

Introduction to the Fourth International Gallipoli Symposium

Mehmet Mehdi İLHAN

This is the fourth international symposium of the series of Gallipoli Campaign 1915. The first and second ones were held at the Centre for Arab and Islamic Studies at the Australian National University, Canberra. The “First International Gallipoli Symposium: History, Art and Literature” held on 3rd of April 2008 included only five papers. The second symposium was held on 15-16 April 2009. Sixteen academics from Turkey, New Zealand, Canada and a number of universities across Australia presented papers in this two-day event. The audience of particularly the second symposium were academics from the universities across Australia. Both the participants and the audience of this second symposium apparently were experts in the field and therefore the papers presented and the questions asked after the sessions were very much illuminating. A number of papers presented at the first and second symposia were selected to form coherent themes and were edited in a volume entitled “Gallipoli: History, Memory and National Imagination.”¹ The third International Gallipoli Symposium was held in Istanbul on 20-21 April 2012. The proceedings of this symposium were edited and published in a volume entitled “Gallipoli: History, Legend and Memory.”² The purpose of these three international symposia as well as the fourth one was to bring together the Turkish and Western scholars and encourage them to cooperate². So far it has become apparent that through only an international cooperation of scholars Gallipoli Campaign of 1915 can fully be comprehended. It is clear that the documents and sources of the campaign are not only stored in the archives and libraries of Turkey, England, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, France, Russia or Germany, but also in the libraries and archives of the former colonies of Britain and France as well as those countries that were directly or indirectly involved in the campaign. It is also vital that the various aspects and perspectives of the campaign both prior to and after the campaign

1 Ilhan, M.M.: “Introduction to Book ‘Gallipoli: History, Memory and National Imagination’” in Gallipoli: History, Memory and National Imagination. Edited by M.M. Ilhan. Turkish Historical Society, Ankara 2014, p. 1.

2 Ilhan, M.M.: “Introduction to Book ‘Gelibolu’” in Gelibolu, Tarih, Efsane ve Anı (Gallipoli: History, Legend and Memory). Edited by I.G. Yumuşak & M.M. Ilhan. Istanbul Medeniyet University, Istanbul, 2013, p. 11.

must be studied. Some of these aspects and perspectives were presented in this Fourth International Gallipoli Symposium held in Istanbul on 15-18 March 2015. A number of papers presented in this symposium were selected and arranged in a thematic structure, and were edited for this volume. This Introduction mainly covers the papers presented in Turkish to address the English readers. The papers both in Turkish and English have abstracts for a quick reference.

Before the Gallipoli Campaign of 1915

Göktepe in his paper studied the demographic structure of the Peninsula with a particular reference to the non-Muslim population covering the period from 1831-1914. Such a study is vital to comprehend the drastic fall in the population of the Peninsula after the war. Gallipoli Peninsula according to Göktepe during the Classic Ottoman period besides Muslim Turks was populated with other ethnic groups such as Greeks, Armenian, Bulgarian and Jews. According to 1645 cadastral register of Gallipoli there were 1,200 Muslim, 400 Greek, 48 Armenian and more than 60 Jewish households living in the quarters of the city. Multiplying these figures by 5, the total population of the city of Gallipoli was around 8,500 in the seventeenth century. According to 1881/1882-1893 census that included women the total population of the sancak of Gallipoli was 89,229. Of this 25,605 were Muslims, 59,153 Greeks, 1,080 Armenians, 1,604 Jews, 1,674 Bulgarians and 113 the others. According to 1906/1907 censuses the figures were still in favour of non-Muslims: 25,955 Muslims, 64,604 Greeks, 1,133 Armenians, 2,336 Jews, 1,674 Bulgarians and 120 the others. According to 1831 population census 75% of population of the sancak of Gallipoli were non-Muslims mostly Greeks. By 1914 census the population of non-Muslims was still more than those of Muslims. In 1831 the Muslim population of the Peninsula was 24%. The Muslim population increased to 28% by 1893 and to 41% by 1914. Following the Gallipoli Campaign the population of the Peninsula fell drastically. What is vital in this fall is to work out the ratio of Muslims to non-Muslims. It is very likely that most of the Greeks prior to the start of the campaign either left for the mainland Greece or were forced to migrate to the interior provinces of Anatolia or were deported to the mainland Greece for security reasons. In fact according to The Sydney Morning Herald report, dated 6 February 1913, they would have posed a great threat to the Turks due to the fact that “as the Bulgarians were massing at Bulair (and) if Greek allies could land a force ‘on the western side of the peninsula’, the 50,000 Turkish troops between Gallipoli and Maidos would be ‘in a difficult position.’” Yet “a dispatch on 7 July 1913 (of

The Sydney Morning Herald) reported that Ottoman troops treated Gallipoli's Greeks 'with marked depravity' as they 'destroyed, looted, and burned all the Greek villages near Gallipoli.'³ An internationally collaborative study - by the academics - of the archival documents and other sources both in Turkey and Greece might reveal the truth about these figures and claims.

The Ottomans were not only facing the problems of internal security on the Peninsula itself but also in Anatolia as it is clear from Erdoğan's paper. Dilşen İnce Erdoğan in her paper has dealt with an important issue that is the internal security of Eastern and Western Anatolia; the two parts of Turkey with ethnic and cultural differences, yet with the same basic goal that is eliminating the enemy from the Anatolian soil. In doing so she has concentrated on the adverse activities of bandits and non-Muslims namely Greeks and Armenians while the Ottomans were busy fighting at Gallipoli and other fronts. She has basically focussed on the district of Aydın where the bandits were active both as good guys (so called efe or sosyal eşkiya/social bandit) and bad guys. The Western Anatolia was populated with nomad and half-nomad Turcoman as well as Turks, Greeks, Jews and Armenians - the latter having moved from Eastern Anatolia. Greeks, Armenians and Jews were controlling the economy of the country and therefore were often migrating to the areas with potential economic means. As the war started those Greeks living in Aydın and the vicinity moved further to west, the coastal line of the Aegean Sea for a better living. Yet surprisingly for the same purpose the Greeks living on the Aegean islands and even the main land Greece migrated to Western Anatolia. Greece on the one hand was encouraging the Greek settlements in Western Anatolia and the islands and on the other was supporting the bandits active on the islands. Stefanos Yerasimos (s. 36)⁴ claim that the Greeks joined the brigands to avoid joining the army. As the war started the gendarme, responsible from the security of the civilians against the bandits, were even sent to the front. This encouraged both Turkish and Greek bandits. The Greek bandits were also encouraged and supported by Greece and the Allies. Starting from 1912 the army deserters either joined the existing bandits or themselves formed one in Çeşme, Karaburun, Kilizman, Urla, Güzelbahçe and other costal towns in Western Anatolia. These bandits even acted

3 Williams, J. 2016: "The Ethnic Cleansing of Greeks from Gallipoli, April 1915" (an extract from Deutschland Uber Allah! The Germans and Gallipoli 1915; Australian Scholarly publishing). <https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2013/04/the-ethnic-cleansing-of-greeks-from-gallipoli-april-1915/> accessed on 17.8.2016.

