



The Gallipoli Memorial Club and the Macquarie University



The 2009 Lone Pine Anniversary Lecture

“A Simple Epic”: Gallipoli and the Australian Media

presented by

Harvey Broadbent

Author of *Gallipoli, The Fatal Shore*

Senior Research Fellow, Dept. of Modern History, Macquarie University

“A Simple Epic”, these words printed in an Australian newspaper on Anzac Day, 1916, were used to describe Australia’s and New Zealand’s Gallipoli story. In this lecture, Gallipoli author and researcher, Harvey Broadbent, will trace the role of Australian newspapers, books, films and television in moulding Australian perceptions of the Gallipoli Campaign.

Time: 6 p.m., 6th August 2009,

Place: The Gallipoli Memorial Club, Loftus Street, Circular Quay, Sydney.

And at the History Week seminar Faculty of Arts, Macquarie University,
September, 2010.

I feel very close to this subject as a person who has been actively involved in presenting the Gallipoli story as a media practitioner for over 25 years (as producer of 3 special event TV programs, 3 TV documentaries, two books, a wad of newspapers and journal articles, and a web-site). So it’s a subject that has fascinated me more and more, for as with the best analyses of history, it tells us something about identity or the search for it—if I may encroach on cliché--what it is to be Australian.

For this presentation I need to define my use of the word ‘media’. My definition is: the various modes of communicating information and p.o.v.s regarding that information and ideas relating to that information. So that includes newspapers and in the same category the later developments of radio and TV news and current affairs broadcasting and more recently narrowcasting (on the worldwide

web for e.g.), and, continuing, cinema, TV documentaries, theatre, and last but by no means least-books.

In Australia, the manner and the nature of the Gallipoli saga as it has been presented over 90 years in these various media arms is, I believe as do other commentators, deserving of study in its own right. It would form, I suggest, a study with a depth almost as great as the historiography of the Campaign itself. So rendering an account of nearly 100 years of the media coverage of the Gallipoli saga would be tantamount to the task of writing a history of the Campaign itself. This presentation then can provide only a series of signposts for some determined researcher to follow, perhaps as the centenary in 2015 comes ever closer.

Media, then, was involved from the very first, even before the landings of 1915, in determining the way the Gallipoli story has become rooted in the psyche of Australians and its place as a founding myth for the nation—and so involved in how Gallipoli has become entrenched in the efforts to establish or define an Australian national identity.

This is not the forum to examine or debate whether or not the original Anzacs were exceptional or not, or whether Gallipoli is deserving of its place as the defining moment of Australia as a nation. Some recent commentators, such as Marilyn Lake and even Paul Keating have questioned whether Gallipoli deserves its pre-eminent place in the national psyche suggesting other events as more appropriate for the modern nation. This presentation does not address that issue. It has two main concerns:

1. the nature of the received knowledge about the Gallipoli Campaign as a founding myth, and
2. the channels or outlets by which the received knowledge has reached the Australian population since 1915.

It is possible to divide the analysis into 4 main periods, which can be identified or delineated by their particular events and characteristics.

1. During WW1 and the Gallipoli Campaign itself from 1915-18
2. Post WW1 to 1950s
3. 1960s to 1988 (Year of the Bi-Centenary)
4. 1988 to present day

Received Knowledge as The Message

Media practitioners (and, I would argue, many academics-not the best ones of course) love to reduce the body of knowledge they have acquired for communication to a digestible, even simplistic, message. So, at the risk of over-simplification I suggest that the received knowledge about Australia's part in the Gallipoli Campaign can be summarized in two distinct messages. These

messages however are strangely contrasting. Although related they seem to stand in opposition to each other.

The Tradition Message

The first message, which I call the Tradition Message can be encapsulated in one, albeit longish, sentence:

The Anzacs at Gallipoli created a tradition or perception that they were *distinctive* by exhibiting qualities, such as an elevated ideal of mateship and other attributes special to them which enabled them to be the troops who achieved the most during the Gallipoli Campaign.

