

# Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Bostanbas, Ozge (2018) Turkish and British literary representations of the Gallipoli Campaign. Doctoral thesis, Northumbria University.

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:  
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/42062/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>



**Northumbria  
University**  
NEWCASTLE



**UniversityLibrary**

Turkish and  
British literary  
representations of  
the Gallipoli  
Campaign

O. Bostanbas

Doctor of  
Philosophy

2018

# Turkish and British literary representations of the Gallipoli Campaign

Ozge Bostanbas

A thesis submitted in partial  
fulfilment of the requirements of  
the  
University of Northumbria for the  
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Northumbria  
December 2018

## **ABSTRACT**

The study of the literature of the Gallipoli campaign has mostly been insular. Comparative literary criticism so far has either focused on Gallipoli as a Turkish and Australian nation-building experience or even more narrowly focused mostly on the perspectives of Australia and New Zealand. This thesis attempts to redress the balance, by undertaking a comparative study of literary representations of British and Turkish writings of Gallipoli. It does not include the experience of other nations that participated the Gallipoli campaign due to the limitations of a PhD thesis, but covers and illustrates as wide a range as possible the ways the Gallipoli experience could be met and interpreted in written works of both civilians and combatants. Not only does it bring both famous and little known writers to the fore from both sides, but also, by comparing them, it questions prejudices derived from any possible propaganda intent, since even the most innocent forms of wartime propaganda are likely to betray particular interpretations of history as well as having documentary value. Examining the similar and distinct ways in which British and Turkish writers developed and expressed their responses to the Gallipoli campaign, the thesis explores the ways in which the campaign intersected with issues of identity and the ways in which these writers interrogated nationhood, personal and national discourses of identity as well as critiquing and contributing to state propaganda.

To most people in Turkey the perspectives of British soldiers are an unknown quantity and they are only vaguely referred to in the Ottoman-Turkish writings, with the exception of stereotypical representations of the vilified enemy in war writings. Similarly to most people in Britain, the Ottoman-Turkish experience of Gallipoli has been an obscure case, although Ottoman-Turkish soldiers were a more familiar topic in British writings of Gallipoli. For example, it is impossible to find in the writings of Aubrey Herbert anything which could be described as anti-Ottoman or anti-Turkish, whilst in the Ottoman-Turkish writings we are not likely to find any form of sympathy towards the

Allied Powers. The comparison of British and Turkish literary representations illustrate that the writings of Gallipoli perpetuate many myths about the First World War, yet at the same time often break free of the stereotypes one would associate with war literature.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	2
Abstract	3-4
Acknowledgements	7
Declaration	9
 <b>Chapter I: Introduction</b>	 10-59
Historical Background: The Ottoman Empire	21-32
Historical Background: The British Empire	32-40
British Authors	42-49
Ottoman-Turkish Authors	50-59
 <b>Chapter II: British Perceptions of the Enemy</b>	 60-94
The Enemy as 'Turks' and Popular Perceptions	61-69
Aubrey Herbert's Pro-Turkish Approach	69-78
A. P. Herbert and Humanism	78-83
Ernest Raymond and Geoffrey Dearmer: Crusading Narratives	83-90
W. F. Rollo and Imperial Propaganda	90-94
 <b>Chapter III: Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of the Enemy</b>	 95-126
Ziya Gökalp: A Turanist Perspective on Gallipoli	95-105
Mehmet Akif Ersoy: Islamist Views of the Enemy	106-114
Ömer Seyfettin: Turkish Nationalism and the Enemy within	114-123
Propaganda, Nationalism and Representation of the Enemy	123-126
 <b>Chapter IV: British Perceptions of Themselves</b>	 127-172
Ernest Raymond, <i>Tell England</i> (1922): Gallipoli as a Test Of English Values	129-147
W.F. Rollo – Imperial Patriotism	147-152
Aubrey Herbert: Disillusionment, Humanism and Classical Antiquity	153-165
A. P. Herbert, <i>Half Hours at Helles</i> , Poetic Humour, Mockery and Irony	166-172

<b>Chapter V: Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of Themselves</b>	<b>173-245</b>
Turkism and Turanism: Seekin for Solutions to Turkish Indifference	174-179
Ziya Gökalp and Cultural Solidarity: 'Turkification, Islamisation, Westernisation'	179-195
Ömer Seyfettin's 'Bir Çocuk Aleko' (The Child Aleko) and National Blindness as the National Enemy	195-201
Mehmet Akif Ersoy and Pan-Islamism	201-245
 <b>Chapter VI: British Perceptions of the Gallipoli Landscape</b>	 <b>246-240</b>
The Gallipoli Landscape as the Antithesis of Home: Guerrilla Landscapes	217-227
The National Landscape: the Gallipoli Landscape as an Extension of Home	227-228
'Idyllic Landscape and what Fussell calls the 'Anti-Pastoral'	228-230
Englishness, the Sea and Naval Dominance	230-237
Alien Land 'sown' with English Bodies	237-238
Familiarising the Alien Landscape through Cultural Patterns: Classical and Biblical Allusions	239-240
 <b>Chapter VII: Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of the Gallipoli Landscape</b>	 <b>241-287</b>
The National Landscape	250-257
Guerrilla Landscapes: The Homeland under Attack	257-275
Classical and Historical References	275-280
A Homeland Fertilised with Turkish Blood	280-283
Religious References and Otherworldly Depictions	283-287
 <b>Chapter VIII: Conclusion</b>	 <b>288-289</b>
 Bibliography	 291-302

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Nobody has been more important to me in the pursuit of writing this thesis than my supervisor Ann-Marie Einhaus, who has been an inspiring model and the most encouraging and supportive academic mentor one could ever think of having. Her guidance and support helped me find my own academic voice and has always lifted me up when I felt discouraged. I am grateful to her for providing me with great academic opportunities and envisioning my vision beyond boundaries to be beneficial to the research community. This thesis would not be possible without her constructive feedback on my thesis, particularly without her understanding of and suggestions for my endless illnesses, countless readings of the different versions of my thesis and patient corrections on my 'the's.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my second supervisor Charlotte Alston for her academic support and constructive suggestions on the historical sections of my thesis. Her valuable comments as well as immense knowledge has contributed to this thesis with a major impact.

I am grateful to my PhD colleagues also friends, Ann-Marie Foster and Emily Anderson, with whom I have had to pleasure to work during my research and other related projects on World War I. They both have provided me with great support when things would get a bit discouraging and cheered me up with their conversations during our tea or lunch breaks.

I would also like to thank to the Republic of Turkish Ministry of Education for sponsoring me throughout my masters and PhD.

A very special word of thanks goes for my parents who have been loving and supportive throughout my life and did everything to raise me as an independent woman. They never raised an eyebrow when their one and only daughter told them she



wanted to study in the U.K away from them for many years or the times she claimed in despair that she will not be able to complete her PhD.

## **DECLARATION**

I declare that this PhD thesis has been composed entirely by myself and that it has not been submitted, in whole or in part, for any other degree or professional qualification. Except where explicitly stated otherwise by reference or acknowledgment, the work presented is entirely my own.

## INTRODUCTION

Those heroes that shed their blood and  
lost their lives...  
You are now lying in the soil of a friendly  
country. Therefore rest in peace. There  
is no difference between the Johnnies  
and the Mehments to us where they lie  
side by side here in this country of  
ours...  
You, the mothers, who sent their sons  
from faraway countries wipe away your  
tears; your sons are now lying in our  
bosom and are in peace, after having  
lost their lives on this land they have  
become our sons as well.<sup>1</sup>

These famous poetic and humanistic words attributed to Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who was a commander of the Ottoman army at Gallipoli and later the founder of the new Turkish Republic, are inscribed on the Gallipoli Memorial at Anzac Cove.<sup>2</sup> The alleged words of the Turkish leader, Atatürk, who is also known as having said the words ‘peace at home, peace in the world’, radiate a healing aura at the Gallipoli Memorial in Turkey, illustrating the power of forgiveness and encouraging world-wide peace. Having witnessed the Gallipoli centenary commemorations and seen these heart-rending words, one might assume that Gallipoli has left an inspirational legacy of international peace that emerged from a disastrous tragedy. This positive legacy has already been recognised by a number of Australian prime ministers from Bob Hawke to Tony Abbott, who regarded the inscribed words as evidence of a special bond between Australia and Turkey, formed amid the slaughter of the Gallipoli campaign. As much as the idea of this ‘friendship’ is inspirational and humanistic, the reality of the Gallipoli campaign was not as peaceful and poetic as it is suggested by the emotive words

---

<sup>1</sup> Atatürk, 1934 Anzac Memorial

<sup>2</sup> The alleged words of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk appeared in Turkish and English on the Canakkale Martyr's Memorial in 1958. Turkish authorities officially asserted that Atatürk wrote these words for his Interior Minister, Şükrü Kaya, to use in a speech at Gallipoli in 1934. Yet, based on research done by the Turkish writer Cengiz Özakıncı and the secretary of the Australian organisation *Honest History*, David Stephens, there is no strong evidence Atatürk ever said or wrote them.

inscribed at Anzac Cove, and early representations of the campaign by contemporary writers arguably contradicted these sentiments.

The legacy of the Gallipoli campaign that circulates in Turkey today is a militaristic and patriotic one. It supports current Turkish policy which is, in fact, much closer to the representations of Ottoman-Turkish writers in the 1910s and 1920s than to the present-day international interpretation of Gallipoli. In his speech to commemorate the Gallipoli campaign on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2018, President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, for instance, linked Turkish military operations in Afrin to the victory of Gallipoli saying that ‘the same way our heroic Mehmeds [...] wrote epics in Gallipoli yesterday, today they achieve great success wherever we carry out anti-terrorism operations, such as in Al-Bab and Afrin’.<sup>3</sup> Erdoğan further claimed that the recent terrorism with which Turkey has been struggling, through ‘the most villainous and bloody terrorist organisations’ such as ‘PKK, FETO and ISIL’, is ‘nothing more than an effort to resurrect the Gallipoli attack’.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Erdoğan’s speech here mirrors the ideas that emerged in Turkey in the early twentieth century as he emphasises that ‘the same way that [the Turkish Army] frustrated the ones who brought soldiers from all over the world with their enormous battleships in Gallipoli, [they] puzzled the ones who thought that they had built a passage of terrorism in [Turkish] borders.’<sup>5</sup> The rest of his speech continues to praise the heroism of Turkish soldiers who fought at Gallipoli, including legendary national heroes such as Corporal Seyit who is said to have changed the course of battle by miraculously carrying a heavy artillery shell to an artillery piece, which hit British pre-

---

<sup>3</sup> Original Text: ‘Kahraman Mehmetçiklerimiz askeriyle, polisiyle, jandarmasıyla [...] dün Çanakkale’de nasıl destan yazdıysa bugün de El Bab’ta (Al-Bab), Afrin’de terörle mücadele operasyonu yürüttüğümüz her yerde büyük başarıya imza atıyorlar.’ Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, ‘Çanakkale Zaferi konuşması’, 18 Mart Stadyumu ve Şehitler Abidesi, 18 March 2018. Anonymous, ‘Cumhurbaşkanı Erdoğan Afrin Müjdesini Çanakkale’den Verdi’, *Milliyet*, 18 March 2018, Çanakkale Haberleri < <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/cumhurbaskani-erdogan-afrin-mujdesini-canakkale-yerelhaber-2666975/> > [accessed 25 April 2018].

<sup>4</sup> Original Text: ‘Türkiye’ye yönelik terör dalgası bir asır sonra Çanakkale saldırısının yeniden horlatılma çabasından başka bir şey değildir.’

<sup>5</sup> ‘Görkemli zırhlılarıyla dünyanın dört bir yanından toplayıp getirdikleri askerleriyle erken zafer kutlayanları Çanakkale’de nasıl hüsrana uğrattıysak sınırlarımızda terör koridoru kurduklarını sananları da öyle şaşkına çevirdik.’

dreadnought HMS Ocean. This illustrates that the early-twentieth century ideas of patriotic sentimentalism present in Ottoman intellectuals' Gallipoli writings, such as 'othering' different nations whilst praising the heroism of the Turkish soldiers, still pervade the public understanding of Gallipoli in Turkey. As this thesis will show, Gallipoli writings of Ottoman intellectuals illustrate a nation-building pattern in which the othering of the enemy whilst praising national identity was an important element used to create a collective identity. However, as can be seen from the President's speech, the same ideas which were used to 'construct the self-identity of the nation' in the early twentieth century now serve to feed a new Islamic-nationalist trend in Turkish public consciousness, and to unify the public to support current government policy, providing 'a scapegoat to the nation for its present and past troubles'.<sup>6</sup>

War has been an important factor in Turkish nation-building and Turkish national identity since the wars of the early twentieth century, as the discussion of Ottoman-Turkish writers in this thesis demonstrates. As a result of the foundational nature of the Gallipoli campaign in Turkish national consciousness, stories regarding Gallipoli that have been told from generation to generation have never been questioned. The historical evidence surrounding military myths has never been reassessed in the public sphere and thus myth and reality have been blended in Turkish popular memory. However, it is important to look beyond the Gallipoli campaign as the central pillar of Turkey's history and identity, for the sake of Turkey's future development and progress. To achieve this, Turkey should critically question and re-assess why and how the Gallipoli campaign should be remembered. As David Aldridge asks, '[i]s the purpose of remembrance to bind ourselves to the national community, to strengthen our commitment to [national] values, to fix our eyes on ideals of courage and self-sacrifice'

---

<sup>6</sup> John Evans, 'The Use of "Othering" in the Formation of a Nationalist Society', <[https://www.academia.edu/1338990/The\\_Use\\_of\\_Othering\\_in\\_the\\_Formation\\_of\\_a\\_Nationalist\\_Society](https://www.academia.edu/1338990/The_Use_of_Othering_in_the_Formation_of_a_Nationalist_Society)> [accessed 05 Sept 2018].

or to stop all wars to provide a peaceful future for the next generations?<sup>7</sup> It is important to answer this question, since imposing remembrance on people requires a good justification, with which commemorative events and rituals should be consistent.<sup>8</sup>

As can be seen from the Turkish President's speech, every year, the remembrance of past conflicts centres on the heroism of and gratitude towards Turkish martyrs and the power of their Islamic faith, invoking a repetition of the past in the present. However, Turkish remembrance events never witness the inclusion of the horrors experienced at the front line by the soldiers, yet 'horror [was and] is an inescapable element of warfare' and the reality of war is undoubtedly gruesome and traumatic.<sup>9</sup> The deaths of soldiers, each of whom was a mother's son, are never included in Turkish remembrance speeches, nor how those sons, brothers and fathers turned from whole men into 'heads, eyes, torsos, legs, arms, chins, fingers, hands, feet/ rain[ing] down onto ridges, valleys', as described in Ersoy's 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine' (1915).<sup>10</sup> The traumatic experiences of front-line soldiers, such as İbrahim Naci, who experienced the filth, indignity, fear of death and shock of combat, are hardly ever remembered. Each year, commemorations take place 'lest we forget', but each year, the real war that was waged at the front is forgotten once more. David Aldridge suggests that,

However revisionist we may be about the real conditions of the trenches in the 'Great War', each corpse collected from no-man's land is one more body broken or destroyed by deliberate human action. Each single death, regardless of scale, is worthy of the sentiment of horror. The death of a soldier might be heroic, but it will always be horrific.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> David Aldridge, 'How Ought War to be Remembered in Schools?', *Impact: Philosophical Perspectives on Education Policy*, 21 (2014), pp.1-45 (p.2).

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid p.19

<sup>10</sup> Mehmet Akif Ersoy, 'Asım'dan Bir Parça (Çanakkale Şehitlerine)', *Sebilürreşad*, 24 (1924) pp.145-146, (p.146) (First Published in 1915).

<sup>11</sup> Aldridge p.21

For this reason, 'if there can be justification for a special moment or event of remembrance', it must be to remember 'the horror of war, which should act as a spur to the constant critical evaluation of involvement in any and all armed conflict.'<sup>12</sup>

British literary representations of war prompt critical questions about remembrance and what we should remember of Gallipoli, and they provide a good comparison to Turkish memory of the Gallipoli campaign with regards to providing a critical assessment of war. Whilst modern scholars of English-language war writing have been recognising war writings with patriotic sentiments as only one, propagandist and romantic, version of the war for some time, for instance, Turkish scholars tend to treat them as the only real history of the war. Another issue is that Turkish memory of the Gallipoli campaign as well as Turkish literary representations of Gallipoli almost solely consist of the Turkish national collective perspective. Whilst the defensive nature of Gallipoli for the Turks legitimised the omission of the Allied Powers' perspectives on Gallipoli, such as those of the British, Australian, French and Indian troops who fought there, the concern for Turkish nation-building during the early twentieth century also justified the omission of Ottoman minorities such as Greek, Albanian, Armenian and Kurdish perspectives even where these were allied with the Ottoman Empire. Turkish historiography and literary scholarship, consequently, lacks the perspectives of others involved in the campaign on both sides. For this reason, I believe that comparing the British and the Turkish perspectives will introduce a new critical dimension to the Turkish perception of war. This is not to say that war writing or people's perception of war can only take a certain form. On the contrary, when it comes to war, there is not one absolute truth or one correct perspective. History should be written and told from various perspectives, otherwise objectivity would be lost. As Tricia Lootens suggests, '[t]here is no suggestion that one, true version of war writing exists or should be striven for, either of war in general or wars in particular – but rather to show what writing can

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid p.37

do with the ineffable and intractable.<sup>13</sup> As subsequent chapters will show, patriotism played an important part in literary representations of Gallipoli both on the Turkish and the British sides, and just as a nationalist interpretation of Gallipoli currently prevails in present-day Turkey, British centenary commemorations also contain a notable patriotic element. A comparison of Turkish and British writings on Gallipoli, for this reason, can offer various perspectives to challenge and complicate the current Turkish myth, illustrating that patriotism was not the only lens through which Gallipoli was experienced by the Turks during the campaign, that Turks were not the only 'heroic' soldiers who sacrificed their lives for their motherland and their loved ones, and not the only nation who thought God sided with them. It will also introduce the Gallipoli campaign as a battle which was not only about a victory earned by the young Turkish martyrs' sacrifice who defended the holy motherland, but also about the other belligerents, the trauma of the individuals who fought the war, lost comrades, experienced the battlefield, dirt, blood and death intimately, fear, guilt and disillusionment; concepts that have long been ignored by Turkish historiography as well as Turkish myths of the campaign. Although there is some historiographical research about the literary representations of World War I fought on the Eastern Front and the perspectives of belligerents on the Eastern and Middle Eastern front like the Ottoman Empire, representations of World War I in Turkish literature have been neglected both by 'global historiography' and by 'its own national historiography'.<sup>14</sup>

Similar to the Turkish perspective, the international literary dimension of the the Gallipoli campaign has not been fully understood or researched in Britain either. From Paul Fussell's *The Great War and Modern Memory* to the most recent publications, the dominant accounts that have emerged explore English, French and German responses to the war, and in most cases focus entirely on the Western Front. Gallipoli bore

---

<sup>13</sup> Quoted in Kate McLoughlin, *Authoring War: The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p.8

<sup>14</sup> Erol Köroğlu, *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity: Literature in Turkey during World War I* (London: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd, 2007), p.xiv.



significance for Turkey in terms of Turkish nationalism and has been commemorated each year for some time as ANZAC commemorations are of importance in Australia and New Zealand. However, for Britain Gallipoli remained a fatal mistake and is still largely forgotten. This is partly due to the failure of British policy in the Middle East. In parliament, Aubrey Herbert – one of the British writers investigated in this thesis – referred to this policy as ‘mistakes in the Near East’ that ‘the government has made’, but also added that the role of the British was ‘to keep it dark.’<sup>15</sup> Therefore, the Middle Eastern chapter of World War I was deliberately forgotten, though more recently, a number of researchers, such as Santanu Das, Nadia Atia, Jenny Macleod, Angela K. Smith and Eugene Rogan have drawn more attention to World War I on the Eastern fronts.<sup>16</sup>

Existing research on literary representations of the Gallipoli campaign centres upon the British ‘heroic-romantic’ myth, as Macleod describes it, and on ‘classical receptions’ in poetry about Gallipoli in Elizabeth Vandiver’s work.<sup>17</sup> Both bodies of research are significant in understanding British perceptions of the Gallipoli campaign, yet the scope of the British Gallipoli writings is far wider than that of heroic-romantic and classical perception just as the scope of the Turkish Gallipoli writings is far wider than patriotic and nationalist views. Thus, this thesis seeks to frame the literature of the Gallipoli campaign based on two different perspectives and to provide fresh and historically coherent readings of selected Gallipoli writings. It explores the on-going expansion of the canon of First World War literature and pushes it in new directions, whilst the

---

<sup>15</sup> 19. House of Commons, House of Commons Debate (17 November 1919, vol CXXI col 742) <<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1919-11-17/debates/59df291c-17ab-4c2d-9026-4a0e7a02dd2a/MotionForAdjournment>> (accessed 19 September 2017).

<sup>16</sup> Santanu Das, *India, Empire, and First World War Culture: Writings, Images, and Songs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018); Jenny Macleod, *Reconsidering Gallipoli* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004); Eugene Rogan, *The Fall of the Ottomans: The Great War in the Middle East, 1914-1920* (London: Allen Lane, 2015); Nadia Atia, *World War I in Mesopotamia: The British and the Ottomans in Iraq* (London: Tauris, 2015); Angela Smith, *British Women of the Eastern Front: War, Writing and Experience in Serbia* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

<sup>17</sup> Elizabeth Vandiver, *Stand in the Trench, Achilles: Classical Receptions in British Poetry of the Great War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p.x; Macleod, p.5.

heroic-romantic and classical perception of the Gallipoli campaign is broadened to accommodate the wealth of individual responses by British authors, and new religious, patriotic, propagandist, imperialist and nationalist approaches to the campaign are discussed. A comparison of the literary perspectives of two clashing empires and an examination of their similarities and differences will also provide a sense of empathy as well as help identify the place of World War I writings in Turkey. Therefore, a comparative study of British and Turkish literary representations of the Gallipoli campaign will fill a significant gap in World War I research.

This study, however, does not aim for comprehensive coverage of the British and Turkish literature of the Gallipoli campaign, as the area to be considered is so wide. The combatants in the Gallipoli campaign consisted of multi-national troops, including from the British Empire (Welsh borderers and Irish troops, the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps, troops from Ceylon, India and Nepal), the French Empire (Algeria, Morocco, Senegal), Palestine, the Ottoman Empire (Arabs, Armenians, Greeks and Jews) and Germany; in principle, all these nations could have been included in this thesis to achieve its overall purpose.<sup>18</sup> However, this would not be feasible within the limitations of a PhD thesis; therefore, it is limited to two perspectives, Ottoman-Turkish and British. The British perspective offers a good foil for the Turkish side as it is generally more disillusioned, and lacks the clear sense of purpose and the links to nation building that define the majority of writings on the Turkish side. Yet a comparison of British and Turkish perspectives contributes to building a foundation for future research regarding the literature of a global conflict.

This thesis focuses on a variety of male authors to illustrate as wide a range as possible of Turkish and British responses to the literary representations of the Gallipoli

---

<sup>18</sup> Wales was a part of the British Empire during World war I, but Ireland's situation was more complicated as World War I coincided with the Irish revolutionary period. The Third Home Rule Bill – which sought to establish self-government for Ireland – had passed but been suspended until the end of the war. However, at the outbreak of the war, regardless of political and religious affiliation, Irish people served in the British forces as well as in the armies of British dominions.

campaign. On the one hand, Ottoman-Turkish writers including Mehmet Akif Ersoy, Ziya Gökalp, Ömer Seyfeddin, Celal Nuri İleri, Ahmet Nedim and İbrahim Naci represent the Turkish perceptions of the Gallipoli campaign, while on the other hand British writers such as Aubrey Herbert, Allan Patrick Herbert, Ernest Raymond, W.F. Rollo and Geoffrey Dearmer illustrate a cross-section of the British responses to Gallipoli. These representations include narrative and discursive prose, essays, letters, and verse written by civilians as well as combatants. Most authors of narrative prose and verse on the Turkish side were civilian intellectuals, whereas on the British side combatant authors are dominant. This could be attributed to the low literacy rate in the Ottoman Empire due to difficulties in learning the written Ottoman language, which was based on Persian and Arabic, as well as to the strict censorship of the government. In some Turkish sources, there are a few poems presented as the works of fallen soldiers, yet there is no credible evidence to support this claim. Therefore, with the exception of diaries written by officers such as İbrahim Naci, the Ottoman-Turkish experience of the Gallipoli campaign neither displays the emphasis on the pity and bitterness that marked the works of many canonical English First World War poets, nor does it relate to death and suffering with the same sense of immediacy in narrative prose and verse.

The variety of genres examined contribute to the overall aim of the thesis. As different genres have different impacts both on content and readership, they reveal new and different viewpoints on the Gallipoli campaign. Whilst Gökalp and Ersoy's epic poems provide an excellent tool to extol patriotism, formulate greater ideological ambitions and enlist soldiers, A. P. Herbert's satirical and humorous doggerel poetry offers an appropriate form to criticise the British politicians, officers and military strategies without risking censorship and brings out the folly in war propaganda. The diaries of Aubrey Herbert and İbrahim Naci are not only important to reveal some historical information based on their individual experiences at Gallipoli but also to

analyse what feelings and thoughts were entailed in a serving soldier's duties at Gallipoli. Herbert's diary was published right after the war, and therefore, concerns about readership and censorship affected the publishing of the diary as some parts that depicted violence in the original diary were taken away. Naci's diary, on the other hand, was not intended to be published and therefore was written (and published just a decade ago) free from the concerns of propaganda and censorship. This quality makes the diary unusual in Turkish Gallipoli myth making as it reveals the fears and internal struggles of a soldier, which clash with the patriotic and nationalistic legacy of Gallipoli in modern Turkey. Ernest Raymond's novel *Tell England* became popular as soon as it was published after the war since it blurred the violence and defeat at Gallipoli through religious redemption and provided the bereaved reader some type of consolation claiming that Gallipoli achieved something. Its novel form made it widely accessible and placed it in a tradition of imperialist adventure narratives reaching back to late Victorian Britain.

The Ottoman-Turkish and British writers of Gallipoli differ as much in literary competence as they do in tone and politics, yet both sides engage with or contribute to the propaganda of the time in different ways. Compared to the overwhelming homogeneity of the perspectives of the Ottoman Turkish writers, most of whom have a clear nation-building goal in writing about the campaign, the British writers of Gallipoli under investigation voice more heterogeneous views on politics and patriotic propaganda. Although the British writers of Gallipoli do not reflect the same pity and bitterness expressed by soldier poets such as Wilfred Owen or Siegfried Sassoon, some writers such as Alan Patrick Herbert (A. P. Herbert) and Aubrey Herbert manage to approach the war itself and the politics that created it critically. The main purpose of this study, then, is to suggest a variety of possible literary responses to the Gallipoli campaign and to offer a sketch-map of the literary portrayals of the campaign in Turkish and British literature.

As much as the Ottoman-Turkish and British writers of Gallipoli differ in many aspects, religion makes a useful bridge and point of comparison between the sections of the thesis and brings the writers together. As the closeness of death brought religion or unbelief into light for the men serving on the front and for those left behind at home, the experience of the war, whether combatant or civilian, Turkish or British, shaped the religious belief of Gallipoli writers. The Ottoman-Turkish and British writers of Gallipoli shared similar religious ideologies and thoughts on life and death despite different religions. For some writers such as Seyfettin, Naci and A. P. Herbert, the war led to questioning of their religion and its relationship to war. Whilst A. P. Herbert and Seyfettin recognised that God has nothing to do with the war but human folly, a secular view which was pitched against the popular belief of the clergymen in both communities, the futility, fear and brutality of the lethal conflict led Naci to have complicated and variant feelings towards the spirituality of dying at war. At times Naci lost faith, but at other times he found comfort and control in his faith at a time when life and death seemed out of his hands. By contrast, some writers such as Raymond and Ersoy found refuge in religion – Christianity and Islam respectively – and believed that the victory could be achieved only if their communities followed the principles of true Christianity or true Islam and united as one under the religion with the other nations of co-religionists. However, despite their belief in religious unity, they both denied sympathy to the enemy of the same religion fighting on the opposite side in their Gallipoli writings, by viewing the war as a war of religions and describing the Gallipoli campaign as a Crusade or jihad respectively. This occasion was described in Herbert's diary as the British soldiers often got provoked by the religious differences at Gallipoli, but Herbert himself did not believe in enmity stemming from religious differences as he believed in humanity.

Although a variety of perspectives are explored, the perceptions of women writers are excluded in this thesis. This is partly due to the fact that not as many women as men wrote about Gallipoli, and partly due to difficulties with achieving parity between British and Turkish representations by women. Although the diaries of women like Scottish QAIMNS (Queen Alexandra Imperial Military Nursing Service) nurse Mary Ann Brown are worth examining to understand British women's views on the Gallipoli campaign, there are no prominent examples of Ottoman-Turkish women nurses available in modern Turkish.<sup>19</sup> Similarly, there are no prominent examples of Gallipoli novels written by British women, whereas a novel by Halide Edip Adıvar – Turkish nationalist novelist and political leader for women's rights – entitled *Ateşten Gömlek* (The Shirt of Flame) (1922) about the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1923), which touches upon the Gallipoli campaign, is an important text. The lack of accounts by nurses in the Turkish language could be due to translation problems, as they might not yet have been translated into modern Turkish from the Ottoman language. However, in recent years Turkish scholars have turned their attention to translating diaries about Gallipoli and World War I from the Ottoman language in modern Turkish which, I believe, will illuminate this dark area in Ottoman history.

Working across two languages has also been one of the challenges in writing this thesis. Most of the Turkish writings discussed in this thesis were originally written in the Ottoman language, but they are all available in modern Turkish. To make them more comprehensible for the reader, I have translated most of the Turkish writings into English myself, with the exception of Naci's diary which was published in both English and Turkish. Occasionally, this English translation does not reflect the original depth and quality of the diary or seems to be flawed grammatically. When this occurs, an explanation is provided with regard to its original meaning. Other Turkish writings, such as Ersoy's 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', have few available English translations; however, I

---

<sup>19</sup> For more information about Mary Ann Brown, see: Angela K. Smith, *Women's Writing of the First World War: An Anthology* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)

preferred to use my own translations as the existing translations are incomplete, seemed clunky and/or did not reflect the original complexity of Ersoy's Gallipoli writings.

This thesis is divided into six chapters: 'British Perceptions of the Enemy', 'Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of the Enemy', 'British Perceptions of Themselves', 'Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of Themselves', 'British Perceptions of the Gallipoli Landscape' and 'Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of the Gallipoli Landscape'. Each consecutive pair of chapters are symmetrical to each other to allow cross-references for a smooth comparison between the two perspectives. Chapter I, 'British Perceptions of the Enemy', examines the British authors Aubrey Herbert, Ernest Raymond, A. P. Herbert, W.F. Rollo and Geoffrey Dearmer to explore the way in which the Gallipoli campaign shaped the perceptions of the enemy in British writings. It illustrates how the poems, novels and diaries of the selected writers reflect or challenge their understanding of the enemy they encountered in the Gallipoli campaign and how the campaign shaped their perception of the Ottoman-Turks. Chapter I provides a foundation for Chapter II, 'Ottoman-Turkish Perception of the Enemy', which examines Ottoman Turkish writers such as Mehmet Akif Ersoy, Ziya Gökalp and Ömer Seyfettin and illustrates how the defensive nature of the Gallipoli campaign formed the Ottoman-Turkish literary understanding of the Allied Powers, particularly the British. In this chapter, the role of the nation-building process is also discussed as it is directly related to the Ottoman-Turkish understanding of the war.

The first two chapters provide the foundation for the following symmetrical chapters, 'British Perceptions of Themselves' and 'Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of Themselves', as they provide the conditions to define self-identity which stems from the way in which the 'other'—in this case, the enemy—is perceived.<sup>20</sup> National identity as defined in the

---

<sup>20</sup> A number of nationalist theories illustrates that the existence of the 'other' is an important factor in defining national identity: See: Anna Triandafyllidou, 'National Identity and the "Other"',

selected works becomes meaningful through the contrast with the enemy that confronts them. The British question and re-evaluate their imperial identity through an analysis of the enemy Muslim-Turks; whilst the Ottoman-Turks make sense of their self-identity by distinguishing and differentiating themselves from the Allied Powers, including the British.

The last two symmetrical chapters – ‘British Perception of the Gallipoli Landscape’ and ‘Ottoman-Turkish Perception of the Gallipoli Landscape’ – broaden the scope of the thesis by extending both perspectives into the landscape of Gallipoli and examine how the Ottoman-Turkish and British writers came to terms with violence and tragedy to illustrate the interconnectedness between landscape and the struggle for identity and an understanding of the war. The comparison in three pairs of symmetrical chapters tests the hypothesis that the Gallipoli campaign formed a turning point for identity for both the Ottoman-Turkish and the British writers. As the subsequent analysis shows, for the majority of Ottoman-Turkish intellectual writers, the Gallipoli campaign was a tool to discover a national identity, whereas for the British it was also a questioning of imperial identity and the purpose of the campaign as combatants.

### **Historical Background: The Ottoman Empire**

World War I was part of a continuum of internal and external wars for the Ottoman Empire which lasted more than ten years, starting with the Balkan Wars (1912-1913) and ending with the Turkish War of Independence (1919-1923). From the eighteenth century onwards, the Ottoman Empire had been in military, political and economic decline whilst the Western European states were gaining power. By the turn of the twentieth century, the situation of the Ottoman Empire was so desperate that Tsar Nicholas I of Russia famously described the Empire as ‘the sick man of Europe’.<sup>21</sup> In the nineteenth century, with the rise of nationalist movements, the Ottoman Empire

---

*Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21 (1998), pp.593-612; Gerard Delanty, *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995).

<sup>21</sup> Harold Temperley, *England and the Near East* (London: Longmans, Greens and Co., 1936), p. 272.



struggled to retain control of its territories.<sup>22</sup> The minorities living under the rule of the Empire demanded independence, such as in Bulgaria and Greece, which threatened the traditional religious order of Ottoman society.<sup>23</sup> The crumbling religious order and the struggles for independence of the Ottoman subjects brought about concerns over the integrity of the empire. These concerns grew in 1913 with defeat in the Balkan Wars, since the Balkan defeat of the once formidable Ottoman Empire by its subjects led to a sense of shame, frustration and betrayal in the Ottoman mind-set and hence, according to Ebru Boyar, created a 'victim mentality'.<sup>24</sup> Erol Köroğlu considers this creation-of-the-victim process as a part of building a new national identity and describes this period in Miroslav Hroch's terms as 'patriotic agitation'.<sup>25</sup> According to Ernest Renan, what constitutes a nation is to have a common past, either glorious or suffering, and 'a common will in the present'.<sup>26</sup> However, in national memories, 'griefs are of more value than triumphs' since a common suffering 'unifies more than joy does'.<sup>27</sup> According to this theory, during the nation-building process of the Turks, the 'common will' of the Ottoman Empire was to survive and the 'common past' constituted the 'common suffering' of the Balkan Wars, which were later used as a propaganda mechanism in the Ottoman Empire during World War I.

The critical problems the Ottoman Empire faced within its borders and significant losses of territory after military defeats in the Italian (1911-1912) and Balkan Wars also contributed to European tensions that caused imperial instability. As a result, the Ottoman region attracted the attention of Europe's imperial powers, and this caused rivalry over the Ottoman territories which later led to the physical partition of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), p.25.

<sup>24</sup> Ebru Boyar, *Ottomans, Turks and the Balkans: Empire Lost, Relations Altered* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007), pp.141-142.

<sup>25</sup> Köroğlu, *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity*, p.46.

<sup>26</sup> Ernest Renan, 'What is a Nation?', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. by Homi K. Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990), p.19.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

Ottoman State.<sup>28</sup> Gallipoli was a gateway to the Middle East for the European imperial powers which were seeking to enlarge their colonial presence in the Middle East.

Leading up to World War I, the Young Turks, the leaders of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), felt threatened by the growing European tensions. The geopolitical position of the Ottoman Empire, as Mustafa Aksakal points out, encircled by 'Russia looming across the Black Sea and in the Caucasus, the British ensconced in the Persian Gulf and Egypt, the French protecting their Mediterranean encroachments from Syria to Algeria and Morocco, and

both Britain and Russia occupying parts of Iran', put the CUP leaders in search for international security and eventually led the empire to enter World War I allied with Germany.<sup>29</sup> In the eyes of the Ottoman leaders, a possible victory in World War I would ensure the integrity of the empire and recover its former glory even though the empire was not in a condition to fight in either financial or military terms.

The war also increased suspicion of the loyalty of non-Muslim and non-Turk minorities, which worsened the internal conflicts and violence since 'Armenians and Kurds appeared as the potential allies of Russia' while 'Jews' and 'Arab Muslims' were seen as 'those of Britain'; 'Arab Christians, of France; and Orthodox Christians in Anatolia, of Greece'.<sup>30</sup> The best known examples of this increased violence are the Armenian massacres in 1915. Uğur Ümit Üngör explains this increased violence in terms of the relationship between the strict Young Turk rule and previous events in the Balkan Wars, claiming that '[h]ad some form of justice been delivered to Ottoman Muslims in 1913 [after the Balkan Wars], there might not have been a vindictive Young Turk dictatorship that launched the later genocide' because '[t]he idea of the Ottoman-Turkish state as victim granted many a necessary moral certainty that enabled mass

---

<sup>28</sup> Mustafa Aksakal, *The Ottoman Road to War in 1914: The Ottoman Empire and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp.65-68.

<sup>29</sup> Mustafa Aksakal, 'Perspectives on the Ottoman First World War', *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 14 (2014), pp.334-342 (p.335).

<sup>30</sup> Ibid p. 337.

murder'.<sup>31</sup> Black-and-white portrayal of the enemy in Ottoman-Turkish war writing, which the following chapters will discuss, substantiate Üngör's theory concerning the victimisation of the Ottoman-Turkish state, since the aggressive portrayal of the enemy substantially derives from the Balkan Wars and the Great Powers' involvement in bringing about minority independence. In this sense, the Gallipoli campaign and Armenian massacres and thus, the sentiments reflected in the Turkish writing of Gallipoli, can be said to be a direct follow on from the Balkan Wars.

Before their strict rule and incompetence in leadership were proven by the end of the war, the Young Turks were the heroes of the 1908 revolution when they ended the absolute monarchy of the Ottoman Sultan and started governing political affairs. This was a critical moment for the future of the Ottoman Empire, not only in social and political terms as mentioned above but also in the intellectual and cultural sense. The Ottoman intellectuals who could not express themselves freely under the Ottoman government until 1908, benefited from the revolution with the resulting increase in print media.<sup>32</sup> This led to the emergence of many ideologies, such as Ottomanism, Islamism, Westernism and Turkism, and to heated arguments on finding a way to save the Ottoman Empire in the political and cultural sphere. According to Eric J. Zürcher, these heated arguments concentrated on two main issues: 'the degree of Westernisation needed to strengthen state and society' and 'defining [what] the national [entailed for the Ottoman Empire]' on the part of the state.<sup>33</sup> Whilst arguing over these concepts, Ottoman intellectuals also criticised the government from different perspectives: Islamists blamed the government for not being a real Islamic state, Westernists for it not being secular and Turkists for not being nationalist. In this sense, these different ideologies form the roots of the modernisation process of the Ottoman Empire, influencing the intellectual and political direction of the Ottoman Empire and the

---

<sup>31</sup> Uğur Ümit Üngör, *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913–1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp.103-104.

<sup>32</sup> Köroğlu, p.49.

<sup>33</sup> Eric J. Zürcher, *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2010), pp.147-148.

struggling for power until the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, when Turkism overpowered the other ideologies and became increasingly secular.<sup>34</sup>

Until 1918, although it evolved gradually, the ideology of the state was Ottomanism, which aimed to preserve the integrity of the empire by ensuring equality between Muslim and non-Muslim citizens. According to Erol Köroğlu, Ottomanism became 'a protective reflex of the state' after 1908 since the Westernist, Islamist and Turkist Young Turks in power appeared as Ottomanists due to concerns about jeopardizing the integrity of the multi-ethnic empire.<sup>35</sup> However, especially after the Balkan Wars, with the increase of separatist nationalisms and the intervention of the Great Powers, the influence of Ottomanism decreased, gradually relinquishing its role to Islamism, which argued that the Ottoman Empire could only develop through Islam.

Shaped by the question of whether traditional values could be preserved in a modern civilisation after the Russian defeat by Japan in 1905, Islamism became a political ideology in 1908, when the Islamist journal *Sırat-ı Müstakim* was first published and later followed by *Sebilürreşad*.<sup>36</sup> According to Islamists, Western and Eastern civilisations were two separate kinds of civilisation despite the superiority of the West in science and technology, Eastern civilisation was considered superior to the West due to its moral and spiritual structure. The Islamist rationale for diagnosing 'Western moral and spiritual backwardness' was the secular nature of Western states, and it was claimed that the West was materialistic and mechanised and hence brutal and should not be emulated. Rather than adopting French civil law, for example, Islamists pointed to the importance of implementing 'Mecelle', an Islamic system of private law constructed between 1868 and 1876.<sup>37</sup> By the end of 1918, however, Islamism had lost

---

<sup>34</sup> Köroğlu, p.25.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid p.26.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid p.27.

<sup>37</sup> Tarık Zafer Tunaya, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi yayınları, 2010), p.74.

its appeal following the Arab revolt (1916-1918) and was replaced by Turkism, which was seen as the only viable option 'to define the national'.<sup>38</sup>

Turkism first appeared among Turkic peoples living under Russian rule, such as Azerbaijan, in an effort to preserve their identity in Russia and as a reaction against Russian Pan-Slavism.<sup>39</sup> The reaction of Turkic peoples under Russian rule against Russian Pan-Slavism and separatist nationalisms in the Ottoman Empire influenced Ottoman intellectuals and nourished Turkism, which aimed for the cultural and political unity of all Turkish peoples.<sup>40</sup> Newly emerging knowledge of the history and language of pre-Islamic Turkic peoples uncovered by eighteenth-century orientalists and the question of purifying the Turkish language of Persian and Arabic words preoccupied Ottoman Turkists such as Yusuf Akçura and Gökaltp during this era. Their work constituted the first steps towards shaping Turkish national consciousness in the empire. Turkism made its presence felt in the Ottoman Empire when Türk Derneği (the Turkish Association) was founded in 1908 and spread by newspapers and journals. After this association was shut down when the Turkists in the association broke up, Turkism became more systematic and political with the establishment of the journal *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Homeland), which aimed to bring out the national consciousness of the Ottoman Turks who were thought to be unconscious of their identity. According to Turkists, this was only possible through the modernisation of the empire. One way such modernisation could have been achieved was by adopting the technology of the West, the morality of Islam and the culture and tradition of the Turkish nation. The possible achievement of Turkism on a national level within the Ottoman borders would also enable Turkists to extend this aim on a more international level, bringing together millions of Turks living outside the Ottoman borders from the Balkans to China, such as

---

<sup>38</sup> Zürcher, p. 148.

<sup>39</sup> Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 348.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

Kazakhs, Kirgыз, Uzbeks and Uigurs.<sup>41</sup> This ideal is also known as Turanism, which derived from the idea that the Turkic peoples under Russian rule, such as Uzbeks, Kazakhs and Kirghz, must be saved from Russia. It was encouraged and elaborated upon by the Turkist intellectuals who had emigrated from Russia such as Hüseyinzade Ali, and Ottoman intellectuals such as Gökâlp.

Westernism, on the other hand, was based on the idea that the modernisation of the Ottoman Empire would be achieved through emulating the West, where an arguably more modern civilisation existed. Although there were discussions among adherents to the other three ideologies as well as Westernists about whether to emulate every aspect of the West, they did not argue against the Westernist idea that some aspects of Western civilisation were necessary to Turkey. This was because the desire to preserve the Ottoman Empire's integrity, modernisation and Westernisation constituted the official agenda of the empire during the pre-war period and were interrelated in an agenda which gradually became the national policy of the Republican Period. Durmuş Hocaoglu points out that the popular concern over protecting the empire's presence and improving its structures was believed to be dependent upon modernisation, which in turn was to be achieved through Westernisation.<sup>42</sup>

During this period, unlike in nation-states in the West, the Ottoman Empire had not completed its nation-building process, which would have contributed to the moral strength of the nation during World War I. Therefore, the different ideologies of Westernism, Turkism, Islamism and Ottomanism were the first steps towards building a new nation. World War I was a time when Turkish nationalism was built and understood in various and conflicting ways in the Ottoman Empire. The Gallipoli campaign was an important part of this process, since Turkish victory in the disastrous battle gave hope to the whole nation and strengthened the consciousness and

---

<sup>41</sup> Tunaya, p.75.

<sup>42</sup> Durmuş Hocaoglu, 'Çağdaşlaşma, Modernleşme ve Batılılaşma Kavramlarının Yeniden Formatlanması Hakkında', *Türk Yurdu*, 109.16 (1996), 121-130 (p.121).

determination of Turks to become one nation, resulting in the eventual rise of Turkism over competing ideologies.

Literary works produced by the Ottoman intellectuals of these different ideologies – particularly the works of Turkist nationalists – formed the majority of Ottoman propagandist literature during World War I.<sup>43</sup> However, these were doomed to fail as wartime propaganda since the Ottoman Empire could not form effective propaganda mechanisms, unlike some of its opponents who were already nation-states and were using literature in a more systematic way to produce war propaganda.<sup>44</sup> Instead, the propagandist literature, ‘which should have aided the war effort’, started using ‘the war [itself] as a means of completing the national identity construction process’ by the end of the war.<sup>45</sup> As K ro lu points out, the material circumstances as well as the incomplete nation-building status of the Ottoman Empire had been a great obstacle to Ottoman propaganda efforts during wartime.<sup>46</sup> Consequently, the literature produced failed to satisfy the state’s pro-war propaganda needs.<sup>47</sup> This led to harsh criticisms in the Ottoman media at the time. An anonymous article written in 1916 in the Ottoman newspaper *Tanin* criticised the silence of the intellectuals about any critical event for the nation and the insufficiency of Ottoman literary works to form a body of war literature:

Trablus Harbi'nden beri hemen her  
taraftan aynı kelimelerle iřitti imiz bir  
řik yet var: Sanatk rlarımız memleketin  
ge irdi i tarihi vakaya karřı muhafaza-i  
s k t ediyorlar! Filhakika řu d rt beř  
senenin matbuatı tetkik edilecek olursa  
v s  birer matba-ı heyecan olması lazım  
gelen m tem di vakay in  
edebiyatımızda b y k intibalar v cuda  
getirmedi ini g r yoruz. .... bizzat bir  
kısım muharrirler tarafından ilan olunan

---

<sup>43</sup> K ro lu, p.187.