4 Yerasimos, S. 1995: Milliyetler ve Sınırlar, Balkanlar, Kafkasya ve Ortadoğu. (Trs. Şirin Tekeli), İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

as guides to the Greek brigands coming from the Aegean islands in confiscating the property of the inhabitants and kidnapping the sons of rich in return for ransom. As the Gallipoli campaign started and the Ottomans allied with the Germans the activities of both Turkish and Greek bandits doubled in confiscating properties, robbery and kidnapping. The local Ottoman forces felt helpless. By 1916 the number of deserters from the army increased further and the bandits were out of total control. So the Ottomans on the one hand were confronting the enemy and on the other the civilians were suffering in the hands of bandits, brigands and robbers. Matthias Bjørnlund using Udenrigsministeriets Arkiver [UM, Archives of the Foreign Ministry,] and secondary sources mostly Western inserts that “bashibozuks”, alternatively called “Turkish gangs” or chetes in the reports, numbered 8–10,000 in the vilayet of Aydın alone, and according to Van der Zee they were financed and run by the state. Many of these gangs consisted of members of the SO (the Special Organization) and radicalized Muslim refugees from the Balkans or the Caucasus, the so-called muhadjirs, who plundered and murdered “as many of the hated Greeks as possible.” Also according to Bjørnlund CUP (Committee of Union and Progress) and government agencies like the Ministry of War, and the members of SO jointly either forced out thousands of Greeks living in Aegean littoral and Thrace or gave them a choice of converting into Islam. Alfred van der Zee, Danish consul at Smyrna, vilayet of Aydın (Smyrna) since 1910, was the main witness to these events. He was a Dutch⁵. Apparently the Turks hated the Greeks and all the Christians hated the Turks as Vahram Dadrian puts it bluntly and relates that on the day of declaration of Jihad in November 1914, there was a meeting held in Çorum “to which the city’s Greek and Armenian dignitaries were also invited. Those who spoke there insisted that there was no difference among Christians, regardless of their nationalities: they were all malicious enemies of the Turks.”⁶ Whatever may be the case the truth can only be reached through cooperative studies by objective academics capable of selecting and analysing the archival documents and all other primary sources of the countries involved in the campaign. I personally believe that history is more than a grandma’s tale. History should not be a piece of tool in the hands

5 UM, 2-0355, “Konstantinopel/Istanbul, diplomatisk representation. 1822–1920. Korrespondencesager vedr. Danske konsulater i Levanten 1864–1918,” pk. 27, “Upplysningar om danska konsulstjäntmännen och om d. vicekonsulars [illegible] 1911,” 12/1, 1911; Bjørnlund, M. 2008: “The 1914 cleansing of Aegean Greeks as a case of violent Turkification” in *Journal of Genocide Research*. 10(1), March: pp. 42-43.

6 Dadrian, V. 2003: *To the Desert: Pages from My Diary*. Princeton and London: Gomidas Institute, p 8. See Bjørnlund 2008 f.n. 54.

of amateurs and those academics incapable of interpreting or are deliberately misinterpreting the documents, accounts of eye witnesses and evidences. Without non-biased documentation and evidences history is merely a piece of story put together for a layman to read and enjoy.

Gallipoli is at the cross roads along the Dardanelles and since the ancient times have been an important station and a port that the merchants, travellers as well as the invaders that could not do without either stopping over for a rest or passing through the city and its territory. In this respect the paper presented by Ayyıldız, who has chosen the Italian travellers as his subject matter, is of importance for the period prior to the Gallipoli campaign that is with regard to a good description of Gallipoli and the other towns along the Dardanelles. Turco-Italian relations date back to the 15th century and continued until the end of 19th century. The Italian travellers just like any other travellers had to pass through the Strait and by the city of Gallipoli in order to reach Istanbul. These travellers wrote their memoirs and gave the description of the fortresses and towns along the Strait, as well as the information on the commodities grown in the region, markets, and trade activities. Of these Giuseppe Rosaccio (1530-1620) in his *Il Mondo e le sue parti, cioè Europa, Affrica, Asia et America* (Verona 1596) points out that the Dardanelles is the key to the Ottoman Empire. Rossacio's *Viaggio da Venetia a Costantinopoli* (published 1598) is a vital article for the topography of Gallipoli Peninsula for he included a number of maps in his work and marked in detail all the stations (menzil) along the way. Likewise Giovanni Francesco Gemelli Careri (1651-1725)⁷ in his six-volume work entitled *Giro del Mondo* (A Voyage Around the World, published in London 1704 and 1745 in A & J. Churchil's *A Collection of Voyages and Travels*)⁸ touches upon the natural beauties, geographical structure and panorama of Gallipoli and then gives vital information for the merchants and sailors.

Soon after the Ottoman conquest of the Peninsula, Gallipoli became a meeting place for the Ottoman forces undertaking the campaigns against the Balkans, and the Gallipoli port for the Ottoman navy to sail into the Mediterranean. The open-air prayer areas (namazgah)⁹ were initially built to serve the soldiers to pray before setting out for the campaigns. They were also used by the civilians

7 According to Bülent Ayyıldız, Careri was born in 1648 and died on 25 July 1724.
8 Buccini, S. 2008: *Americas in Italian Literature and Culture, 1700-1815*. Penn State University Press, p. 18

9 For open areas and courtyards see <http://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfs-wm/45434.pdf> (The Use of Courtyards and Open Areas in the Ottoman Period in Istanbul by Gülhan Benli [chapter 32]; accessed on 26.8.2016.)

for Friday, 'Id and even the daily prayers¹⁰. It is very possible that the Turkish soldiers used them for prayer during the 1915 Campaign. Demiraslan's paper is about the well-known Azaplar Namazgahı (Open-air Prayer Area) located to the northeast of the Gallipoli town centre. The patron of the namazgah that dates back to 1407 was İskender bin Hacı Beşe and its architect was Aşık bin Süleyman of Ladik (the ancient Laodicea Pontica). The Ottoman marines prayed here before they sailed to the open seas. The other namazgah is at Bolayır built to serve the Ottoman soldiers crossing over to the Balkans. Demiraslan in this paper studies the architectural and artistic features of these namazgahs and their inscriptions comparing them with a number of other namazgahs such as those in Bursa and Sofia.

Yasemin Nemlioğlu Koca in her paper studies a variety of maps printed both in Turkey and Western countries. Some of these maps were used during the Gallipoli campaign and some others were drawn while the campaign was going on. These maps no doubt are of great importance particularly for the military historians, and may shed light both on the Naval and Land operations. Although some of these maps are ancient and have already been published, they can serve as a good source for those carrying out research on comparative study of the Gallipoli peninsula with reference to the pre and post Ottoman period. Murat Karataş has already studied and published the maps from Ottoman period relevant to the 1915 Campaign¹¹. There is no doubt many maps and charts were used both by the Allied and Central Powers. It would be an interesting contribution to the studies on the Gallipoli campaign to have an access to the German Archives as well as British and French Archives, and to study the maps relevant or used during the Gallipoli campaign.

Gülşah Eser in her paper with reference to The Times Newspaper gives a detailed information and impressions on the career and activities of Liman von Sanders (1885–22 August 1929) particularly with regard to his commandership and the role he played during the Gallipoli campaign and the Ottoman war at Palestine (1914–1918). His biography was published in The Times under the heading “General Von Sanders Gallipoli and Palestine.”

10 Öney, Gönül, Lale Bulut, Şakir Çakmak, Ertan Daş, Aydoğan Demir, Yekta Demiralp, İnci Kuyulu, Rahmi H. Ünal: Early Ottoman Art: The Legacy of the Emirates, MWNF 2002.