The Myth Message

The second message, which I call the Myth Message, contradicts the first. It is that this sturdy image of the Anzacs is essentially an overly generalised myth perpetuated for the purposes of assisting the realization of a national identity that combines desired qualities in both men and women, such as the fair-go or egalitarianism, concern for one's fellow countrymen and women and hardiness. Or as Charles Bean advocated, a healthier, fitter, more optimistic transplanted version of the British race, exhibited in their performance first at Gallipoli, and thereafter. Some or many original Anzacs possessed these qualities, but many didn't, and other nations' troops also exhibited similar qualities.

In communicating these messages at different times I would argue that the various media modes have been responsive to public sentiment in Australia and generally attempt to stroke it. The complexity arises when determining how far the various modes of media:

1. go in their stroking (Public broadcasters such as the ABC, and so-called 'independent' journals, for example have a strong record, a tradition even, of questioning dominant public sentiment and perceptions.
2. how far the various modes of media actually influence that collective sentiment, and
3. whether public sentiment most strongly influences media coverage or vice-versa.(the chicken or the egg syndrome).

So having given that background, let's look at my dual concerns: the nature of the received knowledge about the Gallipoli Campaign, and the channels by which the received knowledge has reached the Australian population.

Outbreak of World War 1

After the outbreak of war in August 1914, understandably it was newspapers, the main source, if not the only source, of public information, which reported events as they unfolded. With the development and popularity of the home wireless after the war, newspapers were never again to be the pre-eminent medium of news, particularly in war-time. But under the War Precautions Act, a massive centralizing of power in the government and its authorities, the imposition of war

time censorship was a source of frustration for journalists and editors. The measures were excused by Chief of the General Staff, Colonel Legge, as being necessary to prevent any “unpatriotic disclosures of some of the daily press”. The newspapers complained constantly that the appointed censors, who Legge had described as “hard-working citizen officers, who are doing their best in a difficult task for the safety of the Empire,”ⁱ had no real understanding of the newspaper industry. The *Argus* (Melbourne) outlined the problem on 29 Dec, 1914 in pointing out that those chosen as censors had “no training and possess no aptitude’ for dealing with newspaper work, ‘which they do not in the least understand’ and frequently ‘showed ludicrous ignorance...and some of them have not the least notion of when to censor or how.” and so on.ⁱⁱ But that was to be the pattern for the next four and half years, and certainly the case when the first landings occurred at Gallipoli. The general news from the front came through a series of filters to Australians, starting with the War Correspondent, who was subject to the local high command, and being further scrutinized by various authorities before any publication. Frequently then the news from abroad (and home) was minimized to the degree that it misrepresented or put a spin on events and more importantly their war-time implications.

The Gallipoli Landing

The most potent example of this factor is the reporting of the Anzac landing itself. News of the landing was kept from publication in Australian newspapers until the 30th April, five days after the event. Details, announced by the British War Office, with no contributions allowed from the War Correspondents at the front, were reduced to a such a cryptic minimum of nineteen lines as to be frustratingly inadequate given that the landing was the first active service in which the A.I.F and the New Zealanders were involved, a historic event. Moreover, the cursory report was inaccurate and misleading.ⁱⁱⁱ

However, even with so little information the newspapers of the day were true to representing the received knowledge as the pre-determined message of Anzac distinctiveness. Since the outbreak of war the newspaper columns had lauded praise born of hope on the AIF and here at the landing they followed the already established pattern of substituting facts with hyperbole. The editorials on this day, the 30th of April, with no real information, which they acknowledged knowingly obliged public hope. The *Argus* wrote: “But while in one respect we know little, in another we know much. We know that our troops are credited with ‘splendid gallantry and magnificent achievement’ . . . It now appears that the Canadians at Hill 60 [on the Western Front] and the Australians at Gallipoli distinguished themselves in action almost simultaneously”. The editorial then continues in a denunciation of the Germans.