<sup>44</sup> Troy R.E. Paddock, ‘Introduction’, in *World War I and Propaganda*, ed. by Troy R.E. Paddock (Boston: BRILL, 2014) pp.1-17 (pp.1-2).

<sup>45</sup> K ro lu, p.187.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid p.187.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid

bu ihtiyaç bilhassa iki senedir  
hükümetçe de düşünölmeye  
başlanmıştır.<sup>48</sup>

(Since the Italo-Turkish War, we have been hearing constant complaints from all sections with the same words: our artists continue to remain silent on the historical events of our homeland. In fact, if the publication of the last four-five years is examined, we see that the continuous events which should have been a big excitement for printing works did not create a big impression in our literature. [...] the need for [a war literature] which has been established by some authors has also been considered by the government.)

Gökalp also criticised his peers for not being active in a national matter such as Gallipoli and wrote a poem to encourage Turkish poets to write about the Gallipoli campaign and support Ottoman soldiers:

O, orada senin için kanını  
Seve seve döker iken ey şâir!  
Sen ne için ona birkaç ânını  
Vakfederek yazmıyorsun bir şiir!<sup>49</sup>

(Whilst he sheds blood for you there  
Putting his heart and soul oh poet!  
Why don't you spend a few moments  
And write a poem for him!)

Having considered this literary 'silence' around previous wars in which the Ottoman Empire fought, the Ottoman government formed a group of prominent intellectuals to be sent to the front line in Gallipoli to encourage them to compose a body of war literature.<sup>50</sup> After this visit to the front line, the intellectuals started to produce more literary work about Gallipoli; however, this was still not considered to be sufficient to form a distinct body of war literature that met the nation's needs.<sup>51</sup> In a sarcastic article

---

<sup>48</sup> Anonymous, 'Harp Edebiyatımız', *Tanin*, 2755 (1916), p.1; Quoted in Ömer Çakır, *Türk Şiirinde Çanakkale Muharebeleri* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2004), p.35.

<sup>49</sup> Ziya Gökalp, 'Asker ve Şair', *Harp Mecmuası*, 14 (1916) p.214.

<sup>50</sup> Ömer Çakır, *Türk şiirinde Çanakkale muharebeleri* (Ankara: Atatürk kültür merkezi, 2004), p.46.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.



published in 1940, Peyami Safa harshly criticises this scholarly group sent to Gallipoli, as they ‘watched their brothers die whose pupils were switched off by the enemy bullets’ whilst they ‘smoked their cigarettes’ in the safe zone and ‘when they got bored of this scenery, they came back to Istanbul with superficial thoughts in their little heads sufficient only for a few articles.’<sup>52</sup> Safa considers their visit a shame since they witnessed the difficulties and sacrifices that Turkish soldiers encountered in the battlefield, but did nothing about it, even failed to produce an effective war literature.

Contrary to Turkish literary stagnation, British war writing boomed during World War I. Britain also had more systematic and comprehensive propaganda mechanisms than the Ottoman Empire. The British government established a War Propaganda Bureau at Wellington House and British authors were called upon to support Britain’s war effort. However, in the Ottoman Empire, despite the government’s efforts, an efficient and sufficient propaganda mechanism could never have been constructed. Britain’s approach to send authors to the front was also more fruitful than the Ottoman Empire’s. Wellington House writers such as Rudyard Kipling, Arnold Bennett and Arthur Conan Doyle were also occasionally sent to the fronts to produce propaganda material. This had varying literary value; however, it received a more positive reception at home in Britain than did Turkish propaganda works produced during the time of war in the Ottoman Empire.

### **Historical Background: The British Empire**

The eve of World War I was a troubled time not only for the Ottoman but also the British Empire. Until the early twentieth century, the British Empire prioritised protecting its trade routes between Britain and India since its power relied heavily on India with its resources and manpower, but this led the empire to be isolated from the

---

<sup>52</sup> Original text: ‘Ecnebi gazetecilerin harp muhâbirleri kadar bile tehlike bölgesine sokulmayan bu üdebâyı kıram hazerâtı, orada rejinin kodamanlara mahsus sigaralarını tûttûre tûttûre, kardeşlerinin göz bebeklerini düşman mermilerinin nasıl söndürdüğünü bir müddet seyrettiler ve bu manzaradan yorulunca, kafacıklarında ikişer, üçer makalelik sathî ve hafif bir intibâ stokiyla İstanbul’a döndüler.’ Peyami Safa, *Objektif 2: Sanat - Edebiyat – Tenkit* (İstanbul: Ökuten yayınları, 1990), p.116-117.

rest of Europe.<sup>53</sup> The rivalries between European powers also contributed to this; by the early twentieth century, Belgium and France both had large colonies in Africa which threatened British control over its colonies in North Africa, and Russia wanted control of the Bosphorus to have access to the Mediterranean Sea which jeopardised the British Empire's trade route to India and led the British to support the Ottoman Empire until the formation of the Triple Entente.

After the Boer Wars, it became apparent to the British Empire that problems regarding finance, public health and colonial government as well as domestic unrest among labour and suffrage movements needed to be resolved. In addition to these problems, Germany started building up its armed forces and navy, challenging British naval dominance, which forced the British Empire to abolish its 'splendid isolation' policy from Europe to form an alliance first with Japan, then with France, and lastly with Russia in order to maintain its power and supremacy.<sup>54</sup> This alliance was later referred to as the Triple Entente, and it created regional balance between rival European states and gave the British Empire a sense of security whilst protecting its Indian trade routes and territories in North Africa.<sup>55</sup> However, Germany counteracted the Triple Entente and allied with Italy and Austria-Hungary and these alliances set the foundation of a world-wide catastrophe in 1914. According to the Treaty of London (1839), the British Empire had to defend Belgium if it was to be invaded. When Germany invaded Belgium to attack France, the British Empire declared war on Germany based on the Treaty. German control of Belgium would also jeopardise the British coast due to the proximity of Belgium and Britain. As soon as the war started, the British Empire and France suffered from heavy casualties on the Western front. Meanwhile in August 1914, the

---

<sup>53</sup> Salman Bangash, 'Tribal Belt and the Defence of British India: A Critical Appraisal of British Strategy in the North-West Frontier during the First World War', *India and World War I: A Centennial Assessment*, ed. by Roger D. Long & Ian Talbot (London: Routledge, 2018), pp.100-120, pp.100-101.

<sup>54</sup> Stephen J. Lee, *Aspects of British Political History 1815-1914* (New York: Routledge, 1994), pp.254-256; Simon Peaple, *European Diplomacy: 1870-1939* (Oxford: Heinemann, 2002), p.131.

<sup>55</sup> Lee, p.199.

Ottoman Empire allowed two German warships, the Goeben and Breslau, to take shelter in Turkish waters, which led to the Ottoman alliance with Germany. To find a solution to the heavy casualties suffered on the Western front, Winston Churchill suggested opening a second front and proposed a plan that aimed to knock the Ottoman Empire – the sick man of Europe – out of the war, gain control of the strategic waterways of the Bosphorus to aid Russia and convince the neutral countries such as Greece and Bulgaria to join the Allies. Britain's war cabinet supported the plan and sent British and French battleships to attack the Gallipoli Peninsula to pass through the Dardanelles Straits and seize the Ottoman capital Istanbul. However, the Dardanelles were controlled by Turkish guns and mines, which led the Allied battleships to fail in the naval attack on 18<sup>th</sup> March. The Allied powers then initiated a land invasion on 25<sup>th</sup> April based on Churchill's idea that army units landing on the peninsula would quickly capture the guns to let the Navy pass through the straits safely. After nine months of slaughter – with approximately 44,000 Allied troops and 87,000 Turkish troops dead – the Allied powers evacuated Gallipoli in January 1916.<sup>56</sup> The failure at Gallipoli was later attributed to the incompetence of military commanders and of Churchill, which put the British government into political crisis.

Meanwhile, propaganda played an important role on the home front to maintain support for the war. According to Jay Winter, the fundamental threat that World War I posed necessitated clarifying and emphasising the definition of the national identity which was to be used in calls for patriotism.<sup>57</sup> As a result, the idea that 'war was being waged to preserve a specifically English set of values against attack from foreign competition' circulated in the British Empire through various means of propaganda during the war.<sup>58</sup> Yet this set of values had been established since the late Victorian

---

<sup>56</sup> Ashley Ekins, *Gallipoli: A Ridge Too Far* (Auckland: Exisle Publishing, 2013), p.326.

<sup>57</sup> Jay Winter, 'British National Identity and the First World War', in *The Boundaries of the State in Modern Britain*, ed. by S. J. D Green & R. C Whiting (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 261-277, (p.262).

<sup>58</sup> Judy Giles, Tim Middleton, *Writing Englishness, 1900-1950: An Introductory Sourcebook on National Identity* (London: Routledge, 1995), p.6.

period and a sense of Englishness was being invented as the British Empire's dominance in the world economy necessitated transformations in areas such as education and research, which would help to revitalise the leadership qualities of the ruling class in governing both the overseas empire and at home.<sup>59</sup> Being held responsible for the poor dissemination of a national identity, the ancient universities as well as public schools, for instance, went through a significant transformation to become secularised and take on a national role during the late nineteenth century.<sup>60</sup> This secularisation, however, did not mean that the influence of religion on British culture entirely disappeared.<sup>61</sup> This is discussed further below under the concept of muscular Christianity, which was encouraged by British private schools at the time through competition in games. In 1914, 'patriotic nationalism [that emerged during the war] fostered identification with national aspirations' even more; however, in the post-war context 'the failure to deliver on the promises made in the interests of morale and national unity led to a growing disillusionment in many sectors of society.'<sup>62</sup>

The seeds of this post-war disillusionment were rooted in British educational institutions, including the ancient universities and public schools. During the late Victorian era, these institutions were widely criticised due to their classical curriculum before being consequently reformed to align with nationalist goals. Brian Doyle states that:

the eventual transference from the classical curriculum to a modern alternative and the enhancement of English and Englishness which was one of its major products, drew on the raw materials provided by the scholarly work of the middle decades of the nineteenth century. In the process of inventing the

---

<sup>59</sup> Brian Doyle, 'The Invention of English', in *Englishness: Politics and Culture 1880–1920*, ed. by Robert Colls & Philip Dodd (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp.89-115, (p.113).

<sup>60</sup> Doyle, p.120; Philip Dodd, 'Englishness and the National Culture', in *Englishness: Politics and Culture 1880–1920*, ed. by Robert Colls & Philip Dodd (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp.25-52, (p.28).

<sup>61</sup> Michael Snape, *God and the British Soldier; Religion and the British Army in the Era of Two World Wars* (London: Routledge, 2005), p.4.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

new English, these materials were substantially transformed to serve a national and imperial culture.<sup>63</sup>

This meant that the Victorian set of values, attitudes and ideals encouraged by the classical curriculum were being utilised to promote a national and imperial identity in the modern curriculum, laying the foundations of World War I patriotism. However, these values and ideals were threatened by international rivalry. As Giles and Middleton suggests, '[w]hilst Germany and the USA [...] increasingly threatened the world dominance of English trade and commerce, English good manners remained a highly exportable commodity in many middle-class accounts of Englishness.'<sup>64</sup> British politicians and public figures romanticised this set of values in their public speeches in order to ensure their preservation and thus the preservation of English identity in order to accentuate English and by extension British moral superiority. According to David Monger, the most important of these values and ideals included 'liberty, democracy, justice, honour' and 'civilisation' combined with Christianity.<sup>65</sup> For instance, regarding German atrocities in Europe, Basil Mathews, a writer on the missionary and ecumenical movement, claimed that the 'code of loyalties [such as honour] and faith [...] stands between us and barbarism'.<sup>66</sup> Lord Leverhulme, an English politician, on the other hand, stated that peace with Germany would be 'undermin[ing] [the] Anglo-Saxon mentality' since 'death' prevails over 'dishonour'.<sup>67</sup> Propagandist rhetoric such as this was also utilised to portray German qualities as opposed to English values, casting Germany as a brutal bully, which was emphasised by references to the fate of Belgium.<sup>68</sup> Both the extolling of British national values and vilification of the enemy contributed to a reappraisal of English national identity during the war, leading to

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid p.117.

<sup>64</sup> Giles and Middleton, p.23.

<sup>65</sup> David Monger, *Patriotism and Propaganda in First World War Britain: The National War Aims Committee and Civilian Morale* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012), p.93.

<sup>66</sup> Quoted in ibid p.181.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid p.182.

<sup>68</sup> Monger, p.133.

rhetoric such that 'so long as the blood of Englishmen flowed through English veins, so long as this people peopled the British Empire', Germany would be stopped, as British MP Rigby Swift claimed.<sup>69</sup>

In the Victorian era, English identity was identified as masculine; as Dodd suggests, the terms '[v]igorous, manly and English' were often collocated, in an ethos which male-populated public schools often articulated.<sup>70</sup> Public school education was perceived as the means by which boys were turned into perfect English citizens with future responsibilities in the Empire. The yardstick of masculine values was even used as a measurement in determining the quality of literary works of the period.<sup>71</sup> According to Dodd, masculinity, however, was 'best articulated in the public schools in the recently institutionalized games', which were considered as an 'English [educational] tradition'.<sup>72</sup> After the Football Association was established in 1863 and professional football clubs were developed in the 1890s, football as well as sportsmanship became part of English culture and identity beyond the privileged classes by the 1900s.<sup>73</sup> Games in public schools were considered to provide appropriate training to transform boys into men, who would favourably serve King, country and Empire in the future.<sup>74</sup> As a game accessible to the working and lower middle classes, football extended the benefits of games training and sportsmanship to those unable to afford private education. During World War I, this tradition was reflected in British perceptions of the war, as the British government used ideas of sport and sportsmanship to foster recruitment among men and to encourage a 'fighting spirit' within the British Army.<sup>75</sup> Baden-Powell, for example, wrote in 1914 that officers should treat the soldiers like 'players in a football team', who

---

<sup>69</sup> Quoted in *ibid* p.175.

<sup>70</sup> Dodd, p.30.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>73</sup> J. Wilson, 'It Still Goes on: Football and the Heritage of the Great War in Britain', *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9 (2014), 197-211 (p.198).

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid* p.198; Colin Veitch, "'Play up! Play up! And Win the War!'" Football, the Nation and the First World War 1914-15', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 20 (1985), 363-378 (p.370).

<sup>75</sup> James Roberts, "'The Best Football Team, The Best Platoon": The Role of Football in the Proletarianization of the British Expeditionary Force', 1914-1918, *Sport in History*, 26 (2006), 26-46 (p.37).

'adhere patiently to the rules and to play in his place and to play the game'.<sup>76</sup> Baden-Powell must have seen the centrality of sportsmanship in British culture as Vita Sackville-West did when she wrote tongue-in-cheek in 1947 that '[t]he English man is seen at his best the moment another man starts throwing a ball at him.'<sup>77</sup>

'Chivalric and gentlemanly codes' were also commonly used to encourage particular forms of masculine behaviour and even to accredit imperial endeavour.<sup>78</sup> For instance, *The Times* regarded Captain Scott of the British Discovery Expedition as 'chivalrous'.<sup>79</sup> Similarly, Edward Cadogan, one of Herbert's contemporaries, defined Aubrey Herbert as 'the embodiment of chivalry' due to his travels in the Middle East.<sup>80</sup> This idea reverberated in British education (and particularly public school education) in the pre-war period, as classical and medievalist discourse became an important medium of public school education. As mentioned above, the ideal of sport, as a part of public school culture, supposedly forged physical courage and athletic heroism in the upbringing of gentlemen. During World War I, these notions were also underpinned by revivals of classical and medieval chivalric ideals. Stefan Goebel states that some refused to consider history as 'irretrievably past' during and after the war, but on the contrary, used history, particularly from the Middle Ages, to make sense of 'the war-torn present', where 'the Crusades, chivalry, medieval spirituality and mythology provided rich, protean sources of images, tropes and narrative motifs for people'.<sup>81</sup> An ethos inherited from the heavily Latin- and Greek-based syllabus of the public schools glorified death in battle as observed in middle-class perspectives of war such as

---

<sup>76</sup> Quoted in Veitch, p.374; Robert Baden-Powell, *Quick Training for War* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1914), p.150.

<sup>77</sup> Giles and Middleton, p.167.

<sup>78</sup> Mark Girouard, *The Return of Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), pp.130-133 / J. A. Mangan, 'Noble Specimens of Manhood: Schoolboy Literature and the Creation of a Colonial Chivalric Code', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 27 (2010), 389-408, (p.390).

<sup>79</sup> Ibid.

<sup>80</sup> Quoted in Margaret FitzHerbert, *The Man who was Greenmantle: A Biography of Aubrey Herbert* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p.2.

<sup>81</sup> Stefan Goebel, *The Great War and Medieval Memory: War, Remembrance and Medievalism in Britain and Germany, 1914-1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p.1.

Raymond and Rollo's account of Gallipoli. Macleod states that classical and medieval allusions idealised the notions of bravery, honour, courage and defending the church, which supported 'the idea that fighting [was] not only necessary but [also] glorious.'<sup>82</sup> For this reason, during World War I, '[t]he generation of public school men [who] had been brought up on martial stories [...] were ready to liken [those stories] to their own [war] experiences'.<sup>83</sup> Kate McLoughlin suggests that a 'likeness of [war] experience' is a common 'trope' in representations of war, reflecting 'a complex meeting of representation and reality capable of further exploitation' which gives war writings an 'intertextual' or 'interbellical' character.<sup>84</sup> Although every war and every individual war experience is different, many Gallipoli writings are similarly 'intertextual'; taking shape based on comparable descriptions of modern war to representations of previous wars, as will be discussed below.

Another aspect of the public school ethos of the nineteenth century that encouraged fighting during World War I was the concept of muscular Christianity. The war provided an opportunity for the Church of England to regain its declining cultural and political authority following the aforementioned process of secularisation of some key institutions in Britain.<sup>85</sup> Patriotic expectations began to parallel and entangle with the practice of Christian faith.<sup>86</sup> Despite the pre-war secularisation and the decreasing power of the Church, however, as Michael Snape notes, the Church did not lose all its cultural power; on the contrary, it still had a significant amount of influence on the public, particularly on the working classes, and thus reached a part of society that public school education could not influence.<sup>87</sup> Matthew Grimley also asserts that

---

<sup>82</sup> Macleod, p.10.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

<sup>84</sup> Kate McLoughlin, *Authoring War: The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p.14.

<sup>85</sup> Shannon Ty Bontrager, 'The Imagined Crusade: The Church of England and the Mythology of Nationalism and Christianity during the Great War', *Church History*, 71 (2002), 774-798 (p.775).

<sup>86</sup> Adrian Hastings, *History of English Christianity 1920 -1990* (London: SCM Press, 1991), p. 132.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid; Snape, p.3.



religion remained central in Britain until after the Second World War.<sup>88</sup> When World War I broke out, in an attempt to regain the Church's waning influence, many Anglican clerics quickly turned their peaceable approach to war into support of military patriotism.<sup>89</sup> While evangelical circles emphasised the Christian Just War concept in the defence of Belgium, a doctrine which emerged and was promoted by St Ambrose and St Augustine during the fourth and fifth centuries, Anglicans thought God was on Britain's side.<sup>90</sup> Some senior church members, such as Bishop Handley Carr Glyn Moule, proclaimed the 'holiness of patriotism' and others propagated the war as a Christian duty, which was 'an even greater cause' than patriotism.<sup>91</sup>

However, Christianity in Britain was experiencing a crisis in the nineteenth and early twentieth century over the issue of religious unity. Catholicism was positioned separately according to origin in Britain; rather than being 'British', for instance, it would be recognised as Irish Catholicism or Roman Catholicism and this consequently led to concerns about 'Catholic loyalty and British patriotism' during the war.<sup>92</sup> Increasing the tension between England and Ireland, this challenge led Catholics to feel that they had to prove their national loyalty and the compatibility of their faith with patriotism.<sup>93</sup> In addition, divisions within the Church of England inevitably led to dissension over 'the extent to which theology could accommodate itself to the scientific developments of the modern world, or whether it was forced to make a stand against what was frequently perceived to be the decadence of a society which had lost its earlier sense of unity.'<sup>94</sup>

Whilst many Anglicans sought ways to reconcile old religious values and modern

---

<sup>88</sup> Matthew Grimley, *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State Between the Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp.1-3.

<sup>89</sup> Albert Marrin, *The Last Crusade: The Church of England in the First World War* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1974) pp.119-122; Bontrager p.778.

<sup>90</sup> Alan Wilkinson, *The Church of England and the First World War* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2014), p.9.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid* p.33.

<sup>92</sup> Katherine Finlay, 'British Catholic Identity during the First World War: The Challenge of Universality and Particularity' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2004), p.3.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>94</sup> Mark Chapman, 'The Evolution of Anglican Theology, 1910-2000', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume IV*, ed. by Jeremy Morris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) pp.25-50 (p.25).

developments, some Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics resisted modernity.<sup>95</sup> The Oxford movement in 1830, which was later recognised as signalling the onset of Anglo-Catholicism, challenged modernist Anglicanism and condemned increasing secularisation in an attempt to re-establish the Church of England based on its heritage of apostolic and catholic doctrines of the early Christianity.<sup>96</sup> In the interwar years, such debates as well as concerns over unity continued.<sup>97</sup>

According to Paul Avis, the early twentieth century saw several attempts to unite the Church of England.<sup>98</sup> The aforementioned divisions and rivalry among the clergy contradicted the teachings of the Church and its rhetoric of unity and communion. This problematized missionary endeavour, and thus 'generated a concern for a united witness to non-Christians' and created 'a desire to proclaim the gospel with one voice.'<sup>99</sup> The Edinburgh World Missionary Conference held in 1910 articulated this desire for global and institutional unity among Christians and laid the foundations for the ecumenical movement.<sup>100</sup> Reflecting upon the conference, in his book John Mott stated that, with imperialist triumphalism, 'it [was] the time of all times for Christians of every name to unite and with quickened loyalty and with reliance upon the living God, to undertake to make Christ known to all men, and to bring his power to bear upon all nations.'<sup>101</sup> However, although the conference was effective in providing unity in the missionary fields, it ruled out the unity of Churches at home.<sup>102</sup> The aftermath of World War I strengthened the idea of unity and reconciliation. The Lambeth Conference in 1920 was influential in promoting the idea of Christian unity by embracing diversity.<sup>103</sup> The Lambeth Appeal to All Christian People was welcomed in England and Anglo-

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid p.27.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid p.34.

<sup>98</sup> Paul Avis, 'Anglicanism and Christian Unity in the Twentieth Century', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume IV*, ed. by Jeremy Morris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) pp.186-214 (pp.186-187).

<sup>99</sup> Ibid p.188.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid p.187.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid p.189.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid p.191.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid p.193.

Catholic leaders such as Weston as well as leaders of the Free Churches embraced the idea of unity.<sup>104</sup>

The aforementioned debates and attempts to unify Christians re-asserted the significance of religion in British intellectual, political and cultural life during the inter-war years. As the Catholic historian Christopher Dawson noted in 1939, 'religion has come to have much greater significance in the eyes of politicians and publicists than it had thirty years ago' in Britain.<sup>105</sup> This led to a revival of religious and spiritual discussions in the public sphere, particularly in the print media and literary texts published during the inter-war years.<sup>106</sup> In popular culture, the Church of England was often represented as an embodiment of English national character, which Ernest Raymond instantiates with his post-war Gallipoli novel, *Tell England*.<sup>107</sup>

### **British Authors**

Compared to Ottoman-Turkish writers, all British writers whose work is examined in this thesis actually served at Gallipoli. A. P. Herbert, who used a blend of satire and humour most effectively among the Gallipoli writers that this thesis examines, for example, served in the Hawke Battalion of the Royal Naval Division at Gallipoli. He was an Anglo-Irish humourist writer, political activist and a Member of Parliament, whose reason for joining the war was neither a sense of excitement nor 'Kitchener's pointing finger'; rather, he hoped that during the Gallipoli Campaign, he would meet his brother who was in the Navy.<sup>108</sup> He did not want to be left out of the war when both of his brothers were in it, especially as he believed the war to be for a just cause.<sup>109</sup> On the way to Gallipoli, like many other soldiers, he was also caught by the romantic setting and by the story of Troy. During the campaign, he gained a reputation in his division

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid pp.195-196.

<sup>105</sup> Christopher Dawson, *Beyond Politics* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1939), p.99.

<sup>106</sup> Matthew Grimley, 'The State, Nationalism, and Anglican Identities', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume IV*, ed. by Jeremy Morris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp.117-137 (p.124).

<sup>107</sup> Ibid pp.124-125.

<sup>108</sup> A. P. Herbert, *A.P.H. His Life and Times* (London: Heinemann, 1970), pp.35-36.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid p.36.

because of his Gallipoli poems being published in the satirical magazine *Punch*. Just after the campaign, in 1916, he collected all his Gallipoli poems together in one publication, *Half-Hours at Helles*. Most had already been published in *Punch*. Herbert also served in France and wrote poems about his experiences on the Western Front, but unfortunately, not much is known about his experience on either front, as his private papers from the two war fronts have not survived.<sup>110</sup> What makes him unique is that he used humour and satire in his Gallipoli poems, offering a contrast to the otherwise serious treatment of the campaign by other British writers. The verses in his *Half-Hours at Helles* analysed in this thesis, however, are so vivid that they often give the reader the impression that they were extracts from a diary, telling the story of A. P. Herbert's Gallipoli experience from the beginning till the end, including his perspective on the whole campaign and the enemy.

Among all the authors mentioned in this thesis, perhaps the most knowledgeable on Turkish culture and experienced in dealing with the Turks themselves is Aubrey Herbert. Aubrey Herbert – A. P. Herbert's namesake, but not relative – also wrote verses about the Gallipoli campaign as well as keeping a diary, later published as *Mons, Anzac and Kut* (1919). He was a diplomat, politician, traveller and poet who was very much involved in British-Ottoman politics and had extensive knowledge of Turkish culture and the Ottoman-Turkish language. During his education at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford, the South African War broke out and he fell victim to war fever and enlisted with a sense of adventure. However, due to his extremely poor eyesight, Herbert's mother convinced him not to join the war and unwillingly, with a sense of shame and loss of honour, Herbert cancelled his enlistment. After his years in Oxford, he led a nomadic life. In 1902, he first went to Tokyo and then in 1904 to Istanbul as an honorary attaché. During that time, he had the chance to travel to the Balkans, Greece and Macedonia, where he witnessed the minority unrest within the Ottoman Empire.

---

<sup>110</sup> Reginald Pound, *A. P. Herbert: A Biography* (London: Joseph, 1976), p.45.

During his first years as an honorary attaché in Istanbul, Herbert had some prejudice against Turks, which he explains in his Turkish-titled book *Ben Kendim* (1924) ('I myself'). The transformation in his ideas about the Turks is traced in the book: he begins by recounting his initial anti-Turkish feelings, and ends with a pro-Turkish chapter about why Britain should understand and feel sympathy for the newly built Turkey in its current difficulties.<sup>111</sup> A letter Herbert wrote to Raymond Asquith in his initial years in Istanbul warns him: '[d]on't ever be a Turko-phile,' while another letter to his mother says 'I'm getting more anti-Turkish every day, though I like the Turks themselves immensely.'<sup>112</sup> However, as he delved into the complex world of Ottoman politics and increased his knowledge about the Ottomans, his anti-Turkish feelings became instead Turko-phile, but turned into 'anti-Sultan' sentiments as Herbert felt that the Ottoman Sultan did not have the power to deal with the minority unrest within his borders that Herbert witnessed involving 'Greeks, Armenians, Turks, Bulgars, Albanians, Slavs, Kurds, Serbs, Jews', where '[r]ace fought against race.'<sup>113</sup> In a letter to his cousin Bron, Herbert describes the Ottoman government as 'swinish' and as one which he 'want[s] to see' to be 'knocked out.'<sup>114</sup>

When the Ottoman Sultan Abdul Hamid II was deposed after the Young Turk revolution, Herbert felt that 'the millennium [was] regained' since the excitement of the revolution re-united the Ottomans in Istanbul, '[w]here before there had been silence, crowds wandered singing' and 'Christians had their arms round the neck of Moslems' as the 'murders ceased.'<sup>115</sup> As the British government started changing its policy towards the Ottoman Empire to its own benefit and cut off its support to the Ottoman Empire, Herbert noted that a strong reformed Turkey would not serve the interests of

---

<sup>111</sup> Aubrey Herbert, *Ben Kendim: A Record of Eastern Travel* (New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1925).

<sup>112</sup> FitzHerbert p.52.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid p.45.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid p.82.

European Powers and nationalist Balkan countries since 'Europe wanted a client not a competitor.'<sup>116</sup> This made Herbert feel betrayed by British politicians.

When his career as a diplomat ended in Istanbul, he travelled to countries in Persia where he extended his knowledge about the internal turmoil in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>117</sup> In 1911 he became a Member of Parliament. After the Balkan Wars, he contributed so greatly to the establishment of modern independent Albania that he was offered the throne of Albania twice.<sup>118</sup> When World War I broke out, he enlisted in the Irish guards and was initially sent to France. After he was wounded in the Battle of Mons and was sent back home, he was sent to Gallipoli with the ANZAC forces as an interpreter.<sup>119</sup> This time, Herbert was unwilling to fight against an enemy he liked, especially in a campaign which Herbert felt had not been carefully planned.<sup>120</sup> He negotiated the only armistice in the whole campaign on 24 May 1915 to bury the dead and bring in the wounded.<sup>121</sup> In his *Gallipoli Memories*, Compton Mackenzie says that who demanded the armistice was never clear as both Liman Von Sanders and Sir Ian Hamilton claimed they did, but according to Mackenzie, 'Aubrey Herbert alone was responsible for it.'<sup>122</sup> After Gallipoli, he was sent to Kut-al-Amara in Iraq as a Captain in intelligence. After the war, Herbert published his wartime diaries, *Mons, Anzac and Kut* (1919) anonymously at a time when publishers were fairly wary of war books because they believed people would want to forget the war.<sup>123</sup> The publication was not a great success during his lifetime; however, it is an important source for this thesis as it sheds light on the British perspective on the Ottoman enemy in Gallipoli.

---

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, p. 151.

<sup>121</sup> Ibid

<sup>122</sup> Compton Mackenzie, *Gallipoli Memories* (New York: The Country Life Press, 1930), p.76.

<sup>123</sup> Vincent Trott, *Publishers, Readers and the Great War: Literature and Memory since 1918* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017), p.21.

Geoffrey Dearmer's war poems, however, were well-received during his lifetime when his two volumes of poetry were published in 1918 and 1923.<sup>124</sup> In 1918, in *The New York Times* for example, the critic Robert McBride described Dearmer's first volume of poetry as having 'a dignity that approaches grandeur.'<sup>125</sup> Although critics like McBride praised Dearmer's Great War poems right after the war, his poems are not often classified along with Owen's. However, Dearmer did not think highly of his achievements and in an interview he observed that '[r]emember, all the great poets died.'<sup>126</sup> Dearmer was born into a literary, religious and artistic family in London. In 1915, just a few days before Dearmer was sent to Gallipoli to serve in the Royal Fusiliers, his brother was killed by a shell at Suvla Bay in the Dardanelles. His mother, who was also a well-known author, had died of enteric fever when she was a medical orderly helping wounded Serbs in the same year. After staying in Gallipoli until the evacuation, he went to the Somme as a transport officer in the Army Service Corps. Dearmer did not publish a war memoir or diary, but left two volumes of war poetry. He is known as the last surviving poet of World War I, one of whose most famous poems was 'The Turkish Trench Dog', based on his experiences in Gallipoli. Different from the other British poetry analysed in this thesis, although comparable to the one novel explored below, Dearmer's war poems are interwoven with a strong Christian faith which remained intact during a time full of horrors and disillusionment. This is one of the reasons that his poetry can be characterised as optimistic in the face of bloodshed, as it is full of belief in the resilience of life and the rebirth of nature. Another reason might be that Dearmer arrived at Gallipoli when the bloodiest fighting and harshest conditions in summer were over. In an interview with the Imperial War Museum, he

---

<sup>124</sup> Laurence Cotterell, 'Introduction', in *A Pilgrim's Song: Selected Poems to Mark the Poet's 100th Birthday* (London: John Murray, 1993), pp. xi-xiii (p.xi).

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> Nigel Steel, "'The Dead Turk'", Geoffrey Dearmer (1916): Echoes of Calvary in Gallipoli', *The Telegraph: Inside the First World War Part Six: Redrawing the Middle East*, 2 February 2014, p.9.

explained that he saw only two Turks during the entire campaign, one of whom was dead, which inspired Dearmer to write his poem 'The Dead Turk' analysed below.

As a Lance Corporal and poet, W. F. Rollo potentially represents a different social class to the writers examined in this thesis, although in the absence of any biographical information, his precise background must remain a matter of speculation. There is almost no information about him available apart from the fact that he served with the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion Border Regiment in Gallipoli. This thesis looks at some of the poems in his collection, *Stray Shots From the Dardanelles* (1915).

Ernest Raymond (1888–1974) was a British novelist who published over fifty novels and served as an Anglican Army chaplain on six fronts in World War I, including in the Gallipoli campaign.<sup>127</sup> Raymond wrote his first and best-known novel, *Tell England* (1922), based on his experiences at Gallipoli, although he did not witness much of the violence as he joined the campaign in its later stages. Before the war, Raymond attended church schools such as St Paul's and Chichester Theological College where he caught 'the splendid fever of Anglo-Catholicity' and strove to be a priest.<sup>128</sup> When World War I started, young and inexperienced, he was a three-weeks ordained deacon with a strong Christian faith who was inspired to serve at Gallipoli by reading Ian Hamilton's despatches, as they reminded him of Homer and the *Iliad*.<sup>129</sup> Just a year later, he was sent to Gallipoli which, among all the other fronts that he served at, such as Sinai, France, Mesopotamia, Persia, and Russia, had the most significance in his memory as 'it was [not only his] first sight of battle' but also 'had a glamour, a tragic beauty, all its own.'<sup>130</sup> The fact that famous patriotic poets such as Charles Lister, Patrick Shaw Stewart and Rupert Brooke served at Gallipoli at the same time as

---

<sup>127</sup> Mavis Norris, Ian Norrie, *The Book of Hampstead* (London: High Hill Press, 1968), p.176.

<sup>128</sup> Ernest Raymond, *The Story of My Days: An Autobiography 1888-1922* (London: Cassell, 1968), p.114.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid* p.122.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid* p.127.



Raymond contributed to his romantic sentiments about the campaign.<sup>131</sup> Greatly influenced by the 'tragic beauty' of Gallipoli with its 'grand classical background among the seas and islands of Greece', Raymond decided to combine the 'untidy chapters of his school story' – which he wrote right after he left school with the intention to publish it as a novel – with his experiences at Gallipoli.<sup>132</sup> Raymond was so excited about this idea that at Gallipoli he 'began to dread lest, with the shells and bullets flying around, and the diseases infecting so many on Helles, [he] should not survive to write the book.'<sup>133</sup> After the war, by 1923, his 'fever of Anglo-Catholicity' faded away as he resigned from Holy Orders and decided to be a writer, although he remained strongly attached to Christian ethics.<sup>134</sup>

When the war ended, Raymond tried to publish *Tell England*, yet no publisher was interested in a war book on the assumption that that nobody wanted to hear about the war.<sup>135</sup> However, Raymond did manage to publish it, subsequently attracting a great deal of negative criticism due to its portrayal of war as a romantic and noble enterprise. Rose Macaulay, for instance, wrote in the *Daily News* that the novel was 'sloppy, sentimental and illiterate' while the *Evening Standard* considered it 'laughable'.<sup>136</sup> However, despite the negative criticism, the novel became popular among a general readership, selling three thousand copies by the end of 1939.<sup>137</sup> Cyril Falls linked the popularity of the novel to its 'qualities [which are] dear to the British middle class reader' such as an idealised England and 'a dash of religion'.<sup>138</sup> Macleod, likewise, asserts that the 'romantic myth' Gallipoli writings possessed granted readers a 'consoling power'.<sup>139</sup> The romanticism and heroism depicted in Raymond's *Tell England* fulfilled the needs of contemporary readers, providing them with hope and

---

<sup>131</sup> Ibid p.130.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid p.133.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid p.133.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid p.114.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid p.167.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid pp.182-184.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> Cyril Falls, *War Books: A Critical Guide* (London, Peter Davies 1930), p.293.

<sup>139</sup> Macleod, p.161.

reassurance in the post-war years of national mourning. In 1931, Anthony Asquith turned the novel into a film, and A. P. Herbert helped write the screenplay.<sup>140</sup>

Raymond's understanding of literature was more than just an 'entertainment', an 'escape' or a 'relief'; rather, it was a way 'to approach the presence [of God]' in order to live 'a complete [and] full life'.<sup>141</sup> He claimed that the 'grandeur' and 'nobilities' of men co-existed in life alongside harsh, brutal and grim realities and that therefore there was a place for romance in life.<sup>142</sup> At a time of increased literary and critical emphasis on gritty realism and modernist experimentation, he must have felt the need to defend his romantic narrative in his literary criticism published in 1928: 'Shakespeare knew – no one better – that much of his romance was illusory; but he knew also that there is place for illusion in life.'<sup>143</sup> In his view, realism hiding the 'nobilities [...] from our nearer sight', deprives the reader of living life fully, since literature is about making people 'not only feel about more things, but feel more about them'.<sup>144</sup> Providing readers with more about reality, romanticism makes people more 'awake' and therefore the form of the narrative should not matter 'so long as it satisfies [the writer] as the one perfect vehicle for what he has to say'.<sup>145</sup> His understanding of literature and the place of romanticism in it explain how Raymond made sense of World War I and is illustrated in the way he depicted the Gallipoli campaign in *Tell England*. Rather than narrating the harsh realities of war as a futile waste of life, his heroic-romantic interpretation of the Gallipoli campaign as a holy crusade was an attempt to convey to the reader a different sense of 'beauty' and a positive outlook, because, in his view, romance 'provides [...] an escape into a world of finer heroes and heroines and more perfect happiness than any we know.'<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> Andrew Kelly, *Cinema and the Great War* (London: Routledge, 1997), p.75; Ibid p.162.

<sup>141</sup> Ernest Raymond, *Through Literature To Life: An Enthusiasm and an Anthology* (London: Cassell, 1928), pp.19-21.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid pp.41-48.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid p.42.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid p.47.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid p.42.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid p.41.

## Ottoman-Turkish Authors

Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924) was one of the most important Ottoman intellectuals to leave a mark on Turkish ideological, cultural and political history. Since his youth, Gökalp had experienced the social and political troubles with which the Ottoman Empire was struggling. These struggles along with economic problems rendered him unable to continue his education and his family's pressure on Gökalp to get married led him to attempt suicide when he was 18.<sup>147</sup> After his suicide attempt, however, Gökalp dedicated himself to education, moved from his hometown of Diyarbakır to İstanbul, and became interested in learning about Western culture.<sup>148</sup> During his university studies to become a vet (he could only afford to enrol for a veterinary degree), Gökalp was arrested for 'reading banned publications and his membership of harmful associations', jailed for twelve months and then exiled to his hometown Diyarbakır.<sup>149</sup> In 1912, Darülfünun (İstanbul University) Faculty of Education, where he later worked as the first sociology professor, re-assessed and planned its modules and course books based on Gökalp's suggestions.<sup>150</sup> After this period, keenly aware of the military, economic, religious and political problems that the Ottoman Empire faced, Gökalp centred his thoughts on formulating his ideological views, a version of Turkism and Turanism based on cultural nationalism, and published books, articles and collections of poems, such as *Kızıl Elma* (Red Apple) (1914) and *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Turkification, Islamisation, Modernisation) (1918).<sup>151</sup> In 1919, Gökalp was exiled to Malta for his involvement in the Committee of Union and Progress and when he returned to the country, he continued to publish articles about nationalism in

---

<sup>147</sup> Ali Nüzhet, *Ziya Gökalp'in Hayatı ve Malta Mektupları* (İstanbul: İktisat Kutuphanesi, 1931), pp.14-17, p.21.

<sup>148</sup> Hasan Tuncay, *Ziya Gökalp* (İstanbul: Toker Yayınları, 1978), p. 34.

<sup>149</sup> Şahin Gürsoy and İhsan Çapcıoğlu, 'Bir Türk Düşünürü Olarak Ziya Gökalp: Hayatı, Kişiliği ve Düşünce Yapısı Üzerine Bir İnceleme', *AÜİFD* 47 (2006), pp. 89-98, (p.90).

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid.

the first issue of the journal *Küçük Mecmua*, and he explained why the Turks and Kurds must love and accept each other.<sup>152</sup>

According to Mehmet Ali Beyhan, Gökalp's nationalist ideology was influenced by three important personalities.<sup>153</sup> The first of these was Gökalp's father, Tevfik Efendi, who strove to raise Gökalp to be a man who 'can speak French, Arabic and Persian on one hand, and perfectly master the Western sciences as well as Eastern knowledge on the other' and 'then reveal the great facts that [the Ottoman-Turkish] nation needed based on the comparison and assessment of all this knowledge'.<sup>154</sup> The second, Gökalp's private philosophy teacher, Dr Yorgi Efendi, was an Ottoman Orthodox Greek and another influential figure in shaping Gökalp's ideology, as he introduced the idea of nationalism to Gökalp by inspiring him with the study of the Greek philosophers.<sup>155</sup> In a meeting with Gökalp and his friends in 1895 when Gökalp was still a student, upon hearing Gökalp's ideas for constitutionalism, Yorgi congratulated them as 'Turkish youth want[ed] to make reforms and establish a constitutional governance' and '[t]his idea [was] worthy of celebration'.<sup>156</sup> However, Yorgi warned them that a successful and beneficial revolution must fit in with the sociological and psychological structure of the country that is being formed.<sup>157</sup> Yorgi's words influenced and guided Gökalp towards the social sciences so as to be able to determine the psychology and sociology of the Turkish nation, which greatly shaped his nationalist thoughts.<sup>158</sup> Lastly, Naim Bey, whom Gökalp met when he was arrested, inspired him with his lectures on the freedom of the press, educating the 'sleeping Turkish nation' and building constitutionalism.<sup>159</sup> Working on the social and cultural structure of the Turkish people, Gökalp invested all

---

<sup>152</sup> Nüzhet, pp.166-167; Gürsoy and Çapcıoğlu, p.92.

<sup>153</sup> Mehmet Ali Beyhan, 'Ziya Gökalp'in Tarih Anlayışı ve Türk Medeniyeti Tarihi Adlı Eseri', *Turkish Journal of Sociology*, 3 (2006), pp.47-61 (p.48).

<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

<sup>155</sup> Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, *Bir Fikir Adamının Romanı: Ziya Gökalp* (İstanbul: Atlas, 1984), p. 34; Beyhan, p.48.

<sup>156</sup> Ziya Gökalp, 'Hocamın Vasiyeti', *Küçük Mecmua*, 18 (1922), pp. 1-5 (pp.1-3); Beyhan, pp.48-49.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid

<sup>158</sup> Ibid

<sup>159</sup> Ziya Gökalp, 'Pirimin Vasiyeti', *Küçük Mecmua*, 19 (1922), pp. 1-5 (pp.1-3); Beyhan, p.49.

his knowledge in his ideology, Turanism. According to him, Turanism meant the unity of all Turkic peoples, yet after the new Turkish Republic was established in 1923, he abandoned his idea of Turanism and turned towards a more social Turkism, which centred on Turkish peoples in Turkey.<sup>160</sup>

Like Gökalt, Ömer Seyfettin (1884-1920) was an important Turkist writer and was considered to be one of the greatest modern Turkish story-tellers.<sup>161</sup> Due to his father's job in the military, Seyfettin lived in various cities and, following his father's steps, graduated from the Turkish Military Academy in Istanbul.<sup>162</sup> Right after graduation, he was assigned to suppress an uprising in Macedonia, where he proved to be a successful soldier.<sup>163</sup> In 1909, Seyfettin served in the Balkans to suppress guerrilla attacks for two years, and the Balkan nationalism and anti-Ottoman stance he witnessed in the Balkans ignited the first sparks of his Turkist ideas.<sup>164</sup> Upon returning to Istanbul, Seyfettin resigned from the army and started publishing essays about his nationalist ideas. He founded the journal *Genç Kalemler* and collaborated with Gökalt to start the 'yeni lisan' (new language) movement, which aimed to simplify the Turkish language by removing superfluous Persian and Arabic words.<sup>165</sup> However, the outbreak of the Balkan Wars interrupted his literary work and he returned to the army to serve in the Balkans, subsequently being held captive in 1912 in Greece for almost a year.<sup>166</sup> Seyfettin wrote his short stories 'Bomba' (1911), 'Beyaz Lale' (1913) and 'Tuhaf Bir Zulüm' (1918) based on his experiences in the Balkans, which he published in various journals such as *Genç Kalemler* and *Yeni Mecmua*, becoming the first writer to write about the Balkans in Turkish novels and short stories.<sup>167</sup> In 1914, Seyfettin started

---

<sup>160</sup> Gürsoy and Çapcıoğlu, p.98.

<sup>161</sup> Köroğlu, pp.153-154.

<sup>162</sup> A. Macit Canataş, *Ömer Seyfettin'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul: Nesil Yayınları, 2015), p.1.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid.

<sup>164</sup> Köroğlu pp.154-157.

<sup>165</sup> Hilmi Yücebaş, *Ömer Seyfettin; Hayatı, Hatıraları, Şiirleri* (İstanbul: A.H. Yaşaroğlu Kağıtçılık ve Kitapçılık, 1960), p.35; Köroğlu, p.353

<sup>166</sup> Ibid p.2.

<sup>167</sup> Bilge Ercilasun, *Türk Roman ve Hikâyesi Üzerine* (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2013), p.98.

working as a teacher at Istanbul Kabatas High School and published over a hundred short stories in various journals during his lifetime.<sup>168</sup>

Mehmet Akif Ersoy (1873-1936) was an Ottoman-Turkish poet, writer, academic, politician, and the author of the Turkish national anthem. Ersoy's views were 'a synthesis of Eastern and Western Islamism' as Sezai Karakoç describes him, due to his father's roots in Albania and his mother's in Buhara.<sup>169</sup> Due to his command of the Turkish language, Ersoy has been widely considered as one of the best literary figures of his time by literary scholars such as Cenab Sahabettin and M. Cemal Kuntay.<sup>170</sup> Ersoy's father, Hoca Tâhir Efendi, was not only a parent for him but also 'his mentor', since he 'learned all that [he] knows from [his father]'; he taught Ersoy the Arabic language and instilled in him the love of the Islamic religion.<sup>171</sup> During his university education at Halkalı Mülkiye Baytar Mektebi to become a vet,<sup>172</sup> Ersoy lost his father, yet still managed to graduate with the highest grade in 1893 and became Hafiz (a person who has successfully memorised the Quran).<sup>173</sup>

His first poems were mostly about morality and Islam, and were published in *Resmî Gazete* (The Official Gazette) between 1898-1899.<sup>174</sup> However, 1908 was the turning point in Ersoy's literary and intellectual life as he started a new career as a literature professor at Darülfünun (today's Istanbul University), which cultivated his interest in literature.<sup>175</sup> Ersoy started writing in a journal called *Sırat-ı Müstakîm* (later known as *Sebilürresâd*) and published twenty-nine poems in the same year, which brought him

---

<sup>168</sup> Ibid.

