



The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

JASSS

International Journal of Social Science

Doi number:<http://dx.doi.org/10.9761/JASSS7984>

Number: 74 , p. 481-495, Spring 2019

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Yayın Süreci / Publication Process

Yayın Geliş Tarihi / Article Arrival Date - Yayın Kabul Tarihi / Article Acceptance Date

15.01.2019

13.03.2019

Yayınlanma Tarihi / The Published Date

25.03.2019

FILMS, POLITICS AND HISTORY: THE EXAMPLE OF THE GALLIPOLI CAMPAIGN

FİLMLER, SİYASET VE TARİH: ÇANAKKALE SAVAŞI ÖRNEĞİ

Asst. Prof. Dr. Şebnem Cansun

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0797-9699>

Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,

Department of Political Science and International Relations,

sebnem_cansun@yahoo.com

Abstract

The Gallipoli Campaign, which turned out to be a failure for the Allies and a victory for the Ottoman Empire, is a significant part of World War One. The representation of the Gallipoli Campaign in film and its connection to politics and history have thus far not been academically examined from a comparative perspective. To fill the literature gap, I conducted a document analysis of four films about the Gallipoli Campaign, focusing on the experience of the Australians and the Turks. I chose two Australian and two Turkish films based on their accessibility and recognition. Two of those films, *Gallipoli* (1981) and *The Water Diviner* (2014), are Australian-made and show mostly the Australian experience. The two other films, *Çanakkale 1915 (Gallipoli 1915, 2012)* and *Çanakkale Yolun Sonu (Gallipoli: End of the Road, 2013)* are Turkish-made and emphasize the Turkish experience. All four films highlight the inhuman characteristics of war and the suffering of the soldiers and their families, hence the common pain. Not surprisingly, patriotism and heroism are the emotions that emerge in all the films in question because, for the Australians, the Gallipoli Campaign was part of the national identity-building process, whereas for the Turks it was about the survival of the nation and the defense of the motherland. The four films also have the common point of a somewhat anti-British approach, though

the Australian-made films differ from the others by having more anti-war elements. *The Water Diviner* has a pro-Turkish political perspective whereas *Gallipoli 1915* seems to cater to the current political arena in Turkey. A future work could include other films about the subject and make a complementary comparison.

Key Words: Gallipoli Campaign, Politics, History, Film, Australia, Turkey

Öz

Çanakkale Savaşı, ki İtilaf Devletleri için bir başarısızlık, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu için ise zaferle sonuçlanmıştır, Birinci Dünya Savaşı'nın önemli bir kısmıdır. Çanakkale Savaşı'nın filmde temsili ve bunun siyaset ve tarih ile ilişkisi karşılaştırmalı perspektifle akademik olarak bugüne dek incelenmemiştir. Bu literatür eksiğini gidermek üzere, Avusturalyalılar ve Türkler'in tecrübesine odaklanarak, Çanakkale Savaşı hakkındaki dört filme doküman analizi yaptım. Erişilirlik ve tanınırlıklarını çıkış noktası olarak iki Avusturalya ve iki Türk filmi seçtim. Bunlardan ikisi, *Gallipoli* (Gelibolu, 1981) and *The Water Diviner* (Son Umut, 2014) Avusturalya yapımıdır ve özellikle Avusturalyalı tecrübesini göstermektedir. Diğer iki film ise, *Çanakkale 1915* (2012) ve *Çanakkale Yolun Sonu* (2013) Türk yapımıdır ve Türk tecrübesini vurgulamaktadır. Dört film de savaşın insanlıkdışı özellikleri ile askerler ve ailelerinin acılarını, dolayısıyla ortak üzüntüyü vurgulamaktadır. Şaşırtıcı olmayan şekilde, vatanseverlik ve kahramanlık bahsedilen filmlerdeki öne çıkan duygudur, çünkü Avusturalyalılar için Çanakkale Savaşı milli kimlik oluşturma sürecinin parçası, Türkler için ise milletlerinin hayatta kalma mücadelesi ve anavatanlarının savunulmasıdır. Dört filmin diğer ortak noktası Britanya karşıtı yaklaşımdır, öte yandan Avusturalya yapımı filmlerde diğerlerinden daha fazla savaş-karşıtı unsurlar vardır. *The Water Diviner*'da Türk taraftarı bir siyasal yaklaşım vardır, *Çanakkale 1915* ise Türkiye'deki güncel siyasal arenaya hitap eder görünmektedir. İlerideki çalışmalar konu hakkındaki diğer filmleri de içerebilir ve tamamlayıcı karşılaştırma yapabilir

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çanakkale Savaşı, Siyaset, Tarih, Film, Avusturalya, Türkiye