Editorials over the next week concentrated on morale boosting in the face of the arrival of the first casualty lists. The *Argus* of the 3rd May 1915 stated that “Australians have all the high patriotism and self-control of a ruling race and they will not let their private sufferings dim their eyes to the glory of wounds and death

incurred in their country's cause by its gallant sons". And with the main message in mind, "Australia could not wish for a more inspiring scene in which to make her European debut as a fighting unit of the Empire . . . already our troops have established a superiority that should have a potent moral effect upon the Turk and cause the German to reconsider his views on the solidarity and military resources of the British dominions."^{iv} And this without any hard facts of the situation available.

The pattern leading to the Tradition Message is thus established from the outset and it continues when the first war correspondent's report of the landing arrives and is published on 8th May 1915, two weeks after the event. The report comes not from the official Australian War Correspondent, Charles Bean. His report was still under the censors' scrutiny. It comes instead from *British War Correspondent*, Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett. It's a colourful, derring-do, dramatic account, devoid of any tactical reporting or accurate assessment of gains and losses. It's published in newspapers around Australia and in Britain and combines moments of accurate description with the less than accurate, lashings of hyperbole and emotion. It was a heaven-sent report for the secure establishment of the Tradition Message. It reads as if it might have been designed for the purpose.

"The Australians rose to the occasion . . . it was over in a minute . . . those colonials, practical above all else, went about it in a practical way . . . this race of athletes proceeded to scale the cliffs without responding to the enemy's fire. They lost some men but did not worry . . . The courage displayed by these wounded Australians will never be forgotten . . . In fact I have never seen anything like these wounded Australians in war before. Though many were shot to bits, without the hope of recovery, their cheers resounded throughout the night . . . They were happy because they knew that they had been tried for the first time and had not been found wanting . . . There has been no finer feat in this war."

Re-action from Australians was widespread, emotional and pride-filled, and with a sense of relief that the A.I.F. had not, according to a *British* report, been found wanting. I suggest that this report and its publication in Australian newspapers is highly significant. It colours and influences so much of what follows in Australia relating to the mythology of the Anzac story. Although gestating for months in the Australian press since the outbreak of war with the determination of the press to present the A.I.F. as distinctive, Ashmead-Bartlett's report published on the 8th May 1915 is I suggest the tangible moment that the Anzac legend is born. The anti-imperialist *Bulletin*, always a proclaimer of the Eureka rebellion as the true beginning of Australia's national history, now stated the landing of the Australian IMPERIAL Force at Gallipoli as fit to stand alongside Eureka as a determiner of nationhood.

Charles Bean

And what of Australia's own correspondent Charles Bean and his reports? He had gone ashore earlier than Ashmead-Bartlett and had quickly written a less colourful but wide-ranging account of the first and subsequent days, more detailed and more accurate than his British counterpart's. But British military authorities held it over till 13 May and it appeared in Australia on 14 May. The reports soon become 'set in concrete' as it were, printed as early as 18 May as an official booklet *Australians in Action: the Story of Gallipoli* for use by senior public school students in NSW 'in proud and grateful memory of the bravery of the Australian Troops'

Gallipoli, 'that new word of liquid syllables' (as described in the *Age* of 16 May 1915) had entered the Australian consciousness, never (yet) to be removed. More and more panegyric accounts of the campaign appeared. A speech by the imperial patriotic author W.H. Fitchett was reported in the *Age* on 25 May in which he concluded that the Anzacs' achievement at Gallipoli equaled Waterloo and surpassed it in one respect. "Wellington's lads", he is reported as saying, "wouldn't have had the initiative and daring to climb that cliff. That was the 'Australian touch'." The audience applauded loudly, this was heady new stuff for the colonial cousins of Wellington's people.

The Bulletin of 3rd June 1915 carried a poem by J.A Allen, which encapsulated the public and official mood in stating that by the deaths at Gallipoli, "was our new war-saga written—We who 'had no history'".

