempting to record it as point of departure in Australian history. As Anne-Marie Willis has suggested, a reconsideration of Australian history after Gallipoli required the assertion of an identity that retained the positive associations of Australia's British heritage, yet was different enough to justify the annunciation of an independent character and nation. It was the desire to present an independent identity that led Charles Bean to remark that "the big thing in the war for Australia, was the discovery of the character of Australian men". However, a distinct Australian identity did not simply arise from the shores of Gallipoli. Rather, the national image embodied by the Anzac soldier was a conscious construct, a re-presentation of pre-war conceptions of the Australian character. As Richard White has argued, such Australian national identities are inventions - intellectual products that reflect the vision of their creators. White rejects the notion of national identities as fixed ideologies with prior existences in need of discovery. Instead, he explores the formation of national identity, labelling it an active and creative process that is "invented and embroidered in different ways by different people for different reasons". In Australian Gallipoli mythologies, the methodology behind the re-presentation of the Australian identity was one of detachment and reconnection. For Gallipoli to function as the locus of a new Australian history, the Australian character required a degree of separation from its British identity. Only then could a new history of Australia be afforded a place amongst the genealogies of other great nations.

Through his role as Australia's official historian, Charles Bean attempted to present an account of Australia's war effort that linked it with wider movements in world history. Though conscious of Australia's British heritage, in his Official history and other writings, Bean distinguished the character and history of the Australian nation from its British progenitor. The most important factor in defining such an identity for the Australian nation was the identification of the Australian 'type' - as White describes it, a national icon that could be imbued not only with physical and racial characteristics, but with a moral and psychological character. Prior to the First World War, the Australian bush had been seen as the site for the creation of national character. Drawing inspiration from bush mythology, Bean generalised and distilled a national identity that he embodied in the Australian soldier,
establishing the Anzac as the national avatar and Australia's involvement at Gallipoli as a litmus test for the character of the nation.

Bean was eager to identify Gallipoli as the site of the birth of Australian nationalism and to justify the campaign as a triumph of the Australian people. This required the colouring of Gallipoli with an emotional symbolism that was not only felt by those who experienced the conflict, but could be inscribed upon future generations of Australians as well. The tragedy and sacrifice of Australian soldiers at Gallipoli provided a suitable symbolic event which allowed pre-existing ideologies of national type to be enshrined in an icon that commanded an emotional resonance. The methodology of Bean's recording of history became the mechanism by which this emotional resonance was transmitted. Bean viewed his role as official historian as one of not only faithfully reporting facts, but drawing from them conclusions about the Australian nation and the traits of its people. As Alistair Thomson has demonstrated, though Bean at times struggled, in both his public and private writing, to reconcile his conception of the Australian character with his observations of the behaviour of Australian soldiers, the creation of a historical account that reflected his own ideological agenda was of utmost importance to him. The fastidious empiricism that otherwise underscored the compilation of Bean's *Official history* gave legitimacy to the ideological subtext of Bean's account of Australia's participation in the First World War. His highly-detailed accounts were designed to allow readers to experience the events described by proxy, ensuring that the symbolic resonance of the Gallipoli campaign would be replicated in the minds of future generations. By positing the Anzac soldier as Australian avatar and allying Gallipoli with emotional symbolism, Bean's historical method allowed the campaign to function as a locus for a reconsideration of Australia's historical identity.

Though Australian historians have begun to analyse Bean's historical methodology, less critical attention has been given to the relationship between written and visual histories in the creation and transmission of Gallipoli mythologies. This is in spite of the undisguised romanticism with which the organisers of the Official War Art Scheme sometimes approached the imaging of the campaign. As a result of Bean's close contact with the Australian war artists and his influence in the selection and commissioning of subjects, the scheme became a tacit extension of Bean's historical cataloguing of Australia's wartime experience. As such, the products of the scheme often bore the marks of Bean's influence and historical vision. This is particularly evident in the works of George Lambert at Gallipoli. Of all the official war artists, none was closer to Bean than Lambert. Lambert was
considered to be technically proficient enough to capture war scenes featuring scores of figures, and was also seen as a craftsman who possessed the knack for linking events with greater historical themes. In this way he was viewed by Bean as an ideal candidate for not only projecting his vision of Australian history, but for doing so in an empirical manner that mimicked Bean's own historical methodology. Lambert was criticised by some contemporary commentators for the overly clinical nature of his painting. However, like Bean, Lambert employed an empirical approach in order to imbue the themes of his war works with greater historical legitimacy.

Thomson suggests that the construction of the identity of the Australian soldier was a process of simplification and generalisation. In this, Lambert was a master. His biographer, Anne Gray, describes his works as intentional artifice. "He did not portray episodes in daily life", she writes, "but located them as if frozen in time". In his Gallipoli paintings, Lambert, like Bean, used his artificer's skills to manipulate settings and protagonists, creating an image of nation that was generalised from pre-existing stereotypes of the Australian bush landscape and the character of its men. Lambert saw Gallipoli as a dramatic stage onto which he imported the mythological connotations of the Australian bush and upon which he could direct the bodies of the Australian soldier like actors. By mythologising the Gallipoli landscape in this way, he found a visual link for connecting the history of Australia with a greater world history.

In his two major Gallipoli works, Anzac, the landing (1920-22, fig. 9), and The charge of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade at the Nek, 7 August 1915 (1924, fig. 13), Lambert the artificer freezes the action at its most dramatic moment. In doing so, he compresses the image of Gallipoli to what he saw as the essential characteristics of the Australian type — courage and sacrifice. In Lambert's paintings, the Australian struggle at Gallipoli was framed as an extension of Australia's homeland experience, transplanted onto a world stage. In this way, Lambert's historical vision succeeds where Peter Board's failed; Lambert's Gallipoli validates the previous history of the Australian nation by enshrining a quintessentially Australian experience. The sacrifice valorised in Lambert and Bean's historical vision is not that given in service of empire, but one given in the establishment of an independent character and nation. In this chapter I explore the interaction between written and visual histories in the creation of Gallipoli mythologies and how the visions of Australia's official historian and artist combined to manufacture a new and distinct Australian avatar from romantic myths of the Australian bush character.
The image of Gallipoli in Australian visual culture owes much of its valency to George Lambert. In his capacity as an official war artist, in addition to his major commissioned paintings, Lambert produced hundreds of drawings, oil sketches and smaller paintings from which he built a visual history of Australia’s campaigns in the Near East. Lambert was a particularly apt choice as the official artist for the Gallipoli campaign. Prior to his work on the campaign, he had been well acquainted with military life through his service in an British home-front military unit and in his capacity as Australia’s official artist in Palestine. At the beginning of the war, unable to enlist in the A.I.F. in London, he joined a volunteer training unit named the United Arts Rifles, where as the commander of ‘A’ company, he trained recruits in horse riding. After that he obtained a position as a divisional works officer with the timber supplies department of the British home force, overseeing the manufacture of timber needed for the western front. When artists began to be appointed for the Official War Art Scheme, Lambert was the only artist chosen to record the Australian campaign in Palestine, arriving there in January 1918. In covering the campaign, Lambert gained valuable first-hand experience of not only war, but the character of Australian soldiers. Whilst in Palestine he contracted malaria, which almost killed him, and the effects of this illness would haunt him his entire life. Yet his time with the light horse brigade exposed him to fantastic landscapes and “sweating, sun-bronzed men and beautiful horses”, which reminded him of the Australian bush and the masculine pioneer lifestyle.

Lambert had been particularly favoured for the task of officially recording Gallipoli by Bean himself. Bean’s preoccupation with accuracy and historical fidelity led him to Lambert, whom he considered a worthy candidate to faithfully record what he envisaged to be a momentous historical occasion. In 1919 Lambert joined Bean on a historical mission to the Gallipoli peninsula, during which time he gathered the visual material that would provide the foundation of his major Gallipoli works. Bean had been “particularly anxious” to have Lambert accompany him on his Gallipoli mission. During their Gallipoli expedition he remarked upon Lambert’s desire to record the landscape and events with the greatest accuracy, and years after the expedition he wrote that “nothing could have induced [Lambert] to swerve a hair’s breadth from what he believed to be the truth – [Lambert’s] integrity was absolute”. Lambert’s position as official Gallipoli artist was also endorsed by members of the military, who recognised that the Australian public’s sentimental
attachment to the campaign required special attention. General Chauvel wrote in endorsement of Lambert that he “strongly recommended” the artist’s commission be extended to cover the Gallipoli campaign and that:

His work speaks for itself and although this campaign may not be of the same military interest in the future as that in the main theatre of the war, on account of the historical and religious association of the country it will be of more interest to the Australian public generally and it lends itself to artistic effort very much more so. Hence my request for Lieutenant Lambert’s return. 20

Lambert’s official endorsement was therefore made on two accounts. On the one hand he was seen as an artist technically capable of accurately depicting the campaign and on the other, he was considered renowned enough to record an event of spiritual significance to the nation.

It is clear that more important to Bean than the mere recording of details was that in his eyes Lambert was an artist who would fulfil what he considered to be the proper role of the historian. In hindsight, Bean would write of Lambert that he “looked on himself as a soldier fulfilling a directive”. 21 Lambert’s directive of course, would be Bean’s vision for the remembrance of the Australian identity. While compiling his official history, Bean wrote of the role of historian that:

The historian has actual men and women, real characters, crowds, and choruses as the subject of his work; and it seems to me that if he cannot see their qualities, motives and ideas in interplay combine to produce vast actual dramas in the rise and fall and other vicissitudes of nations then he is inadequate for the real task. 22

In other words, Bean’s primary intent was not only to record the events as they happened, but also to place them in context within the histories of other nations. 23 In his estimation, this required the manufacture of historical drama.

Bean created this drama not by manufacturing events, but by strategically involving the reader’s experience in the transmission of historical narrative. The written history he attempted to create was one that allowed readers to imaginatively reconstruct the recorded events in detail from his account. Bean’s proximity to the battlefields meant that
he felt that he alone was in a privileged position to gather the necessary material for such an endeavour. In his diary he recorded that:

I shall eventually be able to give the Australian people an account of one of the most interesting events in history from a position closer than that of any observer who has been allowed to write his impression in the present war...24

To this end, Bean was meticulous in his cataloguing of military and personal records, which he presented in his extensive twelve-volume *Official history*. The authority of Bean’s assessment of Australia’s wartime performance relied on his ability to gather and present factual evidence in an empirical manner; this of course was a familiar trope of historical writing. According to Stephen Bann, the claim of a historical narrative to represent the real is reliant on the use of ‘superfluous’ details, rather than on the historian’s evaluation of the evidence.25 Bann argues that plausibility of a historical account relies less on the objectivity by which evidence is evaluated, but on the skill and creativity of the historian in using historical detail. Historical details became superfluous when their inclusion was not necessary to the historical narrative itself. The use of such superfluous detail allows the historian to generate meaning whilst maintaining the appearance of objectivity, encouraging the reader to imaginatively conceptualise history as if it were a dramatic reconstruction and to interpret the events in a manner commensurate with their own experience.26 Bean’s historical methodology relied on the presentation of such details. As Bruce Kapferer suggests, the interplay between the empiricism of Bean’s account and the reader’s experience was a key to establishing Gallipoli as part of an active and regenerative culture within Australian society; “the world of Anzac”, he writes, “made to live in its recorded details, would enable later generations of Australians to enter its mythic reality, to re-embody the Anzac ideals, and thereby to regenerate the nation established by the Anzacs”.27

Bean had always intended his written historical work to provide the basis for an artistic romanticising of Australia’s deeds in the war. He believed that his writing would not only provide material for a comprehensive history of the war, but would inspire future artists to create a vision of Australian courage and valour that affirmed his framing of Australia’s war history.28 In this sense, in Bean’s opinion Lambert was the perfect ambassador to transpose the official vision of Anzac to visual culture. “[Lambert] considered himself the artist-historian [my emphasis]”, he recorded, “and he purposed... to show the reaction of different
types of Australian to this shocking experience. Lambert's role was thus intended to be two-fold: not only to record the events verbatim, but like Bean's proper historian, to place them within a historic, symbolic context. Bean's reference to Australian 'types' is yet more significant, revealing a desire to generalise the image of nation to composite characteristics in order to show that in the face of adversity, the Australian type passed the test.

Lambert's portrait Charles E W Bean (1924, fig. 4) reveals a complex and dynamic relationship between artist and sitter, and historian and history, that belies the sitter's taciturn countenance and unassuming disposition. Begun shortly after Lambert's return to Australia in 1921 from Bean's Gallipoli mission, it is more than a mere record of Bean's likeness. Rather, the painting functions as a memorandum of understanding between the two men that stakes a claim for their roles as historians, artists and creators of history. Lambert approaches Bean with an aloofness that disengages the artist from his role as a creator of meaning, giving the portrait an impression of objectivity. It has been argued that this appearance of aloofness was characteristic of Lambert's style. Indeed Lambert's wife remarked that there was a "touch of remoteness" about him which gave her the impression that he "was with us, but not of us." Lambert himself acknowledged as much. "You know my mental system when I am working" he wrote, "after acknowledging affinity with my subject I stand aloof and create the damned thing with all my emotions frozen to a correct working degree".

At first glance, the portrait does not reveal a particular affinity between painter and subject, nor is the viewer encouraged to engage with the sitter. Bean is aligned perpendicularly across the picture plane, his body angled away from the viewer and artist, closing the space off and denying the viewer psychological engagement with the subject. Bean focuses on some object outside the picture space, and the furrows of his brow, the arch of his nose, and his gaze guide the viewer towards the unseen object of his attention. In this way he deflects attention from himself, becoming more an object to be viewed rather than an identity to be interacted with. Adding to this sense of disconnection, his form is masked by the large trench coat which seems to swallow his wiry frame and he is placed against a dark, nondescript background that further isolates the sitter.

Susan Hunt identifies this dispassionate distance between artist and subject, as seen in Lambert's portrait of Bean, as a desire of Lambert's to focus on the subject's formal compositional and aesthetic qualities rather than an intention to fulfil portraiture's traditional role of depicting an individual's character. "Thus in many of his works the colour
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is heightened”, she writes, “the form of the body simplified or distorted, and the sitters’ clothing emphasised”:

From this point of view the social position of his sitters is not relevant. Housekeepers, maids, society women and politicians are treated by Lambert in the same way — that is, according to their potential as a decorative device.

In the case of Bean’s portrait, which seems to deflect an individual characterisation, this is initially a convincing argument, especially when a comparison is made with Lambert’s *The Housekeeper* (1911, fig. 5), a work that bears a striking resemblance. Here, like Bean, the woman holds a sheaf of papers, her pen is at an identical angle and she is even clothed in a similar fashion to the historian. From this second painting it is not difficult to see how, in Bean’s portrait, Lambert manipulates familiar compositional elements in order to explore forms and shapes in a new setting. However, small changes in composition reveal Lambert’s ability to orchestrate meaning. Though the housekeeper is placed in a similar isolated setting, her gaze engages the viewer and breaks the distance between viewer and subject—a reciprocal correspondence between two parties hinted at by the act of her answering household letters. In Bean’s portrait, the lack of engagement between viewer and subject encourages a different interpretation. Rather than functioning as an interlocutor between viewer and object, his engaged observation suggests that he is a mediator between reality and its record.

Despite his supposed aloofness, Lambert usually knew his subjects intimately and in Bean’s portrait he utilises the illusion of disconnection as a dramatic device in order to emphasise Bean’s essential characteristics. Here Lambert subtly makes a claim for Bean’s objectivity as an observer, journalist and historian. In his portrait, Bean eschews an individual connection with the viewer. Focused in observation, his individual identity is subsumed by his role; he is defined by his work and clothed by his occupation. Bean is portrayed as a ‘type’ by Lambert, who, through his subtle staging of compositional elements, strips away the subject’s individuality while retaining his essential character. Lambert approached his imaging of the Australian soldier in a similar manner, moulding the image of the Australian experience at Gallipoli into a generalised metaphor for nation that embodied the ideas of Bean’s ideal Australia.
UNITING HISTORIES

Bean saw the Australian bush as a historical tableau upon which the history of the Australian nation would be written:

The Australian one hundred to two hundred years hence, will still live with the consciousness that, if he only goes far enough back over the hills and across the plains, he comes in the end to the mysterious half-desert country where men have to live the lives of strong men. And the life of the mysterious country will affect Australian imagination much as the life of the sea has affected that of the English. \(^{37}\)

Bean had developed a fondness for the bush after having written a series of articles for the Herald on the wool industry. At first he had not relished the task; “the young reporter was not enthusiastic”, he recorded later, “and then it flashed upon him that the most important product of the wool industry was men; it was responsible for creating some of the outstanding national types”. \(^{38}\) Bean’s interest in the bush was piqued after he was able to locate it as the birthplace of a national character type that was rugged, resourceful and egalitarian. Yet he believed that the bush affected not only the physical characteristics of the Australian type, but his mental disposition as well. “There is no doubt”, he wrote, “that the Australian finds his ideal in that strong-hearted and sturdy philosopher who is being at this day turned out by the thousands for him in the bush”. \(^{39}\)

As an artist, Lambert shared Bean’s view of the Australian landscape as the foundation for Australian society. Like many other Australian artists, Lambert adopted this romantic view of the bush as the real Australia. Inspired by Julian Ashton’s missive to ‘paint the Australia of today’, Lambert’s rural landscapes reflected a view that the Australian character was built on the back of a harsh land and hard work. To this end, Lambert imbued some of his landscapes with a sense of masculine domination of the land that metaphorically represented the struggle for the establishment of the Australian nation.

Nowhere is this more evident than in his first major, large-scale Australian landscape, Across the black soil plains (1899, fig. 6). As Bean was impressed by the Australian character while on the wool track, so was Lambert inspired in this work by his experience of horse teams hauling bales of wool. \(^{40}\) Here, individual figures are less important than the general pictorial
rhythms of the horses as they drag their load across the landscape. There is a heightened sense of drama in Lambert’s placement of the horses in the space. The high contrast between the dark foreground against the wide, pale skyline creates a tonal tension that complements the physical tension of the horses’ bodies as they pull along a heavy, strained diagonal across the picture plane. A unison is created throughout the various elements of the work – the teamster’s movement and limbs echo the diagonals created by the horses’ bodies, as do the lean of the wagon behind, the blades of grass in the foreground and the angling of the clouds in the background. This dynamic force not only affects the movements of the horses and man, but the earth and sky as well. Lambert himself remarked on the unity between the elements. “It is strong, ‘masculine’ if you like”, he wrote in the *Australian Magazine*:

...the horses are well drawn and painted, the movement and actions are ‘all there’, the teamster (and his dog) are realistic, the sky is good, the colour is harmonious, the subject is popular...\(^{42}\)

The subject indeed was popular; in 1900 *Across the black soil plains* won the Wynne prize and in 1900 Lambert was awarded a travelling scholarship by the Society of Artists which enabled him to leave Australia for England. What Lambert articulated in *Across the black soil plains* was not merely a scene from the Australian bush, but the notion that the Australian landscape would give birth to the Australian type. The landscape here becomes a metaphor for the struggle of the Australian nation, its taming a symbol of the triumph of Australian manhood. This struggle against nature provided an ideological foundation upon which to ground the Australian ideals of mateship and togetherness. As Inglis Moore puts it, mateship was an inclusive bush ideal, born from ‘the hazards or hardships of an environment, against loneliness, danger, and death, or is directed towards an ideal” – it
united the Australian identity in the image of the bushman. In *Across the black soil plains* Lambert created an image of nation by distilling what he saw as the essential qualities of the Australian character from one facet of the Australian lifestyle.

Lambert approached his wartime paintings with a similar understanding of the metaphorical relationship between landscape and identity, which he employed to manufacture a historical drama that articulated Australia's national wartime sacrifice. To his Images of Palestine and Gallipoli, Lambert transposed the harsh landscape of the Australian environment. In 1907, for a book entitled *Romance of empire: Australia*, he produced the watercolour *Burke and Wills on the way to Mount Hopeless* (1907, fig. 7).

In this painting, the landscape is as bleak as the protagonists' situation. Burke lies slumped against a tree in the foreground, his body emaciated. Likewise, Wills crouches on the ground, a dejected figure. Both bodies are united by the bleak palette of ochres and whites that makes up the landscape; by doing so, Lambert suggests that the harsh land is reclaiming the men. The legs and body of the camel resemble bleached bone, emphasising this reclamation and acting as a prolepsis for what is to come. As a pedagogical device the work does much to portray the bleakness of the situation. The landscape, once again, becomes a protagonist in the framing of Australian history.

When Lambert approached his war work, he brought with him a similar flair for the staging of historical drama. His small oil sketch *Trenches, Bersheeba, looking towards Tel el Saba* (1918, fig. 8) bears a strong resemblance to his *Burke and Wills on the way to Mount Hopeless*. Here also, the ochre palette infuses the composition with a sense of despair. Lambert uses the motif of camel carcasses to convey the extremes of the situation; they are consumed by the land, becoming macabre abstract shapes that add a sense of pathos to the painting. Like the Burke and Wills painting, in *Trenches, Bersheeba, looking towards Tel el Saba*, Lambert mythologises a moment in Australian history by mobilising the metaphor of the land in Australian culture as both a dramatic stage and an active agent. It is interesting that in both paintings the themes of tragedy and sacrifice form an essential component of the drama. Yet as Gavin Souter explains, the depiction of hopelessness within Australian mythic culture was not seen as a flaw in national character, especially when it came to Gallipoli and Australia's wartime experience:

...failure was not really any disqualification for the purpose which Gallipoli would serve; on the contrary it may well have been essential. Australians had not evolved many legends to reflect and
glorify aspects of their collective identity; but those they valued most — Lalor at Eureka, Burke and Wills at Cooper Creek, Kelly at Glenrowan — were all concerned with men who had taken their chances against great odds, and failed. Did Australian self-esteem perhaps contain a core of self-pity?46

Lambert’s Bourke and Wills on the way to Mount Hopeless and Trenches, Bersheeba, looking towards Tel el Saba succeed as historical vignettes in spite of their pathos because of the characterisation of struggle as an essential component of the Australian experience. It is the viewer’s understanding that the Australian nation survives in spite of such adversity that allows the failure of such individuals to paradoxically signal the strength of the national character as a whole.

In his Gallipoli works, Lambert transposed many of the characteristics of Australian bush mythology onto a foreign landscape. In doing so, he appropriated the symbolic importance of landscape in order to position Australian history amongst the histories of other nations. To Lambert, the wartime landscape of the Near East was a wondrous palette which he could manipulate for his own purposes. “I raved about the beauty of the place...”, he wrote of Palestine, “insisting that [my guide] should not only admire the beauties of nature, but especially my skill in interpreting them”.47 Indeed Betty Snowden argues that as a result, Lambert’s Middle Eastern wartime landscapes are a balance of the real and the imagined, a combination of observation and construction.48 Similarly, Grey suggests that “Lambert blended the real and the imagined... he modified what he saw, creating artificial constructs”.49

Lambert certainly viewed the Near Eastern landscape as tool for creating meaning. However, he also conceived of it as an active agent with a particular identity that resisted manipulation. On painting the Palestinian landscape he recorded:

A word to those who would paint this country. Leave your gay pigments at home. Approach Nature with a simple palette but an extravagant love of form. These sand-hills take on shapes and curves, cut concave and convex, interwoven into an entrancing pattern, here rhythmical, there jagged and eccentrically posed. With all the knowledge the artist may, nay must, bring to bear, he need only copy and he achieves art; but it takes doing.50
FIGURE 7: GEORGE W. LAMBERT, BURKE AND WILLS ON THE WAY TO MOUNT HOPELESS, 1907, WATERCOLOUR ON PAPER, 26.2 X 38.5 CM, BENDIGO ART GALLERY, VICTORIA.

FIGURE 8: GEORGE W. LAMBERT, TRENCHES, BERSHEBA, LOOKING TOWARDS TEL EL SABA, 1918, PENCIL, OIL ON WOOD PANEL, 22.5 X 30.6 CM, AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL, CANBERRA.
To Lambert, the Near Eastern landscape held an artistry of its own that could be revealed by Western artists; but this required a certain amount of interpretive skill. In fact, he was derisive of Western culture in comparison to the grand history of the East, which impacted greatly upon him. Upon landing in Egypt he recorded that:

I should have liked to crack a bottle of the best by way of clearing the palate from the after-taste of ship's cabin and train compartment, and also the mind, upon which, according to your nature, will be imprinted either the oriental grandeur of Egypt, past and present, stimulating in its kaleidoscopic colour-pattern, or else the notorious insistence of the pagan and limited art and outlook which we have been cultivated to call beautiful.51

In *Anzac, the landing 1915* (1920-2, fig. 9), Lambert associates the Australian experience at Gallipoli with the grand cultural heritage of the Near East. Lambert moulds the landscape into a symbolic, mythological space, borrowing tropes from both Australian and Eastern myths to situate the Australian soldiers within the mythological and historical landscape of the Dardanelles. The imposing physicality of the landscape – as seen in *Across the black soil plains* – is a familiar Australian trope. Lambert no doubt intended to generate an association in the viewer's mind between the land being fought over at Gallipoli and the land hard won on the home-front. As Ian Burns suggests, such an association gave "visual credence to
claims that the fighting was for the safety of Australia. To this Lambert includes additional symbolism. The composition is overlooked in this distance by 'the Sphinx', a promontory so named by Anzac soldiers for its resemblance to the Egyptian wonder that they had witnessed during their training in Egypt. While Lambert’s placement of the feature in relation to the events of the actual landing is topographically correct, in its dominant position in the background and reflecting an almost mythical dawn light, it imbues the scene with metaphorical connotations that link the landscape of Gallipoli with previous national mythologies.

Many historians and commentators have emphasised the mythological history of the Dardanelles in their accounts of Gallipoli. As Patsy Adam-Smith wrote of the Anzacs’ journey in The Anzacs:

On [Mudros'] peaks Agamemnon, King of Mycenae, had lit a chain of fires to signal to Clytemnestra, his queen, that he had taken nearby Troy. Here, to the one place consecrated by poets to the conflicts of heroes, to the forces and passions personified by the Olympian gods and goddesses, half European half Asia, came the new men, bred beneath a cross of stars that Herodotus had not known of when he portrayed the localized war at Thermopylae as global conflict. It is the most famous arena of the world, the birthplace of the Iliad. Men had tried their mettle here before Australia was dreamed of.

Frank Crozier and George Benson visualised this mythological journey in their painting Training in the desert, Mena (1921, fig. 10). Here, Anzac soldiers mingle with colourful stereotypes of the Near East. Groups of soldiers dominate the fore, mid and backgrounds, while in the distance four pyramids, swathed in a foggy sandstorm, complete the landscape. The comparison here between ancient Egyptian civilisation and the young Australian one is unavoidable. While the grand monuments to history loom in the background, the Australian men stand atop a hill in the foreground. In Training in the desert Mena, two histories are interwoven and overlapped, the new being written alongside the old. This is exactly how the Sydney Mail interpreted Australia’s involvement in the Near East. “The most important of all the discoveries of the last five years in Egypt and the Near East has been Australial”, it recorded:

Out here in the oldest part of the world, amidst the ruins of successions of ancient civilisations this new nation has fixed its
place in modern history, and established for all mankind’s admiration the character of its people. Where Homer sang and Cleopatra loved; where the Pharaohs built and where the Israelites wandered, there Australian and New Zealand soldiers have been, to erect for themselves a reputation that lifts their land above its old designation as a place of kangaroos and emus and goldfields and sheep ranches. Australia lost cruelly of the flower of her youth at Gallipoli; but she found her soul. National consciousness and solidarity, and a sense of the nation’s mission among men, have been born over here in the realism of the golden age. Troy, Sparta, Greece, Rome, Judea, Egypt, have no nobler stories of valour and sublime heroism to their credit than may be written of these young giants from the unknown land beneath the southern cross. 54

The imaging of foreign armies on the Egyptian landscape had of course been visited before. In Jean-Léon Gérôme’s Oedipus (1867-8, fig. 11), a cultural hierarchy is imposed onto the landscape of the Near East. In the painting, a proud Napoleon stands face-to-face against a sphinx – a visual metaphor of the difference between the modern, European colonial power and the ancient Eastern civilisation. Though Napoleon is the only identifiable figure in the scene, the shadows of his generals loom ominously behind him. In addition, the vast French army is just visible in the distance, a minute but significant blemish on the landscape.

In Gérôme’s work, the image of the French soldiers is empowered by their domination of the landscape; their cultural authority is gained by supplanting the ancient civilisation with their own, modern one. However in Anzac, the landing, Lambert does not reference the mythology of the Near East in order to subvert it; such a claim in any case would be undermined given the fact of Australia’s defeat at Gallipoli. Rather, the prominence of the Sphinx in the work places established Australian cultural mythologies onto a historical timeline that validates Australia’s claim to nationhood. As Kapferer notes, “the Australian history made and pointed to by the Anzacs as the history-making action of a new nation was a history simultaneously continuous with previous orders and transcending them”. 55 Lambert’s genius lay in not only manipulating and adapting existing Australian conceptions of the bushman stereotype in his portrayal of Australian character, but also in placing it within the scope of wider national histories. In doing so, he fulfilled Bean’s missive to not
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only paint and record history, but to “produce vast actual dramas in the rise and fall and other vicissitudes of nations”.

AN AUSTRALIAN TRAGEDY

In Anzac, the landing 1915, the figures seem to resist individual identification and the meaning of the work is generated through the interaction of the compositional elements as a whole rather than through a focus on individual protagonists. None of the Australian soldiers are recognisable individuals; indeed many of their faces are left as abstract blobs of colour that blend into the shapes and tones of the background. There are no real indications of a threat from the enemy; the only visible Turk is a dead, contorted figure in the lower right of the work, who is casually stepped over by an advancing Australian soldier. As such, at first instance it appears that Lambert’s composition does not encourage a direct engagement or personal reaction from the viewer, an attribute that led one commentator to write that the work “is impersonal, and does not touch the emotions. Those little grey figures struggling up those grey cliffs do not really concern us”.

This critic was responding to a perceived lack of sublimity in the landscape and figures of Lambert’s landing scene; a sublimity that was essential to his imaging of the Australian bush landscape, its people and history. Though Lambert’s execution was technically proficient, by omitting reference to the imminent danger faced by the troops and in choosing to venerate a scene in which Australian troops were not portrayed in the conventional heroic mode, Lambert did not allow the viewer to identify with the work in a way that provided spiritual or moral justification for the sacrifice of Australian lives. By this account, Anzac, the landing 1915 was not successful as a war work; even though it signalled Gallipoli as a significant historical episode, it did not allow Australian viewers to reconcile their understanding of the events with the wider framework of Australian history.

Though Anzac, the landing 1915 was criticised for its impersonal, unemotional approach, it was through Lambert’s empiricism that the artist attempted to connect the viewer’s experience of the work with a greater historical understanding. Lambert responded to criticism of his work by defending its empiricism, noting that:
Visitors to the Museum... complain there is a lack of fire, a lack of action and of the terror of war, but on the facts... we must accept that men equipped as these men were, moving upwards on this particular place, without any idea of where the enemy was, what they had to do, would look just like this small swarm of ants climbing, no matter how rapidly, climbing painfully and laboriously upward through the uneven ground and spiky uncomfortable shrubs. It is significant that in his response, Lambert both defends his portrayal as having been based on historical facts and suggests that a proper engagement with his work requires not only the viewer’s understanding, but acceptance of the facts upon which the scene was based – facts drawn from Bean’s official version of the events. As such, although the viewer is not engaged through sublime emotional drama, they are engaged in an intermediary role between visual and written histories.

Lambert’s empirical method signalled a new approach to Australian history painting that encouraged the viewer to engage with multiple historical narratives – an approach that had gained momentum in eighteenth and nineteenth-century British war art. In his analysis of John Singleton Copley’s The Siege of Gibraltar (1791, fig. 12), John Bonehill argues that the visual arts, through an increasingly close engagement with written texts, played a critical role in re-evaluating the function of history painting as a genre. Bonehill argues that Copley’s painting – commissioned to commemorate the British victory at Gibraltar at a time when British national prestige was still suffering from the loss of the American Revolutionary War – relied on the viewer’s interpretation of multiple historical accounts in order to authenticate its meaning. He suggests that Copley’s image elides events crucial to understanding the significance of the British victory at Gibraltar, forcing the viewer to perform an intermediary role and fill such gaps with their own knowledge garnered from written accounts of the battle. Such an interaction between visual and written histories, Bonehill argues, “could at once both authorize them as ‘history’, providing a near official version, and promote a national art that would be inextricable from the authority of that ‘history’”. From this interaction a new model of historical writing emerged – one that relied on the interpretation of a combination of accounts in order to involve the viewer experientially in the artist’s vision of history.
Lambert followed a similar experiential strategy in *Anzac, the landing 1915* in order to both situate Gallipoli within the wider context of Australian history and validate the symbolism with which Bean had inscribed it. In hindsight, Bean wrote of Lambert that his:

> ...appointment as an 'official artist' meant to him, among a few others, was entrusted the creation of a true record of the sacrifice which so many Australians made, often unseen, unheard, untended, on some dreadful night or in the cold hour between the dawn and the rising of the sun.

It is significant that Bean's references to the role of the official artist and the "true record" of Australia's sacrifice are synonymous; though his intent was to stress the gravitas of the duty of Australia's war artists and historians, he simultaneously signals the potential for official representations to create rather than reflect historical experience. Lambert's role as official artist was to create a visual history of Gallipoli that could be experienced as an extension of Australia's historical tradition. In order to effect this, he inserted symbolic details into his war works in order to distinguish the events and protagonists as particularly Australian. Such details, whose symbolism could be read only by an informed, Australian
viewer, functioned as an interlocutor between the viewer's experience and the historical meaning Lambert attempted to impart.

In *Anzac, the landing 1915* Lambert identified the scene as particularly Australian through a focus on the symbolism of the Australian uniform. In the work, despite the fact that no individual faces can be made out, the men can be clearly distinguished by their characteristic slouch hats and uniforms – details that contained particular meaning for the Australian viewer. Since the beginning of the war, the A.I.F. uniform had become a source of pride for its wearers that reflected a particular Australian character. In his history of the 8th Light Horse Brigade, John Hamilton examines the iconic outfit's uniform, suggesting that the brigade set out to have their own distinctive design and appearance that consisted of symbols that were distinctive to the heritage of the Australian horseman – their badge, for example, was a rampant horse rearing on its hind legs under a crown and between two sprigs of wattle. In particular, the slouch hat became a marker of Australianness. The light horse drill manual suggested that the hat be worn "at a rakish tilt", and as Hamilton suggests, in the case of the Light Horse Brigade, the slouch hat, with its recognizable emu feather, became a symbol of the troops' legend. Because of this image, troopers were portrayed as being "very sure of themselves, at times almost cocky or verging on the larrakin, their hats at a jaunty angle and appearing nothing less than the epitome of their hardened colonial background". The Anzac uniform not only marked the soldiers as Australian, but hinted at their difference in character from their British counterparts.

Such was the cultural valency of the slouch hat that such a symbolic characterisation would have been recognisable to Australian viewers, as suggested by a 1942 poem, *A Brown Slouch Hat*:

*A Brown Slouch Hat*

There is a symbol, we love and adore it,  
You see it daily wherever you go.  
Long years have passed since our fathers once wore it,  
What is the symbol that we should all know?  

It's a brown slouch hat with the side turned up, and it means the world to me.  
It's the symbol of our Nation – the land of liberty.  
And as soldiers they wear it, how proudly they bear it, for all the world to see.
Just a brown slouch hat with the side turned up, heading straight for victory.

Don't you thrill as young Bill passes by?
Don't you beam at the gleam in his eye?
Head erect, shoulders square, tunic spic and span,
Ev'ry inch a soldier and ev'ry inch a man.

As they swing down the street, aren't they grand?
Three abreast to the beat of the band,
But what do we remember when the boys have passed along?
Marching by so brave and strong.

Though writing from a period distanced from the First World War, the poet describes the slouch hat as a symbol of nation that transcends generation; after sighting marching soldiers it is “just a brown” hat that the poet remembers, but it is, he suggests, a symbol that Australians should know.

However, at the time of the landing, the uniforms that the Australian soldiers wore more closely resembled the British uniform; instead of the Australian slouch hat, the soldiers wore the British peaked cap, a fact of which Lambert was well aware. This was an issue that was brought up by the War Records Section upon receipt of the painting. In a letter to Bean, the head of the Official War Art Scheme wrote that “you will of course have noted that in Lambert’s picture of the landing the men are shown as wearing hats. A few have challenged the correctness of this, claiming that the men should have been shown as wearing caps”. Nevertheless, Lambert deliberately chose to depict the men wearing the characteristic slouch hats in order to distance the events from the actions of the English and distinguish the significance of the events as uniquely Australian.

This distinction between Australian and British identities was one that Bean sought to identify in his writing. As Inglis argues, in his writing, Bean claimed that the Australian “was becoming to some extent distinguishable from the Englishman in bodily appearance, in face, and in voice. He also displayed certain markedly divergent qualities of mind and character”. As a result, Bean’s rationalising of the defeat at Gallipoli often followed from a belief in intrinsic flaws in the English character that were not present in the Australian type. In the Australian record of Gallipoli it became particularly important to differentiate between the old and new orders to expiate any Australian responsibility for defeat. In
Australian accounts, the Gallipoli landing is a controversial issue. Most Australian Gallipoli historians suggest that the Anzac soldiers were disembarked at the incorrect position — on account of British error — which resulted in the Australians being faced with a tactically flawed objective. This framing of the Australian role at Gallipoli under the rubric of a compromised military strategy absolves the actions of the Anzac soldiers from particular tactical reproach.

However, Broadbent offers a different interpretation of the landing uniform worn by the Anzacs that raises questions about the Anzac renown at the time:

The covering force had also been issued with British flat peaked caps to wear instead of their usual slouch hats, probably so they could not be identified as an inexperienced contingent carrying out a diversion — as in fact they were.

Broadbent’s hypothesis is certainly plausible and it is the viewer’s intermediary interpretive act that changes the image of the slouch hat in Lambert’s painting from a symbol of inexperience to one of nation. Lambert’s deliberate distancing of the Australian image from the stigma of this military error frees the Australian character from culpability and allows the viewer to focus on the artist’s true intention — the depiction of the Australian character overcoming adversity. This distinct disassociation from the English character was required for Gallipoli to function as the locus for a new national history, for as Kapferer notes, “the bureaucratic error and mindless authoritarianism often held responsible for the destruction of the Anzacs are metaphors of the degeneration of the old social order”.

One other curious inclusion in Anzac, the landing 1915 supports the view that Lambert inserted symbolic historical details to frame the drama as characteristically Australian. In the work, on the belt of each Australian soldier, Lambert includes a white pouch that contrasts sharply against the subdued background. This white ration pouch was an English initiative that was met with disapproval from the Australian soldiers as they believed the white material would attract the attention of Turkish snipers. Most visible in the men climbing from the beach in the bottom left corner of the work, the white pouches function as a unifying visual element that traces the general path of the Australian men up the hills and reveal the various poses of the soldiers from the background: climbing, scrambling, ducking and dying. Although contemporary accounts suggested that many Australian soldiers had either lost their pouches in the landing or else discarded them soon after, Lambert nevertheless chose to include them on all the soldiers climbing the hills as a
reminder to the informed viewer of the controversial British strategies that Bean and the Australian public held responsible for the tragedy of Gallipoli. That the Anzac soldiers could acquit themselves with honour in spite of such perceived English incompetence symbolically affirmed the arrival of a unique Australian identity and framed it in a traditional Australian mythological trope.