<sup>169</sup> Sezai Karakoç, *Mehmet Akif*, (İstanbul, Yağmur Yayınevi, 1968), p.9.

<sup>170</sup> Mehmet Doğan, *Mehmet Akif, Dönemi ve Çevresi: Vefatının 71. Yılında Mehmet Akif Ersoy: Bilgi Şöleni* (Ankara: Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği, 2008), p.108.

<sup>171</sup> Original Text: 'Benim hem babam, hem hocamdır. Ne biliyorsam, kendisinden öğrendim.': Banarlı Nihad Sâmî, *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Târîhi II* (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2004), p.152.

<sup>172</sup> Attending university to become a vet was the cheapest higher education option in the Ottoman Empire during that time, which explains the surprising number of writers who studied for a degree in veterinary medicine.

<sup>173</sup> Ertuğrul Düzdağ, *Mehmet Akif Hakkında Araştırmalar 1* (İstanbul: Mehmet Akif Araştırmaları Merkezi Yayınları, 1989), p.30.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid., pp.32-33.

<sup>175</sup> Ibid.

immediate fame.<sup>176</sup> Learning Arabic and Persian helped Ersoy to delve into Eastern sources and culture and learning French helped him to benefit from Western culture; he synthesised the two by creating his own unique pattern of thoughts in his written work. In 1908, after the declaration of the second constitutionalism, Ersoy joined the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), but stayed away from its political activities. Erişirgil explains this situation by stating that ‘the only people who benefited from Akif’s membership of CUP were the ones who attended his “Arabic literature” lectures’.<sup>177</sup>

In 1908, Ersoy started publishing parts of his masterpiece, *Safahat*, which consists of seven separate parts, *Safahat* (1911), *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde* (1912), *Hakkın Sesleri* (1913), *Fatih Kürsüsünde* (1914), *Hatıralar* (1917), *Asım* (1924) and *Gölgeler* (1933). After the 1908 Constitutionalism, the CUP government pursued a strict policy of censorship and the journal *Sırat- Müstakim* in which Ersoy published his works was occasionally shut down. Whilst Ersoy published twenty-nine poems in the journal in 1908, the next year he could only publish a handful. This situation not only led Ersoy to branch out into prose, but also focused his ideas on Islamism.<sup>178</sup> After 1911, Ersoy turned his attention to the Islamic world, the common problems of Muslim communities, backwardness and dependence on Western states and wrote about his Pan-Islamist ideology concerning how Muslim communities that were far from being collaborators should unify under an ideal in which Islam is defined, interpreted and applied properly.<sup>179</sup> According to Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, Ersoy wrote *Süleymaniye Kürsüsünde* to spread the idea of pan-Islamism in Turkey and to provide strength against the Western countries.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> Ibid.

<sup>177</sup> Orihinal Text: ‘Doğrusu Akif’ in İttihatçı oluşundan, yalnız cemiyetin ilmiye kulübündeki “Arap edebiyatı” derslerini dinleyenler faydalandılar, o kadar.’ Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, Aykut Kazancıgil, *İslamcı Bir Şairin Romanı: Mehmet Akif* (Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2006), p.93.

<sup>178</sup> Fazıl Gökçek, ‘Mehmet Akif’te Millet Kavramı’, *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim: Mehmet Akif*

*Ersoy Özel Sayısı*, 73 (2006), pp. 69-73 (p. 69).

<sup>179</sup> Ibid.

<sup>180</sup> Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, *Mehmed Akif Hayatı ve Eserleri* (Ankara: Mehmet Akif Ersoy Fikir ve Sanat Vakfı 1991), p.61

The outbreak of the Balkan Wars and then World War I affected Ersoy so deeply that he wrote poems and gave sermons in mosques to warn the Ottoman public against the consequences of war, such as the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire between the Allied Powers. During World War I, Teşkilat-ı Mahsusa (Special Organisation), an Ottoman special forces unit under the control of the War Department, sent Ersoy to Berlin to check upon the status of Muslim prisoners in Germany, where Ersoy witnessed the advances in Europe in contrast to the East and published his experiences and memories as a series of poems entitled 'Berlin Hatıraları' (The Memories in Berlin) (1915) in the *Sebilürreşad* journal.<sup>181</sup> After the Allied powers' invasion of the Ottoman Empire after World War I, Ersoy joined the national struggle and the Turkish War of Independence. In 1920, when the Chief of the General Staff of the new Republic of Turkey, İsmet İnönü, requested a national anthem from the Minister of Education, Hamdullah Suphi, Suphi launched a contest for potential anthems.<sup>182</sup> When none of the poems submitted to the competition was of the required quality, Suphi asked Ersoy to write the Turkish national anthem, but Ersoy refused to participate in the contest because he did not want to accept the prize money despite his poor financial situation. Only once it was conceded that the prize money would be donated to a charity called 'Darül Mesai' (Design Studio: an institution that taught women and children the skills necessary to work), did Ersoy write his masterpiece, the Turkish national anthem, within forty eight hours. Since then, he has been referred to as the national poet of the Turkish Republic.<sup>183</sup>

İbrahim Naci Efendi (1894-1915), who was born in Ohri and grew up in Istanbul, was a lieutenant who fought in the Gallipoli campaign in the 71st Regiment of the 10th Company, which experienced very heavy fighting. His diary represents the only Ottoman combatant perspective of Gallipoli explored in this thesis. The first words of

---

<sup>181</sup> Mithat Cemal Kuntay, *Mehmed Akif: Hayatı, Seciyesi, Sanatı, Eserleri, Ek Kitapta Bahsi Geçen Muharrirlerin Eserleri*, (Istanbul: S. Lûtfi Kitabevi, 1939), pp. 181-182, p.198

<sup>182</sup> Abdullah Uçman, 'Mehmet Akif ve Milli Mücadele', *Ölümünün 50. Yılında Mehmet Akif Ersoy*, 439 (1986) p.27.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid pp.27-28.



his diary contain information about his identity and his address in Istanbul, followed by a note stating that 'whoever should find this notebook shall send it to the address above out of respect to a martyr'.<sup>184</sup> The way Naci started his diary illustrates that he feared he would be killed at Gallipoli, yet he was afraid of being forgotten: 'I am recording my painful memories. However, I do not know if my family will read these lines? Would my diary reach them?'.<sup>185</sup> Tragically, the last date in his diary entry, which corresponds to 21 June 1915, is the date when he was killed at Gallipoli during the battle of Kerevizdere against the French.<sup>186</sup> The last words he noted down with his signature in his incomplete diary were:

7.00 am  
The enemy attacked us the whole night.  
Now we are leaving. I hope the best  
from [God].  
11.00 am  
We went into battle. Millions of canons  
and guns exploded [...] now, my first  
corporal has been wounded. Farewell!<sup>187</sup>

The signature after these words indicates that Naci knew that he would not survive the battle. The last word he used was translated as 'Farewell' in English by Nilüfer Epçeli; however, the original Turkish word is emotionally and religiously more loaded than this. Naci ends his diary saying 'Allahaismarladık', which literally means that 'we [have] entrusted [our lives to] Allah [God]'.<sup>188</sup> This Islamic word used to say goodbye refers to a deeper meaning, in Islam, it is believed that, in daily terms, a person who leaves another might not come back, he might die as no one knows when they will die and death is under the control of Allah. Ending his diary with these simple words, Naci enriches the emotional meaning of his diary. His commander, Captain Bedri Efendi,

---

<sup>184</sup> Ibrahim Naci, *Farewell: A Turkish Officer's Diary of the Gallipoli Campaign*, ed. by Seyit Ahmet Silay, Lokman Demir, trans. by Nilüfer Epçeli (Çanakkale: Gallipoli Peninsula Historical National, 2013), p.45.

<sup>185</sup> Ibid p.133.

<sup>186</sup> Ibrahim Naci, *Allahaismarladık: Çanakkale Savaşı'nda Bir Şehidin Günlüğü*, ed. by Seyit Ahmet Silay, Lokman Demir (İstanbul, Yeditepe, 2013.) p.35.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid. p.134.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

who tried to write a postscript at the end of his diary, was also killed before finishing it.<sup>189</sup>

Celal Nuri İleri (1882-1938) was a Westernist Ottoman-Turkish thinker, politician, and journalist, who was born into a wealthy and cultured family in Gallipoli.<sup>190</sup> As a journalist, İleri published over two thousand articles in various newspapers – most famously for his own newspaper *Âtî-İleri* – and journals in the French and Ottoman languages, such as the newspapers *Le Courrier D'Orient*, *Le Jeune Turc*, *İkdam* and *Vakit* as well as the journals *İctihat*, *Türk Yurdu*, *Resimli Kitap* and *Edebiyât-ı Umûmiye*.<sup>191</sup> İleri's reason for publishing was to 'reform, improve and raise up' the Ottoman state and to bring a cultural and political Renaissance to the Turks.<sup>192</sup> As a well-travelled journalist, İleri had the chance to get to know European culture. As a Westernist writer, İleri correlated Hellenic civilisation and the status of Western civilisation and asserted that the solution for many problems troubling the Ottoman Empire was to imitate various innovations that existed in the developed countries, which would elevate the empire to the level of Western civilisation.<sup>193</sup> In an article titled 'Müslümanlar, Türkler kalkın geciktiniz' (Muslims, Turks, wake up, you are late), İleri explained that the responsibility to improve the Ottoman Empire in ideology, literature, art, technology and science did not only belong to the government or politics but also to the nation itself by working hard like Western civilisations did.<sup>194</sup> According to him, whilst Asia and Africa represented the Ottoman past, Europe and America represented the future and therefore it was now time to create an Ottoman Europe.<sup>195</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> Ibid p.137

<sup>190</sup> Haydar Kemal (Celâl Nuri İleri), *Tarih-i İstikbâl Münasebetiyle Celâl Nuri Bey*, (Istanbul: Yeni Osmanlı Matbaa ve Kütüphanesi, 1913), pp.8-9.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid pp.10-13

<sup>192</sup> Necmi Uyanık, 'Siyasi Düşünce Tarihimizde Batıcı Bir Aydın Olarak Celal Nuri', (unpublished doctoral thesis, Selcuk Üniversitesi, 2003), pp.39-42, p.466.

<sup>193</sup> Ibid

<sup>194</sup> Celâl Nuri İleri, 'Müslümanlar, Türkler, Kalkın, Gecikdiniz', *İctihad*, 86 (1914), pp.1902-1904.

<sup>195</sup> Uyanık p.471.

Both the Ottomans and the British ruled multi-ethnic, multi-national and multi-faith empires expanding across different continents until this multi-faith and multi-national structure led to problems in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Both empires then came under pressure by ethnic nationalist movements, which caused concerns about maintaining the empires' expanse and integrity. However, this process was further advanced in the case of the Ottoman Empire as it was not only a matter of maintaining the entirety and power of the Ottoman Empire as in the British case, but also was a matter of its very survival. As outlined above, the Ottoman Empire was already in decline, struggling with minority independences by 1914 and defeated by its subjects in the Balkan Wars. The British Empire, on the other hand, was one of the most powerful states in the world controlling the economies of many regions such as India, Asia and Africa, but was threatened by a potential Irish civil war just before World War I. Whilst World War I worsened the situation of dissolving minorities in the Ottoman Empire, leading to the establishment of a new nationalist Turkish state, the outbreak of the war averted the threat of Irish civil war for the moment and united nationalists and unionists in the support of British war effort. The Third Home Rule Bill which intended to provide self-government for Ireland was suspended until after the war, which was thought to end by Christmas 1914. However, the prolonging war led to a split in the Irish Volunteer Force; whilst the majority supported the British war effort, others wanted to end the British control in Ireland. In 1916, Irish republicans saw the war as 'England's difficulty' but 'Ireland's opportunity' and started an uprising to establish an Irish Republic using armed force against the British.<sup>196</sup> The British quickly sent troops to Dublin, martial law was declared in the city and when the Irish agreed to surrender after some violence, leaders of the rebellion were executed for their

---

<sup>196</sup> Oonagh Walsh, *Ireland's Independence, 1880-1923* (London: Routledge, 2002), p.42.

actions.<sup>197</sup> After this incident, the city continued to remain under martial law and the British army committed atrocities against the Irish.<sup>198</sup>

Meanwhile in 1916, the British Empire secretly signed the Sykes–Picot Agreement with France for a post-war partitioning of the Ottoman Empire and helped the Sharif of Mecca to initiate an Arab revolt against the Ottoman Empire on June 1916, giving the Sharif of Mecca the impression that the British Empire supported the creation of a unified independent Arab state.<sup>199</sup> Whilst the British Empire responded violently to its own internal conflict, it helped the internal struggles of the Ottoman Empire to grow. In the light of the violent British response to the 1916 Irish uprising for autonomy, British aims to help to liberate Arab and Balkans subject peoples of the Ottoman Empire are somewhat problematic.

The Gallipoli campaign brings together diverse groups of writers on both sides as outlined above. Under the pressure of war, their writing about the campaign intersects with issues of identity and nationhood and interrogates personal and national discourses of identity as well as critiquing and contributing to state propaganda.

---

<sup>197</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>198</sup> Fearghal McGarry, *The Rising: Ireland, Easter 1916*, p.186; Charles Townshend, *Easter 1916: The Irish Rebellion* (London: Allen Lane, 2005), p.193.

<sup>199</sup> Eliezer Tauber, *The Arab Movements in World War I*, (London: Routledge, 2014), pp.80-81.

## **BRITISH PERCEPTIONS OF THE ENEMY**

This chapter looks at the way in which the Gallipoli Campaign shapes the perception of the other – the enemy – in British writings. It covers poems, novels and diaries of the selected writers and examines how British representations of the Ottoman enemy fit into the experiences of war suffering as well as how these representations relate to a variety of cultural, literary, political and religious issues. What did the British authors think of the religious, political and cultural differences between Allies and Ottomans and how did they challenge them? Did religion challenge or justify the war during the Gallipoli campaign? Did the religious differences between the Turks and British matter in justifying or challenging the war? How were the differences between Turkish and British war politics represented in the British writings on Gallipoli and how did these differences affect or change the authors' perception of war suffering? In what ways did cultural differences contribute to this? These are some of the questions this chapter tries to answer. This is achieved by referring to Turkish texts when necessary and drawing analogies between British and Turkish perceptions, which helps to emphasise mutual understandings of and for both sides.

However, it should be taken into consideration that the selected Turkish authors were mostly civilian intellectuals, and therefore did not experience the harsh realities of the war, whereas all selected British authors served in the Gallipoli Campaign since very few portrayals of the Gallipoli Campaign were written by British non-combatants. As outlined in the Introduction, some British authors such as Ernest Raymond and Aubrey Herbert had already experienced the war at the Western Front and so they were familiar with the realities of war and the trenches. Authors such as A. P. Herbert, Geoffrey Dearmer and possibly W. F. Rollo, on the other hand, had their first combat experience at Gallipoli. Some of the authors were familiar with the politics, culture and language of the Turks, such as Aubrey Herbert who had lived in the Ottoman Empire as an honorary attaché before the war. For others, Gallipoli and the Dardanelles were

new sites, which they only knew about from the story of Helen of Troy and the Trojan war in Greek mythology, which took place in the Dardanelles. The Ottomans also represented a new cultural encounter for them to discover in the Gallipoli trenches.

### **The Enemy as 'Turks' and Popular Perceptions**

Interestingly, as the Ottoman writers of Gallipoli identified themselves as Muslim Turks rather than multi-national and multi-religious Ottomans, British writers for the most part also perceived the enemy as either Turks or Muslim Turks. In his diary entry regarding prejudice against interpreters, for instance, Aubrey Herbert commented on the difficulty in explaining to the Colonial troops the distinctly different nationalities that lived in the Ottoman Empire, and who were conscripted to fight against the Allied Powers, as the soldiers could not differentiate between a Turk and members of an ethnic minority such as Greeks or Armenians who could speak Turkish:

It was a work of some difficulty to explain to the Colonial troops that many of the prisoners that we took – as for instance, Greeks and Armenians – were conscripts who hated their masters. On one occasion, speaking of a prisoner, I said to a soldier: "This man says he is a Greek, and that he hates the Turks." "That's a likely story, that is," said the soldier; "better put a bayonet in the brute."

The trouble that we had with the native interpreters is even now a painful memory. If they were arrested once a day, they were arrested ten times. Those who had anything to do with them, if they were not suspected of being themselves infected by treachery, were believed to be in some way unpatriotic. It was almost as difficult to persuade the officers as the men that the fact that a man knew Turkish did not make him a Turk. There was one moment when the interpreters were flying over the hills like hares.<sup>200</sup>

---

<sup>200</sup> Aubrey Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut by an MP: Aubrey Herbert*, ed. by Edward Melotte (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2009), pp.86-87.

This may be connected to the British policy toward the Ottoman Empire leading up to the outbreak of the war as outlined in greater detail in the Introduction. The Ottoman Empire was experiencing civil strife relating to religious and ethnic minorities, and the British Empire stood up for the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire until this unrest signalled the inevitability of its dissolution in the late nineteenth century. After that, Britain started revising its Near East policy and eventually, especially after its rapprochement with Russia, which was the traditional enemy of the Ottoman Empire, switched its policy into a divide-and-rule strategy.<sup>201</sup> The pretext of the protection of Christian minorities was a good opportunity to interfere in the affairs of the Ottoman State for the benefit of Britain's new strategy, as well as to stop the killings.<sup>202</sup> The Christian minorities, which included minorities in Austria-Hungary, were also given the promise of independence and were supported by the Great Powers in the case of an uprising, which created a virtual alliance between the Great Powers and minorities in the Ottoman Empire. In his diary of the Gallipoli Campaign, Aubrey Herbert, for example, mentions surrendering Greek and Armenian soldiers fighting on the side of the Ottomans wishing to cooperate with the Allied Powers.<sup>203</sup> Since the historical and political events during the period shaped perceptions of the enemy, it is thus perhaps not surprising that the British soldier-poets writing about Gallipoli identify the enemy as Turks or Muslim Turks allied with Germany, excluding those virtual allies, non-Muslim Ottoman citizens.

Another reason for recognising the enemy as Turkish rather than Ottoman is based on British popular perceptions of the Turks during World War I. Whilst during the Crimean war Turks were considered as allies, the general view of the Turks following that conflict came to be that they were 'ignorant people' led by 'bloodthirsty and fanatical Muslims' after the Bulgarian uprising of 1876 as the brutalities of that uprising

---

<sup>201</sup> Arman Dzhonovich Kirakosian, *British Diplomacy and the Armenian Question: From the 1830s to 1914* (Princeton: Gomidas Institute Books, 2003), p.32.

<sup>202</sup> Salahi R. Sonyel, *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society Printing House, 1993), p.218.

<sup>203</sup> Herbert, p.75,76,79,105.

were echoed frequently in the British literature of the time (as shown the cartoon below).<sup>204</sup> Jeremy Salt argues that:

Much of the animosity expressed toward the Turks and the eagerness to interpret the failings of the Ottoman state in religious, racial or ethnic terms was part and parcel of the centuries old Christian polemic against Islam [...] Although the religious fervour associated with 19th century England has faded away, people still tend to see Turks in extreme terms.<sup>205</sup>

---

<sup>204</sup> Kate Ariotti, 'Australian Prisoners of the Turks: Negotiating Culture Clash in Captivity', in *Other Fronts, Other Wars?: First World War Studies on the Eve of the Centennial*, ed. by Joachim Bürgschwentner (Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp.146-166, (p.155).

<sup>205</sup> Jeremy Salt, 'Johnny Turk Before Gallipoli: 19th Century Images of the Turks', in *Before and After Gallipoli: A collection of Australian and Turkish Writings*, ed. by Rahmi Akçelik (Melbourne: Australian-Turkish Friendship Society, 1986), pp.15-27 (pp.20-25).





### REALIZATION.

[“When I went to Bulgaria I resolved that if there were to be any assassinations I would be on the side of the assassins.”—Statement by FERDINAND.]

*Realization. [“When I went to Bulgaria I resolved that if there were to be any assassinations I would be on the side of the assassins.” - Statement by Ferdinand.] (Wilhelm II stands with bloodied dagger drawn in front of Belgium while Ferdinand I of Bulgaria and Mehmed V of Turkey stand in front of massacred women and children in Armenia during WW1)*<sup>206</sup>

<sup>206</sup> Leonard Raven Hill, ‘Realization’, cartoon from *Punch Magazine*, WW1 Great War Cartoons, (1915), [http://punch.photoshelter.com/image/I0000KDp\\_kljUp3k](http://punch.photoshelter.com/image/I0000KDp_kljUp3k) [last accessed 22 August 2016].

Justin McCarthy claims that British anti-Turkish war propaganda was 'a continuation of a long tradition of rhetoric against Muslims'.<sup>207</sup> This can be argued to tap into longer-standing orientalism which both romanticises and others the Eastern world, including the Ottoman Empire. The world of Islam had created complex sentiments of respect, awe and fear in Western Europe in the Middle Ages. The Ottoman Empire had shown itself to be a significant military and political power in the Eastern Mediterranean, South East Europe and North Africa, which threatened the very existence of Christian Europe. In this sense, orientalism made the Eastern world 'less fearsome' to the West and allowed Westerners to rationalise imperial conquests of the East.<sup>208</sup> In the Victorian era, the British used orientalism to justify their superiority over other societies to serve the British ideology of 'paternalism and utilitarianism'.<sup>209</sup> The comparison of the East and the West led to a distinct definition of civilised versus non-civilised (savage or barbarian).<sup>210</sup> The East was often viewed to lack civilised qualities such as 'technological superiority', 'the structure of family life and gender relations', 'individual moral and intellectual capacity' and 'economic success'.<sup>211</sup> This image of the Orient led to the idea that these societies were incapable to rule themselves, which paved the way to the justification of imperialist invasion and European assumption of 'a decisive superiority to correct the Orient's infelicities'.<sup>212</sup>

In the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire was considered as an anachronistic and despot empire in which the Christian minorities were 'unfortunate prisoners of the Orient'.<sup>213</sup> In his *Transcaucasia and Ararat* (1878), James Bryce claimed that '[n]o

---

<sup>207</sup> Justin McCarthy, 'The Bryce Report: British propaganda and the Turks', in *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*, ed. by Kemal Çiçek (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2000) pp.504-512, (p.504).

<sup>208</sup> Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), p.60; pp.322-343.

<sup>209</sup> K. Humayun Ansari, 'The Muslim World in British Historical Imaginations: "Re-thinking Orientalism?"', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 38.1 (2011), 73-93 (p.83).

<sup>210</sup> Duncan Bell, *Victorian Visions of Global Order: Empire and International Relations in Nineteenth Century Political Thought* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p.10.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid.

<sup>212</sup> Hakan Erdagöz, 'Reading the Eastern Question through the Prism of Orientalism: Hubris, Founding Genealogy and James Bryce', *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* (2019), 1-26 (p.12).

<sup>213</sup> Ibid p.9.

Mohammedan race or dynasty has ever shown itself able to govern well even subjects of its own religion; while to extend equal rights to subjects of a different creed is forbidden by the very law of its being.<sup>214</sup> Ultimately, the idea of an exotic and despot East created a way of thinking about World War I events and produced its counterview in which the British national and imperial character was represented as civilised, moral, and strong. Orientalist representations of the 'savage' East became more systematic in anti-German and anti-Turkish war propaganda through the efforts of Wellington House as the Ottoman Turks were defined as 'ill-equipped to rule' and 'well-equipped for massacre by nature.'<sup>215</sup> Anti-Turkish propaganda also served to increase donations to Armenian and Assyrian Christians organised by the American missionary establishment, which occasionally aided the British propaganda efforts.<sup>216</sup> During World War I, the view of the Orient continued to contribute to Britain's more specific imperial ambitions, since 'convincing the world that the Ottoman rule had been a disaster and that the Turks were murderous tyrants' (a view for which the massacres of Armenians were perfect material) would make it easier to establish British influence in Anatolia and Mesopotamia.<sup>217</sup> The Prime Minister Lloyd George, for instance, instructed the Director of the Propaganda Bureau, John Buchan – the author of the anti-German and anti-Ottoman-Turkish novel *Greenmantle* (1916) – to organise the campaign called 'the Turks must go'<sup>218</sup>:

---

<sup>214</sup> James Bryce, *Transcaucasia and Ararat: Being Notes of a Vacation Tour in the Autumn of 1876* (London: Macmillan, 1970), p.425.

<sup>215</sup> Justin McCarthy, *The Turk in America: The Creation of an Enduring Prejudice* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2010), p.222.

<sup>216</sup> McCarthy, 'The Bryce Report', p.504.

<sup>217</sup> Ibid.

<sup>218</sup> Isaiah Friedman, *The Question of Palestine: British-Jewish-Arab Relations, 1914-1918* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1992), p.170; For more on Buchan's involvement in British propaganda, see: Michael Sanders and Philip M. Taylor, *British Propaganda during the First World War, 1914-18* (London: The Macmillan Press LTD, 1982); Michael Sanders, 'Wellington House and British propaganda during the First World War', *The Historical Journal*, 18.1 (1975), 119-146 (pp.123-127).

I am anxious you should pay special attention to the futility and iniquity of the Turk... How the Turk, by his rule, made all the arts of industry and husbandry impossible, and how once rich lands have become wilderness... Emphasize his incapacity for good Government, his misrule, and above all, his massacres of all the industrious populations; his brutality... in Armenia and Syria.<sup>219</sup>

Viscount Bryce, who produced the official Bryce Report on alleged German atrocities in Belgium in 1915 and also compiled a record of the Armenian massacres published by the British government in 1916 entitled *the Blue Book*, defined the Turks in similar terms to Lloyd George's instructions for the 'Turks must go' campaign. Bryce, in his preface to Arnold J. Toynbee's book, *The Murderous Tyranny of the Turks*, says that '[t]he Turk has never been of any use for any purpose except fighting' and quotes famous figures and historians who consider the Turks as 'nothing but a robber band' or 'savages, with whom no civilised Christian nation ought to form any alliance.'<sup>220</sup> Toynbee also makes similar comments about Turks in justifying the Allied Powers plan for the re-settlement of the Ottoman Empire. McCarthy considers both Bryce's reports about Germans and Turks as successful attempts at the vilification of the enemy and points out that, whilst most of the existing research had thoroughly examined and labelled British propaganda against the Germans as 'wartime propaganda with little veracity', British propaganda against Turks has never been as thoroughly examined.<sup>221</sup> McCarthy's view is problematic, not only because as he makes this point primarily to question the veracity of research on the Armenian Genocide that relies on or quotes Bryce's Blue Book since it was supported by Wellington House, but also because it relies on now debunked claims that anti-German atrocity propaganda was largely

---

<sup>219</sup> Quoted in Friedman, p.76.

<sup>220</sup> Viscount Bryce, 'Preface', *The Murderous Tyranny of the Turks*, ed. by Arnold J. Toynbee (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1917), 4-6 (pp.4-5).

<sup>221</sup> McCarthy, 'The Bryce Report', p.510.

fabricated.<sup>222</sup> It is undeniable, however, that existing research on World War I British propaganda mostly focuses on the propaganda against Germans, exploring its structure, methods and veracity, whilst no sustained scholarly attention – apart from McCarthy’s research – so far has been devoted to the British propaganda efforts with regard to the Ottoman Empire. This could also be because most propaganda materials against the Turks were lost immediately after the war as the propaganda office records were destroyed.<sup>223</sup>

According to McCarthy’s research, British propaganda about the Turks focused on bringing out the charms of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, the Turkish inability to ensure commercial progress and its rule over multi-national and multi-ethnic populations, and the intolerance of its Islamic government to the opposing religions.<sup>224</sup> He summarizes the general themes of propaganda as follows:

Turks were illegitimate rulers who have destroyed all lands in which they have ruled. They were Muslims who hated all other religions, particularly Christianity. They had always treated Christians badly, and now were committing inhuman atrocities against Armenians and other Christians, including mass murder and awful sexual crimes. The Germans stood behind Turkish evil deeds. The mass of the people of the Ottoman Empire, even the Muslims, looked to the British for salvation.<sup>225</sup>

In contrast to unfriendly perception of Muslim Turks in British popular culture and World War I propaganda, or hostile representations of the European enemy in Turkish writings, some historians such as Nigel Biggar, Alan Moorhead and Richard Harries have noted the positive attitudes in the memoirs and diaries of British front-line soldiers

---

<sup>222</sup> Alan Kramer and John Horne, *German Atrocities, 1914: A History of Denial* (New Haven: Yale University Press 2001), pp.2-3; Nicoletta F. Gullace, ‘Allied Propaganda and World War I: Interwar Legacies, Media Studies, and the Politics of War Guilt’, *History Compass* 9.9 (2011), 686-700 (p.686).

<sup>223</sup> Ibid p.508.

<sup>224</sup> Ibid p.507.

<sup>225</sup> Ibid p.508.

towards the Turkish enemy.<sup>226</sup> Moorhead asserts that the Turks' request for an armistice following one of their disastrous attacks increased the sympathy towards the Turks among the British soldiers at Cape Helles; however, he notes that although the British soldiers felt sorry for the Ottoman Turks individually and often offered the Ottoman prisoners their cigarettes and waterbottles, they still felt ferociously towards the Turkish enemy as a group.<sup>227</sup> Moorhead further quotes Ernest Raymond – whose novel *Tell England* is discussed in this thesis – who talks in his autobiography about a sense of 'amiability' toward the Turk.<sup>228</sup> Aubrey Herbert also wrote in his diary that '[m]en seem to like the Turks much better now that they see what fighters they are.'<sup>229</sup> Likewise, the British poems and prose on Gallipoli reflect a sense of appreciation of the enemy. There is a parallel here with the poems, letters and fictions written by many front-line soldiers who served on the Western Front, who showed the same sense of fellow-feeling with the German enemy. It is worth bearing in mind, however, that not all British writing about Gallipoli was friendly towards the Turks, since Ernest Raymond and W.F. Rollo, for instance, experienced the Gallipoli battlefields but did not show sympathy for the Turks in their Gallipoli writings.

### **Aubrey Herbert's Pro-Turkist Approach**

Aubrey Herbert's sympathy for the Turks can be traced back to well before the Gallipoli Campaign. One of the best examples of this sympathy can be found in an untitled poem by Herbert about the Balkan Wars, which were fought just a few years before the Gallipoli Campaign and were often referred to in Turkish writings on Gallipoli. It is important to mention this poem in this chapter not only to establish the longstanding sympathy that Herbert felt towards the Turks, but also to shed light on how the anger

---

<sup>226</sup> Nigel Biggar, *In Defence of War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p.83; Alan Moorhead, *Gallipoli* (London: The New English Library, 1956), p.85; Richard Harries, 'The De-romanticisation of War and the Struggle for Faith', in *The Straits of War: Gallipoli Remembered*, ed. by Martin Gilbert (Stroud: Sutton, 2000), pp.180-195, p.190.

<sup>227</sup> Moorhead, p.216.

<sup>228</sup> Ernest Raymond, *The Story of My Days*, p.120.

<sup>229</sup> Herbert, *Mons, Kut and Anzac*, p.69.

expressed towards the European powers in the Turkish literary works of Gallipoli stemmed back to the years before World War I.

During the Balkan Wars, Aubrey Herbert witnessed the atrocities committed by Serbian forces in Albania and the Great Powers' diplomatic strategies to further their own interests in the area, which increased his dislike of British politicians and his sense of betrayal on behalf of the Turks. When he returned to England, seeing that the newspapers ignored pro-Turkish material but only praised the Balkan Allies, he wrote this poem in anger, in which he looks at the politics of the Balkan Wars from a Turkish perspective:

There falls perpetual snow upon a  
broken plain,  
And through the twilight filled with flakes  
the white earth joins the sky  
Grim as a famished, wounded wolf, his  
lean neck in a chain  
The Turk stands up to die.

Intrigues within, intrigues without, no  
man to trust,  
He feeds street dogs that starve with  
him; to friends who are his foe  
To Greeks and to Bulgars in his lines, he  
flings a sudden crust  
The Turk who has to go.

By infamous unbridled tongues and  
dumb deceit,  
Through pulpits and the Stock Exchange  
the Balkans do their work,  
The preacher in the chaper and the  
hawker in the street  
Feed on the dying Turk

The Turk worked in the vineyard, others  
drank the wine,  
The Jew who sold him plough shares  
kept an interest in his plough.  
The Serb and Bulgar waited till King and  
Priest should sign,  
Till Kings said 'kill, kill now'.<sup>230</sup>

---

<sup>230</sup> FitzHerbert, p.115.

The poem starts and ends as a tale with a description of a snowy twilight and employs animal metaphors, telling the honourable Turks' dramatic and bitter story in which other ethnic groups try to take advantage of the Ottoman Empire's decline. This contributes to the understanding of the poem's perspective, which British readers would not have been very familiar with. In the poem, the Turk is described as '[g]rim as a famished, wounded wolf, his lean neck in a chain', who 'stands up to die' in the Balkan Wars.<sup>231</sup> Herbert's association of Turks with wolves shows his knowledge of Turkish cultural history. According to Turkish, Mongolian and Altai mythology, Turks descended from a grey wolf. For this reason, the Turks have, since ancient times considered the wolf as sacred and as their national symbol due to its connotations of a fighting spirit and fierce independence.<sup>232</sup> Just a few years after World War I ended, in the first years of the Turkish republic, the wolf was printed on Turkish currency as a symbol of Turkish nationalism. The Ottoman Empire, the poem suggests, once as courageous, strong and dignified as a wolf, as Turks had perceived themselves for centuries, is now wounded by the independence of minorities and chained by foreign forces who control its internal affairs. Since minorities were encouraged to strive for independence by the European powers, with '[i]ntrigues within, intrigues without', the Turk has 'no man to trust' and is left alone with the failing Ottoman Empire.<sup>233</sup>

Despite the hardships experienced by the Empire, the Turk 'feeds the street dogs that starve with him' and 'flings a sudden crust' to the 'friends who are his foe'; that is, 'to Greeks and Bulgars in his lines'.<sup>234</sup> Greeks and Bulgars are portrayed ironically as 'dogs' who are considered to be the symbol of loyalty, faithfulness and trust, the qualities which Greeks and Bulgars are shown to lack in the poem. They are 'street dogs' seeking for a new home, striving to be independent from the Ottoman Empire and fighting over 'a sudden crust' the Turk 'flings'; that is, the land that the Ottomans

---

<sup>231</sup> Ibid.

<sup>232</sup> İbrahim Kafesoğlu, *Türk Bozkır Kültürü*, (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1987), p.81.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid.



lost during the Balkan Wars. In the poem, Jews, Serbs and Christians are portrayed as no different from Greeks and Bulgars in terms of loyalty, for example, when the poem describes how 'the preacher in the chapel and the hawker in the street / feed on the dying Turk', and '[t]he Serb and Bulgar waited till King and Priest' said 'kill, kill now.'<sup>235</sup> The Christians and Serbs are associated with scavengers as they wait for the Turk to die to 'feed on' him. This association reminds us of Ersoy's depiction of the enemy as 'hyenas', which are scavenger animals, to emphasise the greediness of imperialist nations, which is discussed in the next chapter. In Herbert's poem, the minorities share the same greediness as they are already competing with each other to grab what would be left over from the fall of the Ottoman Empire, and this suggests how steeped Herbert, in reflection on the Turkish perspective. In Herbert's view, the minorities with whom the Turkish lived for hundreds of years under the roof of the Ottoman Empire betrayed them as they were fighting against them, and becoming enemies.

Aubrey Herbert demonstrates his frustration and sense of betrayal with regards to British policy within the framework of the Ottoman frustrations over minority betrayals. The poem ends with news of a second betrayal, this time perpetrated by the British media, a betrayal he felt for not only for the Turks but for himself:

So now the twilight falls upon the twice  
betrayed,  
The *Daily Mail* tells England and the  
*Daily News* tells God  
That God and British Statesmen should  
make the Turks afraid  
Who fight unfed, unshod'.<sup>236</sup>

Considering his knowledge and experience of the Turks, it is striking that in Aubrey Herbert's Gallipoli poems there is little mention of the identity of the Turkish enemy. Most of his Gallipoli poems are about his fallen comrades, since he was a very popular figure among his peers for whom he developed a great admiration in return. However,

---

<sup>235</sup> Ibid.

<sup>236</sup> Ibid pp.115-116.

his diary gives more detailed information about what he and other British soldiers thought about the Turks, and even gives the perspective of the Turks during the Gallipoli campaign.

In his diary, Herbert frequently mentions how good Turks were to him and throughout the campaign, and he tried to influence the British soldiers' opinions of Turks in this direction. In one instance, for example, he brings British and Australian soldiers together with Turks and makes them talk to each other to show that both sides are actually good fellows. During that encounter, there seems to be a friendly atmosphere in which the soldiers exchange money and badges, which pleases Herbert as he says that '[the] Turks have seen we aren't bad fellows.'<sup>237</sup> When it is time for Herbert and his men to leave, Herbert says that he hopes to see them again if they don't shoot him the next day. Upon hearing this, the Albanians present say: 'We'll never shoot you' and the Turks add: 'Oghur Ola, gule gule gedejecseniz' (a Turkish expression to say farewell, wishing good luck and happiness) whilst Herbert's men say: 'Good bye old chap; good luck!'<sup>238</sup>

However, the perception of the enemy changes quickly the next day, and the friendly atmosphere does not last long as the Ottoman-Turks sink the *Triumph*:

This morning I was talking to Dix, asking him if he believed there were submarines. "Yes," he said, and then swore and added: "There's the Triumph sinking." Every picket-boat dashed off to pick up the survivors. The Turks behaved well in not shelling. There was fury, panic and rage on the beach and on the hill. I heard Uncle Bill, half off his head, saying: "You should kill all enemies. Like a wounded bird, she is. Give them cigarettes. Swine! Like a wounded bird. The swine!" He was shaking his fist. Men were crying and cursing. Very different from yesterday's temper.<sup>239</sup>

---

<sup>237</sup> Ibid p.94.

<sup>238</sup> Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut*, p.81

<sup>239</sup> Ibid p.82.

Despite the inconsistent perceptions of the enemy in the trenches depicted in Herbert's diary, the Turks do not seem as hostile towards the enemy as most Turkish literary representations would have us believe. As illustrated in the next chapter, 'Turkish Perceptions of the Enemy', the Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals who wrote about Gallipoli voiced a shared hatred towards the Allied powers through the literature they produced, frequently referring to past victories of the Ottoman army and exhorting the Ottoman army to fight against the enemy as courageously and ruthlessly as possible. Herbert's definition of Turks contradicts those exhortations as the Turks he came across were not as bloodthirsty as they were asked to be by their own writers and intellectuals. Herbert proposed a cease-fire in May 1915 which would give both sides enough time to bury their dead, which enabled Herbert to communicate with the Turks. Upon this proposal, the Turks suggested meeting the officer behind it and Herbert offered himself as hostage to show good faith. Blindfolded, Herbert was taken through the Turkish lines to a café where he was served a nice meal as a show of good faith in return. According to Herbert, 'all the Turks [he encountered] cursed politicians and their work.'<sup>240</sup> In the Turkish café to which he was taken, he had a long conversation with Sahib Bey, the Turkish commanding officer, who also said he hated all politicians and swore that he had stopped reading the newspapers.<sup>241</sup> His remarks show that soldiers felt the war was brought upon them by the politicians and that there should not be any hatred between the British and the Turks.

For nine hours, the cease-fire continued, allowing both sides to retrieve their dead and wounded. While the Ottoman and Allied soldiers were burying their dead, often in common and nameless graves, Herbert and a Turkish captain were wandering among the wounded and dead soldiers, witnessing the carnage but trying to remain composed. Feeling touched by what he saw, the Turkish captain said: 'At this spectacle

---

<sup>240</sup> Ibid p.94.

<sup>241</sup> Ibid p. 90.

even the most gentle must feel savage, and the most savage must weep.<sup>242</sup> Facing the same horrific view, one of the Turkish soldiers pointed to the dead bodies and blamed politics for the carnage, and Herbert described the event in his diary in these words:

The dead fill acres of ground [...] They fill the myrtlegrown gullies. One saw the result of machine-gun fire very clearly; entire companies annihilated- not wounded, but killed their heads doubled under them with the impetus of their rush and both hands clasping their bayonets. It was as if God had breathed in their faces, as "The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold." [...] I talked to the Turks, one of whom pointed to the graves: "That's politics" he said. Then he pointed to the dead bodies and said: 'That's diplomacy. God pity all of us poor soldiers.'<sup>243</sup>

In Herbert's description, the normal is replaced by abnormal horror; the gullies are supposed to be filled with myrtles, but instead they are full of death, the dead bodies piled over one another. The dead soldiers are described as if they were frozen while they were in action and killed so suddenly that they retained their posture, a sight which reminds Herbert of Lord Byron's poem 'The Destruction of Sennacherib', first published in 1815, which was very popular for its links to *Hebrew Melodies*, a book of songs, in Victorian England. Byron died of malaria while fighting on the Greek side for Greek Independence in 1824, which contemporary commentators occasionally referred to as a parallel between Brooke and Byron. Herbert's reference to the biblical story specifically via Byron cannot be accidental. Like Byron, Herbert is fighting against the Ottomans and purportedly for Greek independence but, unlike Byron, he is not actually convinced of this cause. As a result, his quoting from Byron's poem complicates Herbert's own position, given his pro-Turkish sympathies.

---

<sup>242</sup> Ibid p.92.

<sup>243</sup> Ibid.

Byron's poem narrates a biblical event, the Assyrian king Sennacherib's attempt to besiege Jerusalem. The Assyrians were a military society and had conquered the entire Near East except for tiny Jerusalem. In Byron's poem, the Assyrians were bearing down upon Jerusalem 'like the wolf on the fold', an image derived from the Bible, but, overnight, the whole Assyrian army was destroyed mysteriously in its sleep as the Angel of Death 'breathed on the face of the foe' and the camp filled with the dead. The battlefield scene Herbert observed was filled with so much death and carnage that it seemed to him as if everything happened in one moment, like in the biblical story that Byron's poem describes. Herbert associates the British, seen as having overwhelming military strength and domination in the Middle East, with the Assyrians described as evil predators in the biblical story who try to capture Gallipoli, a tiny area left untouched like Jerusalem. In this way, it seems as though Herbert puts the Turks into an innocent position with regard to the Gallipoli campaign. However, as in Byron's poem, 'God [...] breathed in their faces' and killed thousands of soldiers, but this time causing an even a bigger massacre by not only exterminating the British but also the Turkish soldiers. As mentioned above, Herbert, even in the pre-war years, never approved of changing the British policy towards the Ottoman Empire and disliked the idea of warring with the Turks. Therefore, it is not surprising that his reference to Byron's poem highlights his belief that God's carnage was brought to Gallipoli by the British. However, the Turkish soldier talking to Herbert still blamed politics generally, not a particular nation or side, for causing all the horrors that they had gone through. This way, Herbert tries to illustrate that peace does not mean the absence of the war, which was what he strove for on behalf of the Turks and the British during the whole campaign, and he highlights to his readers that the Turkish soldiers were also in search of peace even in battle just like him, protesting against the hatred imposed by politics as they considered the violence caused by politicians as morally wrong.

Herbert's record of his encounters with the Turks is interesting as it contradicts the Turkish literary themes of the Gallipoli campaign written mostly by Ottoman intellectuals who sought to establish a national Gallipoli legacy. Whilst in Herbert's descriptions the Turks also saw the enemy as equals, fraternizing with the Allied soldiers in search for peace, in Turkish literature there is no chance of compromise with the enemy as the Turks are represented to be full of righteous hatred of them. Turkish intellectuals adopted a communal nationalist approach in illustrating this Turkish hatred, whereas in Herbert's descriptions soldiers individually demonstrated fellowship. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Turkish literature on the Gallipoli campaign, describing the enemy as evil and the Turks as innocent, has been used to further a nationalist cause in Turkey rather than individual soldiers' accounts of the campaign, since accounts by soldiers such as Ibrahim Naci's *Allah'a ismarladık* (2013) have only recently started to be published in modern Turkish. However, considering both Turkish literature and Herbert's perspective, one cannot help but ask: if most of the Turkish literature of Gallipoli had been written by the Turkish soldiers rather than civilians, would the Turkish interpretation of Gallipoli be as nationalist as it now is?

Herbert not only talked to Turks during the temporary cease-fire, but also communicated with Turkish troops as part of British propaganda activities. As soon as World War I started, all belligerent countries prepared propaganda campaigns and the British soon recognised the importance of propaganda in foreign countries targeting neutral and enemy populations as a response to anti-British activities in such countries.<sup>244</sup> During the Gallipoli campaign, these campaigns were pursued in various ways, such as in brochures, leaflets, cartoons and announcements, to break the strength of the Ottoman soldiers at the front by trying to dissuade them from fighting against the British or to drive a wedge between Ottomans and Germans.<sup>245</sup> Herbert's

---

<sup>244</sup> Philip M. Taylor, 'The Foreign Office and British Propaganda during the First World War', *The Historical Journal*, 23.4 (1980), 875-898 (p.876); Paddock, p.16.

<sup>245</sup> Servet Aşar, 'Çanakkale Savaşlarında İstihbarat ve Propaganda', *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yılığ*, 1 (2003), 64-102 (pp.74-78).

role at Gallipoli came into play during these activities as he was the only interpreter fluent in Turkish among the British at Gallipoli. During the campaign, since the Turkish and British trenches were so close to each other, Herbert could speak to Turks across the trenches asking them to surrender. His approach to his propagandist mission was based on his language and literary skills. He chose traditional terms and words with religious connotations and proverbs while communicating with them, which helped to show the Turks that he was not their enemy since the war was 'a German business', as he told the Turks during his propagandist speech.<sup>246</sup> He referred to the British as old friends of the Turks, pronouncing that 'eski dost düşman olmaz' (an old Turkish proverb meaning an old friend cannot be the enemy) and ended his speech with a farewell in Turkish: 'Allaha ismarladuk' (a Turkish saying used to express farewell meaning 'entrusted to Allah').<sup>247</sup> Even though his duty was to weaken the Turkish defence by convincing them to surrender, Herbert was sincere in what he said to the Turks. His knowledge of the Turkish language and culture, combined with his friendly attitude, must have brought him the trust of the Turks; even to the extent that surprisingly, some Turkish soldiers, on a few occasions went to Herbert to take orders from him.<sup>248</sup>

#### **A. P. Herbert and Humanism**

A sense of sympathy with the Turks can also be found in A. P. Herbert's poems, although they are very different compared to Aubrey Herbert's Balkan Wars poem in terms of both the defensive attitude towards Turks and in their style of writing. The hostile representations of Turks in British popular culture must be the reason why A. P. Herbert finds it strange in his poem 'Twitting the Turk I' when his speaker actually has the chance to confront the Turks on the Gallipoli Front, to see what Turks are really like. In the first paragraph, Herbert describes the Turk and shows a transformation in British soldiers' impressions of their Turkish counterparts: 'We [the British soldiers] find

---

<sup>246</sup> Herbert, p.72.