Introduction

The Gallipoli Campaign was an important part of World War One. During an eight-month campaign in 1915, Allied soldiers from Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, Ireland, France, India and Newfoundland tried to open up the Dardanelles Strait and capture the Ottoman capital, Istanbul. The campaign started on April 25, 1915 with the landing of ANZAC (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps) troops in a small cove on the Gallipoli peninsula. The troops were under the leadership of British officers, and their

mission was to fight the Ottoman Turks. The campaign turned out to be a failure for the Allies and a victory for the Turks. Many academic works from different disciplines have treated the Gallipoli Campaign. However, the representation of the Gallipoli Campaign in film and its connection to politics and history have thus far not been academically examined from a comparative perspective. To fill the literature gap, in this study I focus on *Gallipoli* (Lovell, Stigwood and Weir, 1981), *The Water Diviner* (translated as *Son Umut* in Turkish; Lum, Mason, Rodger and Crowe, 2014), *Ça-*

nakkale 1915 (*Gallipoli 1915*; Örumcek Yapim and Sezgin, 2012) and *Çanakkale Yolun Sonu* (*Gallipoli: End of the Road*; Aydın, Aydın, Akar, Uzun and Karaman, 2013).

Here, brief information about the Gallipoli Campaign is in order. The Gallipoli Campaign was about patriotism, heroism, comradeship and courage. It was about young men who died for their countries. The case of the ANZAC at Gallipoli is particularly interesting because World War One did not take place in their homeland or even their hemisphere. The ANZAC voluntarily joined the war to support the British Empire, and their participation is considered to have played a role in the building of the national identity. For the ANZAC, the idea of heroism was mixed with a sense of romantic adventure. For the Turks, the campaign was a matter of survival. The Gallipoli Campaign, known as *Çanakkale Savaşı*, was about the defense of the motherland against the invaders.

During the Gallipoli Campaign, the Australians and the Turks -who fought so close to each other that at times they were able to clearly hear and see the other side- paid attention to the rules of politeness during war. For instance, there were moments of ceasefire to bury the dead. During these moments, vehicles and staff bearing the Red Cross or Red Crescent sign were safe from bullets. Afterwards, the fighting continued (Reynolds, 2007 cited in Karaduman, 2016). Part of this understanding of the enemy can also be seen in the fact that the ANZAC attributed a name to the Turkish soldiers. They called them "Johnny Turk" to show their sympathy towards them (Murray, 1965 cited in Karaduman, 2011).

The two nations became friends, particularly after the war, and have commemorated their deceased together. In this respect, the speech of the founder and president of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938), is significant. Atatürk, who was a Gal-

lipoli Campaign veteran, reassured the mothers of the dead ones. In 1934, he said, "You, the mothers who sent their sons from faraway countries, wipe away your tears; your sons are now lying in our bosom and are at peace. After having lost their lives on this land, they have become our sons as well" (Uyar, 2016).

Previous works

The analysis of the Gallipoli Campaign through films has not received significant treatment. Instead of academic articles, there are more often newspaper articles based on the content and criticisms of the films. There are also a few comparative works, such as those mentioned below, that treat both the Australian and Turkish perspectives.

Freebury (1987) focused only on the cult film *The Gallipoli* (1981) and treated it within the nationalist paradigm. She argued that the film has anti-Britishness and that, for Australian audiences, it was the proper representation of national history. The author also drew attention to the confusion over the genre, regarding whether Gallipoli was a war film or an anti-war film.

Yıldız (2017a) focused on a Turkish-made film called *The Children of Gallipoli* (2012) and argued that the film involves hyper-empathy syndrome. The film presents both the Turkish and British flags as of equal worth, gives the same attention to Turkish and British religious songs and takes the same distance from the Turkish and other dead soldiers. Hence, the film shows hyper-sympathy rather than sympathy, which the author finds wrong. According to Yıldız, the film despises the Turkish national resistance culture.

Yıldız (2017b) also made a comparative work on *The Gallipoli* and *The Water Diviner*, stating that attention was paid to subliminal messages. According to Yıldız, *Gallipoli* defends humanism but presents Muslims as primitive and corrupt and Turks as barbaric. Also, Yıldız argues that in *The Water Diviner*,

the invaders are presented as the saviors of Turkish women, whereas Turkish society is presented as ignorant. Yıldız believes that both films ignore the fact that the ANZAC came to invade Turkey with a crusader mentality.

Bennett (2014) made a comparative work. However, he compared not films with historical content, but new documentaries. He focused on two "borderless productions", Wain Fimeri's *Revealing Gallipoli* and Tolga Örnek's *Gallipoli: The Frontline Experience*, each made in 2005 for the campaign's ninetieth anniversary. The two documentaries explore the story through experts' perspectives. They address the conflict from all sides, focusing on the lives of ordinary men in a very humanist way.

Lastly, Hillman (2014) drew attention to new/different perspectives on the Gallipoli Campaign, focusing on both filmic and literary texts. Hillman focused on both the novel *Birds Without Wings* (2004) by the British author Louis de Bernières and the documentary *Gallipoli: The Frontline Experience* by Turkish director Tolga Örnek. Hillman compared those texts to Roger McDonald's novel *1915* (1979) and the cult film *Gallipoli*. Örnek's work combines different national viewpoints and involves almost "a ghostly, supranational oral history". Bernières' novel presents a historic contextualization of the battle, "a strong sense of the confluence of many Australian and Turkish perspectives, rather than Australian and British". Furthermore, Hillman drew attention to the importance of "transnational" and "cross-disciplinary" debates.