11 Karataş, M. 2007: Haritalarla Çanakkale Savaşları: Gelibolu yarımadası kuzey bölgesi kara muharebeleri. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

The Grand Vizier Mahmut Şevket Paşa on 22 May 1913 officially invited Germany to send a military committee to reorganise the army. The Kaiser's choice was a military mission under the command of Liman von Sanders aged 57 then. The Ottoman Empire signed an agreement with Germany on 27 October 1913 and accredited Sanders with full authority over the Ottoman army. Few days later on 31 October The Times published an article entitled "German Military Mission to Turkey". According to The Times article entitled "The Ottoman Army Appointments" and dated 9 January 1914 Sanders then was appointed as the Commander in Chief of the 1st Ottoman Army Corps taking over the office from Cemal Paşa on 14 January and then was given the full authority to run the show at Gallipoli. Soon after exploring his responsibilities, he realised that he might face some confrontation from Ottoman officers. However shortly after Sanders' appointment The Times publishes an article entitled "Enver Paşa and the Germans" pointing to a dispute between the Germans and the Young Turks blaming each other for the failure of the 3rd Army's campaign in December 1914 at Sarıkamış; Enver Paşa blamed Sanders for the faulty plan while Sanders blamed Enver for the faulty execution. The Germans had encouraged the campaign as part of the plan to divert the Russian forces from the Caucasus while some of the senior Ottoman officials were against the campaign arguing that the harsh winter conditions of Sarıkamış could be the cause of failure¹². The dispute between Enver Paşa and Sanders is penned in The Times' another article entitled "Enver's Quarrel With Liman Paşa" where it is stated that none of the German officials were invited to a political banquet organised by Enver Paşa while all Ottoman state officials and the Grand Vizier were present. If they were invited and did not attend obviously would have meant they were boycotting Enver Paşa. The dispute grew further and irritated the public as according to a news report of The Times dated 4 May 1916 Sanders' house in Istanbul was bombed and Enver kept away from the public eye. Apparently Sanders was also critical of Enver Paşa and his advisor for the failure at Palestine arguing that the Ottomans had wasted their resources at İnan, Azerbaijan and Caucasus. Enver Paşa and his men protested. Sanders offered his resignation, but the Government in Germany refused to accept.

12 For the details of the campaign see Rogan, E: The Fall of the Ottomans: The Great War in the Middle East, 1914-1920, Penguin 2016; Nikolski, General 2010: Sarıkamış Harekatı 12-24 Aralık 1914, İstanbul: Kariyer Yayınları, pp. 13-40.

Sanders' role and plan at Gallipoli is much more crucial. The naval attack of the Allies at Dardanelles and the 18th of March 1915 operation had ended in failure and therefore the Allies had to resort to the land operation. Enver Paşa formed a new army for the defence of the Strait and despite the former disputes Liman von Sanders was appointed as the Commander in chief and was charged with running the operations at Gallipoli. He resumed the duty at the Headquarter of the 3rd Army at Gallipoli. His first action was to change the defence plan drawn by Esat Paşa, the Commander of the 3rd Army. This was probably the start of another dispute. Sanders, according to Eser, positioned the Ottoman forces at the least or less likely places where the enemy would land instead of the strip of land along the shore between Arıburnu and Seddu'l-bahir as planned before by the Ottoman commanders. According to Carl Muhlmann, an officer of Sanders' staff at Gallipoli, Sanders saw Saros/Bolayır as the most likely place for landing, while Liman von Sanders in his post war book, *Five Years in Turkey*, states that Asian shores were his main concern followed by Seddu'l-bahir and Gaba Tepe and then Bolayır. Yet another German staff officer Colonel Hans Kannengiesser Asiatic shore and Bolayır were the two danger points, the former was crucial for cutting off the Ottoman supplies from Anatolia¹³. The fortresses Çanakkale and Kumkale on the Asiatic shore where the French had landed were not only built to control the Strait but also to accommodate the soldiers and receive the supplies from Anatolia. Although Sanders' plan did turn out to be as he expected, but by employing only a small unit on the strip of land along the shore between Arıburnu and Seddu'l-bahir gave birth to the national hero Mustafa Kemal who rushed to the defence of Arıburnu. According to Eser whereas *The Times* newspaper ends in praising Liman von Sanders as the hero who enabled the Ottomans to come out of the war victorious at Gallipoli.

Critical of Sanders' change of plans Erickson states the following information. The Turkish General Staff poured reinforcements into the Peninsula during the late winter and spring of 1915, and by the time of 18th of March naval attack the 5th and 11th Infantry Division into the area. Enver Paşa, aware of the approaching danger, ordered for the reconstruction of the commander

13 Muhlmann, C. 1927: *Der Kampf um die Dardanellen*. Oldenburg: G. Stalling, pp. 80-84; Sanders, O.L. von 1927: *Five Years in Turkey*. Annapolis, Md.: U.S. Naval Institute, pp. 59-60; Kannengiesser Pasa, Hans 1927: *The Campaign in Gallipoli*. London: Hutchinson, pp. 92-93. Cf. Travers, T. 2001: 'Liman von Sanders, "The Capture of Lieutenant Palmer, and Ottoman Anticipation of the Allied Landings at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915"' in *The Journal of Military History*, Vol. 65, No. 4 (Oct.), pp. 969-970.

arrangements for the defence of the Dardanelles and Peninsula. He also activated the new Ottoman Fifth Army on 24th of March and had Liman von Sanders appointed the command of this powerful force. Upon taking the command and arriving on 26th of March in Gallipoli, Liman von Sanders put all his energy into rectifying the deficiencies in the Ottoman army claiming in his memoirs that “his was the hand that saved the inept Turks from defeat.”¹⁴ Yet according to Erickson in fact Liman von Sanders’ exaggeration in his memoirs “concerning his own role have had a significant and long-lasting effect on the historiography of the campaign.” Erickson also believes “the defensive plans for the peninsula matured prior to Liman von Sanders’s arrival and without significant German assistance.”¹⁵

The Gallipoli Campaign of 1915: participants, heroes, naval and land operations, and aerial warfare.

Serez’ paper similar to Herwig’s¹⁶ also deals with German contribution to the Gallipoli Campaign and their losses. He points out that about 1,5000 German military personnel, soldiers and other officers participated in the Gallipoli campaign and the campaigns thereafter. Of these about 5,000 German officers and soldiers participated in the Gallipoli campaign. The management and administration was mostly in their hands. About 40% of the high officials at Gallipoli were Germans. The German military mission under the command of Liman von Sanders arrived in Istanbul on 14th of December 1913. Shortly after on 29th of March 1914, Ismail Enver Paşa, the Minister War, restricted the authority of German Military Mission due to their arbitrary activities. The Ottoman alliance with Germans was signed on 2nd of August and remained in force until 31st of January 1918.

A group of men of about 500 from various military and civil professions met at Berlin under the command of German admiral Ernst Adolf Julius Guido von Usedom and General Johannes Merten. They were given fake passports and IDs as workers and contractors of Bagdad–Berlin railway, whereas they were 26 military officers and 432 soldiers commissioned as the commandos for the defence of Dardanelles.

14 Sanders, O.L. von 1928: *Five Years in Turkey*. London: Bailliere, Tindall and Cox, pp. 53-54. Cf. Erickson E.J. 2001: “Strength against Weakness: Ottoman Military Effectiveness at Gallipoli, 1915” in *The Journal of Military History*. Vol. 65, No. 4 (Oct.), pp. 992-3.

15 Erickson 2001 pp. 998-9.

16 Herwig, H.H.: “Slaughter at Gallipoli: A German First-Hand Account April-May 1915” in this volume.

Friedrich (Fritz) Heinrich Bruno Julius Bronsart von Schellendorf formed a general staff made up of young and talented officers. The foremost duty of this general staff was to plan an effective military mobilisation that was missing during the Balkan Wars. During the preparation of this plan they were in constant touch with the German Military Staff, but the Ottoman officers were excluded of its details. The documents of this plan and correspondences were archived and were kept away from the Ottoman officers. This situation continued until the end of the Gallipoli campaign. Following the Mudros Armistice (30th of October 1918) these documents and correspondences were taken to Germany and refused to return them to Istanbul despite the Ottoman Government's official demand. Nothing is known of their fate.

The German losses at Gallipoli were 21 officers, 35 petty officers, 133 soldiers and 2 engineers. Also 336 German soldiers were killed on the board of "SMS Breslau" when it was sunk on 20th of January 1918.

Nesrin Ispova or Kiratli to use her Turkish name in her paper gives vital information on the question of Bulgaria joining the Central Powers, and the young Muslim lads of her village Ustina, where she was born. The youth of her village were recruited alongside the Bulgarians from other villages and were sent to the front where the former enemies were fighting side by side and carrying each other's news from front to their parents back at home. The war lasted four years and the losses of Ustina village were about 93. Of these 23 martyrs, 20 disabled and 50 fallen prisoners. The prisoners returning home brought with them plague that caused the death of almost another hundred. The total number of Bulgarian losses was 88,106. Of this 11,580 were Muslims: 9,604 Turks and 1,976 Pomaks.