<sup>247</sup> Ibid.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid.

him [the Turk] strangely reconciled.<sup>249</sup> The following lines convey the sense of appreciation in Herbert's poem, which is felt through the description of the enemy's character:

The Turk, he is an honest man,  
And fights us fair and true,  
But we annoy him all we can  
As we are paid to do [...]<sup>250</sup>

Herbert uses a popular form of doggerel poetry or comic verse as one would find in any popular newspaper of the period, and George Robb observes that a large number of World War I poems were 'patriotic doggerel.'<sup>251</sup> This form of poetry is usually considered by critics to have little literary value as its intentions are primarily humorous. However, Herbert states in his autobiography, that unlike what he felt for some of his early poetry, he was not 'ashamed of' his *Half Hours at Helles*, some of which he wrote on the Gallipoli Peninsula at a young age.<sup>252</sup> This is because, even though Herbert was not a latent Wilfred Owen, his Gallipoli poems were heartfelt, and subverted their doggerel form for his own ends. He makes a virtue of simple metre and often deliberately laboured rhymes to achieve witty and entertaining poetry despite its technical faults. While the doggerel form was most widely used, both deliberately and unintentionally, in patriotic poems during the period to justify the war, Herbert's poems denounce some aspects of war, criticizing common beliefs and revealing popular delusions. In other words, using the doggerel form, Herbert signifies the opposite of patriotism for humorous and emphatic effect in his Gallipoli poems, achieving an ironic effect through the very form of his poetry. This can be seen in Herbert's verse cited above, in that although British policy and popular culture identified the enemy as Turks rather than Ottomans, the 'barbaric' qualities inflicted upon the Turkish enemy by patriotic British newspaper verse and cartoons seem to have faded away in the poem,

---

<sup>249</sup> Alan Patrick Herbert, *Half Hours at Helles* (Oxford: B.H. Blackwell, 1916), p.3.

<sup>250</sup> Ibid.

<sup>251</sup> George Robb, *British Culture and the First World War*, (London: Pelgrave, 2015), p.170.

<sup>252</sup> A. P. Herbert, *A.P.H. His Life and Times*, p.48.



and rather have turned into a form of sympathy. It seems that, as the Gallipoli Campaign showed its true face with all of its horrors, the trust in politicians, uncritical patriotism, naïve romanticism and piety diminished and in many cases vanished, and Herbert, like many other front-line soldiers, started sympathizing with the enemy and seeing them as peers since the Turkish soldiers seemed no different from the British in the hellish frontline trenches.

However, A. P. Herbert seems to make a distinction between Turkish and British reasons for fighting and appreciates how and why the Turkish soldiers fight, 'fair' and 'true', whilst British soldiers fight as they 'are paid to do'. The British soldiers sent to Gallipoli were voluntary soldiers since Britain did not have conscription until 1916. They were paid soldiers who enlisted due to a widespread collective sense of patriotism and duty to King and Empire. However, for Herbert, the reasons why British soldiers fought at Gallipoli, which he reduces to the pay and benefits offered by the British military, seem not to be legitimate reasons to go to war. Indeed, British soldiers often asked themselves why they were going to war, looking for a reason to justify all the horror and killing. On the Western Front, events such as the invasion of Belgium and atrocities committed by the German army gave more motivation to most British soldiers to fight Germany, whereas in Gallipoli, with regard to the Ottoman Empire, the case for war was less clear-cut. In contrast, the reason to fight was very obvious to the Turks as they were fighting for a specific cause, to defend their homeland, their wives, mothers and children, which in Herbert's eyes made the Turk 'honest', fighting their enemy 'fair' and 'true'. This view chimes with the adjectives used to describe the Turkish soldiers. Herbert frequently chooses positive adjectives to describe the Turks, whereas he uses none to describe the British, which seems to be deliberate in supporting this view and in emphasising that the Turks' fight was a matter of life and death, whereas the British cause was weaker by comparison, which seems to contradict Herbert's former belief in the 'just cause' that made him enlist.

In 'On Standing to', A. P. Herbert imagines that, in the trenches, the Turk 'too is standing by' just like them, and 'sometimes swears and sometimes winks an eye' as they do, but '[w]ith wistful visionings of Stamboul taverns' rather than their own public houses back at home.<sup>253</sup> The poem's speaker empathizes with the Turkish enemy and shares with them the same discomfort:

For he like us is painfully aware  
That neither host is like to leave his lair  
Yet all stand vigilant and full of care  
And no one quite knows why.<sup>254</sup>

In his collection of Gallipoli poems, *Half Hours at Helles*, Herbert shows a great understanding of how Turks felt about the war. In his poem, 'Twitting the Turk II', Herbert gives a version of how he imagines the Turks think and somehow manages to voice actual sentiments expressed on the Turkish side:

For it was clear the Christian cur  
Intended something sinister,  
And Pashas hastened to confer  
On that hypothesis;  
Stout souls, they felt prepared to cope  
With stratagems within their scope,  
But, Allah, what was this?<sup>255</sup>

Herbert tells the story from the Turkish perspective with a mixture of sympathy and friendly mockery and shows how the Turkish nation-building process is perceived from the outside. The language he chooses to describe the Allied soldiers, such as 'the Christian cur,' 'sinister,' and 'stratagems', seems similar to words that Turkish poets would use to describe them in their poems, as the next chapter illustrates in the discussion of the Ottoman writings which outline 'Christian and British deceitfulness'. Herbert acknowledges the bravery and stoutness of the Turks in the sense of moral solidity, but also manages to make them look a little puzzled and the British clever by

---

<sup>253</sup> A. P. Herbert, *Half Hours at Helles*, p.9

<sup>254</sup> Ibid.

<sup>255</sup> Ibid p.6.

comparison. Thinking of the Turkish enemy as a person who can be confused humanises the Turks and makes them recognisable to the British soldiers.

While his soldier protagonists may be intrigued or bewildered by the Turkish enemy, A. P. Herbert himself does not seem to be ignorant of Islamic culture. Interestingly, in his Gallipoli poems, he describes the enemy in two separate and distinct forms, either as Turks or as Muslims. Whenever he describes them as Turks, he ennobles their character or shows a positive attitude, but whenever he brings forward their religious identity as Muslims, he uses satire. In several instances, Herbert gives voice to the prophet of Islam, Muhammad ('Mahomet') in his poems; for example, in his poem 'Some Reflections on the Evacuation': '[o]nce more sits Mahomet by Helles' manges' indifferent to what is happening on the British side as he '[n]or snipes from scrubberies at British targets' and '[n]or views them wallowing in sacred seas' but only 'cleans his side arms.'<sup>256</sup> When he wakes up from his sleep that morning, he becomes aware '[t]hat in his slumbers he had fought a battle' which was '[a] bloody battle' in which 'a little bird' who '[p]iped (in German) at his side' tells him that the 'infidels [the Allied Powers] have been and fled.'<sup>257</sup> Mahomet is described in the poem as being engaged in soldierly activities such as 'clean[ing] his side arms.' This might suggest that Mahomet has some sympathy with the common soldiers on both sides, but does not care for the greater political goals of serving governments and army high commands. At the same time, Herbert's use of satire in this poem suggests that he is responding to M. Akif's 'war of religion' concept, which relates to the fact that the Ottoman Empire had issued five fatwas declaring jihad since the outbreak of World War I. These fatwas meant that the Muslims fighting with the Christian Entente against the Ottoman caliphate would be considered as infidels.<sup>258</sup> The satire in the last two lines lies in the bird referring to the enemy as 'infidels' in the German language. While the prophet

---

<sup>256</sup> Ibid p.40.

<sup>257</sup> Ibid.

<sup>258</sup> Dr. Hamit Pehlivanlı, 'Çanakkale Muharebeleri Sırasında Müttefiklerin Propagandası ve Karşı Propaganda', *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 7.21 (1991), 535-552 (p.538).

'Mahomet' represents the Islamic enemy, the bird represents its ally Germany. The German ally, who is of course Christian, refers to the enemy who evacuates Gallipoli as 'infidels' as if he was not an infidel himself in the eyes of the Muslim Turks. Herbert, here, seems to draw attention to the hypocrisy inherent in the alliance of the Muslim Turks with Christian Germans against the Allied Powers, themselves allied with Indian Muslims, and Herbert mocks the idea of jihad which, to Muslims, the Gallipoli Campaign was thought to be a part.

### **Ernest Raymond and Geoffrey Dearmer: Crusading narratives**

In Raymond's romantic novel *Tell England*, Rupert Ray, the narrator and protagonist who is a young soldier who heroically fought at Gallipoli, also empathises with the Turks for their cause of defending their homeland. Despite his ideas being influenced by the pastor Padre Monty, who justifies the war and portrays the enemy as wicked, Ray still can manage to understand the Turks and compares them favourably with the English: 'the Turks hung to the extremities of their territory with the same tenacity that we should show in defending Kent or Cornwall.'<sup>259</sup> Ray recognises that, if any English county were invaded, the English soldiers would be fighting for their homeland with the same perseverance. However, as the novel progresses, Ray's perception of the enemy is increasingly dominated by the ideas of Padre Monty. The epilogue of the novel gives a religious and spiritual message, which is further examined in detail later in this chapter.

In Raymond's novel, we come across the Christian equivalent of the aforementioned Islamic idea of 'jihad'. If there is any critic whose words best describe the plot of Raymond's novel, it would be Philip Jenkins, who suggests that World War I was 'a thoroughly religious event.'<sup>260</sup> According to Jenkins, many Christian nations who fought in World War I viewed it 'as a holy war, a spiritual conflict' and did not hesitate to

---

<sup>259</sup> Raymond p.271.

<sup>260</sup> Philip Jenkins, *The Great and Holy War: How World War I Changed Religion For Ever* (Oxford: Lion Books, 2014), p.4.

use 'fundamental tenets of the faith as warrants to justify war and mass destruction'.<sup>261</sup> Many Christian leaders in Britain and the Commonwealth contributed to this, as they enthusiastically embraced the war as a righteous crusade, sanctified the war effort, and demonised the enemy in fiery wartime sermons.<sup>262</sup> That is also how Raymond depicted World War I in a religious context in his novel; which is perhaps not surprising considering that he served as a priest on six fronts in the First World War. Raymond's novel, as an embodiment of Jenkin's assertions, is a story of two young soldiers, Ray and Doe, and a clergyman of the Church of England, Padre Monty, who serve at Gallipoli. Padre Monty has a strong influence on both young men in terms of his ideas on religious redemption and the idea that God creates good out of evil and that there is beauty in everything, even in war.

On the voyage to Gallipoli, the soldiers are given a speech by the Colonel who claims that 'the Gallipoli campaign is a New Crusade.'<sup>263</sup> He speaks of the Dardanelles being 'the Hellespont of the Ancient world' and the stories of 'Troy; and of St. John the Divine at Patmos gazing up into the Heavenly Jerusalem.'<sup>264</sup> He goes on in his speech to say that:

you're Christians before you're  
Moslems, and your hands should fly to  
your swords when I say the Gallipoli  
campaign is a New Crusade. You're  
going out to force a passage through the  
Dardanelles to Constantinople. And  
Constantinople is a sacred city. It's the  
only ancient city purely Christian in its  
origin, having been built by the first  
Christian Emperor in honour of the  
Blessed Virgin. Which brings us to the  
noblest idea of all. In their fight to wrest  
this city from the Turk, the three great  
divisions of the Church are united once  
more. [...] Thus Christendom United  
fights for Constantinople, under the  
leadership of the British, whose flag is

---

<sup>261</sup> Ibid.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid.

<sup>263</sup> Ernest Raymond, *Tell England* (London: Cassell, 1922), p.189.

<sup>264</sup> Ibid.

made up of the crosses of the saints.  
The army opposing the Christians fights  
under the crescent of Islam.<sup>265</sup>

In his view, the British soldiers are going to Gallipoli to take back the 'sacred city', Constantinople, which he claims is 'the only ancient city purely Christian in its origin'.<sup>266</sup> He says that even though not all the British soldiers are necessarily over-religious, they are 'Christians before [they are] Moslems'. By emphasising that '[t]he army opposing the Christians fights under the crescent of Islam' the Colonel seeks to emphasise why it is their Christian duty to fight against the Ottoman Muslims at Gallipoli to take the 'sacred city' back from the Turks, which was built by the Roman Emperor Constantine and, according to the Colonel's religiously motivated logic, therefore belongs to Christians by right. After he sanctifies the war effort for the British soldiers, he moves on to a more secular reason:

For 500 years the Turk, by occupying Constantinople, has blocked the old Royal Road to India and the East. He is astride the very centre of the highways that should link up the continents. He oppresses and destroys the Arab world, which should be the natural junction of the great trunk railways that, tomorrow, shall join Asia, Africa, and Europe in one splendid spider's web. You are going to move the block from the line, and to join the hands of the continents. Understand, and be enthusiastic. I tell you, this joining of the continents is an unborn babe of history that leapt in the womb the moment the British battleships appeared off Cape Helles.<sup>267</sup>

Jenkins suggests that one reason that led to the sanctification of the war effort was the intertwined relationship of Church and State.<sup>268</sup> The Colonel, for example, exemplifies this as he explains the justice of the cause of Gallipoli by not only using

---

<sup>265</sup> Ibid.

<sup>266</sup> Ibid.

<sup>267</sup> Ibid p.188.

<sup>268</sup> Jenkins, p.7.

arguments based on the Christian faith, but also by ennobling England's imperial interests with regard to Middle Eastern territory. He speaks of British imperial ambitions and claims that the Turks were an obstacle to bringing those ambitions about due to the geopolitical position of the Ottoman Empire being the bridge that links Europe to Asia, standing between Britain and the Middle East where the British imperial interests lie. Just like the Turkish representations of the British, he demonises the enemy, portraying the Turks as brutal and aggressive as, in his belief, they constrain and 'destroy the Arab world'. For this reason, according to him, the British soldiers should 'move the block from the line, and [...] join the hands of the continents.'<sup>269</sup> As discussed in the next chapters, similar to the Ottoman-Turkish claim (particularly in Gökâlp's poem 'Çanakkale') that the Ottoman victory at Gallipoli has a wider significance for the freeing of colonised nations elsewhere in the world, the Colonel argues for a wider significance of the British campaign that is not driven by self-interest, but benefits humanity at large. Both sides thus claim wider benefits of their war efforts in an attempt to ennoble their cause. Interestingly, this belief contrasts with the Turkish defensive idea of homeland as, for the Colonel, the invaders are not the British troops that land on the Gallipoli shores, but the Turks themselves as they had been 'occupying Constantinople' for '500 years'.<sup>270</sup>

The idea that '[t]he army opposing the Christians fights under the crescent of Islam' also appears in Aubrey Herbert's diary when the soldiers use religious differences to provoke the other side. As if the soldiers described in Herbert's diary were inspired by the words of Raymond's character the Colonel, 'many' of them wished to destroy the minaret of the village's Mosque during the shelling of a village in Anafarta.<sup>271</sup> Herbert, however, does not agree with those soldiers, empathising with the Muslim Turks as he says: 'I can see no difference in principle between this and the

---

<sup>269</sup> Ibid.

<sup>270</sup> Ibid.

<sup>271</sup> Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut*, p.83.

destruction of Rheims Cathedral.<sup>272</sup> However, it seems that the war was not only a 'Crusade', as some Christians perceived it, it was also a jihad according to some Muslims. This is evident in Herbert's diary entry describing a battle when Turks raise crosses from their trenches to mock the British and Australian soldiers making them shoot at the symbol of their religion.<sup>273</sup>

The Colonel's declaration that the Gallipoli Campaign was a Crusade is very similar to the assertion of Ersoy's concerning the war of religions, which is explored in more detail in the next chapter. Both ignore the fact that on both sides there were Christians as well as Muslims. However, the Colonel's omission of the fact that Germans were Christians can be linked to how the traditional Anglican theologians perceived German theology at that time. Stuart Bell has noted that the liberal Protestantism of German theology, 'which had wholeheartedly embraced critical Biblical scholarship and the scientific and archaeological discoveries of the previous century', was seen as a 'threat to the Faith.'<sup>274</sup> Frank Weston, for instance, wrote in 1918 that 'German theology had got rid of Christ', which in his view made Germany 'the most complete and thorough expression of the sins of all Europe.'<sup>275</sup> Germany's status as Britain's enemy during World War I must have helped the British perception of Germany representing the anti-Christ and, in the novel, the character Padre Monty is a traditional churchman who shares a similar view to the Colonel's view of crusade, which is discussed further below.

Throughout the novel, the enemy is defined within the framework of religious sanctification and redemption, and reshaped in the novel's epilogue (written by Padre Monty) as a triumph of Christianity against Turkish Muslims. According to the Colonel,

---

<sup>272</sup> Ibid.

<sup>273</sup> Ibid, p.110.

<sup>274</sup> Stuart Bell, 'The Church and the First World War', in *God and War: The Church of England and Armed Conflict in the Twentieth Century*, ed. by Stephen G. Parker and Tom Lawson (Surrey: Ashgate, 2012) pp. 33-59, p.40.

<sup>275</sup> Frank Weston, *Conquering and to Conquer* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918), pp.16-17.



during the Gallipoli campaign, the Turk was an obstacle to the English and Christian siege of Istanbul. However, at the end of World War I, Monty says that 'the Turk was a fool to let [the Allied soldiers] go' in the evacuation of Gallipoli because 'a nobler crusade than [...] the Dardanelles campaign had been fought and won by the army which entered Jerusalem' and 'the men who won these victories were in great part the men who escaped from Suvla and Helles.'<sup>276</sup> According to Monty, the Turk was a 'fool' because he did not understand God's plan which brings good out of evil since, in his view, all the suffering and death at Gallipoli has spiritually and religiously enabled a Christian victory on other war fronts as 'the game losers of Gallipoli had avenged themselves at Bagdad, Jerusalem, and Aleppo'.<sup>277</sup>

During World War I, many Christian priests supported the popular view that good could come from the evil of war, but Jenkins suggests that the war 'destroyed one religious world and created another.'<sup>278</sup> A. P. Herbert's satirical language about Islam derives also from the recognition that God has nothing to do with the war, a secular view which was pitched against the popular belief of the clergymen. Herbert puts his doubts into poetic terms by adopting, to a certain extent, the perspective of Islam. For instance, he seems to disagree with the Muslim Turks who blindly believed that Allah was on their side:

And, when at last the Turk comes  
 creeping through,  
 As some old golfer, once considered  
 warm,  
 Is deadliest yet where thick the hazards  
 swarm,  
 They in a flash may find their ancient  
 form  
 But Allah help the Faithful if they do!<sup>279</sup>

---

<sup>276</sup> Raymond p.326.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid.

<sup>278</sup> Jenkins p.377.

<sup>279</sup> A. P. Herbert, *Half Hours at Helles*, p.30

In the poem, 'Mahomet' as an embodiment of the Muslim enemy, observes the Gallipoli battlefield after the evacuation and sees '[h]ow Allah here was gracious to his legions' while '[h]ow here, again, he was not quite so good.'<sup>280</sup> At the times that Allah was not so 'gracious' with the Muslims, A. P. Herbert saw what happened on the battlefield: '[a]nd they – I whisper it – they turned and ran' showing that Allah was not always on their side.<sup>281</sup> Herbert's satire shows that both sides had very heavy losses which neither God nor Allah did anything to protect them from, and the poem thus condemns the idea that religion justifies the war. However, this does not mean that Herbert necessarily had doubts about either Christian or Islamic religion generally. The established view on religion during World War I in academic circles, supported by critics such as E.R. Wickham, suggests that religion was an irrelevance to the soldier during World War I, which led to the secularisation of British society and increased religious scepticism.<sup>282</sup> However, soldier poets such as Herbert frequently dealt with religious concepts in their poems and reflected on their own interpretation of religion rather than illustrating a religious scepticism leading to a complete denial. Michael Snape has more recently indicated that religion was in fact an important element of British national identity and thus significant for the morale of the British soldier.<sup>283</sup>

One of the soldier poets that fits into Snape's description is Geoffrey Dearmer, whose poems are full of optimism due to his strong religious faith, though not in a traditional Christian understanding but with a new perception of religion parallel to what Jenkins suggestion about the new perceptions in religion that World War I brought about. A comparison of Turkish and British poetry shows that Muslim Turks (or at least those who were in a position to write poetry) saw the war as an Islamic duty throughout the Gallipoli campaign, whereas some Christian British soldiers, such as Dearmer, discovered as the battle continued that there was nothing holy in war and respected

---

<sup>280</sup> Ibid p.41.

<sup>281</sup> Ibid.

<sup>282</sup> E.R. Wickham, *Church and People in an Industrial City* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957), p.206.

<sup>283</sup> Snape, p.17.

their enemy as equals rather than seeing it as their religious duty to kill. In his poem 'Dead Turk', Geoffrey Dearmer describes a dead Turkish soldier in Biblical terms, showing that Christian faith could actually also serve to oppose the war. The dead Turkish soldier seems to be 'carved from the earth, in beauty without stain' while the 'cry of stark amaze' of '[a] still Centurion with eyes ablaze' resounds in 'Calvary.'<sup>284</sup> Dearmer's description reminds the reader of the Roman Centurion who is quoted in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke as he witnesses the death of Jesus and identifies him as 'the Son of God' (Mark 15, 39). Dearmer juxtaposes the death of Jesus with the death of one of the Turkish soldiers 'so that the latter is seen in the light of the former.'<sup>285</sup> The dead enemy also becomes a son of God, reaching the holy status of a martyr, no different from his Christian peers. This shows that Dearmer protests against the idea that a 'Christian's death is seen as a triumphant victory', keeping his religious faith and using crucifixion to emphasise that hope could live after death on both sides of the Christian-Muslim divide.<sup>286</sup>

### **W. F. Rollo and Imperial Propaganda**

Dearmer, Aubrey Herbert and his namesake A. P. Herbert seek to convey a sense of sympathy for the Turkish enemy, albeit derived from different motivations, while Raymond's fictional Colonel firmly supports the British war effort by casting the Turkish enemy as non-believers as well as an obstacle to imperial expansion. W. F. Rollo, too, illustrates a sense of an imperial view of war in his Gallipoli poems, rather than offering a personal, sympathetic view of the enemy. In fact, he barely speaks of the enemy, but refers to them indirectly, either giving a national identity to a landscape, or referring to them in general terms as the 'foe'. The cultural, national and religious differences between British and Turkish soldiers did not seem to mean much to him. In his poem,

---

<sup>284</sup> Geoffrey Dearmer, *Poems* (New York: Robert M. McBride, 1918), p.18.

<sup>285</sup> Harries, p.190.

<sup>286</sup> Ibid p.193.

'The Capture of the Boomerang Redoubt', for instance, he vaguely refers to the Turkish enemy whose weapons must be stopped:

No chance the Turkish rifle fire  
To stay their swift career  
[...]  
Or quell their frenzied cheer.<sup>287</sup>

There is no understanding of the characteristics of the Ottoman army, no deeper sense of the enemy's identity. The enemy is just there to be overcome and destroyed. Unlike the other writers discussed, Rollo was a lance corporal, the lowest rank of non-commissioned officer. Rollo's duty was to follow orders and ensure the completion of missions, and this is reflected in his poems with a sense of indifference to the carnage suffered by the enemy. His poems give a sense to the reader that he was merely mechanically following the order to write war poems. There is a sense of duty evident in those of his poems which were written from the perspective of machine guns. In his poem, 'The Field Gun's song' for instance, the gun is fulfilling its duty by killing the enemy:

I see them falling, I see them die  
But what care I  
For all their slain  
I shake with laughter grim, and cry.<sup>288</sup>

Speaking from the perspective of an anthropomorphised piece of weaponry prompts the reader to think of the parallel between the machine and the man who operates it. The machine gun shakes with physical reverberations and its 'grim laughter' and 'cry' refer to the rattle of bullets speeding through the air. The adjective 'grim' and verb 'cry' imply that neither the machine gun nor man operating it are as indifferent as they ought to be, but the machine gun 'see[s] them falling' and 'die', which indicates that, just like the machine gun, it is a soldier's duty to complete the mission of killing in battle. This is also felt in his poem 'The Naval Bombardment, Preceding the Landing', in which the

---

<sup>287</sup> W. F. Rollo, *Stray Shots from the Dardanelles* (Carlisle: Chas Thurnam & Sons, 1916), p.27.

<sup>288</sup> Ibid.



As can be seen, Dearmer, Herbert and his namesake A. P. Herbert seek to convey a sense of sympathy for and humanity of the Turkish enemy in their Gallipoli writings and thus challenge the British propaganda of World War I. Dearmer interprets Christianity in humanistic terms and uses religion to illustrate that the Ottoman-Turkish enemies are as human and have lives as valuable as those of their Christian peers. Similarly, due to his close-relationships with the Turks in the Ottoman Empire in his past, Herbert sympathises and understands the Turkish perspective on the Gallipoli campaign, which he tries to convey to Allied soldiers as well as his peers to provide at least momentary peace in the trenches at Gallipoli. A. P. Herbert, on the other hand, uses humour and satire to both sympathise with and criticise the Ottoman-Turkish enemy.

Considering the efforts of the British Propaganda Bureau to vilify the enemy leading up to and during World War I and the negative portrayals of Turks in the British press outlined earlier in this chapter, Rollo's and Raymond's Gallipoli writings fit into the bigger picture of World War I propaganda in Britain. On both sides of the propaganda divide, religious differences between the British and the Turks play an important role in perceptions of the enemy. Raymond views the Turkish enemy as non-Christians and therefore justifies the war for Christians. Raymond's view in this sense is similar to the Turkish writings on Gallipoli, since they define the war as a war of religions and justify the war for Muslims. Although in Turkish works there is no specific mention of Christians – perhaps because Islam accepts Christianity – or non-believers, Turkish texts do mention Western oppression of Muslims and thus indirectly establish a sense of Muslim victimisation and hatred against the non-Muslim West. In this sense, Raymond echoes British wartime propaganda by describing the Turks as Muslim oppressors who invaded Christian lands five hundred years ago and who blocked the British way to Asia and Africa. As Turkish authors accused the West of colonialist motives behind the Gallipoli invasion without considering Ottoman colonial control over

minorities, Raymond accuses the Turks of invading Christian Byzantine lands without considering the moral implications of British colonialism or their invasion of Ottoman lands. W.F. Rollo also fulfils the needs of British propaganda, not in Raymond's sense of the vilification of the enemy, but in the sense of believing in the enemy's lack of humanity and blindly obeying orders. However, whilst many British writings on Gallipoli contain ideas that both challenge and justify the war, showing sympathy for and vilification of the enemy, Turkish ones for the most part illustrate no sense of sympathy for the enemy or any account of challenging the war, as the next chapter shows.

## **OTTOMAN-TURKISH PERCEPTIONS OF THE ENEMY**

During World War I, going to war gained a defensive meaning for Turks not only due to the threatened annexation of the Turkish homeland by the Allied Powers, but also the possible dissolution of the Ottoman Empire based on its internal struggles. This chapter examines how this defensive meaning of war shapes descriptions of the enemy in Turkish literary works on the Gallipoli campaign, including poems, novels and diaries of the selected writers, and looks at how the Ottoman authors describe the enemy informed by a variety of cultural, literary, political and religious concerns linked to the context of Turkish nation-building. It should be taken into consideration that Turkish literary works of the Gallipoli campaign are mainly written by civilian intellectuals who, unlike the British authors discussed in this thesis, did not experience the harsh realities of the front line. This may explain why Turkish works dealing with the Gallipoli campaign tend to describe this period from a collective perspective rather than an individual one as in the British works, as Turkish literary portrayals are not based on individual experiences. Being based away from the front, the Ottoman intellectuals were less preoccupied with individual experiences, losses and bereavement, and hence are able to focus on the bigger national picture. This also links to the point about the propagandist dimension of the writing of Ottoman intellectuals such as Mehmet Akif Ersoy and Ziya Gökalp, since their wartime writing was not just about the actual experience of the war but about nationhood and identity, whereas British writers are less likely to be interested in those concerns because their nationhood and identity are more secure. Hence, the British writers can focus on individual experience.

### **Ziya Gökalp: A Turanist Perspective on Gallipoli**

As the historical context provided in the introduction to this thesis shows, the Gallipoli campaign happened at a crucial moment in the early Turkish nation-building process. This chapter shows how the competing ideologies of this period informed Ottoman-Turkish writers' accounts of Gallipoli and their portrayal of the enemy. Gökalp, known



as ‘the father of Turkish nationalism’, was one of the Ottoman intellectuals who helped to lay the foundations of Turkish nationalism. The defeats in the Balkan Wars proved to Gökalp that the survival of the Ottoman Empire was dependent on a new unifying element which, according to him, was Turkish nationalism, since Islam alone was insufficient to save the Empire. In his book *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (1918), he argued that ‘wherever the spirit of nation existed, there emerged great development and progress in the ‘political, religious, moral, juristic, scientific, economical and linguistic areas’.<sup>291</sup> During World War I, Gökalp’s nationalism aimed to build a much greater state which would unify the whole of the Turkic people under one rule; however, with the start of the War of Turkish Independence (1919-1923), his ideas on nationalism evolved to become more secular and local. In his poem ‘Turan’ (Pan-Turkist country) (1911), he defines Turan as the homeland of all Turks, which later became the motto of Turanism:

Vatan ne, ne Türkiye’dir Türklere  
Türkistan;  
Vatan büyük ve müebbet bir ülkedir:  
Turan.<sup>292</sup>

(The homeland is neither Turkey to  
Turks, nor Turkistan;  
The homeland is a grand and eternal  
country: Turan.)

Ottoman Turkists described Turan in various ways, some perceiving it in ethnic terms whilst others defined it as an Islamic unity. However, as can be seen from the poem, Gökalp’s Turan, the Turkish homeland, was an entity greater than would be defined in purely ethnic or religious terms. According to Gökalp, Turkish unity did not

---

<sup>291</sup> Original Text: ‘Tarih genel bir kural olarak gösteriyor ki her nereye milliyet ruhu girdiyse orada büyük bir gelişme ve ilerleme akımı doğdu. Siyasi, dini, ahlaki, hukuki, bilimsel, ekonomik, lisani hayatların hepsine gençlik, samimilik ve tazelik geldi. Fakat bütün terakkilerin fevkinde olarak yeni bir özelliğin ortaya çıktığını da yine bize mukayeseli tarih haber veriyor: milli vicdan nerede ortaya çıkmışsa, artık orası sömürge olma tehlikesinden ebediyen kurtulmuştur.’ Ziya Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2006), p.100.

<sup>292</sup> Tansel, *Ziya Gökalp Külliyyatı-1, Şiirler ve Halk Masalları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1989), p.5. First published in: Ziya Gökalp, ‘Turan’, *Genç Kalem*, 1.6-14 (1911), 167 (p.167).

have to be 'absolutely political' but could also be 'cultural' and 'only the Turks who actively speak Turkish are included in Turan'.<sup>293</sup> Gökalp's Turan was a 'grand and eternal' world of the Turks united by 'the common language, religion and culture' in the geography of 'five regions which are Eastern Turkistan, Southern Turkistan, Central Turkistan, Western Turkistan and Northern Turkistan', holding not only ethnic and religious, but also a geographical and linguistic meaning.<sup>294</sup>

However, in his Gallipoli poem 'Çanakkale' ('Gallipoli'), his Turanism is applied to a particular situation – the Gallipoli campaign –which is described through two main formidable enemies:

Moskof dedi İngiliz'e:  
"Çanakkale aşılmalı;  
Kızıl, Kara, Akdeniz'e  
Hakimiz, anlaşılmalı..."

İngiliz, Fransalı'yı,  
Aldı beyaz kotrasına...  
Tutmuşum sandı yalıyı,  
Geldi Boğaz sefasına.<sup>295</sup>

(Moskof told the British:  
"Dardanelles should be crossed;  
Red, Black, Mediterranean Sea;  
Dominated by us, must be  
understood..."

English took the French  
To their white warship...  
Assuming that it seized the Mansion,  
Came to enjoy the Bosphorus)

Gökalp perceives the Gallipoli campaign within the framework of Russia's historical ambitions for the Ottoman Empire and British dominance over the seas. In the poem 'Moskof', or in other words Russia, he tells the British that the Dardanelles must be conquered so that Russia can dominate the warm seas, the 'Red, Black and

---

<sup>293</sup> Ziya Gökalp, *Kızıl Elma*, ed. by Hikmet Tanyu (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1976), p.167.

<sup>294</sup> Ibid p.5.

<sup>295</sup> Ziya Gökalp, 'Çanakkale', *Yeni Mecmua 5-18 Mart Çanakkale Nüsha-i Fevkalade* (Special Issue), (1918), pp.33-34, p.34.

Mediterranean Sea'. The British, on the other hand, are described as having ambitions over Istanbul. In the poem, the British are enjoying a moment of 'Bosporus pleasure', thinking that they have seized the 'Mansion', which is the name given to both shores of the Bosphorus where luxurious mansions were built during the Ottoman Empire and which were often associated with the Bosphorus itself. The poem defines Britain as having the most powerful navy during World War I. In the poem, the British take the French into their warship, implying that the British dominance over the seas was so great that even other nations such as France could benefit from it. This stress on the formidability of the enemy emphasises the prowess of the Turkish soldiers and the miraculous victory of the Turks in Gallipoli later in the poem.

However, strength did not equate with honour, according to Gökâlp, since he criticised the British in harsh terms:

Uzaklarda bir ada var,  
Halkına derler İngiliz,  
Hem medeni, hem canavar,  
Fendinden (hilelerinden) emin değiliz.<sup>296</sup>

(There is an island far away,  
Its people are called English,  
Both civilised and monster,  
We are not sure about their deceit.

The close relationship between preserving the existence of the Ottoman Empire through modernisation and Westernisation and the question of whether or not the West should be emulated led Ottoman intellectuals to re-define the concept of civilisation and to take a closer look at Western civilisation itself, as it was seen to be the only representative of modernity during the period. In this verse, Gökâlp describes the British to be 'both civilised and monster'.<sup>297</sup> The word 'civilised' illustrates Gökâlp's understanding of how advanced the British were in social, cultural and scientific matters. However, Gökâlp discredits the British perception of civilisation, believing that

---

<sup>296</sup> Ibid.

<sup>297</sup> Ibid.

the British turn into a 'monster' and abuse their superiority in science and technology when it comes to peoples who are not British, whether Ottomans or colonies under British rule, such as India and Egypt. The British are also referred to in the poem as 'deceit[ful]', which highlights a seeming paradox in Gökalp's eyes, since the British were considered to be the cradle of civilisation but, according to him, there is no civilised justification for invading the lands of others.

However, this is not to suggest that Gökalp protests against Western civilisation per se in his Gallipoli poem, since a complete break with Western civilisation would go against the essence of Turkist ideology, which aimed for the integration of Western civilisation, Turkish culture and Islamic morals. According to Gökalp, there was a distinction between civilised Europe and political Europe, or in other words, between European thinking and European behaviour. In his article 'Garp Meselesi I', he points out a mistake repeatedly committed by the Ottomans, which was 'to confuse European civilisation with European politics.'<sup>298</sup> In his view, European intellectuals, poets and philosophers were the best examples of 'the right, good and moral' and represented positive civilised values, whilst those 'ideological heroes' should not be likened to their 'politicians, diplomats and merchants'.<sup>299</sup> Accordingly, what Gökalp actually criticises in this poem is not European civilisation itself, but European politics that do not match 'the good' that Western civilisation represents. In this sense, as discussed below, Gökalp's perspective of Western civilisation dissents from Ersoy's Islamist perspective.

As can be seen above, Gökalp defines the British enemy as untrustworthy due to their imperialist international politics. This idea is also applicable to Russia in the poem.

---

<sup>298</sup> 'Avrupalılara karşı daima aldanmamızın başlıca sebebi, medeni Avrupa ile siyasi Avrupa'yı birbirine karıştırmamızdır. Avrupa'nın birçok yüksek zekalı alimleri, yüksek ruhlu şairleri, yüksek ükölü filozofları var... Bunlar bize 'dogru, iyi, güzel' ideallerinin en mükemmel örneklerini gösterirler. Bu yükselmiş insanlar, bize medeni Avrupa'yı gösterirler. Bizim başlıca hatamız, Avrupa'nın siyasilerini, diplomatları, tüccarlarını da bu fikir kahramanlarına benzetmemizdir.' Ziya Gökalp, 'Siyasi Garp Meselesi-1', in *Küçük Mecmua* –iii, trans.by Şahin Filiz (Antalya: Yeniden Anadolu ve Rumeli Müdafaa-i Hukuk Yayınları, 2009) pp.52-53, p.52; First Published in Ziya Gökalp, 'Siyasi Garp Meselesi-1', *4 Kanun-ı Evvel* 338, 25 (1922), pp.39-53.

<sup>299</sup> Ibid.

However, in this case Gökâlp's mistrust originates specifically with Turkish subjects of Russia, and his Turanist identity is brought out in the poem:

Doğrulukta Rus Kazağı,  
Onun yanında sofudur.  
Topu tutar dört bucağı  
Denizlerin Moskofu'dur.<sup>300</sup>

(In honesty the Russian Kazakh,  
Would be a Saint next to him [the  
British]  
Holding the cannon everywhere  
He is the 'Moskof' of the seas.)

As mentioned above, Turanist ideals included saving the Tsar's Turkish-speaking subjects from the yoke of Russia. World War I fostered this Turanist hope since it was believed that the war would lead Turkic peoples to rebel against Russia, gain their independence and join the Ottoman Turks for the realisation of the Turanist dream.<sup>301</sup> Even outside the scope of Turanism, on the Caucasus front, for instance, it was vainly hoped that the idea of fighting against the Ottoman Turks would incite an insurrection among Russia's Turkish-speaking subjects in Transcaucasus and Central Asia.<sup>302</sup> However, contrary to these expectations, no such insurrection occurred.

The Ottoman-Turkish disappointment about the Tsar's Turkish speaking subjects can be traced in the poem via Gökâlp's references specifically to Kazakhstan. In the poem, Gökâlp compares the British with Kazakhstan and says that the British were so deceitful that even 'Russian Kazakhs' could not surpass them in dishonesty. Kazakhs were Turkic people and fellow Muslims; during World War I, they were recruited by the Russians to fight against the Central Powers, which included the Ottoman Empire, as fellow Turks and fellow Muslims.<sup>303</sup> This meant that, in Turanist terms, Kazakhs failed to be true to their Turkish identity by obeying Russia, betraying not only the idea of

---

<sup>300</sup> Gökâlp, 'Çanakkale', p.34.

<sup>301</sup> Vehbi Vakkasoğlu, *Tarih Aynasında Ziya Gökâlp* (Istanbul: Cihan, 1984), p.97.

<sup>302</sup> Geoffrey Jukes, Peter Simkins, Michael Hickey, *The First World War: The Eastern Front, 1914-1918*, (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002), p.15.

<sup>303</sup> Emilio Cassese, 'Kazakhs during the Great War: The Case of an Uprising in Central Asia (1916)', in *The First World War: Analysis and Interpretation, Volume 2*, ed. by Antonello Biagini, Giovanna Motta (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), pp.67-73, p.69.

Turan, but also their Kazakh lineage and their kinsmen, the Turks. Furthermore, Gökâlp believed that communities that have a 'national conscience' would forever be free from 'the danger of being colonised' and that people who are deprived of the idea of nationality are selfish, self-seeking, hopeless and cowardly.<sup>304</sup> According to him, Turkish subjects of Russia, including Kazakhs, fell into this latter category since they did not hold on to their national identity and did not revolt against Russia, which would have granted them their independence. However, in reality, when Tsar Nicholas II declared the mobilisation of Central Asian men, including Kazakhs, in 1916, the Kazakhs started an uprising against Russia, which was eventually suppressed by the Russian army causing great suffering.<sup>305</sup>

The last two lines of the passage quoted above hint at the identity of another enemy as they define the British Empire as 'Moskof of the seas', which is a Turkish word meaning both 'Russians' and 'brutal'. Russia pursued a pan-Slavic policy, and was involved in the Balkan Wars and helping Balkan states such as Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Montenegro to fight against the Ottoman Empire and to end the Ottoman Empire's hegemony in the Balkans.<sup>306</sup> The poem suggests that whilst the British Empire threatens the Ottomans from the sea, Russia does on land. As the unity of all Turkic-Muslim peoples would be a threat to the pan-Slavic ambitions of Russia, its traditional ambitions to dominate the seas through the Ottoman Empire as well as its pursuit of pan-Slavic ambitions would be a threat to Gökâlp's Turanism.

According to the poem, the Russians and British not only have strategic ambitions over Gallipoli, but also intertwined tangible and intangible interests:

Budur en gizli emeli:  
Müslümanlar uyanmasın!  
Uçtan uca İslam ili  
Kendine arpalık kalsın..<sup>307</sup>

---

<sup>304</sup> Gökâlp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.44, p.100.

<sup>305</sup> Cassese, p.70.

<sup>306</sup> Richard C. Hall, *The Balkan Wars 1912-1913: Prelude to the First World War* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp.103-104.

<sup>307</sup> Gökâlp, 'Çanakkale', p.34.

(This is their most secret aspiration:  
Muslims shall not wake up!  
From end to end, the world of Islam  
Shall be their own barley field.)

Gökalp sees the Gallipoli campaign as a threat to Islam and reveals his view that the real purpose of the enemy in Gallipoli is to prevent Muslims from 'wak[ing] up' and claiming the Muslim world for their own benefit. He uses a Turkish idiom, 'their own barley field, which stems from the fact that horses would follow anywhere one goes as long as one gives them barley. So if 'the world of Islam', the Ottoman Empire, goes on sleeping, it will become the 'barley field' of the Europeans whom it will have to serve just like other colonies of the West. In this verse Gökalp illustrates his concerns over the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, as the industrial rivalry of the Western imperial countries reached Ottoman borders in the Gallipoli campaign. Gallipoli is thus defined as one of the first steps towards the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire among Western countries.

Gökalp's perception of the Gallipoli campaign as a war of religions is interesting considering that nationalism was often accused of being contrary to Islam itself during the period. However, Gökalp's conception of the war as a religious struggle is not founded in Gökalp's religious sentiments but in his political ideology. Gökalp believed that the weakness of the Ottoman Empire compared to the West was due not only to economic reasons, but also a lack of spiritual motivation. He believed that if nationalism were supported by a spiritual cause, the chances of military success for the Ottoman Empire would increase. In his view, this spiritual motivation was Islam, which was necessary to strengthen Turkish patriotism. While nationalism has the power to bring the nation together, Islam has the power to maintain its unity. In his book *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, he states that '[w]e do not wish to give our youth religious and national training, but what guides individuals to die for sacred purposes are merely

religious and nationalist sentiments'.<sup>308</sup> In his Gallipoli poem, by showing Islam to be victimised by the West, Gökarp seems to give the Ottomans a religious sentiment 'to die for'. As pointed out later in this chapter, unlike in Ersoy's case, Islam is not the primary objective behind Gökarp's definition of the Gallipoli campaign as a war of religions, but it is the means necessary for the survival of the empire. Portraying the enemy as anti-Islamic, Gökarp attributes a religious meaning to Gallipoli.

Another factor that Gökarp criticises was the colonialist policy of the enemy. Criticising the colonialist policy of the Allied Powers, Gökarp ascribes to the Gallipoli campaign international importance:

Çanakkale dört devlete,  
Galebeye sen çevirdin!  
Çar kölesi yüz millete,  
İstiklali sen getirdin!

Senden ötürü bilsen daha,  
Kurtulacak nice ülke...  
Ne Afrika, ne Asya'da,  
Kalmayacak müstemleke...<sup>309</sup>

(Gallipoli, four states,  
Are defeated by you!  
A Hundred Tsar-enslaved nations  
Are given liberty by you!

If you knew how many  
Countries will be saved because of  
you...  
Neither in Africa, nor in Asia,  
Will there be any more colonisation)

Gökarp considers the Gallipoli victory and the Allies' defeat to represent a potential liberation of the Allied Powers' colonies. As mentioned above, Gökarp harshly criticised colonised peoples for being lazy and for not holding on to their national sentiments to save themselves from Western imperialism. However, as these two verses reveal, Gökarp also sympathises with the colonies and considers them as fellows since in

---

<sup>308</sup> Original Text: 'Biz gençlerimize milli terbiye ve dini terbiye vermek istemedik, hâlbuki fertleri mukaddes gayeler için ölmeye sevk eden duygular din ve milliyet hislerinden ibarettir.' Gökarp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p. 40.

<sup>309</sup> Gökarp, 'Çanakkale', p.34.



Gallipoli, a similar story is experienced and Turkish liberty is threatened by the same Western European enemy. Shared religious and national fraternity also contributes to his sympathy. Gökâlp regards the colonies as slaves of the Europeans from whom their liberty was taken and who need to be saved from them. He refers to the Russian colonies as 'Slaves of the Tsar' and claims that liberty is given to them by the victory at Gallipoli. In his Gallipoli poem, Gökâlp claims that Turks held on to their Turkish nationality and, as a result, won the Gallipoli victory. Gökâlp relates this to the Islamic countries' resistance to nationalism, challenging the common perception that nationalists were necessarily against religion. However, in Gökâlp's view, it was time for Muslims to embrace nationalism since 'the idea of nationalism is a weapon to save peoples from captivity' and to ensure for the Muslims that 'as the idea of nationality grows stronger, the idea of Pan-Islamism will flourish, and it will support and strengthen the existing culture', contrary to what Islamists think.<sup>310</sup> According to Gökâlp, if fellow Muslims and Turks under the rule of the Allies realise that the Ottoman Muslim-Turks won the victory at Gallipoli by embracing both their national identity and their religion, then they might do the same, embrace their national identity and oppose the Western imperial powers to regain their liberty. As a result, 'neither in Africa nor in Asia', whether over Turkish or Muslim peoples, would Western colonisation endure. Gallipoli, to Gökâlp, sets an example for other colonies to become freed from their slavery, as nationalism is the only way to independence. In the poem, as the Ottoman-Turks realise the importance of nationalism, the Gallipoli campaign turns into a defeat for the Allied powers:

---

<sup>310</sup> 'Çünkü milliyet fikri mahkûm bir kavmin mahkûmiyetten kurtulması için kullanılan bir silahtır. Artık İslam hükümetlerinin idaresi altında Müslüman olmayan kavimler kalmadı. Hâlbuki bugün Müslüman kavimlerin çoğu mahkûmiyet ve esaret halindedir. İslam kavimler arasında ise hâkimiyet ve mahkûmiyet kayıtları olmadığı için milliyet fikri İslamlar arasında ayrılık çıkaramaz. Tersine milliyet fikri kuvvet buldukça İslâm ümmetçiliği fikri de o derece başaklanacağı için mevcut kültürü takviye edecek ve sağlamlaştıracaktır.' Ziya Gökâlp, *Türkleşmek, İslâmlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, pp. 99-103.