Methods

Aiming to contribute to the analysis of the Gallipoli Campaign from the Australian and Turkish perspectives, I decided to conduct qualitative research based on a descriptive film analysis. I chose two Australian films (*Gallipoli*, 1981; *The Water Diviner*, 2014), and two Turkish films (*Çanakkale 1915/Gallipoli 1915*, 2012; *Çanakkale Yolun Sonu/Gallipoli: End of the Road*, 2013), because of their accessibility

and recognition. In July 2018, I accessed all the films online except for *The Water Diviner*, which I purchased in a store. I watched the films several times, noting the important points related to the plot and the portrayal of the Gallipoli Campaign. Afterwards, I highlighted the interesting points, including the differing and common points among the films, and connected the results to political and historical perspectives.

Results

Findings on *Gallipoli* (1981)

Gallipoli is an Australian-made film that depicts the story of rural, young Australian men who, mesmerized by the idea of adventure, join the army and go to Gallipoli to fight the Ottoman Turks in 1915. Archy Hamilton, a stockman and sprinter, is the lead character, whereas his friend, Frank Dunne, another sprinter and unemployed ex-railway worker, is the secondary lead. The film also depicts the tragic story of Dunne's ex-coworkers from the railway, who enlist and have a tragic experience in Gallipoli. The film audience witnesses the young men's enlistment process, as well as their days in the training camps in Cairo and then in Gallipoli as members of the Light Horse Brigade. The film ends with Hamilton's death scene in a freeze-frame.

Gallipoli shows how Australians, who mostly considered the Turks as enemies, did not even know where the fight was taking place. In one of the early scenes, railway workers learn and think about the war through a newspaper. The news involves the victory of the Turks. Young Australian men identify themselves with the Allies, call the Turks "bastards" and decide to join the army on the spot. The exception is Dunne, of Irish descent, who appears hesitant in the beginning. In the same scene, while one man reads the news and pronounces "Gallipoli", another man repeats the name of the city using a different intonation, to correct the first man. In addition, other people in the film say Gallipoli consecutively because they hesitate in their

pronunciation. This issue shows that Australians have probably learned about this city only quite recently. Also, newspapers always include a map because Australians, who mostly know who their enemies are, do not necessarily know where they are. However, it is clear that Australians have some understanding of the connection between Gallipoli and "Troy". An enlistment call is held during festivities after a race, where Hamilton and Dunne get to know each other. Army officials show up with a big wooden Trojan Horse to get people's attention and no one questions why.

Australians' general approach towards the war is quite positive. The enlistment call mentioned earlier becomes part of the after-race festivities. The departure of the army ship to Cairo in July 1915 is almost like a party as well. Only a few people seem unhappy. War appears to be a means of strengthening national unity, and for the most part, people are enthusiastic about it. Men who are not old enough to join the army try to fool the army officials so that they can enlist, as if they don't want to miss the experience. For instance, Hamilton produces a false birth certificate and wears fake facial hair.

Although most people support the war, a few are against it or do not even know a war is taking place. Dunne is the one who questions the motives behind the war. While Hamilton believes that Dunne must be a coward or aligned with the other side, Dunne believes that the war is an British conflict that has nothing to do with the Australians. Dunne's father is against his son's participation in the war because the British killed his father (Dunne's grandfather). Dunne tells his father that he has joined the army not to fight for the British Empire but to return as an officer. To Dunne, joining the army means finding a job.

One person in the film -the camel driver whom Hamilton and Dunne encounter in the desert on their way to Perth- has a com-

pletely different viewpoint from the others. He does not even know that a war is going on. When Hamilton tells him that he is off to war, the man asks naive questions such as "What war?" and "How did it start?" Hamilton is shocked to encounter someone who has not heard about the war. Similarly, the camel driver has a hard time understanding why the Australians are at war. Hamilton says that the war is against Germany, that he does not know how it started but that it is the Germans' fault, and that Australia is fighting against Turkey because Turkey is Germany's ally. Hamilton believes that if the Australians do not stop the Germans, they could end up in Australia. The camel driver says, "And they're welcome to it".

The Cairo days are like an exotic journey in which the film audience sees mostly Dunne and his former coworkers from the railway. The soldiers cheerfully play rugby in front of the pyramids. They visit a bazaar to buy local ornaments, clothing and food. They also visit cheap brothels. In fact, because it is expected that some of them will visit brothels, the soldiers receive a lecture on sexually transmitted diseases at the beginning of their stay.

At times, the soldiers' relations with the locals are abusive. In one scene, Dunne's friend, who believes that he has overpaid for an ornament, loots a shop. The soldiers are not familiar with the bazaar area, and they enter a shop that they think is the one where the ornament was purchased. They try to convince the shop owner to take back the ornament and return the money. The shop owner refuses. Dunne damages the shop and gets the money. However, the soldiers have entered the wrong shop, and they emerge as aggressive tourists.