*Anzac, the landing 1915* is not a traditional battle scene depicting the valiant acts of individual heroes, but rather a work that intends to generalise about the character of Australian men. What was important to Lambert was the depiction of the struggle against adversity that he had signalled in *Across the Black Soil Plains* as a trope of the Australian experience. As in the earlier work, the elements in *Anzac, the landing 1915* are united by a strong diagonal composition, here running left to right across the picture plane. Again, the figures are united with the landscape, not only by a unified colour palette, but by the push of the landscape as it rises to the right. In *Anzac, the landing 1915*, as he did in his Australian paintings, Lambert signals the landscape as the foe in this Australian historical drama, the struggle against which serves as a validation of the national character. The progression of the men from bottom to top and left to right indicates a temporal progression as much as it does a physical one. We witness the soldiers not only as they land on the beach, but as they ascend the heights, reaching up to their objective at the apex of the hill at the far right of the canvas and extending beyond. The composition thus suggests the enormity of the drama as it subtly pays homage to the courage of the men. As Gray suggests, Lambert’s unusual depiction of the landing from a high position looking down emphasises the scale of the task ahead and the primary role of the landscape as a protagonist, yet it simultaneously acknowledges the accomplishments of the Australian men in having come so far. In her estimation, Lambert’s decision to avoid focusing on identifiable individuals assisted him in transforming the image of the Gallipoli landing from a single historical event to a broader statement of national and mythological significance:

Lambert used [Gallipoli] to generalise from the particular, to represent the triumph against odds, the energy and chaos of battle, and the bloody slaughter. He did not portray recognisable people. By representing scrambling, crawling, khaki-clad soldiers scarcely discernible against the rocky precipitous cliff at Anzac Cove in *Anzac, the landing*, Lambert conveyed more than a particular historical event: he summed up ‘sacrifice and achievement’ and the universal experience of people overcoming obstacles.
Though, as Gray suggests, ‘sacrifice’ and ‘achievement’ were familiar historical themes, Lambert’s genius was to identify them as essential characteristics of Australian history. *Anzac, the landing 1915* is a tribute not to individual actions, but rather the general character and courage of the Australian nation. This is how another reviewer, Alexander Colquhoun, read it. “This is not a pretty picture, nor a cheerful one”, he wrote,

...and there is an uncanny lack of anything individual or personal in the scrambling, crawling, khaki figure scarcely discernible against the rocky precipitous ground. It speaks however, as a declaration of sacrifice and achievement in a way that no other war picture has done.”

Colquhoun raises the familiar charge against Lambert’s dispassionate approach; the critic’s response betrays a lack of personal, emotional affection for the work. Lambert’s elision of dramatic battle imagery prevents the work from being read in the heroic mode by the viewer, but in Colquhoun’s view this does not preclude *Anzac, the landing 1915* from being a successful war work. On the contrary, in *Anzac, the landing 1915*, Lambert succeeded in presenting Gallipoli as an integral part of Australia’s historical identity. The critic’s admission that the work venerates Australian sacrifice “in a way that no other war picture has done” conceals a double meaning; while it lauds the efficacy of Lambert’s thematic intent, it simultaneously recognises the singleness of the artist’s methodology in involving the viewer in the process of generating meaning.

Lambert’s history gained its authenticity from the artist’s use of symbolic details. His inclusion of the slouch hats and ration pouches in *Anzac, the landing 1915* allowed him to manipulate historical fact whilst emphasising the symbolic meaning of his works. Yet despite this manipulation, on occasion Lambert paradoxically expressed a revulsion at the idea of sensationalising events. During preparation for *Anzac, the landing, 1915* when Bean told him that the men of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade had been ordered to roll up their sleeves to be able to be distinguished from the Turks, Lambert, in Bean’s words, sensing “that we were expecting him to paint something like that flamboyant illustrated-newspaper pictures of the Anzacs which seldom failed to show their forearms bare”, replied “how disgusting” at the notion of creating an image that resembled melodramatic heroic propaganda. As a result, Bean recorded that

Nothing could have induced him to turn up the sleeves of that landing brigade. In his great picture, of all the scores of climbing
men who, in the flat morning light, almost blend into the colour of the scrub, every one has his sleeves down to his wrist, and every one wears an Australian hat, though Lambert knew that they landed in the little round peaked caps which were the general wear of Australian infantry in that great battle.\textsuperscript{76}

Bean's attitude towards Lambert's doctoring of the image of the soldier is remarkably flexible considering Bean believed that Lambert could not be persuaded to deviate from the truth and that his artistic integrity was "absolute".\textsuperscript{77} In 1924 Bean wrote of Lambert that "no desire to please would induce him to draw a line which would not satisfy his own high standard. His fixed principle was... never scamp at details".\textsuperscript{78} Yet in cases where a small deviation from the truth facilitated the veneration of the Australian character, both Lambert and Bean were amenable to factual flexibility. Bean's intention was not only to record the facts, but to present them in a light that justified his vision of the emerging Australian nation.\textsuperscript{79} Lambert's factual embellishments were selective. He did not condone the sensationalising of the Australian image in an ostensibly propagandistic manner, but in the cases where Lambert's alterations better emphasised the meanings of Bean's historical vision, they were allowed into the official image of Gallipoli.\textsuperscript{80}

**ORCHESTRATING EXPERIENCE**

To Lambert, Gallipoli was a dramatic stage upon which to explore the image of Australian nationhood. To this end he viewed a certain artistic license as a necessary component of the presentation of history. In perhaps his most evocative Gallipoli work, *The charge of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade at the Nek, 7 August 1915* (hereafter *The Nek*) (1924, fig. 13), he continued the subtle manipulation of the Anzac image to create a work that represented the tragedy and futility of Australia's sacrifice at Gallipoli. Lambert remarked that at the Nek:

\begin{quote}
Evidence grins coldly at us noncombatants, and I feel thankful that I have been trained... to stop my emotions at the border line. From the point of view of the Artist Historian the Nek is a wonderful setting for the tragedy.\textsuperscript{81}
\end{quote}
Though Lambert claimed to be able to separate his emotional response from his historical reportage, he was nonetheless affected by the sight of so many dead Australian soldiers that still lay on the ground when he and Bean visited the battleground a year after the end of the war. While surveying the Nek, Bean's party was forced to bury more than 300 Australian bodies in a strip the size of three tennis courts, the sight of which obviously affected Lambert and prompted Bean to remark that "Lambert was, I think, more sensitive than the rest of us to the tragedy - or at any rate the horror - of Anzac".\(^8\) In a letter to his wife Lambert remarked that the "gruesome is... scattered all over the battlefield".\(^8\) Yet despite his recognition of the events as a "wonderful setting for the tragedy", Lambert was conscious of the fact that the most effective representation of the tragedy would require a deliberate construction rather than objective reportage. "The worst feature of this after battle work", he wrote of his Gallipoli expedition, "is that the silent hills and valleys sit stern, unmoved callous of the human and busy only in growing bush, and sliding earth to hide the scars left by the war disease".\(^8\) Lambert's concern that the visible marks of the war were being reclaimed by the land reveals his desire to shape the Gallipoli landscape as a commemorative space. By his admission, the worst part of his expedition was not the sight of the remains of dead Australian soldiers, but the thought that without intervention their sacrifice would be forgotten. His aim was to manipulate the setting so that it expressed in fullness the horror of the Australian drama.
In *The Nek*, Lambert manipulates historical details in order to mark the tragedy as Australian; like in *Anzac, the landing, 1915*, he depicted the slouch hat despite the fact that the soldiers at the Nek wore British helmets during the attack. Bean wrote to Lambert to correct what he thought was perhaps his misapprehension on the matter, writing that “there is no doubt that helmets were the order of the day for the light horse charge... there were a few hats also, but helmets was the rule. The 3rd Light Horse Brigade practically all wore helmets at Gallipoli”. Nevertheless, Lambert made a conscious decision to ignore this detail, at least partially on compositional grounds. In response to Bean he wrote that:

The two survivors of the charge at the Nek... assured me that they were wearing helmets during the operation. They positively insisted. They ought to know. Somehow it looks queer in the picture. These two mentioned above told me that the recruits wore the soft felt but the original lot all wore helmets. I have improvised in this way and as most of the figures are hatless or helmetless the effect isn’t so bad.

Almost thirty years later, Bean had seemed to forget this inaccuracy, admitting that Lambert had altered the uniform in *Anzac, the landing, 1915*, “but in his picture of the charge at the Nek he gave the men exactly the uniform they would have worn... the ‘Anzac uniform’”. It is possible that Bean forgot the disagreement about the issue of helmets, or that he considered it a minor infraction. However Bean’s reference to the slouch hats as an essential part of the “Anzac uniform” raises another alternative; speaking in hindsight, his recollection appears coloured by the rise of the Anzac culture and its symbols.

It is most telling that Lambert admits sacrificing historical accuracy for pictorial effect, for *The Nek* is redolent with the marks of Lambert’s dramatic staging. The twisted and contorted bodies were not immune to the artist’s dramatic touch. For the most part, the figures were composed from uniformed models in his London studio, but while he was at Gallipoli he recreated death scenes using his assistant William Spruce as a model. Many of Lambert’s earlier studies are utilised in some way in *The Nek*, giving the dead an appearance of compositional harmony. In 1924, in the same year in which *The Nek* was completed, Julian Ashton compared Lambert’s handling of the brush and “his technical dexterity to the beautiful bowing of an accomplished violinist”. The image of Lambert as orchestrator is a particularly apt one given the choreography of figures in *The Nek*. The soldiers’ bodies are strongly ordered – twisted and contorted not only by enemy bullets, but by the artist’s brush for best artistic effect. The figures are ordered in the space by a strong diagonal push
through the canvas from the bottom left to the top right, forming a set of strong diagonals that unify the composition. It was this dramatic manufacturing that inspired one critic to describe the bodies as being thrown "into the air like marionettes jerked into eternity." 89

Lambert’s dramatic staging was assisted by his desire to incorporate a physical experience as an essential part of the viewer’s interaction with the work. Despite the creative license he employed to manufacture drama, he took pains to accurately model the landscape and the effects of war on men’s bodies. At Gallipoli he rose before daybreak so as to ensure that the colours of his work would match the early morning light. 90 In addition, Bean recorded how Lambert, in order to get a better sense of the effect of battle on men’s bodies, would often ask him:

...how I thought a man would fall if hit on one side and spun round; Lambert used to jerk himself forward as he imagined this charging man would, and as you see one figure falling in the centre of the picture today. 91

It is significant that Bean identifies a figure in the work as a product of Lambert’s physical experimentation, for the artist’s reconstruction of the experience of the charge provides a framework for the composition. Though the figures are strongly aesthetically ordered, the forensic manner by which Lambert poses the bodies renders each of them a credible consequence of the action. The dramatic effect of the scene is thus bound in the physicality of the figures. Lambert intended viewers of the work to relate to the figures not through an understanding of historical and symbolic details alone, but in a personal, corporeal manner by which they could imagine their bodies as a substitute for those depicted. The physical plausibility of Lambert’s figures allows the viewer to transform the memory of Gallipoli from a public, historical event to a personal, lived experience. Lambert heightens this experience by freezing the scene at its most dramatic moment. That the bodies of the men hang preternaturally in the air heightens the emotional effect of their sacrifice; however, although Lambert indicates the tragic consequences of the action, he suspends the ultimate dénouement, denying the viewer the ability to emotionally reconcile the fatal charge with a wider historical context. In doing so, the artist frames the event as one that is not limited merely to the annals of history but one that may be revisited and possessed by future generations of Australians. By engaging with the physicality of the scene, the viewer becomes both an active agent and a custodian of the Gallipoli mythology.
At first, it seems ironic that Lambert employs such physical violence in a valedictory piece in which the protagonists are national icons. However, as Willis suggests, in some cases the inclusion of extreme violence as an element of national mythology paradoxically serves to validate, rather than destroy, faith in a nation. "The spilling of blood is a privileged ritual in myths of the formation of nations", she writes, "The fact that large numbers of people are prepared to die in defence of their country is evidence enough of popular faith in nation".

Accordingly, wilful sacrifice indicates "The extent to which people have become subjects of the state through the mechanism of their belief in the myth of nation":

So entrenched has this nationalist ideology become that it has been possible for Australian forces defeated at Gallipoli by Turkish forces, who posed no direct threat to the Australian state, to be seen as the trial of Australian nationhood, as its most glorious moment.

In *The Nek*, the viewer is not allowed to forget who is being sacrificed. One figure — a hatless, pale man on his knees, who turns to face the viewer — becomes a symbol of the subsuming of individual for nation. Kneeling in the midground on the right of the composition, he is positioned at the vanguard of the Australian soldiers' push to the right, which metaphorically and temporally positions him at the climax of the drama. Placed at such a crucial point, he becomes an interlocutor, engaging the viewer with the horror of the piece; his is the only face that stares out into the space of the viewer, and the only one that is recognisable from the crowd of soldiers, Australian and Turkish. However his vacant expression belies any attempt by the viewer to engage with him on a personal level. Instead, the viewer is encouraged to view him in a symbolic light, divorced from his individual identity.

This symbolism is accented by the stigmata-like puncture wound that appears on his right hand. Though only a tiny red dot on his skin, through Lambert's ingenious placement of the hand in a down-turned flop, its presence transforms the soldier's identity from individual to allegory. Such mannerisms and hand gestures were of great interest to Lambert and he deployed them in his portraits in order to convey meaning and character. According to Gray, this manipulation of mannerisms was also a means of displaying his artistic virtuosity. She suggests that he "used his mannerisms, his pretence, to demonstrate that he was master within the universe of the picture, and that this was the constructed image of the world". The stigmata wound in *The Nek* betrays Lambert's ability to direct the drama of the scene and create meaning through gesture. While the soldier's right hand reveals the
stigmata, symbolising the horror of war and the sacrifice of the young men, with his left he reaches up to his head, his fingers half clenched as if to grip the brim of his missing slouch hat — that treasured symbol of Australian identity. His personal tragedy is thus subsumed by the tragedy of a nation. In drawing upon Christian allegory Lambert cements the figure of the Australian soldier as not only a figure of nation, but a symbol of redemption.6 Defeat at Gallipoli is transformed from senseless slaughter to symbolic sacrifice. In doing so, Lambert
validates the populist views of many, like Bean, who not only saw Gallipoli as a baptism of fire, but the birthplace of the independent Australian character.

Of The Nek, Lambert wrote to Bean “this work [I think] goes far to epitomize not only the Gallipoli spirit of our forces but I saw it in all modesty epitomizes the attitude of [myself] to [my] own War record...” 97 In depicting such violence, Lambert recognised his own revulsion towards war. Indeed, Gray remarks that The Nek “epitomised Lambert’s personal attitude to war as a ghastly debacle”. 98 Yet beyond that, it reveals Lambert’s propensity to treat war as a dramatic device, a stage upon which players could be moved and manipulated for the greatest effect. “Lambert intentionally sought artifice in his work”, Gray writes, “presenting his figures as if they were actors stilled in motion, on a stage”. 99 More than simply a reflection of the artist’s personal reaction to the vulgarity of war, it epitomizes Lambert as an artist-historian who saw battles and historical events as markers in a grand history of nations.

A self-portrait by Lambert entitled The official artist (1921, fig. 14), goes a long way to revealing his attitude towards his role as artist-historian. Renowned for his penchant for play-acting and mimicry, here the artist appears in the uniform of the Light Horse Brigade, replete with the characteristic plumed hat.100 In the usual style of his self-portraits, Lambert looks out enigmatically at the viewer, his left hand holding a glass in toast. On a tag attached to the hat read the words “DEDICATED TO THE AUST. LIGHT HORSE PALESTINE”. The words have a dual meaning. The painting itself serves as a tribute to his colleagues in the light horse, for whom he held so much admiration. But in another respect, it is a confession by Lambert of his dedication to creating the image of the Australian soldier. Here, though the artist-historian dresses himself in the uniform he wore in the field, his military identity is destabilised by the rolled-up sleeves of his shirt and the appearance of his pipe and the wine glass. As Lambert’s individual persona is revealed, we are reminded of his artistic role in the creation of Australian history. That Lambert’s dedication is presented on a tag that references a similar historical cataloguing to that in which Bean was engaged is itself significant. The artist and historian, Lambert seems to cheekily suggest, played an equal role in the formation of the Anzac image, through a dramatic staging of events and a careful framing of history. In the case of the Gallipoli campaign, Lambert certainly helped to frame the legend by transposing existing Australian historical themes onto a mythological landscape that allowed Australian history to be fused with world history. In the process he fortified the image and ideal of the Australian soldier as the Australian national icon.
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26 Bann’s argument about historical methodology reflects the literary process Roland Barthes terms “the reality effect”. In *The Rustle of Language*, Barthes argues that the appearance of objective reality created through fastidious use of detail may come to signify something other than actual reality. In this process, empirical observations are able to refer to an epistemological discourse that undermines their supposed objective intentions. The reality effect is a ‘referential illusion’, whereby an object presented as a depiction of the ‘real’ becomes a metaphor for some other meaning or purpose and acts only to signify the ‘real’ object without denoting it directly. See Roland Barthes, *The Rustle of Language*, trans. Richard Howard, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986, 141-8. Barthes’ concept was applied to visual culture by Linda Nochlin in her discussion of Orientalist Realism. See Linda Nochlin, “The Imaginary Orient”, *Art in America*, May 1983, 118-31. The reality effect, applied to visual culture, results in a visual fallacy, whereby the artist convinces the viewer through details that there is a direct relationship between the painting and the experience of the real world. As such, the appearance of the real functions to generate a fantasy that is legitimised by the consistency of its falsified knowledge.

27 Kapferer, *Legends of People, Myths of State*, 122.


This was especially the case in the portrait of Bean, for whom he held a special regard. In a letter to the war office, he wrote that he would "take a great pride in portraying faithfully my dear friend Chas. Bean". George Lambert, letter to Treloar, AWM38 302 PART1 War Artists and their work: George Lambert Part 1, Australian War Memorial Archive.

Indeed, Bean had requested to be painted in his coat writing to Lambert that "I should like to be painted in my old trenchcoat, if this suits your views. It is the only uniform I really ever wore". C.E.W. Bean, letter to George Lambert, 24/6/1924, AWM38 419/81 Correspondence between DR Bean, George Lambert and G.H. Wilkins and Shins, relating to Lambert and Wilkins, dated 1923-1925, Australian War Memorial Archive.

This story of the failed expedition of Robert O'Hara Burke and William John Wills is an infamous one in Australian history and mythology. In 1860, Burke and Wills intended to lead a team of 19 men from Melbourne, on Australia's south coast, to the Gulf of Carpentaria on its north coast - a journey of more than 3000km across terrain that had yet to be mapped by European settlers. After a series of misfortunes, the expedition ended with the death of seven men, including both leaders. Only one man from the party completed the journey and returned to Melbourne.
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Broadbent however, raises the possibility that the landing at Anzac Cove was a deliberate change of plan executed by Australian officers which, if true, significantly challenges a major trope of the Gallipoli myth. However, he admits that little evidence remains for this hypothesis. See Harvey Broadbent, Gallipoli: the fatal shore, Sydney: The Helicon Press, 2005.
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For example, Thompson argues that Bean struggled to show how the behaviour of the Australian soldier fitted his idea, and that the creation of an account which justified his own preconceptions was more important than merely providing a purely factually accurate account. See Alistair Thomson, "Steadfast until death?", 462-478.

Despite being the favoured official war artist, the War Office did have concerns about the authenticity of Lambert's production. A letter to Lambert from the War Museum Committee expressed disappointment in the fact that in four years Lambert had only produced two Gallipoli works, and this delay contributed to his having two commissions withdrawn in 1925. See Letter to Lambert from War Museum Committee, undated, AWM38 302 PART1 War Artists and their work: George Lambert Part 1, Australian War Memorial Archives, Canberra. More than that, the War Museum Committee was concerned that Lambert's slow progress would lead to a dilution of the authenticity of the paintings. Yet Lambert remained Bean's favourite, and the War Museum Committee seemed to be content with allowing Bean to "manage" Lambert. See Letter from Treloar to Bean, undated, AWM38 302 PART1 War Artists and their work: George Lambert Part 1, Australian War Memorial Archives, Canberra.
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Susan Hunt for instance, argues that hands were a key expressive motif which he utilized in his most famous works as well as his self portraits. See Susan Hunt, "The Return of the Expatriate", 212-19.

Gray, George W. Lambert heroes & icons, 37.

Lambert was not alone in appropriating Christian imagery in his Gallipoli history. The myth of Simpson and his donkey is redolent with such symbolism, as is George Coates, First Australian wounded at Gallipoli arriving at Wandsworth Hospital, London (1921) and Rayner Hoff's Sacrifice (1932), amongst many others.
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Bean mentioned that Lambert was an expert mimic who would entertain the party with his impressions of Scottish, Welsh, French and one occasion when he convinced a stray cat that he was its mate. Bean, "George Lambert at the Front", 23.
In its role as one of Australia’s foundational myths, Gallipoli is often assumed to possess a hegemonic authority within Australian culture as an exemplar of cultural character. As Graham Seal notes, so powerful is Anzac mythology, it has become the predominant part of the formal identity of Australian society. Soon after the commencement of the campaign, Gallipoli and the identities of Australian soldiers were adopted in public rhetoric as instruments of nationalistic expression. In 1916, William Morris Hughes, then Australian Prime Minister, congratulated the Anzac soldiers on their achievements by proclaiming:

Soldiers, your deeds have won you a place in the Temple of the Immortals. The world has hailed you as heroes. Your comrades of the British Army have claimed you as brothers in arms, and the citizens of the Empire are proud to call you kinsmen.

Hughes appropriated the Anzac identity in order to articulate a unified national agenda, however the Anzac legend admitted numerous influences in its genesis and expression. As Alistair Thomson suggests, the creation of the legend necessitated a process of identity selection, simplification and generalization, articulated by official institutions as well as by the Australian soldiers themselves. As such, the Anzac identity encompassed a range of ideologies as well as individual and collective memories. Hughes’ statement, while it acknowledges the actions of the Anzac soldiers as instrumental in actuating the national legend, projects a vision of the Anzac identity without admitting the agency of the soldiers in its expression.
A pen sketch entitled *The Ideal and the Real* (1915, fig. 15) by Francis Hewkley, drawn on the Gallipoli battlefields during the conflict and published in *The Anzac Book*, refines the spectrum through which the Anzac identity is expressed. In it, Hewkley depicts an Anzac soldier in two guises. In the first, subtitled "The Ideal", the soldier advances, bayonet outstretched, head proudly held high. The second, captioned "And the Real" adds to the first vision by picturing a disenchanted view of the soldiering life. Here the soldier’s rifle is shouldered as he carries supplies to the front. Instead of proudly advancing, his body slumps
forward, his eyes downcast as he proceeds with his mundane activity. The sketch is interesting not only as an article of self-expression, but in that the artist is conscious both of the soldiering ideal and his expression's opposition to it. It is significant that these antithetical Anzac visions come from the same source and are not presented independently. Rather, the ideal vision appears as a thought visualised in the mind of the soldier – an apparition that reflects the self-consciousness with which the artist has explored his identity as an Anzac.

The contrast between Hughes' adoption of the Anzac myth and Hewkley's self-representation raises questions regarding the genesis and custodianship of the Anzac legend. These contrasting appropriations of the same soldiering culture evidence the varied sources from which Gallipoli mythologies were created: the private self-representation of the Anzac soldiers themselves, and the idealised national image propagated in public. Both Hughes and Hewkley's expressions signify that neither the public nor private realms that influence Gallipoli mythologies exist entirely independently of one another. Rather, the seemingly hegemonic myth of Gallipoli that has been perpetuated in Australian society exists in an interstice – it is a negotiated legend that adopts elements of a private culture in order to articulate a national identity. In The Ideal and the Real, it is significant that both visions of the Anzac soldier are drawn to the same scale. Though Hewkley's image of his 'real' experience of soldiering strongly contrasts the idealistic vision, his drawing hints that the alternative image may have equal potency in a different context. In The Ideal and the Real, there is no recoverable private experience uninfluenced by the ideal public image of the soldier; the two visions are opposites in apposition. The image of the grizzled, redoubtable pioneer was as essential to the propagation of the public Anzac myth as was the valorised and venerated official image of the soldier necessary to validate the wartime experiences of such men. Though tensions exist between public and private representations of Gallipoli, their relationship is symbiotic. The public view of Gallipoli relies on the culture of the Australian soldier for its identity. In return, the self-representation of Australian soldiers is subsequently affected, and in part defined, by the expression of public rhetoric.

The Anzac Book, in which The Ideal and the Real was published, provides a unique forum through which the interaction of these two elements may be observed at the point of their intersection. Compiled between the lines on the Gallipoli peninsula during the conflict from works submitted by soldiers participating in the campaign and then printed in London in 1916, The Anzac Book delivers an insight into the lives and experiences of Australian soldiers
at Gallipoli. Comprising prose, poetry, limericks, jokes, photographs, sketches, paintings and other forms of literary and visual articles, *The Anzac Book* purported to offer a candid view of the Gallipoli conflict and the culture of the Anzac soldiers who experienced it. However, the works in the Anzac book were not an unadulterated survey of Gallipoli experiences; indeed, as Hewkley’s drawing suggests, it is unlikely that such an unadulterated counter-discourse could exist. In fact, *The Anzac Book* was composed under the aegis of numerous competing interests, including the aims of the military hierarchy who commissioned the book, the desires of the soldiers whose self-expression was to enter public discourse and the tastes of the home-front public, to whom the publication would eventually be marketed.

The chief influence on the creation of *The Anzac Book* was its editor, Charles Bean, under whose auspices it was conceived, published and distributed. Before their publication in *The Anzac Book*, the visual and literary materials created by the Anzac soldiers underwent a process of validation by one of the key makers of the Anzac legend. Such was the popularity of *The Anzac Book* that it has been claimed that the Anzac myth itself had its genesis in the publication. In particular, David Kent has argued that the production of *The Anzac Book* became a vehicle through which Bean’s manipulation of historical recording at Gallipoli could establish a nationalistic vision of the Anzac soldier in the popular imagination. In spite of the fact that the content of the publication was drawn from various members of the allied forces at Gallipoli, Bean’s editorial control over what was eventually printed afforded him the opportunity to shape the Anzac character projected in the publication along the lines of his vision of Australian national identity, transposing the self-expression of Australian soldiers at Gallipoli into a public mythology propagated by official apparatuses. In affirmation of Bean’s influence in *The Anzac Book*’s production, Megan Cook has gone so far as to claim that it should be considered the first of the Australian War Memorial’s literary publications. As such, *The Anzac Book* must be considered alongside Bean’s other works to examine how, due to his involvement with the publication, it was shaped in accordance with his historical mission.

In this chapter I explore the complexity of the transmission of myth of the Anzac soldier in public discourse through an examination of the visual images of *The Anzac Book*, which have been heretofore overlooked by Australian scholarship. By first examining the historicity of *The Anzac Book* as a wartime publication, including a consideration of the aims of publication in relation to Bean’s *Official history*, I locate the book as a unique text within the
sphere of the historical motivations responsible for the genesis of the myths of the Anzac at Gallipoli. In addition, through an examination of Bean's heretofore overlooked personal copy of The Anzac Book, I raise questions regarding the authorship of the publication. Through a comparison between the visual works published in The Anzac Book and those rejected, rather than attempting to recover the composite elements of the Anzac myth from their amalgamation, I address the tensions between the public Anzac image and the wartime experiences of the soldiers, examining their intersection in the initial formation of Australian Gallipoli mythologies. In so doing I examine how the ways in which Anzac soldiers represented themselves contributed to the reception of the Gallipoli campaign and its remembrance in Australian society. Though the works of The Anzac Book purported to be a view of the Anzac soldiering identity from members within the soldiering culture, its impact upon Gallipoli mythologies must be discovered by reading between the lines.

THE PUBLIC PRIVATE: CREATING THE ANZAC BOOK

The Anzac Book was compiled and produced almost entirely on the Gallipoli peninsula during the conflict, from works submitted by Australian, British and New Zealander troops. The book was originally conceived of by Major S.S. Butler of the Anzac forces who, along with Lieutenant H.E. Woods, formed a committee to produce it. On 14 November 1915, a memorandum was circulated amongst the Anzac troops seeking contributions for the publication, which would contain "short poems and stories, pictures, jokes, topical advertisements, skits, limericks, cartoons and the Anzac alphabet", asking contributors to "do their best to make it worthy of Anzac and a souvenir which time will make increasingly valued". To encourage submissions, the publication committee offered prizes totalling £24. Submissions were accepted until 8 December, during which time The Anzac Book was compiled. The final publication included works attributed to 55 written and 15 artistic contributors, though a number of submissions were rejected for publication.

As the majority of contributions to The Anzac Book were literary, poems, stories and yarns largely shape the image of the Anzac identity that the book projects. These literary contributions covered a variety of topics and genres: many of them take the form of written adaptations of oral traditions, including jokes, anecdotes and furphys that employ a black humour to express an egalitarian, anti-authoritarian in-group culture. Other entries took a
more historical approach, recounting moments within the campaign from the perspective of the soldiers who had experienced them. The lengthiest of these articles is "The Story of Anzac", which was compiled from the dispatches of Sir Ian Hamilton. However, like Hamilton’s *Gallipoli Diary*, "The Story of Anzac" at times downplays the failures of the British and Anzac forces, eschewing criticism of tactics and strategy that could be imputed to Hamilton himself.11

Although the number of submitting artists was far fewer than the number of writers, the visual images included in *The Anzac Book* cover a variety of themes and styles. Of the artists whose works were accepted for publication, the most prominent were David Barker, Frank Crozier, Ted Colles, C. Leyshon-White, L.F.S. Hore, H.C. Wimbush, B.H.C. Price and G.T.M. Roach, all of whose works were featured as either full-page plates or large illustrations. A number of other artists contributed smaller sketches, or illustrations to texts. Bean himself contributed one watercolour painting entitled *The Silver Lining*, 1915, which depicts a sunset over the Aegean from the Gallipoli peninsula, which was reproduced as one of the few full-page plates in the publication. He also contributed a number of small sketches which were used to illustrate written submissions, or placed throughout the text as gap-fillers between articles. The majority of the visual images are illustrations made to accompany written submissions, but amongst the standalone visual works a number of predominant themes and styles can be identified. Of these, the most numerous are humorous, self-satirising caricatures of various types of Anzac troops, or of mundane aspects of soldiering. Twenty-five official photographs were also included in the collection which included topographic photographs of the battlefield terrain, scenes of Anzac soldiers operating in the trenches and the landing beach at Anzac Cove, as well as photographs of military leaders such as General Birdwood and Lord Kitchener during his visit to the peninsula. Many of these photographs were taken by Bean himself, with others being supplied by the Central News Bureau and by the Printing Section of the Royal Engineers Corps.

Although intended to be produced entirely on the battlefield and then printed in Athens, the evacuation of the peninsula forced the final preparations for the volume to be made at Imbros after the Australian departure on 19 December, and as a result *The Anzac Book* was eventually printed in London in 1916 by Cassell and Co. The book had been intended as a trench journal for the soldiers at Gallipoli, to be published at Christmas 1915 in an attempt to enliven their spirits and provide a tonic against the harsh winter conditions. However, as
the conditions of its publication changed, the purpose of The Anzac Book broadened to become a memorial of the campaign and a public advertisement of the Anzacs' performance at Gallipoli. The sentiment of The Anzac Book as a memorial was echoed by General Birdwood in his introduction to the book where he wrote, rather glibly, that he hoped to “be occasionally reminded of old times by a glance at The Anzac Book”. The publication certainly proved to be a popular memento amongst the A.I.F. From an initial printing of 55,000 copies, 36,000 were purchased by units of the 1st Anzac Division alone, with the publication being especially popular in France. By September 1916, a royalty statement showed that 104,432 had been sold and by November 1916, the A.I.F. alone had ordered 53,000 copies.

The Anzac Book was framed by its creators as an expression of the thoughts and talents of the men who fought at the Gallipoli campaign. The blurb of the 1975 reprint of the publication went so far as to claim that it illustrates “the truth behind the legend”. As such, it was positioned as a privileged representation of the culture of Australian soldiers on the peninsula during the conflict. In his introduction to The Anzac Book, Bean staked a claim for the authenticity of the work as both a reflection and product of the experience of the Gallipoli conflict, claiming that:

Practically every word of it was written and every line drawn beneath the shelter of a waterproof sheet or of a roof of sandbags – either in the trenches or, at most, well within the range of the oldest Turkish rifle, and under daily visitation from the smallest Turkish field-piece... The contributors had to work with such materials as Anzac contained: iodine brushes, red and blue pencils, and such approach to white paper as could be produced from each battalion’s stationery.

The Anzac Book was indeed compiled in treacherous circumstances from limited resources. However, the mode of Bean’s introduction not only dramatises the creation of the publication via reference to the trying conditions under which The Anzac Book was produced, but by corollary makes a positive statement about the character of the Anzac soldiers who, though faced with these conditions, were able to create a work of such quality. More importantly, Bean’s focus on the veracity of the material contained within The Anzac Book meant that it could possibly be read in conjunction with his Official history as a valid – though stylistically different – representation of Australia’s war history.
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In his *Official history*, Bean made a claim for the experiential authenticity of his historical methodology:

Great care has been taken to ensure the complete accuracy of every detailed mentioned. While it is impossible for absolute veracity to be achieved in any narrative so largely involving human conduct and motives, it can at least be claimed that the writer has derived his information, as far as possible, only from those who actually saw and took part in the particular events narrated.\(^{15}\)

Bean's history relied on his mediation of collected narratives in order to create, in conjunction with his own research and experience, a reliable composite account. However, he noted that the material from which the Gallipoli section in his *Official history* was composed was limited, and insufficient for creating a detailed account of the battle:

The facts contained in those volumes of this history which deal with Gallipoli are derived either from the official records of the Australian Imperial Force or from the notes and diaries of the writer... the official narratives [of Gallipoli]... are meagre in the extreme. Of the Landing and other fighting in Gallipoli there exists no such record from which even the shortest history of these events could be written. For the volumes dealing with that campaign the writer has had to rely almost entirely upon his private diaries and upon notes of his conversations with officers and men at the time and afterwards.\(^{16}\)

Such an admission raises questions concerning the function of *The Anzac Book* in establishing an understanding of the Gallipoli campaign in both Australia's historical record and popular culture. In his analysis of *The Anzac Book*, Robin Gerster notes that it is likely that the publication had a greater impact on the Australian imagination of Gallipoli than Bean's *Official history*, on which the author's historical reputation depended – while sales of *The Anzac Book* exceeded 100,000 copies, the *Official history* sold only 17-22,000 copies.\(^{17}\)

In the years preceding the publication of the *Official history* and in light of that publication's incomplete coverage of the campaign, *The Anzac Book* possessed a distinct advantage in being the closest available approximation of a reliable account of the Gallipoli experience. Furthermore, Kent has argued that although the Anzac legend was shaped by a variety of wartime and post-war literary accounts, its genesis can be traced to *The Anzac Book*:

---
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Much of what was passed into historical parlance as the 'Anzac Legend' is owed to [Bean], but it was neither the despatches of the correspondent nor the reflections of the historian that decisively established the image of the 'Anzac' in the popular imagination. His historical writing was a product of the post-war period and was read by relatively few. His despatches, although reprinted for use in schools, were nonetheless deliberately unemotional and matter-of-face, for he despised the 'wretched cant' printed in the newspapers... it was not as an historian or as a correspondent that Bean gave human form and recognisably Australian characteristics to the 'demi-gods' of Gallipoli. Rather, it was The Anzac Book which gave him the opportunity to do this.18

Though the official records of the campaign were insufficient to allow Bean to valorise the campaign in his historical writing, The Anzac Book offered him an alternative forum to promote his vision, freed from the strictures of academic discourse. Though, as Kent notes, Bean despised "wretched cant", he was aware of the role of such sensationalist journalism in the creation of mythology; in his pre-war writing Bean sometimes employed euphemism for rhetorical effect in spite of an expressed desire to avoid it.19 As such it is likely that Bean viewed in The Anzac Book an opportunity to influence popular conceptions of the image of the Australian soldier. Given its popularity and cultural valency, Gerster argues that The Anzac Book validates Paul Fussell's claim in The Great War and Modern Memory, that modern mass wars "require in their early stages a definitive work of popular literature" which reassuringly demonstrates "how much wholesome fun' is to be had in playing the game of war".20 According to Gerster, The Anzac Book provided the first 'official' literary portrait of the digger, and the mediated delivery of this image provided a pattern for the Anzac identity that was subsequently rarely refuted in Australian popular culture.

It is important to note that although the submissions for The Anzac Book filled the gap in Australia's historical record of the campaign to a certain degree, Bean did not consider the publication a direct substitute for his Official history, which was compiled using a strict historical methodology. Later twentieth and twenty-first century historians have since uncovered primary accounts of the Gallipoli landing and subsequent battles, from which comprehensive histories of the Australian campaign that extend Bean's account in the Official history have been written.21 Nevertheless, Bean was conscious of the value of The Anzac Book as an illustration of the campaign and its future potential as an historical text. Interestingly, Bean insisted that several hundred copies of the book be reserved for
presentation to various museums and libraries in Australia and that the War Records Section should collect the book as an important wartime document.22

In fulfilment of his own missive, Bean donated his personal copy of *The Anzac Book* (fig. 16) to the University of Sydney Library. Heretofore overlooked by Australian scholarship, an examination of it reveals the multivalency of the publication as both a souvenir and a historical record.23 The bookplate to Bean’s copy suggests that, in addition to any other intent, he embraced *The Anzac Book* in its function as a souvenir. With Bean’s characteristic attention to detail, it records the location of his receipt of the copy as “1st Anzac Corps, B.E.F. France” and, with illuminating tautology, states with dual signatures that the book was presented “To C.E.W. Bean Esq.”, “From C.E.W.B”. This inclusion has the unintended effect of suggesting that the creation of *The Anzac Book* was in satisfaction of the agenda and vision of its creator. More personally, the contrast between the location of Bean’s
receipt of the book and the setting of its compilation highlights the role of *The Anzac Book* in documenting a specific episode in Bean’s own lived wartime experience.

A closer examination of Bean’s personal copy reveals the extent to which his own records of the battle and of the production of *The Anzac Book* were incomplete at the time of its publication. Throughout his copy, Bean appended various entries with editorial comments and corrections. On page 25 he corrected a minor misprint in a line of the poem *The Graves of Gallipoli* that reads “Shook to the roar of guns and those wild ranks” with the following handwritten remark: “By Leslie Lawrence (Renton’s correspondent in Gallipoli)/ Lawrence tells me that this is a misprint for “Franks””.²⁴ Bean’s addendum clarifies the author’s identity as well as nuances the meaning of the poem. Similarly, on page 101 he attributed the name “Wilson”, to the poem *How I won the V.C.*, which was originally attributed to a soldier listed only as “crosscut”; on page 121 the author’s initials “HBC” are clarified as “H Baliman Champain (a British officer at Suvla)”; on page 131 the poem *Grey Smoke* is attributed to “Nash”. The necessity for such addenda was no doubt a product of the circumstances in which *The Anzac Book* was created, and these later annotations evidence Kent’s claim that although Bean displayed a great editorial influence in the selection and rejection of works, he made very few editorial alterations to the text of those submissions that were accepted for publication.²⁵

Though Bean’s addenda refine the authorial specificity of some of the included works, his corrections were not made to the text when *The Anzac Book* was reprinted in 1975, a realisation that raises a number of possibilities. Firstly, it is highly likely that Sun Books, the publishers of the new edition, were simply unaware of Bean’s corrections. Secondly, it is questionable whether minor typographical errors would have been corrected in any case, as such vagaries were the result of the singular circumstances of the book’s compilation and their correction would dilute the historicity of the text. Both possibilities are equally plausible; Bean had died in 1968 and his addenda to the text may not have been recorded elsewhere. Additionally, apart from a brief blurb on the back cover, the Sun Books’ edition of *The Anzac Book* retains the typography of the original version and does not contain any additional explanatory or introductory text, marking it as a reprint rather than a re-envisioning of the 1916 edition.