İngilizler korktu kaçtı,  
Rus ümidi kesti artık;  
Anarşistler bayrak açtı,  
Rus ilinde düştü Çarlık...

Çok geçmeden birdenbire,  
Parçalandı Rus ülkesi,  
Sevinçle düştü tekbire,  
Elli milyon Türk'ün sesi...<sup>311</sup>

(The British ran away with fear,  
Russia lost hope  
Anarchists erected their flag,  
In Russia, the Tsar fell from power...

Not long after, suddenly,  
The Russian country fell into pieces,  
50 million Turkish voices  
Echoed with Allahu akbar...)

In the poem, while the British flee from the Ottoman Empire following the victory at Gallipoli, Tsarist Russia falls from power, which creates great joy among the Muslim-Turks. As mentioned above, during World War I, Turanist hopes for the independence of Turkish-speaking subjects living under Russian rule increased. Although the defeat of the Empire on its Eastern front blunted this Turanist hope, the Bolshevik revolution in Russia exhumed it.<sup>312</sup> The poem in this sense prepares the ground for Ottoman propaganda to establish a Gallipoli legacy in Turkish history; in which the Gallipoli campaign is considered as a defining moment in Turkish national history since the campaign and the actions of the Turkish commander Mustafa Kemal, who became the founding father of the Turkish republic in 1923, have come to symbolise the birth of the modern Turkish identity.<sup>313</sup>

---

<sup>311</sup> Gökalp, 'Çanakkale', p.34.

<sup>312</sup> Uriel Heyd, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp* (London: Luzac & Company Ltd and The Harvill Press Ltd, 1950), p.128.

<sup>313</sup> Mehmet Akif Okur, 'The Meaning of Gallipoli in Turkish National Identity', in *The Gallipoli Campaign: The Turkish Perspective*, ed. by Metin Gürcan, Robert Johnson (Oxfordshire: Routledge Studies in First World War History, 2016), pp.173-180, pp.173-174.

## Mehmet Akif Ersoy: Islamist views of the Enemy

Ersoy was an Islamist who opposed the idea of modern nationalism since, in his view, nationalist ideas separated the identity of Turks from their religion. In one of his poems, Ersoy complains about a duality in the Ottoman Empire with; on the one hand, supporters of secularism and traditionalists on the other:

Yıkılmamış, ne kadar yıkmak istesek,  
îman;  
Ayırmak istemişiz sonra dîni dünyâdan.  
Ayırmışız, ederek Şer'i muttasıl ihmâl;  
Asıl ikincisi olmuş, şu var ki, berzede-  
hâl!"<sup>314</sup>

(However hard we tried to destroy faith,  
it was not destroyed;  
Then we wanted to separate religion  
from the world.  
Ignoring evil, we separated them;  
In fact, the latter became our current  
situation!)

In this verse, 'the world' and 'religion' not only complete each other but are also integrated since the peace and health of the state can only be maintained through the incorporation of state and religion. However, this did not mean a state which uses religion as a tool to maintain its self-interest and oppressive rule. In an article he published in 1908, Ersoy considered the Ottoman government that ruled before the Young Turks as one such government which he harshly criticised: 'God damn the government in charge! It wants to prevent the improvements and civilisation with the language of religion for its personal benefits'.<sup>315</sup> Ersoy protests against the government's manipulation of Islam for political or personal benefits and believes that Islam was being diverted from its true purpose. Gökâlp also opposed the Ottoman government's manipulation of religion to rule over the Muslim community; however,

---

<sup>314</sup> Mehmed Akif Ersoy, *Safahat*, ed. by Haz. M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (İstanbul: Şule Yayınları, 1999), p. 212.

<sup>315</sup> Başımızdaki hükümetin Allah belasını versin! İstibdadını idame için terakkiyat -ı fikriye, medeniye namına vuku bulacak hareketi lisan-ı din ile men etmek istiyor, görüyorsunuz ki ne güzel muvafık oluyor!' Mehmet Akif Ersoy, 'Hasbıhal', in *Kuran'dan Ayetler ve Nesirler*, ed. by Ömer Rıza Doğrul (İstanbul: Yüksel Yayınevi, 1944) pp.292-295 p.294

contrary to Ersoy's idea of the correct implementation of Islam in state affairs, Gökâlp argued against any conflation of the state's affairs with religion altogether. However, contradictorily, Ersoy himself manipulated the idea of religion in his Gallipoli poem (as well as in other poems promoting his ideology) to justify the Gallipoli campaign and to vilify the enemy, as discussed below.

Similar to Gökâlp, Ersoy also starts his Gallipoli poem, 'To the Martyrs of the Dardanelles', by describing how formidable the enemy is:

Şu Boğaz harbi nedir? Var mı ki  
dünyada eşi?  
En kesif orduların yükleniyor dördü  
beşi,  
Tepeden yol bularak geçmek için  
Marmara'ya  
Kaç donanmayla sarılmış ufacık bir  
karaya.<sup>316</sup>

(What is this Bosphorus War? Is there  
any equal to it in the world?  
Four or five of the toughest armies are  
embarking  
Trying to find a way to cross Marmara  
Surrounding a tiny land with an  
outnumbered navy)

In the second and fourth lines, the use of comparative adjectives and the choice of verbs illustrate the difficulty in which the Turkish army finds itself, giving a sense that all odds were stacked against the Turks: the enemy is described as the 'toughest', while the Turks are 'outnumbered' and the landscape of the battlefield is 'tiny'. The question asked in the first stanza also strengthens this view since it indicates the greatness and uniqueness of the campaign. This is a time-honoured literary device used to emphasise the value of victory and its use here to show how desperate the situation was for the Turks, since the enemy was seen as the invader of the Turkish homeland and a threat to Turkish liberty.

---

<sup>316</sup> Mehmet Akif Ersoy, 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', *Sebilürreşad*, 24, (1922), 146 (p.146).

As outlined in the introduction, Islamists divided civilisation into Western and Eastern civilisations and, as an Islamist, Ersoy perceived and described the enemy as typical of Western civilisation in his Gallipoli poem:

Ne hayâsızca tehaşşüd ki ufuklar  
kapalı!  
Nerde – gösterdiği vahşetle – “Bu bir  
Avrupalı!”<sup>317</sup>  
[...]  
(Such a shameless invasion that  
horizons are blocked  
There it is – with its violence – “this is  
European!”

In this poem, Ersoy condemns the Gallipoli Campaign as such a ‘shameless’ destruction that the ‘horizons’ of the future of the Turkish nation are shut off. The future of the nation is endangered, and thus, Turkish liberty is threatened. In his view, the ‘European’ is ultimately responsible for this danger since the ‘European’ invades Gallipoli and this leads to ‘violence’. However, Europeans had been seen by many in the Ottoman Empire as the representatives of civilisation prior to World War I, leading many Ottoman citizens and intellectuals to admire Europe.<sup>318</sup> According to Stanford J. Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, this admiration of the technologically advanced West started with Mahmut II in the early nineteenth century.<sup>319</sup> Carel Bertram suggests that ‘as much as [the Young Turks] admired Western thought, they feared Western culture as a threat to that very identity that they wanted to create around a concept of Ottomanism’.<sup>320</sup> Ersoy’s poem, ‘This is European’, as rendered with an exclamation mark, is meant to criticise this Turkish admiration as well as illustrating the Turkish ‘fear’ of the Western ‘threat’ to their ‘identity’; however, in Ersoy’s case this is a ‘threat’ to the Islamic identity of the Ottomans:

---

<sup>317</sup> Ersoy, ‘Çanakkale Şehitlerine’, p.146.

<sup>318</sup> Vedica Kant, ‘Çanakkale’s Children: The politics of Remembering the Gallipoli Campaign in Contemporary Turkey’, in *Remembering Gallipoli in Contemporary Turkey*, ed. by Bart Ziino (London: Routledge, 2015), pp.146-164 (p.151).

<sup>319</sup> Shaw, Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey: 2. Reform, Revolution and Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p.49.

<sup>320</sup> Carel Bertram, *Imagining the Turkish House: Collective Visions of Home* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008), p.127.

Maske yırtılmasa hâlâ bize âfetti o  
yüz...  
Medeniyyet denilen kahbe, hakikat,  
yüzsüz.  
Sonra mel'undaki tahribe müvekkel  
esbâb,  
Öyle müdhiş ki: Eder her biri bir mülkü  
harâb.<sup>321</sup>

(If the mask was not torn off, that face  
would still be dazzling to us.  
The bitch called civilisation is indeed  
impudent.  
The tools of the damned to destroy and  
burn,  
Are so horrendous that they tear up  
every country.

In the early twentieth century, the Ottoman Empire was fundamentally underdeveloped compared to in Europe with its technological and scientific advances. For this reason, the Ottoman intellectuals admired Europe and the Young Turks wished to be a part of such a large civilisation.<sup>322</sup> Ersoy did not agree with being a part of Western civilisation, but not because he was against the idea of civilisation itself. As Abdulvahit İmamoğlu points out, according to Ersoy, civilisation could only be achieved by satisfying two conditions: one is to preserve values such as religion, culture and traditions, and the second is the development of science and technology.<sup>323</sup> While for Gökalp civilisation means only the latter, for Ersoy, civilisation consists of both moral and scientific efficiency. In this sense, Ersoy considered Western civilisation as incomplete and criticised the West for using their supremacy in the fields of science and technology to pressurise and dominate other countries.

In the poem, the 'face' of the West is 'dazzling' to the Ottomans because of the West's supremacy in science and technology; however, the Gallipoli campaign tears away their 'mask' and reveals their real face. Western 'civilisation' is an 'impudent bitch' in Ersoy's view because it has achieved advances in science and technology but lacks

---

<sup>321</sup> Ersoy, 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', p.146.

<sup>322</sup> Kant p.151.

<sup>323</sup> Abdulvahit İmamoğlu, 'Mehmet Akif'te Medeniyet Kavramı (Mehmet Akif's Concept of Civilization)', *Journal of Islamic Research*, 21(3), (2010), 165-71 (p.166).

morals. According to him, the Ottomans have been exposed to the injustice and insults of the West for the best part of a century through capitulations and compensation, starting from 1838 with the Anglo-Ottoman Treaty and continuing to the Balkan Wars, and now the West had come to Gallipoli to use their 'horrendous tools' to destroy the Ottoman Empire as they had destroyed other countries. This is the Western civilisation that Ersoy perceived and did not want to be a part of. In his sermon in a mosque at Kastamonu on 10 April 1920, he stated that:

Europeans' advance in science, knowledge, civilisation and industry cannot be denied. However, it would not be right to measure their humanity and treatment of other people with this advance. Their science and knowledge should be emulated. However, Europeans themselves should not be trusted and fallen for.<sup>324</sup>

According to Ersoy, the Ottoman Empire must also develop its achievements in the fields of science and technology as in the West; however, it must not achieve this development by compromising its culture, morals and inner dynamics as the Western European powers had done, such as by bringing violence to the Ottoman Empire through the attack on Gallipoli or their exploitation of other developing countries in the name of colonialism. In practice, the viewpoints of Gökâlp and Ersoy are similar in terms of their judgement of civilisation; however, in theory, they are completely different due to their definition of what civilisation is or should be.

Differing definitions of civilisation bring out Ottoman perceptions of Western colonialism. As Ersoy defines the concept of civilisation in moral terms, he perceives colonialism from the same critical moral standpoint. Abdulhavit İmamoğlu states that the concepts of the international politics of the West and colonisation are the same for Ersoy since, according to him, Europeans bully other nations under the name of

---

<sup>324</sup> Original Text: 'Avrupalıların ilimleri, irfanları, medeniyetteki, sanayideki terakkîleri inkâr olunur şey değildir. Ancak insaniyetlerini, insanlara karşı olan muamelelerini kendilerinin maddiyattaki bu terakkîleri ile ölçmek katiyen doğru değildir. Heriflerin ilimlerini, fenlerini almalı. Fakat kendilerine asla inanmamalı, kapılmamalıdır.' Ersoy, *Sebilürreşad*, p. 250.

civilisation.<sup>325</sup> As he outlines in the quote above, Ersoy was sceptical about the European understanding of ‘humanity’ and ‘treatment of other people’, which refers to colonisation and the foreign politics of the West. In his Gallipoli poem, he describes the Western European enemy as follows:

Dedirir: Yırtıcı, his yoksulu, sırtlan  
kümesi,  
Varsa gelmiş, açılıp mahbesi, yâhud  
kafesi!<sup>326</sup>  
(A predatory, insensible herd of hyenas  
Arrived, released from their cages)

Ersoy refers to Europeans as ‘a predatory and insensible herd of hyenas’ to criticise Western colonialist and imperialist policies. Hyenas are animals who feed on the carrion of those killed by other predatory animals. In other words, hyenas do not run, chase, and catch the animal, but wait for the other predatory animals to kill the prey first and then eat the carrion which is not actually theirs or won by their own effort. According to Ersoy, the European powers are no different from hyenas since they colonise and invade countries to which they do not belong. Furthermore, as the hyena analogy shows, Ersoy felt that Europeans took advantage of the internal conflicts of the Ottoman Empire to move in and ‘feed’ (and feed on) the Ottoman Empire’s internal problems. In one article, Ersoy explains these internal problems, claiming that the Ottoman Empire was ‘not destroyed by the military, technological or economical improvements of [the] enemy’, but by ‘the dissension which they introduced to [the Ottoman Empire] before their armies.’<sup>327</sup> In his poem, he criticises the European powers who adopted a divide-and-rule strategy in the late nineteenth century for using ‘the pretext of the protection of Christian minorities as an opportunity to interfere with the affairs of the Ottoman State’ for their benefit, which would lead to the independence

---

<sup>325</sup> İmamoğlu, p.169.

<sup>326</sup> Ersoy, ‘Çanakkale Şehitlerine’, p.146.

<sup>327</sup> Original Text: ‘Bizi düşmanlarımızın üstün kuvveti perişan etmedi; belki onların öncüleri başımıza

bu felaketi getirdi. O öncüler neydi biliyor musunuz? Ordularından –senelerce– önce sınırlarımızın içine soktukları bölücülüktü.’ Mehmet Akif Ersoy, *Düzyazılar, Makaleler, Tefsirler, Vaazlar*, ed. by A. V. Akbaş (İstanbul: Beyan Yayınları, 2011), p.238.



of minorities and the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>328</sup> According to Hanioğlu, this interference with the Empire's internal affairs 'tended to override strategic concerns or interstate rivalries'.<sup>329</sup> In other words, according to the poem, the European powers both nourish and feed on the efforts of other predatory animals, the minorities, to weaken the Ottoman Empire, and to the benefit of their plan for the physical partition of the empire.

However, as far as the Gallipoli battlefield is concerned, colonialism is also defined as yet another element of the destruction that was brought by the Allied Powers to the Ottoman lands, as colonised peoples are helping them to destroy the Ottomans in Ersoy's poem:

Eski Dünya, Yeni Dünya, bütün akvâm-ı  
beşer,  
Kaynıyor kum gibi... Mahşer mi, hakikat  
mahşer.  
Yedi iklimi cihânın duruyor karşısında,  
Ostralya'yla beraber bakıyorsun:  
Kanada!

Çehreler başka, lisanlar, deriler  
rengârenk;  
Sâde bir hâdise var ortada: Vahşetler  
denk.  
Kimi Hindû, kimi yamyam, kimi bilmem  
ne belâ...  
Hani, tâ'ûna (veba) da zuldür (alçalma)  
bu rezil istilâ!<sup>330</sup>

(Old World, New World, all peoples,  
With which it was swarming. A real Last  
Judgement day.  
Seven seasons of the world are  
standing against [Gallipoli],  
Canada is glancing [at Gallipoli] with  
Australia!

The faces are different, languages, skins  
are colourful  
There is only one common event:  
violence is equal

---

<sup>328</sup> Ebru Boyar, p.37; Hanioğlu, p.51.

<sup>329</sup> Hanioğlu, p.69.

<sup>330</sup> Ersoy, p.410.

Some are Indian, some are cannibals,  
some are who knows what nuisance.  
This villainous invasion disgraces even  
the plague)

When both verses are taken into consideration alongside the image of the Allies as a 'hyena' mentioned above, Ersoy's critique of Western colonialism becomes evident in terms of the enemy's multi-ethnic and multi-national characteristics. The first verse describes how the 'Old World, New World', people from all communities are present in Gallipoli where 'seven seasons of the world' are standing against the Ottoman Empire, while 'Canada is glancing [at Gallipoli] with Australia'.<sup>331</sup> Ersoy's interest in the identity of the enemy relates to a common saying in the national myth of Gallipoli that 'the Ottoman army had fought "seven nations" and emerged victorious'.<sup>332</sup>

In the second verse, Ersoy goes on to describe the multi-ethnic and multi-national enemy, as in Gallipoli 'the faces are different, languages, skins are colourful', but the 'violence' is 'equal'. All those different enemy soldiers are defined as equally brutal and violent, no matter where they came from, and hereby the enemy is shown to be unwelcome in Gallipoli regardless of origin: 'some are Indian, some are cannibals, some are who knows what nuisance', meaning that no matter what their nationality or ethnicity they have, they are still considered to be hostile at Gallipoli.

It is interesting to note that, even though Ersoy is so interested in the identity of the enemy and uses every detail to criticise them, even referring to Indian soldiers specifically, he never mentions the presence of the fellow Muslims who fought for the British. The poem, however, considers the Gallipoli Campaign as a war between the Muslims trying to save Islam and the Christians as a threat (which is explained in more detail in the next chapter on Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of themselves), despite the presence of Muslims on the British side and other religious groups in the Ottoman army. The absence of any mention of Muslims on the British side in the poem seems to

---

<sup>331</sup> Ibid.

<sup>332</sup> Kant, p.149.

be intentional, in order to justify Ersoy's construction of Gallipoli as a war of the religions. This is somewhat contradictory considering Ersoy's Islamist views. According to Grunebaum, Islam uses the Muslim faith as a unifying power which minimises the disparity and diversity of different nations with regard to their different traditions and cultures.<sup>333</sup> Based on this view, Ersoy prioritizes the needs of the nation during a time of war over his Islamist views since he uses the 'war of religions' concept to encourage and motivate the Ottoman Muslim Turks. However, he still uses religious references to describe the diversity in Gallipoli in order to hint at the idea of the war of religions and a world at war, by associating the Gallipoli campaign with the Last Judgement, Allah's final assessment of humanity when all creatures will be resurrected and judged.

### **Ömer Seyfettin: Turkish Nationalism and the Enemy within**

In the selected poems of both Ersoy and Gökalt, it can be seen that they define the enemy in Gallipoli as the Allied powers and their colonies. Both poets in their poems reflect on the idea that minority independence and thus the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire were the fault of the Western European enemy, and such examples can further be found in their other poems such as 'Kurt ile Ayı' (The Wolf and the Bear) by Gökalt and 'İstiklal Marşı' (Turkish National Anthem) by Ersoy. However, what about Christian minorities who were themselves living in the Ottoman Empire? In such a conflicted era, when the loyalty of Christian subjects was being questioned with the increase of minority mutinies and independence campaigns, how did Ottoman intellectuals view these non-Muslim, non-Turkish Ottoman subjects and portray them in their writings?

The best and most comprehensive answer to this question can be given with reference to Seyfettin's short story 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', as it extends the Ottoman perception of the enemy beyond the Allied Powers. In 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', Seyfettin narrates the story of a young Turkish child named Ali (Aleko) whose village in Gallipoli is evacuated before the forthcoming battle when he is separated from the rest of the

---

<sup>333</sup> Gustav Edmund Von Grunebaum, *Classical Islam: A History, 600 A.D. to 1258 A.D.*, trans. by Katherine Watson (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2009), p.126.

villagers and gets lost. He goes after his fellow villagers, struggling to survive alone on the road, but on the way he encounters a small group of displaced Greeks. Before the evacuation, Aleko has lived very close to a Greek village, has grown up with Greeks, and therefore is familiar with Greek culture and language, which he can speak as well as Turkish his mother tongue. When he encounters the Greeks, he disguises himself as an orphaned Greek child, introduces himself as Aleko and starts living with the Greeks, but he struggles as a Muslim child pretending to be a Christian as he witnesses the Greek hatred against Turks. The Greek priest asks him to pray in the church for the Muslim Turks to lose the war and Aleko resents this. When the Greek priest, who thinks that Aleko is Greek, realizes that he speaks perfect Turkish, he suggests Aleko could be their little spy. He asks him to deliver a letter to the British soldiers fighting at Gallipoli and Aleko accepts the offer since he finds it an opportunity to warn the Turkish soldiers against the Greeks who cooperate with the British. After a tiring journey, he arrives at Gallipoli and, instead of delivering the letter to the British, he gives it to the Turks and tells them his story. During his time in the Greek village, Aleko has learnt some Greek history such as the story of Thermopylae where three hundred Spartans purportedly held the pass against overwhelming odds. Inspired by these stories of bravery and heroism, he wants to be useful to his nation. He insists that the Turkish Pasha in command should allow him to stay in Turkish headquarters and help. When the Turkish Pasha does not accept this, he offers to be a spy. The Turkish Pasha accepts the offer and gives him another letter to deliver to the British. Again disguised as a Greek child, Aleko delivers the letter, but the British in return give him a time bomb and ask him to place it in Turkish headquarters. Desperate to be useful to his nation, Aleko decides to take the bomb, trigger it and blow up the British headquarters even though it means killing himself as well.

Seyfettin was a nationalist Ottoman writer whose nationalism resembles Gökâlp's as it evolved from Turanism to Turkism. His story 'Bir Çocuk Aleko' is characterised by a

mixture of nationalist and Turkist sentiments and overt racism. In a way, Seyfettin's nationalism can be said to be a logical extension of Gökâlp's nationalism. Whilst Gökâlp described the events of the period through his Turanist lens, Seyfettin was more concerned with spreading the ideal of Turkism and nationalism throughout Turkish society. According to him, 'a nation without a national ideal is dead', and becomes a nation in which 'the individuals do not sense the existence of a nation and are not ready to sacrifice their lives for it.'<sup>334</sup> This theme recurs in different forms in his Gallipoli writings, which often encompass his Turkism and nationalist ideals.

In the story 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', Seyfettin offers three different interpretations of who the enemy is: the Allies versus the Ottoman Empire, Christians versus Muslims, and Greeks versus Turks. The first interpretation is how all of the other authors mentioned above see the enemy as the Allied Powers and more specifically, the British versus the Turks. When Aleko is sent to their headquarters by the Turkish Pasha to spy on the British, the British general asks Aleko to leave a time bomb next to the tent of the Turkish Pasha. Aleko considers this request to be 'villainous' since 'the Turkish Pasha did not think to offer such a dishonourable game.'<sup>335</sup> Such a comparison suggests that the British have a dishonourable and wicked character whilst the Turks are honest and honourable. This is reminiscent of Ersoy's description of British deceit in his Gallipoli poem, which is a running theme in Turkish Gallipoli writings.

The second interpretation of the enemy in the story is the idea of Christians fighting Muslims. When Aleko starts living with the Greek villagers, he is worried about the Christian prayers against the Turks in the church. He compares his observations of the Christians with those of Muslims. He remembers what the hodja (Muslim cleric) of his village used to say about the Christians ('Christians too are the servants of Allah; to

---

<sup>334</sup> Original Text: 'Mefkuresi olmayan bir millet ölmüş demektir. Çünkü bu suretle fertler milletin varlığını duymuyor ve canını onun uğrunda fedaya hazır bulunmuyor demektir.' Ömer Seyfettin, 'Turan Devleti', *Ömer Seyfettin Bütün Eserleri: Makaleler*, ed. by Hülya Argunşah (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2001), p.323.

<sup>335</sup> Ömer Seyfettin, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', in *Ömer Seyfettin'den Seçme Hikayeler: Yazarın Yaşamı ve Hikayeciliği*, ed. by Kemal Demiray (İstanbul: İnkılap ve Aka, 1977), pp.144-169, p.165.

abuse or mistreat them is a much bigger sin than to mistreat Muslims'), whereas he observes how eagerly the Christians talk about how 'the Turks will fail before winter, Istanbul will be seized and all Turks will be killed until not even one Turk exists'.<sup>336</sup> He cannot comprehend why, while the Muslims promote kindness to Christians, the Christians wish harm to Muslims. He resents the fact that the Greek priest who promotes harm to Turks in the church would converse with the Turkish soldiers every morning and that the Turkish soldiers would ask about his wellbeing, which to him is a sign of the priest's (and by extension all Christians') hypocrisy.<sup>337</sup> Due to his resentment, whenever the Greek priest speaks against the Turks, he imagines him as the hodja in his village giving the same speech against the Christian Greeks. In Seyfettin's story, this comparison of Christians versus Muslims is not only used to illustrate how wicked the Christians are and thus reinforce Muslim commitment to the war, but also to suggest that Muslim clerics should follow the example of the priests. Seyfettin's ideal cleric is one who works for the nation and influences the public to destroy the nation's enemies. This idea is explained in greater detail in the next chapter.

The Christians in the story are the Greeks, which leads to the third and main interpretation of the enemy as non-Muslim, non-Turkish subjects of the Ottoman Empire; that is, Greeks versus Turks. In the story, because Gallipoli has not yet been taken by the Allied Powers, the Greek villagers are grieving. The Greek priest decides to send a letter to help the British via Aleko containing information about the numbers of soldiers, ammunition and horses sent to Gallipoli. As the story reveals later, the letter contains lies and accusations against the Muslim Turks as the Greek priest begs the

---

<sup>336</sup> Original Text: 'Her sabah kilisede Türkler'in perişan olması için duâ edilirdi. Bütün iki köy halkının ihtiyar, genç, her sabah bu duâları candan, gönülden tekrarlayışları, sanki Ali'yi derin bir uykudan uynadırıyordu. Köydeki hocanın "Hristiyanlar da Allah'ın kuludur, onlara fenalık etmek, Müslümanlar'a fenalık etmekten daha günahdır." diye vaaz ettiğini hatırlıyor, "Acaba yanlış mı aklımda kaldı?" şüphesine düşüyordu. Pazar günleri kilisenin avlusu ağzına kadar dolardı. Efendisiyle, eski papaz muharebeye dair köylüye havadisler verirler, Türkler'in kış geçmeden bozulacağını, bu sefer İstanbul'un mutlaka alınacağını, ne kadar Türk varsa bir tane kalmamak üzere kesileceğini yana yakıla söylerlerdi.' Ibid p.150.

<sup>337</sup> Ibid.

British to save his village from their alleged atrocities. Seyfettin portrays the Christian Greeks as insidious villains and hypocrites, who pretend to be good Ottomans on the surface, but in reality help the enemy and desire the Empire to be defeated in the war. In an article Seyfettin published in 1912 about cultural and political life after the Second Constitution, he talks about the aspirations of minorities:

Under the name of constitutionalism, tragic dramas were played. However, the Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbians, Armenians, Albanians had national ideals, national literature, national languages, national aims and national organisations. And these nations were quite cunning. They would deceive the Turks by saying “we are genuine Ottomans”, they would make the Turks disrupt their language, literature, even their scientific books, inasmuch as they would make them erase the words of “Turk and Turkey” from their geography and history books.<sup>338</sup>

Within the framework of constitutionalism, Seyfettin considers the minorities to be of a deceitful nature and to be a threat to the country, and it is evident in the story that the Gallipoli campaign, according to Seyfettin, creates an opportunity for the minorities to take advantage of the Empire to achieve their own national aspirations. In his attempt, for instance, to convince Aleko to deliver the letter, the priest talks about ancient Greek history; including the stories of Thermopylae and Hydna of Scione, which inspire Aleko later. The priest also gives him a speech about how grand the ‘Megali Idea’ is and talks about the importance of Greek nationalism in this grand ideal.<sup>339</sup> The Megali Idea emerged after Greek Independence in 1830, which aimed to establish a Greek state in all Greek-inhabited areas, including the Greek populations who lived under Ottoman

---

<sup>338</sup> Original Text: ‘meşrutiyet namı altında feci dramlar oynanıyordu. Halbuki Rumlar’ın, Bulgarlar’ın, Sırp’ların, Ermeniler’in, Arnavutlar’ın milli mefkureleri, milli edebiyatları, milli lisanları, milli gayeleri, milli teşkilatları vardı. Ve bu milletler gayet kurnazdılar. “Biz samimi Osmanlıyız...” diye Türkleri kandırıyorlar, Türkler’e lisanlarını, edebiyatlarını, hatta fenni kitaplarını bozduruyorlar, hatta coğrafya ve tarih kitaplarından “Türk ve Türkiye” kelimelerini sildiriyorlardı.’ Ömer Seyfettin, ‘Milli Tecrübelerimizden Çıkarılmış Ameli Siyaset’, *Bütün Eserleri*, ed. by Muzaffer Uyguner (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993), p.38.

<sup>339</sup> Seyfettin, ‘Bir Çocuk Aleko’, p.153.

rule, thus forming a direct threat to the Turkish equivalent of Turanism. By mentioning this in the story, Seyfettin not only illustrates how far ahead of the Turks the Greeks are in terms of developing their national identity, but also alerts the nation to the danger of secession, since a possible success of the Megali Idea would mean the failure and end of the Ottoman Empire. The dialogue about nationalism between the Priest and Aleko proceeds as follows:

— Senin anan, baban yok, değil mi?  
— Yok  
— Hayır... Senin anan, baban var, kimsesiz değilsin.  
Ali'nin yüreği oynadı. "Acaba Türk olduğum duyuldu mu?" şüphesiyle titredi. Bozuntu vermemeye çalıştı.  
— Hayır, papaz efendi, benim sizden başka kimsem yok!..  
— Var.  
— .....  
— Var ama, sen bilmiyorsun. Senin anan, baban milletindir.

[...]  
— "Adam anası, babası için her türlü fedakarlığı etmeli. Hatta canını bile vermeli. Öksüzlerin anası, babası milletleridir. Her öksüz, milleti için en büyük hizmetlere hazır olmalı. Öksüze bakan, büyüten millettir. Millet, evladından yardım ister."<sup>340</sup>

(— You don't have a mother and father, do you?  
— No  
— No. You have a mother and a father, you are not an orphan.  
Ali's heart started beating faster. He shivered with the suspicion of thinking "what if they heard that I am a Turk?" He tried not to reveal any feelings.  
— No, Father, I do not have anyone else but you.  
— You do.  
— .....  
— You do, but you don't know yet. Your mother and father are your nation.  
[...]

---

<sup>340</sup> Ibid, pp.151-152.



— ‘A man should be able to sacrifice anything for his mother and father. He should even die for them. The mother and father of the orphans are their nations. Every orphan should be ready to undertake the biggest duties for their nation. Who takes care of and raises the orphans is their nation. The nation asks for help from its children.’”)

Aleko compares Greek history with that of the Turks and thinks that ‘if these coward Greeks could have managed to defeat their enemy bravely in history, the Turks must have conquered Istanbul and Gallipoli with even more bravery and courage.’<sup>341</sup> Homi K. Bhabha explains the context of the ‘minority discourse’ within a nation which ‘sets the act of emergence in the antagonistic in-between of image and sign, the accumulative and the adjunct, presence and proxy’ and which ‘contests genealogies of “origin” that lead to claims for cultural supremacy and historical priority.’<sup>342</sup> Aleko, who has been unaware of his own national identity until he meets the Greeks, who hold on to their national identity very tightly, begins to apply their nationalist views to himself and his nation, and in his mind the histories of both nations compete for historical ‘supremacy’. The reason for this can be explained in terms of the definition of the nation itself, since history plays a crucial role in constructing a nation.

Bhabha defines nation as ‘a soul, a spiritual principle’ which consists of two crucial elements, one of which lies in ‘the past’ whilst the other is located in ‘the present’. In other words, ‘[o]ne [of these elements] is the possession in common of the rich legacy of the memories’ and ‘the other is present-day consent, the desire to live together, the will to perpetuate the value of heritage that one has received in an undivided form.’<sup>343</sup> Bhabha also points out that a nation is ‘a

---

<sup>341</sup> Original Text: ‘Ama bu korkak Rumlar bu kadar yaparsa, Türkler’in evvel zamanda İstanbul’u, Çanakkale’yi almak için neler yapmış olacaklarını düşünebiliyordu.’ Ibid p.152.

<sup>342</sup> Homi K. Bhabha, ‘Dissemination: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation’, *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1990), p.307.

<sup>343</sup> Bhabha p.19.

dynasty, representing an earlier conquest, one which was first of all accepted, and then forgotten by the mass of the people.'<sup>344</sup> Seyfettin's compares the two nations' histories in an effort to reveal the 'forgotten' Turkish national consciousness in the Ottoman Turks, since he believed that the Turks lacked a national ideal which could have been the salvation of the empire. In an article published in 1914, Seyfettin compared the minorities with the Turks in the same way as in the short story: 'Every nation turned into a nation, walks over us with national enthusiasms, national ideals. However, we do not have any ideals. Just as we do not know why, for whom and where we will fight, we also do not know what we want to achieve as a nation.'<sup>345</sup> In the story, Seyfettin gives the Turkish nation a past, a present and an ideal. According to Bhabha, '[o]f all cults, that of the ancestors is the most legitimate, for the ancestors have made us what we are' and 'a national idea' is based on a 'social capital' of a 'heroic past, great men' and 'glory'.<sup>346</sup> In his story highlighting the Turkish conquest of Istanbul, Seyfettin seems to use the most essential and legitimate condition of being a people, which is a shared history, to justify his meanings; to reinforce the national consciousness by creating an awareness of the most crucial element of being a nation, its history.

Having a strong consciousness of Greek national history and thus of nationalism, the Greek enemy ironically serves as an example for the Turks, since they make Aleko realise that the Turks have everything the Greeks have in terms of a shared history. The irony is inherent in the fact that Aleko is inspired by the very people he comes to consider his worst enemy, and the words that the priest speaks seem to encapsulate Seyfettin's own sentiments except that

---

<sup>344</sup> Ibid p.12.

<sup>345</sup> Original Text: 'Çünkü her millte millet haline geçmiş, milli heyecanlarla, milli mefkurelerle üzerimize yürüyor. Halbuki bizim bir mefkuremiz yok... niçin, kimin için, nerede muharebe edeceğimizi bilemediğimiz gibi, milletçe ne yapmak istediğimizi de bilmiyorduk.' Ömer Seyfettin, 'Türklük Mefkuresi', *Türklük Üzerine Yazılar* (Ankara : Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993), p.87.

<sup>346</sup> Ibid p.19.

Seyfettin applies them to the Turks rather than the Greeks. This way, Seyfettin suggests that the Turks have been remiss in their patriotism compared to other nationalities within the Ottoman Empire, and he uses the Greeks' well-developed sense of identity to reproach the Turks for having less well-developed national allegiances. According to Seyfettin, if the Turks do not develop a sense of nationalism, the Empire will lose more power and territory.

When Aleko accepts the mission to take the letter to the British, the priest tells him that, if the British do not trust him, he should give them the password which the British and Greeks use for safety: 'Cyprus'.<sup>347</sup> The secret word between the British and Greeks in the story, which foreshadows the 1914 British invasion of Cyprus, is Seyfettin's warning to the Turkish nation concerning the cooperation between the British and Cypriot Greeks to unite Cyprus with Greece. In 1878, for example, the bishop Kitium Kyprianos gave a speech in Larnaca expressing Greek aspirations and expectations that 'Great Britain will help Cyprus, as it did the Ionian Islands, to be united with mother Greece'.<sup>348</sup> Like most Turkish Ottomans, Seyfettin considers these events concerning the ambition for a greater Greek state and a Greek Cyprus, as part of the long-expected conspiracy of the West and non-Turkish Ottoman subjects to destroy the Ottoman Empire. By giving examples from the Greek minority, Seyfettin tries to teach a lesson to the Turkish nation, which is to encourage Turks to emulate the idea of nationalism current amongst non-Turkish Ottoman subjects and to unite around national ideas just like them. In this sense, the idea of nationalism that the non-Turkish Ottoman subjects follow is a desirable inspiration for Turks whilst the Ottoman subjects themselves are unwelcome.

---

<sup>347</sup> Seyfettin, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', p.154.

<sup>348</sup> Anna Jarstad, *Changing the Game: Consociational Theory and Ethnic Quotas in Cyprus and New Zealand* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2001), p.88.

However, negative views of Greeks or other Ottoman subjects were not universal among Ottoman Turks. Contrary to the views in Seyfettin's story, Ibrahim Naci, who was a Lieutenant in the Turkish 71<sup>st</sup> Regiment and killed during the Gallipoli campaign when he was twenty-one years old, defines the Greeks in positive terms. He wrote in his diary, which has only recently been published, how impressed he was by the benevolence of the Greeks during the Gallipoli campaign:

I saw many times that Greek villagers on our way – particularly in the village of Maltepe – were carrying water on their heads and shoulders with pitchers and butter churns. Most particularly, a woman whose husband had joined the army drew water for hours and continued, even though her arms were almost completely exhausted. Although they were Greek, they were making such a sacrifice, only because one of their beloved was with us, namely in the army.<sup>349</sup>

Naci outlines his gratitude for the Greeks for providing the soldiers with food and water, and his disappointment with the Turkish civilians later on in his diary when they were not so helpful. Despite his positive and objective description of the Greeks, however, it is obvious from his phrase 'Although they were Greek' that he considered the Greeks as the other, not as Ottoman.

### **Propaganda, Nationalism and Representations of the Enemy**

In their Gallipoli poems, both Gökalp and Ersoy criticise the colonialist policies of the West. Gökalp perceives colonialism in nationalist terms as competing missions of the pan-Slavic policy of Russia in the Balkans and the Turanist ideal in the Ottoman Empire in addition to being a threat to the nation's spiritual motivation, Islam. Ersoy's criticism of Western colonialism is justified primarily in religious terms. However, this illustrates a weak spot in Ersoy's and Gökalp's arguments, since both poets focus on

---

<sup>349</sup> Naci, *Farewell*, p.63.

the Muslim colonies of the West but ignore the situation of Christian subjects in the Ottoman Empire. In other words, the poems fail to see the other side of the history, in which the Ottoman Empire was itself an empire based on the domination of other ethnic groups and nations, such as the Balkan states, Greeks and Armenians, that wished to be freed from Ottoman rule. In this sense, especially considering that the Armenian massacres coincided with the Gallipoli campaign, Ersoy's and Gökalp's arguments can be considered to be not only propagandist but also to a certain extent rather hypocritical. Both Ersoy and Gökalp used atrocity propaganda not only to mobilize hatred against the enemy in support of the Ottoman war effort, but also to justify their Turanist and Islamist ideologies.

Similar types of propaganda writing during World War I can also be found in any combatant nation's literary culture. British papers and magazines were full of similar stories about the wickedness, deceit and brutality of the Germans. The previous chapter has already discussed the representations of the Turks as brutal in the British media. In the case of the literature of Gallipoli, W.F. Rollo's collection of poems *Stray Shots from the Dardanelles* and Ernest Raymond's novel *Tell England* provide similar examples as in the Ottoman propaganda writings, although they do not give such in-depth descriptions of the identity of the enemy as in the Ottoman writings. Even though they do not illustrate a deeper sense of the enemy's identity, W.F. Rollo's poems are similar to the Ottoman Gallipoli poems in that the enemy is to be destroyed and the state's political aspirations should be met. Ernest Raymond's novel, on the other hand, defines the enemy from a religious perspective to justify the decision to go to war, just as the Ottoman Gallipoli writings do. Whilst in Raymond's novel it is the Ottoman Muslims at Gallipoli who are portrayed as wicked, in Turkish writings, the Christian Allied Powers are defined as deceitful and wicked.

Seyfettin's story about Gallipoli is interesting since its propagandist approach is closely linked to the internal conflicts in the Empire. Whilst atrocity propaganda on a

global scale primarily blames external enemies, as in the examples of Gökalp and Ersoy, Seyfettin lays the greatest portion of blame on internal enemies; that is, the Greeks. Seyfettin's propagandist portrayal of the enemy is modelled on the specific concerns of Turkish nationalists during World War I and his nationalist perspective leads to the peculiarly split perception of the enemy in 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', which addresses specific concerns such as non-Turkish and non-Muslim minorities and their wish for independence. In this sense, the story 'Bir Çocuk Aleko' represents resistance to Ottomanism, since it suggests that non-Muslims and non-Turks who have languages, histories and religions different from those of the Turks would never be able to blend with them, and that a multi-ethnic society would be an obstacle to Turkish nationalist aims with no nationalist ideal and thus no unity.

As outlined in the Introduction, the Ottoman literature about Gallipoli produced during wartime failed to serve its purpose of war propaganda; however, it intentionally or unintentionally used World War I itself in propaganda to promote a Turkish nation-state.<sup>350</sup> Accordingly, the fact that Gallipoli writings took shape based on the authors' political ideologies, such as Islamism and Turanism, which informed the early nation-building stage of the Turks, illustrates that the Ottoman intellectuals used the Gallipoli campaign itself to justify and promote their individual political views. When the victory of the Gallipoli campaign and the intellectuals' unintentional nationalist propaganda efforts are seen in combination, it is not surprising that the Gallipoli Campaign has become a symbol of the birth of the Turkish nation. Furthermore, in the Ottoman literature, the vilification of the enemy, which failed as war propaganda during World War I, served the purpose of discovering the 'Turkish self' among all the other nationalities and ethnicities in the Ottoman Empire. In other words, defining the 'other' through war enabled the Ottoman intellectuals to define the 'self'. In this sense, the Turkish writings about Gallipoli are not only interesting from a literary point of view, but

---

<sup>350</sup> Ibid p.185.

also have cultural value in helping us trace the development of a Turkish national identity at this time.

## BRITISH PERCEPTIONS OF THEMSELVES

As outlined in the previous chapter, Turkish-Ottoman writers have a relatively homogenous way of portraying the enemy and themselves in their Gallipoli writings. Even though different writers have different ideologies and different ideas about how the empire can survive war, they all perceive the Gallipoli campaign as a defensive war in which the homeland should be protected at any cost, and all contribute to the same Turkish nation-building process emerging from the ruins of the Ottoman Empire. Similarly, this chapter explores whether there was an overarching narrative available to British writers regarding the Gallipoli campaign and investigates how the British authors who wrote about Gallipoli perceived themselves during the period of writing and publishing based on their experience in the Gallipoli campaign. It includes literary texts such as Ernest Raymond's novel *Tell England*, W.F. Rollo's collection of poems *Stray Shots from the Dardanelles*, Aubrey Herbert's diary *Mons, Anzac and Kut* and A. P. Herbert's collection of poems *Half-Hour at Helles* in examining authors' engagement with British wartime propaganda in a variety of contexts and the influence of propaganda on the evolution of British authors' perception of themselves. The chapter argues that contrary to the more homogeneous Turkish literary perspective, no such strong overarching narrative was available to British writers at Gallipoli, but the British writers, too, grappled with issues of identity and questioned, criticised and contributed to state propaganda as well as interrogating personal and national discourses of identity.

The best definition of British Gallipoli writing can be borrowed from historian Jay Winter, who states that '[t]he years after the Armistice were a time when competing and contradictory narratives were elaborated, at times by different people, at times by the same person, at different stages of his or her life.'<sup>351</sup> British responses to the Gallipoli

---

<sup>351</sup> Jay Winter, *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), p.76



campaign, as well, were highly individual and contradictory, with some recurring elements, most notably an engagement with the British propaganda of war, Christianity as motivation for war, and references to classical antiquity. Nation-building, unlike for the Turks or the Australians who participated in the campaign, was not an issue for British writers and therefore the campaign could not be construed as part of a nation building effort. The Gallipoli campaign was also not a defensive war in the traditional sense, as the British soldiers did not fight on or even near British territory, but were sent to Gallipoli to provide a distraction from and relief for the Western Front. As a result, British authors had different views of the campaign and what it meant for Britain and themselves, yet they tried to make sense of the campaign without clear narratives to which they could take recourse. Some writers, such as Ernest Raymond, construct a way in which the campaign can be justified as somehow defensive, and that can be either as defending Christianity or as defending classical (Greek) culture/civilisation. By contrast, other writers such as Aubrey Herbert, who knew the Ottomans well, see through these strategies and focus on personal narratives of loss or on criticising the official war effort.

As outlined in the introduction, the key aspects of British identity during World War I consisted of English 'good manners' that existed before and during the war, along with the 'Victorian legacy of high melodrama or excessive sentimentality', 'optimistic assertions of England's imperial greatness', 'public school codes', 'the ideals of a patriotic blood-sacrifice', a 'threatened rural way of life', sportsmanship, masculinity and Christianity.<sup>352</sup> These discourses were utilised by the government for different purposes, from instilling patriotism to encouraging recruitment and sustaining morale within the British army. This chapter discusses British self-perception during the Gallipoli campaign by defining Englishness within the framework of these concepts, particularly in terms of masculinity, sportsmanship, a public school ethos and

---

<sup>352</sup> Giles and Middleton p.7

Christianity and their relationship to the Gallipoli campaign. This provides a better understanding of Raymond and W.F. Rollo's defensive perspective on Gallipoli and of Aubrey Herbert and A. P. Herbert's engagement with and challenge to that perspective.

### **Ernest Raymond, *Tell England* (1922): Gallipoli as a Test of English Values**

As outlined in the introduction, Ernest Raymond (1888–1974) served as an army chaplain at Gallipoli and published his first novel, *Tell England*, in 1922. Set during the Gallipoli campaign, the novel attracted great attention since its 'romantic' qualities and thus 'consoling power' provided contemporary readers with hope and reassurance after the war.<sup>353</sup> It also appealed to 'middle class reader[s]' due to its portrayal of an idealised England and 'a dash of religion'.<sup>354</sup> The novel legitimises the campaign by emphasising the glorious selflessness and chivalry of young British men who die honourably in the name of patriotism and religion. Macleod considers these types of 'heroic-romantic' Gallipoli writings as an 'equivalent to the Anzac legend'.<sup>355</sup> Infused with pre-war values, the novel portrays a certain version of Englishness as national identity and promotes a modified version of Christianity justifying war. In this sense, although it is not founded on political ideologies similar to those that Turkish writers promoted, *Tell England* can also be seen as the British equivalent of the Turkish Islamist-nationalist myth of the Gallipoli campaign. In the Turkish case, elements of nationality and a collective understanding of national identity strongly depended on elements such as language, culture and religion, as narrated in Turkish Gallipoli writings. Although *Tell England* does not share the exact same elements with Turkish perceptions of national identity, Raymond presents a particular version of Englishness prevalent in pre-1918 England, just as Gökalp and Seyfeddin reflected a particular version of Turkishness belonging to this era.