According to 1880 statistic almost half of the population of Bulgaria were Muslims and Turks. This was mainly due to the Ottoman policy of forced settlements from Anatolia, conversion, migration of Tatar Turks from Crimea following 1853 Crimean war, and Pomaks, the natives of Bulgaria. Turcomans, Yörüks, Abazas and Circassians were also among the migrants. Following the 1912-1913 Balkan Wars and the Russian policy of Pan-Slavism, there was a drastic decline in the number of Muslims. The further decline in Muslim population came after the First World War. Both the Allies and the Central Powers were after Bulgaria to enter the war on their sides. In the spring of 1915 an agreement was reached in favour of Ottoman Empire following the initiative of Mustafa Kemal and Fethi Okyar. Bulgaria joined the Central Powers, opened its borders

for the German ammunition and supplies to pass through to the Ottoman lands and allowed its Muslim and Turkish citizens to travel to Gallipoli to join the Ottoman forces. Müftü Hasan Vehbi, in support of Ottoman army, collected two saddlebags of 5,000 gold coins, loaded them on a mule and personally took them to Fethi Okyar, the Ottoman ambassador in Sofia. Mustafa Kemal, then military attaché in Sofia, was very much impressed with the Müftü's action stating, "The Turks will never be defeated as long as there are dedicated hocas like this Mufti."

Bulgarian Muslims besides Macedonian and Dobruca fronts fought in a number of other fronts. Those who fought at Gallipoli were mostly martyred. Those survived were sent back home. Bulgarian authorities, hoping the survivors to remain in Turkey, were not so keen in finalising the paper works for their return as none of them had passports. The nationalists were alarmed of their return.

Akın and Erdemir's paper deal with the imams appointed to the Ottoman army units during the 1915 Gallipoli campaign. The paper is basically divided into three parts; an overview of the subject matter, the religious personages employed in the Ottoman army, and the role the imams played in motivating the soldiers during the campaign.

The appointment of imams and other religious personages in the army goes way back to about 1380, the time Sultan Murad I founded the Janissaries corps, and the tradition continued thereafter. Apparently the purpose was to meet the religious needs of the army corps and encourage them to fight vigorously without fear during the campaigns. Another importance that needs to be noted is that these imams were most probably fluent both in Arabic and Turkish. They preached the army corps no matter what their ethnic backgrounds were. This policy of Ottomans at the same time helped the Ottomans to keep the soldiers together no matter what ethnic background the members of the army corps were. A strong belief in Islam was the basic factor that brought together the youth of different ethnicities such as Arabs, Kurds and Circassians in the Ottoman Empire to fight side by side with the common enemy. The presence of Armenians most probably was due to the fact that they had been living side by side with the Muslims for centuries. According to Akın and Erdemir the Ottoman victory at Gallipoli was the outcome of strong belief in Islam. The Turks were armed with this strong belief and to back their thesis quote Lord Byron who argued that it was an honour for a soldier to fight shoulder to shoulder with the Turks who were fighting an army equipped with the most modern weapons; they were fighting

with a spirit filled with the love of their country. General Hamilton on the other hand is of opinion that the only way to break the spirit of the Turks and to defeat them is to distance them from their strong belief in Allah who is protecting them. Yet according to the authors the strong belief must be accompanied with careful planning, preparation and the fulfilment of the prerequisites that Islam requires before plunging into an adventure. Thereafter the authors deal with the method of appointments of the religious personages in the Ottoman army and their promotions and duties, ranks and salaries such as imams of a battalion, regiment, and corps and also mufti of the regiment and the Sheikh of the army [in Ottoman terms: Tabur (Battalion) İmamlığı, Alay (Regiment) İmamlığı, Ocak (Corps) İmamlığı, Gemi (Ship) İmamlığı; Alay (Regiment) Müftüsü and Ordu (Army) Şeyhi.]

Regarding Gallipoli campaign apart from the imams and müftüs already sent to the front along their units, va'izes (preachers) were sent from Istanbul to the various fronts on the Peninsula as well as to various mosques within the city of Istanbul to preach the soldiers in combat and the public in Istanbul in order to boost their morals.

These imams, müftüs and va'izes did not simply lead prayer and preach, but also held the Qur'an in one hand and sword in the other so as to lead and encourage the soldiers in attacks leading them to victory. An imam lead the prayer before his regiment went into battle and he then accompanied them in combat to boost their morale. Apart from preaching the imams would also lead the daily prayers, perform burial rituals and collect the belongings of the martyrs to return them to their families.¹⁷ Some of these religious personages fell martyred and some others returned home as veterans.

The naval attack was the most important phase of the Gallipoli campaign. Although the Ottomans apparently came out the victorious, they had to face and stop the most powerful joint armada of the Allies. Admiral de Robeck's flagship, Queen Elizabeth Battleship was the strongest vessel of British fleet bombarding the Ottoman fortresses and coastal defences along the Dardanelles. Esra Oğuzhan Yeşilova's paper is about the role of the Queen Elizabeth - the most powerful battleship of the British Royal Navy - in the naval attack based

17 <http://www.dailysabah.com/feature/2015/03/18/the-imam-of-the-71st-regiment-an-eyewitness-to-gallipoli> ("The imam of the 71st Regiment: An eyewitness to Gallipoli," Daily Sabah, March 18, 2015. accessed on 19.8.2016).

on the articles published in Scottish, Australian and English newspapers such as Aberdeen Evening Press, Newcastle Journal, and The Sydney Morning Herald. Vice Admiral Carden commanded the French and British ships including Queen Elizabeth until mid-March 1915. He was then taken ill on 15th of March and replaced the same day by Rear Admiral John de Robeck.

Gazanfer Sanlıtop's paper a biographical study of Lieutenant Mehmet Hilmi (Sanlıtop), a graduate of Manastır Military Academy (Idadi) in 1902, Istanbul Military College (Mekteb-i Harbiye) in 1905 and Artillery (Topçu) School in 1907. Following his graduation he was appointed to the 5th Division Headquarters of the 5th Army at Canakkale. On the 18th of April 1915 the Allies (British and French) started bombing the Strait. This was Mehmed Hilmi's first experience and the first battle that he participated in. Apparently beside strict discipline he had imposed on his soldiers through a constant training, he advised them to be ethical, honest, never to tell a lie, and maintain brotherhood with their soldier fellows. His efforts were fruitful and he became very sure of his soldiers' ethics and good behaviour. At the start of the War of Liberation he skilfully managed in disguise (as Mehmet Hilmi Efendi, a tradesman from Batum) to have a boat full of arms sailed to Trebizond to be used at the Eastern front. He joined the 9th Army Corps at the Eastern Front and fought the Armenians.