Historian Ken Inglis has pointed out that Charles Bean publicized the existence or emergence of *character* that the war-time experience and performance of the Anzacs that began at Gallipoli discovered.^v This view that develops to the point where Gallipoli is seen as a defining moment of nationhood for Australians and Nzlanders sits uncomfortably for some people as Gallipoli was a defeat. (Many foreign observers express this view). But for Bean and others that follow, the achievement was survival, not victory, and the manner of behaving in defeat which is seen as a victory of the spirit.

The Anzac Book

Charles Bean's other publishing achievement, *The Anzac Book*, should not be overlooked in a survey such as this. Compiled from writings and sketches of Gallipoli men themselves, it became a major best seller both in Australia and with the A.I.F overseas in Egypt and Europe—100 000 copies by September 1916, with another 53 000 on order by November of that year. Its appeal lay in its depiction of the "stalwart Anzacs" as Alastair Thomson states. But Thomson also cites Bean as editing and excluding manuscripts not just on literary merit, but also to 'project a certain image of the Anzacs . . . the battered but unyielding warrior, and thus implied that Gallipoli was a triumph rather than a failure.'^{vi}

Media Note: Newspapers came to Gallipoli with these reports from 8 June, and also wireless messages beamed from the Eiffel Tower, written up daily on a

notice board for the troops. Australian historian, Ken Inglis, states that the Bulletin was the most popular paper at Gallipoli and the ANZAC troops identified with Ginger Mick, C.J. Dennis's larrikin hero from his doggerel verses.

Ginger Mick

The Moods of Ginger Mick, written in 1915, and published early in 1916, with its doggerel verse represents the first popular literary attempt to capture and promulgate the Tradition Message. Dennis published his book *Songs of A Sentimental Bloke* in 1915 and it sold 50 000 copies in the first nine months. He demonstrated that popular sales were very much in his mind with the character Ginger Mick, who he creates as an archetypal heroic Anzac, when he wrote to his publisher, "I have decided to kill Mick, but I don't know whether to finish him up on Gallipoli or not. If any further news comes through about the Australians I shall have to."

Dennis was timing Mick's death to coincide with public sentiment affected by any long current casualty lists.^{vii} And the *character* of Mick at work in the poem, or the attributes of the Anzac being transmitted—the Tradition Message? According to Inglis, Mick becomes a fallen hero at Gallipoli but he is a larrikin who loves a 'stoush', he identifies himself as a member of a nation and race.

The Pride o' Race lay 'olt on 'im, and Mick shoves out 'is chest
To find 'imself Australian an' blood brothers wiv the rest'^{viii}

The film, Hero of the Dardanelles

It was not long before the newest mass medium, film, was to play its part in delivering the message. As casualties at Gallipoli began to grow dramatically, by the end of May 1915, the A.I.F. required large numbers of reinforcements. This need was further impacted when Whitehall and Kitchener planned to send a new army out for a new offensive in August. In Australia, the Gallipoli experience was pounced upon by the authorities as a vehicle to entice more recruits for the cause. This resulted in the film *The Hero of The Dardanelles*.

The message was the same—the new Anzac identity was heroic. You, as a new Anzac, could be a hero. Moreover, it was your duty to be one. A recruiting film it might be, but it was the Australian cinema's first Gallipoli film and it further cemented the image of the Anzac soldier as distinctive and heroic. It also realised dramatically in moving images a sense or a depiction of the Anzac landing.

A scene direction note in the script instructs that "All scenes at Dardanelles to be produced according to Ashmead-Bartlett's report."^{ix} This leads to the film's hero, William meeting a Turk on a cliff edge and "There follows a life and death struggle (as described in cable). Men fall over into water and William drowns his adversary and struggles to the shore badly wounded." The cable referred to did not indicate the Australian survived. In its fictionalized and exaggerated depiction of a reported events, or use of the 'faction' tool, *The Hero of The Dardanelles* in

1915 has a number of similarities in approach to Peter Weir's more sophisticated production *Gallipoli* 65 years later.