Furthermore, the soldiers take their military training lightly. For training purposes, they are divided into two groups in the desert and told to attack each other. It is like a

play; for instance, Dunne and Hamilton act as though they are dead but cannot stop laughing. Meanwhile, the officers checking on the training have serious looks. This scene shows the lack of experience and naivety of the volunteering soldiers, as well as the consciousness of reality among the superiors.

The Gallipoli days are like a mixture of game and bloody reality. The soldiers arrive at night. The following day, while they happily swim naked and even plunge into a sunken ship, they are bombed at sea. Most of them continue smiling and laughing, particularly at the beginning. Hamilton remarks in a letter to his family, "Everyone is terribly excited. There is a feeling [they] are all involved in an adventure somehow larger than life". The Australians shoot at the Turks as if the war were a game. The film audience hears the Turkish soldiers talking to the Australians or among themselves, which shows how the two groups fought at a close distance. It is only when the Australian soldiers see the wounded and the cemeteries with crosses, as well as when they lose a close friend who asks that his diary be given to his parents, that they start to understand the reality of their situation. The mournful tones of *Adagio in G Minor* play in the background, in the scene in which the Australian soldiers arrive in Gallipoli as well as in other scenes in which the soldiers understand that they are close to death. The music emphasizes the Australians' shock and recent consciousness. Some of the soldiers try to find courage through their diaries, letters and family photos. Others seek courage through prayer beads. In the end, the Australian soldiers understand that most of them will die. Colonel Robinson, the British superior officer, asks to "push on", although the Australian officer, Major Barton, describes this act as "cold-blooded murder". The film ends with the shooting of Dunne, which represents the deaths of innocent Australian soldiers.

Findings on *The Water Diviner* (2014)

The Water Diviner tells the story of Joshua Connor, an Australian farmer and

water diviner from North Western Victoria, Australia, who lost his three sons in the Gallipoli Campaign. In 1919, four years after the war, Connor travels to Turkey to track down his sons. He tries to find his way using the bloodied diary of his son, which had been passed along to Connor after the war. At the beginning of the film, Connor's wife, who cannot take the suffering related to the losses of her sons and who accuses Connor of not having tracked them down, commits suicide. Connor aims to bring back his sons' bodies to Australia and bury them with their mother. He travels first to Istanbul, then goes to Gallipoli. Hasan, a Turkish Major, tries to help him in his search. Connor learns about the deaths of two of his sons, then finds that his third son has survived, though too traumatized to return home. The film shows both the war, through flashbacks, and the situation in Turkey in 1919. Although the main plotline involves Connor's search for his sons in Turkey and his flirtation in Istanbul with Ayşe, who lost her husband in Gallipoli, the film also depicts what Turkey was going through in 1919. The Australians' war is over, but the Turks' war continues. The British remain, whereas the Greeks have invaded some parts of Turkey. The Turks are trying to organize so that they can fight back and defend their country. The film ends with Connor and his son returning to Istanbul, where Ayşe implies that she loves him.

Both the Australians and the Turks experience the hardships of war. The dead soldiers on both sides are very young. The Australians and Turks fight very close during the war. Once the war is over, the Turkish land becomes home not only to the Turks but to all the deceased. The Australian officer says that Australia lost more than 10,000 soldiers in Gallipoli and that he does not know where half of them are. The officer asks Major Hasan for help locating them. Hasan answers that Turkey lost 70,000 of its people in Gallipoli and that to him the area is just "one big grave". Both sides grieve for their dead.

The film draws attention to the ages of the dead soldiers. Connor's son's grave -or, rather, the cross on it- is marked "17 years and 17 days". The son died quite young. Sergeant Cemal, drunk, sings with other soldiers, "Hey fifteen fifteen" (*Hey onbeşli onbeşli*), a song referring to the soldiers who participated in the Gallipoli Campaign and who, according to the Muslim calendar, were born in the year 1315. According to the Gregorian calendar, these soldiers' year of birth was 1899, which makes them the same age as Connor's son.

As far as the distance between the two fighting groups is concerned, the film audience learns that the two sides were close to each other. Major Hasan says that on the frontlines, the Turkish soldiers were able to see the blue eyes of the Australians, and that there were so many. Although the two sides were enemies in 1915, they are no longer enemies in 1919. When Connor wants to take his sons' bodies back to Australia, the Australian officer tells him that to the dead soldiers, Gallipoli is "home", "it is not enemy ground anymore". The dead soldiers are "among friends, probably the closest they ever had".

The film emphasizes the fact that some Turks resent the Australians, who came from so far away to fight them. For instance, when Ayşe learns that Connor is Australian, she tells him that there is no room in the hotel. She connects with him only after learning about his losses and pain. Sergeant Cemal also shows his resentment several times. Cemal thinks that Australia was in the war to benefit from it. Calling Connor "ambassador" (*büyükelçi*), Cemal asks him which part of the Ottoman land Australia took. When Connor answers that the issue was not about the land but that the Australians fought for principle, Cemal does not look convinced. According to him, "the issue is always about the land" (*Me-sele her zaman topraktır*). When people fight and die, they do so to get something out of it.