Işıl Tuna in her paper presents Mustafa Kemal's role at Gallipoli. She particularly stresses that prior to Gallipoli campaigns Mustafa Kemal had already studied and analysed a strategic plan for the defence of the Straits in case there is an attack on Bolayır and Gallipoli. This is when he was an operation officer of the Dardanelles (Akadeniz Boğazı) Corps later named Bolayır Corps. Apparently this idea of an advanced strategic plan occurred to him at the time when Enver Paşa grabbed an opportunity at the start of Second Balkan War and recaptured Edirne from the Bulgarians with an instant operation on 21st of July 1923. The Allies forced the Straits and Mustafa Kemal, upon insisting his posting to Gallipoli, was appointed as the Commander of the 19th Division of the 3rd Army Corps on 20th January 1915. Mustafa Kemal predicted that the enemy following the landing would target at Alçıtepe and Kocaçimen hills. He therefore, without loosing any time, sent his forces to stop them. He was also the one who stopped the enemy at Arıburnu to advance any further. The other Ottoman commanders also believed that the region along Seddu'l-bahir-Kabatepe-Arıburnu-Maydos was the most critical contrary to Liman von Sanders' plan that is Bolayır isthmus and the Gulf of Saros. The Sunday 25 April 1915 operation was the turning point for the

Ottomans. Had the Arıburnu and Conkbayır, and the Sarıbayır region fallen into the hands of Anzacs, the Ottoman defences would have collapsed and the enemy would have reached Istanbul. The enemy lost 29,561 men within two to three weeks and the Ottoman losses of the 2nd Division were around 9,000 dead and wounded only on 18-19 May attack. The Ottoman victory at the I. Anafartalar on 6th of August 1915 was a turning point for Mustafa Kemal's career. He was promoted to the rank of colonel and was appointed as the Anafartalar Group Commander (Anafartalar Group Chief-of-Staff) on the 9th of August. Mustafa Kemal resigned from his post of Anafartalar Group Commander on the 10th of December 1915 and returned to his former post as the Commander of 16th Army Corps in Edirne. Harp Mecmuası (War Journal), one of the important publications during First World War, published the general description of the war including a photograph of Mustafa Kemal (Issue nu. 2)¹⁸ and another photograph of Mustafa Kemal standing before a monument made of empty shells collected from Kireçtepe (Issue nu. 4)¹⁹.

Gallipoli Campaign for the Turks is a campaign with many heroes. One of these heroes is Sergeant (Çavuş) Mehmet (1891-25 January 1972) of Kırşehir who despite having been wounded managed to defeat the enemy with a small contingent of 15-20 soldiers at Seddu'l-bahir-Kumkale landing on 19th of February 1915. Enver Paşa during his visit to the hospital awarded him with a war medal. Burgaç in his article gives detailed information on the Seddu'l-bahir landing and the heroism of Sergeant Mehmet. Mehmet was wounded during the fighting, but soon after his wounds were healed, he returned to the battlefield at Arıburnu and joined the 27th Regiment to fight against the enemy on 19th of May with utmost courage. He was wounded once more and had to return to hospital again. He once more returned to the front and this time joined the 19th Division under the command of lieutenant colonel Mustafa Kemal on 29th of May. Kemal this time charged him with the defence of Cesarettepe that was later named after him as 'Mehmet Çavuş Siperleri' (trenches) and a memorial was erected in his name soon after the British withdrew from Arıburnu. After the war was over the Algerians were the first and C.E.W. Bean was the second visitor to the memorial.

18 http://www.byegm.gov.tr/uploads/docs/say%C4%B1-2_web.pdf (Harp Mecmuası, Year 1, Nu. 2, dated December 1915, accessed on 25.6.2016.)

19 http://www.byegm.gov.tr/uploads/docs/say%C4%B1-4_web.pdf (Harp Mecmuası, Year 1, Nu. 4, dated December 1915, accessed on 25.6.2016.)

Aerial warfare is an important part of the Gallipoli campaign. Reconnaissance aircraft, fighters, aircraft carrier, and balloons were used during the campaign. At the beginning of the campaign the Allies had more aircraft than the Ottomans had. Fesa Bey and Yusuf Kenan Bey had flying lessons in Paris from 1911 to 1912. The Ottomans as part of the deal bought two aircrafts from France in 1912. These aircraft had their first flight on 27 April 1912 at the commemoration of Sultan Mehmed Reşad's accession anniversary to the throne that took place at Okmeydanı then known as Hürriyet-i Ebediyye Square. The same year an aviation school was opened at Yeşilköy and started training students. At the start of war four aerodromes were opened at Gallipoli warzone and operate against the Allies; one between Çanakkale – Karacaören, the other between Çanakkale – Erenköy, the third at Gallipoli town and the fourth to the southwest of Galata waist. An agreement was also reached between the Ottomans and Germany for twenty aircraft that were to be deployed at the Gallipoli, Caucuses, Iraq and other fronts²⁰. Of these twenty aircrafts, seven arrived in July 1915, flown by the Ottoman pilots for about 650 km. non-stop from Hungary to Edirne. Four were brought to Turkey via sea and eight others were crashed either due to faulty motors or were shot by the enemy. These aircraft were mostly used for reconnaissance and surveillance. Only a few of them were used attacking the enemy using bombs, guns and nails. Apart from these the Ottomans used these aircraft throwing leaflets in Urdu targeting the Indian Muslims fighting side by side with the Anzac units cautioning them that they are waging war against their fellow Muslims, the Ottomans. Similar leaflets were thrown on to the French lines to caution the Muslims recruited from colonies of France in Africa. It is also crucial to point out that the Ottoman aircraft send back to the Headquarters the surveillance reports and photographs that recorded the withdrawal of the Allies.

Australian War Memorial no doubt is very rich in the number of documents including letters, reports, memoires, photographs, art works, medallions and all kinds of other materials such as weapons, and military equipment left over from the Gallipoli campaign. Although most of these have already been studied

20 According to Yıldırım (p. 201) Ottomans entered the First World War with five or six aircraft, but throughout the war they bought from Germans 290 aircraft of eighteen different types. For a detailed study of Ottoman aviation see Yıldırım, C. 2015: "Birinci Dünya Harbi Ekseninde Çanakkale Muharebeleri'nde Hava Gücü," in 100'üncü Yılında Çanakkale Zaferi Sempozyumu Ulusal Sempozyum. Edited by Zekeriya Türkmen. 28-29 Nisan, İstanbul, pp. 197-239. Also see Holzhausen, R., 1982: "Birinci Dünya Harbinde Almanya'nın Türkiye'ye Sağladığı Hava Desteği" in Askeri Tarih Bülteni Eki. Nu. 14. Trs: Fahri Çeliker. Ankara: Genel Kurmay Basımevi.

and published by the Australian authors, very few of them have been evaluated from Turkish perspective. Apparently Akpınar and Kanalga have evaluated a number of such documents and pointed out that the letters, memoirs and photographs of the Anzacs at the same time reflect the culture, customs and social conditions of the Middle East people. Akpınar and Kanalga using diaries, letters and photographs reflecting military equipment and medical services as well as newspapers, concentrate on the issues such as the conditions of hospitals in Cairo and Aegean islands, naval and land operations, aviation, and vital issue such as the Allies propaganda to convince the Muslims from British colonies such as India and Sudan fighting along the British lines that they are fighting the Turks who are oppressors and tyrants suppressing the Greeks living on the Peninsula and along the Anatolian shores; confiscating their properties and forcing them to migrate to Greece.²¹ The authors surprisingly assert that the Allies were also using the Broken Hill incident as part of this propaganda.

After the Gallipoli Campaign of 1915

Sadigov's paper deals with the Russian refugees who were settled at the Gallipoli Peninsula and their memoirs. Following the Bolshevik Revolution, the supporters of Tsar reacted against the revolution and fought against the new Government for several years. However, they were defeated and were expelled from the country. About 150,000 Russians took refuge in Turkey and about 25,000 were settled at Gallipoli. Later these refugees left for Europe. Some of the refugees wrote their memoirs of Gallipoli days. Sadigov's paper is based on these memoirs and some other Russian documents. Çatalca near Istanbul was earmarked for the Don Cossacks of the White Army. The Gallipoli Peninsula was earmarked to the First Army Corps under the command of General Alexander Pavlovich Kutepov. The third camp was decided to be on the Limnos Island where Kuban and Terek Cossacks were settled. The ships boarded with 25,000 refugees arrived at Gallipoli on 22nd of November 1917. Of these 9,500 were military officers. Some of the refugees however were civilians. Apparently it was not possible to settle them in the city and therefore some of them were settled at

21 For the Allied propaganda in inciting the Colonial Muslims against the Ottomans and the Ottoman counter propaganda in British and French colonies calling the Muslims to wage war against the enemies of Islam see <http://www.britac.ac.uk/sites/default/files/01%20Rogan%201825.pdf> (Rogan, E. 2016: "Rival jihads: Islam and the Great War in the Middle East, 1914-1918," *Journal of the British Academy*, 4, 1-20. DOI 10.5871/jba/004.001 Posted 19 January 2016, The British Academy, pp. 1-20, accessed on 22.8.2016.)

a valley at distance of six kilometres to the city. The British who lost some of their soldiers bitten by the snakes had named this valley as “Rose and Death Valley”. The Russians later named the Valley as Golove Pole.