Anzac Day

It is clear then that the Gallipoli story does not end with the evacuations of 1915-16, but continues post Gallipoli to the present day in which the media plays an important role. This is the story of its commemoration and the interplay of the Tradition Message and the Myth Message. The first anniversary of the landing at Gallipoli was a major national event that received huge press coverage. Although the first official Anzac Day was not gazetted in Australia and NZ till the 1920s, the press were echoing the sentiments of many who were calling the 25th April, 1916, Australia's birthday. Newspapers ran banner headlines and the whole campaign was re-reported.

The Melbourne *Argus* ran a main 'Anzac' page, containing a Gallipoli diary with photographs and a leader by Defence Minister Pearce, entitled, "What Anzac Means", in which Pearce articulated that Australia now had a military tradition.

Every unit of the citizen army will now have its tradition. Every soldier of the Australian army will have that inspiring example of the Anzac heroes to live up to in his military work, and we can regard the future with a calm confidence in the military prowess of our soldiers.^x

As a rite of passage for a new nation, this newly founded military tradition was being presented effectively as a founding myth. It can be asserted that the press on this day were reflecting the public mood across the country. In Sydney a crowd estimated at 80 000 crammed the Domain to welcome home the arrival of 4000 returned Gallipoli troops. They spontaneously took up 'Abide With Me'. A report stated "it was as though the crowd were swayed by a great wind, and sobs and sighs went up on every hand."^{xi} The *Telegraph* was already calling the day by its future name as it wrote: "What Made Anzac Day? The test of the qualities of the Britons of the south in a crucible of fire. It is a simple epic . . ."^{xii}

The 2nd AIF and the 1950s

By the 2nd World War, this Tradition Message was recalled for the purpose of recruitment. The 2nd A.I.F. were told they had a tradition to match and a distinctive character to uphold. Press coverage and the relatively new information media of radio and cinema newsreels largely continued the delivery of the Tradition Message and how the 2nd A.I.F. were matching up to the tradition. WW2 boosted Anzac Day attendances and RSL membership during the postwar years, but something starts to happen in the 1950s as surviving original Anzacs pass in to old age and a new post war generation, that cannot relate to the commemoration of military events, makes its cultural strength felt. Anzac Day attendances drop and the so-called 'generation gap' makes an impact.

This becomes manifest across a range of media—broadcasting, theatre, and the press. Alan Seymour's popular play, *The One Day of the Year*, chronicled this change and, so doing, helped to sustain it. In the play, Hughie, the son of an Anzac veteran, refuses to accompany his domineering father on the Anzac Day march. The play focuses on the changing attitude of the new generation of Australian youth, which sees Gallipoli and Anzac Day as symbols of an old and outdated conservatism and irrelevant to them. The Tradition Message is replaced by the Myth Message.

Australia's controversial participation in the Vietnam War further devalues the place of Anzac Day and Gallipoli as the peace movement questions the ethics of conflict and going to war. The news media again reflects and helps to influence public opinion. A good example is the *Sydney Morning Herald* on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the Gallipoli landings, as it runs a full-page debate, "Can Anzac Day Survive?", which involves prominent people and a representative of Australian 'youth'. Conflicting views include: "To most schoolchildren, Anzac Day is quietly dying out . . . It's very strange how you go to great lengths to commemorate what was after all a defeat . . . It is meant not to commemorate a type of warfare, but a type of spirit, a sort of selflessness . . . Just supposing there had never been an Anzac Day, do you think there would be any difference in Australia, and our feeling for Australia?"^{xiii}

Similar sentiments appear in the medium of popular music. So-called protest songs had appeared in growing numbers in the recorded music industry from the early 1960s to the extent that by the 1970s they had established a genre of their own. (e.g. Seeger, Dylan, Baez). Australia produces its own exponents, one of the best known, Eric Bogle penning a song, *And the Band Played Waltzing Matilda* at the end of the 70s, which decries the Anzac Day marches, the futility and horror of the Gallipoli Campaign and echoing the sentiments of Hughie in *The One Day* the commemorations of "tired old men from a forgotten war". Bogle is later to state that he wanted this song to refer to the Vietnam War and its veterans, but that emotional controversy surrounding the war and his sympathy for the Vietnam veterans as victims, led him to use the demise of the Gallipoli memory as a reference to the inappropriateness of war commemoration as it was carried out—in marches etc^{xiv}.