The film also depicts the results of the war. Although the Turks won the Gallipoli Campaign, they lost the war. In fact, most of the film takes place in the year 1919 rather than 1915; 1919 is the year when the Turks started their War of Independence (May 19, 1919 - October 29, 1923) under the guidance of Mustafa Kemal, who later founded Modern Turkey and was given the surname 'Atatürk', father of Turks. When Sergeant Cemal and the others sing a song about the war, they also drink to Mustafa Kemal, who has given them hope for a victory.

Because of the Armistice, in 1919 the Gallipoli peninsula is not under the control of the Turks but, rather, of the Allies. In the Imperial War Graves Unit area in Gallipoli, Major Hasan and Sergeant Cemal, who are supposed to help the ANZAC investigate a mass burial detail in the area between Kılıçbayır and Kocaçimen, are escorted by Allied soldiers. This fact humiliates the Turkish soldiers. In Istanbul, rallies take place and Turks shout "Get out, British". Also, scenes portray women and children evacuating their villages on the Aegean because the Greeks set everything on fire. Other scenes portray the Turks organizing to fight the Greeks.

Beyond the political and military effects of war, there is also an emotional effect. Families -and particularly women- are significantly affected. Connor's wife is so traumatized, she asks her husband to read a bedtime story to his sons, as if the sons were still children and still living with them. As mentioned, she ends up killing herself. Ayşe, who lost her husband, is depressed and tries to resist her brother-in-law, who insists on taking her as a second wife. According to Ayşe, Gallipoli is not a regular city anymore; it contains nothing but ghosts.

Findings on Gallipoli 1915 (2012)

Gallipoli 1915 is a Turkish-made film that depicts the spirit of resistance and highlights the poor conditions that the Turks expe-

rienced, such as a lack of ammunition. There is no leading role, and the plot is not as detailed as those of the other films. However, the film has the distinction of portraying historical figures such as Colonel Mustafa Kemal and Corporal Sait (1889-1939). It is the only film in which the audience sees Colonel Mustafa Kemal, who later founded modern Turkey. Kemal gives his famous speech in which he orders the soldiers not to attack but to die, as in the time it will take them to die, other forces can assume their places. The other historical figure in this film is Corporal Sait, who picked up three 275 kg shells for an artillery piece without any help. The film ends with several soldiers holding the Turkish flag, signifying the Turks' victory. The film audience also learns that "After the Second Anafartalar War the British army corps was vanquished. General Hamilton was relieved of his command. The Allied power quietly left Çanakkale". Furthermore, a dedication appears at the end of the film: This film is dedicated to the martyrs and ghazis defending their native-land.

Like the other films in this study, *Gallipoli 1915* highlights the youth of the soldiers, the importance with which they regard prayer, and the politeness of war. In the scenes showing dead soldier, a famous Turkish folk song about Gallipoli plays in the background. The lyrics of this song focus on how young men lost their lives: "In Çanakkale they shot me. They buried me before I died, oh, my youth, alas!" (*Çanakkale içinde vurdular beni, Ölmeden mezara koydular beni, off, gençliğim eyvah!*). Soldiers seek courage from God. They often say, "In the name of Allah, fire" (*Haydi bismillah, ateş*) or "God is the greatest" (*Allahu ekber*). They perform the *namaz*, treat the Allied soldiers as infidels and, most of all, trust in God and in their mothers' prayers. In addition, the film contains scenes indicating the politeness of war. For instance, one scene depicts a Turkish soldier who hears a moaning Australian soldier among the dead; the Turkish soldier approaches the front line

with a white flag, finds the wounded soldier and carries him to the Australian line.

Gallipoli 1915 shows the sacrifices of Turkish women. A small group of educated women go to the Istanbul Red Crescent Center to talk to a pasha in charge. Those women declare their interest in helping. They cannot stay where they are, doing nothing while their sons, brothers and fathers are on the front lines and while the number of deaths and casualties increases. They ask to take classes that will enable them to become nurses. According to the pasha, people might object to this, believing it a sin for women to work so closely with men and to touch them when necessary. However, the women are willing to become nurses so long as their efforts help save the motherland. When the pasha promises to offer nursing training classes and warns them that nursing is almost as difficult as military service, the women declare that they will become soldiers as well if they must. Women in Istanbul knit, weave, iron and prepare clothing for the soldiers. They also create small packages containing items like soap, eau de cologne and figs; these packages will be passed along to the Turkish soldiers in Gallipoli. The film highlights the connection between the protection of the motherland and the protection of women. According to Sergeant Mehmet Ali, who gives a speech of encouragement to the soldiers, "The homeland is the soldiers' mothers' purity" (*vatan anamızın ırzıdır*).