---

<sup>353</sup> Macleod p.67.

<sup>354</sup> Falls, p.293.

<sup>355</sup> Macleod p.159.

As outlined in the introduction, English values, attitudes and ideals, such as sportsmanship, Victorian sentimentality and the public school ethos, were defined in many public school novels.<sup>356</sup> According to Jeffrey Richards, these novels were not only shaped by British society but also shaped this society from the Crimean War to World War I and thus 'cohere to form [...] national identity'.<sup>357</sup> In *Tell England* these pre-war values, attitudes and beliefs are entrenched to justify chauvinism, heroism and self-sacrifice, all represented in the idea of dying for one's King and country. In the first part of the novel, Raymond narrates the public school experiences of three young boys where they internalise the main English characteristics of reserve, restraint and resilience taught in their school. Idealising rural landscapes, portraying the three boys as the 'public school educated "new gentleman"' and narrating their pride in sporting achievements in the first part, and juxtaposing this with wartime Englishness in a romanticised setting of the Gallipoli campaign, Raymond explores the idea of Englishness.<sup>358</sup>

### ***Englishness and Sportsmanship***

*Tell England* reflects an understanding of Englishness peculiar to the early twentieth century, probably most obviously with its references to cricket and football. Paul Fussell states that the symbolism of war as sport was often utilised by public school-educated combatants in World War I writings as '[i]n nothing [...] is the initial British innocence so conspicuous as in the universal commitment to the sporting spirit'.<sup>359</sup> As public school-educated combatant writers compared their experiences in the trenches to various sports in which they used to engage, such as fox-hunting or cricket, Raymond illustrates a similar 'commitment to [that] sporting spirit' in his novel. The portrayals of matches and battles are intertwined, both images are used to mimic one another.

---

<sup>356</sup> Jeffrey Richards, *Happiest Days: The Public Schools in English Fiction* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), p.16.

<sup>357</sup> *Ibid* p.1.

<sup>358</sup> Giles and Middleton, pp.4-6.

<sup>359</sup> Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1977), p.ix.

The first part of Raymond's novel draws attention to the boys' public school lives abounding with descriptions that illustrate their passion for cricket and allude to a 'public school educated gentleman' figure that they might grow up to emulate. While watching a cricket match at school, Chappy, one of the masters, observes to his colleague Radley: 'I say, Radley, don't you think this generation of boys is the most shapely lot England has turned out? I wonder what use she'll make of them.'<sup>360</sup> Hints such as these are woven into the first section of the book, which prepares the reader for what is going to happen in the second section when the war begins. On the eve of war, for example, Radley is described as distressed that the public schoolboys will be called to arms. When Radley informs Ray about this, Ray replies 'What fun!', unaware of the implications of war for himself.<sup>361</sup> Radley ends the conversation with farewells, saying '[t]here are great times in front of you.'<sup>362</sup> Trying to make sense of Radley's distress, Ray describes the moment:

All the while he said it, he held my hand in a demonstrative way, very unlike the normal Radley. Then he dropped it abruptly and turned away. And I went exuberantly out—so exuberantly that I left my hat upon his table, and was obliged to hasten back for it. When I entered the room again, he was staring out of the window over the empty cricket fields. Though he heard me come, he never once turned round, as I picked up my hat and went out through the door.<sup>363</sup>

Radley looks out over cricket fields, which are empty due to the summer holidays, and foresees that these cricket fields will remain empty for longer than just the summer as a generation of public schoolboys will be swept away by the coming war. Radley's forebodings come true, as his public schoolboys are killed at Gallipoli.

---

<sup>360</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.61.

<sup>361</sup> Ibid p.175.

<sup>362</sup> Ibid p.176.

<sup>363</sup> Ibid.

A cricket field comes up again in the novel during Doe's death at Gallipoli. Doe is assigned a critical task for the next bombardment and put in charge of the bombers in order to blow up the crater in which a Turkish machine gun is placed. When Doe starts his mission, he drops his cap and Ray describes it thus: 'the wind [blows] his hair about, as it used to do on the cricket-field at school.'<sup>364</sup> Ray's description of Doe's mission consists of brief and passionate commentaries with frequent uses of exclamations and imperatives: "'Tain't the bombers' fault, sir" exclaimed [the] sergeant-major. "The mine failed to produce a crater. They'd nowt to occupy."<sup>365</sup> Ray and his sergeant-major describe Doe's 'triumphant' performance at the battlefield as if his mission was a cricket match, in which Doe is the cricketer and Ray is the reporter:

Look! Doe had something in his hand.  
He hurled it. A distant thud and a small  
report merged at once into a great  
explosion, which reverberated about the  
Bluff. Doe laughed shrilly. He fell. But it  
could only have been the shock which  
knocked him over, for he was on his feet  
again, and staggering home.  
"Gawd!" screamed the sergeant-major.  
"He's bombed the gun and exploded the  
shell-dump. Finish whizz-bang!" And he  
bellowed with triumphant laughter.  
"I knew he would," cried I. "I knew he  
would. This way, Doe!"  
He was going blindly to his right.  
"Message from C.O. to retire at once,  
sir."  
"This way, Doe!" I roared at him,  
laughing, for I thought he was well and  
unhurt.  
But no. He pitched, rolled over, and lay  
still.<sup>366</sup>

Re-creating the cricket-field in the bombing scene euphemises the violence of battle, but intensifies the emotional impact of the death of Edgar Doe. The ironic juxtaposition of cricket with images of battle accentuates heroism and bravery in the manner of Edgar Doe's death, at the same time suggesting a way to remember and

---

<sup>364</sup> Ibid p.312.

<sup>365</sup> Ibid.

<sup>366</sup> Ibid pp.312-313.

honour the dead. Fussell draws attention to the propagandist function of football at the start of the war, when British propaganda held that the enemy did not play football and thus lacked individuality, whereas English soldiers had been trained in team spirit and an uncomplaining acceptance of disappointment or pain on the football pitch, and would therefore do well on the battlefield.<sup>367</sup> In his novel, Raymond appears to promote the same idea, which emphasises the glories of a public-school education that provided the boys with experience of athletics and character-building as much as intellectual growth. Fussell notes that the frequent use of Arcadian images in World War I writings, 'is a way of invoking a code, to hint by the antithesis at the indescribable; at the same time it is a comfort in itself'.<sup>368</sup> Similarly, Raymond uses the cricket field as a place of 'comfort'; an image from home he uses as an 'antithesis' of 'the indescribable' fighting or battlefield. However, Raymond uses this image not to describe the 'indescribable' horrors of the battlefield, but to emphasise that the 'magnificent endurance, heroism, self-sacrifice, even to the point of death, of hundreds and thousands of young Englishmen in the awful European war were largely owing to the habits fostered on our playing fields'.<sup>369</sup> The sense of 'comfort' Raymond tries to convey is also not only for Ray's loss, as Doe is very dear to Ray and his death hurts him deeply, but also, by extension, providing comfort for English mothers, fathers and wives who lost sons and husbands in the battle.

In *Tell England*, Raymond often describes the bombardments at Gallipoli in sporting terms, not only as cricket matches but also in football terminology.<sup>370</sup> Similar to the above, commentaries such as "'We're on top! On top of the Boche, and he asked for it!'" during a bombardment gives Ray 'the sensation [he] got when [his] house was winning on the football-ground at school' and makes the fighting more 'exciting'.<sup>371</sup> Far

---

<sup>367</sup> Fussell, *The Great War*, p.27.

<sup>368</sup> Ibid p.255.

<sup>369</sup> Ernest Protheroe, *A Book About Cricket* (London: J. Alfred Sharp, 1924), p.10.

<sup>370</sup> Football most likely stands in for rugby football rather than soccer, which was seen as a working men's game at this point.

<sup>371</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.338.

from home, during the bombardment at Gallipoli, Ray and other English soldiers enthusiastically cheer for each shell hitting its target just as they would do for successes in football or cricket back in England. Re-creating the image of cricket and football games on a foreign battlefield such as Gallipoli reminds the reader of Rupert Brooke's famous lines: 'That there's some corner of a foreign field/ That is for ever England.'<sup>372</sup> The English sporting spirit on foreign battlefields functions to glorify England, figuratively transforming a foreign soil in England. As in Brooke's poem, the graves of the boys in foreign lands will take England to eternity both in terms of earthly conquest and in heavenly immortality. Consequently, in Raymond's *Tell England*, the literary cricket and football fields become 'the symbol of a powerful and successful military nation.'<sup>373</sup> The concept of sport in literature becomes a medium in which to explore the notion of Englishness and to symbolise British national and imperial culture in *Tell England*. Its national and imperial emphasis evokes patriotic and nationalist feelings, which parallel the Turkist nationalist writings of Gallipoli.

### ***References to Classical Antiquity and Medieval Crusades***

As the previous chapter outlined, Turkist writers of World War I utilised Turkish national history and cultural myths to represent the Gallipoli campaign. Due to the strategic location of Gallipoli, Seyfettin's character Aleko, for instance, remembers Fatih Sultan Mehmet, the glorious conqueror of Istanbul, before his patriotic self-sacrifice in blowing up British headquarters. Gökalp, on the other hand, describes Turks as grey wolves in his poems referring to the ancient legend of Asena, a myth associated with Turkic ethnic origins. Gökalp and Seyfettin describe the war and Turkish soldiers using national and cultural allusions; they promote a message that dying for one's country is a noble end and that the Ottoman Empire is the noblest country for which to die. Raymond's *Tell England* promotes the same patriotic message and views the Gallipoli

---

<sup>372</sup> Rupert Brooke, 'The Soldier', in *Rupert Brooke: Collected Poems*, ed. by Lorna Beckett (Cambridge: Oleander Press, 2010), p.139.

<sup>373</sup> Anthony Bateman, *Cricket, Literature and Culture: Symbolising the Nation, Destabilising Empire* (London: Routledge, 2016), p.58.

campaign as an event of epic proportions, just as Gökalp and Seyfettin viewed it. In parallel to Turkists' use of Turkish cultural history, Raymond glorified self-sacrifice at Gallipoli using classical allusions that are meaningful in British culture. However, even though Raymond and Turkist writers have a common purpose of promoting patriotic sentiment in their respective nations, glorifying the death and heroism of the soldiers, they differ in their views as to the concept of empire. Turkist writers believed in the ineffectiveness of the multi-ethnic structure that constituted the Ottoman Empire and therefore focused on boosting Turkish national identity instead, which they considered as an antonym to the concept of empire, whereas in Raymond's account the concepts of English nationalism and the British Empire complement each other.

As mentioned above, the World War I period witnessed a new adaptation of classical discourse, which was already an important medium of public school education, to portray the idea of fighting as honourable and glorious. For instance, in Raymond's *Tell England*, Padre Monty associates the soldiers waiting to see action in Gallipoli with the vigil of medieval knights, aspiring to be 'brave, loyal, honourable and courageous [and] a defender of the Church.'<sup>374</sup> Monty reminds Ray of the knight's vigil claiming that the 'voyage' to Gallipoli is the vigil for 'the British soldiers':<sup>375</sup> 'Aren't they young knights setting out on perilous work? And I'll prove we have a Church still, and an Altar, and a Vigil.'<sup>376</sup>

Since it was sited in a region replete with heroic stories of antiquity and the Classical world as well as a site associated with the crusades, the Gallipoli campaign helped this understanding appear in and nourish the Gallipoli writings of British writers. Gallipoli's proximity to the Classical world, as Raymond admits in his autobiography, rendered his service as a chaplain in Gallipoli ideal and 'the most memorable' among all other five fronts at which he served:

---

<sup>374</sup> Macleod, p.10.

<sup>375</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.226.

<sup>376</sup> Ibid.



the Gallipoli campaign assumed the perfect pattern, the Attic shape, of a Greek tragedy. It began in the dawn of a spring morning with the boats running towards the beaches; it ended in a winter midnight with an army of tired men, who had fought well, endured terribly, and failed at last, slipping quietly away. It began with a thunder of guns; it ended in a shuffling silence. On that spring morning thousands died, the sea was laced with blood, and the sandy beaches filtered it away; on that winter midnight, so successful were the evacuation plans, not a man died; the only blood on the beach and hills was that of our poor mules who had been brought through the scrub to their sacrifice.<sup>377</sup>

The classical associations that Gallipoli evoked in him led to Raymond's romanticised view of the Gallipoli campaign to the extent of idealising 'heroic failures', as Macleod observes of the Gallipoli writings.<sup>378</sup> For Raymond, Gallipoli, abounding with 'dreams of Greek legends', spawned new modern legends with the stories of Rupert Brooke, Charles Lister and Patrick Shaw-Stewart:

We [Raymond and the officers at Gallipoli] had read Rupert Brooke's '1914' war sonnets, and newspapers had told us how the Dean of St Paul's on Easter Sunday in his pulpit had described them as the enthusiasm of a pure and elevated patriotism which have never found a nobler expression. [...] We knew the story of Rupert Brooke's death on a hospital ship less than forty hours before the Royal Naval Division were to take their share in the Gallipoli landings at dawn on April 25th; and how Charles Lister, Patrick Shaw-Stewart, and others had taken his body on to the Island of Skyros, Achilles' Island, and there buried it with every honour in an olive grove under those Gracian hills.<sup>379</sup>

---

<sup>377</sup> Raymond, *The Story of my Days*, p.127.

<sup>378</sup> Macleod, p.10.

<sup>379</sup> Raymond, *The Story of my Days*, p.130.

Rupert Brooke, becoming a legend and symbol of heroic patriotism at Gallipoli, was a notable influence on Raymond's novel. Before his death, on his way to Gallipoli, Brooke wrote in a letter to Violet Asquith in 1915 about his 'confident and glorious hopes' for the campaign:

Do you think perhaps the fort on the  
Asiatic corner will want quelling, and  
we'll land and come at it from behind  
and [the Turks] will make a sortie and  
meet us on the plains of Troy? [...] Will  
Hero's Tower crumble under the fifteen-  
inch guns? [...] Shall I loot mosaics from  
St. Sophie's? [...] Shall we be a Turning  
Point in History? Oh God!  
I've never been quite so happy in my  
life, I think [...] I suddenly realize that the  
ambition of my life has been – since I  
was two years old – to go on a military  
expedition to Constantinople.<sup>380</sup>

Sharing many of Brooke's romantic attitudes, Raymond alludes to earlier battles in his novel, emphasising Rupert Brooke's style of patriotism. Brooke's ironic self-mockery with capital letters in the phrase 'Turning Point in History' is reflected in Ray's envisioning of Gallipoli in the novel, fictionalising Brooke's excitement. Brooke's idea of triumph in death is superseded by Raymond's view of triumph in failure in the novel. In order to excite the young officers on the way to the Gallipoli campaign, the Colonel reminds them of the Dardanelles being 'the Hellespont of the Ancient world' telling them stories of 'Achilles in Scyros' and 'Poseidon sitting upon Samothrace to watch the fight at Troy'.<sup>381</sup> The colonel's speech becomes 'the ambition of [a young boy's] life' like that of Brooke, as Ray envisions Gallipoli in Brookean terms with enthusiasm for fighting and dying for England, re-constructing the ancient Hellespont:

From the fender and the hearth-rug, we  
saw Leander swimming to Hero across  
the Dardanelles; we saw Darius, the  
Persian, throwing his bridge over the  
same narrow passage, only to be

---

<sup>380</sup> Violet Bonham Carter, *Winston Churchill: An Intimate Portrait* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1965), p.296.

<sup>381</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.195.

defeated at Marathon; and Xerxes, too,  
bridging the famous straits to carry  
victory into Greece, till at last his navy  
went under at Salamis. We saw the  
pathetic figure of Byron swimming where  
Leander swam; and, in all, such an array  
of visions that the lure of the Eternal  
Waterway gripped us, and we were a-  
fidget to be there.<sup>382</sup>

In a country defined by class, only upper- and middle-class men could become officers in the British Army during the war, although a shortage of officer-class men gradually led to the phenomenon of the ‘temporary gentleman’, the lower-middle or working-class junior officer, as the war progressed.<sup>383</sup> Junior officers were often only teenagers and needed to be taught how to control and command men in their own right. In this regard, the Colonel preaches to those young officers using classical references to keep alive their fighting spirit by drawing connections between themselves and Gallipoli. The ordinary ‘Tommy’ may have heard of Homer and the Trojan War, but was far less likely to know Greek and Latin or to be intimately familiar with the classical texts to which the Colonel refers. The junior officers, however, needed to mediate between the Colonel and the enlisted men, for whom Christianity is likely to have been the more accessible reference point. Since the majority of young English officers at this stage had grown up within a public school culture dominated by the study of classical literature, a speech like the Colonel’s in the novel helped English officers make sense of the war in a battlefield far from their homelands. Classical references, in this sense, are intended to give the young officers a sense of belonging to the new remote land while simultaneously portraying the campaign as somehow defensive. Vandiver states that ‘poems that compare British soldiers to Homer’s heroes often do not even mention any cause for which the soldiers were fighting; when they do, the underlying assumption [...] seems to be that Homer’s heroes as well were

---

<sup>382</sup> Ibid.

<sup>383</sup> Laura Root, “Temporary Gentlemen” on the Western Front: class consciousness and the British Army officer, 1914-1918, *All Volumes*, 5 (2006)  
<[http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/ojii\\_volumes/72](http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/ojii_volumes/72)> accessed [accessed 10 May 2017] (p.1).

fighting a war of liberation.<sup>384</sup> Rather than giving a realistic reason for the Gallipoli campaign, Raymond also offers a romantic cause for the campaign – that the Turks have been ‘occupying’ Constantinople ‘[f]or 500 years’ – stripping it of the futility and disillusionment that otherwise might become pervasive. Vandiver also points out that, despite the difference between Homeric battles and modern descriptions of Gallipoli, portraying the Gallipoli campaign as an Homeric battle brings out ‘the valour of the modern soldiers by presenting them as the equivalent of the Homeric heroes, or even by claiming that the modern British outstrip the soldiers of Troy in courage, prowess and heroism.’<sup>385</sup> In the passage cited above, although not directly associating the young soldiers with Homeric heroes, the Colonel conveys a sense of encouragement in that, when the soldiers fight at Gallipoli, they will achieve the legendary status of Homer’s heroes.

Another ‘defensive’ portrayal of the campaign can be observed in Raymond’s adaptation of the Thermopylae epitaph, which was written to commemorate fallen warriors at the battle of Thermopylae by the Greek poet Simonides.<sup>386</sup> In *Tell England*, we encounter a different version of this epitaph:

Tell England, ye who pass this  
monument,  
We died for her, and here we rest  
content.<sup>387</sup>

Doe and Rupert read this epitaph on a Lieutenant’s grave they come across on Achi Baba, which Doe asks Rupert to write on his grave if he dies. Doe’s grave in Gallipoli is later engraved with this epitaph, honouring his wish to ‘tell England’ about the dead schoolboys of his generation.<sup>388</sup> Inspired by Thermopylae, Raymond commemorates the fallen English soldiers at Gallipoli using classical references. Doe’s grave itself – and the beauty, idealism and selflessness in Doe’s death as discussed above –

---

<sup>384</sup> Vandiver, p.229.

<sup>385</sup> Ibid p.245.

<sup>386</sup> Vandiver, pp.337-339.

<sup>387</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.294.

<sup>388</sup> Ibid.

represents Rupert Brooke's grave, which mythologises and idealises not only Brooke's death but also all of the British boys who lie at Gallipoli, bringing the old and new mythologies together. This collocation of old and new myths of heroism and sacrifice – Thermopylae and Brooke – functions 'as a powerful source of solace and as a guarantor of the worthiness of the present sacrifice' for those who are left behind in post-war period.<sup>389</sup> Gallipoli, which was widely acknowledged among British historians to have been a military failure, turns out to be a test of valour by ordeal for British soldiers in the novel and gains meaning and significance that defy the sense of military defeat. This re-interpretation of Gallipoli as a parallel to Thermopylae suggests that, like at Thermopylae, the sacrifice of lives in the British campaign has achieved something.

### ***Celebration of the Empire and Revival of the Crusades***

Before authors such as Raymond turned to classical antiquity to provide consolation for the bereaved in the post-war period, classical antiquity had been used to legitimate imperialism in the nineteenth century. The concept of empire was not something essentially new to Britain in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The British Empire had begun to take shape under the rule of Elizabeth I during the seventeenth century, with overseas trading and exploration. However, the empire remained a 'highly local affair' during her reign until the British colonisation of the Americas during the reign of King James I took place.<sup>390</sup> Apart from the idea of unification that King James I wished to achieve between his English and Scottish subjects, this period also involved the beginning of 'internal colonialism' with the plantation of Ulster, which gradually led to the domination of Wales, Scotland and Ireland by England by the nineteenth century.<sup>391</sup> In the nineteenth century, with the

---

<sup>389</sup> Ibid p.228.

<sup>390</sup> Philippa Levine, *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset* (London: Routledge, 2013), p.1.

<sup>391</sup> Ibid; Nicholas Canny, 'The origins of Empire: an introduction', in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume I: The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p.2.

expansion of the British rule in Africa and the Pacific, a new type of empire was acknowledged which was a colonial empire.<sup>392</sup> The word imperialism was first introduced in 1870 and began to be widely used during the 1890s, suggesting that '[e]mperors and empires were old but imperialism was new.'<sup>393</sup> Apart from the new concept of imperialism, though, the British Empire was modelled in part on many other empires that had existed before it, such as the Roman Empire.<sup>394</sup> Phiroze Vasunia, for instance, suggests that the British took the 'Roman conceptions of virtue, liberty and law' as a model 'as they sought to extend and maintain their own empire'.<sup>395</sup> Other empires as well, such as the Spanish, Portuguese, French and German empires, continued to exist in a historical tradition, like the British, claiming to be following in the steps of empires before them. In the British Empire, however, this tradition led to the construction of a particular imperial identity among the elites, who spread the idea of imperial greatness by exploiting classical antiquity to rationalise European imperialism and thereby contributing to the development of imperial identity.<sup>396</sup> As a result, 'classical discourse' became 'an important source of models and standards that shaped British conceptions of empire and of imperial roles' and 'close comparisons between classical antiquity and Britain's imperial present' became widespread in defining imperial perceptions, conduct, virtue and vision.<sup>397</sup> During the war, this perception took the form of idolising patriotic heroism and, through public school culture, was reflected in war writings as 'optimistic assertions of England's imperial greatness or economic progress.'<sup>398</sup>

---

<sup>392</sup> Eric J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire 1875-1914*, (London: Abacus, 2012), p.58.

<sup>393</sup> Ibid p.60.

<sup>394</sup> Christopher A. Hagerman, *Britain's Imperial Muse: The Classics, Imperialism, and the Indian Empire, 1784-1914* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p.55.

<sup>395</sup> Phiroze Vasunia, *The Classics and Colonial India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p.259.

<sup>396</sup> Ibid p.56, p.6.

<sup>397</sup> Ibid pp.54-55.

<sup>398</sup> Giles and Middleton, p.7.

Raymond's novel, for instance, defines the Gallipoli campaign in the context of an imperial defence, claiming that 'England [already] dominates Gibraltar and Suez, the doors of the Mediterranean'; however:

For 500 years the Turk, by occupying Constantinople, has blocked the old Royal Road to India and the East. He is astride the very centre of the highways that should link up the continents. He oppresses and destroys the Arab world, which should be the natural junction of the great trunk railways that, to-morrow, shall join Asia, Africa, and Europe in one splendid spider's web.<sup>399</sup>

The Colonel's speech aims to encourage young officers to be 'enthusiastic' since, in his view, 'this joining of the continents is an unborn babe of history that leapt in the womb the moment the British battleships appeared off Cape Helles.'<sup>400</sup> For him, the idealised England is the one that conquers, spreading her power throughout the world and hereby registering its glorious name in history. This is only possible if the soldiers at Gallipoli fight enthusiastically enough to 'let [England] complete her constellation by winning from the Turk the lost star of the Dardanelles, the only other entrance to the Great Sea.'<sup>401</sup> The soldiers at Gallipoli, therefore, are the means for the Empire to reach its pinnacle, their self-sacrifice for the greater good of the British Empire is necessary for the Empire to expand its influence across the world.

As outlined before, Brooke's impact on Raymond becomes visible again in *Tell England* in the idea of 'glorious selflessness and spiritual beauty of living and dying honourably in the name of patriotism'.<sup>402</sup> Like Brooke's depiction of the beauty in dying for one's own country, the novel gives a sense that, although English soldiers may be killed at Gallipoli, their death is beautiful because the English values that led them to

---

<sup>399</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.196.

<sup>400</sup> Ibid.

<sup>401</sup> Ibid p.195.

<sup>402</sup> Macleod, p.159.

give their lives for a cause will last forever. Ray, for instance, epitomises this idea while grappling with complex feelings as to whether he wants to live or die:

Another minute I try to recapture that  
moment of ideal patriotism which I  
touched on the deck of the Rangoon. I  
see a death in No Man's Land to-morrow  
as a wonderful thing. There you stand  
exactly between two nations. All Britain  
with her might is behind your back,  
reaching down to her frontier, which is  
the trench whence you have just leapt.  
All Germany with her might is before  
your face. Perhaps it is not ill to die  
standing like that in front of your  
nation.<sup>403</sup>

Raymond's *Tell England* contains a combination of the aforementioned ideologies such as nationalism and imperialism as well as Anglo-Catholicism, as discussed below. Published in a time of post-war spiritual uncertainty and disillusionment, when social, religious and moral structures were changing as outlined above, Raymond attempts to revive the traditional values of Christianity by using making reference to St. Aidan and St. Augustine, reflecting his evangelist tendencies:

What the Catholic movement really  
meant was the recovery for our Church  
of England – God bless her – of the old  
exalted ideas of the Mass and of the  
great practice of private confession.  
“What we want,” said the Catholic  
movement, “is the faith of St. Augustine  
of Canterbury, and of St. Aidan of the  
North; the faith of the saints who built  
the Church of England, and not the faith  
of Queen Elizabeth, nor even of the  
Pope of Rome.”<sup>404</sup>

His anti-modernist, reactionary and conservative response to the idea of lost faith shows parallels with Mehmet Akif Ersoy's Islamism. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Ersoy regarded the newly emerging nationalism of the Young Turks as a

---

<sup>403</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.341.

<sup>404</sup> Ibid p.220.



divergence from traditional Islam and therefore criticised it since he thought the glory of the Ottoman Empire could only be regained if the Empire went back to following traditional Islam which, in his view, was the real Islam. Similarly, Raymond tries to revive 'the old exalted ideas' of Christianity, suggesting that the religion of 'Queen Elizabeth' or 'the Pope' is not the real Christianity, as in the Christianity of the saints who built the Church of England. As an Anglo-Catholic, Raymond denounces the increasing secularisation of the Church of England. In his autobiography, Raymond's anti-modernist views are evident since, in his view, Britain was going through 'dark days' due to 'over-arrogant secularism', 'ever-thickening atheism' and 'general indifference to the Church'.<sup>405</sup> In the passage above, Raymond suggests that the recovery of the Church of England depended on retrieving apostolic and catholic doctrines from early Christianity. Raymond also hints at the religious separation in Britain, which was outlined above, criticising the Church of England for being an agent of national unity rather than religious unity. By giving examples from 'Queen Elizabeth' to 'the Pope', Raymond attempts to prove the negative influence of power and politics on religion since he, as an Anglo-Catholic, believed that political control over the Church would damage its purity. Raymond hints at the idea that Queen Elizabeth I ruled during the period when the conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism tore Europe apart in the sixteenth century and the Papacy maintained its legacy of divided Christianity, neither of which, in his view, were true embodiments of Christianity. This idea of religious purity is further emphasised with reference to the saints, St. Aidan and St. Augustine, as models of true Christianity, as these saints are respectively considered as the 'Apostle of Northumbria' and 'Apostle to the English' who spread Christianity among the English and Irish peoples regardless of nationality.<sup>406</sup> In his autobiography, Raymond responds to the accusations of being 'religionless' due to his beliefs, summarising his understanding of the relationship between religion, politics and

---

<sup>405</sup> Ernest Raymond, *Good Morning, Good People: An Autobiography – Past and Present* (London: Cassell, 1970), p.3.

<sup>406</sup> John J. Delaney, *Dictionary of Saints* (New York: Doubleday, 1980), pp. 67–68.

unity.<sup>407</sup> Quoting Christ, Raymond explained that true Christianity reflects the injunction to love 'God with all your heart, soul, mind and strength; and love your neighbour as yourself', whereas there is '[n]o need for God in morals, politics, science or philosophy.'<sup>408</sup> Accordingly in his novel, Raymond criticises the legacy of religious dissension among Christians that was left by Queen Elizabeth and maintained by the Pope, envisaging a British society with diverse sects, all unified under the Church of England. In the novel, this is evident in the Colonel's speech as he suggests that the young men's self-sacrifice is for the greater good of all Christian peoples: not only England's glory, but the unification of Christendom:

[Constantinople is] the only ancient city purely Christian in its origin, having been built by the first Christian Emperor in honour of the Blessed Virgin. [...] In their fight to wrest this city from the Turk, the three great divisions of the Church are united once more. The great Roman branch is represented by the soldiers and ships of France: the great Eastern Orthodox branch by the Russians, who are behind the fight: the great Anglican branch by the British, who can be proud to have started the movement, and to be leading it. Thus Christendom United fights for Constantinople, under the leadership of the British, whose flag is made up of the crosses of the saints. The army opposing the Christians fights under the crescent of Islam.<sup>409</sup>

According to the passage above, the Gallipoli campaign ensures the integrity of Christendom 'under the leadership of the British'. The British Empire is idealised and celebrated since its zest for conquest has led to the revival of traditional Christianity. This compares to the Islamist ideas in Ersoy's Gallipoli poem, in which the author glorifies the Ottoman Empire for its leadership and bearership of Islam for centuries. Similar to Raymond's integrative ideas, Ersoy's view of Islamism is also that it is

---

<sup>407</sup> Raymond, *Good Morning, Good People*, p.80.

<sup>408</sup> Ibid.

<sup>409</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.196.

inclusive of all Muslims, including those in other nations such as Arabs or Kurds and other sects such as Shia and Sufism. Another similarity is that both Ersoy and Raymond convert the Gallipoli campaign into a Holy War. In the novel, the colonel, for instance, tells the young officers: 'You're not over-religious, I expect, but you're Christians before you're Moslems, and your hands should fly to your swords when I say the Gallipoli campaign is a New Crusade.'<sup>410</sup> Richard Gamble suggests that '[o]ne of the principal ways the belligerent powers mobilized religion was in how they defined themselves, the enemy, the stakes in the war, and what victory would bring.'<sup>411</sup> Similarly, Raymond uses Christianity in defining themselves (the British soldiers) and the enemy (the Turks) just as Ersoy defines the enemy and the Turkish self in Islamic terms.

As can be seen, *Tell England* reflects a sense of English identity which was peculiar to the pre-war period. This middle-class 'Englishness' involves Victorian sentimentality, public school culture through sport and classical references, patriotic self-sacrifice and imperial greatness. Both sport and classical references are used to 'praise modern fighters' and 'glorify death and heroism' as well as to 'ennoble the [Gallipoli] campaign'.<sup>412</sup> Retelling stories from antiquity and the Middle Ages as well as re-creating English sporting exploits enables Raymond to contextualise the British Empire within the Mediterranean and imperial traditions. He provides for the British a link between the Classical past, contemporary British culture and the future of the Empire, in order to make sense of a war that takes place in foreign fields. Raymond uses the Gallipoli landscape as an access point to the history and mythology of ancient Greek civilisation, placing the British Empire within a Mediterranean continuum to emphasise that there is room for conquest. If Raymond had not romanticised the war with his epic novel of noble sacrifice, as Macleod argues, 'Gallipoli could have been transformed into

---

<sup>410</sup> Ibid p.196.

<sup>411</sup> Richard Gamble, 'Was World War I the last crusade?', *American Conservative*, 13 (2014), 53-56 (p.54).

<sup>412</sup> Macleod, p.9.

the ultimate disillusioning experience.<sup>413</sup> However, although Raymond's novel was popular and influential, it is not necessarily representative of all British writing about Gallipoli, since other, lesser known, veteran-writers take different approaches that dismantle various aspects of Raymond's heroic romantic portrayal of Gallipoli. The remainder of this chapter explores a number of these alternative approaches.

### **W. F. Rollo – Imperial Patriotism**

Raymond's middle-class Englishness, patriotism and ennoblement of imperial Britain were not essentially peculiar to British Gallipoli writing. As Tricia Lootens notes, 'there was something peculiarly "Victorian"' in World War I writing, particularly in patriotic war poetry.<sup>414</sup> The Victorian era saw many debates over a revitalisation of poetry in the literary sphere as well as over the perception that 'poetry decline[d] as civilisation advance[d]'.<sup>415</sup> This paralleled ongoing debates over nationhood and empire. As mentioned above, like many other empires, the British Empire also defined itself in the image of previous empires, such as the Roman Empire, which was manifest in those debates as concerns over a possible decline of the British Empire since even the grand Roman Empire fell.<sup>416</sup> The debates also included whether or not the British Commonwealth nations should still be considered as British regardless of their race and culture.<sup>417</sup> This meant that definition of British identity had to undergo change since the modern British nation was 'politically, ethnically, religiously and linguistically diverse' and 'Protestantism and anti-French sentiment' were no longer a binding force

---

<sup>413</sup> Macleod, p.12.

<sup>414</sup> Tricia Lootens, 'Victorian poetry and patriotism', in *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Poetry*, ed. by Joseph Bristow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.255-280 (p.255).

<sup>415</sup> Margaret Linley, 'Nationhood and empire', in *A Companion to Victorian Poetry*, ed. by Richard Cronin, Alison Chapman and Antony H. Harrison (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002) pp.421-438 (p.424).

<sup>416</sup> Krishan Kumar, 'Greece and Rome in the British Empire: contrasting role models', *Journal of British Studies*, 51 (2012) 76-101 (p.79).

<sup>417</sup> *Ibid* p.96.

for the British nation.<sup>418</sup> Instead, the concept of empire forged the Victorian nation and shaped Victorian nationalism.<sup>419</sup>

Patriotic poetry stepped in at this point. Taking up the subject matter of 'national discourse, which derived from discourses on empire', poetry was not only to be revived but also used to help forge the nation's relationship to empire.<sup>420</sup> Poets such as Alfred Tennyson, Felicia Dorothea Browne Hemans and Rudyard Kipling wrote about patriotic devotion to the mother country and spoke of imperial duty and loyalties to the 'land of one's birth'.<sup>421</sup> Patriotic poetry benefited from the romantic qualities in the literature of ancient Greece and Rome within the context of imperial heroism.<sup>422</sup> The idealisation of classical images such as purity and chaste perfection to promote imperial duty and patriotic devotion to one's country became a recurring tendency. The questions of imperial domination, imperial citizenship, and the globalising and civilising mission of empire constituted the main themes of comparison between ancient Rome, Greece and Britain.<sup>423</sup> The virtues of heroism and patriotism that once had perfected ancient Rome were believed to represent the English national character in the Victorian Era.<sup>424</sup>

As outlined earlier, some World War I writings show commonalities with Victorian patriotic poetry, particularly – as far as this chapter is concerned – regarding to the topic of empire and imperialism. Some World War I poets considered the war to be an imperial business such as Raymond, and glorified the British Empire within the aforementioned Victorian conventional values. Concerning the 'Georgian poetry' of the period, Santanu Das notes that its use of conventional form in war poetry was a way of challenging 'the age of decadence' between 1880 and 1914 and as a 'return to the cultural center of an English national imaginary where decadence was disclaimed and

---

<sup>418</sup> Ibid p.423.

<sup>419</sup> Ibid.

<sup>420</sup> Ibid pp.424-426.

<sup>421</sup> Lootens, p.256.

<sup>422</sup> Richard Jenkyns, 'The classical tradition', in *A Companion to Victorian Poetry*, ed. by Richard Cronin, Alison Chapman and Antony H. Harrison (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), pp.229-246 (p.229).

<sup>423</sup> Kumar, pp.90-100.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid p.95.

innocence reclaimed.<sup>425</sup> Das further suggests that the Georgian poetry of World War I offers a sense of 'natural innocence' that is 'politicized as well as militarized'.<sup>426</sup> W.F. Rollo's collection of Gallipoli poems, *Stray Shots from the Dardanelles* (1915), though hardly Georgian in nature in other ways, exemplifies this, showing signs of 'natural innocence' within the framework of its patriotic imperial perspective. Rollo's collection illustrates a similar portrayal of Gallipoli to Raymond's *Tell England*; however, this appears in a less sophisticated form, lacking Raymond's religious depth or the complexity of his literary style. In contrast to Raymond, Rollo is a mostly forgotten poet soldier of Gallipoli and little biographical information is available about him beyond the fact that he served as a Lance Corporal with the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion Border Regiment in Gallipoli. His collection of poems offers a chronological storyline of poems outlining his experiences at Gallipoli, but in his poems Rollo does not stick to pure facts and embellishes his poetic expression with conventional patriotic and imperialist rhetoric.

A reading of his Gallipoli collection shows that Rollo seemed convinced of the need to fight Germany and the Ottoman Empire at Gallipoli and that he believed the British cause was just. His poem 'The Capture of Boomerang Trench', which describes the battle as a Boomerang game that England eventually wins, for instance, correlates the idea of 'fair play' in war with British sportsmanship, as does Raymond's work. In his poem 'To the Fallen Officers of the 34<sup>th</sup>', Rollo calls attention to the noble sacrifice of men who laid down their lives for England and suggests that their bravery and sacrifice was for a 'righteous cause':

Brave hearts! The highest courage  
showing,  
More priceless gem than potentate e'er  
wore,  
The thirsty land that drank thy life when  
flowing,

---

<sup>425</sup> Santanu Das, *The Cambridge Companion to the Poetry of The First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p.37.

<sup>426</sup> Ibid p.36.

In righteous cause, is richer than  
before.<sup>427</sup>

‘Righteous cause’ reinforces the poem’s argument for consolation. Since men sacrificed their lives for a just cause, current sufferings linked to their loss will be substituted for eternity in time, as the fallen soldiers will be immortalised in the memory of the living:

The ancient spirit of an Empire’s glory  
In brightest flame illuminates thy shrift,  
Posterity will reverence thy story,  
And time will heal the present cruel  
rift.<sup>428</sup>

Their everlastingness is defined not only in memory but also in the lasting glory of the Empire, purifying the sins of the fallen soldiers. The strength and glory of the Empire is often emphasised in Rollo’s poems. Like Raymond, Rollo also provides, however casually, a link to classical mythology. In ‘Naval Bombardment, Preceding the Landing’, for instance, the navy is depicted as ‘Neptune’s sons’, who ‘[h]ave brought the angry lion from his lair’ at Gallipoli.<sup>429</sup> The expression of pride in the naval power of Britain is embodied by the ancient Roman god of freshwater and sea. Rollo, here, sees the British Navy, and thus the British Empire, in the image of the Roman Empire. The comparison between the navy and Neptune implies imperial power; that Britain was now the dominant imperial power and the carrier of the civilizing mission to the world, as the Roman Empire once had been. The use of this comparison not only challenges the Turks in the Dardanelles but also the British Empire’s most formidable rival on the seas, Germany, since a potential victory at Gallipoli would be a proof of British dominance over the Mediterranean damaging Germany’s bid to win the war. The British army, as well, could be read as the representatives of the Empire. The analogy

---

<sup>427</sup> Rollo, p.11.

<sup>428</sup> Ibid.

<sup>429</sup> Ibid pp.12-13.

of 'the angry lion [coming] from his lair' to Gallipoli is reminiscent of Ersoy's description of the Western European armies as 'hyenas' who 'are released from their cages'. Both poets depicted the British as wild animals being released from a 'cage' or a 'lair' to emphasise imperial ambitions. Whilst Ersoy's 'hyena' analogy, with the hyena as a symbol of stealth and cowardliness, satirizes and censures the British for these ambitions, Rollo's 'lion' analogy, as a symbol of courage and pride, praises the British, emphasising the strength of the British army 'who fight with freedom for a cause'.<sup>430</sup>

Yet Rollo combines myth with actuality in his poems. The poems portray the fighting and modern warfare as part of the ordinary human world, but also stress the spiritual reward of dying for a good cause and for the British Empire. In 'Naval Bombardment', the bombardment is described as a part of the ordinary life of a soldier since, as 'the day is breaking' and the soldiers are awaking, '[t]he air with death is pregnant and is shaking/ With salvos that from ships of war are born.'<sup>431</sup> Through the focus on death, the vulnerability of young men to modern weaponry is emphasised. Rollo's poems are not designed to provoke pacifist sentiments or to end the war, however; instead, they are testimonies to the brutality of historical and modern warfare. However, comments such as 'ours shall be the triumph of the day' illustrate a sense of reconciliation of Rollo's individual identity with the military discourses imposed by the imperial state.<sup>432</sup> Rollo's poem 'A Broken Melody From Lemnos' similarly depicts this discourse from the perspective of a French soldier who, speaking to the author, celebrates England's participation in the war saying 'Bon jour cher Tomi, Vive l'Angleterre!' since it is the 'Tommies' who 'make old Eenglan' Merree' and 'help to make ze German canaille fall'.<sup>433</sup> His last poem 'l'Envoi' (shipment), in which Rollo's poetic alter ego is dying, illustrates his fear of death but also his consolation in the thought that death is not the end, but a means of change into the soul, which 'perfect[s] all that once imperfect was'

---

<sup>430</sup> Ibid.

<sup>431</sup> Ibid p.12.

<sup>432</sup> Ibid.

<sup>433</sup> Ibid pp.23-24.



since by death, 'Nirvana's found in Universal cause.'<sup>434</sup> The poem holds suffering to be close to sacrifice ending in spiritual peace.

In addition to the spiritual peace in the deaths of soldiers, the everlastingness of memory and the afterlife is emphasised in Rollo's poems. In his poem 'The Landing', the speaker defines his division as the 'Immortal Twenty ninth' who 'for ever tells / a deed that set the world amazement crying'.<sup>435</sup> Similarly, in 'To the Fallen Officers of the 34<sup>th</sup>', the dead soldiers are assured that their immortality not only lies in 'the stained grass' and 'the crimson flower', but also in the memory of posterity who 'will reverence [their] story' whilst '[t]he ancient spirit of an Empire's glory/ In brightest flame illuminates [their] shrift'.<sup>436</sup> As mentioned above, the tone of English patriotism can be seen once again in the death of soldiers, since dying for the Empire in the poem wipes away all of the earthly sins of the dead soldiers and their 'heroism' writes their names on 'Heaven's Scroll of Fame':<sup>437</sup>

No eulogy sufficient praise can tender,  
No useless pen extol each gallant name,  
Immortal hands thy heroism render  
In purest light on Heaven's Scroll of  
Fame.<sup>438</sup>

The poem reminds the reader of Ersoy's 'To the Martyrs of the Dardanelles', in which dead Turkish soldiers at Gallipoli are depicted to be so noble that nothing is enough to cherish their memory; not even the whole of the glorious Islamic history is vast enough to compensate for their sacrifice and bravery. Similarly, in 'To the Fallen Officers of the 34<sup>th</sup>', no eulogy or pen can sufficiently praise the heroism of the dead soldiers in Gallipoli.

---

<sup>434</sup> Ibid p.31.

<sup>435</sup> Ibid p.14.

<sup>436</sup> Ibid p.11.

<sup>437</sup> Ibid.

<sup>438</sup> Ibid.

### **Aubrey Herbert: Disillusionment, Humanism and Classical Antiquity**

Contrary to the imperialist-romantic perspectives of Rollo and Raymond, Aubrey Herbert, who was an honorary attaché in Istanbul between 1904 and 1905, took a more critical, empathetic and humanitarian approach to the Gallipoli campaign and its belligerents. His excellent knowledge of the Turkish language and culture eventually led him to serve at Gallipoli as a Liaison Officer and Interpreter in the ANZAC's New Zealand contingent, which Herbert enjoyed, but, as Desmond MacCarthy puts it, with 'a devoted detachment'.<sup>439</sup> According to MacCarthy, Herbert was 'the antithesis [...] of the "party man," even in patriotism and war', and he was capable of understanding the points of view of others, even of an enemy, and of criticising 'anything he deplored in the attitude of his own countrymen'.<sup>440</sup> As outlined in the previous chapter on the 'British Perceptions of the Enemy', Herbert's political judgements on the British and Turkish positions regarding the Gallipoli campaign were influenced by his diplomatic tour of duty in Istanbul. Events such as the Balkan Wars, the Ottoman Empire's internal struggles and the British way of handling these shaped his perspective of the British at Gallipoli and, for this reason, it is important to consider the historical events prior to the Gallipoli campaign in examining his perspective and writing on Gallipoli.

Contrary to Raymond, Rollo and Turkish authors such as Ersoy and Gökalp, Herbert shows neither any interest in religion or Christianity in his writing when describing the Gallipoli campaign nor any intention to justify the war in terms of religion. However, he confesses in his travel book, *Ben, Kendim* that he was 'full of imperialist ambitions' like Raymond in his early days of travelling, such as in his travels to Yemen in 1905, and that he was 'looking forward to the day when [Yemen] should be controlled and its extraordinary resources should be developed by Great Britannia'.<sup>441</sup> In 1905, Herbert believed that the British Empire was the representative of world

---

<sup>439</sup> Desmond MacCarthy, 'Aubrey Herbert', in Aubrey Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut* (London: 1925) <<http://www.gwpda.org/wwi-www/Mons/mons.htm#intro>> [accessed 21 October 2016].

<sup>440</sup> Ibid.

<sup>441</sup> Aubrey Herbert, *Ben Kendim*, p.75.