Peter Weir's Film, 'Gallipoli'

But this view of Gallipoli as 'forgotten war' for the new post-WW2 generation is not to persist. Australia, in the 1980s and 90s, is to resurrect the Gallipoli story and its Tradition Message. It is to be the medium of the moving picture that will lead the resurgence—particularly Peter Weir's film *Gallipoli* in 1981, of which more anon. But the roots of the re-rise of Gallipoli in Australia can be traced to the mid-70s in the aftermath of the short-lived Whitlam Government's new directions in social engineering, education and the arts, which, together with as response from the ABC, assisted the re-livening of interest in Australian history. In particular the government's incentives for film industry investments spawn

sudden vibrant activity in the making of Australian films many on historical themes, (eg. *Seven Little Australians*, *Rush*, *Caddie*, *Picnic At Hanging Rock*, *My Brilliant Career*, *Newsfront*, *The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith*, *Breaker Morant*). The government subsidy contributes strongly to the dismantling of the cultural hegemony enjoyed by US and British TV programs and films, where little space or funding was left for the Australian local product. Australian films and TV programs could now reflect our image of ourselves, through current *and* historical themes.

Weir's 1981 film, *Gallipoli* comes into being after the phenomenal success of two books in 1975, *The Broken Years*, *Australian soldiers in the Great War*, by Australian historian, Bill Gammage and in 1978 Patsy Adam-Smith's *The Anzacs*. The former, with its use of soldiers' diaries and letters, is the first major work to focus on the Australian experience at Gallipoli as it impacted on the ordinary soldiers. It will sell 17 000 by 1981, while by the same year Adam-Smith's *The Anzacs* sells 30 000 copies with pre-orders for 15 000 of the soft back edition. Both books are highly influential and widely reviewed in the press and electronic media.

Weir's film in a sense emerges from this background and it is received with general approval in its nationalistic sentiments by Australian audiences. The film plays strongly on the triumph of the Australian character against adversity, lauding many of the features of the Anzac identity—sporting and physical prowess, mateship, anti-authoritarianism, egalitarianism. It is Weir's take on the Tradition Message. In its reliance on a simplistic story line the film is criticized for its one dimensional presentation of the original Anzacs and for incidental misrepresentations, such as scenes showing the Anzacs as heroic victims of British incompetence. As a strong purveyor of the Tradition message, the film is analysed extensively in Australia and in Britain, where its message is less warmly received. And it will be dissected and debated for many years to come by commentators and academics alike, taking its place as a seminal film in Australian film and media studies. Film historian Jane Freebury, as an example, suggests the film has 'the rhetorical tone and lack of moral ambiguity of a propaganda film . . . it tries to avoid the possibility of setting other meanings, apart from the preferred meaning, into play ..' and it is 'not so much about Australians in war as it is a celebration of the national ideology.'^{xv}

Time prevents us analyzing it further here, except to note that the film's executive producers were Robert Stigwood and Rupert Murdoch, whose father, the well-connected Sir Keith Murdoch was at Gallipoli assessing conditions at the bidding of the Australian government and was the author of the notorious letter in which he denounces British conduct of the campaign and asserts the supremacy of the Australian soldier. With Weir's film showing the potency and market of the Gallipoli story for an Australian mass audience, a spate of TV mini-series and documentaries on the subject appear throughout the 1980s—*the ABC's 1915*, *The Anzacs*, *The Light Horsemen*, *A Fortunate Life*. It is possible to demonstrate

to a greater or lesser degree how these films like Weir's film communicate the Tradition Message once again.