Findings on *Gallipoli: End of the Road* (2013)

This is another Turkish-made film that shows the spirit of resistance and the miserable conditions under which the Turks tried to defend their land. *Gallipoli: End of the Road* focuses mostly on two brothers who participate in the Gallipoli Campaign upon hearing the enlistment call. They fight against the ANZAC, which is under the leadership of Major Steward. Before the war, the younger brother (Hasan) had not even dared hunt a gazelle; therefore, he is quite uncomfortable

on the frontlines. The older brother (Muhsin) is a war veteran who had participated in the Balkan War (1912-1913) and who volunteers to join the army again. Muhsin becomes a sniper in the army and does his best so that his brother can remain away from the risky frontlines. However, when Muhsin and the Allied sniper, Corporal William Eagle, try to kill each other and get wounded in the process, Hasan ends up taking Muhsin's place. The film's title comes from a line that Muhsin says before blowing himself up in the invaders' arsenal and killing everyone around him: "The end of the road, Gallipoli. There is no further for you" (*Yolun sonu Gelibolu. Size daha ötesi yok*). The film ends with the attacks of the Turks and with Nurse Behice's gaze at this scene from far away. Behice, who had flirted with Muhsin, feels both the victory of the Turks and the death of the two brothers.

From the Turkish perspective, the Allied soldiers fought under better conditions than the Turks did. For instance, in the film, Ibrahim Adil, a Turkish captain, writes a letter to a colleague, indicating that the Allied soldiers have tents, arms and animals whereas the Turks have only their faith and their love of the country with which to fight. The same officer argues that the Turks know only the British as the enemy, but at Gallipoli they encounter a unity of black-skinned, yellow-skinned and slant-eyed people. To him, it is almost like a crusader army. As for the soldiers, the army enlists men born between 1308 and 1312 according to the Muslim calendar. This makes the soldiers' years of birth between 1892 and 1896 according to the Gregorian calendar. In other words, they are roughly 20 years old. However there are also older volunteers like Muhsin, who participated in the Balkan War. One such soldier says that he did not see the birth of his daughter because he was at the frontlines at the time. He adds that the next time he sees her, it will probably be at her wedding.

The Turkish camp does not consist of only Muslims. There is a German doctor and an Ottoman soldier of Greek descent. This soldier asks to be buried with the Muslims when he is killed, speaks Turkish with a Greek accent and finishes his sentences with "endaxi?" - "ok" in Greek. Towards the end of the film, the soldier is shot in the heart. At this point, the film audience learns that his name is Kostas. The Turks call him "brother" and bury him with the others. They say Muslim prayers by the cross that marks his grave.

Throughout the film, the audience sees the religiosity of the Turks as well as of the Allied soldiers. The Allied soldiers cross themselves, whereas the Turks show their trust in God through prayers and speeches. For instance, Muhsin the sniper asks for forgiveness every time he shoots at the enemy. When another soldier tells him it is not a sin to kill the enemy, Muhsin says he believes it is a sin to make the dead ones' family members cry. Also, Turkish soldiers attack with 'Allah Allah'-the name of God in Islam- to give themselves courage and power.

This film touches upon the discord within the Allied army. For instance, an Australian soldier afflicted by lice and flies argues that the British officers have medicine but do not pass it along to others. In another scene, a British officer chooses an ANZAC with a German mother to be a spotter for the sniper. The British officer selects that particular soldier because of his German mother and because the officer trusts that soldier more than he does the others.

Discussion and conclusion

The Gallipoli Campaign is important to both the Australians and the Turks. Although the four films have different plots, they all show how innocent and young men on both sides, mostly from agrarian origins and hit by the political atmosphere of their era, committed themselves to the war and walked to death for the sake of others. Soldiers fol-

lowed the rules of patriotism, courage and comradeship, and when they saw others do the same, they became closer to one another.

The main difference among those films is that the Australian films include more anti-war elements than the Turkish ones. In that sense, I agree with Freebury (1987), who discussed the anti-war approach taken by *Gallipoli*. Historically speaking, Australia federated in 1901 but retained its Commonwealth identification status and sent troops to Gallipoli. Australian soldiers lost their lives in a country that was not even in their hemisphere. Both *Gallipoli* and *The Water Diviner* depict Australian soldiers more like “victims” than “invaders”. This is why I argue that they have anti-war elements. *The Water Diviner* in particular tells the story of a family shattered by war. The plotline in itself delivers a pacifist message. On the other hand, the Turkish films fall within nationalist frameworks. This is because whereas the Australians were able to choose whether they would become soldiers, the Turks did not have any options; they had to defend their homeland.