Although in some cases the relative anonymity of the authors and artists was the result of *The Anzac Book*’s frontline compilation, it is nonetheless interesting to speculate about the varying degrees of anonymity attributed to some of the included works, as it is highly likely
that in some cases the full identity of contributors was masked as part of a rhetorical strategy. In the case of articles that purport to be historical records of the campaign, Bean was careful to name the author, as in the case of Hamilton's *The Story of Anzac* which was derived from the General's dispatches and in A. R. Perry's account *The Landing, by a Man of the Tenth*, which, though affected in its prose by the author's subjectivity, is an important addition to the collection, given Bean's admission of the lack of contemporaneous accounts of the landing. In addition, both General Birdwood's introduction to the publication and Bean's editor's note rely on the authority of their authors in order to establish the historical context of *The Anzac Book*’s production. However, when the included pieces resemble literary ephemera of the kind familiar to other trench magazines (including furphys, yarns and trench humour), for the large part, the authors are acknowledged only by initials, on their own, or combined with a unit citation. For instance, although the poem *From Quinn's Post* is attributed in full to "V.N. Hopkins, Pte., A.M.C., att. 17th Aust. Bn.", the humorous *The Yarn that Abdul Tells* is attributed only to "A.P.M". Often, anecdotal pieces are attributed to a *nom de guerre*, such as in the case of *Bobby of the New Army*, by “Tentmate”, and *Another Attempt at an Anzac Alphabet*, by “Ubique”. In such cases, it is questionable whether these accounts, which rely heavily on trench anecdotes, the general forms of which were commonly circulated amongst troops on a variety of fronts not limited to Gallipoli, were the original work of the named author, a fact which would account for the effective anonymity of their listed authors in *The Anzac Book*.

The aforementioned anecdote *The Yarn that Abdul Tells* illustrates the difficulty with which authorship is applied to trench publications such as *The Anzac Book*. In it, the author A.P.M recounts an anecdote about the Turkish folk identity, Nastradi Hodja (commonly referred to as Nasrettin Hoca in Turkish texts). The anecdote takes the form of a joking interchange between Nastradi and his wife. Though the humour of the piece is typical of other inclusions in *The Anzac Book*, its authorship is clouded by the fact that A.P.M purports to recount a Turkish story that is "one of the chief pastimes of the Turks who live behind the black and white sandbags opposite". This translation is further complicated by the fact that A.P.M admits that his account is had second-hand, from "an officer who knows them intimately". Thus, A.P.M’s account is at best third-hand and apocryphal enough that Bean may have been encouraged to attach only a vague authorial attribution to it commensurate with the ambiguity of its provenance.
Another example more clearly demonstrates this authorial ambiguity. The poem *The Trojan War, 1915*, which compares the Gallipoli conflict to the Greek legend, was attributed to “J. Wareham, 1st Aust. Field Amb.”. However, Wareham was exposed as a plagiarist who copied his work from poems taken from the *Bulletin*, a fact that came to light when the poem’s real author, Arthur H. Adams, read it in *The Anzac Book*. In response, Adams reacted with considerable tact:

> ...Well, if J. Wareham wants the copyright of my verses he is welcome to them. Anybody who fought at Anzac has more right to them than the author, who didn’t. In fact, it is a highly appreciated compliment that J Wareham selected the verses and that the editors thought them good enough to appear in that brilliant record of Australianism. That’s good enough for me.²⁸

The ridiculousness of a retroactive authorial reattribution aside, Wareham’s case illustrates the danger of reading *The Anzac Book* as an unfettered account of the lived experience of Anzac soldiers at Gallipoli.

*The Anzac Book* soon acquired a wide readership. Bean recorded in the preface to the book that “it was realised by everyone that [The Anzac Book] which was to have been a mere pastime, had now become a hundred times more precious as a souvenir. Certainly no book has ever been produced under these conditions before”.²⁹ Given that this preface was written before a single copy of the book had been sold, Bean’s claim was at that time suggestive of a desire to create such a legacy. Bean’s actions in promoting and distributing *The Anzac Book* suggest that, after the evacuation of the peninsula forced a dramatic change of purpose for the book, his intention for the publication became to promote its soldiering image amongst military and civilian audiences. As Kent demonstrates, Bean went to extraordinary effort to promote the publication.³⁰ Arriving in London after the evacuation of the peninsula to find that Sir George Reid, the Australian High Commissioner, had failed to arrange a publisher for *The Anzac Book* as requested, Bean personally arranged for Cassell & Co. to publish the work. Bean’s involvement with the publication extended to securing its distribution. He obtained an agreement with the A.I.F. Pay Office whereby Australian troops could order the volume by a direct deduction from their pay, and he secured with the publisher an agreement to consign the book to any address for an additional 6d. Bean prompted Brigadier-General Carruthers of the Anzac Book Committee to set up selling committees in every unit in Egypt. In addition, he personally coordinated the sale of over 29,000 copies in France.
Furthermore, Kent suggests that in addition to facilitating the supply of *The Anzac Book*, Bean actively sought to create demand for the book. Bean won Brigadier-General White’s agreement that the Anzac Book Committee should purchase 20,000 copies of a reprint of the publication, and within days of doing so he offered copies to the units. The proliferation of *The Anzac Book* ensured that Bean’s vision was widely adopted: “in this way”, Kent writes, “the Anzac tradition, the role model, the image, and the legend was disseminated among the reinforcements and also, because so many copies were sent home, among the people of Australia”.

Given that circumstances compelled Bean to seek a private publisher in London for *The Anzac Book*, it is likely that in preparing the book for publication he was conscious of appeasing the demographics both in which it would be produced and to which it would be marketed. Bean had previously published his books *On the Wool Track* and *Dreadnought of the Darling* in England before their publication in Australia and for the former had tailored his introduction to the English reader. Alternatively, Denis Winter argues that, in spite of Bean’s editorial intent and influence, *The Anzac Book* may have been intended as an article of British propaganda. Using evidence from British military documents, Winter claims that *The Anzac Book* was not originally conceived of as a magazine to entertain the troops, but instead was planned with full knowledge of the impending evacuation. He argues that the publication of *The Anzac Book* fitted in with the general intent of the British war propaganda that was being produced in England at the time. In particular, Winter uses the example of the “Wellington House guidelines”, developed by a group of twenty-five leading British authors who had gathered there at the beginning of the war to produce literary propaganda directed at America. The Wellington House authors proposed a publication similar to *The Anzac Book*, that would have “a large number of articles the propaganda value of which is not at all apparent but which is interesting, so read”.

The particular selection of David Barker’s painting *Gallipoli* (1915, fig. 17) as the cover art for *The Anzac Book* suggests that, whether from commercial or military pressure, concessions with regards to the content and presentation of the book may have been made in order to broaden the market for the publication. In Barker’s painting a wounded soldier, bandaged around his temples, strides forward with a rifle held across his chest, beneath the banner of the Union Jack. One the one hand, Bean was taken by the quality of Barker’s work. In his diary he recalled being disappointed by a large number of poor contributions before being
impressed by "a single study of a dirty, shabby looking head carried out in a few bold black lines and coloured with red and blue pencils borrowed from the regimental office". However, as the cover for a book titled after the particular identity of the Australian troops at Gallipoli, it is significant that neither the soldier's nationality nor the conflict's location is immediately identifiable. Barker largely omits a distinctly Australian identification in his composition. By depicting a wounded soldier, he signals the courage of the man, but in doing so omits the distinctive Australian slouch hat. The dust jacket to the 1st edition of The Anzac Book featured an oval cut-out frame which further focuses the cover image around the dual images of the soldier and Union Jack. As such, the figure acquires a nationalistic ambivalence that prevents it from being read as particularly Australian. By contrast, the prominence of the Union Jack within the composition colours the book with an imperialistic rather than nationalistic tone.
A consciousness of commercial pragmatics may account for the decision to use Barker’s illustration to position The Anzac Book towards a wider audience throughout the Empire. The image of Australia as an active member of a broader, ‘federated Empire’ was at the time a popular idea in contemporary public discourse. At the outbreak of war, Sir Ronald Munro Ferguson, then Governor-General of Australia, recorded that “there is indescribable enthusiasm and entire unanimity throughout Australia in support of all that tends to provide for the security of the Empire in war”.

Similarly, in their review of The Anzac Book, the London Daily Telegraph hinted at this dualism between nation and empire. On 26 May, 1916, it recorded that “in the case of the invested Australians and New Zealanders”:

...this book signifies more than a victory of mind over matter. It expresses the soul of the Anzac, its consuming love for the mother country, its splendid fearlessness, its audacious and whimsical humour, its robust good nature.

While the author acknowledges a unique Anzac identity characterised by a fearlessness, humour and good nature that is preserved in spite of the realities of war, he locates these psychological traits under the banner of a consuming love for mother country.

Barker’s cover sets an imperialist tone for the publication that is not reflected in the other images in The Anzac Book. In particular, Barker’s expression does not find voice in the other cover designs submitted for consideration. Alternatively, these works evince a tension between the self-expression of Anzac soldiers and its eventual transposition for public purpose. In particular, a cover design by W. Otho Hewett (1915, fig. 18), published instead as the frontispiece to The Anzac Book, provides a more nuanced expression of the relationship between Anzacs and Empire. In Hewett’s painting, the soldiers of Australia and New Zealand are portrayed in partnership, linked by, but not subservient to Empire. In it, two Anzacs link the flags of their respective nations beneath a banner displaying the Anzac acronym which is in turn headed by the Union Jack. In Hewett’s work, there is a greater sense of equality in the negotiation of identities; though the Australian soldier is slightly larger and positioned towards the front, a compositional balance is struck between the two soldiers by his nursing of the flag of the New Zealand soldier who is positioned higher. Although the symbols of the British Empire remain, the Anzac troops are distinctly identifiable through their unique uniforms and their national flags. Likewise, the Gallipoli peninsula is recognisable in the background, marking the conflict as particularly Anzac.

Though the composite nature of the Anzac identity is referenced in this work – the painting
The Australian and New Zealand troops have indeed proved themselves worthy sons of the Empire.

GEORGE R.I.

is captioned with a quote from King George that declares the Anzacs "worthy sons of the Empire" – it is this refinement of nationalistic identities and purposes from those of Empire that admits Hewett’s cover a greater nationalistic autonomy. A. H. Bardin’s alternative Cover design for 'The ANZAC Magazine' (1915, fig. 19) more overtly plants an Australian identity within the Gallipoli landscape. Here the artist frames the Gallipoli landscape within a wider frame of a typical Australian outback environment. In a trompe l’oeil composition, the landscape of the Gallipoli peninsula intrudes upon an Australian farmhouse setting. There is a marked disjunction between the two frames: the horizons do not correspond, the waterline of the Aegean seemingly floats above the outback landscape and the hills of the peninsula are barren compared to the foliage of the Australian setting. However, Bardin
integrates the contrasting landscapes convincingly enough to suggest a custodianship over both environments. Though the horizons do not align, the perspectival system in the windowed peninsula landscape forms a natural alternative for the Australian scene. A closer examination of the composition reveals areas in which the boundaries between the two opposing spaces are broken. In the Gallipoli landscape, the diagonal in the bottom right of the frame breaks into the Australian scene, enabling the viewer to read the suggested hill as common to both spaces. This suggestion is enhanced by a second line above the first intersecting line that, when continued beyond the smaller frame, makes a convenient continuation of the hill on the right of the larger frame. The positioning of farmhouse completes the illusion; though it takes its form from the Australian setting, it intrudes comfortably into the Gallipoli landscape on the right of the window. Likewise, the fence that frames the Australian scene similarly reads as a boundary for the Turkish landscape, and the telegraph poles running through the Gallipoli scene read equally plausible in both landscapes. It would be a mistake to read this overlapping of landscapes as a form of cultural imperialism. Though in Bardin's drawing the Gallipoli landscape forms a subset of the greater Australian environment, neither landscape dominates the other. Rather, they interact symbiotically, each forming elements absent in the other.37

REJECTING ANZAC: CRITICISING THE ANZAC BOOK

The thematic tensions between Barker's cover design and the alternative images provided by Hewett and others raise a challenge to the positioning of The Anzac Book as a privileged view of the self-expression of Anzac soldiers. It is on this basis that The Anzac Book has drawn considerable criticism, in particular from David Kent, whose chief concern centres on Bean's editorial influence. Kent argues that Bean's control over which submissions would be included and which rejected led to a misrepresented image of the soldier at Gallipoli that was not only distorted to fit Bean's personal vision, but also manipulated by his motivation to create a market for the Anzac image on the home front. Kent's analysis revolves around a comparison between the textual submissions included in The Anzac Book and those rejected for publication. A comparison of the two, he asserts, reveals that while Bean on occasion included submissions that referred to the minor trials and tribulations of soldiering life, he rejected any material that he believed would tarnish the name of Anzac. In particular, Bean omitted references to fear, emotional distress or malingering. Where references to fear
appear in literary accounts, Kent argues that they are tempered in the dénouement, such as in the case of 'Icy' – a character whose initial admission of fear is ultimately resolved by a display of bravery in a solo raid. The end result of this process was that although superficial wartime hardships – for example flies, heat, cold and discomfort – were referenced with black good humour in the publication, The Anzac Book does not document the brutal or dehumanizing aspects of the conflict. Nor, by avoiding the presentation of immoral character traits such as malingering, shirking, gambling, drinking and sexual promiscuity, does it project an image that reflects the complexity of the Australian soldiering culture that was evident from reports of the behaviour of Australian soldiers. As Kent writes, "it is evident... that Bean deliberately excluded any contributions which dealt realistically with the dangers of combat, with the result that The Anzac Book trivialized the experience." Kent’s criticism of The Anzac Book reveals this selective cultivation of national image through a focus on its exclusions. However, whether or not Bean’s editing of the publication resulted in a ‘trivialisation’ of the self-representation of Australian soldiers at Gallipoli is a claim that requires further examination. It would be incorrect to assume that the works that were not selected for publication were discarded for thematic reasons alone. As Kent admits, in the records of those submissions not selected for publication, some of the rejected works contain themes similar to those that were included in the publication and some are of a literary standard noticeably poorer than those printed. In his introduction to The Anzac Book, though he makes no mention of the criteria by which works were selected, Bean expressed regret at having had to condense some submissions and exclude others due to logistical constraints. This must have had some basis in truth as some of the rejected submissions were later published in the trench publication The Red Sun, indicating that Bean had considered them worthy of publication.

Extending Kent’s analysis to a comparison of the visual images of The Anzac Book against those rejected for publication reveals that the included images were used in conjunction with the textual themes of the book to support Bean’s Anzac vision. In particular, the imaging of dead and wounded soldiers in The Anzac Book was tempered by Bean’s editorial selection and used variously to memorialise the memory of the soldiers’ sacrifice and to create a heroic image of the Anzac identity. As such, a graphic depiction of the horrors of war is avoided in the publication. Crozier’s illustration to the poem The Unburied (1915, fig. 20) illustrates this interaction between text and image. Two dead soldiers lie prostrate in the foreground of the drawing, their faces buried in the ground. Of the written and visual
accounts in The Anzac Book, Crozier's illustration comes closest to admitting a sense of visceral violence. The image lacks an overt idealisation; the soldiers' identities are indeterminate and their deeds go un-valorised. The drawing is made more confronting by the bayonet and outstretched hand of the closest dead body which break through the frame of the work into the space of the viewer. This interlocution further disrupts the viewer's ability to ally the scene with romantic visions of war.

However, what may have been a critically bleak work is tempered by the poem it illustrates, which is an elegy to the casualties of war:

**The Unburied**

Now snowflakes thickly falling in the winter breeze
Have cloaked alike the hard, unbending ilex
And the grey, drooping branches of the olive trees,
Transmuting into silver all their lead;

And, in between the winding lines, in No-Man's Land,
Have softly covered with a glittering shroud
The Unburied dead.

And in the silences of night, when winds are fair,
When shot and shard have ceased their wild surprising,
I hear a sound of music in the upper air,
Rising and falling till it slowly dies-
It is the beating of the wings of migrant birds
Wafting the souls of these unburied heroes
Into the skies.

*The Unburied* focuses on what should be a gruesome subject matter. The image of bodies left to rot in indignity in no-man’s land contradicts the public image of fallen soldiers most often imaged by neatly curated cemeteries and memorials that vindicate the sacrifice of soldiers. As such, *The Unburied* appears to act as a counterpoint to the assertion that Bean edited out any negative images of the conflict. However, it is likely that Bean included the poem due to its elegiac and metaphorical qualities. Although the subject matter is horrific, the poet transposes the Gallipoli battlefield into a scene of natural beauty and wonder. The dead are buried by a “glittering shroud” of the snow that permeates the scene and the olive trees are “transmuting into silver”. Though the bodies are left un-venerated on the battlefield, the poet is able to transform the landscape into a scene that monumentalises the memory of the dead, rescuing a theme that would normally destroy heroic notions of war. The poem concludes with the souls of the dead being transported heavenward by migrating birds, completing the vindication of their sacrifice. Approaching Crozier’s illustration in light of its textual accompaniment encourages a similar elegiac reading. Though at first the anonymity of the men could be construed as a stripping of identity, the sentiment of the poem allows them to be read metaphorically. Framed by copses of trees on both sides of the work, Crozier imbues the drawing with an element of the picturesque that is further heightened by his compositional use of strong contrasts and angular forms, common to both the figures and surrounding landscape. Subsumed into the metaphorical landscape, the artist is able to reclaim the dead bodies as elements of the picturesque, mitigating the horror of their appearance.

In other depictions of wounded soldiers, the theme is often approached with a sense of humour and fatalism rather than as a critique of war. In particular, many of these works present these soldiers in the heroic mode, with ‘presentable wounds’ that arguably misrepresent the experience of war. In C. Leyshon-White’s drawing *Complaints of the Season* (1915, fig. 21), a wounded Australian soldier calmly smokes a cigarette, his right eye bandaged, his left cheek patched and a wry smile on his face. Leyshon-White’s satirical style imbues the theme with a black humour. Its comical representation of a war injury is emphasised by the title of the work, which trivialises the severe injury suffered by the soldier as an insignificant, inevitable and ultimately surmountable inconvenience of the soldiering life – a mere niggle to pass with a change of season and fortune. The title also
plays upon the original function of *The Anzac Book* as a seasonal souvenir publication. The display of such a nonchalant attitude to violence and injury was not merely in order to represent the theme in a manner acceptable to the general public. Rather, such representations actively participate in the creation of the image of the Australian soldier by presenting him as stoic in the face of death.
This process of identity-building is likewise evident in a satirical cartoon by David Barker, entitled ‘Are you wounded, mate?’ (1915, fig. 22), that explores the character of the Anzac soldier by establishing caricatures of two character types – the courageous Anzac and its antithesis: the shirker. In this illustrated joke, a wounded man being carried to a field hospital on a stretcher is interrupted by a larrikin who asks:

The Ass: “Are you wounded, mate?”
The Victim: “D/yer think I’m doing this fer fun?”

Barker’s illustration subtly advocates for the courageous character of the Australian soldier. The wounded man’s sharp retort puts to rest any insinuation that Australian soldiers may engage in malingering, through the self-infliction of wounds in order to escape combat. As Joanna Bourke has shown, soldiers reacting to the experience of combat engaged in a number of measures to avoid battle which found different degrees of acceptance amongst male wartime cultures. Although the practice is maligned in Barker’s cartoon, Bourke argues that in some military cultures the avoidance of combat took on a social function that was not necessarily looked down upon, with some soldiers participating in shirking and malingering as group activities and even supporting other community members who engaged in the practice. In fact, as Thomson recorded in interviews with surviving Anzacs, shirking was not an uncommon characteristic within the A.I.F. One interviewee, Stan D’Altera, recalled his own experience of shirking as follows:

I was cashed up, I’d had a good win at a two-up school. I had me papers. It took me three weeks to find them. I went round having a good time, [laughs], going to what they call the pub, the estaminet, and having some good feeds and that. I was really AWL [absent without leave], but I wasn’t AWL really, officially.

Likewise another Anzac soldier, Alf Stabb, recorded a similar experience:

You wouldn’t go AWL in France... but if you got the chance to slip away in England well you’d just nick off for a few days and if you were lucky you’d get back and if you weren’t lucky you’d get caught [laughs].

Both men play down their flouting of military law, speaking proudly of their ability to evade reprisal, and attempting to pass their shirking off as a regular part of military life. However, both men draw distinctions between acceptable and non-acceptable shirking: in D’Altera’s
The Ass: "Are you wounded, mate?"
The Victim: "D'yer think I'm doing this fer fun?"

FIGURE 22: DAVID BARKER, ‘ARE YOU WOUNDED MATE?’, PEN, INK AND PENCIL ON PAPER, 31.8 X 25.5 CM, AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL, CANBERRA.
account through reference to an "official" form of being absent without leave and in Stabb's case by referring to the unacceptability of shirking duty at the front in France. Avoiding duty through self-inflicted wounds was a practice that was unacceptable in the Australian military culture and a notion rejected in the expression of Australian Gallipoli mythologies. Indeed, evidence of this conscious distinction between acceptable and unacceptable forms of shirking can be found within the rejected illustrations of *The Anzac Book*. In one illustration by R.W. McHenry entitled *Stiff? Ain't I Stiff?* (1915, fig. 23), two soldiers are depicted talking about an injustice one of them has suffered. The caption reads:

"Stiff? Ain't I stiff? I was finkin a lot about Egypt so I chewed some cordite and my temperature went up. I goes over to the Doc and the cow sends me back to swallow the bullet! Ain't that stiff."

Here the soldier brags about his attempt to obtain a discharge from active service by chewing cordite in order to fake a fever and erratic heartbeat. Although he was rebuked by the doctor, the soldier expresses no shame about the incident, merely putting it down to bad luck and unfair treatment. In fact the casualness of his address and his plea "Ain't that stiff" hints that within the Anzac culture such behaviour may have been condoned to the point that his inability to secure a discharge through malingering could be considered an
injustice. Tellingly, he refers to his memories of Egypt, in which the Australian soldiers became notorious for their unruly behaviour, so much so that Bean himself found difficulty in reconciling his observation of the Australian soldiers with the ideal vision of them that he was attempting to propagate. In his diary, Bean recorded that:

There was a time about Xmas when the sights in the streets of Cairo were anything but pleasant for an Australian who had any regard to the good name of Australia. There was a great deal of drunkenness and I could not help noticing that what people in Cairo said was true—the Australians were responsible for most of it... the most frequent offenders were Australians.48

The experience of this behaviour in Cairo was one that Bean was keen to downplay as an aberration in an otherwise noble military culture. However, in his diary he admitted that a certain ignobility existed in the character of the Australian soldier:

I think we have to admit that our force contains more bad hats than the others, and I think also that the average Australian is certainly a harder liver. He does do bad things... If he is unrestrained he is also extraordinarily generous and openhearted... He often has strong positive vices but he more often has strong positive virtues also; and the virtues are so good and so attractive that I think the Australian will have to rely on the good things he does to wipe out the bad ones; and I think the sum will come out on the right side when it is all totted up. That is my great comfort when I wonder how I shall ever manage to write up an honest history of this campaign. I fully expect the men of this force will do things when the real day comes which will make the true history of this war possible to be written.49

Bean’s admission that the Australian soldier possessed “strong positive vices” is matched by a hope that history would focus on the virtues of the Anzac character. Paradoxically, Bean states that the hope of virtuous acts to come is a comfort to himself and that it is only with these future heroics that he will be able to write an “honest history” of the campaign. Such claims evidence Bean’s reliance on a preconceived notion of the heroism of the Australian soldier, formed before such notions could be confirmed. His final line echoes this hope to the point of absurdity: the true history of war, he asserts, is one in which the Australian character is proven to be heroic, yet he states this before the heroic deeds could be
committed. Meanwhile he tacitly dismisses the observed vices of the Australian character as historically insignificant.

It is therefore unsurprising that McHenry’s picture, with its display of brazen pride in malingering, even if presented in a humorous and parodical fashion, was vetoed by Bean. The exclusion of McHenry’s picture corresponds to Bean’s vetting of the literary submissions to *The Anzac Book*. As Kent shows, a letter written by a Sapper to a wounded friend, in which the author describes a soldier pleased at having been wounded, was omitted by Bean:

> A young fellow was being carried down on a stretcher the other day, and in answer to my sad enquiries said “I’ve got two bonzer wounds. They’re worth twenty pound to me. I’ll get a trip away at last”. He seemed quite pleased though he was rather badly hit.50

Bean seemed interested in vetting negative aspects of the Australian character that he deemed as ultimately insignificant. In his diary he claims that “Australia will have to rely on the good things [the Anzac] does to wipe out the bad ones; and I think the sum will come out on the right side when it is all totted up”.51 This statement assumes that both sides of the Anzac character would be historically accessible. Bean’s vetting of undesirable characteristics from purview however, suggests that Bean may have had an interest in making available only those characteristics that he wished to promote.

Barker’s illustration affirms Bean’s conception of the Anzac character by eliminating the possibility of malingering from the Anzac culture in the public consciousness. It appears to promote a sanitised vision of acceptable wounding that trivialises the real experience. The wounded soldier is hidden beneath a dark black blanket, the heaviness of which draws the viewer’s gaze to the man even as it conceals his wounds from view and his head is neatly bandaged. However, the humour in Barker’s illustration is quite bleak; although we are not presented with graphic violence, the sharp retort of Barker’s wounded man hints at severe injury, a gravitas confirmed by the stony gazes of the stretcher bearers and their deliberate ignorance of “The Ass”, who is lampooned both visually and through the written joke. It is significant that “The Ass” appears as an interjector to the scene, with only his head sticking into the frame from the left hand side. He thus appears as an outcast, disassociated from the other men engaged in the business of war, an aberration in the Anzac military culture. As such, through Barker’s sketch, the Anzac soldier is confirmed as one who does his duty
with courage, a characteristic so well entrenched that to question it is to not be part of the culture. Barker’s image was drawn after a similar cartoon by B. Hartman (1915, fig. 24) which was submitted for The Anzac Book but rejected by Bean, most likely due to its cruder execution. Barker’s illustration appropriates Hartman’s original — a debt Barker acknowledges in his work — and uses the same caption, but improves upon the execution and composition of the cartoon. Interestingly, the delineation between the courageous Anzac and the shirker is not present in Hartman’s original drawing. Barker draws many of the elements from Hartman’s illustration — for example in both drawings the stretcher bearers smoke cigarettes and wear slouch hats. However Hartman’s illustration relies more upon the literary joke for its effect which is limited to a humorous trench anecdote. Barker’s drawing extends the scope of the humour and uses the visual to develop the anecdote into an assertion about the Anzac soldiering culture.
It would be reductive, however, to say that the humour and general positivity expressed in many of the works of The Anzac Book was solely a function of Bean's editing and his desire to shape history. Rather, Graham Seal has argued that such comedic storytelling was an integral part of the Anzac culture that formed the basis of their intra-group communication and identification – a means of expressing a sense of coherence rather than a conscious attempt to doctor the realities of war. “The major components of digger culture”, Seal writes, “were language, song, verse, story, joke and belief, expressed in various narrative forms such as the legend and, specially, the rumour or ‘furphy’...”.53 Indeed, other publications of soldier-writing from the Great War exhibit a similar sense of parody and ridicule as an essential characteristic of the Australian soldier identity. T. Carlyon’s c.1940 publication The Diggers’ Book: Anzac Memories, a collection of digger yarns and trench humour, displays a similar jovial character to that of The Anzac Book. The Digger’s Book is comprised entirely of written pieces, ranging from yarns several paragraphs long to personal anecdotes and one-line jokes that encompass a variety of themes from soldiering life. A typical example of the attitude expressed in the collection is a short interchange between two soldiers titled Humiliating:

Humiliating

Corporal: The General was very angry this morning.
Lance-Corporal: What about?
Corporal: He received a letter marked “Private”54

Humiliating is of particular interest in that it hints towards the egalitarian nature of the Australian character. The two non-commissioned officers’ gossip about the General’s bumbling misunderstanding of the address of his letter subtly lampoons the incompetence of the military hierarchy, suggesting a leadership more concerned with rank and privilege than common sense, and leaving the reader to laugh at the wit of the common soldier.

In his introduction to The Digger’s Book, Carlyon addresses the role of humour within the character of the Anzac soldier, citing it as an essential component of the Australian wartime experience. “The sense of humour is the ability to see the funny side of life”, Carlyon writes,
It is the source of that courage which refuses to take the bludgeoning of fate lying down; it comes up smiling every time and never takes the count. It is the safety valve of existence which prevents disaster when disaster seems imminent.

The Anzacs have a super-abundance of it. With them the sense of humour is a gift. This is amply borne out in the experiences of the A.I.F. Regiments during the Great War. 55

Carlyon’s identification of humour as a ‘safety valve’ hints at its function as a mechanism by which soldiers could negotiate the emotional stress they encountered in their wartime experience. Seal’s analysis of the function of humour within Anzac culture mirrors Carlyon’s. He argues that trench publications are an attempt to crystallise the informal aspects of the Digger tradition into a more formal mode intended to alleviate the desperation of the wartime experience. 56 Furthermore, in the wider interrelation between the experience of individual soldiers in wartime and the portrayal of Anzac identity in popular culture, Seal suggests that the humour of Anzac anecdotes, alone and in conjunction with other forms such as when they were adapted to musical parody, played a more serious role in the negotiation of complex emotions within the all-male culture:

Because the individual was unable to express emotions of love, fear or pity due to the male codes that underlay the digger persona, bleak, black-humoured lyrics were fused with the sentimental melodies of the Victorian parlour... to perfectly reflect the conflicting values of war and peace, bravery and fear. This reflection allowed the individual expression through communal articulations, but only in forms that denoted the dominant moral codes, while connoting a more personal set of values and emotions in their music, resonating as the tunes did of home, peace, safety, familial and romantic love, and religious solace. 57

Many forms of illustrated jokes which display this culture of black humour appear in The Anzac Book. In one cartoon, two sentries, covered with snow, hold a conversation as they stand guard. Again, the joke takes the form of an NCO addressing a lower-ranked soldier, who provides the punch line to the joke:
"Gawd help the first bloomin' Turk I see to-night."

FIGURE 25: NORMAN WIMBUSH, ‘GAWD HELP THE FIRST BLOOMIN’ TURK I SEE TO-NIGHT’, 1915, PEN AND INK ON PAPER, 26 X 12 CM, AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL, CANBERRA
Sergeant (during wet weather): “Hallo, my lad, have you got nails in your boots?”

Slowly Freezing Australasian: “well, I’m that ----- cold I hardly know if I’ve got nails in my feet.”

A similar illustration by Norman Wimbush, of an Australian soldier standing sentry, hunched-up against the rain and cold, entitled ‘Gawd help the first bloomin’ Turk I see to-night!!’ (1915, fig. 25), references experiences of hardship and privation in a humorous fashion. The drawing itself is quite bleak; the soldier’s face and body is obscured by the darkness of the trench at night and the tight cross-hatched technique adds to a sense of enclosure and tension. However this is alleviated by the caption to the work which reads: “Gawd help the first bloomin’ Turk I see to-night”. In conjunction with the caption the illustration changes complexion. Instead of a man harrowed by the horrors of war, we read the soldier as one inconvenienced by the weather, his hatred of the enemy based upon his culpability for necessitating his standing in the rain.

Having thus seen the prominent and complex role played by humour in the self-identification of the digger identity, it would be erroneous to claim that Bean’s editorial direction of The Anzac Book was solely responsible for its tone. In its review of the publication on June 17, 1916, the Daily Telegraph read the comedic nature of The Anzac Book as proof of the invincibility of the Australian spirit, recording that:

In the prose sketches the humorous element predominates. Nothing apparently could suppress the fountain of natural fun that bubbled up in spite of heat, flies, hard rations.... The men of Anzac never allowed themselves to be depressed even by the horrors of war in the ghastliest shape.

This last claim is a gross exaggeration; Australian soldiers, like those of other nations, were similarly prone to the dehumanizing effects of the First World War. The absence of recordings of the horrors of war is better explained by a combination of group self-identification and in-group communication within members of the soldiers at Anzac, as well as Bean’s editing, rather than purely on the selection of works by Bean alone, or any claims for the invulnerability of the Australian soldier.

Nevertheless, although the Anzac troops appropriated humour as a unique mode of self-expression, it is evident that there were boundaries to the extent that it could be used to
FIGURE 26: GNR BLOMFIELD, A SUGGESTION, 1915, PENCIL, PEN AND INK ON PAPER, 20.3 X 23 CM (IRREGULAR), AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL CANBERRA.

FIGURE 27: GNR BLOMFIELD, XMAS DAY IN GALLIPOLI, WHICH WILL IT BE?, 1915, PENCIL, PEN AND INK ON PAPER, 13.5 X 29.5 CM (IRREGULAR), AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL CANBERRA.
criticise the military hierarchy. One illustrated joke lampoons a British officer, showing the wit and independence of the Australian character. In it the British officer is portrayed as gaunt, haughty and dislikeable, setting him up for a retort to his haughtiness to be delivered by an Australian soldier:

Young Officer: “Haw, haw, no shave?”
Australian: “He, he, no ----- razaw!”

Such jokes evince a self-awareness amongst Anzac troops of the cultural divide between the Australian and English identities. However, though a certain critical licence was afforded the contributors to *The Anzac Book*, several submissions which critiqued the actions of the military hierarchy were omitted from publication. One artist, Gnr Blomfield, of the 1st Battery, New Zealand Field artillery, had two submissions rejected, both of which criticised military strategy. In *A Suggestion* (1915, fig. 26), Blomfield uses a panelled cartoon scheme to criticise the conditions of the trenches. In the first panel, an officer toff is depicted remarking upon the division headquarters being “the cosiest spot on the peninsula”. In the second, the headquarters is destroyed by an artillery shell. The third shows miners digging a new dugout, which is revealed in the fourth panel. Although the intent of the cartoon is a constructive criticism, it portrays the officers as unpractical elitists, whose decisions are based more on aesthetics than safety. Simultaneously, Blomfield suggests that a more useful, practical knowledge of soldiering is to be found within the common soldier. In another of his illustrations, the conditions of the campaign are similarly criticised. In *XMAS day in Gallipoli, Which will it be?* (1915, fig. 27), the scene is separated into two panels. On the left appears an idyllic scene depicting men opening presents. On the right are men huddled in a cave amongst the snow, eating bully beef and food marked “biscuits iron rations”. The caption to the illustration reads: “what we hope for and what we may get”.

Though it is true that Bean would have possessed a vested interest in vetoing Blomfield’s criticisms of the military hierarchy, Seal suggests that such critical submissions to trench newspapers and publications, rather than representing genuine artistic self-expression, instead provided an informal means of criticizing and condemning the actions of officers in an approved forum:

Expressions of discontent could be included with some degree of safety, avoiding charges of insubordination. Even if the supervising officer or censor overseeing the publication would not allow a
FIGURE 28: ANON., XMAS DAY IN GALLIPOLI, 1915, PENCIL, PEN AND INK ON PAPER, 18.4 X 27 CM, AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL, CANBERRA.
FIGURE 29: FRANK CROZIER, THE CAVE MAN, 1915, PEN, INK, BRUSH AND PENCIL ON PAPER, 10.4 X 18.4 CM, AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL, CANBERRA.

FIGURE 30: SAPPER ANON., 'NEATH ANOTHER LONESOME PINE, PEN AND INK ON PAPER, 25.6 X 20 CM (IRREGULAR), AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL, CANBERRA.
particular item to be published, its presence informed him of
dissatisfaction or criticism from below.61

It is possible that Blomfield’s cartoons were intended as a tacit criticism aimed at the
military hierarchy rather than for the public at large, an assumption made probable by the
fact that Blomfield’s criticisms were mirrored in other rejected submissions to The Anzac
Book. One anonymous cartoon, Xmas day in Gallipoli (1915, fig. 28) presents an identical
theme to Blomfield’s cartoon of the same name. Here again the work is separated into two
panels, the top depicting men opening gifts with the caption “what we hope for”, the
bottom showing men sleeping in dugouts, attempting to light a fire, eating biscuit and bully
beef, accompanied by the caption “what we’ll probably get”. The similarity between the
two illustrations indicates not only the prevalence of such attitudes with the Anzac forces at
the time, but that these attitudes found expression in common forms that were circulated
widely enough for the same illustrated joke to be submitted twice for The Anzac Book.

Critical voices did, however, find a modicum of expression within The Anzac Book. In
Crozier’s illustration to the poem The Caveman (1915, fig. 29), a sleeping Anzac is awoken in
his dugout by a neanderthal brandishing primitive tools. However, the critical element in
this image is tempered. Though Crozier’s drawing accompanies a poem which describes the
privations of trench life, it is delivered in limerick form with characteristic humour. It is clear
that there were unwritten limitations to both the level of criticism afforded to published
submissions and the mode of their expression. An illustration similar to Crozier’s The
Caveman was not allowed such liberty. In this anonymous work, entitled ‘Neath another
lonesome pine (1915, fig. 30), two cavemen are depicted, one brandishing a club, the other
marked with sergeants’ stripes, running for a dugout marked “ye funkhole”. This
anonymous sketch lambasts the character of the officer as well as the conditions of the
campaign. As such, it appears that the editors of The Anzac Book, while allowing a certain
amount of licence in the expression of general grievances, did not allow submissions which
linked the suffering of the soldiers to decisions made by the military hierarchy, regardless of
the prevalence of these views.
In his review of *The Anzac Book*, published in 1916 and entitled "'The Anzac Book': Record of Gallipoli: Tragedy and Fun", Archibald T. Strong summed up the attitudes of many of those who read *The Anzac Book* as an expression of a newfound Australian identity. "Gallipoli, as a great Australian soldier remarked, has given Australia tradition", he wrote, "'The Anzac Book' is the record of that tradition, and its place in Australian literature is therefore unique".62 Strong continues by claiming that the book was not necessary to prove Australians could write or draw but that "what the Anzac Book has shown, however, is that the writing and the fighting can be done by the same men, and that Australians, if we may filch a thought from Thucydides, can practice the arts without losing the quality of warriors".63 In doing so he echoed Bean's approach to venerating the Gallipoli conflict; by prophesying the future cultural value of the book, Strong contributed in part to the fulfilment of this claim. Strong was keenly aware of Bean's role in the production of the work. "Mr Bean's brilliant and versatile hand", he writes, "is also evident in several of the illustrations, and the admirable get-up of the volume, for which he is apparently responsible, is in itself an artistic triumph".64 Yet though he notes Bean's editorial role, like many other commentators on the work, Strong fails to admit Bean's influence in shaping the expression of the newfound national identity that he so strongly venerates.

*The Anzac Book* received almost universal praise from reviewers both in Australia and England. Many of them recount the conditions in which the book was published and cite them as evidence of the book's remarkable achievement, though, as many of these descriptions come verbatim from Bean's own introduction to the volume, they appear as a reiteration of Bean's own self-appraisal.65 Nevertheless, reviewers were keen to identify *The Anzac Book* as the record of a new era in Australian history. One publication sought to link the Anzacs' battle at Gallipoli with the great wars of ancient mythology. The *Stock and Station Journal* recorded that:

I'll bet it was the only book ever produced on that barren, God-forsaken peninsula, but it was in sight of the scene of Homer's Iliad, and the city of Troy. Only it was across the strait that the Greeks and Trojans fought. And this book will be as famous as the Iliad!66
Likewise, the London *Morning Post* suggested that "[if] the well-greaved Greeks (did they wear putties?) had left a similar story of the *vie intime* of the siege of Troy, how highly it would be valued by scholars and historians!".

The comparisons between *The Anzac Book* and Homer’s Iliad reveal the underlying tension between history and mythology that lies at the heart of *The Anzac Book*. Though the reviewers are keen to view the work both as an accurate representation of a national culture and as the record of a national mythology worthy of veneration, ironically they do not admit the process of transposition whereby the private experiences, recollections and culture of the Anzac soldiers themselves were curated for the consumption of a public audience. At the point of intersection between private recollection and public exposure, the private experiences of individual soldiers was homogenised to describe not only individual experiences, but the character of a nation seeking identification with a historical past.
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A catalogue of reviews of *The Anzac Book* can be found in the Australian War Memorial archives alongside the rejected manuscripts from the publication. See MSS1316 *The Anzac Book Reviews, 1916*.