'justice' and 'administration', which 'ruled other people discreetly', 'interfered only when [she] had to interfere', 'did not kick' and 'did not cajole', 'developed without exploiting', in short, believing that 'a backward nation could look forward to the amenities of life and self-respect under British tutelage.'<sup>442</sup>

However, his imperialist perspective changed during his posting in Istanbul, especially after the start of World War I. This change arguably began when Herbert witnessed internal conflicts in the Ottoman Empire, such as in the Balkans. This time his prejudice began to switch sides against Christians living in the Empire. The conflicts in the Balkans, especially in Macedonia, led Herbert to criticise Christians to some extent for the violence they initiated.<sup>443</sup> Having started his journey to Istanbul as an anti-Turk, his increasing knowledge about the Ottoman Empire led Herbert to think that Muslim Turks were not the only culprit in the violent events in the Balkans as he learned that 'many of the worst atrocities were committed by the Christians upon their own kind' in Macedonia.<sup>444</sup> In a letter to his mother, for instance, he defined Ottoman Christians as 'cringing' and 'unattractive' and compared them to the Turks who are 'genial' and 'polished.'<sup>445</sup> He also notes his meeting with a Turkish captain in Damascus who lost his eye while 'preventing Christians from killing each other.'<sup>446</sup> Herbert portrayed pre-war Christendom in the Ottoman Empire as divided, intolerant and violent against one another, which deeply upset him. It must be for this reason that the Young Turk revolt in Salonika excited him as he observed that 'Christians had their arms round the necks of Moslems, the old order and the new mingled. There were high hopes for the future. Murders ceased, there was no thieving: baksheesh was refused, the Millenium regained.'<sup>447</sup>

---

<sup>442</sup> Ibid.

<sup>443</sup> FitzHerbert, p.52.

<sup>444</sup> Ibid.

<sup>445</sup> Ibid p.47.

<sup>446</sup> Herbert, *Ben Kendim*, p.71.

<sup>447</sup> Ibid p.257.

While in 1905, Herbert was proud of British imperialism and dominance in the Middle East, his feelings towards the international politics of the British Empire started to change with the Young Turk revolution. Herbert supported the revolution, as he believed that it would bring peace to peoples from different races, nationalities and religions in the Ottoman Empire. Herbert believed that the Young Turks had Anglophile leanings and the British government should have helped them. However, in his view, a strong reformed Turkey would have been not only a threat to the nationalist aspirations of the Balkan countries, but also inconvenient for the Western Europeans desire to 'meddle in, and extort economic concessions' from the Ottoman Empire.<sup>448</sup> Europe, in Herbert's words, 'wanted a client and not a competitor'.<sup>449</sup> Upon witnessing the counter-revolution in 1909 when the Sultan re-gained his power, Herbert wrote in *The Spectator* that the Sultan's regaining his power was a 'sad reminiscence [rather] than hope, a contemplation of the past rather than a prayer for the future'.<sup>450</sup> His feelings about the counter-revolution made him resent the role of the British Embassy in its support for the Sultan and he told his mother that the British diplomats 'have snubbed [the Turks] whenever it was possible, have supported the people they most disliked'.<sup>451</sup> During the Balkan wars, Herbert's resentment of British foreign politics grew as he considered the Great Powers to be 'animal in their lusts, Pharisees in their aspirations'.<sup>452</sup> Whereas the British media praised the Balkan allies and propagated anti-Turkish feelings, he wrote a pro-Turkish poem about the Balkan wars in which his critique centres on the countries which, in his view, took advantage of the weak Ottoman Empire for their own aspirations, and he ends the poem with a verse that condemns the British media for their hypocrisy:

---

<sup>448</sup> Ibid p.82.

<sup>449</sup> Ibid p.271.

<sup>450</sup> Ibid p.86.

<sup>451</sup> Ibid p.87.

<sup>452</sup> Ibid p.113.

So now the twilight falls upon the twice  
betrayed,  
The Daily Mail tells England and the  
Daily News tells God  
That God and British Statesmen should  
make the Turks afraid  
Who fight unfed, unshod.<sup>453</sup>

When World War I started, Mark Sykes wrote in a letter to Herbert explaining Herbert's duties in Egypt where he was to ally himself with tribes willing to fight against the Ottoman Empire:

Turkey must cease to be. Smyrna shall  
be Greek. Adalia Italian. Southern  
Taurus and Northern Syria French,  
Filistin British, Mesopotamia British and  
everything else Russian – including  
Constantinople and Noel Buxton and I  
shall sing a Te Deum in St Sophia and a  
Nunc Dimittis in the mosque of Omar.  
We will sing it in Welsh, Polish, Keltic,  
and Armenian in honour of all the gallant  
little nations.<sup>454</sup>

Even though the duties Sykes explained to Herbert did not match Herbert's ideas and his love of Turks, his loyalty to the British Empire remained strong. However, as Herbert wanted to help countries such as the Ottoman Empire and Albania and his duty suggested otherwise, he felt betrayed by British politicians.

When World War I started, Herbert was eager to enlist to compensate for his feeling of shame and loss of honour during the South African War, which he could not join due to his poor eyesight.<sup>455</sup> However, his enthusiasm for war did not last long when Turkey decided not to remain neutral and entered the war siding with Germany, which, to Herbert, meant that he would have to fight against an enemy that he loved at Gallipoli.<sup>456</sup> When he arrived at Gallipoli, however, he was still happy to be a part of the campaign since '[t]here have been Turkish vocabularies to write, scraps of intelligence

---

<sup>453</sup> FitzHerbert pp.115-116.

<sup>454</sup> Ibid p.148.

<sup>455</sup> Ibid p.26.

<sup>456</sup> Ibid p.144.

to do, winds to meet and wine to drink and Greeks to beat'.<sup>457</sup> Herbert was satisfied at being close to his Turkish friends, having the opportunity to communicate with them, making the whole regiment 'Turkophile' and being able to play to his strengths.<sup>458</sup> In this sense, Herbert's motive in the Gallipoli campaign was to promote peace between Turks and the British, even briefly in the midst of carnage, and to further a sense of friendship between both sides as much as possible in a violent war.

However, his humanistic perspective and loyalties to the British Empire did not stop him from criticising British politics and the Empire's Gallipoli strategy and to feel betrayed by them. As he witnessed the daily slaughter of his comrades and soldiers, the whole Gallipoli strategy failed to make any sense to Herbert. In his diary, *Mons, Anzac and Kut*, he states that '[t]ime, men, money, ammunition are all being wasted here [at Gallipoli]!'<sup>459</sup> However, according to him, 'the home authorities cared nothing and knew nothing about the Dardanelles' and for this reason '[t]he policy and the strategy of the expedition were bitterly criticized' among other officers.<sup>460</sup> In his published diary, mixing criticism with sarcastic humour, Herbert shares what his friend believes about the campaign:

"All this expedition is like one of Walter Scott's novels, upside down. Walter Scott generally put his hero at the top of a winding stair, where he comfortably disposed, one by one, of a hundred of his enemies. "Now," he said, "what we have done was, first of all to warn the Turks that we were going to attack by having a naval bombardment. That made them fortify the Dardanelles, but still they were not completely ready. We then send a small force to attack, to tell them that we really are in earnest, and to ask them if they are quite ready. In fact, we have put the man who ought to be, not the hero, but the villain of the piece, at the top of the corkscrew stair,

---

<sup>457</sup> Ibid p.152.

<sup>458</sup> Ibid p.150.

<sup>459</sup> Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut*, p.77

<sup>460</sup> Ibid p.142.

and we have given him so much notice  
that when the hero attacks the villain  
has more men at the top of the circular  
stair than the hero has at the bottom. It's  
like throwing pebbles at a stone wall," he  
said, mixing his metaphors.<sup>461</sup>

Herbert not only criticises in his diary the general strategy of the Gallipoli campaign, but also prominent political and military figures; however, he often does it implicitly, by either mentioning a universal hatred for that specific politician or military man or by pointing out somebody else's criticism. For instance, in his diary, Herbert claims that 'Winston's [Churchill] name fills everyone with rage' and as 'Roman emperors killed slaves to make themselves popular, he is killing free men [at Gallipoli] to make himself famous.'<sup>462</sup> Herbert deflects his anger at Churchill onto the general mood of the soldiers to avoid direct criticism and censor his anger. This could perhaps be due to concerns over the publishability of the diary and as Margaret FitzHerbert suggests, Herbert left out many parts of the original in his published diary.<sup>463</sup> However, in some parts of the diary, Herbert directly blames Churchill for the heavy toll at Gallipoli. For instance, he asks '[i]f Kaiser is a man of blood, what about Winston?' and asserts that '[h]is vanity [is] primarily the cause for us getting killed.'<sup>464</sup> As Herbert's anger grew with the daily sight of men dying violently, in a letter to his wife, where he did not censor his thoughts and anger, he wrote that '[a]s for Winston, I would like him to die in some of the torments I have seen so many die in here. But his only "agony" [...] is missing being P.M.'<sup>465</sup> In his diary, Herbert also does not hesitate to criticise the military strategies that the politicians and military used. Discussing the naval bombardment of 19<sup>th</sup> February 1915, Herbert claimed that, '[i]f he [Churchill] hadn't tried that coup [the naval bombardment] but had cooperated with the Army, [the British] might have [already] got

---

<sup>461</sup> Ibid.

<sup>462</sup> Quoted in FitzHerbert, p.151.

<sup>463</sup> Ibid p.154.

<sup>464</sup> Ibid p.84.

<sup>465</sup> Ibid p.155.

to Constantinople with very little loss'.<sup>466</sup> Another public figure that Herbert did not approve of regarding his strategies was General Ian Hamilton, who commanded the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force during the Gallipoli Campaign. In a letter to his wife, he wrote that 'Hamilton has the obstinacy of weak men. I have had one or two instances when I have seen how he and his staff believe what they want to believe in the face of all sense and evidence.'<sup>467</sup> Interestingly, just as Hamilton and Herbert held opposing views concerning the conduct of the campaign, their diaries about Gallipoli are in remarkable contrast as well.<sup>468</sup> Whilst the diary of Hamilton mostly covers themes such as the beauty of the landscape, heroic confrontations with the enemy and his communication with the War Cabinet, Herbert's diary covers the tension in the trenches, the condition of the wounded and the smell of unburied dead – although his published diary omits most of the horrors mentioned in the original.<sup>469</sup>

Herbert's diary informs the reader of the character of the British and Australian soldiers at Gallipoli as well. Noting the difference between the British war against the Germans and that against the Turks, he claims that in France, 'it took considerable time to work [the British soldier] up to a pitch of hatred', whereas 'at Anzac the troops from the Dominions began their campaign with feelings of contempt and hatred, which gradually turned to respect for the Moslems.'<sup>470</sup> Herbert links this hatred to the British soldiers' initial lack of knowledge of the Turks, and he illustrates the irony in the relationship between ignorance and hatred through an experience with soldiers under his control:

Once looking down from a gun  
emplacement, I saw a number of Turks  
walking about, and asked why they had  
not been shot at. "Well," said one man,  
"it seems hard on them, poor chaps.  
They aren't doing any harm." Then up

---

<sup>466</sup> Ibid.

<sup>467</sup> Ibid p.153.

<sup>468</sup> Ibid p.154.

<sup>469</sup> Ibid.

<sup>470</sup> Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut*, p.113.



came another: "Those Turks," he said "they walk about as if this place belongs to them." I suggested that it was their native land. "Well," he said "I never thought of that."<sup>471</sup>

Herbert seems to have empathised with the Turks, perceiving the Gallipoli campaign as a war of defence and the British as the intruders in the Turks' native land. Herbert was a very popular figure among his peers. Compton Mackenzie, for instance, wrote in his diary that '[e]verybody who knew Aubrey will understand how one's heart would leap to see him' and 'it is difficult to believe that Aubrey ever irritated anybody'.<sup>472</sup> Shortly before sailing to Gallipoli, while Herbert was a member of the Arab Bureau based in Egypt, the Hood Battalion of the Royal Naval Division, which was shipped to Egypt to fight at Gallipoli after the Siege of Antwerp, visited Herbert and he enjoyed the company of his friends, Rupert Brooke, Charles Lister and Patrick Shaw-Steward. Brooke wrote in a letter to Violet Asquith that '[w]e had a delicious glimpse of Aubrey and Mary [...] And rode wildly on donkeys through black and white mysterious streets at night under a full moon.'<sup>473</sup> Steward and Lister, on the other hand, reported that, in case they got caught by Turks, they had been practicing a Turkish sentence meaning: 'Do not kill me. I am a friend of Herbert Effendi (Sir/Mr)'.<sup>474</sup> As Herbert was loved among his peers, he developed great admiration and fondness for them as well. Most of his Gallipoli poems, such as 'To R.B' and 'The New Zealander', are dedicated to his fallen comrades. His poems are important in the sense that they reveal a different perspective from his letters and diary. War suffering and service created a mood of angry resentment in Herbert's letters. Similarly, his war diary reflects more censored, but realistic criticisms and observations of the campaign and its conditions. By contrast, his poems portray a more romantic perspective, eulogising and mythologizing his fallen comrades. His poems lack his criticism of politics and the strategy of the campaign,

---

<sup>471</sup> Ibid.

<sup>472</sup> FitzHerbert, p.159.

<sup>473</sup> Ibid p.151.

<sup>474</sup> Ibid.

and rather focus on individual heroism, perhaps reflecting a desire to keep the memory of the fallen separate from the ugly truth of war, and remembering them as they deserve to be remembered.

Upon the news that Rupert Brooke had died on a hospital ship in Skyros, many poets published poems in newspapers and magazines dedicated to Brooke to immortalise him. In Vandiver's terms, the boom of an 'apotheosis' of Rupert Brooke in poetry eventually led to Brooke's being mythologised, reviving the idea of a public school version of the classical ideal.<sup>475</sup> Vandiver suggests that:

The idea that a modern fighter became, through his death, a tutelary spirit or even a quasi-divinity was most commonly associated with Rupert Brooke. The circumstances of Brooke's life and death – his fame based on the 1914 sonnets, his own personal beauty, his early death on the voyage to Gallipoli, and his burial on a Greek island – made him the perfect vehicle for memorial poems that idealized sacrifice and deified the sacrificed.<sup>476</sup>

Like many others, Brooke's death affected Herbert so deeply that he dedicated his poem, 'To R.B.' to Brooke.<sup>477</sup> Published in *The Times* in 1916, rather than conveying the idea of 'idealized sacrifice' or of having 'deified the sacrificed' through Brooke's death, Herbert's poem, however, reflects a sense of a memorial or praise for a heroic poet. As mentioned before, Brooke along with the other members of the Hood Battalion visited Herbert in Egypt shortly before they sailed for Lemnos in mid-April 1915 and that is why the news of Brooke's death took him by surprise. As the poem relates:

It was April we left Lemnos, shining sea  
and snow-white camp,  
Passing onward into darkness. Lemnos  
shone a golden lamp,  
As a low harp tells of thunder, so the  
lovely Lemnos air

---

<sup>475</sup> Vandiver, pp.361-368.

<sup>476</sup> Ibid p.361.

<sup>477</sup> Herbert, *Ben Kendim*, p.4.

Whispered of the dawn and battle; and  
we left a comrade there.<sup>478</sup>

The poem starts with a romantic description of Herbert's battalion leaving the Greek island for the landing. The beautiful description of Lemnos as shining 'a golden lamp' with 'shining sea' and 'snow-white camp' makes a contrast with the 'darkness' of their destination. The last line of the stanza, 'we left a comrade there' on Lemnos, which is described as beautiful, gives the impression that the 'comrade' is still alive.<sup>479</sup> However, as outlined later in the poem, the comrade – Rupert Brooke – is already dead. The beauty of the island as well as the mundanity of the sentence 'we left a comrade' illustrates Herbert's surprise and unwillingness to accept his comrade's sudden death. However, a factual inaccuracy strikes the reader since the poem speaks of Brooke's grave as if it was in Lemnos, whereas Brooke was buried on another Greek island, Skyros. Although Vandiver believes that Herbert overrides facts by changing Brooke's grave to Lemnos due to the island's associations with Jason and the Argonauts, it is more likely that, when Herbert first wrote his poem, he believed that Brooke's grave was at Lemnos.<sup>480</sup> He enters in his diary that his comrade B. told him that 'Rupert Brooke died at Lemnos' and how sorry he felt upon hearing the news as he believed that Brooke was a 'poet with [a] great future.'<sup>481</sup>

Like many other poets, Herbert uses classical allusions to express admiration for Brooke in his poem 'R.B.'. However, Herbert's use of classical antiquity is not intended to justify the war and portray it as a defensive war like Raymond and Rollo by setting Brooke up as a heroic model for future generations. Instead, he intends to achieve consolation:

---

<sup>478</sup> Aubrey Herbert, 'R.B.', in *The Lost Generation of 1914*, ed. by Reginald Pound (New York: Coward-McCann, 1965), p.124.

<sup>479</sup> Ibid

<sup>480</sup> Vandiver, p.381.

<sup>481</sup> Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut*, p.93.

He who sang of dawn and evening,  
English glades and light of Greece,  
Changed his dreaming into sleeping, left  
his sword to rest in peace.  
Left his visions of the springtime, Holy  
Grail and Golden Fleece,  
Took the leave that has no ending, till  
the waves of Lemnos cease.<sup>482</sup>

With the words 'Holy Grail and golden fleece', Herbert associates Brooke with the 'Greek hero and crusader'.<sup>483</sup> The reference to Brooke as a Greek hero is certainly accurate and unambiguous; however, the word 'crusader' should not be interpreted as depicted in Raymond's novel as a sign that Herbert subscribed to the idea of a 'war of religions', for it would neither match Herbert's perception of the war nor his personality. Rather, the 'Holy Grail' in the poem refers to a religious journey fraught with physical, moral and spiritual peril. In this sense, it is more reminiscent of Alfred Lord Tennyson's version of the grail in his *The Idylls of the King* (1869). The image of the 'Holy Grail' was an important motif in Arthurian literature, which re-gained importance in the nineteenth century, particularly in Tennyson's poem. In Tennyson's poem, the 'Holy Grail' is depicted to have miraculous powers, from healing the sick to bringing salvation to humanity.<sup>484</sup> Only if men were pure, God would send the 'Holy Grail' to the earth again.<sup>485</sup> In the poem, Sir Percivale, the retired knight and a monk, goes on a quest to locate the 'Holy Grail' so as to find salvation. Herbert applies this idea in his poem; the image of the 'Holy Grail' is used to emphasise Brooke's good intentions in joining the war to end it. The image of the 'Golden Fleece', on the other hand, symbolises authority and kingship in Greek mythology. This image refers to Brooke's patriotic literary persona reflected in his sonnets. The rhyming pattern between the words 'Greece', 'peace', 'golden fleece' and 'cease' provides a link between earlier Greek poets, England and Brooke and highlights Brooke's experience of war which started in

---

<sup>482</sup> Herbert, 'R.B.', p.124.

<sup>483</sup> Vandiver, p.383.

<sup>484</sup> Alfred Lord Tennyson, *Idylls of the King*, p.174.

<sup>485</sup> Ibid.

Greece and ceased in Greece, emphasising his aspirations for peace and for England and the King.

In the rest of the poem, Herbert continues to praise Brooke's character and elevate him as a poet:

There will be enough recorders ere this  
fight of ours be done,  
And the deeds of men made little, swiftly  
cheapened one by one;  
Bitter loss his golden harpstrings and  
the treasure of his youth;  
Gallant foe and friend may mourn him,  
for he sang the knightly truth.

Joy was his in his clear singing, clean as  
is the swimmer's joy;  
Strong the wine he drank of battle, fierce  
as that they poured in Troy.  
Swift the shadows steal from Athos, but  
his soul was morning-swift,  
Greek and English he made music,  
caught the cloudthoughts we let drift.<sup>486</sup>

Herbert portrays Brooke as a singer and musician who sings 'Greek and English music' playing his 'golden harp strings'. These images establish that he associates Brooke with the mythological Greek poet and musician Orpheus, despite not mentioning his name directly. The lines 'clean as is the swimmer's joy' and '[s]trong the wine he drank' also seem to echo Brooke's own sonnets on patriotic sacrifice for England. Herbert thus combines the idea of 'Greek hero' with 'Greek poet' to emphasise the idea of 'lost poetry' and 'lost friendship'.<sup>487</sup> Brooke is depicted as singing his 'knightly truth', finding chivalry and heroism in his death. As the fighting continues, Herbert still wants to believe this idealised version:

Sleep you well, you rainbow comrade,  
where the wind and light is strong,  
Overhead and high above you, let the  
lark take up your song.  
Something of your singing lingers, for  
the men like me who pass,

---

<sup>486</sup> Herbert, *Ben Kendrick*, p.5.

<sup>487</sup> Vandiver, p.382.

Till all singing ends in sighing, in the  
sighing of the grass....<sup>488</sup>

The last verse of the poem casts Brooke as an emblem of patriotism indirectly. In the trenches, Herbert asks Brooke to pass 'his singing' onto the lark so that he can hear Brooke's 'knightly truth' sung from the trenches. '[T]he men like him' need to keep Brooke's song in their memory to give strength in the trenches during the fighting and need to hold on to the belief that dying for their country is glorious and honourable. This need, however, is temporary in the poem, only lasting until 'the sighing of the grass'. In this sense, Brooke is depicted to have already accomplished his quest of finding 'the Holy Grail and Golden fleece', since Brooke's poems provide Herbert and soldiers like him with salvation from suffering in the trenches and the onslaught of modern weapons. With the ultimate salvation, however, the singing will stop lingering, since Brooke's mission to bring peace and salvation to his compatriots will be accomplished.

Herbert's critical approach to British politics and the official war effort as well as his use of classical antiquity to commemorate the dead is a result of his constant questioning of British foreign politics as well as the war and of his interpretation of these through his moral and intellectual filter. All this is a part of his attempt to make sense of the Gallipoli campaign and a way to deal with the distress and loss that the campaign caused. His perspective on the Gallipoli campaign is by no means as a religious crusade or an imperial conquest as depicted in Raymond's and Rollo's writings, but rather an opportunity to humanise the war as much as possible through a momentary sense of justice and peace. These contradictory responses lead to the overarching argument of this chapter, and illustrate that British writings about the Gallipoli campaign were heterogeneous and individual as the writers tried to make sense of what the campaign meant for Britain and themselves.

---

<sup>488</sup> Herbert, *Ben Kendim*, p.5.

### **A. P Herbert, *Half-Hours at Helles*: Poetic Humour, Mockery and Irony**

Another author who complicated the British narrative of the Gallipoli campaign and contributed to its heterogeneous character was Aubrey Herbert's namesake A. P. Herbert. In July 1915, A. P. Herbert had to spend time in a military hospital due to an illness contracted at Gallipoli, and when he recovered he was passed 'fit for light duty' and appointed to the Naval Intelligence Division in Whitehall. His poem 'The Illusion' describes the moment he was discharged from the military hospital and mocks military rigour and challenges common perceptions of war. In the poem, A. P. Herbert protests that he passed as 'fit for duty' since he does not want to be sent back to the trenches. A. P. Herbert describes that he no longer has the fighting spirit necessary for war, as his 'martial fervour' is 'subject to caprice' and therefore he '[has] performed [his] piece' in this war.<sup>489</sup> Since 'to his recollection', he 'never killed a Turk', he suggests that he is useless for war, not 'fit for duty':<sup>490</sup>

With Private Kent, the sniper,  
I've done some prodigies;  
I spot a Turkish viper  
And tell him where it is;  
Though mine the primal vigour  
To indicate the figure,  
The hand that pressed the trigger  
Was uniformly his,

Perhaps, to be quite candid.  
I'm not cut out for CAIN;  
I slaughter second-handed,  
I fire the distant train;  
My influence in the trenches  
May well compare with FRENCH'S,  
But never a maiden blanches  
To know that I have slain.<sup>491</sup>

From the verses above, we gather that A. P. Herbert (or his poetic alter ego) despises the business of killing so much that during his time in the battlefield he refrains from shooting an enemy, but instead 'fire[s] the distant train[s]'. He compares

---

<sup>489</sup> A. P. Herbert, *Half Hours at Helles*, p.37.

<sup>490</sup> Ibid.

<sup>491</sup> Ibid p.38.

himself with the Biblical figure Cain who murdered his brother Abel, and implies that he cannot commit murder against the enemy whom he sees as brothers. The Biblical comparison is important here since it exposes and criticises the hypocrisy of the state, which required men to kill at war, whereas they had been brought up on the fundamental basis that killing was both legally a crime and spiritually a sin. Despite refraining from first-hand murder himself, he cannot help but participate in the business of killing. However, the irony in these verses rests on his 'second-handed slaughter', as his consolation that '[t]he hand that pressed the trigger/ was uniformly his [comrade's]' actually indicates a strong sense of personal guilt that pursues him even into the comforts of the hospital:

All this impairs my pleasure,  
As poets hate to see  
Some almost perfect measure  
Not quite what it should be;  
Yet have I consolation  
For having failed the nation  
By some miscalculation  
They never finished me.

From experts' truthful stories  
I do my best to learn;  
They all agree that war is  
A murdering concern;  
And since it seems my presence  
Adds nothing to its essence,  
I feel a mere excrescence  
And simply shan't return.<sup>492</sup>

Since he is unable to kill in the trenches, satirising the propagandist language of recruitment, A. P. Herbert metaphorically blames himself for 'having failed the nation' to prepare the ground for the humorous lines that describe his penance in the military misjudgement that put him back on duty. The militarist and propagandist language he uses, such as 'Turkish viper' and 'failing the nation', exhibit a sharp contrast with his unwillingness to participate in war, which is a 'murdering concern' that creates heroes of murderers. In this sense, with the use of irony and humour, A.P. Herbert not only

---

<sup>492</sup> Ibid p.39.



expresses his unwillingness to commit what he considers as murder, but also mocks the ideas of the militarists who perceive war as patriotic duty.

However, if not wanting to fight means failing the nation, in his poem 'In Reserve', A. P. Herbert points out the distant position of generals who do not fight on the battlefield either:

We are, in fact, and should be flattered.  
The last resource the General's got;  
When everybody else is battered  
He'll send us to relieve the lot;  
And even now he broods before his map  
(Where we are represented by a pin),  
Trying to make his mind up, poor old  
chap,  
Whether to drag us in.<sup>493</sup>

The merry opening of the verse, in which the soldiers 'should be flattered', stands in striking contrast to the grim mood of the third and sixth line, 'when everybody else is battered' and the soldiers 'are represented by a pin'. This contrast frames a moment of bitter disillusionment. The portrayal that reduces soldiers to 'pins' creates an image of the general, who is absent from the trenches, unthinkingly sending his men to death. In this sense, A. P. Herbert condemns the general for not only planning campaigns on the map instead of on the field but also for his lack of sympathy for the common soldier. Calling the general a 'poor old chap' who is depicted as planning the proceedings of the war on his map creates bitter humour, which emphasises the contrast that his decision will ultimately be responsible for leading to the carnage of men in the trenches whereas he will be safe whatever his decision results in. In another poem, 'The Dud', A. P. Herbert, mocks Churchill's poor planning of the Gallipoli campaign:

For it [the Gallipoli landing] amused  
them [the Turks], I suppose, to see  
The pride and bulwark of the British  
Empire,  
With coal-black warriors from Senegal,  
In piebald mass emerging from the sea

---

<sup>493</sup> Ibid p.26.

And with fierce gestures scuttling for the  
rocks,  
Like crabs before the shrimper.<sup>494</sup>

'The pride and bulwark of the British Empire', fighting alongside French colonial troops (the 'coal-black warriors from Senegal'), suggests how far the power of the British Empire extended and how formidable the empire is perceived to be. However, the portrayal of the British soldier as 'like crabs before the shrimper' contradicts this statement. Along with the first line, this contrast between the empire's power and the 'crab' metaphor turns into a mockery of the landings, since they are so poorly planned that the powerful British Empire's soldiers are rendered prey before the hunting Turks. Although A. P. Herbert does not directly satirize the war leaders and politicians, it is clear that he finds them incompetent enough in their planning of the campaign. Regarding the trenches, A. P. Herbert also draws attention to the boredom of daily life and the filth full of 'flies' in his poem 'In Reserve'. The poem mocks the idea of Britain's duty to protect Belgium:

In short, I feel the situation's  
About as grave as it could be.  
I only hope the Smaller Nations  
Will show their gratitude to me.  
And when at last we get the clarion call,  
And seize our hyp and bustle up the  
slope,  
And, in the end, do nothing after all,  
They will be pleased, I hope.<sup>495</sup>

Referring to the filth and dirt in the trenches as a 'grave' situation, A. P. Herbert humorously draws attention to the trivialities of being a soldier. Using humour, A. P. Herbert tries to make sense of how his struggle with the 'flies' and 'whirling dust' that turns soldiers into 'mummies' in the trenches relates to the protection of the 'Smaller Nations' such as Belgium. There seems to be a subtle innuendo in this humour that is directed at the British government, which systematically denied the population at home

---

<sup>494</sup> Ibid p.22.

<sup>495</sup> Ibid p.26.

an insight into the real nature of warfare through its propaganda efforts and the imposed ideas of patriotic duty and chivalric ideals that had little to do with the experiences of soldiers at the front.<sup>496</sup> According to A. P. Herbert, 'do[ing] nothing' in the trenches feels nowhere near chivalrous or heroic. In his poem 'Hazards of Home', A. P. Herbert even humorously understates the dangers at the front compared to the danger of air raids at home:

THEY said. 'You will not mind the  
Zeppelin  
Who know so well the sound of iron  
shards;  
You will not blench when breakages  
begin  
Who stood to battle with the SULTAN'S  
GUARDS.

But they were wrong. And when the  
guns went off,  
And undeterred the sausages came on,  
While gay civilians bustled out to scoff  
And happy crowds occurred in  
Kensington,

I said, for these intrepid citizens  
It's well enough to carry on like this;  
They view through habit's minimising  
lens  
The menaced doom of their Metropolis;

But to an officer who only knows  
The milder dangers of the Dardanelles,  
It is too evident that foes are foes,  
And these old bombs much worse than  
many shells.

[...]

Blessed, indeed, I deem the soldier's lot  
In happier hazards far across the foam;  
I doff my hat to those who seize it not,  
The staunch dare-devil souls who stay  
at home.<sup>497</sup>

---

<sup>496</sup> M. L. Sanders, 'Wellington House and British propaganda during the First World War', *The Historical Journal*, 18 (1975) pp. 119–146 (p.119).

<sup>497</sup> A. P. Herbert, *Half Hours at Helles*, p.36.

The poem opens with irony to ridicule civilians as they preach and comment on A. P. Herbert's experience at Gallipoli by suggesting that he 'will not mind the Zeppelin' and 'will not blench when breakages begin' as if they know better than him about the carnage and horrors at the front. However, as a soldier with actual battlefield experience, he knows to take the threat of Zeppelins seriously, while the civilians at home brush off the threat of being hit by a bomb as the 'gay civilians' and 'happy crowds' cheer for war with a patriotic zest in the streets as portrayed in the poem. As the poem continues, A. P. Herbert compares bombings in London with shelling at Gallipoli and criticises civilians for being ignorant of dangers that war brings both at the front and at home, whilst simultaneously presenting both soldiers and civilians as victims of the same war.

As this chapter illustrates, the British authors' perception of themselves differed significantly and depended on the authors' individual backgrounds and convictions. Raymond and Rollo's Gallipoli writings illustrate a sense of pride regarding England's imperial greatness and view the Gallipoli campaign as an imperial opportunity for Britain. Linking the campaign to the Crusades, Raymond claims that the British Empire only defended itself in Gallipoli against Muslims who had invaded and occupied Constantinople for half a century. To support this view, Raymond uses national elements such as public school codes of honour, loyalty and fair play, through which he promotes a sense of Englishness in his novel and religious elements such as the Crusades to justify the idea of religious self-sacrifice and dying for one's country. Rollo, on the other hand, promotes this view by repeating wartime propaganda and giving the reader a sense of soldierly duty in Gallipoli. In his poems, what matters at Gallipoli is to win the war for imperial greatness. Contrary to Raymond and Rollo's idea of religious crusade and imperial conquest, Aubrey Herbert questioned his duty at Gallipoli at every opportunity, although he never compromised his loyalty to the British Empire even at the times when he disagreed with British politicians or military figures the most. In his

Gallipoli writings, Herbert illustrates mixed views; in his diary he voices critical perceptions of what he thought of as injustice in his own compatriots and politicians, whereas in his poems he describes the fallen soldiers in heroic terms to elevate them, which seem to represent his attempts to humanise the war as much as possible. A. P. Herbert's perception of the British war aims is highly individual as well as critical and his humorous criticism is usually directed at military personnel, civilians and even himself.

As this chapter illustrates, British writings about Gallipoli provide the reader with diverse and even contradictory sets of ideas and interpretations regarding the meaning of the Gallipoli campaign for the authors themselves and for the British Empire. Their common ground is the effort to understand the campaign without clear narratives to which they can take recourse, as well as recurring elements such as an engagement with British wartime propaganda, Christianity as motivation for war, and references to classical antiquity. However, their perceptions of the British position probably only find common ground in their personal writings about loss, in which they commemorate their fallen comrades. Regardless of what they think about Gallipoli or their personal views on the British Empire, patriotism and imperialism, they illustrate a sense of, in Macleod's terms, the 'heroic-romantic' approach in their eulogies for fallen soldiers.<sup>498</sup>

---

<sup>498</sup> Macleod, p.10.

## OTTOMAN-TURKISH PERCEPTIONS OF THEMSELVES

After the Ottoman Empire started to shrink and began to lose its multi-ethnic and multi-national structure following the Balkan Wars, the Empire needed to re-define its identity in order to survive during and after World War I. Expressions of this need for a new identity first appeared among intellectuals in the context of different ideologies such as Ottomanism, Islamism, Turkism and Westernism, as mentioned in the previous chapter on Turkish perceptions of the enemy. The social awakening of Turks towards the building of a nation started with the influence of these ideologies and concerns over World War I, and was accelerated by the annexation of the Ottoman Empire by the Allied powers in the post-war period, which led to the Turkish War of Independence. Defining their political ideologies that were often influenced by Western philosophers, the Ottoman intellectuals compared the identity of Western Europeans with that of the Ottoman so as to create a shared hatred towards the enemy (Western Europeans). Whilst this hatred was used as a tool by Ottoman Turkish intellectuals to unify the Ottoman-Turks, it also spawned intellectual discussions about the definition of the collective identity of the Empire and what it should be like.

In this process, since it represented an attack on the Turkish nation's physical and spiritual integrity as well as its political existence, the Gallipoli campaign made the Turkish nation aware of its own value, prompting it to develop a reflexive attitude in its self-perception and a strengthened national consciousness.<sup>499</sup> As a reaction to this attack, the Ottoman intellectuals tried to bring out the nation's common sense of belonging in their Gallipoli writings by re-evaluating and re-defining common values such as language, history, ancestry, homeland and religion. This, in their view, could prevent the loss of social identity due to exposure to Western civilisation and provide for a future existence for the Empire. In this sense, the period around World War I was

---

<sup>499</sup> M. Fatih Kanter, 'Ziya Gökalp'in Çanakkale Şiirinde Benlik Algısı ve Kimlik Kurgusu', *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yılığ*, 13.18 (2015), pp. 551-562, (p.552).

a time of collective self-realisation, which led to the nation-building process of the Turks. This chapter explores Turkish Gallipoli writings to contextualise the early nation-building process in Turkey in relation to evolving Turkish self-perception. By examining a variety of poems, novels and diaries, the following discussions investigate how Gallipoli, as a defensive battle, shaped descriptions of self in Turkish literature and related to a variety of cultural, literary, political and religious issues during this period. The authors' engagement with propaganda is also considered, in an examination of how propaganda shifted from vilification of the enemy to the boosting of national self-understanding in the Gallipoli writings.

### **Turkism and Turanism: Seeking for Solutions to Turkish Indifference**

As outlined in the previous chapters, Ziya Gökalp and Ömer Seyfettin were Turkist intellectuals who aimed to strengthen national consciousness in Turkish peoples living in the Ottoman Empire. Both intellectuals believed in Turanism (pan-Turkism) during the time of World War I and reflected their Turanist and Turkist ideals in their literary works. However, contemporary scholars such as Christopher Powell and Robert F. Melson have interpreted their Turkist and Turanist ideals as a trigger for ethnic cleansing, particularly in relation to the Armenian and Assyrian massacres.<sup>500</sup> Melson, for instance, claims that Gökalp's nationalism rejected Ottomanism, which 'not only accorded minorities a place in the empire but also defined certain moral and political responsibilities of the state toward them and toward all millets [nations]' and therefore 'set the stage for [the Armenians'] destruction.'<sup>501</sup> Sociological theorist Powell agrees with Melson that Gökalp's nationalist theories both 'implied that any action is good if carried out for the good of the nation' and 'excluded Armenians from the Turkish nation'

---

<sup>500</sup> Robert Melson, *Revolution and Genocide: on the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), p.167; Christopher Powell, *Barbaric Civilization: A Critical Sociology of Genocide* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011), p.93.

<sup>501</sup> Melson, p.167.

and therefore 'sanctioned genocide'.<sup>502</sup> Emin Alper, on the other hand, alleges that Seyfettin's short stories try to justify and encourage the Armenian massacres within the context of social Darwinism.<sup>503</sup> Such contemporary interpretations offer interesting perspectives on the roots of the Armenian massacres; however, they also illustrate a lack of understanding of the historical conditions of the late Ottoman period. Although it is undeniable that both intellectuals and their nationalist ideals excluded Armenians or any other ethnic group from their definition of the Turkish nation, accusing Turkist and Turanist intellectuals of inciting violence against non-Turks or of claiming any form of national superiority against them based on this exclusion would be problematic. In an article, defining the relationship between racism and nationalism, George L. Mosse argues that nationalism, unlike racism, even though it always contains elements which might lead to the exclusion of other nations, could be 'tolerant' and respect 'the culture of other nations'.<sup>504</sup> In this case, excluding non-Turks such as Armenians from the definition of the Turkish nation within the concept of Turkist and Turanist ideals did not necessarily mean that the Turkist intellectuals intended to massacre and eradicate non-Turks living in the Ottoman Empire. However, to make such an assertion, it is also essential to understand how Gökâlp and Seyfettin individually defined their nationalist ideologies since, as Mosse points out, 'condemning [nationalism] without distinction, or identifying it automatically with racism, deprives us of any chance to humanise an ideology whose time, far from being over, seems to have arrived once more'.<sup>505</sup> To be able to understand Seyfettin's and Gökâlp's nationalist ideals in their Gallipoli writings, rather than adopting a contemporary perspective, one needs to gain an understanding

---

<sup>502</sup> Powell, p.273.

<sup>503</sup> Original Text: 'Seyfettin'in eleştirisi gayrimüslimlere ya da Türk olmayan unsurlara gösterilen hoşgörüyü ve tanınan yaşama hakkını bir gaflet olarak değerlendirme yönüne saptıkça tehlikeli bir biçimde Sosyal Darwinizmin düşünce sınırları içine dalar.' Emin Alper, 'Ömer Seyfettin', in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce: Cumhuriyete Devreden Düşünce Mirası, Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyetin Birikimi*, ed. by Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekinçil (Istanbul: İletişim, 2009) pp.186-196, p.186.

<sup>504</sup> George L. Mosse, 'Racism and Nationalism', *Nations and Nationalism*, 1.2 (1995), 163-73, (p.167).

<sup>505</sup> Ibid p.168.



of the historical conditions of the late Ottoman Empire in the way that Ottoman intellectuals saw it.

Twentieth-century Ottoman intellectuals were preoccupied with the thought of saving the Ottoman Empire from dissolution. They believed that one of the reasons for the weakness of the empire was the indifference of the Turkish community to the empire's internal and external problems. In a diary attributed to his daughter Nevhiz, Ahmet Nedim Servet Tör epitomises this indifference in the context of war:

'Balkan Harbi bütün kötülük ve acılıklarıyla gerçekleşip görüldü gibi, bizde erdemli ve yüksek ahlaktan hemen hiçbir eser kalmamış. Düşman-ı canımız olan Bulgarlarla müttefikleri bütün Rumeli'yi çiğneyerek İstanbulun kapısına, Çatalcaya dayandıkları vakit, bizim [...] hepimizin beynimizi tutuşturan his yurt telaşı değil, hayat ve gelecek endişesiydi. Hatta cakit ve fırsat buldukça, imkan dairesinde zevk ve eğlenceden geri durmuyor ve bütün felaketlerle yüklü olan bir acıklı harbin binlerce, yüz binlerce aç ve çıplak orduları, muhacir kabileleri için hükümetin dilendiği milli yardımlaşmaya beş on kuruş istemeye istemeye verirken, bir Kağıthane gezintisi için bir kaç lira otomobil veya sandal ücretini vermekten çekinmiyorduk.'<sup>506</sup>

(As the Balkan Wars progressed with all its menace and sorrow, it appears that we [the Turks] are left with no virtue and high morals. Today, when our mortal enemy the Bulgarians and their allies crushed the whole of Rumelia and reached the borders of Istanbul, what lit our brains up was not the panic for our homeland but the concerns over our future and life. Even so, as we found the opportunity, we did not hesitate to have pleasure and fun. When the government begged us for money for thousands and hundreds of thousands of hungry and naked soldiers in this disastrous and distressing war, we unwillingly donated

---

<sup>506</sup> Ahmet Nedim Servet Tör, Nevhiz'in Günlüğü: Defter-i Hatırat (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000), p.93.

a few kuruş, whereas we did not hesitate to give a few liras for a car or a boat trip. [...] They say that Greeks send an important part of their earnings to the Greek government. Ah, Nevhiz, how much I wish you would acquire from your foster-nurse such a grand example of sacrifice which deserves glorification!)

Tör's advice to his daughter on taking on the national sentiments of her Greek foster-nurse parallels Seyfettin's short story 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', in which the Turkish child Aleko takes inspiration from Greek national sentiments. In the same way, Seyfettin criticises the indifference of the Ottoman-Turkish soldiers to the Balkan Wars:

Sekiz sene evvel, mektepten yeni çıktığım vakit gezdiğim bu yerleri bir gün böyle kaçarak terk edeceğimizi hiç aklıma getirir miydım?  
Heyhat... Mademki biz asker değiliz, mademki bizde askerlik için lazım olan zeka ve itaat yok, mademki bizde bir ideal, bir vatan hissi, nihayet bir lisan yok...  
Bölüğün yarısından ziyadesi Türkçe bilmiyor. Tabor Babil Kulesi gibi. Ne alanın satandan, ne satanın alandan haberi var.<sup>507</sup>  
(How could I imagine eight years ago when I left school and wandered around these places that we would escape and desert these places some day?  
Alas. Now that we are not soldiers, now that we do not possess the intelligence and obedience that are required for the military, now that we do not have an ideal, a sense of patriotism, and a common language.  
Half of the company cannot speak Turkish. The battalion is like the Tower of Babel. The seller does not know what the customer wants, the customer does not know what the seller sells.)

Just a year after Tör and Seyfettin criticised this indifference, nothing much must have changed in the society so that İbrahim Naci, who was a lieutenant who served and died at Gallipoli, complained about a lack of unity and solidarity among Ottoman-

---

<sup>507</sup> Ömer Seyfettin, *Balkan Harbi Hatıraları* (Istanbul: DBY, 2011), p.13.

Turks during the Gallipoli campaign. In his diary, Naci appreciates ‘helpful’ and ‘self-sacrificing’ Greek civilians, who provided the Ottoman Army with supplies and compares them with Ottoman-Turks:<sup>508</sup>

How about us [the Turks]! We are in a war for our lands, spilling blood for our honour. Must it be like this? Oh! I did not know how senseless, how spiritless and how bloodless we [Turks] are. As we were passing streets [of Turkish villages] covered with mud and stones under heavy rain, I barely saw signs of sadness in the faces staring out of the narrow windows. How cold were these men!<sup>509</sup>

On different occasions from the Balkan wars to the Gallipoli campaign, Tör, Seyfettin and Naci regretfully point out that the sacrifices made in the battlefields did not mean much to Ottoman-Turkish civilians. Both Tör’s and Naci’s accounts (and also Seyfettin’s short story ‘Bir Çocuk Aleko’ as shown below) convey a sense of appreciation mixed with envy of the Greeks’ sense of patriotism and national unity which, according to their observations, the Turks lacked. Mosse points out that ‘nations which possessed empires’ look upon ‘their subject peoples as counter-types’ and that ‘some nationalisms [made] use of the counter-type in order to sharpen their own sense of community.’<sup>510</sup> It seems that Tör, Naci and Seyfettin make use of non-Muslim minorities as ‘counter-types’ to reveal a Turkish sense of community. In the Gallipoli writings, the ‘counter-type’ of the Turks can also be argued to be the Allied Powers, as the authors compared not only non-Muslim minorities but also the Allied Powers with Ottoman-Turks in ways aligned with their ideology. The extracts above clarify the social reasons (whereas ideological reasons are discussed below) why Turkist or Turanist writings cannot be interpreted as a trigger to violence against non-Turk minorities or as an extreme form of patriotism marked by a feeling of superiority over others. Rather,

---

<sup>508</sup> Naci, *Farewell*, p.63.

<sup>509</sup> Ibid.

<sup>510</sup> Mosse, ‘Racism and Nationalism’, p.170.

they should be read as an attempt to encourage the Turkish defence to win the war by revealing a Turkish consciousness of community and pride in what was being defended, in which minorities primarily act as foils to show the Turks the importance of national identity and patriotism.

Although Mesut Uyar illustrates in his article, 'the Gallipoli campaign was not [always] regarded as significant to the foundation of the Turkish Republic nor as a powerful source of national identity', the Gallipoli campaign has been considered in modern Turkish history as the basis for the Turkish War of Independence and the establishment of the Turkish Republic.<sup>511</sup> Uyar points out that the Gallipoli campaign has been popular in Turkey for only about three decades at most, particularly following the construction of the Gallipoli Memorial in the 1950s and the official campaign of the 1980s, which created a more coherent Gallipoli history.<sup>512</sup> However, the narrative of Gallipoli played its part in constructing national identity, since the Gallipoli writings of Gökalp, Ersoy and Seyfettin not only produced patriotic propaganda but also a self-critique, which led to initial attempts to redefine self-identity and eventually to produce a Turkish national identity.

### **Ziya Gökalp and Cultural Solidarity: 'Turkification, Islamisation and Modernisation'**

'For a hundred years, there has been a microbe crumbling the last hope of the Muslim world, the Ottoman Empire. This microbe has been the enemy of Ottomanism and it has damaged Islam on a large scale. However, today it is trying to compensate for the damages it has caused to Islam. This microbe is the idea of nationalism.'<sup>513</sup>

---

<sup>511</sup> Mesut Uyar, 'Remembering the Gallipoli campaign: Turkish official military historiography, war memorials and contested ground', *First World War Studies*, 7.2 (2016), pp.165-191, (p.165).

<sup>512</sup> Ibid.

<sup>513</sup> Original text: 'İslam aleminin son ümidi olan Osmanlı Devletini yüz seneden beri parçalayan manevi bir mikrop var. bu mikrop şimdiye kadar Osmanlılığın bir düşmanı idi ve İslamiyete büyük zararlar verdi. Fakat bugün artık İslamların lehine dönerek yaptığı zararları telafi etmeye çalışıyor. Bu mikrop milliyet fikridir.' Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.72.