The main common point in the films is an anti-British element. I agree with Freebury (1987), who described the anti-British approach of *Gallipoli*, and I argue that this particular approach exists in the four films. For instance, in *Gallipoli*, Colonel Robinson, who has a British accent, emerges as “the anti-British personification”. Although the director, Peter Weir, drew attention to the fact that Robinson is not British and is simply an example of rigid leadership, many viewers considered him British because he is “callous” and “chauvinistic”. Major Barton is fatherly and friendly with the soldiers, and is contrasted with the British officers (Haltof, 1993). In *The Water Diviner*, the British are the invaders in Istanbul and the locals hate them. In *Gallipoli: The End of the Road*, in addition to the general cruelty of the British officers, a contrast is made between the Turkish sniper Muhsin and the British sniper Eagle. Muhsin undergoes an operation without medicine and

accepts it bravely, whereas Eagle, who receives morphine for his operation but still shows signs of pain, is depicted as the “coward British” and “desperate” (Birincioğlu, 2017). In *Gallipoli 1915*, the British are the main enemy.

The four films treated in this paper have received criticism, particularly of a political nature. For instance, *The Water Diviner* has been criticized for assuming a pro-Turkish political approach and reading of history. The line of criticism states that the film overlooks several important historical realities (Macnab, April 3, 2015). It argues that “the displacement and murder of millions of ethnic Greeks, Assyrians and Armenians, beginning in 1914” is missing, which is “a shameful and/or oblivious whitewashing of a hugely important historical crime” (Quinn, April 23, 2015). On the other hand, according to the pro-Turkish approach, what took place during that era was certainly understandable for a country fighting for its survival and the killings were reciprocal rather than one-sided. Here, I do not enter the debate over which perspective has better arguments, as such a debate is not the subject of this study.

Gallipoli, although considered a classic, is criticized for having an anti-British bias and for showing too little of the war. For instance, in the portrayal of the Nek clash in the film, Colonel Robinson orders the attack. A pro-British political approach and reading of history argues that in reality it was mostly ‘the poor decision-making [of] 3rd Australian Light Horse Brigade commander Brigadier General Frederic Hughes’ that mattered (Chilton, April 25, 2016). On the other hand, the ANZAC point of view was that the Australians were let down by the British military establishment (Australian Government Department of Veterans’ Affairs, 2001). In defending himself against criticism that he showed too little of the war, director Weir cited a Chinese proverb: “It’s not the arriving at one’s destination but the journey that matters” (Weir, 1981).

Unsurprisingly, the Turkish films ha-

ve not had as wide of an audience or as many reviews as the Australian films. *Gallipoli 1915* is criticised for being an awful treatment of the Ottoman resistance to the Allied landing, lacking “a proper dramatic focus” (The Guardian, May 9, 2013). According to Turkish reviewers, the film is “a heroic docudrama” lacking a real plot. The main political criticism of this film relates to the presence of chants. According to some critics, the chants seem to have been particularly placed to align with the current political atmosphere in Turkey (Habertürk Kültür Sanat, October 17, 2012). The AKP (*Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi*, Party of Justice and Development), a conservative democratic party that has a religious inspiration, has ruled over Turkey since 2002 through a single-party government. Hence, a connection might exist between the chants in the film and the current Turkish political climate.

The Turkish-made films can also be criticized from pacifist and feminist perspectives. Ottoman Turks fought for survival. Hence, the Turkish-made films highlight a militaristic approach. Within this framework, the films depict men as warriors and protectors of their land. Women are depicted as carriers of the community, with secondary roles (Birincioğlu, 2017). This criticism could also be made not only of the Australian films but of most war films in general. Feminist scholars argue that *history* is treated mostly as *his story* and that *her story* is often overlooked. I will not go into detail about this perspective because it is not the main topic of this paper.

Finally, I would like to provide examples of criticism about not the Gallipoli Campaign films but about the reading of the Campaign itself. McDonald argued that the Gallipoli myth in Australia excludes native Australians, women and New Zealander soldiers, that it emphasizes the sacrifices of only white men and that it celebrates militarism by exalting “participation in armed conflict as the ultimate demonstration of citizenship”.

McDonald also highlighted the fact that when Australian troops were in Cairo, some of them “terrorised Cairo residents, ransacking brothels and assaulting locals” (McDonald, 2017). These points can be considered among those that were not emphasized earlier.

In Turkey also, with the Islamic resurgence, some new readings of the Gallipoli Campaign and criticisms of the existent myth have emerged. For instance, an Islamic interpretation of the Gallipoli Campaign considers Turks who fought at Gallipoli as defenders of Islam rather than as defenders of Ottoman Turkey. According to this approach, the Gallipoli Campaign was an example not of a national war but of a Huntingtonian clash of civilizations, and during the war, “saints, angels and other holy beings” helped the Turks. Furthermore, this approach questions Atatürk’s place in the war, which for years has been highly exalted by the official/secular perspective. It argues that he was “a minor figure, merely a divisional commander and moreover a commander who made serious mistakes which had allegedly been covered up ever since” (Uyar, 2016). These criticisms demonstrate how a different political approach sees a different political and historical reality.

This study analyses four films about the Gallipoli Campaign, showing their similarities and differences as well as their connections to politics and history. Although it is the most comprehensive work on this subject in the literature so far, it has the limitation of not covering all the films about the Gallipoli Campaign. A future work could include other films about the subject and make a complementary comparison.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Nuray Ocaklı for her support.