*Stock and Station Journal*, June 20, 1916.

The formative, pre-war years of Australia's nascent nationhood had given rise to the expectation of a 'coming man' – a national icon whose physical and psychological character embodied the nation's self-image. On 8 May, 1915 the arrival of this much anticipated Australian avatar was announced by an unexpected herald: the British war correspondent Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett. In penning the first journalistic report from the Gallipoli peninsula for The Age, Ashmead-Bartlett fortified an image of Australian character that would subsequently inform a national institution. Ashmead-Bartlett's report spoke of the young Australian soldiers waiting to go into action for the first time as "cheerful, quiet and confident". "There was no sign of 'nerves' nor excitement", he wrote:

...they did not wait for orders, or for the boats to reach the beach, but sprung into the sea and, forming a sort of rough line, rushed the enemy's trenches. Their magazines were not charged, so they just went in with cold steel... I have never seen anything like these wounded Australians in war before. Though many were shot to bits, without hope of recovery, their cheers resounded throughout the night... they were happy because they knew they had been tried for the first time and not found wanting... There has been no finer feat in this war than this sudden landing in the dark and storming the heights, and, above all, holding on while the reinforcements were landing. These raw colonial troops, in these desperate hours, proved worthy to fight side by side with the heroes of Mons, the Aisne, Ypres and Neuve Chapelle."
Ashmead-Bartlett compared the efforts of the Australian soldiers at the Gallipoli landing with the achievements of the European soldiers on the Western Front, but he may as well have been speaking of Thermopylae, Cannae and Hastings, so premature was his panegyric on the Australian soldier. According to Ashmead-Bartlett, the Anzacs were equal to the heroes of the Western Front not for a victory won, but for storming the Gallipoli heights, an act in comparison with which he could find “no finer feat in [the] war”. However, Ashmead-Bartlett’s praise for the Australian soldiers was not for what they had done, but how they did it. The Australian soldiers were “happy” to be “shot to bits, without hope of recovery”. These unproven soldiers did not need orders, guidance or military discipline; they simply formed up amongst themselves and with unwavering, steely nerve conquered the enemy, bayonet in hand. In Ashmead-Bartlett’s account, the success of the landing relied on the character of the Australian soldier: a man strong in body, but more importantly, one with a redoubtable psychological spirit.³

As Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett prepared his dispatches from the British battleship *HMS Majestic*, a second Ellis was painting a different portrait of the unfolding conflict. From the trenches of the Gallipoli battlefield, Ellis Silas – a signaller with the 16th Battalion, who had landed on the peninsula on the first day – was keeping a diary and recording his experiences in words and in pictures. Silas was intent on portraying the war from his own perspective, by his admission “as the soldier sees it, shorn of all its pomp and circumstance; the war that means cold and hunger, heat and thirst, the ravages of fever; the war that brings a hail of lead that tears the flesh and rends the limb, and makes of men, heroes”.⁴ At dawn on 3 May, 1915, as Ashmead-Bartlett prepared his dispatch detailing the Australian soldiers as the heroes of Europe, Silas recorded an alternative impression of the Australian soldier. In his drawing *Dawn, May 3* (1916, fig. 31) we are made witness to the aftermath of an attack by Silas’ battalion against an enemy trench. Absent here are valiant charges and heroic figures; all that remains are the dead and dying remnants of Silas’ former comrades. One dead soldier lies in an inverted, crucifixion-like position. Another lies on the ground, his head resting against his arms beneath a tree. The most interesting figures however, are the two survivors. The first crouches in the foreground, his head between his rigid arms, a shattered and disconsolate figure. The second is in the middle-ground, fleeing the scene of battle, with his hands clutching his head in terror and a horrified expression on his face. The caption that accompanies the drawing further disturbs any heroic identification. “I shall never forget the indescribable scene in the gully” Silas wrote:
FIGURE 31: ELLIS SILAS, DAWN, MAY 3 1915, 1916, PEN AND INK ON CARD, 28 X 15 CM, PRIVATE COLLECTION.
It was choked with dead and wounded, these poor lumps of clay had once been my comrades, men I had smoked and worked, and laughed a joked (sic.) with, oh God! The pity of it! It rained lead in this gully!

This was a very different image of Australian manhood to the one that Ashmead-Bartlett had envisaged — a visceral, gritty drama in which both bodies and minds were destroyed — yet this was the experience of one who had lived and fought through the Gallipoli conflict. Almost exactly one month after recording these events Silas was evacuated from the Gallipoli peninsula diagnosed with neurasthenia. He, like thousands of other soldiers, would spend years recovering from his psychological distress.

The two Ellises provide contrasting visions of the Anzac character at Gallipoli. Ashmead-Bartlett’s panegyric idealises the war and positions Gallipoli as a symbolic event — what Jenny Mcleod terms the ‘romantic war myth’: a simplified, dramatised story that evolves to contain only the meanings of war that the public can tolerate. Ashmead-Bartlett was less concerned with a methodical recording of events than he was with creating character. His account gave the Australian public a ready-made hero and a sense of national identity, but in order to retain this mantle, the psychological identity of the Australian soldier hero had to be preserved unscathed. Ashmead-Bartlett’s account of the first day and his identification of the character of Australian men became so entrenched in Australian public consciousness, that a conflicting report by Aspinall-Oglander in the official British history of the campaign, that described stragglers and malingerers at Anzac Cove, caused a massive public outcry.

The Sydney Daily Guardian spoke of the ‘vilest libel of the war’ and of Australians being portrayed as a rabble, and the report was protested by the Australian Government. Ellis Silas’ descriptions of Gallipoli were anathema to this emerging tradition. His pictorial depictions of broken bodies and broken minds were diametrically opposed to heroic visualisations of the Australian national type.

One Ellis would go on to great influence in the English media and play a hand in the eventual deposition of General Hamilton as the commander in chief of the Gallipoli front. The other, one of the first documenters of the Gallipoli experience, unable to match the symbolic identity imagined by Bean and Ashmead-Bartlett, would be excluded from a place in the pantheon of Australian cultural history that he had helped to create. As such, a consideration of the work of Ellis Silas is of particular importance in re-evaluating the formation of the Australian national identity. Silas appears as merely a footnote in
Australian wartime literature — his work relegated to the status of the naïf soldier artist, or treated as historical anecdote. However, his work deserves reassessment in light of recent challenges to the imaging of Australian masculinity, nationhood and identity.

Silas' works focus on marginalised aspects of Anzac mythology — dead and wounded men, brutalised and un-idealised — as well as more mundane military activities. His art and writing allows a space for psychological complexity that is largely absent from the official legend. Silas' graphic focus on the broken bodies and minds of Australian soldiers threatens the established image of the idealised soldier figure by introducing psychological wounds as a facet of the Anzac experience. The idealised representation of the male Australian body was of a physiologically intact, well-muscled, whole man that represented national strength. The prevalence and treatment of wounded bodies in Silas' work challenges this dominant order. His works establish a tension with the national type, offering an alternative understanding of Australian masculinity.

ELLIS SILAS: ARTIST AND SOLDIER

Ellis Silas occupies a contested space within the culture of the Australian soldier, not only for the themes evinced by his artworks, but also due to the fluidity of his national identification. Not only was Silas not born in Australia, but in total he spent only eight years in the country. Born in London in 1885, the son of an artist and an opera singer, Silas gained his artistic training working in his father's studio and later under the tutelage of Walter Sickert, eventually becoming known as a specialist painter of maritime and naval scenes. In 1907 he moved to Australia to pursue a career in painting and established a studio in Western Australia. After the war he returned briefly to Australia in 1921, from whence he travelled to Papua New Guinea in 1922 on an extended painting expedition which he later recorded in his travel novel, A Primitive Arcadia, a pseudo-ethnographic study which was published in 1926. After travelling in Papua, he returned to England, where he settled.

Despite feeling an affinity for Australia and fighting for the A.I.F., it is unclear whether Silas considered himself an Australian national. At the time, this was not necessarily a barrier to inclusion within the Australian paradigm, as national identities between Australia and Britain were fluid; even in the post-war period, it was common for Australian nationals to consider themselves English. In spite of his relatively brief Australian residence, rather
than returning to England to serve in the British Army, Silas volunteered for the A.I.F. in 1914. After initial training in Western Australia and further training in Egypt, he landed at Gallipoli at mid-afternoon on 25 April, 1915 as a signaller in the 16th Battalion. Throughout his wartime service, he sketched and kept a diary, which was later amended and donated to the Chelsea Arts Club in the hope that it would offer an insight into the experience of war as depicted by an artist. In 1916 Silas reworked his diary and sketches into a picture book entitled *Crusading at Anzac A.D. 1915* (hereafter *Crusading at Anzac*) which was published in London by *The British-Australasian*. Though records of *Crusading at Anzac*’s sale and distribution are incomplete, a second printing of the title within a year – which featured an amended and more evocative text – suggests that the publication was popular and that it was aimed at least in part to a lay public in Australia and England eager for visual representations of the Gallipoli campaign.

*Crusading at Anzac* contains a collection of drawings spanning the artist’s military career, from his time in Egypt to the Gallipoli campaign and his subsequent residence in military hospitals. It is unique among pictorial depictions of the campaign because the majority of visual and written texts that comprise the book were made during the conflict and published soon after. Like *The Anzac Book*, *Crusading at Anzac* purported to provide a privileged view of the Gallipoli campaign, drawn from a source who had experienced it firsthand. Unlike the former publication however, the content of *Crusading at Anzac* was not subjected to an external editorial process. This is not to say that the content of Silas’ work was not tempered during the process of its translation into publication, indeed, even between the first and second printings of *Crusading at Anzac* Silas made a number of textual modifications that alter the inference of the publication. Rather, an examination of the interaction between text and image in *Crusading at Anzac* reveals a set of tensions between Silas’ expectations of soldiering and his lived experience of the conflict.

Silas’ works focus on the day-to-day exigencies of soldiering, for the most part eschewing the grand rhetoric of traditional war art. His Gallipoli drawings fall into three main categories: battle scenes, scenes of trench life and depictions of wounded or hospitalised men. They take on a documentary quality because he depicted only scenes that he witnessed firsthand. The drawings of *Crusading at Anzac* are presented chronologically and are accompanied by either a short extract taken from his battlefield diary, or a descriptive caption written in hindsight. These captions not only give the drawings the appearance of
documentary authenticity and temporal immediacy, but imbue them with a personal intimacy that engenders a sympathetic engagement between reader and author.

Silas' drawings pulse with an energy that encourages the viewer to imagine they are witness to the unfolding events. In *The Landing* (1916, fig. 32), his frantic pen strokes create a sensation of movement and chaos that analogously transmit the aural sensations of the din of rifle fire, the nearby explosion of a shell and the crashing of boat against boat. The foreground is spatially detached from the background, which focuses the *mise en scène* and creates a sense of immediacy. The background is reduced to a few abstract strokes, while the foreground is unbalanced and cluttered, brimming with texture from rapid, oscillating hatching. The figures here become mere suggestions of forms, resisting individual identification, appearing instead as a writhing, homogenous mass. Boxes become people, who become shadows that melt into the water thrown up by shell blasts.

These pictorial rhythms are part of a visual vocabulary that replicates Silas' lived experience. In his caption to *The Landing* in *Crusading at Anzac* he recorded that:

> We were packed so tightly in the boats and, moreover, so heavily laden with our kit, that had a shot hit the boat we would have had no
chance of saving ourselves. It was awful, the feeling of utter helplessness. Meanwhile, the Turks were pelting us hot and fast.\textsuperscript{12}

In the distressed, rippled water torn up by bullets and shell blasts, the viewer is able to witness the angst that Silas felt in the moment. Likewise, the tension of the physical confinement he described can be read in the shapes of the boat and the landing pier on the right of the work; in the turbulent water the boat crashes against the pier, disgorging its occupants in a hurried, chaotic rush. Silas’ technique functions as a transmitter of physical experience from artist to viewer. The viewer’s eye is kept moving throughout the composition, never allowed to rest in a moment of pictorial balance. Rather, the composition engenders a physiological response from the viewer, resulting in an experiential analogy between subject and experience.

Similar effects are achieved in Silas’ other battle works. In \textit{At the Top of the Hill} (1916, fig. 33) and \textit{Capture of Turkish Trenches by Light Horse} (1916, fig. 34), the figures are blended into the landscape via Silas’ slashing horizontal strokes. In these works, chaos reigns – friend and foe are almost indistinguishable. The artist’s style reflects his experience of battle; he lays down harrowed jerking lines quickly, to record an impression of battle as an organic, shifting melee. In some instances, all that is left is an impression. In \textit{A Shell on Either Side} (1916, fig. 35), almost the entire scene is reduced to a few rushed lines indicating a shell blast. Here, form and composition are of less importance than the general impression of the blast and the transmission of a sense of immediacy and chaos. The action is linked to a sense of temporality. The area immediately surrounding the shell strike is reduced to indistinguishable strokes and empty spaces. However, as the viewer’s eye is drawn further from the initial impact, forms begin to focus out of the abstraction, allying the act of viewing to the lived experience.

In spite of his desire to volunteer for the A.I.F., Silas was far from the stereotype of the Australian soldier. In fact, he struggled a great deal with living up to the expectations of soldiering manhood. In his diary Silas often complained that he felt socially isolated in the soldier’s life. “I find this terrible”, he wrote in his early days of training, “life in camp and the uncongenial society of rough bushmen...”.\textsuperscript{13} A month after writing this, he quit soldiering. This was partly due to his disappointment at not having been accepted into the Australian Army Medical Corps, to which he had applied to serve, but it is obvious that he also felt a great deal of peer pressure and a sense of uselessness at not fitting in with the society of

the bushman-soldier. "I have not yet been sworn in", he wrote, "...and as I don't feel I am going to be much use, and as I can't get into the A.M.C. where I know I should be useful, I think I shall take everybody's advice and give it up". Yet Silas was drawn back to the army by a sense of duty, and shame at the thought of other men doing what he himself would not. Feeling an overwhelming remorse, he returned to camp soon after deserting, only to be rejected. Unperturbed, within the month he attempted to re-enlist only to be told that he did not meet the minimum physical requirements. Eventually, he was able to circumvent these requirements and join the 16th battalion as a signaller, through the help of a friend who knew the battalion adjunct.

Despite being reconciled to what he foresaw as his duty, throughout his military career Silas maintained uncomfortable thoughts of inadequacy. He was never comfortable with military life and continued to feel isolated and affronted by soldiering. It is clear that other soldiers in his battalion regarded him, though affectionately, as an outsider. On one occasion, in defence of Silas, a soldier described by Silas as a "rough bushman", reprimanded another soldier who had affronted Silas with the rebuke "aven't you got an 'eart mate; can't you see 'e nin't used to this kind of life like we are?". Silas was keenly aware of this difference. In January 1915, he wrote in his diary that "I'm a snob even in my feeding... even now I cannot

get used to the rough conditions with which I am surrounded".\textsuperscript{16} Two weeks later he asked rhetorically: "I feel like an outcast; will I ever get used to this life?"\textsuperscript{17}

Not only did Silas feel socially isolated, but he also felt inadequate in the performance of his duties. He found signalling extremely difficult and possessed an aversion to physical violence. After firing his first shots with a rifle in October 1914 he recorded that "I know I shall never be able to shoot at a man".\textsuperscript{18} At Anzac Cove he reiterated doubts about his capacity as a soldier: "I wonder how I shall get on in a charge", he asked, "for I have not the least idea how to use a bayonet; even if I had, I should not be able to do so, the thing is too revolting – I can only hope that I get shot – why did they not let me do R.A.M.C. work?"\textsuperscript{19} This feeling of inadequacy was quite unfounded however, as Silas acquitted himself with great courage and honour at Gallipoli. In the opening days of the campaign he acted with great bravery by signalling under heavy fire to a company of New Zealand troops who were about to stumble into an ambush. For this act, he was mentioned in dispatches for a decoration and was told that he had earned signallers a good name. Silas was self-deprecating about this incident. "I do not feel that I have done anything more than my duty", he wrote, but:

...at least it has shown the lads that Signaller Silas, the joke of the Battalion, was able to do his bit with them, and also to show a somewhat sneering world that artists are not quite the failures on the battlefield, though I would admit that we are not quite cut out for this sort of work. I don't think I can stand much more of it, my nerves seem to be going; what little I did have.\textsuperscript{20}

Silas' crisis was one of meeting the expectations of soldiering manhood. Such expectations, constructed through a combination of martial stereotypes and societal expectations of masculinity, relied upon the identification of the Australian soldier as a physically redoubtable allegory for national strength. In the Australian case, this physical characterisation was bound to a psychological identity that accentuated its masculinity. The Australian soldier was loyal to his mates and courageous in the face of adversity, if a little disdainful of authority. Alistair Thompson suggests that this particular identity was often imputed to the Australian soldier by Bean.\textsuperscript{21} Thompson argues that in Bean's diary and written accounts, positive incidents are explained as the result of the decency of the Australian character and negative ones were refuted by reference to the exigencies of war.\textsuperscript{22} Doing so allowed for the retrospective blaming of Australian failures upon the actions of a few disparate individuals who were unrepresentative of the character of the nation as a
whole. This definition of Australian manhood relied not only upon an understanding of what it was, but by what it was not—weak, passive or cowardly.

This version of Australian manhood is often seen as fixed, unambiguous and non-contradictory. However, the dominant association between this particular vision of manhood and Australian nationhood is being challenged by recent feminist approaches to the record of women’s experience of war. Other scholarship has begun to complicate the reductive view of the Anzac character as a hegemonic masculine culture. Alistair Thomson, for example, suggests that individual soldiers forged their own soldiering identities in an act of negotiation between their subjective wartime experiences and social expectations of appropriate masculine behaviour. The challenge faced by soldiers was “to compose masculine identities that bridged the gap between the potentially emasculating effects of much war experience and the macho rhetoric of martial propaganda”.

Michael Tyquin, in particular, challenges traditional conceptions of the psychological character of the Australian soldier. In his opinion, the hegemonic view of Anzac masculinity ignores those soldiers who existed outside “the charmed fraternity of invulnerable youth”, resulting in a national culture that glorifies a fractional element of society to the detriment of the wider social experience. The first A.I.F. incorporated a diverse range of sociological and cultural groups, yet the experience of a relatively small sub-group became idealised in the image of the Anzac soldier. Such a characterisation also bars recognition of the experiences of the thousands of Australian soldiers who suffered from neurological illnesses as a result of war, who did not meet the stereotypical image of the Anzac soldier. As Tyquin observes:

While every city and town has its shrine of commemoration, nowhere on their gilded or marbled exteriors are the ‘shell shocked’ recorded or acknowledged for what they were—the mental debris of the war. While there may be cracks in these stone edifices, no human failures are admitted to these holy sanctuaries.

Tyquin suggests that this exclusion was facilitated by Bean’s official record of the war: “Those soldiers who succumbed to mental illness were not part of Bean’s new world”, he writes, “They had failed to make the grade and... they were the first to fall victim to cynicism... before being quietly forgotten”. As Tyquin notes, “the icon could accommodate...
the physically wounded, the larrikin and the ill-disciplined, but it denied a place to the mentally scarred in the new nation’s pantheon".29

During his wartime service, Silas struggled to reconcile his disenchantment with the military culture with his conceptions of social duty. Physically inadequate, socially awkward and by his admission preferring to be killed rather than to kill, Silas’ response was to withdraw from the typical masculine identity. Although this experience was trivialised in contemporary accounts, research has shown that anxiety caused by the desire to live up to the expectations of soldiering manhood was in fact itself a cause for nervous collapse, and that this anxiety was fairly commonplace.30 In his Anzac Memories: Living with the Legend, Thomson interviews three First World War veterans and discovers that the Australian soldiering culture was certainly not hegemonic.31 All of Thomson interviewees profess a conflict with the expected masculine code of behaviour. One of his subjects, Percy Bird, saw enlistment as “a choice between two different prescriptions of masculinity, between the family man and the independent soldier adventurer”, which required the adoption of a unique set of masculine attributes in order to function.32 Bird also felt a distinct sense of inadequacy when he was told to leave his company for clerical duties, as if he had somehow failed in his duty. As he did not drink, smoke or identify with the masochistic behaviour of his fellow soldiers, he also expressed a sense of isolation. Another of Thomson’s subjects, Fred Farrell, was also affected by a negative masculine self-image, but he could find no expression for it because there was no empathetic public audience. Although this changed in his old age, for decades these memories were repressed. For Thomson, the remembrance and projection of Anzac identities were influenced by a range of factors and were often separated into memories for public reverence and those for private commemoration. Often the two visions would collide, resulting in a distortion of one or both.

**BROKEN BODIES, BROKEN MINDS**

Given Silas’ aversion to the culture of military masculinity, it is unsurprising that his treatment of the male body in his wartime sketches rejects the ideal of the warrior hero. As Joanna Bourke has noted, this ideal relies on the propagation of a unique visual image of the strong male body that not only serves as allegory for nation, but encourages a mode of identification within the viewer which helps to tie the image of the individual to the image
of the nation. This was a common trope of nationalistic wartime imagery. As Christina Jarvis suggests, "idealised representations of male bodies were of physiologically intact, well-muscled, steeled entities that represented national strength". However, such an identification posed a corollary problem, namely that "the inevitable presence of wounded bodies therefore posed potential threats to the wartime body politic".

Bourke suggests that "the most important point to be made about the male body during the Great War is that it was intended to be mutilated". Though the image of the idealised male was symbolic, this was not the only crucial factor in drawing the image of nation. The sacrifice – and by corollary deformation – of the bodies of the Australian soldiers was an equally integral component of the establishment of the Gallipoli myth. The visibility of this deformation in society and culture in general compelled the creation of ideological justifications for such sacrifice, especially in order to assuage those wounded men who had returned to civilian life to find their role in society had shifted in their absence. The imaging of wounded men was therefore bound by certain rules of acceptance. It was not enough to factually record the death or wounding of Australian men; rather, the method of their passing was the primary means by which one’s adherence to the national image would be assessed. The manner in which men were wounded and taken out of battle could be categorised as honourable or dishonourable. Self-inflicted wounds were seen as a form of shirking and faked illnesses a case of malingering, both of which were seen as dishonourable. It was only those physical wounds attained in the line of duty that were to be venerated.

Such considerations informed the manner in which official A.I.F. artists approached the recording of wounded men for public display. More than any other Australian wartime artist, George Coates was able to imbue the image of the wounded Anzac soldier with a sense of national spiritualism. In his First Australian Wounded at Gallipoli Arriving at Wandsworth Hospital, London (hereafter First Australian Wounded at Gallipoli) (1921, fig. 37), Coates transforms the interior of Wandsworth hospital – in which he had worked as a medical orderly during the war – from a functional space into a spiritual one, by invoking the sacredness of the interior of a Christian cathedral. Coates’ transformation of a secular civic building into a spiritual domain was one that he had literally put into practice during his war service. His wife recorded that while at Wandsworth hospital Coates decorated a clothing store that had been converted into a catholic chapel by:
[painting] gothic niches around the walls, in each of which was a saint, and on either side of the altar were crowds of worshipping angels whose wings made circular decorative lines leading inwards and upwards. At the south-east end in the centre was the Virgin in prayer with angels again on either side.\textsuperscript{41}

It is not difficult to read First Australian Wounded at Gallipoli as a similar attempt by Coates to spiritualise the hospital space and the work of its protagonists. The bulk of the interior is unnaturally dark, lending the scene an air of gravitas while simultaneously functioning to highlight the main figure in the work. Light streams in from a window on the right, evoking the glass windows of the Gothic cathedral and, by analogy, signalling the space as sacred. Its focus is the wounded Australian soldier lying on the bed, attended by a troop of nurses, who flock around him like the “crowds of worshipping angels” to which his wife referred.

This is a work in which the artist was able to combine his personal experience with his attitude towards war. Coates’ treatment of the space was inspired by the atmosphere in which he worked. Noel Irving, a contemporary of Coates’ at Wandsworth Hospital, wrote of his experience of working there:

\begin{quote}
Owing to air raids, the precautions against unnecessary illumination held good at the hospital also. And ‘by the struggling moonbeams’ misty light’ (when there was a moon), they carried out their grim and melancholy task. There were other eerie and gruesome jobs, such as attending medical officers on post-mortem examinations and assisting in the operating theatre, but perhaps, a kindly veil had better be dropped over these harrowing details.\textsuperscript{42}
\end{quote}

Irving’s written account similarly transforms the hospital into an ethereal, mystical environment. However, in his record the light, though dim, accents the horror and gruesomeness of the duties that were carried out there, the recollection of which when viewed in this harsh light was too much for the writer. Instead, Irving chooses to ignore the details of his memory, skipping over them for the benefit of the reader. Irving’s eerie night light illuminates the horror of his memory, abstracted from the rest of his experience.

Coates’ light is the brighter light of day and, like Irving’s “kindly veil”, it glosses over gruesome details to provide a sanitised vision of the operations of the hospital. The soldier’s
FIGURE 36: GEORGE COATES, FIRST AUSTRALIAN WOUNDED AT GALLIPOLI ARRIVING AT WANDSWORTH HOSPITAL, LONDON, 1921, OIL ON CANVAS, 154.5 X 128 CM, AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL, CANBERRA.

body is framed by this light, the rays of which parallel the diagonal slant of his upper torso. Like the analogous focus of the light at the apse in a cathedral, the bed in Coates’ work becomes the altar in this spiritual play – the body in the bed the sacrifice to be revered. In this way, the sacrifice of the Anzac soldier at Gallipoli is framed as an act of spiritual significance. In the background through the open, lit portal, a group of orderlies bring a
second wounded man into the scene. Like a priestly procession down the nave towards the altar, they confirm that for the Australian soldier, being wounded is an essential part of the ritual of devotion to nation.  

Coates was highly conscious of the ability of different body types to create meaning. Of his friendship with Coates, the lithographer Charles Stamp remarked that:

> Physiognomy also interested us! We used to criticize every face of note we passed and often had wonderful coincidences in remarking the same features at the same time.

Furthermore, Coates, renowned as a talented athlete, approached his own physicality with a discipline that mimicked his approach to art. In Stamp’s opinion, Coates was “a beautifully built lad”:

> Determination and concentration in that as in his art. Besides being a fine boxer, he was so good at cricket that he would have been an international cricketer if he had followed it up.

So famous was Coates’ physical prowess that Lionel Lindsay himself made note of his boxing ability and that a trainer had encouraged him to take up a “man’s work” and become a professional boxer. However, by the time Coates came to serve at Wandsworth, he was physically a changed man. At the outbreak of war, Coates was already suffering from a disease contracted in 1913 and throughout the course of the war his physical and mental health steadily deteriorated. When, in March 1918, the physically fit staff at Wandsworth were taken for overseas service in Europe, Coates was left behind with the ‘B1’ and ‘B2’ men – those judged physically incapable of frontline service – having been judged unfit and suffering from neurasthenia. It is significant therefore that Coates’ enshrinement of the wounded body as a symbol of spiritualism coincided with a period in which he was denied the opportunity to work or fight on the front lines; it signals the artist’s desire to elevate the status of the war painter to “man’s work”. As Catherine Speck has noted, the appointment of male artists to the official war art scheme “placed a seal of legitimacy on the male artists’ perspective on war”. By actively participating in the spiritualisation of the figure, Coates raises the role of the artist to that of the role of the soldier in sacrificing his body for the nation.

Like Coates, Silas’ treatment of the wounded body in his drawings was influenced by his self-perception and wartime service, but the figures in Silas’ works resist a simple spiritual
characterisation. The dead invade nearly all of Silas’ drawings, be they battle scenes, hospital scenes or scenes of trench life, but they are rarely valorised. In this way, the depiction of dead bodies in Silas’ drawings functions in counterpoint to the imaging of the soldier as a national type. Silas’ treatment of the dead both denies the viewer an empathetic identification with the figures and in many cases removes an ideological justification through which the deaths of the soldiers can be vindicated.

It is not difficult to read Silas’ graphic focus on the bodies of the dead as part of an intention to document the realities of trench warfare. Indeed, this was the artist’s stated intention. “It is not with any desire for morbid sensationalism that I introduce dead in every drawing”, he wrote, “They were part of our daily life; they were part of the character of the Peninsula...”. Yet there is another sense in which Silas’ dead figures serve as a form of mediation for his personal insecurities about soldiering and death. One figure finds repeated inclusion in several of Silas’ Gallipoli sketches; lying dead on his back, one leg raised over the other, arms spread-eagled against the sky, I argue that this figure acts as a metaphor for Silas’ personal reaction to soldiering, including his fear of inadequacy and his aversion to combat. This figure is visible in Dead Man’s Patch (1916, fig. 37), where a picturesque scene is disrupted by two dead bodies. It is tempting to read this figure as a form of the deposed Christ. It is possible that Silas intended this figure as Christian allegory as a reference to the title of his Crusading at Anzac. However, it is unlikely that this particular allegorical symbolism was a motivating factor in his work. Rather, this deposed figure is better read as a dramatic device, a pictorial aid employed to balance compositional forces and as an expression for Silas’ personal response to war.

The recurrent appearance of the deposed soldier challenges the masculine ideal of the heroic warrior as a man perfect in mind, body and soul. When he appears again in The Streams of Wounded (1916, fig. 38), he adds a sense of tragedy. In Stretcher Bearers (1916, fig. 39), he generates a sense of grim pathos. Despite being constantly amongst battle, he cannot participate. His back is broken; his head spills blood; he never confronts the viewer directly. Instead he is passive, withdrawn from the struggle. We read his death as a consequence of the battle, but unlike the heroic dead of Lambert’s paintings – who die orchestrated deaths in the midst of battle – Silas does not often give the viewer access to this crucial moment of action. We know that these men died, but the manner of their deaths is uncertain, which disturbs the viewer’s means of evaluating their deaths in the context of a greater purpose. The absence of this linkage in many of Silas’ drawings initially
removes the compulsion to view these men as honourable sacrifices. Instead they appear as victims rather than martyrs.

The alienation of these victims from an ideological purpose allows for a more developed reading of their bodies. Silas’ experience of emasculation and psychological collapse as a result of the experience of modern warfare was a common one and, according to Bourke, such experiences gave rise to a number of responses. “Language and reason failed when faced with the threat of physical devastation”, Bourke writes, “stripped of these safeguards, men used their bodies to evade perilous situations”.50 This often took the form of the enthusiastic adoption of blood sacrifice, or by taking revenge on one’s own body through the infliction of self-made wounds.

It is important to note that though he held strong reservations about his soldiering ability, on the battlefield Silas did not attempt to avoid his allotted military duty. However, it is interesting that of all the forms of the male wartime body, this deposed figure is the one that Silas most consistently reiterates. Paradoxically, it is perhaps the most appropriate avatar for a man who was drawn to battle by a sense of duty, but who craved withdrawal from a sense of inadequacy. In the first edition of Crusading at Anzac, in Dead Man’s Patch,
where the figure appears most prominently, Silas' caption confirms a degree of existential transposition between himself and the deposed figure:

It was across this exposed spot that many times I had to run despatches. The ridge on the right, where shrapnel can be seen bursting, was thick with snipers, who had this patch so well set that they rarely missed their mark. The poor chaps seen in the drawing all got caught when trying to get across. I wondered if I was to join them.51

The highlighting of Silas' frequent need to run across this patch – with its snipers who "rarely missed their mark" – when read in conjunction with his wondering whether he too would be shot, has the effect of making the eventuality seem like a mathematical certainty. As such, it is possible to read the dead man in the scene as a projection of Silas' own imagined death.

The intrusion of this deposed figure in the landscape is characteristic of an intersection in Silas' drawings of the picturesque and the gruesome, an apposition that fulfils a number of roles in Silas' works. At times, it allows Silas to express his revulsion for war and portray morbid experiences outside the trope of the traditional heroic battle scene. Disturbing images of physical violence often interrupt otherwise picturesque landscapes in Silas' drawings. In Signalling – Quinn's Post (1916, fig. 40), a pair of boots sticking out of a trench wall is a bizarre macabre spectacle that highlights a grim reality of the battlefield. In this case, the soldier to whom the boots belong died days or weeks before, his body covered over in the construction of earthworks by surviving soldiers. Silas' recording of the fact extends the horror of the man's death beyond the temporal immediacy of the sketch. Likewise, in My First Dugout (1916, fig. 41), a prostrate body interrupts an otherwise placid landscape, functioning as a reminder to the viewer of the context of the drawing when no signs of immediate danger are visible. In At the Water Hole (1916, fig. 42), two diggers calmly fill their water bottles, oblivious to the presence of a corpse lying in a rocky niche beside them.

At other times, Silas' apposition of picturesque and gruesome achieves a compositional balance which partly reconciles the deaths of the men he depicts. In The Streams of Wounded, the deposed soldier is incorporated into the physical environment, lying contorted around a tree so that his outstretched arms, which rest on the ground, form a

perpendicular to the vertical lines of the tree. In this case, the gruesome becomes an essential component of the picturesque. In such cases as these, Silas' apposition of death and the picturesque may be an attempt to attain a degree of reconciled peace for the dead soldiers that grants them what Bourke has termed 'the beautiful death'. As Bourke explains, war promised men a death that was at odds with what they experienced in civilian life. Her conception of the ideal death was 'between clean sheets':

...in a familiar bedroom, surrounded by family and friends. The bereaved strove to lay out a 'handsome corpse' that could be photographed and whose likeness could be kept on the mantle piece.52

The war robbed men and families of this process of bereavement and commemoration. In the public eye, this was somewhat assuaged by public ceremony. For those on the battlefield however, the experience of death was somewhat different. It is possible to read Silas' deposed figure as a method of mediating the two experiences of death. Through the regulation of some aspects of the depiction of the dead body, the gruesome becomes the picturesque as an adjustment necessary to reconcile Silas with the realities of the battlefield.

While much of the accompanying text in Crusading at Anzac was drawn verbatim from Silas' diary, several omissions from the diary text complicate the picture that Silas presents of his experiences. Although he is candid about physical horror, in Crusading at Anzac Silas omits virtually all references to his psychological torment. In particular, no mention is made of the injury that led to his hospitalisation at Gallipoli. In fact, Silas was evacuated to Alexandria on account of a mental breakdown due to shell-shock, and an incapacitating fever. Although he makes frequent mention of his deteriorating condition in his diary, Silas removes these references for the captions in Crusading at Anzac. For instance, the caption that accompanies Bathing Under Shell Fire (1916) begins almost whimsically: "This was certainly a most unique experience", he wrote, "I remember how delightful it was to be immersed in the sea, after not having had a decent wash for about three weeks".53 The text that Silas excluded from his diary tells a different story. The entry: "have been delirious all night, my nerves have quite gone to pieces" precedes the description of bathing in his diary, revealing an understanding of Silas' inner torment.54 Similarly, he omitted the entry "delirious again last night" from his caption to Stand to Arms (1916).55 This is typical of the chronology of Silas' pictorial record in general. His works progress from depictions of his training in Egypt.
to his experience of fighting at Gallipoli, to drawings of the hospital ship Galeka and his journey to Alexandria without overt recognition of his mental condition.

Two editions of *Crusading at Anzac* were published in 1916. In the second edition, Silas made a number of changes to the captions accompanying his drawings. These changes were for the large part relatively minor expansions of the existing captions. For *Heliopolis – The Paper Seller* (1916), Silas provides a new paragraph to replace his one-line text from the original edition. A similar effort is made for some of his other Egyptian drawings, which he captioned sparsely in the first edition, including *Heliopolis – Oranges* (1916), *Heliopolis – "Eggs a Cook!"* (1916) and *Heliopolis – The Bootblack* (1916). Where he makes additions to his Gallipoli works, his amendments add narrative flavour to the drawings. For *The Real Thing at Last!* (1916), he added:

> The eventful day had arrived; every moment was bringing us nearer the scene of action. Through the distant haze, as the Dardanelles opened up, we could see the flash of the guns. It was the Real Thing at last.56

Silas' addition neatly links the title of the work with his experience. However, it has the effect of shifting the tone markedly from the original caption, which begins:

> At first, it was a little difficult to realise that every burst of flame, every spurt of water, meant death – and worse.57

This commentary also appears in the second edition caption; however the addition of the heroic opening prose transforms the mood of the caption from one of fear to one of adventurous apprehension. Likewise, the second edition caption to *From the "Ribble" to the Boats* (1916) significantly changes the textual inference. In its entirety, the caption from the first edition reads:

> We were transferred from the transport to the destroyer, which took us close into the shore, and then we were transferred into the ship's boats and rowed to the shore, amidst a hail of shells.58

In the second edition, Silas qualifies his original statement by adding:

> But despite all, there was no confusion. Everything was carried out as though for a review. The work of disembarkation was accomplished by the Navy, which proved to the world that the
British Tar was still made of the same stuff that faced the Invincible Armada in the Channel, and fought in Trafalgar’s Bay.59

In this case, Silas amends his caption in order to mitigate the failure of the campaign by touting the ability of the navy and the character of its men.

Silas made relatively few textual amendments to his captions for the second edition. However, the discovery of Silas’ editorial selectivity raises questions as to whether or not a similar editorial process was exercised on the accompanying drawings. In fact, though the drawings in Crusading at Anzac were based on sketches that Silas made during his active service, many of the images that were published in the book were versions that he reworked after the conflict, in London in 1916. This temporal separation between the drawings’ initial creation and their final, published iterations furnishes the possibility that they underwent compositional alteration in line with the shifting of Silas’ own remembrance of the events, or his desire to represent them in order to elicit a certain experiential response.

In several drawings in Crusading at Anzac, it can be argued that Silas’ reuse of landscape and compositional elements in order to frame separate battlefield incidents removes from these images any claim of visual fidelity based on experiential authenticity. For example, the foreground from Bloody Angle (1916, fig. 43) is reworked to become Dawn, May 3. However, it is unlikely that Silas’ recycling of compositional elements stemmed from a desire to misrepresent his experience of the events. What is more certain is that Silas used familiar imagery to create a uniformity of pictorial effect between events that Silas had identified in his remembrance as similar. In the case of Dawn, May 3, the scene Silas represents chronologically follows that of Bloody Angle. In this way, his recycling of imagery can be read as an affirmation of the experiential authenticity of his works.