Art, Literature, Fiction and Cinema

As the war on the Peninsula was going on, the Ottoman Government arranged for a number of poets, artists and men of letters to visit the battlefronts. A committee of seventeen including storywriter Ömer Seyfettin, poet İbrahim Alaaddin, artist/painter İbrahim Çallı, and composer Yekta Bey left for Gallipoli on Sunday 11th of July 1915 at a time the fighting was very intense²². The poetry was penned while they were at the battlefronts. The committee then left Gallipoli on 22nd of July 1915. The ten-day visit had a great impact on their feelings and was reflected in their works. The Turkish novelists and poets of the following decades were inspired by their writings. As such Sema Uğurcan’s “Gallipoli Campaign Literature” is a comprehensive summary of these well-known poets, fiction and novel writers, covering three distinct periods; soon after the campaign, Republican period, and the Latest period. Of these Ömer Seyfettin, and Süleyman Nazif practiced short stories. Mehmet Âkif, Abdülhak Hâmid, Yahya Kemal, Mehmet Emin, and Ziya Gökalp wrote most well known poems. Gallipoli battles were the core of the novels written by the most well known authors of the Republican period such as Halide Edib, Yakup Kadri, Reşat Nuri, and Peyami Safa. They compared the life at the battlefront and home front. Halide Edip in her “İşildak’ın Rüyası” (İşildak’s Dream), the first story written on the Gallipoli campaign, published in Tanin on 11 December 1914, revives a Turkish cult through a dialogue between the wounded Lieutenant İşildak and Süleyman Şah who bitterly condemns the presence of foreign ships in his territory and the occupation of his domain. Süleyman Şah in Lieutenant’s dream heals his wound with a gentle touch as a token of strength to the fighting soldiers²³.

22 The Introduction to the second edition of İ. Alaaddin’s book *Çanakkale İzleri* (1932) includes the full list of those who visited the Gallipoli front. (Alaaddin’s book was first published in İstanbul: Marifet Matbaası 1926. According some other sources in 1922 – see Kirişçi, C.: “The Representation of Gallipoli in Turkish Literature: A Brief Overview” in *Gallipoli: History, Memory and National Imagination*. Edited by M.M. İlhan. Turkish Historical Society, Ankara 2014, p. 191, f.n. 12). For the list also see Köroğlu, E. 2007: *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity*, London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 82-83.

23 Aslan, P. 2012: “Türk Edebiyatında Fantastik Tür Açısından Farklı bir Durak: Halide Edip Adıvar’ın Bazı Öykülerinde Milliyetçi “tayflar””, Prof. Dr. Mine Mengi Adına Türkoloji Sempozyumu (20-22 Ekim 2011) Bildirileri, Adana, pp. 257-258.

The poets such as Haluk Nihat Pepeyi, Necmettin Halil Onan, and İbrahim Aleaddin Gövsa poeticise descriptive history of the Campaign and its spatial characteristics. Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, the epic writer of the well-known Turkish victories, writes another epic for the Victory at Çanakkale. In the 1980s the interest on Çanakkale revives again. Mustafa Necati Sepetçioğlu, inspired by 'I came, I saw, I conquered,' the famous saying of Julius Caesar, wrote his well-known trilogy novel 'Ve Çanakkale, Geldiler, Gördüler, Döndüler' (And Çanakkale 1 They came, 2 They saw, 3 They returned) (published in 1990). The novel depicts economic (the manpower poverty), human (the exhaustion of Anatolian people) and administrative (difficulties involved in the state and the army management) miseries of the wartime respectively²⁴. Mehmet Niyazi's apocalyptic Çanakkale Mahşeri (Çanakkale Apocalypse) is similar to Sepetçioğlu's. Turgut Özakman's Diriliş Çanakkale 1915 (Awakening Çanakkale 1915) tells the Gallipoli story based on documents. Buket Uzuner's Uzun Beyaz Bulut Gelibolu (The Long White Cloud) (2001) is a postmodernist novel looks at the enemy through the eyes of 'the other', a humanistic approach.

The glorification of Çanakkale by the Turkish poets is worth noting: To Abdülhak Hâmid in his 'İlham-ı Nusret' (published on 27 December 1915) Çanakkale victory is a return to the age of miracles that is a gratification to the Prophet's soldiers and a congratulation to the Sultan. To Mehmet Emin through Çanakkale the ancient Turkish history is revived, and the glorified Gallipoli is a new path to the pilgrimage. For Ziya Gökalp, through Çanakkale Turan has become a reality, and the Gallipoli victory is a liberation of a hundred nations suffering under the Tsar.

Ayşe Tomat in her paper presents a thorough study of the novel 'Rana' written by Osman Necmi Gürmen. She particularly concentrates on the events that took place during First World War and Gallipoli Campaign of 1915; not neglecting the Turkish War of Liberation. Rana, the heroine in the novel tells us the life story of her mother woven into the events running from 1905 to 1928: the collapse of Ottoman Empire and the rise of Modern Turkish State from ashes. The fall of a family is compared to the fall of an Empire: the pre-war, the war, and aftermath. The Ottoman Empire as the 'Sick man' is at the background while

24 Gürcan, M. – Johnson, R. 2016: The Gallipoli Campaign: The Turkish Perspective Oxford: Routledge; Sabanur Yılmaz' paper in this volume entitled "Cephe Gerisinde Yaşanan Çanakkale Savaşı" gives a detailed account of Sepetçioğlu's novel.

the life of Haşım Bey's family forms the centre of the fiction. Mustafa Kemal is not only the hero at Gallipoli, but also the one who leads the Turks to victory chasing the occupying Greek forces from Anatolia and laying the foundation of Modern Turkey. Haşım Bey inscribes Emine Rana's birthday inside the cover of the Qur'an that he reads. The date corresponds to Yıldız Assassination attempt on Abdulhamid II on Friday 21st of July 1905. The Armenian Revolutionary Federation organized the assassination plot. The Armenians were after laying the foundation of an Armenian state in Eastern Anatolia. They had the plot carried out by a European (Belgian) named Charles-Edward Joris in collaboration with Krisdapor Mikaelyan and Varm Shabuh Kendiryan of Arnavutköy²⁵. The bomb went off before Abdulhamid II reached his carriage because Şeyhu'l-Islam, unaware of the plot, had a chat with him for a few minutes and thus saved the Sultan's life. However, as the bomb went off 23 were killed and 58 were wounded²⁶. The events then follow; Abdulhamid is dethroned and sent to exile. The uprisings devastate the country and Haşım Bey and his family face troubled days just like the Empire is itself. 'The sick man' of Europe is at stake as the European powers had planned. The rebels raid Bab-ı Ali and kill Nazım Paşa, the Minister of War. The rebellions and fighting devastate Rana because her beloved uncle Salahaddin Efendi disappears in the midst of the Government circles plunged into disputes. The Allies declare war on Ottoman Empire; the failure of Allied fleet forcing its way through Dardanelles is followed by land operations. The residents of Haşım Bey's mansion, aware of hard days, stock food, although the prices have gone up sky high. Months after the good news comes: Mustafa Kemal has pushed the enemy back into the sea shattering their hopes of reaching Constantinople. However, soon after the enemy occupies Istanbul followed by a peace treaty. Meanwhile Salahaddin Efendi, Rana's uncle is back home and once more she is happy. Her happiness does not last long for soon after Salahaddin Efendi decides to join Mustafa Kemal's forces in Anatolia to fight for the Liberation. Mustafa Kemal once more pushes the enemy back to the sea and lays down the foundation of Turkish Republic. Rana meets Olga and through them the Islamic and Turkish culture is compared with that of the West. Rana is once more devastated when Olga gets married and goes away. As

25 <http://gizlenentarihimiz.blogspot.com.tr/2009/07/iiabdulhamide-yaplan-yldz-suikasti.html> (II. Abdülhamid'e yapılan Yıldız Suikasti, accessed on 20.6.2016).