Gallipoli, the Fatal Shore

So ubiquitous are these 'Anzac' films in the 80s and the debate they encourage about Gallipoli and national identity that by the time of The Australian Bicentenary events in 1988 yours truly and Chris Masters at the ABC decide to embark on making *Gallipoli, The Fatal Shore*, as a contribution to the debate on Australian identity. The TV documentary film, at 90 minutes in length, will actively encourage more interest in the Gallipoli story, but this time by examining both the Traditional Message and the Myth Message. One effect of the film is that it encourages more people, especially younger people, to visit Gallipoli and to examine the Messages for themselves. The Videocassette version is bought in large numbers making it the highest selling Australian-made video in 1988-89. High school history teachers make up a large section of customers, seizing on the film as a way of making the story and its issues accessible to students. The film wins the UNNA Media Peace Award for Television in 1988.

The 1990 Pilgrimage

The convergence of these events with the 75th Anniversary of the Gallipoli Campaign in 1990 cements the resurgence of Gallipoli. The Hawke Government spends \$10 million in taking 52 remaining Gallipoli veterans back to Anzac Cove and Lone Pine for the anniversary. Several thousand people make the journey to join them at Gallipoli. Media coverage is massive. The ABC allocates 5 hours of live OB satellite coverage and relays commercial TV coverage as host broadcaster. Two more TV documentaries by yours truly, *The Boys Who Came Home; Recollections of Gallipoli*, as TV oral history. and *Ten Days of Glory*, documenting the veteran's return to Gallipoli are broadcast. The former is later released as a book and with the recorded highlights of the day as a videocassette. The programs win the Australian TV Society's Award for Best Special Event Television 1990.

Since 1990 regular attendances at Anzac Day services at Gallipoli have risen regularly topping 10 000 and it is common for senior Australian politicians from governors general, prime ministers and other ministers to attend the Gallipoli services. Associating with Gallipoli is often seen as an opportunity to establish populist credentials as television and press coverage is generally guaranteed. Their speeches, reported and broadcast nationally, usually bordering on platitude and invariably imparting the Tradition Message, are frequently indistinguishable.

Carlyon's Book

The best-selling book by journalist and horse-racing writer, Les Carlyon, becomes a huge best seller in 20 01 even though it does not add any new material or research but re-works previous published research in an idiosyncratic, laconic style that, I suggest, echoes the traditionally held view of the original Anzacs and that has appealed to a popular Australian readership. In this way

Carlyon still delivers the Tradition Message in 20 01. 20 01 also sees another book, *Gallipoli 1915*, by Canadian historian, Tim Travers, by contrast, not designed as a blockbuster nor as a vehicle for the Tradition message. Instead it is a dense analytical, highly researched military history, which includes crucial new research and breaks new ground by including original Turkish documentation for the first time. It sells a mere fraction of Carlyon's.

Gallipoli the Brand

The word "Gallipoli" in fact has become a brand. It accounts for the large number of books with the same name. Since 2001 books on Gallipoli have appeared each year by journalists and historians, including my own 90th anniversary highly illustrated, *Gallipoli, The Fatal Shore* in 2005. I discovered an interesting feature in the marketing of these books, when discussing the title of my book with the publisher. I wanted to use a title that was pithy and would relate to the multi-national perspective I had attempted to bring to the book. My publisher, pointed out that to maximize shelf sales the title needed to have the word 'Gallipoli' prominently in the title, preferably the first word, which would be larger than any other words. I have counted more than one hundred and twenty books of different lengths and approaches that have been written since 1915 dedicated to the re-telling of the Gallipoli story. That must be close to some kind of record for a single campaign.

Turkish Gallipoli books for popular reading in Turkey are now also ubiquitous—many new publications each year—and TV documentaries. The Australian trend is now being paralleled in Turkey.