Regardless, Silas’ self-censorship of his psychological experience complicates our understanding of the process through which the Anzac image was created. Though Silas’ drawings present a physical characterisation of the Anzac soldier that contradicted the public ideal, he is less willing to admit a similar complexity in its psychological characterisation. Silas’ self-restraint evidences Thomson’s claim that Australian soldiers were also actively engaged in creating and promoting a collective identity that strongly informed the public Anzac myth.50 Thomson notes that in some cases, the remembrance of wartime experience and its performative expression were essential to a soldier’s
reconciliation of that experience and the development of his self-identity.\textsuperscript{51} He suggests that there is no simple equation between a soldier's experience and their memory of it. Rather, certain memories could be remembered in certain ways depending on the individual.\textsuperscript{62}

Silas may well have refrained from referencing his psychological condition on account of the social stigma surrounding psychological wounds. The psychologically damaged soldier was a troubling case because he displayed no bodily signs of injury. In many cases, horrible mutilation was seen as evidence for having done one's duty to nation. Such visible signs of sacrifice were often very potent symbols. As Bourke suggests, "the absent parts of men's bodies came to exert a special patriotic power. In the struggle for status and resources, absence could be more powerful than presence".\textsuperscript{63} Bourke cites the example of the London Times, which recorded in 1920 that "next to loss of life, the sacrifice of a limb is the greatest sacrifice a man can make for his country".\textsuperscript{64} A personal recollection of this phenomenon appears in Silas' diary. Describing the battle of 3 May, 1915 Silas recorded one wounded man retreating from the battle: "...his right hand shot away, called out: "God, but I've done my duty. Is that you, Silas old chap; I've done my duty, haven't I?".\textsuperscript{65}

However, shell-shock and neurasthenia, though common injuries, were difficult to reconcile with conceptions of heroic duty. As a consequence, recognition of these forms of injury as honourable wounds remained limited throughout the First World War. As Tyquin argues, the term 'shell-shock' was initially used to describe a variety of conditions that included cowardice and maniacal insanity, and thus came to acquire moralistic connotations based around existing Edwardian sensibilities.\textsuperscript{66} As Elaine Showalter suggests, shell-shock in particular was consigned to the same medical category as hysteria, which was seen as an exclusively female malady, but was given a suitably masculine-sounding moniker:

The efficacy of the term 'shell-shock lay in its power to provide a masculine sounding substitute for the effeminate associations of 'hysteria' and to disguise the troubling parallels between male war neurosis and the female nervous disorders epidemic before the war... if the essence of manliness was not to complain, then shell-shock was the body language of masculine complaint, a disguised male protest not only against the war but against the concept of manliness itself.\textsuperscript{67}

This characterisation of the illness only served to accentuate the emasculating effects for those soldiers who suffered from it. As such, shell-shock was initially considered as the
consequence of a failing in the soldier himself. The condition was thus largely elided from Australia’s official history of the war, which relied upon a positive characterisation of the Australian soldier. In Bean’s *Official history*, there are only four references to shell-shock in 4000 pages, despite the prevalence of the condition. As Tyquin suggests, “CEW Bean had seen the threat early and moved deftly to disenfranchise these neurotic soldiers from his celebration of nationhood”.

Nevertheless, though Silas omitted some aspects of his personal experience from his drawings, a sense of psychological horror can be found in his works. In *Dawn, May 3*, the protagonists, and most shockingly wounded of the depicted men, are not the dead soldiers, but those who are now rendered psychologically incapable of fighting. Silas’ representation of battle here is the antithesis of the heroic mode. None of the figures in the drawing allow for a proud, nationalistic identification; in contrast, the fleeing man in the midground and the slumped survivor in the foreground are the antitheses of the warrior hero. These men have survived the battle, but in spite of this they have been incapacitated by their psychological torment and can play no further useful role on the battlefield. Nevertheless, Silas passes no judgment on these men. They are not used as a moral exemplar. Instead, Silas transcribes some of his own lived terror into the image of the Australian soldier, revealing his own repressed psychological trauma.

In *The Roll Call — Quinn’s Post* (1916, fig. 44), Silas reserves a space for psychological complexity. Here we are witness to a reveille the morning after a battle. The slumped shoulders and crooked stances of the men tell of their sorrow at hearing the names of their dead comrades called, a sensation compounded only by the morbid realization that the mangled bodies of their former comrades lie within reach. The caption that accompanies the drawing reflects this moment of pathos:

> Name after name would be called: the reply — a deep silence, which could be felt, despite the noise of the incessant cracking of rifles and screaming of shrapnel. This was taken the morning after the charge, on Sunday night, May 9th. We, the 16th Battalion, were supposed to be resting, and were only to reinforce if the necessity arose. Unfortunately, through some error, we were sent into the firing line. At dawn, the following morning, there were few of us left to answer our names when the roll was called — just a thin line of ashen-faced men.
In the background to the left, a row of dead bodies lying prostrate on the ground forms a morbid reflection of the standing men, though horizontal instead of vertical. Their bodies have lost any sense of identity and their forms are partially subsumed by the rocky background.

The scene in The Roll Call – Quinn’s Post is even more pitiable when compared to Silas’ earlier drawing The Last Assembly (1916, fig. 45), a similar roll call scene taken on a troopship just prior to the fighting. Here, two rows of men with parallel rifles cut a sharp contrast to the single file of broken men in The Roll Call – Quinn’s Post. In The Last Assembly, the men are compositionally unified by both the similarity of their bodies and stances, and the overarching solidity of the tightly-hatched background against which they are presented. In some ways The Last Assembly represents a prolepsis to the later work. The diary entry that Silas selected in accompaniment to the image records a moment of foreboding thought:

There, for the last time in this world, many of us stood shoulder to shoulder. As I looked down the ranks of my comrades, I wondered much which of us were marked for the Land Beyond. We were well in the zone of fire, and every second I was expecting a shell to come bursting through the side of the ship, to answer my question.70

The Roll Call – Quinn’s Post functions as the logical dénouement to The Last Assembly, providing a visual response to Silas’ question. A comparison of the two drawings allows the viewer a means of quantifying, by subtraction, the scale of the tragedy. The shift in subject and tone between the two drawings is matched by a commensurate change in composition. The compositional harmony of The Last Assembly has largely been lost in The Roll Call – Quinn’s Post, which destabilises the eye of the viewer as it is led around the scene.

Interestingly, Silas executed a large oil version of his drawing, entitled Roll Call (1920, fig. 46) – which was acquired by the War Records Section – in which further compositional changes were made. In the oil version of the work, the line of dead bodies on the left has been replaced by a figure similar to the crouched, psychologically injured man from Silas’ drawing Down, May 3. In Roll Call, this figure crouches on the ground at the edge of the frame, his face hidden from view, too weak to stand or perhaps incoherent with nervous shock. However in this case, he is engaged by two soldiers in the reveille who comfort the

fallen soldier. By doing so, they include the psychologically wounded man in the ranks of the heroically wounded. The act is a tacit and symbolic recognition of the experience of the mentally wounded; by including the broken man in their own group they become the interlocutors between the heroic myth of Gallipoli and the elided psychological experience of many Anzac soldiers.

RECORDING SILAS

In General Birdwood's introduction to *Crusading at Anzac*, he embraces Silas as a good soldier, who made a valuable contribution to the Gallipoli campaign. Birdwood's text appeals to the viewer to consider Silas' drawings as documentary pieces that detail the daily exigencies of the soldiering life. "It gives me much pleasure to be able to write a very short introduction to the book of drawings of Signaller Ellis Silas..." he wrote:
... though these will themselves, I hope, appeal fully to all who see them, as portraying incidents in the lives of some of our Australian and New Zealand soldiers on service. The sketches were made by Signaller Silas during the time he spent with the Australian troops on the Gallipoli Peninsula, and they contain an excellent record of the life spent by those troops during the months they and their comrades at Cape Helles and Suvla were upholding the honour of the British flag in that part of the world. I heartily wish Signaller Silas all success with his book, and trust that, before the war is finished, his health will enable him to rejoin the troops, and that he will find opportunity of giving us yet further proofs of his ability as an artist, in showing us something of the life of the troops in other theatres of war.71

Birdwood approaches Silas’ illness with tact and compassion, making no specific mention of the nature of his injuries. His invitation to the viewer to accept the images as faithful documents, knowing that they contained images of physical injury and mental instability suggests that Birdwood was conscious of the realities of warfare that formed a backdrop to the public image of the Anzac soldier.

Sir Ian Hamilton’s foreword provides further insight into the formation of the Anzac myth, by making a claim over part of the Anzac legend:

As the man who first, seeking to save himself trouble, omitted the five full stops and brazenly coined the word “Anzac”, I am glad to write a line or two in preface to sketches which may help to give currency to that token throughout the realms of glory. Though treating so largely of death, they are life-like; though grim, they do justice also to the gaiety and good humour which never deserted any of our troops in the trenches; though slight, they seem solid and serious enough to such of us as were there. Therefore it is that I wish for these outlines of heroes abiding fame, and hope that many an Australian or New Zealander now unborn will better realise by their aid what a splendid thing it was to have been alive and crusading at Gallipoli in the year of our Lord 1915.72

Like Birdwood, Hamilton makes reference to Silas’ sketches as ‘authentic’ reminders of the realities of war, as experienced by men “such of as us, who were there”, placing himself
within the realm of the common soldier. However, this claim to membership is destabilised by his assertion that Silas’ works “do justice also to the gaiety and good humour which never deserted any of our troops in the trenches”. Such a statement, ignorant of the psychological trauma that inspired many of the drawings in Crusading at Anzac, reveals the self-conscious motivation of Hamilton’s endorsement. Hamilton lays claim to the coining of the ‘Anzac’ acronym and credits his involvement at Gallipoli with the glory that the Australian soldiers were attributed in the Anzac legend. In doing so he attempts to mitigate the disaster of the Gallipoli campaign, suggesting that it was a “splendid thing ... to have been alive and crusading at Gallipoli”, as if the death and destruction present in Silas’ drawings were glorious romantisms of the experience. Hamilton was no stranger to retrospective revision of the Gallipoli conflict. In his Gallipoli Diary he often represented the events in a manner that mitigated his role in the failure of the campaign. He suppressed the more horrific elements of warfare in his recollections, passing the blame for the Gallipoli disaster from his own leadership to unavoidable and unforeseeable eventualities. Hamilton attempts a similar act of revisionism in his foreword to Crusading at Anzac, passing off Australia’s defeat as glorious. These two contrasting endorsements of Silas’ works evince not only the cultural valency of Gallipoli in social discourse as early as 1916, but also the interest with which competing concerns attempted to frame the campaign.

Silas himself felt a duty to record the Gallipoli campaign in drawing and painting, as, to the best of his knowledge, he considered himself the only artist present at the landing. Given this, he may have sought the endorsement of both Birdwood and Hamilton for Crusading at Anzac in recognition of the uniqueness of the publication. It was for Silas’ privileged view of Gallipoli that Bean championed his works to some degree, even when it became obvious that the War Records Section did not hold his ability in high esteem. Silas applied to build dioramas for the Australian War Memorial, but was rejected. However, several of his paintings were later acquired for the memorial. It is clear that when Silas was painting his Gallipoli canvases he still suffered from the psychological effects of his wartime experience; this lends these paintings greater currency as texts that complicate the record of the experiences of Australian soldiers at Gallipoli. A medical report of his condition while in London recorded that he still suffered from memory loss, confusion of ideas, excitability, rapid heart beat and unsteady hands. Writing to Bean in regards to his painting Digging in at Pope’s Hill (end of a long day) (1920), Silas recorded that:

The conditions under which ‘digging in’ was executed were such that it is doubtful if another man would have attempted it. Still
suffering acutely from the effects of my experiences at Anzac, Air
Raids every night, ill nourished on account of war rations, eight to
less hours work per day at Air Ministry. Perhaps it was foolish of me
to make the effort, but I felt I simply had to, particularly as I was one
of the few, if not the only artist with the A.I.F. at the landing on the
25th.77

Bean’s subsequent letter to Treloar about this work reveals much about how Silas was seen
by the War Records Section at that time. “Luke Fildes inspected it at Australia House and
said it was ‘a very fine work’”, Bean wrote, “Since [then] Australia House has been quite
respectful to him: poor old chap, I think they looked on him as a bit of a humbug before”.78
More specific recollections of Silas’ dealings with Australia House are unrecorded, but it is
likely that the attitude of the office towards Silas was influenced by his still prevalent
neurasthenia. In any case, the War Records Section did not consider him an artist of any
repute. Treloar wrote to Bean in 1921 that:

I confess I was disappointed in [Silas’] first picture. To me its chief
merit lay in the fact that it was painted by an eye witness. It seemed
to me that it was of poorer quality than the work of the weakest
A.I.F. artist... we all seem to be agreed, however, that the fact that he
is the only Australian artist known to have witnessed the fighting of
the 4th bge [sic.] in the early days at Gallipoli, gives his work a certain
value...79

Likewise, Bean, although acting as a champion for Silas in the matter of obtaining
commissions, held a similar view of Silas’ works, though he possessed a more optimistic
outlook on his potential as an artist:

I always knew that, in spite of the crudeness of his first works,
old Silas had the artist in him and if he has improved in his
execution he might turn out a good picture... it is worth bearing
him in mind in connection with the Gallipoli work of which we
are so much in need... he went six times across nomansland
[sic.] to Lieutenant Haywood during the attack of the Light
Horse upon the Turkish trenches... given the technical training
(of which he needs a lot) Silas could paint. He is almost our only
artist of those days and as such I feel well worth keeping in
touch with.80
Given their task of cataloguing Australia’s war experience and their desire to record the events in a light commensurate with the national interest, it is understandable and unsurprising that both Treloar and Bean valued Silas mostly for his status as an eye witness. Silas’ status as such was potentially a boon or a threat to the War Records Section – Silas’ recording of the campaign had an immense power to either confirm or contradict the official vision of Gallipoli being groomed by Bean. Both Bean and Treloar regarded Silas as a naïf artist and therefore incapable of recording the conflict with the requisite grandiosity. However, the endorsement of Silas’ painting by Luke Fildes, who was such a prominent figure in the British Social Realist movement, raises questions about the motivations of Bean and Treloar in their assessment of Silas. It is possible that they judged him naïf not based upon his technical capacity, but on Silas’ personal response to war and his mode of representation.

This conception of Silas as a naïf artist-reporter belies the fact that within his images lies a view of Gallipoli that was neither recorded nor experienced by any commissioned A.I.F. artist. By virtue of his first-hand experience, Silas captured moments at Gallipoli that the official war artists could not. Yet more importantly, his act of recording the campaign became a vital part of his personal reconciliation of the experience. In the public view, to be an Australian male represented in the Anzac tradition was to adopt a hegemonic image of masculinity. As a result of the artist’s position as an outsider attempting to live within this tradition, the works of Ellis Silas widen the scope of Australian manhood by reserving places for marginalised aspects of the Australian wartime experience. By inviting us to view the world through the eyes of those whose bodies were being sacrificed, he challenges us to reassess the ideal image of the soldier in the heroic mode. In grappling with the expectations of soldiering manhood, Silas’ artworks expose the fissures between the remembrance of personal experience and the creation of public image. His works thus play an invaluable role in the study of the imaging of the Australian national type and provide a complex challenge to public conceptions of the Anzac legend.
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In 2000, at a conference entitled *The Gallipoli Campaign: International Perspectives 85 years on*, Yuluğ Tekin Kurat encapsulated contemporary Turkish perspectives of the Gallipoli campaign by directly allying it to the formation of a new Turkish nation. "It was a unique phenomenon that this campaign led the Turks", he said, "...to acquire their national identity":

Albeit the fact that the Turk was the ruling element over his decaying multinational Ottoman Empire, he realised that this encounter in Gallipoli was not the part and parcel of yet another imperial war. In Gallipoli he was fighting for the sanctity of his own house and the protection of his motherland".¹

By positioning the campaign within the discourses of nationalism and identity building, Kurat mobilised Gallipoli in Turkish history as a site for transition and revision; one at which the Ottoman Empire was replaced by a Turkish Republic invigorated by a Turkish nationalism distinct from its Ottoman heritage and the Empire’s composite nationalities. These sentiments were echoed by the Australian historian, Les Carlyon, who remarked that at Gallipoli, "Turkey realised what it meant to be fighting for survival as a nation. Thus, for both [Australia and Turkey], the Gallipoli experience had much to do with nation building".²

In similarly positioning Gallipoli as a moment of transition, Carlyon went further to identify a distinctly Turkish Republican – rather than Ottoman imperial – identity that prevailed at Gallipoli. "The Ottoman Empire was old and tired and worn out", he said "but the Gallipoli battles proved the Turkish people were not".³ Carlyon allied the assertion of such a distinct Turkish character at Gallipoli with speculation about the relationship of the campaign to the establishment of the Turkish Republic; "How relevant was the mood created by success at..." ¹⁷⁴
Gallipoli to the later victory in the War of Independence?" said Carlyon, "Was the Turkish republic born here or in Ankara?".4

Both speakers were keen to identify a link between Gallipoli, the forthcoming Independence War of 1919-23 and the formation of the Turkish Republic. In doing so, they identified the battles fought at Gallipoli with internal and external national movements. Gallipoli is positioned as a nationalistic defence of a Turkish homeland and a struggle for independence. Additionally, it is positioned as the site of the discovery of a modern Turkish identity. This framing of Gallipoli as a nationalist struggle rather than an imperial one has also permeated contemporary Turkish consciousness.5 As Kevin Fewster, Vecihi Başarın and Hatice Başarın suggest, in contemporary Turkish remembrance, the victory at Gallipoli has been adopted as a tool of specifically Turkish Republican nationalism rather than Ottoman imperialism and the original rationale for fighting the war – the religious inspired fight against the infidel – is rarely mentioned.6

In the artworks of the Turkish Republican period, Gallipoli is usually referenced in conjunction with the image of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk – divisional commander at Gallipoli, leader of the Turkish armies in the Independence War, and founder of the Turkish Republic. Rather than focus on the identity of the Turkish collective, they present Atatürk as an icon symbolic of the modern, secular Turkish state. The effect of this is multiplied by the fact that Atatürk’s representation in these works is almost uniformly copied from a catalogue of several famous poses of the military leader, drawn from photographic archives. These works, which invariably posit Atatürk as the saviour of the Turkish nation, were part of a strategy aimed at legitimizing the new Republic. As Esra Özyürek argues, Republican-era images of Atatürk represented him as the sole victor of the Independence War and sought to validate the position of the new president by imbuing him with a power analogous to the sultans whom he had replaced, but yet which was distinguished from the late nineteenth-century sultanate.7 This identification gained cultural valency throughout the twentieth century; "the cult of Atatürk gained further importance following the leader’s death in 1938", Özyürek writes, "turning the founder’s body into an immortal symbol of the nation".8

Nowhere is this characterisation more evident than in the Çanakkale War Panorama (fig. 47) at the Atatürk and the War of Independence Museum, which I briefly introduced at the beginning on this thesis. Here, the image of Atatürk forms the pinnacle of the immense work.9 From his position in the trench, he looks out confidently over the peninsula, his gaze
and pose representing him as the architect of the Gallipoli defence and Turkish independence. The representation of the gaze of Atatürk was a key metaphor through which the legitimacy of the new state is expressed in Republican-era art. Özyürek suggests that the authoritarianism displayed in this gaze is a visual metaphor for the personal power of the Ottoman sultans, transplanted onto an image of the new Republic. The colossal size of the panorama is itself a reflection of the Republican state’s ability to project cultural power. Yet in spite of the overarching expression of authoritarianism inherent in this depiction of Atatürk, through the structuring of the panorama as an interactive space, a role is left for the viewer to symbolically participate in the creation of the nation by imagining themselves as a soldier in the battle simultaneously playing the dual roles of national
saviour participating in the creation of the Turkish nation; and citizen of the Republic, protected by Atatürk and his nationalistic vision.

However, this framing of Gallipoli solely in Republican nationalistic terms reductively views the Gallipoli campaign in hindsight as part of a continuum that includes the Independence War and the establishment of the Turkish republic. The preceding chapters have, in part, explored the manner in which Australian war art of the First World War validated the arrival of a new national identity. However, in spite of contemporary rhetoric, it would be a mistake to read contemporaneous Turkish paintings of Gallipoli in the same light as, for the Turkish people, the First World War was primarily a struggle to maintain control of the Ottoman Empire and solidify its position against European imperial machinations, not a nationalist movement to emancipate them from an empire in which they were the ruling cultural and ethnic group.

The danger of an anachronistic reading of early Turkish paintings of Gallipoli is revealed in Ali Cemal Benim’s painting Biraz Su/Yaralı Düşman Askerine Yardım Eden Türk Askeri (hereafter A Little Water/Wounded Enemy) (1917, fig. 48), which depicts a Turkish cavalryman offering water and assistance to a wounded Allied soldier. Here the Turk has dismounted to help the wounded man, an act that emphasises his compassion by representing him on the same level as his enemy. A staged propaganda photograph, published on 22 December 1915 in The Sydney Mail, made a similar claim for the humanity of the Anzac soldier. In the photograph, an Australian soldier kneels down to administer aid to a wounded Turk. In hindsight, from the position of the twenty-first century observer, it is tempting to read Benim’s painting as an expression of camaraderie between enemies that has since become an essential part of the Australian Gallipoli myth. As Mete Tuncoku suggests, this humanising element of the campaign is an important factor in contemporary Turkish remembrance. However, this approach would be to project contemporary social and political motivations onto a cultural tradition that had yet to form. Benim’s painting lacks the iconic link to the Australian soldier identity that is a necessary factor in the contemporary Gallipoli myth; a conflagration of the generalised British soldier depicted here with the specificities of the Anzac tradition would be to misread both the intention of the artist and the cultural context of the painting’s production. The pose of the wounded Allied soldier in A Little Water/Wounded Enemy was taken from an earlier study by Benim entitled simply Yaralı Asker (Wounded Soldier) (1917, fig. 49), in which the artist’s impressionistic impasto further distances the figure from any specific representation of a cultural identity.
Despite the overt theme of compassion in *A Little Water/Wounded Enemy* that was intended to humanise the image of the Ottoman army, Benim subtly composes the image so that the Turkish soldier maintains an immense position of power over the wounded man. Despite having dismounted, the Turk still towers over the Allied soldier, who lies at his feet. The notion of fighting cavalry on the battlefields of Gallipoli is itself a fiction, yet it adds a
sense of grandeur and chivalry to the Turkish soldier that is accented by Benim's composition. More than simply an image of camaraderie between enemies, Ali Cemal Benim's image speaks of a present and continuing struggle for cultural power in a contest of empires.

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Ottoman Empire had been engaged in a struggle for legitimacy. Recent Ottoman histories have sought to place the late Ottoman state within the context of wider political and cultural discourses. As Selim Deringil suggests, the Ottoman Empire had been fighting a battle for legitimacy on two fronts, internally and externally. Externally, he suggests, there was a struggle to secure acceptance of the Ottoman state as a legitimate polity in the international system, particularly against the great European powers of England, Russia, Germany and France. The nineteenth century had seen an erosion of Ottoman prestige that resulted in the secession of a number of Imperial territories, agitations amongst various ethnic minorities and a growing insolvency crisis that further allowed European intervention in the Ottoman state. Internally, Deringil argues, there existed a "legitimation deficit" that accrued as the state
intervened – physically and ideologically – in Ottoman society in order to maintain the image of the sultan. In order to counter this deficit, in the nineteenth century the Sublime Porte pursued a program of political, economic and military modernisation, beginning with the Gülhane edict of 1839 which led to the Tanzimat era, an empire-wide reform agenda that aimed to reshape the multi-ethnic components of the Ottoman Empire along the lines of European practices, under the banner of a unified Ottoman identity. As Kaya Özsengin remarks, modernisation became the primary strategy through which the Ottoman Empire sought to ensure its political and cultural survival; “for those who supported the new and modern ideas”, he writes, “the only way to rescue the Empire from its grave crisis was to Westernize it more. Westernization was a problem of continuity and not choice”. 13

The success of the Ottoman modernisation program was contingent not only upon large-scale institutional and industrial reform, but on the projection of the efficacy of such measures to a European public keen on an anachronistic imaging of the Ottoman Empire. This was achieved through a series of strategic incursions into European cultural discourse begun by the Ottoman government in the nineteenth century that included participation in the universal expositions as a means of cultural commentary. 14 These projects sought to rectify both the internal and external legitimation deficits of the Ottoman institution, by presenting an image of the Empire as the cultural and technological equal of the European powers, and by providing a framework for positioning a pan-Ottoman identity around a dominant Turkish heritage. 15

One such instance of this cultural projection was a travelling exhibition of Ottoman-Turkish paintings held in Vienna in 1918 (hereafter the Vienna Exhibition) (fig. 50) and planned for display in Berlin, that aimed to present a cross-section of Turkish cultural and military achievements. Comprising 142 works from 19 artists across a range of genres and styles – including works by military painters, European-trained Turkish artists and Abdülmejid, the last caliph of Islam – it simultaneously constituted the first ever international exhibition of modern Turkish painting and the last Ottoman imperial cultural project. Conceived of by Ottoman military authorities as a propagandistic tool, it was specifically designed to refute European stereotypes of the Ottoman Empire and improve its image with its allies in Europe. Given the historical context of its production, the intended venues for the exhibition take on additional significance in an evaluation of its cultural significance. Though the exhibition venue was determined in a large part by Austria and Germany being the
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Ottoman Empire's principle European allies during the war, the tensions between these three nations must be considered in an analysis of the strategic value of the project. As a wartime exhibition, the primary focus of the Vienna Exhibition was a display of Ottoman military strength. To this end, paintings of the victory at Gallipoli in particular were commissioned for the exhibition and a special studio in Şişli, Istanbul was established for this purpose (fig. 51). As such, images of the Gallipoli campaign formed a considerable focus of the collection and became a critical component of an Ottoman imperial project. The Turkish victory at Gallipoli is easily seen as a fulcrum between Ottoman Empire and Turkish Republic. Some recent scholarship has begun to focus on the wider political consequences of the Gallipoli campaign, viewing it with respect to imperial motivations and the post-war creation of nation states. However, little attention has been paid to Gallipoli's role in fortifying the image of the late Ottoman Empire. Though some commentary on the Şişli Studio and Vienna Exhibition exists within Turkish art history, neither have been critically placed within the wider context of other Ottoman sources of resistance to European cultural hegemony. While Turkish historians have begun to catalogue the works of the artists who participated in the exhibition, little critical visual analysis examining the cultural significance of their themes to the development of Turkish modernism exists. In addition, in spite of the importance of the Gallipoli campaign to Australian history, Turkish representations of the conflict remain unknown to Australian historical studies. In this chapter I place the Vienna Exhibition within the context of other late-Ottoman strategies of image projection. In doing so, I show how the Gallipoli conflict was mobilised within late Ottoman era art as a tool for cross-cultural exchange and the projection of an Ottoman image that counteracted and resisted perceived prejudices against the Ottoman Empire.

THE ŞİŞLİ STUDIO AND THE VIENNA EXHIBITION

The onset of the First World War represented a fresh challenge to the legitimacy of the Ottoman polity, but one that afforded a unique opportunity to simultaneously unite fractious elements of Empire and refute foreign cultural and political challenges through propaganda. At the beginning of the war, Ottoman authorities were slow to mobilise propaganda, both as a tool of cultural warfare and in support of their military campaigns. Erol Körüğlu argues that this delay was in part due to the effects of the repressive pre-war regime of Abdülhamid II (r.1876-1909), in which rigid state censorship had resulted in the
stunting of any unified press, and in part because modern printing and visual media were still relatively new to Ottoman society. However, the conflict at Gallipoli necessitated a response from the Ottoman authorities, who were unable to hide the battle from the public, as they did earlier disasters at Sankamış and the Suez Canal.

The victory at Gallipoli offered the Ottoman Empire an opportunity to rectify its image abroad, as it represented its first decisive victory over the more technologically advanced militaries of England, France and their allies. However, the genre of war art was almost non-existent in Turkey at that stage of the war, a fact that did not go unnoticed by the Turkish press. In the 89th issue of Türk Yurdu published in 1915, the editors of the magazine expressed disapproval of the fact that war scenes comprised only a minority of Turkish paintings. Thus, in order to generate war-themed artworks, in 1915 the Turkish General Staff Headquarters Intelligence Office organised a trip for Turkish writers, artists and musicians to the Gallipoli battlefront, that included the writers Ağaoğlu Ahmet, Ali Canip, Celal Sahir, Enis Behiç, Hakkı Suha, Hamdullah Suphi, Hifzi Tevfik, Muhittin, Orhan Seyfi, Selahattin, Yusuf Razi, Mehmet Emin, Ömer Seyfetting, İbrahim Alaeddin and Müfit Ratip, the musician Ahmet Yekta and the painters İbrahim Çalli and Nazım Ziya. According to the invitations issued by the Intelligence Office, the role of these artists was to produce "real descriptions concerning the quality of the soldiers and the ability of the population".

The works of art and literature that resulted from this expedition were limited and slow in appearing and thus had little effect as wartime propaganda. As the war progressed, new media outlets emerged that allowed the Ottoman government to distribute propaganda material. The most prominent of these was the publication Harp Mecmuası, a journal whose aim was to publish photographs that would laud the achievements of the state and the army. Published by the General Staff Headquarters Intelligence Office between November 1915 and June 1918, it became the most successful source of Ottoman visual propaganda. However, such outlets had a limited, intra-empire scope. As a remedy to the limited reach of existing military propaganda, the Ottoman General Staff planned an international art exhibition to be held in Vienna and Berlin that was designed to project a positive image of the Ottoman Empire to an external audience of its European allies Austria and Germany.

The Vienna Exhibition played an important role in the maintenance of relations between the Ottoman Empire and its allies. The German relationship with the Ottoman Empire had become increasingly strong throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, especially during the reign of Abdülhamid II, and involved a complex arrangement of military
alliances and economic and political interests. Close military ties between Germany and the Ottoman Empire began in 1830, when Prussian military advisers were sent to Constantinople, a military commitment that was strengthened with the arrival by 1870 of German engineers and surveyors, the increase of German officer advisers in the Ottoman army in 1882, and the 1913 appointment of a large retinue of German officers headed by General Liman von Sanders. Military ties with the Ottoman Empire were strengthened by the 1898 visit of Wilhelm II to Abdülmehmet II at which he assured the Sultan that Muslims could count on the friendship of the German nation.

However, though they possessed close military ties, as Ulrich Trumpener argues, prior to 1914 Germany's chief interest in the Ottoman Empire was economic:

Germany's Turkish policies had only one discernible constant, namely the advancement (and protection) of German investments in, and trade with, the Ottoman Empire, while on all other issues Berlin's position was and remained flexible.

Germany held great economic interests in the Ottoman Empire that ranged from treasury loans to arms and industrial manufacturing contracts, and these interests expanded during the late nineteenth century with the construction of the Berlin to Baghdad railway. The expansion of Germany's involvement was seen as deliberately provocative to other European nations who had interests in Ottoman Empire and in the early twentieth century assisted in the further alienation of the Ottoman Empire from the entente powers. Indeed to some extent this was one of the Ottoman Government's aims in allying with Germany. As Feroz Ahmad argues, by turning to Germany the Ottoman Empire aimed to counter the Russian threat and decrease its reliance on British and French political and economic support.

However, in spite of the strength of the economic and military connections between Germany and the Ottoman Empire, tensions and misgivings existed between the two powers concerning the ability of the Ottoman army. Throughout pre-war years many German military leaders did not consider the Ottoman military sufficiently trained or equipped for a modern European war. Military relations cooled after Austria-Hungary's 1909 annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, for which the Ottomans held Berlin partially responsible. Furthermore, even after a military alliance was signed with the Ottoman Empire on 2 June 1914, the German Government, concerned by the program of forced
deportation of Armenians commenced by the Ottoman government in 1915, became reluctant to commit to a fully-fledged military support of the Ottoman army.

Additionally, relations between the Ottoman Empire and Austria-Hungary were not as cordial as those with Germany, and their military alliance, secured after that with Germany, was less secure. As F.R. Bridge argues, although the interests of the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires seemed aligned and there was a certain necessity in their alliance in the historical context, there were many territorial and economic tensions between the two powers.24 Though they were allies during the First World War, Gábor Ágoston has argued that since the sixteenth century, a long-standing rivalry had existed between the Ottoman Empire and Habsburg Austria that was expressed through the maintenance of religious identity and the advertisement of military victories, which were employed as leverage in the projection of competing visions of empire.25

In the early twentieth century, relations between the Ottoman Empire and Austria-Hungary were frayed by a number of incidents. Franz Joseph, Emperor of the Austro-Hungarian Empire until 1916, had no particular liking for the Young Turk regime, and his Empire’s annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina resulted in a rapid deterioration of relations. Though Austria offered compensation to the Ottoman Empire, they were punished by a boycott of Austrian goods and the deliberate discrimination against Austrian advisers in the appointment of military attaches to the Ottoman army and navy. Austrian-Ottoman relations were further damaged by the Italian and Ottoman dispute over Tripoli in 1912, in which year Austria-Hungary declined an offer for alliance with the Ottoman Empire. Though Austria-Hungary eventually signed an alliance, as an acceding party to the German-Ottoman treaty, it was with the insistence that if the alliance were to continue after the war, the conditions of Austria-Hungary’s obligations would be closely regulated by a separate military convention.

The planned Vienna and Berlin exhibitions thus afforded an important opportunity to the Ottoman Empire to fortify their relations with their European allies in an attempt to secure their continued military support. The person responsible for the organisation of the project was a man named Celal Esad Arseven – a soldier, artist, art historian, architect, writer, patron, councillor and professor, who, at the outbreak of war was the mayor of Istanbul’s Kadıköy district. Arseven was himself a product of the Ottoman Westernisation program and the educational reforms to the military college system. Born in Istanbul in 1875 to Müşir Ahmet Paşa, a government official, he attended first Beşiktaş Military School before
graduating from Harbiye Military College in 1894. While there he studied painting and drawing under such artists as Hoca Ali Riza and Fausto Zonaro. In 1908, at the behest of Sultan Abdülhamid II, he was sent to Europe to further pursue his artistic studies, leaving the army to focus on his art. He returned to Istanbul at the beginning of the war, where he assumed the role of Mayor of Kadiköy district. After the formation of the Turkish Republic he served as Professor of Architecture and Municipal Planning at the Istanbul Fine Arts Academy from 1924-1941. Between 1943 and 1954 he published a five-volume art encyclopaedia and wrote extensively on Turkish art.

Arseven was a pivotal figure in Turkish art history, being the first prominent scholar to present Turkish art within a wider historical context. In doing so, he was particularly focused on an exploration of the genesis and development of modern Turkish styles, seeking to establish prehistoric central Asian and Anatolian civilisations as the progenitors of Turkish art and architecture, which then spread to Europe and Asia. Having himself had a European artistic education, Arseven was conscious of the European influence on modern Turkish art. However, while acknowledging modern Turkish art’s debt to its influences, he maintained the position that despite its composite influences, Turkish art retained a distinct cultural identity:

It is important not to misunderstand the term “originality”. There is no art that is born out of itself alone and is completely unique… Undoubtedly, Turkish art, too, bears certain elements and influences of others. Yet in its evolution is has never lost the Turkish character of its origins.

This is in spite of the significant shift in interpretive attitudes and artistic freedom that Turkish art experienced after the adoption of western Modernist styles. Günsel Renda, in particular, argues that the development of western techniques broke the traditional visual schemes of Turkish Islamic art and allowed for the development of personal style and the emergence of dramatic narrative in Turkish painting. Nevertheless, Arseven maintained that Turkish painting was able to keep a unique voice throughout the modernisation process. “Turkish art is completely different from [other Asian styles] in the simplicity of its composition, its restraint from exaggeration, and the harmony and logic of its forms”, he wrote;

It is a grave mistake of Europeans to classify Turkish art as a small branch of Islamic art. No other art among the arts of Islamic
countries are as noble as Turkish art. As in the history of civilisation, in the history of art as well, Turks have been denied their rightful place for so long. 30

With respect to the Turkey’s engagement with European cultural discourse, he was particularly critical of the tendency of European audiences to homogenise Eastern voices into a generic Eastern identity, rather than identifying the specificities of each culture’s heritage. Arseven was especially conscious of the Western gaze and its reductive categorisation of Turkish art. Speaking in particular of the representation of Islamic architecture at international expositions he recorded that:

Today, with the exception of those closely engaged with art and architecture, Europeans cannot see the differences between the characters of various domes and minarets of the orient and the world of Islam. In their minds, there is an imaginary orient composed of Iranian minarets, Syrian domes, Magribi arches, and Egyptian decoration. In the recent exhibition pavilions in Europe and America, it is possible to see an Egyptian masharabbiya on a Turkish house, or an Iranian minaret next to a Moroccan dome. It is not unusual to see the decorative motifs of Islamic countries all jumbled together, such as the geometric decoration of the Arab next to the Rumi and Hayati motifs of the Turk. 31

In planning the Vienna Exhibition, Arseven aimed to counter the homogenising ethnographic categorisations that had been a feature of the world’s fairs. Designing the exhibition specifically for a European audience, his intention was to present an image of the Ottoman Empire that paraded its modernising efforts, but retained a distinct sense of cultural identity. His method for achieving this was through a cross-section of the cultural achievements of the Ottoman Empire, depicted through modern Turkish painting.

As Ussama Makdisi argues, the strategy of projecting a pan-Ottoman identity through a Turkish cultural voice was as much intended as a projection of cultural power within the Ottoman Empire as it was an act of resistance to Western cultural imperialism. 32 Makdisi argues that the process of engagement with the Western Orientalist discourse entailed the creation of an ‘Ottoman Orientalist’ discourse with its own internal complexity. He suggests that a construction of difference between modern and pre-modern cultures analogous to Western Orientalist conceptions of the difference between East and West emerged within the Ottoman Empire. Such a construction sought to distinguish between included and
excluded conceptions of Ottoman cultural heritage. This form of Ottoman Orientalism, Makdisi argues, reflected the rise of a specifically Turkish sensibility as the dominant element of a westernized, Islamic Ottoman nationalism:

Through efforts to study, discipline, and improve imperial subjects, Ottoman reform created a notion of the pre-modern within the empire in a manner akin to the way European colonial administrators represented their colonial subjects. This process culminated in the articulation of a modern Ottoman Turkish nation that had to lead the empire's other putatively stagnant ethnic and national groups into an Ottoman modernity. Islam in this vein served to signify the empire's commonality with the Muslim majority of its subjects, but this commonality was implicitly and explicitly framed within a civilisational and temporal discourse that ultimately justified Ottoman Turkish rule over Muslim and non-Muslim subjects.  

The creation of domains of 'otherness' within the Ottoman Empire itself was part of a modernising process that sought to position the empire as equal to the West in terms of power and progress, but culturally distinct. In this project, Makdisi claims, "Ottoman reform distinguished between a degraded Oriental self... and the Muslim modernized self represented largely... by an Ottoman Turkish elite who ruled the late Ottoman empire".  

Arseven's exhibition followed this model in that it consciously reflected a modernised Ottoman image projected by a Turkish cultural elite. Approaching Şeyfi Paşa, the head of Ottoman intelligence, with his idea, he was commissioned to write a report examining the feasibility of the project. Arseven returned the finding that paintings of a military nature, presented to a European audience would have a beneficial propagandistic effect. However, he was further convinced that the most effective means of achieving a change in international opinion was by including them as a subset of other cultural achievements of the Empire. Şeyfi assented to the idea of a cultural cross-section, however insisted that some works of a military nature were essential. Although some works of a military nature depicting the First World War existed – Ali Cizel for example had painted a series of watercolour paintings of the daily life of Turkish soldiers while he served under Mustafa Kemal's command at Gallipoli during the battles – such examples were scarce. In response, the Turkish general staff founded a studio at Şişli in Istanbul in order to produce war-themed works for the exhibition.
There remains some contention as to the site where the studio was founded. It has been suggested that the studio was built in the garden of the Talimhane at Taksim at the request of Abdülmecid and on the orders of Enver Paşa. Other accounts locate the studio in Şişli, but list Enver Paşa as the founder. However, according to Ahmet Kamil Gören, whose work remains the most authoritative account of the formation of the studio and exhibition, the studio was founded by Şeyfi Paşa on a derelict site in the Bulgarian Market at Şişli, a fact corroborated by Harika Lifij, who contributed eight works to the Vienna Exhibition. At Seyfi Paşa’s direction, the studio was constructed in the image of a battlefield. The studio itself consisted of a large hanger-like building with a glass roof, around which faux trenches were dug to simulate a wartime landscape. To this simulated battlefield were added appropriate accoutrements of war. Models dressed in the uniforms of the Gallipoli campaign were brought to the studio, along with other more eclectic items such as artillery wagons, horses, weapons and other war paraphernalia. The goal behind this recreation was to provide the artists with the most authentic visual material available in order to lend the appearance of authenticity to representations of the Ottoman military in the paintings. As such, the Şişli Studio became an artistic space in which history was to not only be recorded, but staged.