26 Selvi, H. 2014: Sultan'a Suikast: Sultan II. Abdulhamid'e Sunulan Bomba Hadisesi Fezlekesi, İstanbul: Büyük Şehir Belediyesi.

a remedy Rana marries a Kurd despite her father's objection. She is now happy, but heart broken because the couple are longing for a child. She visits doctors, hojas, and tombs of saints. Just as she is about to lose all hopes, she realizes that she is pregnant. However her happiness does not last long. During the last month of her pregnancy her husband Halil Bey receives a letter stating that he is expected in Ankara as the Member of Parliament for Siverek. Rana then just like the Ottoman Empire finds herself imprisoned into the darkness.

Sabanur Yılmaz' article deals with Mustafa Necati Sepetçioğlu's well known novel "They came, they saw and they returned." The novel is based on eyewitnesses and reliable sources. The novel was not limited to the Gallipoli Campaign, but was spread to a wider geographical area covering a wider picture of the campaign that is a panoramic view of both battle and home fronts. Therefore Sepetçioğlu's trilogy is a reflection of the author's imagination and fictitious ability based on the almost near-factual events. Although the historians cannot use these near-factual events as a source, they can penetrate into the hearts of the readers thirsty for the historical facts. For Sepetçioğlu the invaders are of no importance, but the high spirit of those soldiers who stop them. The Ottoman officers studying the military maps and taking the decisions, the imams preaching the youth and urging them to rush to the front, and the captains expected to return to their duties only a day after their weddings to save the country are the heroes of his novel. Mustafa Necati although inspired by Julius Caesar's famous saying "I came, I saw, I conquered" (Veni, Vidi, Vici), his novel's content is a reflection of an historical reckoning and the settlements of the past events. To him the people and the imams are far above the government in this reckoning and settling the account either of the past or present. To him Mustafa Kemal and the Turks are victorious in this campaign. The dance saloons are for the Westerners; they are not the places the Turks to be seen. The Turks walked to victory through reading Qur'an and constantly repeating the word of 'shahade' that is "There is no God, but Allah, and Muhammed is His Prophet." Mustafa Kemal and his soldiers were armed with this high spirit that served like steel armour.

Ece Yassitepe in her paper introduces the Martinican writer Raphaël Confiant's novel *Le Bataillon Créole*. The novel tells the story of five soldiers (Théodore, Ti Mano, Ferjule, Lucien and Rémilien of Créole Battalion) from Martinica (Martinique) and Guadeloupe, two of the French colonies located in

the Lesser Antilles in the eastern Caribbean Sea. These five soldiers – known as Créole, hence Créole Battalion – recruited into the French army were to defend France, their home country, against the Germans during First World War (1914–1918) at battles of Marne, the Somme, Verdun and Gallipoli. The Martinican Ti Mano and Ferjule who had even seen France for the first time in their life meet the entirely different people when they arrive at the Gallipoli Peninsula. They were to fight the Turks who have been introduced to them as wild and primitive. Yet just like the Anzacs these soldiers and their loved ones back at home will find out that they have fought and died for no real cause, perhaps for a glimpse of national consciousness.

Fulya Marmara's paper is a psychoanalytic study of Siegfried, Gaston and Alican Çavuş, the heroes of the novels written by Giraudoux²⁷, Anouilh and Buket Uzuner respectively. Her paper is also a critical approach to the traumatic impact of the war on the veterans and their families. The soldiers' loss of memory during the First World War and the search of a new identity are the main theme of the novels. The heroes' old identities and the new identities pose entirely opposite and extreme poles. The reader through the story of three heroes is awakened to the negative impact of the war and questions the superficial reasons, worthless values and human greed that have given rise to war.

Dalila Özbay's paper concentrates on Turkish artists and painters. Following the First World War and the collapse of Ottoman Empire these artists painted and portrayed not only the war that had a great impact on them, but also the culture and national values of Ottoman society. The war and its impact on the society as well as the feelings of respect and sympathy are well reflected in the paintings and portraits of these artists. These artists, who have had their education and training in Europe, followed the methods of European style arts and paintings. As such they came up with their own style through blending the European and Turkish styles. Thus they brought a different style and interpretation to Turkish art reflecting the trauma of war. Therefore, the culture and the styles of that time are clearly reflected in their paintings. In this respect İbrahim Çallı, Hüseyin Avni Lifj, Namık İsmail, Mehmed Ruhi Arel, Mehmed Sami Yetik, Hikmet Onat were such well-known artists.

27 Giraudoux is a subject matter of two other articles in this volume: Arzu Etensel Ildem, Jean Giraudoux's Gallipoli: A Representation of Continents in War; Ahmet Özkan, Aşk ve Savaş: İki Ateş Arasında Jean Giraudoux. Both Ildem and Özkan have approached Giraudoux from two different perspectives.

Kerime Yıldız in her paper has studied and approached the Australian films ‘Gallipoli’ and ‘The Water Diviner’ from Turkish perspective. She believes that these two films are attempts to justify Australia’s participation in the Gallipoli campaign and the unjustified occupation of the Peninsula. The films according to Yıldız certainly are not apologetic. The Anzacs were innocent and were deceived by the Imperialist powers. The Imperialist powers and their offshoots the Capitalist countries use the cinema and films to impose their own ideology on the countries they want to exploit. Worst of all through the cinema they rewrite history from their own perspective and in their own favour.

‘Gallipoli’ film is the story of the Vicious Imperialist British who have not only sacrificed their own youth in this unjustified war, but also sent the innocent Anzac youth to their death through telling them that the Turks are primitive savages. Behind the scene are the wicked and immoral Muslims. There is no enemy facing the Anzacs, but a machine gun shooting them non-stop.

‘The Water Diviner’ is a continuation of Peter Weir’s ‘Gallipoli.’²⁸ Four years after the Gallipoli Campaign is over, Australian farmer Joshua Connor’s (Russell Crowe) wife commits suicide grieving over her three sons reported deaths at Gallipoli. Connor, a person of mystical talent for ‘divining’ (identifying) underground water sources, soon after burying his wife, travels to the Ottoman lands to locate his three sons. While in Istanbul, Connor stays in a hotel run by Ayşe, a beautiful war widow, whose husband had fallen martyr at Gallipoli campaign. Connor saves Ayşe from her brother in-law who forcibly wants to take her as a second wife and brutally beats her. Ayşe falls in love with her saviour notwithstanding that he is a Christian. Thus Yıldız comments further on the film. To her Hollywood films have a fixed rule and an agenda. The American or European soldier is not an occupier or abuser, but a saviour. For the American hero there is a local woman who falls in love with him. In other words the imprudent abused girl falls in love with her abuser. As such in this ‘master-slave relation’ - the so-called “Stockholm Syndrome” romantic fiction - the hero is acquitted but the other is despised and left behind in contempt.