As far as the electronic media is concerned, the national broadcaster, the ABC, in fulfilling the spirit of its charter by comprehensively reflecting Australian history and society in all its complexities, has taken the lead in presenting a none-cliched, none mythologised Gallipoli to the Australian public. ABC Television returned to Gallipoli in 2005 for the 90th anniversary with live coverage of the ceremonies. It also transmitted a new two-part documentary, *Revealing Gallipoli*, which attempted a broader multi-national view of the campaign, including a substantial Turkish perspective.^{xvi} Since 2005, the ABC has returned to Gallipoli each year to broadcast the Anzac Day ceremonies.

Gallipoli The First Day ABC Website.

And now this year as the ABC expands its internet activities with interactive webcasting, it has invested \$200 000 to create a pilot project *Gallipoli, The First Day*, a non-linear depiction of the events from both the Anzac and Turkish sides, which runs from the confused Anzac Landing to the soggy end of the first day, when ideas of evacuation were dismissed by General Hamilton. The presentation is truly multi-media, using 3D imaging and animations, adapted Google Earth renditions of the landscape, sound effects, commentary and background information in text with still photographs, video clips of interviews with long dead Gallipoli veterans, and statistics. Navigation is left to the user. The plan is to

develop the website to cover the whole of the campaign by the centenary in 2015. (www.abc.net.au/gallipoli)

Conclusion

That brings us effectively up to date where this brief survey of Gallipoli and the Australian Media are concerned. But I would like to conclude with a potent example of how Gallipoli can be easily appropriated for a media message. In 2001 the Australian cricket team was on its way to Britain for the Ashes series against England. It was decided to take a stop over at Gallipoli. The team were filmed, photographed and reported as they visited the battlefield having swapped their baggy green caps for slouch hats.

It was a carefully staged media opportunity as the team re-enacted a famous cricket match played on a place called Shell Green by Anzac soldiers late in 1915 in sight of enemy artillery positions. The soldiers' intention was to fool the enemy into thinking no evacuation activity was under way, that life was normal. The Australian cricket team's intention was two fold—to strike a chord back home and at the same time send a message to the English team that their formidable foes, endowed with the same qualities as their heroic Anzac forbears, were on their way to engage them in battle. The Tradition Message and brand Gallipoli had been well and truly appropriated as a media stunt.

Of course when this occurs damage is caused to the military and historical significance of the event, which is complex. It is often said that the first casualty of war is truth, if you'll pardon *my* use of cliché, a practice which I have criticized in this presentation. The media, though, can be a force of protection against such damage, or it can compound the casualty. I will be very interested to see how things pan out across the media landscape when the centenary in 2015 is finally upon us.

ⁱ *The Argus*, 29 December, 1914, p. 4

ⁱⁱ Op. cit

ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid. 30 April, 1915, p. 7

^{iv} Ibid 3 May, 1915 p.6

^v Ken Inglis, *The Anzac Tradition*, from 'On Native Grounds; Australian Writings from the Meanjin Quarterly', Angus and Robertson, 1965, p.205

^{vi} Alistair Thomson, *Anzac Memories*, O.U.P. Australia, South Melbourne, 1994, p. 66

^{vii} *ibid*, p. 215

^{viii} *ibid* p.215-16

^{ix} Australian Archives Victoria, Accession No. B539, Dept. of Defence, Correspondence Files 1914-1917 File No. 144-1-274A, p.2

^x *Argus*, 25th April 1916, p. 5

^{xi} NSW Parliamentary Diary, 1924, 2nd Series, 98:2761

^{xii} *Telegraph*, 26 April 1916

^{xiii} *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 April 1965

^{xiv} As told to the author in interview for *Minstrels of War, Into The Music*, ABC Radio National, 23 April 2007

^{xv} Jane Freebury, *Gallipoli, a study of nationalism on film*, Media Information Australia, No.43 February 1987.

Copyright: Harvey Broadbent, 2009

^{xvi} *Revealing Gallipoli*, Director Wain Fimeri, Australian Broadcasting Corporation Television and December Films, 25 April, 2005.