The artists enlisted for the project – Mehmet Ruhi Arel, Ali Cemal Benim, Namik Ismail, İbrahim Çali, Hikmet Onat, Sami Yetik and Ali Sami Boyar – formed the core of what was to become known as the ‘Generation of 1914’ (or the Çali generation, such was that artist’s influence). Together with Feyhamman Duran (who did not exhibit war-themed works at the Vienna Exhibition and Nazmi Ziya (who did not participate in the Vienna Exhibition or Şişli studio), this group of artists are considered the first Turkish modernists. All of them studied in Europe and on their return to Turkey, brought back with them European techniques and artistic attitudes. Though the Generation of 1914 worked primarily in a late Impressionistic style, many of them received academic instruction in French ateliers. It was with this experience that many of them approached the establishment of painting classes at the Istanbul Fine Arts Academy; Çali, Onat, Duran, Ismail and Lifij all taught at the school.

The First World War was therefore a catalyst for the development of Turkish modernist painting, as in 1914 the war forced this first generation of Turkish modernists to return to Istanbul from France, where they began work on Turkish subjects. The organisation of the Şişli Studio thus not only gave rise to the first international exhibition of Turkish painting, it was the first project to unify the work of the Turkish modernists. Although the works produced in the studio were of a specifically war-themed nature, the artists were
nevertheless free to employ a variety of approaches. This, in combination with the inclusion of their other, non-military works, meant that the Vienna Exhibition became an important moment in Turkish modernism that brought together the developing strands of new artistic languages.

Extraordinarily, the war paintings were completed in a matter of months, and were shown as part of an exhibition entitled “War Paintings and Other Works” at the Galatasaray Salon in December 1917. In May 1918 a total of 142 works were sent to Vienna, whereby the exhibition, held at the Vienna University, was opened by the Archduke. After the exhibition closed in Vienna the works were intended to be taken to Berlin for a similar exhibition, but in September 1918 roads through the Balkans were closed and the artists and works were left in Vienna. What followed was a series of unfortunate disasters for the works. Arsevan had colour half-tones of the pictures prepared for an exhibition book, but these were lost and no money was available to make a replacement. Although a catalogue of 56 paintings was later published, many pictures from the exhibition remain unidentified and their whereabouts are unknown, although some of the Vienna paintings were purchased for the Elvah-i Nakşîye collection and others found their way into the collections of Turkish institutions such as the Harbiye Military Museum and the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture.  
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CULTURAL PROPAGANDA AT THE VIENNA EXHIBITION

As an article of state-sponsored propaganda, the Vienna Exhibition had a progenitor in a late nineteenth century photographic collection known as the Abdülhamid II Albums. This collection of 1,819 photographs in 51 albums formed the most impressive component of the Ottoman Empire’s contribution to the 1893 Columbian Exposition. The aim of the collection was to present the Ottoman Empire’s cultural sovereignty and technological advancements to an international audience. The albums covered three main categories: landscape photographs portrayed Turkey as a picturesque and fertile land, which was put to both agricultural and recreational purposes. Byzantine and Turkish historical monuments showed the Ottoman Empire as an old and culturally rich society with long-standing traditions. However, by far the largest category of photographs was that of the modernization and industrialization of nineteenth-century Turkey. These pictures covered not only the burgeoning industrial centres and military advancements of the empire, but the educational reforms that were instigated in the late nineteenth century, at all levels from primary through to tertiary. According to Zeynep Çelik, the albums clearly “drew the image of the empire according to the conceptions of its ruling elite”. As such, they attempted to transform the nineteenth-century image of the Ottoman Empire from the ‘sick man of Europe’ to that of a rejuvenated and modern polity.

Many of the albums were dedicated to displaying the industrial and military advances of the Ottoman Empire and the two subjects were often allied. The albums reflect a preoccupation with military training, depicting both Ottoman military capability and ambition. One album was dedicated to the Imperial School of Artillery and Civil Engineering. Other photographs depict armouries, naval ships and units on parade. These images announced a technologically reliant, highly trained, ambitious and strong military, a force which could compete with the Western powers on equal terms. Other industrial centres were depicted, showing foundries that produced the metal goods used in the construction of the Ottoman military weapons and equipment. Textile mills and chemical and rubber plants were also featured. While most of the photographs focused on Istanbul and few featured areas outside Turkey, enough scope was given to other portions of the Ottoman Empire to suggest that the Sultan’s efforts at modernization were widespread and effective.
The paintings displayed at the Vienna Exhibition followed an analogous pattern to the photographs of the Abdülhamid II Albums, and the centrepiece of the collection, Abdülmecid’s Haremde Beethoven (hereafter Beethoven in the Palace) (1915, fig. 52), hints at the exhibition’s aspirations towards cultural engagement. In Abdülmecid’s painting, the musicians playing Beethoven for the Caliph in his palace evince an Ottoman society conscious of European cultural history. The ekphrastic inclusion of the composer’s image in the form of a portrait bust heightens this cultural consciousness. That the painter has placed it alongside his self-portrait, which necessarily possesses a greater vitality in spite of his seated position, hints at a cross-cultural engagement that is active rather than merely mimetic or reactionary.

Abdülmecid’s painting presents a civilised and socially engaged self-image. This humanised view of the Eastern man was far removed from Western stereotypes of the Eastern despot popularised by Delacroix’s Death of Sardanapalus (1827), which cast the Eastern man as a jealous, insecure patriarch and an irrational tyrant. This Eastern identity was matched by a stereotype of the Oriental mind, which was characterised as lazy, unindustrious and
anachronistic, the antithesis of the modern European character. Of the Eastern mind, Lord Cromer wrote that:

Accuracy is abhorrent to the Oriental mind... Want of accuracy, which easily degenerates into untruthfulness, is in fact the main characteristic of the Oriental mind. The European is a close reasoner, his statements of fact devoid of any ambiguity.44

The works of the Vienna Exhibition refuted this stereotype by displaying the cultural products of a modern Ottoman Empire that spoke in the same visual language as its Western counterparts. The military works in particular offered the image of the Turkish soldier as a representative for the modern Ottoman state.

Like Abdülmecid’s Beethoven in the Palace, Hikmet Onat’s Gallipoli painting Siperde Mektup Oyan Askerler (Soldiers Reading a Letter in a Trench) (1917, fig. 53) attempted to reconfigure notions of Turkish cultural character, in this case by imbuing the image of the soldier with a psychological character that opposed stereotypical Orientalist conceptions. Onat’s painting carefully constructs an image of the Turkish character in which the intellect is reserved an almost spiritual place. The composition is structured around a subtle linkage of figures that creates a sense of communal solidarity. Three soldiers gather around a fourth in a trench as he reads a letter from home. Their poses are peaceful, even reverent, as they divert their attention from battle in a moment of respite. The reader is distinguished from his comrades by his white shirt and the visibility of his face, yet his face is not the central focal point. Like the eyes of his comrades his gaze leads down to the letter in his hands, illuminated by a shaft of light that penetrates the trench. Onat’s light makes the letter translucent; it glows as it draws the attention of the viewer as well as the protagonists.

Onat’s preparation sketches for the work show the changes he made in order to emphasise the harmony of this group. In his original studies (fig. 54), both the reader and the sitting soldier have their rifles slung across their laps, which would have had the effect of creating a set of parallel lines that disrupted the compositional flow from figure to figure. In addition, the legs of the reader were opened up and squared on to the viewer in the final painting, which opens up the composition to allow the reader to be more easily introduced to the pictorial space. The size of the letter was itself dramatically increased, giving the act more prominence in the scene. Onat’s final composition humanises the soldiers by not only avoiding bombastic wartime representation, but in displaying a group of men deeply
FIGURE 53: HIKMET ONAT, *SIPERDE MEKTUP OYAN ASKERLER* (SOLDIERS READING A LETTER IN A TRENCH), OIL ON CANVAS, 150 X 124 CM, ISTANBUL MUSEUM OF PAINTING AND SCULPTURE.
FIGURE 54: HIKMET ONAT, SİPERDE MEKTUP (LETTER IN THE TRENCH), 1917, PENCIL ON PAPER, EDİP ONAT COLLECTION.
FIGURE 55: HİKMET ONAT IN THE ŞİŞLI STUDIO, PHOTOGRAPH: ARCHIVE OF PROF. ADNAN ÇOKER.
interested, in and engaged with, news of events outside their present situation: compassionate, thinking, community-minded and bound by a sense of camaraderie.

In addition to the immediate spatial relationship between the figures, the artist builds into the work a wider sense of cultural communication. A space is left between the two soldiers in the foreground of the work; though this functions compositionally to allow a view of the reading soldier, it encourages the viewer to identify themselves as a fourth listener in the scene. A photograph of the artist finishing the work in the Şişli Studio (fig. 55) illustrates this intended viewing position, but discloses a second, unintentional meaning. That Onat has been captured at this critical position with brush and palette in hand reveals the artist’s role as the facilitator of cultural communication. Though the ostensible subject of Onat’s scene is an intra-group communiqué, the intended audience of the painting was a European public unaccustomed to such a privileged view. Such was the essence of the Vienna Exhibition – it was a challenge to its European audience to re-contextualise traditional conceptions of Ottoman identity, using the victory at Gallipoli to present a repositioned Turkish image.

Of the Vienna Exhibition collection, many of the paintings revealed the influence of European Modernist styles in their representations of Ottoman society. Feyhanman Duran’s seascape Genel Haliç’ten (The General in the Golden Horn) (1916), Hikmest Onat’s seascape Limanda (At the Harbour) (1917, fig. 56) and Namik Ismail’s landscape Evening (c.1917) borrow heavily from French Impressionism in both their technique and subject matter. In Harijka Lifij’s Harmony (c.1917), an Ottoman building in the background intrudes on a Post-Impressionistic landscape that is indebted for its composition and symbolism to Cézanne. A similar Post-Impressionistic pictorial influence is present in her İlahlar Eğleniyor (Gods Playing) (c.1915, fig. 57), which also reveals an interest in Graeco-Roman mythology. Several works appropriate European Modernist techniques in order to represent a distinctive Islamic heritage. With a focus on architectural and decorative detail, Şevket Dağ’s paintings Ayasofya Narteksi (St. Sophia’s Narthex) (c.1917) and Rüstem Paşa Camii (Rüstem Paşa Mosque) (c.1917) re-present a traditional Western Orientalist theme from the position of a cultural insider. Unsurprisingly however, the major focus of the paintings at the Vienna Exhibition were paintings of war, predominantly intended to project an image of Ottoman military strength and Turkish heroism in order to position the Ottoman Empire as the military equal of the Allied nations against whom they were engaged. However, some of the paintings did not simply portray the Ottoman Empire in the heroic mode. Instead, the artists
FIGURE 56: HIKMET ONAT, LIMANDA, (AT THE HARBOUR), C.1917, OIL ON CANVAS, 79.5 X 90 CM, ISTANBUL MUSEUM OF PAINTING AND SCULPTURE.

FIGURE 57: HARIKA LİFİ, İHLARLAR EĞLENİYOR, (GODS PLAYING), C.1915, OIL ON CANVAS, 145 X 90 CM, PRIVATE COLLECTION.
preserved a distinct sense of the spiritual and cultural identity of the Islamic Ottoman Empire.

A number of the paintings exhibited in Vienna aimed to redress the power imbalance between the European powers and the Ottoman Empire by valorising the Ottoman military victory at Gallipoli over their technologically superior enemies. In so doing, they sought to counter the image of the East as technological anachronism. Late nineteenth-century European paintings of the Ottoman military often focused on romanticised elements of the Ottoman past – such as the famed Janissaries who had long since been disbanded, but who, due to their exotic costumes and fierce reputations, remained a focus for the Orientalist fantasy as much as the image of the languid odalisque. Nineteenth and early twentieth-century images of the Ottoman military – in particular the Ottoman navy – consciously aimed to project an image of a modernised military that contradicted this anachronistic identification. Within the Abdülhamid II Albums, the modernising Ottoman navy was a conspicuous focus, with photographs of ships accompanied by others featuring dockyards and ammunition factories. One photograph in particular displayed naval drills on the imperial frigate Hamidie, which demonstrated a modern military pedagogy to accompany an updated arsenal. Given that many of the early Ottoman painters were naval officers, paintings of the Ottoman navy occupy a place of special significance within images of the Ottoman Empire. The close relationship between the uptake of European painting styles and the establishment of painting schools within Ottoman military colleges resulted in the recording of Ottoman naval ships throughout the nineteenth century functioning as a tacit chronology of a major aspect of Ottoman modernisation. As such, the image of the battleship took on symbolic significance within the Ottoman modernisation process as a yardstick against which its power, relative to the great European naval powers could be measured. It is no surprise therefore that the sea battles of 18 March that preceded the Gallipoli campaign became a point of particular focus of Turkish paintings of Gallipoli.

In the Vienna Exhibition, Diyarbakırli Tahsin contributed naval-themed works that sought to reposition the power of the Ottoman navy. In his Barbaros ve Turgut Reis (hereafter Barbaros and Turgut) (c.1917, fig. 58), Turkish ships are depicted steaming safely through stormy seas, a familiar motif in Ottoman naval paintings. Though the ships that Tahsin represented, built and launched by the German navy in 1891 and then later sold to the Ottoman fleet, were by that time approaching technological obsolescence, their inclusion symbolically references an earlier period in which the Ottoman navy was the dominant
FIGURE 58: DIYARBAKALI TAHSIN, BARBAROS VE TURGUT REIS (BARBAROS AND TURGUT), C.1917, WATERCOLOUR ON PAPER, SIZE AND LOCATION UNKNOWN.

FIGURE 59: DIYARBAKALI TAHSIN, FRANSIZ KRUVAZÖRÜ BOUVE’NIN ÇANAKKALE ÖNÜNDE BATIŞI (THE SINKING OF THE FRENCH CRUISER BOUVE IN FRONT OF ÇANAKKALE), 1917, OIL ON CANVAS, 142 X 96 CM, ISTANBUL NAVAL MUSEUM.
force in the Mediterranean. The ship Barbaros was named after the famous Turkish corsair Barbaros Hayreddin Paşa, whose military success against European powers including Spain, Naples, Venice and the Holy Roman Empire saw him rise to the rank of Admiral of the Ottoman Fleet and Governor of the North African provinces of the empire. Likewise, the ship Turgut was named after the eponymous Turkish naval officer, who, after joining Barbaros’s fleet in 1520 as a lieutenant in command of 12 ships, succeeded him as the Supreme Commander of Ottoman forces in the Mediterranean and became the Governor of Algiers. Together, Barbaros and Turgut established an Ottoman dominance of the Mediterranean Sea that lasted until the Battle of Lepanto in 1571. As Molly Greene has argued, the Mediterranean was of special symbolic importance to the Ottoman empire; a frontier territory that shifted in character with the waxing and waning of Ottoman military strength. Greene asserts that during the period of Ottoman dominance, Ottoman control of the Mediterranean mimicked that of a land empire:

Through their naval victories the Ottomans did more than snuff out the last remnants of Latin power. They recreated, and even extended, the old imperial unity of the eastern Mediterranean that had been established by the Romans and maintained by the Byzantines.

The inclusion of Tahsin’s *Barbaros and Turgut* thus deflect conceptions of the Ottoman military as an impotent force by reference to the long-standing tradition of Ottoman influence over European powers in the Mediterranean.

Similarly, in his Fransız Kruvazörü Bouve'nin Çanakkale Önünde Batışı (hereafter *The Sinking of the French Cruiser Bouvet in front of Çanakkale*) (1917, fig. 59), Tahsin links the Gallipoli conflict to this tradition of Ottoman naval power. During the heyday of Ottoman naval strength, the town of Gallipoli had been a main naval base from which territorial control over the Dardanelles straights had been exerted. In *The Sinking of the French Cruiser Bouvet in front of Çanakkale*, Tahsin frames the 18 March battle in the Dardanelles straights as a moment of military and cultural resistance. As Fewster, Başarın and Başarın suggest, the sea battle on 18 March 1915 has become a locus of the Turkish remembrance of the campaign. The Turkish name for the Gallipoli campaign, Çanakkale Savaşı, taken from the town situated on the Asiatic side of the straits, gives an indication as to the importance of the 18 March naval battle in the successful defence of Ottoman territory. The sinking of the Bouvet was of particular symbolic significance as it was the first major tactical victory won
by the Ottoman forces in the Gallipoli campaign, contributing heavily to their victory over the Allied navy on 18 March and the subsequent abandonment of the Allied attempt to force the straights through naval power. As such, recording the destruction of the French ship became a focal point not only during the battle itself, but in subsequent visual culture. Lieutenant Colonel Salahaddin Adil, a Turkish battery commander at Çanakkale, recorded in his diary that "when the Bouvet sank at two o'clock, it had a tremendous effect on everybody's morale, because it could be seen from all around. It became not only a rallying call on the day of the battle, but also a visible reminder that the Ottoman Empire was capable of matching a Western military in defence of its territory.

Tahsin's exhibited painting was developed in conjunction with a series of other naval paintings of the 18 March battle. In his Çanakkale Deniz Savaşı (The Çanakkale Naval Battle) (c.1917, fig. 60), he focuses on a broad seascape, showing the manoeuvres of the various Allied ships. In the same year, Ismail Hakki painted a similar work, titled Çanakkale Savaşı (The Çanakkale Battle) (c.1917, fig. 61). Though the composition and depiction of the various ships is highly reminiscent of Tahsin's painting, the breadth of vision is narrowed, the depth of field restricted, and more prominence given to the surrounding landscape of the peninsula, resulting in a scene that is more easily identified within its geographical context. In The Sinking of the French Cruiser Bouvet in front of Çanakkale, Tahsin captures the French ship at the beginning of its death throes as it begins to list, a gaping wound visible in its side. A comparison between the exhibited oil painting and a similar and earlier watercolour sketch by Hakki reveals the compositional devices employed by Tahsin to create emotive effect. Hakki's earlier sketch The Sinking of the Battleship Bouvet (1915, fig.e 62) lacks the dramatic impact of Tahsin's painting. There, the Bouvet sits higher in the water, angled slightly but without the terminal list of the later painting. In the sketch there is no visible damage to the ship; though lifeboats evacuate stranded sailors, the scene lacks the urgency of the later work. By contrast, The Sinking of the French Cruiser Bouvet in front of Çanakkale conveys a strong sense of temporal immediacy. The shells that land around the stricken ship send up blasts of water that are frozen mid-air; the torrent of water that gushes from the side of the vessel is similarly immobilised despite its great force. The temporary suspension of the ship's sinking creates a sense of tragic inevitability in the work that is heightened by the impotence of the allied ships in the background which are unable to aid the French ship. However, the power of the work is sub-textual; what Tahsin celebrates is not merely the battle itself, but the toppling of a technologically superior European invader.
FIGURE 60: DIVARBAKLı TLHSLN, ÇANAKKALE DENIZ SAVAŞI (THE ÇANAKKALE NAVAL BATTLE), C.1917, OIL ON CANVAS, 121 X 195 CM, ISTANBUL NAVAL MUSEUM.

FIGURE 61: İSMAIL HAKKI, ÇANAKKALE SAVAŞI (THE ÇANAKKALE BATTLE), 1915, OIL ON CANVAS, 121 X 97 CM, ISTANBUL MILITARY MUSEUM.
FIGURE 62: İSMAIL HAKKI, BOUVET ZIRHLISININ BATIŞI (THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP BOUVET), 1915, WATERCOLOUR ON PAPER, 48 X 30 CM, ISTANBUL NAVAL MUSEUM.

FIGURE 63: CEMAL TOLLU, 18 MART 1915 ZAFERİ (THE VICTORY OF 18 MARCH), 1949, OIL ON CANVAS, 250 X 180 CM, ISTANBUL NAVAL MUSEUM.
The symbolism of Tahsin’s painting was not lost upon other naval artists and the subject matter makes repeated appearances in later twentieth century Turkish military paintings. In Cemal Tollu’s 1949 work 18 Mart 1915 Zaferi (The Victory of 18 March) (1949, fig. 63), a conflagration of Tahsin’s The Çanakkale Naval Battle and The Sinking of the French Cruiser Bouvet in front of Çanakkale forms the basis for the battle scene that dominates the mid backgrounds. In Tollu’s Republican-era painting, a unified national effort is emphasised as the basis for the military victory. On the left, a team of artillerymen load and fire their gun, unified compositionally by a strong diagonal push that culminates in the tip of their gun. On the right, a group of nurses tend to a wounded soldier while an officer looks on; their group too is ordered by a corresponding diagonal. The symbol of the sinking Bouvet is positioned prominently at the apex of the intersection of these two compositional foci.

While naval paintings of the Gallipoli campaign formed an important segment of the exhibited works, the majority of the war paintings at the Vienna Exhibition depicted the Ottoman army. Some of them – in particular Ali Cemal Benim’s works Türk Savaşı (Turkish Cavalry) (1917), Maydos’tan (From Maidos), Yalak Yanında Atlı (Cavalry next to a Trough) (1917) and Ali Sami Boyar’s Borazancı (Bugler) (1917) – specifically focus on the uniforms and equipment of different types of Ottoman troops, identifying the soldiers as characteristically Ottoman, yet nevertheless modern warriors. In these paintings, the soldiers are divorced from an identifiable narrative, which discourages them from being read in the heroic mode. Instead, read as a collection, they form a pseudo-ethnographic catalogue of Ottoman military types.

In the grandest of the battlefield scenes, the artists of the Şişli Studio were keen to ally the campaign with a sense of unified effort, particularly through the motif of artillerymen, a familiar trope of Western military paintings. In Chapter One, I explored the symbolism of Lambert’s Across the Black Soil Planes, in which the motif of teamsters struggling against the environment symbolised the emergence of national character. Lambert’s motif was transposed specifically to First World War imagery by another Australian war artist, H. Septimus Power, in his painting Bringing up the Guns (1921, fig. 64), in which Power borrowed Lambert’s theme, substituting soldiers for teamsters. In Türk Topçuları (Turkish Artillerymen) (1917, fig. 65), Çallı employs a similar subject matter and compositional elements to Power’s later work, portraying a group of artillerymen not in the throes of battle, but transporting their guns en route. The bodies of the men and horses strain against the thick mud, which, because of Çallı’s impasto technique, possess a tactility that
FIGURE 64: H. SEPTIMUS POWER, *BRINGING UP THE GUNS*, 1921, OIL ON CANVAS, 147.3 X 233.7 CM, AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL, CANBERRA.

FIGURE 65: İBAHİM ÇALLI, *TÜRK TOPÇULARI (TURKISH ARTILLERYMEN)*, 1917, OIL ON CANVAS, 180 X 270 CM, ISTANBUL MUSEUM OF PAINTING AND SCULPTURE.
emphasises the protagonists' struggle. Çalli resists individual identification; though the soldiers are recognisable as Ottoman from their uniforms, their faces are for the most part obscured. By so doing, Çalli eschews a bombastic representation of individual heroism, rather focusing on a communal effort. As Lambert did in his war paintings, Çalli is careful to ally this physical effort with a sense of purposeful progression, indicated by the diagonal compositional construction of the work. The figures move both into and across the picture space, belying the sense that they are inextricably entrenched in the mud. Their movement towards a light on the horizon, coupled with the diagonal flow of the work, implies a reason for the struggle of the soldiers. Thus, Çalli is careful to build in a raison d'etre for the fighting of the war.

The motif of Turkish artillerymen was a particularly popular one with the artists of the Şişli studio. During his time in the studio Sami Yetik painted a similar work depicting the Gallipoli campaign, titled Changing the Front Line (1917, fig. 66), which echoes Çalli’s work in its diagonal compositional construction and its presentation of communal struggle. Like Çalli’s work, Yetik’s is imbued with a strong sense of the tactile, through thick, textured brushstrokes, so that the slow march of the soldiers through the mud is felt, rather than seen by the viewer. Like Çalli’s painting, none of the faces in Changing the Front Line are
visible. Instead, with the exception of one shadowed face inside the horsecart – whose almost entirely obscured face is positioned perpendicular to the flow of the work – the men all stare resolutely forward, ignoring even the distorted bodies of the dead men and horses by the road.

Yetik’s work thus reflects a solidarity that emphasises progression. Interestingly, none of the faces of the dead men are revealed. They are not glorified as martyrs or heroes, but rather appear as a pragmatic reminder of the consequences of war. It is possible to read their bodies as a fateful prolepsis for the men marching into the distance, yet although it is a macabre picture, there is no sense in which the soldiers move inevitably towards their deaths. They are changing the front line, rather than replacing it. It is a subtle distinction, but one that allows Yetik to imply, through the suggestion of communal effort and sacrifice, both a continuing and regenerating Ottoman Empire, protected and strengthened specifically by its Turkish population. Indeed this was a consistent theme running throughout all of Yetik’s works, across three wars – the Balkan War, the First World War and the War of Liberation. As Aksu writes, Yetik “viewed war as a struggle of the people, epitomised by a scene he painted several times – villagers pushing an ox cart loaded with ammunition up a slope”.53

Yetik was also able to bring a more visceral representation to the Vienna works through his first-hand experience of the battlefield. Like many of his Ottoman painter contemporaries, he was educated in the military system, first at the Küleli Military High School and then at the Harbiye War Academy, from which he graduated in 1898. After this he taught at the Eyüp Baytar School and from 1900-06 he studied at the Fine Arts Academy in Istanbul. Furthermore, in 1908 he was sent to Paris where he studied in the atelier of Jean-Paul Laurens. However, in 1912 Yetik was to obtain a more practical understanding of war when he served in the Ottoman Army in the Balkan war, as both a war artist as well as a soldier at the Edirne front. In the same year he was captured by the Bulgarians and interned in a prisoner-of-war camp in Sofia, where he was held for two years. Yetik contributed eight works to the Vienna Exhibition, three of which – The Battle of İsmail Tepe (1917), Hücuma Kalkış (1917) and During War (1917) – are Gallipoli battle scenes. Unfortunately, two of the three are now known only from their listing in the exhibition catalogue. Following the First World War, he visited the battlefields of the War of Liberation and continued to paint war-themed works in the Early Republican era. More than any other Turkish artist therefore,
Yetik served as a documentor of the history of the Ottoman and Turkish armies in the turbulent period that saw the transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic.

**ALTERNATIVE VISIONS OF WAR**

Despite the heroic mode of some of the Gallipoli paintings, alternative voices that display a variety of responses to the wartime experience both on and off the battlefield could be found at the Vienna Exhibition. These works belie the simplistic notion of Gallipoli as a nationalist Republican anacrusis. Instead they reveal a range of complex relationships between Gallipoli in particular, war in general, and wider Turkish society, religion and culture. The drawings of one soldier-artist in particular, Mehmet Ali Laga, complicate the themes of the Vienna Exhibition. Unlike the artists of the ‘Generation of 1914’, Laga was primarily a soldier. He was not sent to Europe to study painting technique and although during his military education he received lessons from artists such as Hoca Ali Riza, his knowledge of European techniques such as Impressionism was self taught. Graduating from the Harbiye Military Academy in 1898, Laga served as an infantry lieutenant and then a captain in the Imperial guard. Like Sami Yetik, he fought in the Balkan war, during which time he spent one and a half years as a prisoner in Sofia. During the Gallipoli conflict, he was posted to the town of Çanakkale, where he served on the staff of Cevat Paşa, the commander of the Dardanelles defenses. Although he did not fight on the Gallipoli peninsula, Laga nevertheless served within the sphere of the conflict and was able to observe the effects of the war on the surrounding towns. Between 1915 and 1918, he executed scores of watercolour and pencil sketches of Çanakkale and the Dardanelles region. Laga exhibited 9 sketches in the Vienna Exhibition, of which 7 remain unaccounted for, though in 1982 a series of 97 of his sketches were found and now reside in the Çanakkale Naval Museum. His Çanakkale works alternate between landscape and cityscapes and are executed with an objective, almost impassive eye for detail that, along with his familiarity with the region, lend Laga’s sketches a documentary quality missing from other Turkish works of the First World War.

Far from glorifying military victories or Turkish bravery, Laga’s works document the effects of war on the civilian population by tracking the Çanakkale landscape throughout the conflict. In his Çanakkale’dede Harabe (Ruin in Çanakkale) (1915, fig. 67), he reveals the
FIGURE 67: MEHMET ALI LAGA, ÇANAKKALE’DE HARABE (RUIN IN ÇANAKKALE), 1915, WATERCOLOUR ON PAPER, SIZE AND LOCATION UNKNOWN.

FIGURE 68: MEHMET ALI LAGA, ÇANAKKALE’DE CAMII (MOSQUE IN ÇANAKKALE), 1915, WATERCOLOUR ON PAPER, SIZE AND LOCATION UNKNOWN.
aftermath of a British artillery attack on the town. The scene is almost completely divorced from any action – no figures interrupt the cityscape and the artist distances it from any sense of narrative continuum. As such, though they document the effect of the war on the populace, Laga’s works are not easily appropriated as part of a nationalist ideology. Instead, they tacitly present a critique of war by focusing on its tragic results. Ruin in Çanakkale entails a sense of the picturesque in the rhythmic verticality of its chimneys and window frames, but there is no romanticism in Laga’s reporting of the ravages of war. Instead Laga’s pictures widen the scope to include the consequences of war on civilian life. Similarly, in his Çanakkale’de Camii (Mosque in Çanakkale) (1915, fig. 68) we view a shattered cityscape ruined by war, with the same sense of isolation and desolation present in Ruin in Çanakkale. What differs in this drawing is that in the centre of the work the mosque stands proudly undamaged, its defiant minaret a metaphor for the resilience not only of the Turkish people, but of Islam itself under the Ottoman Empire. This is a familiar theme within Laga’s oeuvre, and it was replicated within several of his wartime sketches of the town. By allying a sense of homeland with an image of Islam, Laga calls attention to the original religious motivations for fighting the war and announces the resilience of the Turkish cultural heritage.

Interestingly, the destruction of Çanakkale that Laga records mirrors an episode in the recent history of the town. In a memoir of his trip to Çanakkale, William Knight, a visitor to the town, recalled that:

Never shall I forget the scene I then witnessed. A fire had happened in the town in the summer of 1836, by which several of the consulates, the pasha’s palace, a mosque, and a few hundred houses, had been burnt to the ground. Now, twelve months afterwards, the ruins were not cleared away; the minaret of the mosque stood like a tall column recording the event, its sides blackened from the effects of the flames; and around it, reaching to the water’s edge, were tents in which business was carried on...” 35

It is significant that in Knight’s account, the minaret of the mosque, though singed, not only survives the fire, but its survival records the history of the town, and it is around the mosque that the town begins to rebuild itself. Laga’s Gallipoli war scene unwittingly recreates this moment from Çanakkale’s past, tying the contemporaneous conflict to a greater sense of cultural history. By representing the effects of the First World War on contemporary cultural life, he is able to provide a counterpoint that highlights the wider
effects of the war. His drawings do not follow the standard tropes of the genre by necessarily glorifying the Ottoman military and its successes. Instead, they paradoxically present the Ottoman Empire in what might be described as moments of weakness and mourning. However, focusing on the cultural character of the empire, they take on new significance as defiant expressions of an unassailable spiritual identity.

Namik Ismail extended this spiritual allegory in his painting Savaşın Yankıları/Tıfus (The Echoes of War/ Typhus) (1917, fig. 69), a work which strips away heroic allusions of war. In the painting, Ismail follows Laga by focusing on the wider effects of war on Turkish society. Ismail’s impressionistic technique and the presence of the mosque in the background give the work a mystical, otherworldly presence, reminiscent of fantasised Western Orientalist depictions of the mysterious East. The dominance of the mosque and the appearance of five veiled women in the painting, including one positioned in the central foreground add to this sense of disconnection, timelessness and otherness concomitant with stereotypes of the East. However, underlying this mysticism is a strong sense of tragic pragmatism that connects the metaphysical to the actual. Entering the scene from the left are two tool-carrying pallbearers, whose presence links the scene to the war continuing beyond the
borders of the work. The positioning of the men, half within, half outside the pictorial space disrupts the mythical timelessness of the scene by linking it to a contemporary timeline in which the casualties of war — in this case inflicted by disease — are implied to be both present and continuous. This present narrative is emphasised by the tools the men carry and the bucket carried by the veiled woman in the centre of the work, which herald the imminent burial of the coffin and create a sense of loss within the work. Though sombre, İsmail's painting signals a cultural continuity and resilience that persists despite the devastating effects of the war. Like Laga's Mosque in Çanakkale, the mosque in the background of İsmail's work remains defiant and unaffected by the war, subtly suggestive of a strong spiritual foundation upon which the Ottoman Empire was founded.

**BATTLES BETWEEN BORDERS**

The Vienna Exhibition was reviewed favourably in the Austrian press, who were keen to report the emergence of a modern Turkish identity expressed through contemporary European painting styles. One writer, Josef Vernhard, began his review by remarking upon the apparent incongruity of contemporary Turkish painting with its Islamic heritage: "Turkish art?", he began, Doesn't it sound like a fairy tale? Doesn't Koran prohibit the picturing of the world, especially the people, using colors, shapes and figures?". Vernhard was particularly surprised by the work of Harika Lifij in the collection, whom he labelled "brave" for her painting Greek Gods, that portrayed nude male figures. Though Vernhard's comments in some sense acknowledge the progressiveness of contemporary Turkish painting, his mode of expression, with its reference to an Islamic iconoclasm, echoes the familiar rhetoric applied by many European commentators to artists from Islamic countries and paradoxically reveals a latent ignorance of the art of the Ottoman Empire.

The reviewers focused particularly on Namık İsmail's works, most likely because he was present at the opening of the exhibition. They identified İsmail as an artist whose experience and artistic style bridged the distance between Eastern and Western cultures. In this vein, Vernhard suggested that the continued adoption of European culture would be a boon for the emergence of a modern Turkish art:

>[İsmail's] technique will be European, however, his soul will stay Oriental. And that is a win for him. Because this way, Turkish
Painting can improve technically. Improving Turkish art with European culture, and not being eclectic should be the homework of the new generation of Turkish painters. 57

Another writer, Arnold Hollriege, similarly praised İsmail’s integration of European style with an Eastern heritage:

Under the empty ceilings, I met a passionate cavalry lieutenant, Namik Ismail Bey... He was the most interesting person in the exhibition. This young man is Turkish however, he paints like a European. He has the blood of the warriors, of the great Turkish army... In [The Echoes of War/ Typhus] a coffin is carried in front of a mosque; weak, grieving women squatting under the shade are portrayed. This work was made with the eyes and work of a European. 58

Like Vernhard, Hollriege viewed the adoption of European visual culture as having a positive influence on the artistic expression of Turkish culture. However, he was not oblivious to the irony of this paradox and explored it through an analysis of the four works submitted by Abdülmeclid. Hollriege began by comparing Abdülmeclid’s two portraits – one of his ancestor Selim I, the other a self portrait – and forming a link between the artist who by heredity should have been sultan, and Selim I, the “noble Turkish warrior”, who was the “protector of all arts”. 59 Had Abdülmeclid become sultan, the reviewer noted, Turkish art may well have developed more quickly. To Hollriege, Abdülmeclid’s paintings represented not only a defence of Turkish culture, but an opportunity for progression and cultural renewal. However his admiration for the Caliph was tempered by the artist’s other exhibited works, Goethe in the Harem and Beethoven in the Palace. In the former, he noted that the “charming, beautiful lady” in the work reads Goethe’s Faust on a couch; in the latter he described a pasha playing Beethoven with his family, which led him to remark that “it is surprising that an Ottoman prince made propaganda for German culture...”. 60

Hollriege’s last claim is particularly interesting. Though he encouraged young Turkish painters to adopt European techniques, he was scathing about Abdülmeclid’s overt iconographical reference to the German composer in Beethoven in the Palace. A number of possible explanations arise from such a criticism. It is possible that Hollriege’s commentary stemmed from a purely aesthetic concern; though he advocated a mechanistic adoption of contemporary European artistic technique, he believed that Turkish artists should express
Turkish subjects. However, it is significant that Hollriege directed his strongest criticism at a notable Ottoman political figure. It is possible that such a response, given during the closing stages of the war, just prior to the defeat of the Austro-Hungarian army and its allies, reflected a growing dissatisfaction of Austria with the political union of Austria, Germany and the Ottoman Empire. In the historical context of its production and exhibition, Abdülmecid’s painting certainly drew political allegories between the Ottoman Empire and Germany, inferences that could not be ignored by an Austrian audience viewing the painting in their capital in 1918. In context, Hollriege’s oblique critique, masked as cultural criticism, allowed the cultural and political prestige of the Austro-Hungarian Empire to be maintained without causing overt offence to the empire’s military allies.

The Vienna Exhibition was first and foremost a cross-cultural message to a European audience, but the message engendered a number of meanings. The non-military works negotiated boundaries of culture, describing an Ottoman-Turkish cultural identity through European artistic languages. The military works sought to portray an image of imperial strength, and to their military allies the paintings were a tacit assurance of an intent to continue with the political union. The aims of the works overlap, sometimes contradicting each other, other times complementing. The artists at the exhibition, and the exhibition itself, occupied an intermediary space between cultures during a period of great transition for the Ottoman Empire. Yet it would be premature to assume that the artists in this exhibition were prefiguring the unique nationalistic image that was to be introduced in the Republic period. Indeed, after the formation of the Republic, the Şişli works and the “Generation of 1914” remained the domain of a specifically Ottoman-Turkish identity; they received critique by the Turkish painter Nurallah Berk and other emerging Modernists who saw their techniques as derivative and unrepresentative of the new Turkish Republic.

Artists of the new Republic supported the view that art should play a role in diffusing the new ideologies that had been initiated at the Republic’s foundation. In particular, Berk believed that pre-Republic artistic genres could not adequately represent the modern Turkish identity. As such, during this transitional period in Turkish history, art and literature became direct extensions of the modernising project of state. In the Ottoman period this meant a reinvigoration of an existing image, but in the Republican period it required a rewriting of Turkish history. The resurgence of the Turkish military during the later Independence War became a symbol for the replacement of the old regime, and at first instance it may appear as if the military paintings of the Vienna exhibition proclaim this
Turkish nationalist spirit. However, these late Ottoman era Gallipoli paintings must be read within the context of early twentieth-century imperial motivations, for although the Ottoman Empire was externally fighting a war against European powers, within the boundaries of the Empire it also struggled to define an identity that was modernising, but yet retained a characteristically Ottoman-Turkish voice.
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In 1918, in the closing stages of the First World War, the Ottoman-Turkish literary journal *Yeni Mecmuası* published a *Gallipoli Special Edition* entitled *Çanakkale Nüşha-yi Fevkaladesi*. It consisted of approximately 70 articles, including poetry and poetical prose, historical essays, war memoirs, short stories and six interviews with Gallipoli veterans – one of whom was Mustafa Kemal (later Atatürk) – conducted by the writer Mehmet Talat. The articles of the Gallipoli edition reflected a complex array of sentiments indicative of the composite influences on literary practice during the late Ottoman-Turkish epoch. The diversity of topics covered, which ranged from propagandistic accounts to earnest historical reportage, was matched by a corresponding variety of literary and linguistic styles. Some articles were written in the high Ottoman language, others were more colloquial; poetic metres ranged from classical Arabic-Persian to more syllabic forms. The ideological allegiances of the articles reflected a similar range of motivations and social influences and included Turkish nationalist pieces as well as those advocating Ottomanism or Islamism.