The immorality of Turks is also repeated in ‘The Water Diviner’. The veil, belly dance and polygamy are not the only symbols of immorality. There is also an immoral scene in the movie; Sergeant Cemal’s (Cem Yılmaz) visit to a

28 For a review of the film see <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2015/02/14/crow-f14.html> (“The Water Diviner: Russell Crowe’s contribution to the WWI centenary” by Richard Phillips accessed on 26.8.2016). Cf. <http://garryvictorhill.com.au/pdf/The%20Water%20Diviner.pdf> (The Water Diviner Reviewed by Garry Victor Hill, accessed on 26.8.2016).

brothel house accompanied by two other people. Ottoman dominion, the land of harem and prostitution, as depicted in the movie Gallipoli, is repeated and skilfully handled in 'The Water Diviner'. Then there is also a Turkish bath scene. Ayşe's remark 'All our decisions are based on fortune telling through coffee-ground readings' is an allusion to the ignorance of Ottoman society. An English officer telling Connor that the Greeks contrary to their advice occupied Western Anatolia is a cynical way of covering up that the British were behind scene.

Mehmet Kerem Özel's paper is a detailed study of Kumkale Memorial project that was supervised by the author himself. The project was originally commissioned by the OPET in 2014 as part of the 'Tarihe Saygı Projesi' (Respect to History Project) that had been undertaken by 2006. The memorial was due for the completion on the Centenary of Gallipoli campaign in 2015 had the OPET not suspended its support in December 2014. The Memorial still awaits completion.

Ümran Aslan article deals with the time and space allocated to the Gallipoli campaign or to use the Turkish term the Çanakkale Battles in the books so called 'History of Turkish Revolution and Kemalism' prescribed for the secondary schools. According to Aslan the content with regard to the campaign is deficient and the visual quality is not good enough. He therefore comes up with some suggestion for the improvement of the curriculum.

In concluding this Introduction it is clear that there is still more to be done on the Gallipoli campaign. The archives and libraries of the countries directly or indirectly participated in the campaign need to be explored for further documents and evidences. Both the documents and published material need to be collected and made available to the researchers and readers. Perhaps Dr. Acun's database might serve the purpose. As such Acun's paper is on the preliminary findings of the academic works carried out on the Gallipoli campaign through the Social Network Analyses. In doing this an 'info.-web-database has been created and the sources on the Gallipoli campaign with a reference index were listed on the system. The system includes 100 articles mostly published in the refereed International Periodicals or refereed International Conference Proceedings. About 2,100 reference data of these articles have also been put on the system. It is believed that the findings will serve as a good guide to the students and researches working on the Gallipoli campaign.

Canberra

September 2016

Bibliography

“II.Abdülhamid'e yapılan Yıldız Suikasti” <http://gizlenentarihimiz.blogspot.com.tr/2009/07/iiabdulhamide-yapilan-yldz-suikasti.html>.

Alaaddin, I. 1932: Çanakkale İzleri, (First published 1922).

Aslan, P. 2012: ‘Türk Edebiyatında Fantastik Tür Açısından Farklı bir Durak: Halide Edip Adıvar’ın Bazı Öykülerinde Milliyetçi “tayflar” in Prof. Dr. Mine Mengi Adına Türkoloji Sempozyumu (20-22 Ekim 2011) Bildirileri, Adana: 250-261.

Benli, G. ‘The Use of Courtyards and Open Areas in the Ottoman Period in Istanbul’ (chapter 32) <http://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfs-wm/45434.pdf>

Björnlund, M. 2008: “The 1914 cleansing of Aegean Greeks as a case of violent Turkification” in *Journal of Genocide Research* 10(1), March: 41-57.

- Buccini, S. 2008: *Americas in Italian Literature and Culture, 1700-1815*, Pennsylvania.
- Careri, G. F. G. 1699: *Giro del mondo*, Napoli.
- Dadrian, V. 2003: *To the Desert: Pages from My Diary*. Princeton and London.
- Daily Sabah, March 18, 2015: "The imam of the 71st Regiment: An eyewitness to Gallipoli". <http://www.dailysabah.com/feature/2015/03/18/the-imam-of-the-71st-regiment-an-eyewitness-to-gallipoli>
- Erickson, E.J. 2001: "Strength against Weakness: Ottoman Military Effectiveness at Gallipoli, 1915" in *The Journal of Military History*. Vol. 65, No. 4 (Oct.): 981-1011.
- Gürcan, M. – Johnson, R. 2016: *The Gallipoli Campaign: The Turkish Perspective* Oxford.
- Hill, G.V. (review): *The Water Diviner* <http://garryvictorhill.com.au/pdf/The%20Water%20Diviner.pdf>.
- Holzhausen, R. 1982: "Birinci Dünya Harbinde Almanya'nın Türkiye'ye Sağladığı Hava Desteği" in *Askeri Tarih Bülteni Eki*. Nu. 14. (Trs: Fahri Çeliker) Ankara.
- Ilhan, M.M. 2013: "Introduction to Book 'Gelibolu'" in *Gelibolu, Tarih, Efsane ve Anı (Gallipoli: History, Legend and Memory)*. Edited by I.G.Yumuşak & M.M. Ilhan. Istanbul.
- Ilhan, M.M. 2014: "Introduction to Book 'Gallipoli: History, Memory and National Imagination'" in *Gallipoli: History, Memory and National Imagination*. Edited by M.M. Ilhan. Ankara.
- Kannengiesser Paşa, H. 1927: *The Campaign in Gallipoli*. London.
- Karataş, M. 2007: *Haritalarla Çanakkale Savaşları: Gelibolu yarımadası kuzey bölgesi kara muharebeleri*. Ankara.
- Kirişçi, C. 2014: "The Representation of Gallipoli in Turkish Literature: A Brief Overview" in *Gallipoli: History, Memory and National Imagination*. Edited by M.M. Ilhan, Ankara: 183-201.
- Köroğlu, E. 2007: *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity*, London.
- Muhlmann, C. 1917: *Der Kampf um die Dardanellen*. Oldenburg.
- Nikolski, General 2010: *Sarkamış Harekatı 12-24 Aralık 1914*, Istanbul: Kariyer Yayınları.
- Öney, G. Lale Bulut, Şakir Çakmak, Ertan Daş, Aydoğan Demir, Yekta Demiralp, İnci Kuyulu, Rahmi H. Ünal 2002: *Early Ottoman Art: The Legacy of the Emirates*, MWNE.
- Philips, R. (review): "The Water Diviner: Russell Crowe's contribution to the WWI centenary" <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2015/02/14/crow-f14.html>.
- Rogan, E. 2016: "Rival jihads: Islam and the Great War in the Middle East, 1914-1918"

in *Journal of the British Academy*, 4, 1–20. DOI 10.5871/jba/004.001 Posted 19 January 2016, The British Academy: 1-20. <http://www.britac.ac.uk/sites/default/files/01%20Rogan%201825.pdf>

Rogan, E. 2016: *The Fall of the Ottomans: The Great War in the Middle East, 1914–1920*, Penguin.

Rosaccio, G. 1596: *Il Mondo e le sue parti, cioè Europa, Affrica, Asia et America*, Verona.

Sanders, O.L. von 1927: *Five Years in Turkey*. Annapolis.

Selvi, H. 2014: *Sultan'a Suikast: Sultan II. Abdulhamid'e Sunulan Bomba Hadisesi Fezlekesi*, Istanbul.

Travers, T. 2001: 'Liman von Sanders, "the Capture of Lieutenant Palmer, and Ottoman Anticipation of the Allied Landings at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915"' in *The Journal of Military History*, Vol. 65, No. 4 (Oct.): 965-979.

Williams, J. 2016: "The Ethnic Cleansing of Greeks from Gallipoli, April 1915" [an extract from *Deutschland Uber Allah! The Germans and Gallipoli 1915*] Australian Scholarly publishing. <https://quadrant.org.au/magazine/2013/04/the-ethnic-cleansing-of-greeks-from-gallipoli-april-1915/>

Yerasimos, S. 1995: *Milliyetler ve Sınırlar, Balkanlar, Kafkasya ve Ortadoğu*, (Trs. Şirin Tekeli). Istanbul 1995.