REFERENCES

- Australian Government Department of Veterans' Affairs and Ryebuck Media Pty Ltd. (2001). *Gallipoli and Australian Identity 1915-2000*.
- Aydın, T., Aydın, T. (producers), Akar, S., Uzun, K. and Karaman, A. (directors). (2013). *Çanakkale Yolun Sonu*. Turkey.
- Bennett, J. (2014). Breaking out of the nationalist/ic paradigm': international screen texts on the 1915 Gallipoli campaign. *Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, 28(5): 640-653.
- Birincioğlu, Y. D. (2017). Savaş filmlerinde eril hegemonik yapının dışı anlamları. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research* 3(2), 486-499.
- Chilton, M. (April 25, 2016). Gallipoli, film review: "heartbreaking". *Telegraph*. Retrieved 07.12.2018 from <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/filmreviews/11521723/Gallipoli-film-review-heartbreaking.html>.
- Freebury, J. (February 1987). Screening Australia: Gallipoli-a study of nationalism on film. *Media Information Australia*, 43: 5-7.
- Haltof, M. (January 1993). In quest of self-identity: Gallipoli, mateship and the construction of Australian national identity. *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 21(1): 27-36.
- Hillman, R. (2014). Representing Gallipoli on Film- From National to Transnational Myth. İlhan (ed.), *Gallipoli: history, memory and national imagination (171-180)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Karaduman, A. (2016). Çanakkale Savaşı Öncesi ve Sonrasında Anzakların Savaşa ve Türklere Yaklaşımı. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 24: 141-150.
- Karaduman, A. (2011). Recognising the Other: Identities in Conflict at Gallipoli. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15: 139-147.
- Lovell, P. and Stigwood, R. (producers) and Weir, Peter (director) (1981). *Gallipoli*. Australia.
- Lum, T., Mason, A., Rodger, K. (producers) and Crowe, R. (director) (2014). *The Water Diviner*. Australia, USA, Turkey.
- Macnab, G. (April 3, 2015). The Water Diviner, film review: Russell Crowe the director digs deep for his debut, *Independent*. Retrieved 07.12.2018 from <https://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/reviews/the-water-diviner-film-review-russell-crowe-the-director-digs-deep-for-his-debut-10153289.html>.
- Mcdonald, M. (2017). Remembering Gallipoli: Anzac, the Great War and Australian memory politics. *Journal of Politics and History*, 63(3): 406-418.
- Murray, J. (1965). *Gallipoli as I saw it*. London: William Kimber.
- Habertürk Kültür Sanat (October 17, 2012). O film için ne dediler? "Çanakkale 1915" filmi yarın vizyonda, eleştirmenler ortada. Retrieved 07.12.2018 from <https://www.haberturk.com/kultur-sanat/haber/786055-o-film-icin-ne-dediler>
- Örümcek Yapım (producer) and Sezgin, Y. (director) (2012). *Çanakkale 1915 (Gallipoli 1915)*. Turkey.
- Quinn, K. (April 23, 2015). Russell Crowe's *The Water Diviner* faces deluge of protest ahead of US opening. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved 07.12.2018 from <https://www.smh.com.au/entertainment/movies/russell-crowes-the-water-diviner-faces-deluge-of-protest-ahead-of-us-opening-20150423-1mrqzp.html>.
- Reynolds, H. V. (2007). *An Anzac's Story* Auckland The Auckland War Memorial Museum Library.
- Uyar, M. (2016). Remembering the Gallipoli campaign: Turkish official military historiography, war memorials and

- contested ground. *First World War Studies*, 7(2): 165-191.
- Yıldız, K. (2017a). Anzaklarla Aşırı Empati Yapan Çanakkale Çocukları. İlhan, Bulut and Yumuşak, (eds.). Çanakkale 1915: tarih, ekonomi, edebiyat ve sanat (559-562). İstanbul: İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Yıldız, K. (2017b). İşgalci Anzakların, Avusturalya Yapımı Filmlerle Aklanışı: Gelibolu ve The Water Diviner Filmleri. İlhan, Bulut and Yumuşak (eds.), Çanakkale 1915 : tarih, ekonomi, edebiyat ve sanat (563-571). İstanbul: İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Weir, P. (1981). Gallipoli: I felt somehow I was really touching history. *Literature Film Quarterly*, 9(4): 213-217.
- The Guardian (May 9, 2013). Will platoon of Gallipoli films give Turkish audiences battle fatigue? Retrieved 07.12.2018 from <https://www.theguardian.com/film/filmblog/2013/may/09/gallipoli-films-turkey-after-hollywood>.

Citation Information/Kaynakça Bilgisi

- Cansun, Ş. (2019). Films, Politics and History: The Example of the Gallipoli Campaign, *Jass Studies-The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, Doi number:<http://dx.doi.org/10.9761/JASSS7984>, Number: 74 Spring 2019, p. 481-493.