The *Gallipoli Special Edition* was a concerted attempt by Ottoman writers to boost morale and sustain the flagging Ottoman war effort by venerating the Ottoman victory at Gallipoli. As a propagandistic literary project it shared some similarities with the Vienna Exhibition in its attempt to redefine the image of the Ottoman military and the strength of the Ottoman Empire. As Mehmet Talat wrote in his introduction to the issue, though writers from other countries produced “epics of heroism and abnegation”, such literary examples were lacking in Ottoman-Turkish literature – a fact that the special issue aimed to rectify. However, the *Gallipoli Special Edition* displayed a number of significant differences to the Vienna Exhibition. Firstly, the focus of the publication was intra-empire rather than international. Secondly, unlike the Vienna Exhibition, the *Gallipoli Special Edition* was not directly commissioned by the Ottoman Government, which gave the publication a different political inflection. However, perhaps the most significant difference was that the *Gallipoli Special Edition*
was intended not only to provide a literary record of the conflict, but to directly inspire future writers and artists to continue producing Gallipoli-themed works. In an editorial, the naval painter İsmail Hakki implored more artists to do what he described as their moral duty:

The Gallipoli defence has ended in victory, but only the duty of the soldiers and of their commanders has ended. Ours has not ended; it has not even started. Everybody should know that those that spilt their blood into the Mediterranean cemetery have not died just to die. They have died for this history, this history of honour and virtue. We have a blood debt towards them, which we must pay... Let poets write epics, painters paint, sculptors sculpt, writers write stories and survivors pray for the martyrs' souls.³

It is significant that in his missive Hakki justifies the sacrifice of the Turkish soldiers at Gallipoli by reference to a shared history. However, the particular characteristics of the history to which he refers are not specified; rather, Ottoman history is presented in an etiolated form via references to honour and virtue. However, in Mehmet Talat’s introduction to the Gallipoli Special Edition, the writer is less equivocal in his account of the historical significance of Gallipoli, claiming that the Ottoman victory played a major role in contributing to the onset of the 1917 Russian Revolution and thus the safeguarding of the Ottoman Empire from Russian imperial motivations:

Gallipoli has broken the evil and aggression, the wrath and hated of the Tsar and of Muscovy; it has become the bearer of the joyful news of the eternal salvation of the Orient. It has given the golden crown of liberty and independence to the noble and pure sons of the sky and of the sun.⁴

The variance between Hakki’s presentation of the campaign as a defence of Ottoman cultural character and Talat’s attribution of Gallipoli as a major cause of the downfall of the Romanov Empire, as well as the diverse ways in which the various authors wrote about Gallipoli in the Gallipoli Special Edition, suggests that the nascent Gallipoli myth in Ottoman-Turkish society possessed two key characteristics. Firstly, in the late Ottoman era, in literary and visual culture, the Gallipoli campaign became a locus around which contemporary conceptions of modern Ottoman society, and Ottoman-Turkish and world history could be explored. Secondly, at such close temporal proximity to the conflict, the aims of Turkish artistic production with regard to the campaign were not yet codified – Gallipoli engendered a multiplicity of meanings that were in flux and subject to numerous social, cultural and political influences, as well as the individual motivations of the artists. As Koroğlu suggests, “Both İsmail Hakki and Talat the junior stress the need for a representation or rather a
commemoration of the victory... There is a need for artists to increase the significance of the events by representing them with their art and thus ensuring that they are remembered forever." There was certainly a need for Ottoman commemoration of the early battles of the First World War. The death of up to 80,000 troops at Sankamış and nearly 90,000 at Gallipoli had a profound and prolonged impact on Ottoman society and the Ottoman army, the vindication of which necessitated a range of social responses. Nevertheless, there remained a great degree of flexibility in the manner in which artists chose to represent and commemorate the victory.

The proximity of Gallipoli to the Independence War and the nature of Gallipoli as the first major Ottoman victory on home soil during the First World War – a characteristic that subsequently found symbolic resonance with the later conflict – assisted with the insertion of Gallipoli into a Republican narrative. As Köroğlu argues:

Since the point of arrival is a nation-state, even in the case of different interpretations, the historical flow of events has been perceived in a determinist way; since the result reached was in a way preordained, it is imagined that even during the earliest days of empire, long before the creation of a republic, there should have been groups consciously choosing such an aim or at least sensing it and groups opposing it. 

The reductive view that Köroğlu describes attributes an anachronistic proto-republicanism to the social and political motivations of the artists and writers who illustrated Gallipoli. In reality, Ottoman-Turkish artists appropriated the Gallipoli campaign in order to articulate a number of alternative narratives that linked the battles with long-standing Ottoman cultural traditions, as well as to describe events from modern, pre-Republican Turkish history. Rather than a proto-Republicanism, the chief influences on the historical discourse of the late Ottoman era were the tenets of pan-Ottomanism, pan-Islamism and pan-Turkism, which competed ideologically to unify an empire facing the need to modernise under increasing political and military pressure. An exploration of Gallipoli as a thematic locus in Ottoman history must therefore be approached with a concomitant understanding of the discourses of social, political, military and artistic modernisation that occurred in the late Ottoman era.

The previous chapter explored the manner in which images of Gallipoli were used by the Ottoman Government at the Vienna Exhibition to support an external political discourse. Through an examination of the Gallipoli paintings of Mehmet Ruhi and İbrahim Çalli, two key Turkish Modernist painters, in this chapter I broaden an understanding of the significance of Gallipoli by considering...
how these artists adopted the conflict to represent specific themes in Ottoman-Turkish history. In doing so, I introduce two major alternative Gallipoli narratives. Firstly, in the case of Ruhi’s *Triptych* (1917, fig. 73), I argue that the artist adopted traditional Western painting forms in defence of a long-standing Ottoman cultural history. Borrowing pictorial devices from European traditions and incorporating them into an Islamic Ottoman narrative, Ruhi’s work, created in response to European cultural and military intercession, signals the resurgence of a modern Turkish identity that nonetheless acknowledges its roots in the Ottoman Empire. Secondly, with regards to Çalli’s *Night Raid* (1917, fig. 75), I argue that the artist employed a European technique adapted from the ateliers of Paris to describe Gallipoli as a climactic military, political and social event in late Ottoman history. In *Night Raid*, Çalli not only presents a visceral and personal reaction to the impact of modern warfare on human bodies and minds, but draws iconographical resonances with the work of the Spanish artist Francisco José de Goya y Lucientes in order to position Gallipoli as an allegory for modern Ottoman history, the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid II and the turbulent transition from an autocratic sultanate to a constitutional monarchy. As artists who were trained in Europe under the Ottoman Government’s modernization schemes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Ruhi and Çalli became pivotal figures in an era of cultural transition. Ruhi, Çalli and the other artists of the Generation of 1914 occupy a unique position in the history of Ottoman-Turkish art as the artists’ careers spanned not only the modernizing period of late Ottoman history, but the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the struggle for Turkish independence, and the establishment of the Turkish Republic. As such, while Ruhi and Çalli’s historical representations share a continuity with the epoch that preceded them, their paintings of Gallipoli are inevitably inflected by the processes of social and political modernization that had commenced in the late eighteenth century and which had gained increasing impetus throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

**A HEROIC NARRATIVE: MEHMET RUHI’S GALLIPOLI TRIPTYCH**

Of the Ottoman-Turkish artists who depicted Gallipoli and who participated in the 1917 Şişli Studio and 1918 Vienna Exhibition, the paintings of Mehmet Ruhi best articulate the transitional nature of Ottoman-Turkish society. Ruhi’s paintings, though inflected by European techniques and symbolism, advocate a culturally and spiritually resilient Ottoman Empire. Although the biographical sources on Mehmet Ruhi are limited, it is known that he was born in the Galata district of Istanbul in 1880.7 Of his early education, it is believed that he attended the Rüste-i Barhi naval secondary school at Kasımpaşa, before entering the Istanbul Naval Academy in 1892, where he spent four years studying
painting along with nautical engineering. After that he spent a further four years studying at the Harbiye Military College, as well as serving on naval training ships, before graduating in 1900 as a naval engineer with the rank of lieutenant. After graduating, he taught painting at the Naval High School while taking further painting classes at the Fine Arts Academy, which he entered in 1903. During his training at the Fine Arts Academy, he studied painting under Osman Hamdi Bey and Salvatore Valeri, as well as drawing under Ömer Adil and the Polish artist Joseph Wania Zarzecki. After his graduation from that institution in 1909, Ruhi became one of the founding members of the Society of Ottoman Painters and, in 1910, won a scholarship to further his painting studies in Paris. In 1911 he travelled to Paris and studied in the studio of Fernand Cormon, following in the footsteps of Avni Lifij, Sami Yetik and İbrahim Çalli who had been sent to France the previous year. Along with Hikmet Onat, Ali Sami Boyar, Nazmi Ziya, Fehaman Duran and Namik Ismail—who were also in Paris—Ruhi returned to Istanbul in 1914 at the outbreak of war. Back in Istanbul he taught painting at several secondary schools and became the Perspective Master at the Fine Arts Academy.

Along with most of the aforementioned artists, Ruhi was a member of the Şişli Studio group and exhibited four paintings at the 1917 Galata exhibition "War Paintings and Other Works". During his residency at the Şişli Studio he completed seven paintings which were subsequently included in the Vienna Exhibition. While his war works—Düşman Kaçıktan Sonra (Çanakkale Savası) (After the Enemy’s Retreat (Çanakkale War), hereafter After the Enemy’s Retreat) (1917, fig. 72), Triptych and The Battle of Ismail Tepe (1917)—focus on military events within the Gallipoli campaign, he exhibited a number of other paintings that broadened his thematic scope to consider images from Turkish communal life. Unfortunately, though several of these works were later acquired by Turkish military institutions, some of them were lost after the exhibition and are known only from reproductions in the exhibition catalogue. In Bağış/Hilal-i Ahmer’ê Yardîm/lane (hereafter Donation) (c.1917, fig. 70), preserved in the collection of the Istanbul Museum of Painting and Sculpture, Ruhi experiments with a heavy, impasto technique to describe the crowded interior of a mosque. Though Ruhi generalises forms and faces, it is possible to identify a number of characters, in particular an imam collecting money in a white tin marked with a red Islamic crescent moon, and an injured Turkish soldier, his arm in a sling, who leans forward to donate money. In Donation, Ruhi’s impasto brushwork emphasises the lighting and atmosphere of the mosque interior; thick blobs of white paint articulate the hanging chandelier, but these are overshadowed by the light streaming in through the mosque windows, which not only illuminates the general scene, but is given physical emphasis by Ruhi’s use of thick white lines to illustrate individual rays. The strong diagonal of these
FIGURE 70: MEHMET RUHİ, BAĞIŞ/HILAL-I AHMER'E YARDIM/LİANE (DONATION), C.1917, OIL ON CANVAS, 46 X 38 CM, ISTANBUL MUSEUM OF PAINTING AND SCULPTURE.

FIGURE 71: MEHMET RUHİ, KUMAŞ BOYACISI (FABRIC PAINTER), C.1917, OIL ON CANVAS, SIZE AND LOCATION UNKNOWN.
rays draws attention to other elements in the work; the postures of both the soldier and the imam align with the diagonal, and the tin that the imam holds is the brightest point in the work. In creating a relationship between the act of donation and the sacredness of the mosque, Ruhi not only describes the effect of the war on a community, but aligns the fighting of it to a religious justification. Kumaş Boyacı (Fabric Painter) (c.1917, fig. 71), another of Ruhi’s Vienna Exhibition paintings, illustrates another scene from traditional Turkish life. In it Ruhi’s technique is less Impressionistic; the figure of the woman dressed a headscarf decorating a screen is more clearly defined than the figures in Donation, as are decoration on the screen and the fabric in the background.

Ruhi’s Gallipoli paintings explore multiple readings of the conflict as both a military victory and a defence of Ottoman cultural identity. Unlike other painters of the Şişli Studio – such as Ali Cemal Benim, whose A Little Water/Wounded Enemy presents an ostensible military camaraderie between friend and foe – in representing the enemy Ruhi clearly distinguishes the Allied forces at Gallipoli as antagonistic invaders. Ruhi’s After the Enemy’s Retreat, is an almost entirely propagandistic work. In it, victorious Turkish soldiers stand proudly over the crumpled bodies of their dead and dying enemies. In the background, the boats of the invaders lie wrecked against the shore. It is not difficult to read the painting as a fulfilment of Şeyfi Pasha’s original design in mandating the creation of military works for the Vienna Exhibition – a refutation of the image of the Ottoman Empire as the sick man of Europe. Here, it is significant that the Turkish soldiers are represented as strong and courageous, while their defeated enemies are depicted as physically impotent. Ruhi’s other grand war painting Triptych (1917, fig. 73) at first seems almost equally propagandistic in its representation of the heroic Turkish forces at Gallipoli. Like After the Enemy’s Retreat (Çanakkale War), Triptych features a scene of the Allied invaders being driven into the sea. Here the drama is more present and is assisted by the episodic narrative of a peasant soldier’s participation in the battle, from his leaving for war to his return to his home village. The central panel features a Gallipoli battle scene that depicts this soldier attacking an enemy with his rifle. Given the triumphant tone of the painting, it is easy to view it within the typical tropes of wartime propaganda. However, a closer examination of the composite cultural symbolism of the painting and the context of its production admits a more complex reading of the painting that describes a cultural and spiritual defence of Ottoman Turkey.

In his analysis of Triptych, Alistair Wright extends a reading of the work beyond its function as simple wartime propaganda, positioning it within contemporary discourses of Turkish modernism and identifying it as a painting that epitomises Ruhi’s position as an artist traversing the boundaries of cultures. He argues that Triptych reflects a cross-cultural engagement between European and
FIGURE 72: MEHMET RUHI, DÜŞMAN KAÇTIKTAN SONRA (ÇANAKKALE SAVAŞI), (AFTER THE ENEMY’S RETREAT (ÇANAKKALE WAR)), 1917, OIL ON CANVAS, SIZE AND LOCATION UNKNOWN.

FIGURE 73: MEHMET RUHI, TRIPTI (TRIPTYCH), 1917, OIL ON CANVAS, APPROX. 213.5 X 108 CM (IRREGULAR), KURTULUŞ SAVAŞI MUSEUM, ANKARA.
Ottoman forms in which Ruhi adopts a European visual language and then modifies it in an attempt to articulate a Turkish identity that negotiates the temporal boundaries between a romanticised past and a modern present. Such a claim requires an understanding of the complex cultural exchanges undertaken between Ottoman and European military and artistic institutions of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Like the other artists of the Generation of 1914, Ruhi owed his artistic education to a long-established process of modernisation and revision within the Ottoman military, the beginnings of which predate the wide-ranging social and political reforms of the Tanzimat period which began in 1839. The transition of Turkish painting from the traditional miniature form to European-inspired styles was directly linked to the foundation of the Imperial School of Military Engineering in 1795, which offered courses in perspective, topography and cartography. This institutionalisation of painting classes was augmented by the establishment of the Harbiye Military College in 1834, which introduced painting lessons within one year of its foundation. In 1846, the establishment of military high schools – which were designed to prepare students for military colleges – contributed to the dissemination of Western painting styles and from 1869 painting lessons were obligatory at these institutions. The growth of secondary and tertiary military schools led to the appointment of European instructors such as Schranz and Valeri and the establishment of a training program based on those of Western fine arts academies, from which the first graduates began to emerge in 1854. Western artistic techniques were further integrated into Ottoman military institutions when in 1877 a department to train art teachers was founded at the Harbiye Military College, which included courses on geometry, perspective, anatomy, photography and sartorial studies.

Furthermore, from 1835 until 1914, gifted painters from military colleges, cultural institutions and government bureaucracy were sent to European ateliers for advanced painting training, where they trained with artists such as Jean-Léon Gérôme and Fernand Cormon. These early cultural emissaries, the most important of whom were Şeker Ahmet Paşa, Süleyman Seyyit Bey, Halil Paşa and Osman Hamdi Bey, brought back not only the contemporary European techniques of their billets, but pedagogical strategies influenced by French Academism. Until the establishment of the Fine Arts Academy by Osman Hamdi Bey in 1883, officer painters of the military schools remained the principal exponents of Western artistic practice in Ottoman Turkey, and after the creation of the Academy of Fine Arts, the soldier-artists trained in military institutions maintained considerable influence as instructors at the academy throughout the early decades of the Republic.

Given the cross-cultural nature of their artistic education, Wright considers Ruhi and the other artists of the Generation of 1914 as occupying a space in between European and Ottoman cultures. His
analysis focuses on the idea of displacement – the notion that the adoption of European styles by Turkish artists and their use to describe Turkish society created meanings which resembled the original, but were altered by their new context. Although the language may be similar, the meanings change; “gesture upon gesture, one mark added to the next”, he writes, “What we see in [the work of the Generation of 1914] is an act of imitation – or better, of adaptation, of translation”. By comparing Triptych with another of Ruhi’s paintings, Atatürk with the Peasants, Wright usefully identifies a temporal ambivalence in Ruhi’s oeuvre, a “strange collation of the modern and the timeless... it speaks an up-to-date language... even as it claims to speak an unchanging Turkish idiom”. The construction of Triptych certainly reveals Ruhi’s composite cultural influences. The tripartite form, while a pragmatic feature that facilitates the presentation of an episodic narrative, is also a particular symbol of European Christianity that highlights Ruhi’s temporal ambivalence by placing into obvious apposition a contemporary Ottoman historical event and a traditional European Christian pictorial device. Of Triptych, Wright argues that it is:

More propaganda. In the centre panel, the fighting in Çanakkale, the great battle for the Gallipoli peninsula. On the right, the starting-point: a young man takes leave of his family. On the left, the aftermath: the same man returns a veteran. A painting, then, that reads from right to left, against the expectations of a European viewer who reads by habit – with paintings as with text – from left to right... and yet: if we read from right to left this falls in line not with the Turkish text but with the Arabic; yet more accents emerge to complicate our narrative.

Wright’s analysis highlights the complex nature of Ruhi’s artistic influences by positioning Ruhi as an artist who negotiated both Western and Eastern artistic forms, epitomised by his identification of Triptych as a narrative that, though it employs the eponymous European form, flows in the Arabic way from right to left (though a comparison with Ottoman script which reads in the same direction, would have been more appropriate). However this narrative chronology is contested by Gören. In Gören’s catalogue of the Vienna Exhibition, the panels are listed, from left to right in order as The Peasant’s Leaving for the Military, The Enemy’s Casting into the Sea at Çanakkale and The Return to the Village a Gazi. In this case, the narrative flows in the European (and later modern Turkish) form from left to right.

It is not entirely clear from the painting itself which identification is correct, as it is possible to read both frames as either the point of departure or return. Both side panels include similar elements: the soldier protagonist, his family, a military troop beating drums and flying flags in the background,
and a townscape. The major difference in content between the two panels lies in the positioning of the town with respect to the pictorial space. On the right, the figures are located within the heart of the village, on the left, they are on the outskirts. Reading the right panel as a point of departure associates the village – with its mosque prominently positioned in the centre background – as the heart of a vibrant community and culture which the young man leaves to defend. Interpreting it as the point of return allows for a reading in which the returning hero is welcomed back into the inner domain of this community. Though the similarity in subject matter between the two outer panels allows multiple readings, a number of elements lend weight to Wright’s interpretation. In the right panel, the soldier is dressed in village garb, presumably before he is issued with his uniform upon entering the military. To his right stand two waving villagers, their posture, with their weight on their back legs, seeming to imply a gesture of farewell rather than of welcome. This pose is contrasted by those of the woman and her child in the background of the left panel, who run towards the advancing soldiers with their hands thrown in front of them. In addition, if, as it appears, the soldier’s family are duplicated in both panels, the swaddling child that the soldier holds in the right panel has grown into a toddler on the left, indicating the passage of a considerable period of time. Furthermore, Wright’s analysis is supported by the compositional flow of the painting; in the central panel, the soldier’s raised rifle forms a diagonal from top right to bottom left, angling at his victim who falls in the same direction, and whose angled arms extend the compositional force. The amassed Turkish army on the hill in the background similarly complements this thrust, its apex positioned on the British boat in the water on the left, on which the enemy soldiers attempt to flee.

Ruhi’s mobilisation of European and Ottoman pictorial techniques allows a reading of Gallipoli that inserts the campaign into a wider historical narrative. In order to understand the manner in which the form of the painting allies Gallipoli with a particularly Ottoman narrative, it is useful to consider the painting within wider tropes of cultural mythology. As a discursive strategy, the development of the narrative in Ruhi’s painting shares many similarities with what John Mackenzie describes as a ‘heroic myth of empire’ – a narrative allegory that is adopted in order to express the key characteristics of an imperial identity. According to Mackenzie, the mythic story usually begins with an encounter that causes a hero to “cross a threshold from normal life into a fabulous world”. In the new world, the hero is faced with trials that he must successfully complete before a significant personal discovery is made. Typically, the hero’s triumph is assisted by an intermediary character who offers the hero the means – whether in the form of advice,
supernatural power, or a weapon— with which to overcome these trials. Subsequently, the hero returns to his original world in order to make his discovery available to the populace.

Though the phases that Campbell identifies were derived mainly from religious myths, Mackenzie argues that they can be applied to nineteenth-century imperial ideologies, which featured similar narrative strategies in order to create meaning and identity. Crucially, Mackenzie suggests that in the case of heroic myths of empire, the hero subsequently adopts an important role in the formation of society and identity as an avatar of cultural character:

For a hero to be transformed into mythic status he needs to reach beyond his death, to become part of a constantly developed myth-making process to which contemporaries repeatedly appeal. The individual becomes an archetype, representing a set of personal qualities and heroic characteristics that are not only supremely valued by his society but are seen by contemporaries and succeeding generations as having major instrumental power.20

In the imperial myth, the hero's journey is transformed from a mere personal experience to an allegory for social advancement. This form of phased heroic myth was popular in representations of the First World War. In particular, it found resonance with Australian war artists working contemporaneously with the Turkish Generation of 1914, who were keen to present the war as a transitional phase between colony and nationhood. For instance, in his diary George Coates developed a fragmented set of poetic images that described his vision for an epic painting that would function as an allegory for the establishment of modern Australia:


Coates identifies the war as a formative event in the history of the Australian nation. However in his narrative, which features the phases of departure, initiation and return, it is Australia itself which is the mythical world for which the hero departs, the colonization of which, featuring trials such as boundary riding and horse-breaking, is a test of character. As such, though Coates' vision prefigures a recognition of Australia as a mature nation-state, he inserts the process into a British imperial narrative by locating the points of departure and return as the English motherland.
In the case of Ruhi's *Triptych*, the separation of the painting into distinct narrative panels facilitates an easy analogy with Mackenzie's imperial myth. The soldier figure provides a convenient heroic avatar and his village the points of departure and return. In the central panel, Ruhi creates a strong distinction between the battlefield and the home front. The Gallipoli campaign is isolated physically and also conceptually as a liminal space separate from the domestic life of the soldier, which allows it to be identified as the alternative, mythical world into which the hero must depart. While in the outer panels the soldier is situated in the heart of a community, Ruhi chooses the Gallipoli shoreline as the backdrop to his battle scene at which the invading Allied armies are repulsed. The physical thrust of the protagonist's personal battle with another soldier, who drops his helmet into the sea as he attempts to defend himself, is enhanced by the ethereal presence of the Turkish army on the hills behind him, who swarm down towards the water. As such, Ruhi subtly employs the symbolic liminality of the shoreline as a barrier between ocean and earth to emphasise the expulsion of the invading armies from Ottoman territory, though in reality, the Allied troops at Gallipoli withdrew from the peninsula in a series of elaborately organised night time operations during which no battle was fought.

With regards to Mackenzie's identification of the hero as cultural archetype, it is significant that in *Triptych* the Turkish victory is achieved under the banner of a distinctly Islamic Ottoman identity, suggesting that the hero's journey had repercussions beyond his personal experience. In the sky above the battle scene, Ruhi inserts an image of Osman, the founder of the Ottoman Empire, as well as a ghostly representation of the Turkish mythological figure Zafer Meleği, an allegory of victory. Appearing at the crucial moment of battle, these cultural and political figures serve two functions. Firstly, within *Triptych*'s heroic narrative they serve as intercessors in the hero's journey, providing him with necessary inspiration. Secondly, they function as symbolic markers for the viewer, providing a justification of the First World War as a defence of Ottoman territory and tradition. The narrative of the peasant soldier in *Triptych* – which culminates in the accession of the soldier to the status of Gazi (as signalled by the title of this part of the triptych) – reinforces this notion and adds a religious justification for the battle. In particular, the attribution to the soldier of the honorific epithet 'Gazi' creates a symbolic resonance with the figure of Osman. Although the term Gazi can, in Turkish, be read as a general adjective to describe a veteran soldier and in the past was associated with a corps of Ottoman mercenary soldiers, it originated from the name given to the battles in which the prophet Mohammed personally fought and became an honorific title awarded to military leaders who expanded or defended Islamic territory. Significantly, the epithet was first awarded to Osman for his establishment of the Ottoman Empire. The attribution of this honorific was one that possessed a great cultural valency, even after the fall of the Ottoman Empire. As Feroz Ahmad has
demonstrated, although the Gazi was a traditional Ottoman symbol, it was reclaimed by the new Republic in the early twentieth century as a title for Mustafa Kemal as part of a set of strategies to lend historical legitimacy to the new regime and to ascribe an authority to Kemal analogous to that of the sultans. This selective association of Kemal as a protector of a proud Ottoman heritage was a calculated ploy. That the founder of the Turkish Republic was also honoured by the epithet Atatürk – which is commonly translated as ‘father of the Turks’, though is more correctly interpreted as ‘ancestor of the Turks’ – suggests that Ottoman heroic symbols maintained a great power in describing the Turkish collective identity. In Triptych however, by describing the peasant soldier as a Gazi, Ruhi does not prefigure the establishment of the Turkish Republic, but rather describes the Turkish soldier as the defender of the Ottoman Empire in its entirety.

Ruhi’s location of Gallipoli with reference to a classical Ottoman past mirrors a similar strategy employed by artists and writers from other nations. Amongst Australian soldiers in particular, a linking of the Gallipoli campaign in written accounts to classical Greek cultural mythology was not unusual. In his poem Again the Clash is East (1915), which he composed during his wartime service at Gallipoli, the Australian soldier-poet Leon Gellert made such an allusion in describing his soldiering experience:

Again the Clash is East

Again the clash is East, the Gates are barred.
The rolling echoes of Old Troy arise
With trebled sound: its weary threshold scarred
With scattered dead once more, and wild with cries.
The noise that dinned when smiting Hellas reeled
Before the brave defence of Hector’s horde,
The blows that burst on Agamemnon’s shield,
Or echoed from Achilles’ threshing sword
Were weak and small. Before this mighty blast
They seem the tinklings of a timid past.
Today the Grecian arms are still and deep
Within the tomb; those heroes deep in dust;
The eyes of Attic honour closed with sleep,
And wise Ulysses’ arrows red with rust.

The use of the adverb ‘again’ in the title of Gellert’s poem suggests two levels of cultural association between the Gallipoli campaign and Greek mythology. Firstly, it links the Australian nation with the
civilisation of the Ancient Greeks. Secondly, it emphasizes the geographical proximity between the Trojan and Gallipoli battles. However, while Gellert associates the Australian campaign with a classical past, he is careful to indicate a sense of cultural transcendence.

While Ruhi’s transformation of Gallipoli into a spiritual battle shares similarities with other such stylized accounts, it differs from Gellert’s mythological association in that Ruhi’s hero inherits an indigenous chthonic identity that is rejuvenated as part of a continuing cultural narrative. Though this association between Gallipoli and Ottoman Islam is almost entirely excised from later, Republican-era works, in the formative years surrounding the First World War and the Independence War, representations of Gallipoli as a particularly Islamic defence contended with alternative representations of the campaign in the public consciousness. The complexity of this spiritual narrative is revealed by the most famous Turkish Gallipoli poem, Mehmet Akif Ersoy’s To the Martyrs of Çanakkale, published in 1924 as part of Asım, the sixth book of Ersoy’s poetic-narrative epic Sefahad.24

To The Martyrs of Çanakkale

This Dardanelles war - without equal in the world
Four or five mighty armies are pressed and are hurled
To reach the Sea of Marmara by hill and pass
So many fleets have surrounded a small mass...

The Old World and the New World, all have come this way,
Bubbling like sand, like a flood, or like Judgement Day;
The seven climes of the world stand opposite you
Australia, beside which observe Canada too!
Different are these hordes in face and skin and sound
Only their violence, forsooth, is equal all round.

Outstretched he lies there, shot right through his spotless brow,
For this Crescent O Lord, what suns are setting now
O soldier, for this earth’s sake fallen to the dust,
If your heavenly forbears kissed your brow, "twere just"
Brave you are, your blood makes "God is one" victorious,
Only the lions of Badr could be as glorious.

Who can dig a sepulchre great enough for you?
History itself, say I, cannot contain you.
That book records the epochs upturned in this race...
Eternities are needed to give you your place.
You, who destroyed the onslaught of the last crusade,
From the dearest sultan of the East, Saladin,
And from Kılıç Arslan who earned high accolade
You who took the iron hoop hemming Islam in
And shattered into pieces on your own strong breast
You with whose spirit move the legends of your name
The iron hoop that robbed Islam of all its rest;
Ages of history overflow with your fame...
No more these horizons for you no more this test...
Martyr son of martyr ask me not for a grave,
The prophet open armed awaits his warrior his warrior brave.

Published in the second year of the new Turkish Republic, at first reading Ersoy's poem can be misinterpreted as a description of Gallipoli as a nationalistic struggle. The poet reminds the Turkish soldiers he addresses that they are engaged against armies from the "seven climes of the world", from not only the "Old World" of Europe, but its "New World" satellites, Australia and Canada. However, the focus of Ersoy's poem is not a defiant Turkish nationalism, but rather a resurgent Ottoman Islamism. Though his major works were published during the Republican period, Mehmet Ersoy was one of the chief proponents of political Islamism in the early twentieth century. The poet avoids a simple dichotomous positioning of the campaign as a struggle between nationalistic forces by identifying the Turkish soldier as a transcendent figure who functions as a cultural avatar. By comparing the Turkish martyr to the sultans Saladin and Kılıç Arslan, Ersoy describes him as a defender of Islam, encouraging him to be read as a figure that possesses historical resonance beyond the events in which he is presently engaged. The particular references to Saladin and Arslan further position Gallipoli as a cultural battle. Both sultans won renown as defenders of the Islamic holy land from the European Crusades. Kılıç Arslan was Sultan of Rum from 1092-1107 and fought the First Crusade with great success. Saladin was Sultan of Egypt and Syria who fought against the Third Crusade and eventually recaptured Palestine from the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Ersoy's reference to Saladin and Arslan broadens the lens through which the Gallipoli conflict is read; while he acknowledges the position of the campaign with respect to contemporaneous European history, he simultaneously repositions it as a moment of Islamic cultural resistance.
Ersoy’s positioning of Gallipoli as a spiritual defence was, of course, directed at the tensions between the Turkish nationalist and Islamic identities that came into increasing opposition within Turkey in the early years of the Republic. However, the invocation of an Ottoman-Islamic spiritualism functioned analogously in the late Ottoman era as an effective anti-colonialist strategy, through the promotion of an inalienable indigenous spiritual character in response to European cultural influence. As Kemal Karpat has demonstrated, during the reign of Sultan Abdülhamid II (r. 1876-1909) in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the sultan adopted Islamist political policies in conjunction with modernising reforms in order to counter the increasing degree to which European nations began to undermine the economic and social foundations of the Ottoman Empire:

Pressures stemming from structural changes caused by the slowly expanding capitalist system and the state’s inability to understand fully the nature of the economic challenge and its cultural, political, and military effects caused the state to initiate changes designed to perpetuate its own existence... From the start there were both an official state view and a private image of the fatherland: the first stemmed from calculated practical considerations; the second, from historical experience and cultural attachment. 26

The distinction between the official state view and private images of empire that Karpat describes was necessitated by the need of the Ottoman Government to address both internal and external threats to empire. As Selim Deringil has suggested, the Ottoman Empire of the late nineteenth century faced dissolution not only from European political ministrations, but from internal agitation. 27 Nineteenth-century Islamic revivalism, which Karpat argues was “a local-regional effort at adapting Islam to changed circumstances within an orthodox-Islamic frame of reference”, was in part designed to maintain the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire, by strengthening the bonds between its Islamic constituents. 28

As a response to external cultural influence, Ottoman revivalist strategies delineated areas of cultural difference, the maintenance of which allowed a redress to the increase of European power in economic and military relationships. Partha Chatterjee terms such areas of cultural difference as 'domains of sovereignty', which form points of cultural resistance in colonial relationships. 29 Though the late Ottoman Empire was not engaged in the strict colonial relationship that Chatterjee examines, his analysis is useful to consider in the context of the military and economic pressure under which the Ottoman Empire was placed in the late nineteenth century. Chatterjee argues that indigenous responses to colonial influence created their own 'domain of sovereignty' by separately categorising social institutions into material and spiritual domains. The material domain is composed
of tangible social institutions including scientific and technological advancements, economic structures, political systems. This material domain was complemented by an inner domain bearing what Chatterjee terms the "essential marks of cultural identity". Chatterjee argues that the maintenance of this cultural domain was a form of cultural resistance that necessitated the continued promotion and development of a nation's spiritual character, even as it pursued Western modernisation. "The greater one's success in imitating Western skills in the material domain", he argues, "the greater the need to preserve the distinctiveness of one's spiritual culture". Indigenous cultural resistance attempts to create a national culture that is modern but nevertheless not Western. Ruhi's *Triptych* reflects such a desire to represent the Ottoman Empire as the military equal of the Western nations against which they were engaged, but whose cultural identity had not been subsumed by their engagement with them. While it may seem paradoxical that Ruhi adopts Western visual forms as part of a strategy to present a culturally distinct, Islamic Ottoman Empire, as historian Ahmet Ersoy remarks, in the late nineteenth century period of Ottoman revival, the rediscovery of Ottoman tradition inevitably involved representing it with tools borrowed from the West. In Ruhi's case, the cultural appropriation was not mere imitation, but instead used to stake a claim for an identifiable Turkish cultural tradition that was nonetheless active and adaptive. Ruhi's adoption of Western visual language facilitates the articulation of a resurgent Turkish spiritualism. Locating Gallipoli within a long Ottoman military tradition as a defence of a vibrant Ottoman-Turkish cultural identity, he sought to articulate the complexities of an Ottoman-Turkish narrative through reference to European and Ottoman Modernist discourses. The First World War and the Gallipoli campaign offered an opportunity to reconsider the projection of this cultural reinvigoration by positioning the events as a site for historical transformation. Of this process, Ruhi's *Triptych* is an apt representation.

**THE GENERATION OF ÇALLI**

While Mehmet Ruhi inserted Gallipoli into an Islamic Ottoman history, İbrahim Çalli – who visited the Gallipoli peninsula as part of the 1915 battlefield tour of artists and writers organised by the Ottoman General Staff – used his firsthand experience of the conflict to not only describe the horror of modern warfare, but as an allegory for the tumultuous period of societal transition through which the Ottoman Empire passed in the years leading up to the First World War. İbrahim Çalli occupies a central position as the most influential of the artists of the Generation of 1914. Born in 1882 in the town of Çal, from which he took his name, Çalli began his artistic studies at the relatively late age of
In 1904 he enrolled at the Istanbul Fine Arts Academy at which he studied under Osman Hamdi Bey, Salvatore Valeri, Ömer Adil and Joseph Warnia Zarzecki. After graduating in 1910, he was sent to Paris for further training in the studio of Fernand Cormon. After his return to Istanbul on account of the war in 1914, he took up a teaching position at the Fine Arts Academy, at which he taught until his retirement in 1947. In 1917 he participated in the Şişli studio, at which he executed four major war paintings that were exhibited in the Vienna Exhibition – *Morning in the Trenches* (1917), *Night Raid* (1917), *Turkish Artillerymen* (1917) and *Wounded Soldier* (1917). His impressionistic painting *Portrait of a Woman* (date unknown) was also included in the Vienna Exhibition collection.

It is a mark of Çalli’s influence on twentieth century Turkish painting that the Generation of 1914 is alternatively referred to as the ‘Çalli Generation’. In addition to the Vienna Exhibition, Çalli participated in most of the major Turkish painting exhibitions of the early twentieth century. From 1916 to 1927 his paintings formed an influential part of the Galatasaray exhibitions – a series of annual shows organised by the Society of Ottoman Painters, the aim of which was to introduce the public to contemporary Turkish painting. During the 33 years in which he taught at the Fine Arts Academy, Çalli established himself as a principle proponent of Turkish Impressionism, a style that dominated artistic production of the late Ottoman and early Republican eras. Though his style fell out of favour with later Republican era painters such as Nurullah Berk and his ‘D Group’ Turkish Cubists, Çalli’s work continued to find an audience throughout the early years of the Republic. He participated in the 1929 “Young Painters” Exhibition at the Ankara Ethnography Museum, which was a concerted attempt by the Republican government to shift the locus of Turkish painting from Istanbul to Ankara. From 1939 Çalli participated in the annual “State Painting and Sculpture” Exhibition, established under Atatürk’s directive, at which he served as the head of the prize jury in its first, second, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, ninth, tenth and eleventh years. In addition, Çalli exhibited paintings in a 1936 exhibition at the Parnassos Art Gallery in Athens and in the same year his paintings were represented in the Fine Arts Academy’s “50 Years of Turkish Painting and Sculpture” Exhibition. That the artist was also included in a 1956 exhibition entitled “100 Years of Turkish Painting” reveals the contested and formative nature of Turkish Modernist painting in the years during which Çalli studied and taught at the Fine Arts Academy.

In spite of his formative influence on modern Turkish painting, as his biographer Kaya Özsezgin notes, Çalli’s works have received surprisingly little critical attention in Turkish art histories. Apart from a valedictory catalogue produced on the occasion of Çalli’s retirement from the Academy of Fine Arts in 1947, no monograph was produced on the artist until 1993. A monograph had been
planned on Çalli in 1936, but was inexplicably cancelled. This may have been due to political tensions between the artist and the Republican government. In particular, Özsezgin attributes the absence of Çalli scholarship partly on the effect of Çalli’s reputation for alcoholic over-indulgence as well as his notoriously ‘liberal’ political inclinations. Because of this, the author surmises, “there may have been people, taking it one step further, [who] nearly deemed it unnecessary to dwell on those
aspects of him which may help to elucidate Ibrahim Çalli the artist, rather than the pleasure-loving side of his character. Probably for this reason, nobody has ever undertaken to prepare a serious book on him”.

Given the relative paucity of Çalli scholarship, much work needs to be done in situating Çalli’s oeuvre with regards to movements in Ottoman-Turkish society. In light of his key role in the Vienna Exhibition, his wartime paintings have been the subject of notably scant visual analysis. Çalli viewed his role as a war artist as an opportunity to explore not only the wartime experience, but also the complexity of the modernising Ottoman-Turkish identity. Like Ruhi, Çalli used his familiarity with European painting traditions in order to transform Gallipoli into an allegory for Ottoman history. However unlike Ruhi, Çalli was able to use his firsthand knowledge of the Gallipoli battlefield, acquired from his participation on the 1915 tour of artists and writers to the peninsula, to present a more visceral and personal experience of the conflict. In his Siperde Sabah (Morning in the Trenches) (1917, fig. 74), Çalli positions the viewer within the space of the soldiers he depicts, which he restricts in order to create a sense of immediacy. The trench walls in the foreground, which increasingly encroach on the viewer’s space as they progress from the left to the right side of the composition, are topped by sandbags that prevent a view of the battlefield beyond. The restricted liminality of the composition, combined with Çalli’s hurried, impasto brushstrokes, encourage direct interaction with the soldiers. Although the main figure turns his back on the viewer, that he does so in the act of morning prayer increases rather than diminishes the sense of intimacy between viewer and subject.

In his most significant wartime painting Night Raid (1917, fig. 75) – a visceral depiction of hand-to-hand combat in a trench raid during the Gallipoli campaign – Çalli assigns the viewer a similarly privileged position in the trenches amongst the action. A sense of claustrophobia is generated in the painting tonally by the oppressive, dark palette, and physically by the trench walls in the background which limit the depth of the painting and restrict the pictorial space to the immediate proximity of the viewer. A further tension is generated between viewer and subject by the objects scattered on the ground, including a bayonet, a helmet and an ammunition pouch which, while they extend the viewer’s space into the composition, simultaneously keep the viewer at a distance by acting as physical obstacles. It is this tension between the acts of viewing and participation that allows Çalli’s painting to transmit a sense of the physical and psychological horror of modern warfare.

Çalli’s visual description of Gallipoli in Night Raid eschews heroic rhetoric; his figures are too ambiguous to allow a didactic reading. Though the soldiers holding rifles on the left and the man
strangling his opponent on the right can be identified as Turks by their Enver hats, the identities of the other combatants are less clearly defined. When they can be identified, the Turkish soldiers do not possess individual identities; their features are reduced to flattened planes and pale colours. More often they are hidden – behind a raised rifle, turned away from the viewer, or blended into the background. Çalli’s victims do not fare much better. The strangulation victim on the right resists individual identification. We assume that he is an Allied soldier because his assailant wears the Enver cap of a Turkish soldier, yet in the chaos of Çalli’s nightmare this is not a certainty. The identity of the main figure in the work – who kneels in the foreground, grasping his head with his hands and staring out at the viewer with maniacal eyes – is similarly ambiguous. It is difficult to discern his nationality from his uniform; Çalli’s restricted palette attributes a similar grey-green to the uniforms of all the combatants and, although the belt pouches of the figure are similar to those of the Turks behind him, the brim of his hat suggests that he may be wearing a British-style helmet. Additionally, it is difficult to discern whether he is the target of the Turkish soldiers behind him with raised rifles, or
whether they attack the kneeling figure to the right of the frame, who holds one hand up in defence. Both identifications open interpretive possibilities. Read as an Allied soldier, the main figure depicts the terror of a man about to be killed. An alternative reading of the man as a Turkish soldier not under attack allows a reading of him that admits psychological responses to physical combat.

It is this ambivalence that makes identifying a moralistic reading of Çallı’s work problematic. In contrast to Ruhi’s After the Enemy’s Retreat, the viewer of Night Raid is left unconvinced by a reading of the painting that pits the heroism of the Turkish defenders at Gallipoli against the moral culpability of the invading enemy. The Turkish soldiers in Çallı’s painting seem to be winning this battle, but there is little honour in the victory. Though the Turkish soldier on the right has overcome his enemy, the horrific bulging of the asphyxiated soldier’s eyes as he clutches at the hands of his assailant disturbs both a heroic identification of the Turkish soldier and a moral justification for his actions. Reading the main figure as a Turk similarly destabilises a heroic narrative by focusing on the destructive effects of war on both the body and mind of individual soldiers. As such, is difficult to read Night Raid as an article of wartime propaganda. Read as an isolated visual text, it is difficult to reconcile Çallı’s particular representation of Gallipoli with the need for its vindication in public remembrance; his visceral representation creates a tension against the expected function of war art to commemorate loss. Instead, it is only by reading Night Raid concomitantly with other contemporaneous Turkish accounts of the conflict that Çallı’s representation of Gallipoli finds resonance as a text that documents the physical and psychological experience of trench combat.

The diary of Mehmet Fasih – a Turkish soldier who fought at Gallipoli and then in the Independence War of 1919-23 – provides one such text that allows the nihilism of Çallı’s painting to be understood by viewers within the context of a lived experience of the campaign. Mehmet Fasih’s military service spanned the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Turkish Republic. Born in 1893 in Mersin on the Turkish Mediterranean coast, Fasih was a product of the military education system, attending a military high school in Edirne, then the Küleli Military School in Istanbul. In 1913 he joined the Istanbul Military Academy and in 1914 he was ordered to command a platoon in the 16th division of the 6th Army Corps. On 27 May 1915 his unit left Istanbul for the Gallipoli peninsula, relieving the 27th regiment at Bloody Ridge. Fasih was wounded at the front line during the Battle of Anıburnu and was evacuated to Istanbul at the end of May, rejoining his unit in October 1915 after his recuperation. After the victory at Gallipoli, Fasih’s unit was stationed in defence of the Bergama region on the Aegean coast, before it was sent in 1916 to the Sinai front, at which Fasih again fought British and Australian forces at the first and second battles of Gaza. However, after the second battle
Fasih was captured by the British and sent to a prisoner of war camp at Suez, where he was interned for the remainder of the war.

At the end of the First World War he returned to Istanbul, and at the outbreak of the Independence war in 1919 he left Istanbul to join Atatürk's new army. In Ankara, he was give command of a military company and later fought in the Battle of Sakarya, at which he was again wounded. After the Independence war, Fasih completed his study at the Istanbul Military Academy and between 1926 and 1928 he attended the French War Academy, from which he graduated at the top of his class. In the early Republican era, Fasih rose through the ranks to occupy some of the highest positions in the Turkish Army. He was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel in 1935 and served as Professor of Tactics at the War Academy and from 1939-43 he was Director of Operations at General Staff Headquarters. He was promoted to Brigadier General in 1945 and from that date until 1951 commanded numerous army divisions. In 1955 he was appointed Chief of Staff of Turkish land forces, and before his retirement in 1956 became the chief of the Department of Inspections at the Turkish Ministry of Defence.

From his return to Gallipoli after his convalescence in Istanbul until the end of the campaign, Fasih kept a personal diary, which was edited and translated by H. Dansman and published in 2004. 39 Fasih's diary is unique in being one of few published Turkish soldier diaries, and one of a handful of primary sources translated to English. As an historical document, it is particularly remarkable not only in illustration of the life of a man who would rise to become one of Turkey's most decorated officers, but due to the candidness and detail with which the author describes the physical and mental effects of trench warfare. Fasih's diary was intended not only as a means of reconciling his wartime experience, but to be a record of the Gallipoli campaign for future readers. In an inscription written on the front of the second volume of his diary, he recorded that:

To remind me of earlier period, I have a few insignificant souvenirs plus a piece of shrapnel embedded in my right shoulder-blade. To remind me of present phase, I shall have this slender note-book. As time goes by, both sweet and bitter memories are stolen from our hearts. Even if the strength of the awe or delight we felt prevents the theft of all our memories, in the normal course of life, the degree and nature of the emotions we felt fade. Will this note-book help preserve these details? Never!... Only I shall be able to relive these moments when I return to these lines. Read with attention. You will find here a record of fleeting moments in the life of the owner of a fatalistic heart. 40
Fasih's inscription reveals an interesting intersection between his wartime experience and its commemoration in literary form. Though he admits that his diary is an imperfect method of transmitting all the details of his wartime experience to an external reader, Fasih identifies his physical experience — in particular his wounding by shrapnel — as an integral part of his personal remembrance of war; a form of recollection that can be invoked by his own reading of his literary account. Fasih's literary expression is thus inextricably tied to his physical experience and remembrance of Gallipoli. This analogy between physical and literary remembrance is revealed by his writing style, in which vivid imagery is frequently employed in description of gruesome detail. On 28 October 1915, in description of enemy activity in his sector, he recorded:

Enemy illuminates front with white parachute flares sent up from several spots. There is some increase in infantry-fire. Moon has not yet appeared. Flares now going up in our sector. Everything bathed in a bright white light. Just as if the full moon was out. Our fellows set fire to kerosene-soaked rags. Immediate vicinity lit up by ruddy flames. Their colour brings to mind visions of all the blood already and yet to be spilled.\(^4\)

The relative mundanity of the events that Fasih describes and the perfunctory manner of his reportage lend them a documentary quality. However, the author's allusion to the parachute flares as a surrogate moon, and the manner in which he describes their light and that of his men's flaming rags illuminating not only the immediate vicinity but a vivid image of death in his mind's eye, gives the account a metaphorical quality in which the experience of the events cannot be separated from an evocative reconstruction of them. Similarly, on 16 November he recorded an image of the Gallipoli landscape which more closely links experience to reconstructed image:

Dawn is breaking. Wash my face and settle down to smoke my water pipe. Daylight gradually spreads and will eventually bathe everything. The valleys become pictures. The hills stick out. Puddles caused by last night's rain shine like mirrors. And, so do the streams which flow at the bottom of gullies.\(^4\)

Here, Fasih's account again contains elements of both the documentary and the metaphorical; an account of his early morning routine quickly shifts into florid prose. His reference to the valleys becoming pictures is a response to the irony of discovering a sense of picturesque beauty even in the sunrise of a battlefield, but it also reflects the manner in which his diary shifts from a documentary account to reflect an artistic sensibility.
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It is with this linkage between the artistic and the visceral that Fasih's literary account of Gallipoli finds resonance with Çalli's pictorial representation. Fasih approaches his account of trench combat with the same literary sensibility as he does his description of the Gallipoli landscape, a sensibility that allows the reader to understand the effect of combat on his body and psyche. On 27 October, Fasih recorded the discovery of his comrades after a shell attack on Turkish trenches:

As if tossed in by hand, an enemy shell penetrated the position from this aperture. The carnage it caused is awful. Six dead lie there. Dismembered, parts of their bodies are intermingled. Blood has drained out of bodies, and chests and arms look like wax. Shins and legs, seared by the explosion, are purple. Some bones have been stripped of flesh. The men's features are unrecognizable. Pitch black...

‘Graves, graves... lie open throughout the World,/ lightning has blighted the rose gardens,/ Soldiers, soldiers... have become corpses,/ Heroes are now carrion for wild beats.’ First-aid men are collecting bits and pieces. The men's comrades have gathered. Waiting to help carry their dead friends away. Alas... This is impossible... The machine-gun stand has been smashed to bits. Its various components are covered with blood and bits of human flesh. Mud is everywhere... Shredded underwear from the dead is encased in the most inaccessible parts of the gun... As I write this in my diary, relight and smoke tobacco remaining in my water-pipe, and drink up what was left of my coffee when the shelling started. But the horror of what I saw remains before my eyes. 43

It is obvious from this entry that the horrific scene Fasih describes had a profound impact on him that affected his recording of it. His factual description of the discovery of the bodies is interrupted by the inclusion of four lines of poetry, before it is resumed with a similar attention to detail. In Fasih's recollection, it is significant that the victims are dehumanised and stripped of their identities. They are unrecognisable; their intermingled body parts are warped, mutilated and indistinguishable from one another. In Night Raid, analogous to Fasih's literary style, Çalli's painterly technique, with its flattening of planes and simplification of forms, is the particular mechanism through which this dehumanising experience is transmitted. The paleness of Çalli's palette and his geometric reduction of facial features echoes the blood-drained waxiness of Fasih's description. In the central midground a faceless soldier crouches against a trench wall, blood emitting from a gash on his head; it is impossible to discern to which side he belongs, or indeed whether he still possesses an identity at all. Where they are visible, the eyes of all the combatants bulge unnaturally, regardless of whether
they attack or are being attacked. In a later entry, Fasih describes in detail the discovery of his friend Nuri’s dead body after an attack:

Oh, my god!... What further tragedies are you going to make me witness?... Nuri has injuries to his chest, head, an arm and both legs. Both head and chest are ripped open. His hair is all mussed up, his uniform soaked in blood. He is pale. His mouth is partially open. One can see his white teeth between his lips. His eyes are half-open, staring at the sky. The purity of his handsome features is still evident. His hands are locked together on his chest... he seems to be reproaching those who destroyed him. I can't stand it anymore.  

It is not difficult to see in Nuri’s blood-soaked uniform, pale face, open mouth and staring eyes the main figure in Çaliş’s Night Raid. Though Çaliş’s figure remains alive, it is telling of the transformative effect of trench combat that the artist is able to imbue him with a pallor reminiscent of Fasih’s description of Nuri’s dead body. As such, Çaliş’s treatment of the figure suggests that such a physical transformation was not limited to the war dead. As Fasih recorded, he underwent a similar physical ordeal as a survivor:

[I] Would love to see those who claim, “soldiering is an easy profession and the military are over-paid!”, spend one night sleeping in the mud. Would they ever repeat that statement? I don’t believe so. I’m 21 years old. My hair and beard are already grey. My moustache is white. My face is wrinkled and my body is rotting. I can’t anymore endure the hardships and privations we face without being upset. Becoming an Ottoman Officer only means putting up with grenades and bombs.  

Night Raid personifies this physical reaction; it gives body to the devastation, fear and horror expressed by Fasih and other soldiers at Gallipoli. Understood in conjunction with accounts of the lived experience of the Gallipoli trenches, on one level Çaliş’s painting functions as a visual expression of the transformative experience of trench warfare. The horror of Night Raid is enhanced by the temporal suspension that Çaliş achieves in the work. That the Turkish soldiers are frozen with their rifles mid-arc prefigures a suspended moment of imminent violence that never reaches consummation, which engenders an ineradicable nervous tension in the viewer. Such an effect makes the insertion of the battle scene into a continuous narrative problematic.
Çalli’s main figure, whilst personifying this physical wartime experience, also admits an exploration of the psychological impact of warfare that admits the emotions fear, paranoia and terror. This is indicated visually by the soldier’s gaping-mouthed expression and by his hands which grasp at his head, and it is significant that Çalli’s figure mimics one utilised by Ellis Silas to represent a shell-shocked soldier fleeing from battle in his drawing *Dawn, May 3 1915*. Both artists employ the figure to represent a psychological inability to continue fighting; in both images the figures have abandoned their weapons and can play no further role in the battle. Çalli widens this sense of fear and psychological distress by drawing a symbolic resonance with the mythological figure of the Roman Titan Saturn, as depicted by Goya in his *Saturn Devouring His Sons* (hereafter *Saturn*) (1819-23, fig. 76). In addition, it is through this association that the artist is able to generate multiple meanings in the work and transpose the chaos of *Night Raid* into a wider allegory for modern Ottoman society. A close inspection of *Night Raid* reveals a series of parallels between the Goya and the Çalli. The bodies of both Saturn and the soldier form similar though opposite arcs (one is convex, the other concave), their bent legs project at similar angles, their faces tilt almost identically, their hands clasp, their mouths form the same depthless void and they stare down in terror at the viewer with the same wild, animal eyes. However, Goya’s vision does not survive this displacement entirely intact. The figure of the child in the original is gone and the soldier’s hands are differently placed, but once a likeness to the Goya is admitted, other resemblances reveal themselves. The soldier’s hands clasped to his face bear a likeness to Munch’s *The Scream* (1893), bringing with it a sense of paranoia. The trenches in the midground upon which the shadows of the protagonists are thrown share a resemblance to the background of Goya’s *Third of May, 1808* (1814), and the mood of *Night Raid* reflects the macabre tension of that work. Though Goya’s original vision is evident, its new incarnation reflects its transition between epochs and cultures.

It is likely that Çalli would have been aware of Goya’s work from his European academic training and was conscious of the mythological narrative of the original. In the Roman myth, Saturn, one of seven universe-ruling Titans, acquired sole power over the universe after castrating his father Uranus and deposing him from power. Ironically, upon seizing power, Saturn was delivered the prophecy that one of his progeny would one day overthrow him. Enraged by the thought of his own demise, he proceeded to devour his offspring one by one. Saturn’s wife Ops, appalled by his actions, deceived him, saving their final surviving child, Jupiter, who eventually returned to overthrow his father, assuming celestial power and fulfilling the prophecy. It has been argued that in Goya’s original, painted on the wall of his house the *Quinta del Sordo*, the artist employed this mythological context as both an allegory for his experience of wartime Spain and an expression of the artist’s consciousness of his own mortality – when he began the painting in 1819, Goya was still suffering...
mentally and physically from an illness that he had contracted in 1792 which left him deaf and had nearly killed him. In addition, Goya’s oeuvre from the period reflects his experience of the Peninsular War against the French of (1808-14), which he recorded in his print series *Disasters of War* as well as in his painting *Third of May 1808*.

However, the cyclical nature of the Saturn myth allows for a third reading of *Saturn* as an expression of a societal conflict between old age and youth and a paranoid fear of generational change expressed through violence and greed. More than simply a picture of one tyrant’s paranoia, the mythological narrative of Goya’s painting has been extended to describe the failures of the contemporaneous society in which the artist worked. As Robert Hughes writes:
What Goya painted is the combination of uncontrollable appetite and overwhelming shame that comes with addiction — Saturn goggle-eyed and gaping, tormented by his lust for human meat, for an unthinkable incest. If he were merely hungry, he would not appall and move us so. And in what sort of society would the fathers eat the young? Surely, one in which the old perceive the new as a deadly threat: a society so reactionary that 'tradition,' imagined as the absolute reign of totally authority, is worth murdering for. In this way Goya’s Saturn may be meant to direct our gaze back to the values of Fernando VII and his loyalists, an incarnation of a revolution that ended by eating its children.  

It is fitting that the Roman myth of Saturn was a transposition of the earlier Greek myth of Chronos; here, Hughes translates the mythological narrative to describe the society of Fernando VII and the politics of his regime. Though Çalli’s figure resembles Goya’s, it would be a mistake to read the Turkish artist’s appropriation of Saturn as a simple annex to the European historical and mythological context of Goya’s painting. In the Graeco-Roman tradition, the protagonists are malleable; sometimes Saturn is one of the Roman Numina and other times he is the Greek Chronos, the father of time. It is with an awareness of this cultural mutability that in appropriating Goya’s Saturn, Çalli reforms the original as a palimpsest, borrowing some of its allegorical meanings, whilst generating new meanings in a new context.

Just as Goya’s Saturn functions equally as personal and political allegory, it is possible to read Çalli’s figural appropriation as a reference to the chaotic years of late Ottoman history leading up to the First World War in which the artist worked. This is due to the fact that the reign of Abdülhamid II — the last Ottoman sultan to rule with absolute power and who was often viewed as paranoid and capricious (though recently scholarship has revised his image) — was characterised by an analogous cyclical pattern of revolution and counter-revolution. Both Abdülhamid II’s character and reign share striking similarities with the story of Saturn, in particular because the sultan came to power after a series of depositions that he feared would undermine his own rule, and which eventually did. The reign of Abdülhamid II, which began with elections for the new constitutional Ottoman parliament in 1876, was initially viewed with optimism as a period of transition and reform. Abdülhamid II rose to the Sultanate after a period of political turmoil during which his predecessor Murat V had been deposed for reneging on a promise to enact an Ottoman constitution. However the modernising reforms introduced in the early stages of Abdülhamid II’s reign in many cases did not provide lasting institutional change and it has been argued that they were part of a strategy to
“impress the Liberals in Europe [and] to tighten his personal hold over the empire”. Problems stemming from the electoral and legislative systems, which in effect allowed the Sultan and his ministers to rule by fiat, soon began to erode the new constitution and, in February 1878, the Sultan suspended the parliament and constitution indefinitely, returning Ottoman Turkey to rule by absolute monarchy. Abdülmecid II’s reign was one of contrasts. Though considered a tyrant by some, he viewed the society over which he reigned as one with certain freedoms constrained by strict rules. As Hanioglu argues, the sultan considered himself an “enlightened reformer”:

...articles written at the sultan’s behest for publication in European journals emphasized Ottoman progress under the far-sighted leadership of Abdülmecid II, an Ottoman Peter the Great, who was taking the Tanzimat reforms to new horizons.54

According to Hanioglu, though Abdülmecid II was an authoritarian leader, he was “no simple-minded reactionary blindly presiding over the slow demise of a stagnant empire. He was a shrewd tactician”.55 Similarly, as Karpat argues, although the promised reformation of the Ottoman political system never properly materialised during his reign, Abdülmecid II modernised sections of Ottoman society that assisted him in maintaining the authority of his rule.56 He established a series of bureaucratic schools in order to train government officials, and in support of his regime he expanded the Empire’s telegraph and railway systems. Though he turned increasingly towards a pan-Islamic Ottoman identity, he did so in part to maintain the integrity of its territorial possessions.

Nevertheless, until 1908, Abdülmecid II’s reign was characterised by an increasing paranoia and insecurity that manifested itself through a complex system of police agents, spies and informers. Although during the early part of Abdülmecid II’s reign improvements were made to the Ottoman Newspaper industry, after 1888 the press was heavily censored. The Sultan, fearing assassination and uprising, began to retreat from public life and during the later years of his reign he rarely ventured out of his palaces, doing so only to move from one to the next. As Zürcher puts it, so bad was the Sultan’s insecurity that:

Over the years this suspicion and his natural desire to remain master in his own house grew into a fear of grotesque proportions. The result was that the sultan came to rely more and more on the internal espionage networks he built up, with people of all ranks being encouraged to report on the activities of others.57

In the meantime, secret societies such as the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), and political movements such as the Young Turks, who were agitating for political and social reform, began to
plot to remove the Sultan. In 1896 a planned coup was foiled by Abdülhamid II’s secret police, and in 1897 the Sultan sent a large number of Young Turks into exile. The situation came to a head with the revolution of 1908 where elements of the army who were loyal to the CUP rebelled and demanded the restoration of the constitution. On 23 July 1908, Abdülhamid II assented to their demands and restored the constitution, beginning what is known as the second constitutional period.

However, the 1908 revolution has been described as one in name only, as it initially achieved only the restoration of a consultative body that still functioned beneath the absolute powers of the sultan, who had not lost his status. In addition, as Abdülhamid II proclaimed the restoration of the constitution himself, he was able to mitigate the loss to his prestige by framing himself as a revolutionary figure. During this time, the revolutionary powers of the CUP did not take an active role in governance, preferring to influence political decisions through sympathetic members of parliament. On 12 April 1909, a counter-revolutionary group called the “Union of Mohammad” staged a coup aimed at restoring Abdülhamid II’s monarchy and implementing sharia laws. Attacking the Ottoman Parliament, they managed to force the cabinet to resign, which allowed the Sultan to appoint a new Grand Vizier to restore the old regime. However, on 22 April a CUP army moved on Istanbul, crushing the counter-revolution and restoring the constitutional regime. On 27 April, parliament deposed the Sultan and installed Mehmet V as his successor, finally ending the reign of Abdülhamid II. The modernisation of the Ottoman Parliament during the first and second constitutional periods was thus characterised by a cycle of usurpation and deposition and the revolutionary years of 1908-9 set a precedent by which the Ottoman and later Turkish constitutions were defended.58

In both the late Ottoman era of the Young Turks and the Committee for Union and Progress, and the early Republican era, Abdülhamid II was a frequent target of social and political criticism and, as Karpat suggests, was commonly framed in literature as “as a reactionary who opposed Western civilisation, and, especially, as an intriguer who concocted panislamism in order to subvert and undermine “civilizing” European rule over Muslims”.59 Abdülhamid II was blamed, perhaps unfairly, for resisting Ottoman institutional reform, a neglect that allowed the Ottoman Empire’s position with regard to the European powers to deteriorate in the early part of the twentieth century, and which placed the Empire in a precarious political situation with regards to the Entente powers when the First World War eventuated. Çaliş’s figure, in referencing Goya’s paranoid tyrant, certainly draws parallels with the life and personal character of the sultan. However, drawn nine years after Abdülhamid II’s deposition and situated in the context of the Gallipoli campaign in the guise of a soldier, it is unlikely that the figure is a direct criticism of the sultan himself. Rather, just as Goya
mobilised the classical narrative of the Saturn myth in hindsight to describe a Spanish society disrupted by war and internal conflict, it is likely that ÇoklU appropriated the Goya in order to signal a similar societal chaos. I would argue that Çoklu’s figure thus resonates as an allegory for the political and social upheaval in the period of Ottoman history leading up to the First World War. Indeed, Özseesgin argues that Çoklu’s works cannot be read outside the social and political context of his time: “we cannot regard him in abstraction”, he writes, “from the social and cultural developments of his age, or from the elements determining the formation of the artistic environment he worked in”.

These social and cultural developments focused not only upon emerging modern Turkish identities, but on the very survival of the Ottoman, and later Turkish, States. As Özseesgin suggests:

The period in which Ibrahim Çoklu lived comprises all the turbulent political and social events of the passage from the old Empire to the new Republic... Çoklu was a youth during the spread of the Young Turk movement in Turkey. During that period, when there arose revolutionary groups among the military and civil students, the fundamental question was the continuity of the Ottoman state.

In addition, he notes that:

It would be right to regard the group of artists, who are called the 1910 or 1914 generation, or rather the Çoklu generation, in Turkish painting... as an extension of the cultural atmosphere which was an outcome of the second constitution.

Çoklu's own political affiliations are difficult to decipher. Nevertheless, though few explicit records of the artist's political activity have surfaced, his biographer is keen to make a link between the nature of Çoklu’s artistic education, the epochs across which his career spanned and shifting notions of Turkish identities in the Modernist era. Though Özseesgin stops short of identifying Çoklu as an overt member of the Young Turk movement, he infers a close link between the cultural and political shifts of the early twentieth century and their cultural expression in the works of the Generation of 1914. Other writers have identified a more direct association between the Turkish Modernists and revolutionary political attitudes. Of the political associations of the graduates of the Academy of Fine Arts, Günsel Renda records that:

Those who graduated from the FAA between 1910-20, especially those of the group who had the opportunity to develop their art and gain experience outside Turkey, became the representatives of a
new mentality: they began to deny the past by assuming a
'revolutionary' attitude.64

The revolutionary attitude Renda describes was one both of technique and of ideology. Especially in the early year of the Republic, Turkish artists continued to develop visual languages that differed markedly from those employed by Ottoman-Turkish artists, and which were used in conjunction with a Republican vision in order to differentiate the new Turkish nation from its predecessor. Çalli's painting does not directly "deny the past", as Renda puts it. Rather, the artist employs Gallipoli as an historical and thematic locus in order to explore the process of social and political revolution through which the Ottoman Empire passed in the early twentieth century. In so doing Night Raid thus engenders a complex layering of meaning.

The modernising period of the late Ottoman Empire was a contested era that encompassed a range of cultural and ideological battles. Not only was the Ottoman Government concerned with defending an empire against internal agitation and European enemies, artists and writers of the early twentieth century were engaged in an attempt to define a shifting Ottoman-Turkish identity through the expression of competing ideologies. The European-trained Generation of 1914 were themselves engaged in a long-standing narrative of Ottoman intra-cultural development and revision, which gathered impetus with shifts in Ottoman society throughout the early decades of the twentieth century. In the context of this period of Ottoman modernisation, Gallipoli proved a symbolic fulcrum between an anachronistic past and a rejuvenated modern present. It encapsulated not only a battle between empires and ideologies, but also a cultural battle being fought in Ottoman political and social life. For Mehmet Ruhî, Gallipoli afforded an opportunity to project a culturally distinct Ottoman society, invigorated by reference to an Ottoman heritage that linked the Turkish victory to long-standing traditions of military heroism. To Ruhî, the campaign signified not only a military victory but a cultural defence. It is a mark of the complexity of the ideologies of the period that İbrahim Çalli's representation of Gallipoli differed so drastically from his compatriot. While Çalli's work effectively describes the lived experience of modern warfare, his allusion to the process of social and political upheaval through which the Ottoman Empire underwent in the early twentieth century widens the lens through which we view Gallipoli by locating it as part of a transitional narrative. In describing the Gallipoli campaign as a site for historical revision, the artists of the Generation of 1914 mobilised the campaign as a focal point of Ottoman and Turkish modernity. For İbrahim Çalli and Mehmet Ruhî, attempting to voice this cultural transition was itself a formative process. Borrowing European visual languages, they attempted to forge a new visual identity that broke free of the traditions of the past. In doing so, not only were they able to project a self-
determined image and enter into a cross-cultural discourse as active agents, they also acquired a visual language that allowed them to explore the process by which they defined their identities.
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In a 1916 letter to his colleagues at the Chelsea Arts Club to whom he was donating a copy of his Gallipoli diary, the Australian soldier-artist Ellis Silas described his approach to recording his wartime experience in writing and through visual art. "I have described exactly my feelings at the time the incidents related occurred", he wrote:

Owing to lack of space, opportunity, and, in part, inclination, much was omitted in the original diary that is now herein sat down. Whether or not this record of my experiences during the first terrible year of the Great War will be of interest, time alone can prove.¹

In donating his diary to the club, Silas transformed his personal record into a public one. At first his audience was small, limited to friends and colleagues within the British artistic community. Nevertheless, he was conscious of the new public life his private document had acquired and in his accompanying letter Silas hinted that in re-considering his diary he undertook a process of mediation and negotiation in presenting the material to a new audience. His letter reveals a moment of private misgiving and doubt, a tension between what he thought was necessary to record and what was appropriate to publish. Silas' reworking of his diary and sketches from a position of relative safety in London in 1916 raises questions about how he re-presented his Gallipoli experience as he prepared to make it public. In what ways did he reshape his personal recollection when conscious of its being viewed by others?

What is perhaps most interesting about Silas' letter is his uncertainty as to the relevance of his personal record in the public sphere. Would his writing, paintings and drawings be of lasting interest? This question would be resolved much sooner than Silas imagined; by the end of 1916 public interest in written and visual representations of the war had been well established in Australia, Europe and the Ottoman Empire. Silas' own sketches and diary
extracts had been published in two editions of *Crusading at Anzac*, and *The Anzac Book* had won critical acclaim. Australia’s Official War Art Scheme commenced in 1917 resulting in the commission of hundreds of works of art. In 1915, the Ottoman government had sent a group of writers, poets and artists to the Gallipoli battlefields that included members of a generation of state-trained and sponsored painters. By 1917 plans were underway to create works of art that would depict the campaign for an international audience at the 1918 Vienna Exhibition. Before the First World War concluded it was clear that the visual arts would play a key role in the way in which the Australian nation and the Ottoman Empire responded to the questions of national identity and imperial sovereignty raised by their engagement in the war.

Moving from Silas’ personal recording of war to the ways in which nations and empires represented it through visual art, it becomes apparent that what ties the seemingly disparate interests of the Australian nation and the Ottoman Empire together with the paintings of individual soldier-artists and grand, state-sponsored war art programs, is the process of mediation and negotiation through which war is embodied with ideas about identity. It was a process conducted with a consciousness of audience and place. Silas mediated between his personal anxieties and the appropriateness of his wartime vision in public life. Likewise, in producing a memento intended to illustrate the Gallipoli experience for an audience in Australia and Europe, the creators of *The Anzac Book* were required to negotiate which forms of expression and what subjects were suitable to voice outside the wartime culture of the Australian Army. George Lambert, Australia’s official Gallipoli artist, worked with an understanding of Charles Bean’s historical project to create an image of a ‘new’ Australia that was in dialogue with its colonial past. The Ottoman-Turkish artists who represented Gallipoli played a similar mediating role between both domestic and foreign audiences. The artists of the Şişli Studio balanced personal desires to describe the horrific experiences of modern warfare with their task of venerating a famous victory for the Ottoman public. The Ottoman Government, in commissioning a collection of war paintings for exhibition in Vienna, did so with the knowledge that the image they projected and the manner in which it spoke to its international audience would play a role in consolidating political relationships that were crucial for the survival of the Empire.

As I have shown, in the particular case of Gallipoli the Australian and Ottoman governments instigated highly-orchestrated visual art projects such as the Australian Official War Art Scheme and the Şişli Studio to define a collective character that supported each polity’s
domestic and international ambitions. This raises important questions as to why Gallipoli in particular was chosen as a locus for the projection of ideological messages, and how these messages differed with culture and context. Identifying the meanings embodied by Gallipoli is not always an easy task. In both the Australian and Turkish historiographies of Gallipoli, the campaign has too often been read exclusively within the cultural history of one nation or the other. This narrow approach to analysing its lasting significance has encouraged an anachronistic and teleological reading of the campaign in both contexts as a simple fulcrum between historical epochs. Specifically, the campaign is read as symbolic of the emergence of the Turkish Republic and Australian nation from the Ottoman and British Empires.

Reading the different ways in which Gallipoli was depicted in Australian and Ottoman-Turkish art alongside one another reveals that even though in contemporary discourse it is the rise of nationalisms that is emphasised, it was the context of the campaign as a clash of empires that was the principle reason it was so enthusiastically appropriated by both governments. Though it fought against the Ottoman Empire, Australia’s chief accomplishment at Gallipoli was defining a presence within its British imperial relationship; the fact that its army fought with bravery together with the British at Gallipoli symbolised the arrival of the nation as an international polity. Though Gallipoli was a military failure, it allowed Australia to both engage with imperial discourses of war and nation building while simultaneously distinguishing itself from a solely British character. For the Ottomans, Gallipoli represented a famous victory over the British and French Empires – old rivals whose ambitions threatened the existence of the Ottoman Empire. This victory afforded them the opportunity to demonstrate their military strength to their German and Austrian allies. Clearly, there was value for both the Australian nation and the Ottoman Empire in representing their respective achievements at Gallipoli.

Interpreting Gallipoli in Australian art and history solely as a rite of passage at which Australia transitioned between colony and nation misrepresents both historical fact and the social function of the visual arts. A more productive approach is to consider how it was transformed into a symbolic event that embodied a range of historical experiences, with the Anzac soldier becoming a representative of the new nation. Doing so reveals that Gallipoli was one event in a larger historical sequence in which Australia began to assert a post-imperial identity, and that war art was one way in which this identity was codified. Similarly, the tendency of contemporary Turkish histories to read Gallipoli as a formative step between Empire and Republic ignores the complex cultural contests that occurred between
the Ottoman Empire and its European rivals in the early twentieth century. By analysing the aims of the Şişli Studio and the Vienna Exhibition it can be seen that Gallipoli was adopted in the Ottoman-Turkish context not to develop a post-imperial identity, but to consolidate that of an Empire struggling to maintain its relevance. Interpreting Australian and Turkish representations of Gallipoli in relation to one another thus enables each to be understood as a subset of larger historical and cultural narratives.

In this study I have deciphered visual symbolism within the context of its production. Doing so has revealed that the Gallipoli ‘myth’ – especially as it has been understood in Australian history – is not hegemonic but involves multiple narratives and influences that are contested and evolving. By considering the difference between official public representations and the private representations that oppose them, I have shown that contradictory voices simultaneously coexisted within these larger historical narratives. The ways in which artists and institutions continue to visually represented Gallipoli shows that the subject is revisited and re-imagined with shifts in society and culture. For example, when the Australian War Memorial was opened in 1941, a gallery dedicated to Gallipoli was created from artefacts and primary documents collected by Bean and others during the campaign, which had been preserved by the War Records Section since its inception in 1917. However, they were curated as a collection 25 years after the conclusion of the campaign, at a time in which not only had Australia’s popular imagination been heavily influenced by its First World War experience, but during which Australia was already engaged in a second world war. Even as Australia’s principle war museum was being formed, the historical narrative it presented was influenced by the nation’s continuing engagement in war. Similarly, when the Atatürk Museum was opened in Ankara in 1960, its museological mission was informed by the Turkish nation’s transition from the Ottoman Empire to the Turkish Republic. In particular, it sought to position Mustafa Kemal as a key player within this narrative, a fact emphasised by a later a change of name to the Atatürk ve Kurtuluş Savaşı Müzesi (Atatürk and the War of Independence Museum), and the positioning of Gallipoli – privileged amongst other Ottoman First World War battles – alongside famous battles from the later War of Independence.

Artists continue to embody Gallipoli with themes drawn from wider historical and cultural traditions. When the Australian artist Sidney Nolan first represented Gallipoli in the 1950s – a theme that he would reprise many times over the next two decades – he was heavily influenced by an understanding of Homer’s iliad and the mythological history of the
Dardanelles, as well as classical Greek traditions of depicting the male body and the relationship of individual citizens to the identity of the body politic. Nolan’s paintings were influenced by, and contributed to, Gallipoli mythologies in mid-twentieth century Australian culture. However his conscious linking of this Australian historical event with previous cultural mythologies represented the beginnings of a tradition within Australian art and writing in which the process of creating cultural mythologies came under critical scrutiny. Similarly, a 2006 painting by the Çanakkale-based, Turkish contemporary artist Hakan Daloğlu, titled *River Clyde* (2006, fig. 77), represents the landing at Gallipoli with a consciousness of the composite cultural influences that inform Gallipoli narratives, and the specific historical context of the campaign. In it, the eponymous British collier-cum-troopship is represented in the guise of the Trojan horse. A horse’s skull and cannons protrude from the ship’s bow, and similar armaments sit in place of the horse’s phallus. Stylised feet stretch from the hull of the ship to the ground, though hooves are replaced by wheels that transport the beast across a Gallipoli peninsula metamophised into a chess board. Daloğlu’s selection of the chessboard as the landscape over which the Gallipoli campaign is fought revives the conception of it as the result of European imperial
machinations. Like Nolan, Daloğlu is conscious of the process by which preceding cultural mythologies were adopted in Gallipoli history. His allusion to the Trojan horse, drawn against the Greek attack at Troy, is an apt one; the River Clyde, a converted civilian vessel, landed 2,000 concealed British troops at Seddülbahir Castle on the morning of 25 April, 1915, with the intention of storming the peninsula in a surprise attack.

Daloğlu’s painting shows that the structure of myths and historical narratives can be carried between cultures and epochs. Similarly, the story of Gallipoli is told in particular ways depending on the particular political moment. In the twenty-first century, Gallipoli still plays a major role in Australian and Turkish political discourse; though removed from the context of empire, the remembrance of Gallipoli is now used to forge a strategic relationship between the two nations. The old antagonisms between the British and Ottoman Empires are downplayed and emphasis is placed on the battle as a focal point for the emergence of both Australian and Turkish national identities and finding commonalities in the remembrance of war. Inaugurated by Atatürk’s famous 1934 speech in which he declared that there was “no difference between the Johnnies and the Mehmets to us where they lie side by side here in this country of ours”, the messages emphasising a cultural connection through a shared war experience have become increasingly important in Australian society since the 1967 signing of a Turkish-Australian immigration agreement that saw an increase in Turkish immigration to Australia. For example, in 2001 when sending a medical team to assist victims of the 1999 Turkish earthquake, Victorian Premier Steve Bracks went so far as to say that:

> Australians share a special bond with Turkey that goes back to another terrible experience at Gallipoli. And that shared experience makes our community effort even more meaningful.

Bracks invoked the experience of Gallipoli to suggest a strong communal bond between Australians and Turks that extends to a social obligation in times of crisis. It is this social obligation that is echoed in the monuments to the campaign that stand on the peninsula today. Overlooking Anzac Cove, the words of Atatürk’s 1934 speech are memorialised in stone.

As we approach the centennial commemoration of the Gallipoli campaign, its significance in Australian and Turkish culture seems to be increasing rather than diminishing. This is reflected in the growing number of young Australians and Turks who visit the peninsula on
Anzac Day each year. In the 1960s, only a handful of people visited the peninsula on Anzac Day. The 75th anniversary of the landing was attended by 10,000 people, including then Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke. Today, up to 20,000 visit the battlefields on 25 April. In Turkey, commemorations are held on 18 March as well as 25 April. These events celebrate the establishment of the Turkish Republic, but in recent years alternative voices have emerged that emphasise the First World War as an Islamic struggle, reflecting the rise of Islamism in contemporary Turkish political discourse.5

This resurgence in the significance of Gallipoli and its distinctive contemporary inflection shows how these cultural narratives have varied with time and context, and suggests that the national identities espoused in contemporary Gallipoli mythologies continue to be subject to change and revision. The approach I have taken to the study of Gallipoli in Australian and Turkish art acknowledges this and admits the influence of multiple cultures in the creation of historical narratives. Though contemporary political rhetoric positions the Turkish and Australian experiences of Gallipoli alongside one another, it is nonetheless important to maintain a critical distance in analysing each cultural context. Doing so will allow future studies to extend a multivalent reading of Gallipoli in visual culture to later twentieth and twenty-first century paintings and drawings, films, literature, commemorative paraphernalia, and other cultural ephemera. An analysis of the ways in which Gallipoli is represented in contemporary discourse will shed new light not only on the historical significance of the campaign, but on the ways in which Australian and Turkish national identities continue to be defined and redefined through the representation of these events by those seeking a collective character.
Notes for conclusion

1 Ellis Silas, Letter to the Chelsea Arts Club dated 26 June 1916, *Diary of an Anzac, August 1914 – May 1915*, ML MSS 1840, CY4437, Mitchell Library Archive.


5 This recent adoption of Gallipoli by Islamist groups as an ideological tool is a complex political scenario which is unfortunately outside the boundaries of this study.
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