As can be seen from the extract above, Gökalp had not always viewed nationalism in a positive light, but defined it as a 'microbe' and 'enemy'. In his view, nationalism led to minority revolts and eventual independences, sickening and demolishing the Ottoman Empire. However, in his view, the twentieth century was a time in which nationalism and nation-states dominated, and thus Gökalp came to believe that nationalism was the only cure for the Ottoman Empire, and that 'Turks, like other nations, [were] in need of a national conscience and a national organisation.'<sup>514</sup> His literary works reflected this view, through which he aimed to educate the Turkish public so as to achieve a national consciousness and cultural solidarity, much as non-Turkish minorities within the Ottoman Empire had been doing for much of the preceding century, in his view.

Gökalp applied Emile Durkheim's sociological theories to his nationalist ideology, which aimed to 'Turkify, Islamise and modernise' the Ottoman Empire.<sup>515</sup> His terms 'Turkification' and 'Islamisation' are subject to misinterpretation – as outlined above – as racist or extreme Islamist and nationalist, which were aiming for the ethnic cleansing of non-Turks and non-Muslims living in the Empire. A reading of Gökalp's literary works and an understanding of Ottoman social history also clarifies that 'Turkification' and 'Islamisation' were not aimed at eradicating non-Turk and non-Muslim minorities, but at the Muslim Turk majority in order to revive their national identity. This was because, according to Gökalp, Muslim Turks had forgotten their national identity while living in the multi-ethnic and multi-religious Ottoman Empire. In his 1914 poem 'Kızıl Elma' (Red Apple), Gökalp explains this situation, stating that Turkish sultans 'wanted to conquer all over the world'; however, in each conquest, the Turks 'were spiritually conquered

---

<sup>514</sup> Ibid, p.41.

<sup>515</sup> Taha Parla, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp, 1876-1924* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985), p.21.

themselves'.<sup>516</sup> The Red Apple described in the poem is a heaven-like imaginary country which symbolizes Gökâlp's ideal of Turan, a country where all Turkic peoples live together. However, the poem points out that, throughout history, the Turks always looked for that 'heaven' in the wrong places, forgetting where they came from and who they were:

Bazen Hindu, bazen Çinli olmuşuz;  
Arap, Acem, Frenk dilli olmuşuz.

Ne bir Türk hukuku, Türk felsefesi,  
Ne Türkçe inleyen bir şair sesi...<sup>517</sup>

(We [the Turks] became Hindu at some  
time and Chinese the other;  
Adopted Arabic, Persian and European  
languages.

Neither a Turkish law, nor a Turkish  
philosophy,  
Nor the wailing voice of a poet in  
Turkish)

The poem suggests that, throughout history, by adopting different cultures and languages, the Turks conquered many countries looking for 'the Red Apple', but as a consequence, they were alienated from themselves, their cultural and educational values. In the poem, Turkishness is forgotten and the national self is lost, as Turks do not even have their own law, philosophy and written language. According to Gökâlp, the Ottoman elite ignored Turkishness intentionally with the motto of 'there are no Turks, but there are Ottomans', as they were concerned about endangering the integrity of the Ottoman Empire.<sup>518</sup> The poem criticises the fact that the educated members of elites, such as poets and judges, wrote their works in other languages such as 'Persian, Arabic, French and Russian', not paying attention to the Turkish

---

<sup>516</sup> Original Text: 'Çok yerleri biz fethedebilmişiz; / Her birinde ma'nen fethedilmişiz..' Ziya Gökâlp, 'Kızıl Elma', in *Kızıl Elma*, ed. by Yalçın Toker (Toker Yayınları), pp.1-3, p.3.

<sup>517</sup> Ibid.

<sup>518</sup> Original Text: 'Türklük yok, Osmanlılık var'. Gökâlp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.12.

language ‘as if [the Turks] rented [their] mind’ to other cultures and nations.<sup>519</sup> When the Turkish nation is in such a condition as this, according to the poem, the Red Apple is ‘necessary’ and ‘the cure to the problems of the Turks’.<sup>520</sup> The cure for the Turks is ‘neither in India, nor in China’ or ‘with Arabs, Persians or Greeks’, but ‘in the soul of the Turks’ which can be found in their ‘consciousness’; their sense of national identity.<sup>521</sup> It must be for these reasons that Gökâlp describes Turkism as ‘elevating the Turkish nation’ in his book *Turkification, Islamisation and Modernisation*.<sup>522</sup> According to him, Turks who had lost their strength by losing their national sense of self through years of imitating others could be revived with Turkism, which would fill the linguistic, scientific and cultural voids in the nation. In his view, Turks should be ‘Turkified’ through Turkism, which did not necessitate any violence towards non-Turkish minorities, but merely a matching of those minorities’ sense of national identity.

### ***Ottoman Literature, Perishing Turkishness, and Gökâlp’s Turkification***

Before the acceptance of Islam, Turkish folk literature was based on an oral literary tradition, commonly used among nomadic Central Asian peoples. The acceptance of Islam in Turkish culture from the tenth century onwards led to dramatic changes in the literary understanding of Turks. A new literary form of Diwan literature, mainly poetry, emerged with the influence of Arabic and Persian Islamic culture and dominated the Ottoman literary world between the thirteenth and early nineteenth centuries. During this period, the Turkish literature that existed before the acceptance of Islam was ignored and by the nineteenth century it was largely forgotten among the Ottoman elite. Acceptance of Islam also influenced the Turkish language and grammar; in the sixteenth century, Persian and Arabic constituting words dominated eighty-eight percent of the Ottoman language and words with Arabic origins vastly outnumbered

---

<sup>519</sup> Original Text: ‘Zekamızı sanki kiralamışız.’ Gökâlp, ‘Kızıl Elma’, p.3.

<sup>520</sup> Original Text: ‘Kızıl elma işte buna işaret./ Millete olsa bir gizli ihtiyaç, / Milli vicdan bulur ona bir ilaç’ Ibid.

<sup>521</sup> Ibid.

<sup>522</sup> Original Text: ‘Türkçülük, Türk milletini yükseltmektir.’ Gökâlp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.16

Turkish words.<sup>523</sup> This led to a division between the less educated lower class, who spoke demotic Turkish with fewer foreign words, and educated upper class Ottomans, who could speak Arabic and Persian and thus used the written Ottoman language which was based on these two languages. The written and spoken languages differed from each other and the written Ottoman language was incomprehensible to the uneducated majority of Ottoman society, and particularly Ottoman Turks in the Anatolia region.<sup>524</sup> Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad blamed early Diwan poets for the disconnection between the educated elites and the public:

Halkın söylediği bir lisan ve ahengini  
anladığı bir vezinle yazı yazmak onlar  
için barbarlıktan başka bir şey  
sayılmazdı. İşte halkı “sürünen  
hayvanlara benzettiği için” eski şairler  
mütemadiyen hayattan uzaklaştılar;  
milletin ruhundan kopan sesleri  
duymamak maksadıyla kulaklarını  
tıkadılar; dışardaki alemi görmemek için  
gözlerini kapadılar; nihayet, kör, sağır bir  
halde eski acem divanlarında gördükleri  
yapmacıklığı, sahte alemi kendi hakiki  
muhitleri addederek, onun gülleri,  
bülbülleri, akarsuları, pervaneleri  
arasında hayatsız terennümlere  
daldılar.<sup>525</sup>

(Writing in the language of the public  
and in the metre/rhythm whose harmony  
the public can understand was nothing  
but barbarism for [the early Diwan  
poets]. Thus, because they “associated  
the public with creeping/crawling  
animals”, early poets consistently  
distanced themselves from life; closed  
their ears in order not to hear the voices  
coming from the soul of the nation;  
closed their eyes in order not to see the  
real world outside; eventually, blind and  
deaf, they accepted  
mannerism/artificiality and the fake  
world which they saw in Persian poems,

---

<sup>523</sup> Bertold Spuler, ‘Persian Historiography Outside Iran in Modern Times’, in *Persian Historiography and Geography : Bertold Spuler on Major Works Produced in Iran, the Caucasus, Central Asia, India and Early Ottoman Turkey* (Singapore: Pustaka Nasional, 2003), pp.59-70, p 69.

<sup>524</sup> Ibid.

<sup>525</sup> Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad, ‘Hayat ve Edebiyat’, *Tehvid-i Efkar*, 18 March 1922.



and delved into lifeless expressions  
among its roses, nightingales, rivers and  
windmills.)

This disconnection required Ottoman intellectuals to use traditional means of propaganda to deliver their messages to the Ottoman public. To reach the illiterate, criers or literate members of society would be asked to read out periodicals and newspapers to the public and they would be read out during Friday sermons or in coffeehouses.<sup>526</sup> That is why there is uncertainty concerning how many of their written works reached the illiterate public in this way and to what extent their work affected them.<sup>527</sup>

After the establishment of Constitutionalism in 1908, and with the growth of print media, different ideologies emerged in a bid to find a solution to save the dissolving Empire. Concerns that had emerged during the Tanzimat Period to modernise (and westernise) the empire so as to keep up with the West continued, and Western works such as plays, novels, short stories and articles as well as themes including homeland, justice, freedom and nation entered into Turkish-Ottoman literature. However, the traditional language of Ottoman Diwan literature was suitable mainly for poetry, with its eloquent and complicated word structure and the Western works which were written in simple language and in prose, were difficult to translate into Ottoman. Along with the need to educate the illiterate public, this problem occasioned a search for a new Turkish language and literature which was purified of the foreign influences of Persian and Arabic.<sup>528</sup> Seyfettin draws attention to this issue, defining Diwan literature as 'unnatural':<sup>529</sup>

---

<sup>526</sup> Eric J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History, Revised Edition* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2017), p.342; Mehmet Beşikçi, *The Ottoman Mobilization of Manpower in the First World War: Between Voluntarism and Resistance* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), p.85.

<sup>527</sup> Beşikçi, p.85.

<sup>528</sup> Mehmet Kahraman, *Divan Edebiyatı Üzerine Tartışmalar* (Istanbul: Beyan yayınları, 1996), pp.27-28.

<sup>529</sup> Ömer Seyfettin, 'Yeni Lisan', *Genç Kalemler*, 2.1(1911) pp.1-7, (pp.3-4).

Milli bir edebiyat vücuda getirmek için evvela milli bir lisan ister. Eski lisan hastadır. Hastalıkları, içindeki lüzumsuz ve ecnebi kaidelerdir. Evet şimdiki lisanımızda Arabi ve Farisi kaideleriyle yapılan cem'ler, terhib-i izafi, terhib-i tavsifi, vassf-ı terhibiler yaşadıkça saf ve milli addolunamaz. Bu lisanı kimse anlamaz. Ekseriyet bigane kalır. Kitaplar satılmaz. Vatanda mütalaa ve tetebbu merakı husule getirilemez. Otuz milyonluk bir memlekette en büyük ve en meşhur bir gazeteden otuz bin nüsha satılamaz, en mükemmel ve müfid kitabın satışı nadiren bini tecâvüz eder. [...] Konuştugumuz lisan İstanbul Türkçesi en tabii lisandır. [...] Yazı lisanıyla konuşma lisanını birleştirirsek edebiyatımızı ihya, yahut icat etmiş olacağız.<sup>530</sup>

(Constructing a national literature needs a national language. The old language [the Ottoman language] is ill. Its illnesses are its unnecessary and foreign linguistic principles. Yes, as long as the rhetoric, noun phrases, portrayals and adjective clauses are constructed according to Arabic and Persian principles in our current language, it cannot be pure and national. No one can understand this [old] language. The majority of people remain foreign to this literature. The books are not sold. In a country with a population of thirty million, the biggest newspapers cannot even sell thirty thousand copies and the most perfect and informative book can rarely sell a thousand copies. [...] Istanbul Turkish, which we speak, is the most natural language for us. [...] If we merge the written language with the spoken language, we will manage to revive and build our own literature.)

Seyfettin argues that, if the Turkish language could be rid of foreign language principles, which were incomprehensible to the common people, and the spoken and written languages could be merged into one, the national literature would be revived and literacy rates would increase. In his poem 'Lisan' (Language) (1915), Gökalp

---

<sup>530</sup> Ibid.

agrees with Seyfettin and offers solutions in the critical debates about language during this period while objecting to the alienation between a nation and its language:

Türklüğün vicdanı bir,  
Dini bir, vatani bir;  
Fakat hepsi ayrılır  
Olmazsa lisanı bir.<sup>531</sup>

(Turkism has one conscience,  
One religion, one homeland;  
However, all would dissolve  
If it does not have one language)

As can be seen, for Turkists, this language problem stemmed from a lack of nationalism among Turks. Gökalp asserted that ‘the absence of a national ideal among Turks not only caused them to be deprived of a national economy, but also prevented the simplification of language as well as the emergence of a national style in fine arts.’<sup>532</sup> Gökalp as well as other Turkist intellectuals such as Seyfettin and Halide Edip Adivar, introduced the concept of Turkish national literature to the Ottomans and initiated a new literary movement which promoted the use of demotic Istanbul Turkish.<sup>533</sup> They denied that Diwan literature could be the national literature of the Ottoman Turks and chose syllabic verse as a national poetic form instead of the Aruz prosody which was often used in Diwan literature. Gökalp, for instance, denied that the most prominent early Diwan poets were Ottoman national poets, saying that ‘it is not right to consider the Fuzûlîs, the Bâkîs and the Nedims as our classical poets.’<sup>534</sup> Instead, he claimed that Turks should seek their national literature in ‘inscriptions written on stones, leather of gazelles’ as well as in ‘the folk utterances, tales and legends’, the ancient Turkish writings and culture that existed before the Ottoman

---

<sup>531</sup> Ziya Gökalp, ‘Lisan’, in *Yeni Hayat-Doğru Yol*, ed. by Müjgân Cumbur (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1976), p.17.

<sup>532</sup> Original Text: ‘Milli ülküden mahrum olma, Türkleri milli iktisadiyattan mahrum ettiği gibi, dilin sadeleşmesine, güzel sanatlarda milli üslupların meydana gelmesine de engel oldu’ Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.14.

<sup>533</sup> Ibid pp.43-45.

<sup>534</sup> Original Text: ‘Fuzûlî’leri, Bâkî’leri, Nedim’leri bizim klasik şairimiz addetmek doğru değildir.’ Ziya Gökalp, ‘Tevfik Fikret ve Rönesans’, *Muallim dergisi*, 2.14 (1917), p.420.

Empire.<sup>535</sup> This way the language barriers between the Ottoman public and elite could be lifted and the Turkish language would own a national literature suitable for its linguistic structure. To make their poetry accessible to the Ottoman Turkish public, Gökarp, Seyfettin and Ali Canip initiated the Yeni Lisan (New Language) movement to purify the Turkish language of foreign influences such as Arabic, Persian or Western languages and published articles about these matters in *Genç Kalemler Dergisi* (Young Pens Journal). In their literary works, they usually adopted simple Turkish language; in poetry, they used forms of folk poetry and syllabic meter, which were more suitable to the structure of the Turkish language, and adopted a type of poetry called ‘menzume’ which had fewer aesthetic concerns in order for the public to be able to understand it.

According to Gökarp, linguistic unity is the most important element to keep together the values of a nation and, more importantly, the nation itself. He suggests that constructing a national language would protect national unity and solidarity, and thus save the Empire from internal and external threats. Gökarp illustrates this idea in his Gallipoli poem by linking national language to national solidarity. The victory at Gallipoli, which was seen as a cleansing of the stain of the Balkan defeat and was later regarded as a ‘preface’ to the Republic of Turkey, is described to have brought out a sense of national unity for the first time in the Ottoman Empire. Gökarp interpreted this unity as an actualisation of his Turanist ideal so as to provide linguistic and emotional unity among the Turks:<sup>536</sup>

---

<sup>535</sup> Original Text: ‘Edebiyatımızın kaynaklarını bir taraftan taş üzerine yazılmış yazılarda, ceylan derilerinde, diğer taraftan da halkın konuşmalarında, masallarında, destanlarında aramalyız’ Gökarp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.26.

<sup>536</sup> Although Gökarp relates linguistic unity to Turanism, he recognises the difficulty to unite all the Turkic nations together under one rule, which in fact he calls a distant ‘dream’ because Turkic nations, particularly the ones that are geographically distant from Anatolia such as Kyrgyz and Kazakh Turks already formed a different culture and language from the Turks in Anatolia. According to him, the first stage of Turanism is to improve the sense of nationalism of the Turks living in Anatolia through linguistic and cultural unity, which is what he is trying to achieve in his Gallipoli poems. The second stage is to unite with Oguz Turks whom he considers to have more cultural and linguistic connection to Turks living in Turkey. Only the final stage is to bring all the Turkic nations together in terms of art, literature, culture, language and tradition but also politics.

Ancak "Turan" hayal deęil.  
Hakikata döndü bugün...  
Türk bilecek yalnız bir dil,  
Bizim için bu düęün...<sup>537</sup>

(However, "Turan" is no longer a dream.  
It is becoming true today.  
Turks will speak only one language,  
Which will be our celebration day.)

The structure of this verse also illustrates Gökalp's emphasis on the Turkish language. Gökalp used syllabic verse in his poems, including in his 'Gallipoli'. The 4 + 4 poetic form resembles a type of traditional Turkish folk literature called 'çoşkun koçaklama', in which the poet sings about war, gallantry and bravery in an ardent and challenging manner. Rıza Filizok divides those of Gökalp's poems, which were influenced by folk literature into three categories: those whose subject matter he adopted directly from ancient Turkish myths and tales; those resembling folk poetry in form and content; and those in which he made use of nursery rhymes from anonymous folk literature.<sup>538</sup> According to this classification, Gökalp's Gallipoli poem belongs to the second category, as it resembles folk literature in form and content but introduces modern topical subject matter. This resemblance illustrates Gökalp's intention to approach the common people, since folk literature used simple language that they could understand, and syllabic verse was more suited to Turkish phonology than the Aruz prosody used in Diwan poetry. Gökalp's Gallipoli poem, as well as other Turkish national literary works, was not as rich in rhetoric as Diwan literature; however, its importance lies in its plain language, which made poetry more comprehensible to common Turkish people in the Ottoman Empire. The poem's simple language can also be explained in terms of its didacticism, its mission to educate the common people on the dangers of war upon the Empire and the solution to it which, according to Gökalp, was Turkism. However, it cannot be concluded that Gökalp was only influenced by Turkish folk literature due to his Turkist ideals. Some of his other poems show that he

---

<sup>537</sup> Gökalp, 'Çanakkale', p.34.

<sup>538</sup> Rıza Filizok, 'Ziya Gökalp', in *Şiirimizde Halk Edebiyatı Tesirleri Üzerine Notlar* (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1991), pp.25-39, p.25.

also used types of verses reminiscent of Diwan and Western literature, as literary scholars Tansel and Hikmet Dizdaroğlu illustrate.<sup>539</sup> This can be linked to his views on Islamisation and Modernisation, which Gökâlp considered to be a part of Turkism.

### ***Ziya Gökâlp and Islamisation***

The purification of the Turkish language from Arabic brought about discussions as to whether or not this purging of Arabic would damage the existence and unity of the Islamic community, since Arabic is the language of the Quran. Gökâlp clarifies that this purification did not mean the eradication of Arabic and Persian from the Turkish language entirely. Rather, it signified the eradication of 'redundant Arabic and Persian colloquial language words' as well as Arabic and Persian 'prepositions and subordinatives' as their influence led Turkish grammar to be 'a mixture of the grammar rules of those two languages'.<sup>540</sup> Gökâlp's only exception to this purification was Islamic terms which were adopted from Arabic and Persian. Although Gökâlp did not believe that 'adopting every Arabic and Persian word' would 'fulfil [Muslims'] duty for the unity of the Islamic community', he highlighted the importance of keeping religious unity in language and the necessity of having an Islamic institution responsible for choosing Islamic terms that all languages of Islamic states can make use of.<sup>541</sup> According to him, this process was the only correct way to Islamise the Turkish language.<sup>542</sup>

The Islamisation of the Turkish language was not the only novelty that he thought the Turkish nation needed. Turks had to Islamise their mentality and schooling as well, because in Gökâlp's view the Islamic faith was the most important element of Turkish national identity after language. Gökâlp claims that 'just as [Turks] could not give Islamic and Turkish schooling to [their] children, they also failed to provide them with

---

<sup>539</sup> Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, *Ziya Gökâlp Külliyyatı-1: Şiirler ve Halk Masalları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989), pp. XI -XXVIII.

<sup>540</sup> Gökâlp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.20.

<sup>541</sup> Ibid p.21.

<sup>542</sup> Ibid.

modern education.<sup>543</sup> This meant that Turks failed to follow the steps of 'real Islam' in his view, as they could not differentiate between Islamic religion and 'Arabic traditions and worship styles'.<sup>544</sup> As mentioned above, the Tanzimat period was a period in which the Ottoman Empire attempted to modernise itself by imitating the West and, according to Gökalp, modern and Islamic schooling during this period collided with each other and eventually this collision led Islamic schooling to lose its importance in 'its essence and meaning' whilst Westernised modern schooling gained in importance.<sup>545</sup> In his view, these losses occurred because Ottoman Islamic teachers failed to apply science in Islamic schooling and considered science as a Western creation in contradiction with Islam, which eventually led to disbelief and disinterest among students in religion.<sup>546</sup> However, to build a strong education system in the Ottoman Empire, a reasonable and logical collaboration of all Turkish, Islamic and modern educational principles was needed.<sup>547</sup> Gökalp links these Islamic issues in society to the Gallipoli campaign; whilst the victory at Gallipoli restores the Islamic perception of the Ottoman-Turks in the poem, Islam contributes to the victory itself:

Allah dedi: "Kabul olsun".  
Ümmetimin bedduası,  
Dağılsın ordusu Rus'un,  
İngilizlerin donanması..

Türk dedi: "Demek yaradan  
Kurtarmayı ister bizden;  
Karaları Kızıl Rus'tan,  
Denizleri İngiliz'den...

Türk köyünden kalktı geldi.  
Hazırladı siperine...  
Bu geliş ok gibi deldi,  
İngiliz'in ciğerini.

Çok geçmeden birdenbire,  
Parçalandı Rus ülkesi,  
Sevinçle düştü tekbire,

---

<sup>543</sup> Ibid p.45.

<sup>544</sup> Ibid p.46.

<sup>545</sup> Ibid p.44.

<sup>546</sup> Ibid.

<sup>547</sup> Ibid.

Elli milyon Türk'ün sesi...<sup>548</sup>

(Allah said "I accept  
The damnation of my umma  
The Russian army will disband  
The English navy will decay..."

Turks said: "so the creator  
Wishes us to save  
The lands from the Russians,  
The seas from the English..."

Turks came from their village  
Prepared for the trenches  
Their arrival pierced  
The liver of the English.

Before long, all of a sudden,  
The Russian country disintegrated,  
The voice of fifty million Turks  
Called out 'God is the greatest')

The first two stanzas describe how Allah takes sides and supports the Turks in Gallipoli and how Turks obey their God's orders by fighting back against the Russians and the English. This is similar to Raymond's reasoning concerning the Gallipoli campaign in the sense that Gökâlp also justifies war through religion since God is portrayed as being on the side of the Turks, which eventually leads to Turkish victory. Along with this religious justification, 'fifty million Turks' calling out God's name upon victory illustrates Gökâlp's message that, in a time of crisis such as Gallipoli, if Turks hold on to their religion they can overcome the difficulties of war. What strikes the reader in these stanzas is that, whilst trying to strengthen the Islamic feelings of Turks, he uses the word 'umma' which refers to the entire Muslim community bound by Islamic ties, which in turn indicates that his nationalism included non-Turk Muslims as well. In his article 'Türkler ve Kürtler' (Turks and Kurds) (1922), Gökâlp explains that Turks and Kurds should get along well due to their historical, cultural, religious and geographical togetherness.<sup>549</sup> This is because Gökâlp's Turkism included Islam, and in

---

<sup>548</sup> Gökâlp, 'Çanakkale', p.34

<sup>549</sup> Nüzhet, pp.166-167.



his view, Turkism was the first step leading to Pan-Islamism.<sup>550</sup> According to him, Pan-Islamism was possible, but only in the distant future, which is why in the meantime Muslim countries should protect their independence by holding on to the idea of nationalism since nationalism was what the new age required for independence.<sup>551</sup> This relates to Gökalp's views on racism. In his book *Hars ve Medeniyet*, Gökalp analyses and criticises the theories of Gustave Le Bon and William Z. Ripley on the superiority of races and concludes that:

[H]er cemiyetin onu diğer cemiyetlerden ayıran bir karakteri, kendine özgü bir şahsiyeti vardır. Fakat bu kavimsel karakter; bu milli şahsiyet, kalıtım ve ırkın bir neticesi değil, halk arasında kuvvetli bir şekilde yaşayan [...] milli harstan kaynağını almaktadır.<sup>552</sup>

Every community has its own character and personality, which separates it from other communities. However, this tribal/collective character and national personality are not due to race and genetics, but the result of a national culture, which lives strongly among the public [...]

According to Gökalp, Turkism did not rely on race or genetics, but relied on a common shared culture. Turkism did not claim superiority, but rather was necessary to build a collective future for the Turks since a bigger community with more diverse nations such as the Pan-Islamic community he envisioned was not yet possible. In this sense, for Gökalp, Turkism or Turanism was only a step in the direction of Pan-Islamism and a kind of practicable compromise on the road to an ideal, a utopian future. According to Gökalp, the reason that Christian minorities adopted Western civilisation and lifestyle more easily than the Muslim Ottomans was their Christianity, which in his view created a more familiar culture for Christians compared to Muslims.<sup>553</sup>

---

<sup>550</sup> Ibid, p.42, pp.75-76.

<sup>551</sup> Ibid, pp.75-76.

<sup>552</sup> Ziya Gökalp, *Hars ve Medeniyet* (İstanbul: Toker Yayınları, 2012), p.90.

<sup>553</sup> Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.118.

In his view, since the Christian minorities were the first to discover their sense of nationality and asked for independence from the Empire, it would be impossible to include them in the new Turkish state which was to be established. Gökalp's writings do not directly answer the question of what would happen to these Christian minorities after the establishment of a new Turkish state. However, they convey a sense that Gökalp envisions a separate state for them, as he predicted that they would have already gained independence from the Ottoman Empire by the time the Turkish state was established. Therefore, a common shared Muslim culture should have been used to build a new future. Accordingly, his inclusion of non-Turk Muslims in his Gallipoli poem reflects a deeper sense of his ideology, which is inclusive of other nations as long as they have a common shared culture and religion.

### ***Ziya Gökalp and Modernisation***

Gökalp's modernisation of the Ottoman Empire was dependent on three elements: 'Turkish national consciousness, Islamic community and Western civilisation.'<sup>554</sup> Gökalp claimed that failure in the modernisation of the Ottoman Empire during the Tanzimat Period stemmed from the attempt to imitate Western civilisation in all its aspects. However, according to him, modernisation should refer to Turks' capability to use technology like Europeans, but not to modelling themselves on Europeans in terms of lifestyle and appearance.<sup>555</sup> In his view, 'whenever [Turks] stop being dependent on Europeans to transfer and buy knowledge and industrial supplies, then [Turks] will assure modernisation.'<sup>556</sup> As can be inferred from the above, a modern civilisation was itself dependent upon a new modern perspective and a modern interpretation of self-consciousness and religion. The modernisation of Turkish national consciousness, in Gökalp's view, could only be achieved through strengthening it with reforms and

---

<sup>554</sup> Ziya Gökalp, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Istanbul: Inkılap, 2004), p.60.

<sup>555</sup> Gökalp, *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak*, p.17.

<sup>556</sup> Original Text: 'Ne zaman bilgiyi ve sanayi malzemelerini aktarmak ve satın almak için Avrupalılara muhtaç olmaz hale geldiğimizi görürsek, o zaman çağdaşlaşmış olduğumuzu anlarız.' Ibid.

studies of national elements such as language and history, and the route to a modernisation of the Islamic community lay by ensuring the use of reason and an avoidance of a blind reliance.

According to Gökarp, a blind reliance on religion based on false Islamic hopes led Islamic nations to fail in constructing strong independent countries. Gökarp asserts that, based on a Quran verse which says that 'every community has a saviour', Islamic communities had long been waiting for a religious saviour without making any effort themselves, but that the 'saviour' in question does not have to be a person and it could well be nationalism.<sup>557</sup> In his view, Islamic nations which are not open to the idea of nationalism and modernisation, due to their lazy and superstitious reliance on religion, are doomed to 'slavery and captivity'.<sup>558</sup> Furthermore the reason that they are colonised now is because they did not see what the West foresaw, which is that 'the idea of nationality is a weapon, which is used to save a captive country from slavery'.<sup>559</sup> These three strands of modernisation are linked to the Gallipoli campaign in Gökarp's Gallipoli poem, suggesting that the victory at Gallipoli is the solution for all these main problems:

Çanakkale dört devlete,  
Galebeye sen çevirdin!  
Çar kölesi yüz millete,  
İstiklali sen getirdin!

Senden ötürü bilsen daha,  
Kurtulacak nice ülke...  
Ne Afrika, ne Asya'da,  
Kalmayacak müstemleke...<sup>560</sup>

(Gallipoli, you defeated  
All those four nations!  
You brought liberty to  
Hundreds of the Tsar's slaves!

If you knew, because of you,  
How many countries will be saved.  
Neither in Africa nor in Asia,  
Will there be any more colonies.)

---

<sup>557</sup> Ibid p.74.

<sup>558</sup> Ibid p.76.

<sup>559</sup> Ibid.

<sup>560</sup> Gökarp, 'Çanakkale', p.34.

These last two verses of the poem suggest that, as long as Turks gather together as one nation adhering to authentic Islam and modernise themselves by getting rid of old-fashioned national and religious beliefs, they not only bring independence to their own homeland but also to other Muslim countries that are under the colonial rule of Western powers. According to the poem, the modernisation of both national and religious identity leads to a new modern age in which there is no colonisation, but rather independence.

### **Ömer Seyfettin's 'Bir Çocuk Aleko' (The Child Aleko) and 'National Blindness' as the National Enemy**

Whereas Gökalp perceives the Gallipoli campaign as representing a modernisation process among Muslim Turks through Turkification and Islamisation, Seyfettin perceives it as a battle that needs to be inspired by the Greeks to ensure a Turkish victory. In his view, the Ottoman Turks had so far been lulled by the 'national blindness', and as a result they confused the term 'state' with 'nation' and defined themselves with the name of their state as 'Ottomans', which separated Ottoman Turks from other Turkic nations.<sup>561</sup> Greeks, on the other hand, had left Ottomanism behind a long time ago by holding onto their national identity and gaining independence from the Ottoman Empire.

In his Gallipoli story, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko' (The Child Aleko) (1918), Seyfettin portrays Ottomanism as an outdated political policy that urgently needed to be replaced. The story narrates the social conflict between Christian Greeks and Muslim Turks in the Thrace Peninsula (North-West Turkey) during the period of the Gallipoli campaign through the lens of a Turkish child named Ali (Aleko). This child loses his family due to

---

<sup>561</sup> Original Text: 'Osmanlı imparatorluu içinde yaşayan Türkler bir vakitler "millî gaflet" neticesi olarak "devlet"i "millet" tanıyorlardı. [...] Daha uyanmadan biz de devletimize kendimizin ismini veriyor, "Osmanlı" diye diğer Türklerden ayırıyorduk.' Ömer Seyfettin, 'Büyük Türklüğü Parçalayan Kimlerdir?', *Bütün Eserleri 16 Türklük Üzerine Yazılar*, ed. by Muzaffer Uyguner (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993) pp.107-112, (pp.108-109).

the evacuations during the Gallipoli campaign and, whilst searching for them, he comes across a group of Greek villagers followed by a Greek Priest.<sup>562</sup> Worrying about the priest's questioning in trying to find out whether Aleko is 'Turkish' or 'Greek', he falsely introduces himself as a Greek.<sup>563</sup> The priest believes him because 'in many villages in the [Thrace] peninsula, Turks and Greeks could not be distinguished based on how they dressed' and, strangely, 'the languages, religions and traditions, which could not be unified by the centuries, were united by their clothing on this side of the Bosphorus'.<sup>564</sup> Aleko's similarity to Christians illustrates that, in the pre-war years of the Ottoman Empire, different religious and ethnic groups could co-exist peacefully and that, until the war, the Ottoman Empire accomplished the impossible by unifying different nations and religions in one region, which led Muslims and non-Muslims to live together in peace.

Aleko, as a Muslim child, does not in practice differ from the Christians, so much so that he speaks Greek as fluently as his mother tongue and acts as a spy for the Turkish cause without coming under suspicion by the Greek Priest or the British. Historian Ayşe Özil also draws attention to this similarity in Seyfettin's story in depicting the lives of Orthodox Christians within the Empire, but she considers this similarity as a factor that 'undermines [the story's] purported aim' which is 'to praise the Turkish nation'.<sup>565</sup> However, the discourse of the Muslim boy raised among the Christians does not deviate from the aim of the story; on the contrary, it helps Seyfettin's overall purpose. In the story, the Ottomanism, which led people from different nations and religions to live together peacefully, was about to be destroyed by the betrayal of the Greeks against the Ottoman Empire during the Gallipoli campaign. On the one hand, Seyfettin creates a contrast between the enemy and the Ottoman-Turkish self, portraying the Ottoman

---

<sup>562</sup> Ömer Seyfettin, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', p.147.

<sup>563</sup> Ibid.

<sup>564</sup> Original Text: 'Bu manalı bakışı sanki "Türk müsün? Rum musun?" diyordu. Yarımadanın birçok köylerinde Türklerle Rumlar kıyafetlerinden ayırt edilemezdi. Lisanları, dinleri, adetleri birleştiremeyen asırlar Boğazın bu tarafında esvapları birleştirmişti.' Ibid p.147.

<sup>565</sup> Ayşe Özil, *Orthodox Christians in the Late Ottoman Empire: A Study of Communal Relations in Anatolia* (London: Routledge, 2013), p.20.

Empire as a gracious empire in an internal conflict (for minority independence) whilst condemning the Greeks for destroying the Empire's peaceful unifying policy. On the other hand, the portrayal of Greeks as treacherous contributes to the story's overall message to the Ottoman-Turks who, according to Seyfettin, needed to realise that Ottomanism was an outdated policy which harms the Ottoman Empire and it urgently needed to be replaced by nationalism just as it was by the Greeks.

The Ottoman government efforts to retain its Ottomanist policy so as to protect the remaining minorities in the empire was a mistake, according to Seyfettin. In his view, it was clearly not working. This could be attributed to his own experiences as a soldier during the Balkan Wars. In 1909, he was sent to Rumelia (in the South Balkans) as a lieutenant in the Third Army in Selanik, where he witnessed separatist minority uprisings, and then joined the Balkan Wars in 1912 and was held captive by the Greeks in 1913.<sup>566</sup> Seyfettin's diary of the Balkan Wars illustrates not only his views on the failure of Ottomanism but also Seyfettin's resentment of the Ottoman retreat from the Balkans. In his diary, the multi-ethnic and multi-national Ottoman Army is criticised since the soldiers who speak different languages neither understand each other nor the commands they are given.<sup>567</sup> The Ottoman soldiers are defined as indifferent to news of Ottoman failures, reporting that some villages 'failed to be captured', 'Bulgarians rap[ing] women' in Turkish villages and 'Serbians advanc[ing] towards Pristine'.<sup>568</sup> This indifference along with the joy the soldiers expressed upon hearing the news of the retreat disturbed Seyfettin greatly, and he criticised the Ottomans for not being 'proper' soldiers.<sup>569</sup> In his view, this indifference and failure was the result of a lack of 'a common language, a sense of patriotism and a common ideal' and Ottomanism clearly did not fulfill these conditions.<sup>570</sup> The sense of ineffectiveness Seyfettin felt during the Ottoman failure in the Balkan Wars must have led him to criticise Muslim-Turks in his

---

<sup>566</sup> Seyfettin, *Balkan Harbi Hatıraları*, pp.1-3

<sup>567</sup> Ibid p.9.

<sup>568</sup> Ibid p.7.

<sup>569</sup> Ibid p.13.

<sup>570</sup> Ibid.

short stories – including in his Gallipoli story, ‘Bir Çocuk Aleko’ – as an attempt to warn Turks against making the same mistakes as in the Balkan Wars. Seyfettin published a number of short stories, such as ‘Beyaz Lale’ (‘White Tulip’) (1914), criticising the naïve belief in Ottomanism and Turkish unawareness of their national identity. In ‘Beyaz Lale’, for example, Balkaneski mocks the Turks for their blindness towards nationalism:

Sonra Türklere bakınız. Bu heriflerin  
aptallıkları o derecededir ki, yalnız  
etnografyanın esaslarını kabul  
etmemekle kalmazlar, dünyada  
“kavmiyet, milliyet” gibi bir şey olduğuna  
da inanmazlar. Kendilerinin  
milliyetçilerini bile şiddetle inkâr ederler.  
Tarihleri, Cengiz gibi, Hülâgu gibi en  
büyük imparatorlarına küfürlerle doludur.  
Bu milliyetsizlik yüzünden edebiyatsız,  
sanalsız, medeniyetsiz, kuvvetsiz,  
ailesiz, ananesiz kalan Türkler, tabii en  
basit hakikatlere de akıl  
erdiremiyorlardı.<sup>571</sup>

(Look at the Turks. These people’s  
stupidity is so great that they deny not  
only the roots of ethnography, but also  
the existence of ‘nationality’ in the world.  
They strongly disclaim even their own  
nationalists. Their history is full of  
slander towards their biggest emperors  
such as Cengiz and Hulagu. The Turks  
who are deprived of literature, art,  
civilisation, strength, family,  
grandmother due to their lack of  
nationality cannot, of course,  
comprehend the simplest truth.)

Seyfettin plays with the ideas of Social Darwinism: either minorities survive or Turks, in the context of the harm that minorities can cause to the existence of the Turks. Seyfettin suggests that if Turks do not take precautions and unify around an idea of nationalism like in other nations who found strength in national identity, they are doomed to disappear in this contest of the survival of the fittest. According to Seyfettin, ‘the fittest’ are those who are nationalist, who have a clear sense of identity, which is

---

<sup>571</sup> Seyfettin, ‘Beyaz Lale’, Ibid p.9.

'the simplest truth' that Turks fail to see. What he actually criticises in his stories is not the minorities who commit crimes against Turks in his stories, but the Turkish self that denies its national identity and thus fails to defend the Turkish nation against the enemy. However, through the teachings of the Greek priest, Aleko sees what the Turkish Ottomans fail to see in the Balkan Wars, and he gains strength in his nationalist feelings and fights back against the British in Gallipoli, destroying an entire British headquarters by himself. Whilst 'Beyaz Lale' illustrates the invalidity of Ottomanism, Aleko represents nationalism as a modern ideology for twentieth-century Turkey. In Seyfettin's stories, as shown later in 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', the 'other' – the minorities such as the Greeks and Bulgars or the enemy – plays an important role in revealing the folly and strengths of Turks. The comparison of the other and Ottoman-Turks reveals not only the 'national blindness' discussed above, but also 'religious blindness', and this functions as a tool to bring out a sense of national consciousness among Turks.

In his sarcastic story 'Tuhaf Bir Zulüm' (An Odd Persecution), for instance, Seyfettin mocks Ottoman-Turks' religious blindness. In the story, a witty Bulgarian officer who does not want to commit massacres against Turks, comes up with a new idea to displace Muslim-Turks from the Balkans using their religious bigotry. Claiming that 'Turks have nothing, no idea, no ideal, but only one thing' which is 'religious bigotry', he places many stray pigs – as pigs are considered to be impure in Islamic communities – in Turkish villages, which eventually leads the Turks to leave their houses in the Balkans.<sup>572</sup> He further claims that, if Western Europeans want to capture Istanbul, all they need to do is to send Istanbul more missionaries and to ask them to bring along their pigs with them.<sup>573</sup> In the story 'A Child Aleko', religious blindness refers to the lack of religious propaganda. The Greek priest described in the story delivers nationalist

---

<sup>572</sup> Original Text: 'Türklerde hiçbir şey, hiçbir fikir, hiçbir ideal Yalnız bir şey vardır, dedi. [...] Taassup!' Ömer Seyfettin, 'Tuhaf Bir Zulüm', *Ömer Seyfettin: Hikayeler* 3, ed. by Hülya Argunşah (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1999), p.38.

<sup>573</sup> Ibid p.39.



sermons to the Greeks and gives anti-Turkish Christian prayers in the church in order to help destroy the Ottoman Empire.<sup>574</sup> This reminds him of the sermons that the Hodja (Islamic cleric) in his village used to give: 'Christians are also the servants of God. To mistreat them is a much bigger sin than mistreating a Muslim.'<sup>575</sup> While in the first story Seyfettin sarcastically challenges religious bigotry, in the second he criticises the religious unwillingness to aid the war effort. Seyfettin considers both religious characteristics as reasons why Turks lag behind Europe and struggle with internal and external problems. However, religion constitutes an important part of Seyfettin's nationalism in the sense that religion consolidates nationalism and can contribute to the war effort if applied correctly.

A comparison of Greeks and Muslim-Turks not only brings out the folly of Turks, but also emphasises their honourable qualities in order to remind Ottoman-Turks what it means to be Turkish. When the British officer asks Aleko to sneak into the Turkish headquarters and place a bomb there to destroy them, Aleko considers this suggestion as 'villainous' and highlights the fact that 'the Turkish Pasha did not think of such a dishonourable trick'.<sup>576</sup> Whilst this sentence vilifies the way the British fight, it elevates the Turkish military's worth and honour. Upon hearing the 'villainous' request of the British officer, Aleko contemplates the heroic stories that the Greek priest told him. Whilst condemning the Greeks for betraying the Ottoman Empire, Aleko is greatly influenced by the Greek Priest, who taught him that his nation is equal to his parents and 'a man must sacrifice anything for his mother and father', even 'his life'.<sup>577</sup> Asking himself whether 'a little Greek girl could harm the enemy ships by swimming and a Greek young man could beat thousands of enemy soldiers with only three hundred

---

<sup>574</sup> Seyfettin, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', pp.149-150.

<sup>575</sup> Original Text: 'Hristiyanlar da Allah'ın kuludur. Onlara fenalık etmek Müslümanlara fenalık etmekten daha gūnahtır.' Ibid p.150.

<sup>576</sup> Original Text: 'Ali yemekleri yerken bu adamların alçakça niyetlerini düşünmeye başladı. Halbuki Türk paşası böyle namertçe bir oyun düşünmemiş, teklif etmemişti.' Seyfettin, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', p.165.

<sup>577</sup> Original Text: 'Adam anası babası için her türlü fedakarlığı etmeli. Hatta canını bile vermeli'. Ibid p.152.

men' (as at Thermopylae), could not 'a Turkish boy do something heroic like that?', and he decides to blow up the enemy headquarters as well as himself.<sup>578</sup> Although Aleko himself plays a 'dishonourable trick' on British soldiers by using their 'villainous' idea, this is not intended to label the honourable qualities of Turks as representing 'national blindness' in such a way as to encourage them to massacre civilian minorities such as in the Armenian massacres. It rather presents the Gallipoli campaign as a rightful defence against an aggressor who is devoid of humanity and as representing the resistance of good against evil. The story of Thermopylae that inspires Aleko in Seyfettin's story reminds us of Raymond's adaptation of the Thermopylae epitaph in *Tell England*. For both Seyfettin and Raymond, the story of Thermopylae reinforces the worthiness of the sacrifice and emphasises the heroism of the fallen soldiers (or Aleko in Seyfettin's case) at Gallipoli. Whilst in Raymond's novel, it functions as a source of remembrance that gives Gallipoli a meaning and significance that defies the sense of military defeat, in Seyfettin's case it exemplifies the significance of nationalism and functions as a trigger to achieve national consciousness and solidarity among Turks, much as non-Turkish minorities within the Ottoman Empire had been doing for much of the preceding century. However, what makes the story polemical is the fact that the enactment of Turkish nationalism and patriotism is personified in a small child who experiences violent feelings and decides to become a suicide bomber.

### **Mehmet Akif Ersoy and Pan-Islamism**

Contrary to Seyfettin and Gökalp, Ersoy believed in Pan-Islamism with no intermediate stage of Pan-Turkism, in the sense of the unity of Muslims under one Islamic state regardless of their nationality, and he was strongly opposed to the idea of secular nationalism. Despite the fervent opposition between Islamism and Turkism, however, Ersoy's ideas had similarities to those of Gökalp and Seyfettin in the sense that he linked the failure of Islamic communities to their illiteracy and laziness as well. For

---

<sup>578</sup> Ibid p.158.

Ersoy, this 'disease of laziness' was caused by Muslims abandoning real Islam and believing in false rumours or superstitions instead. In *Safahat*, for instance, he states that the reason for the 'recent downfall of the nation' is because 'Muslims only represent the name of Islam' but not its qualities.<sup>579</sup> He criticises Muslims for attaching importance only to the afterlife, for which they actually forget to work whilst still alive, an omission that possibly not only negatively affects their afterlife but also leads to their downfall on earth.<sup>580</sup> He responds to Muslims who superstitiously consider their downfall as 'fate', stating that Muslims asked for their trouble by not making any effort to save themselves and eventually God gave to them what they asked for.<sup>581</sup> In a poem, he asserts that:

Eğer çiğnenmemek isterseler seylâb -ı  
eyyâma;  
Rücû' etsinler artık Müslümanlar Sadr -ı  
İslâm'a.<sup>582</sup>

(If Muslims do not want to be devastated  
by the flood of these days;  
They shall now return to former Islam.)

According to Ersoy, Muslims' rupture from the main sources of Islam, such as the Quran, Hadiths and Islamic applications of the first Islamic State, led them to fall into ignorance, illiteracy and superstition and thus to lag behind Europe. If Muslims return to the real sources of Islam, they will understand Islam correctly and thereby achieve superior rule again.

Having been raised in the tradition of classical Diwan literature and supporting pan-Islamist ideology, Ersoy employs many components and features of Diwan literature in his poems. His Gallipoli poem was written in the form of masnavi, which is an extensive

---

<sup>579</sup> Original Text: 'Demek: İslâm'ın ancak nâmı kalmış Müslümanlarda; /Bu yüzdenmiş, demek, hüsrân -ı millî son zamanlarda.' Mehmet Akif Ersoy, *Safahat: Safahat'ı Teşkil Eden Yedi Kitabın Tam Metni ile Safahat Dışında Kalmış Bir Kısım Şiirleri*, ed. by M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Istanbul, Inkilâp Kitabevi, 2003), p.276.

<sup>580</sup> Ibid p.272.

<sup>581</sup> Original text: 'Belânı istedin, Allah verdi... Doğrusu bu./ Taleb nasılsa, tabî'î, netîce öyle çıkar,/ Meşîyyetin sana zulmetmek ihtimâli mi var?' Ibid p.229.

<sup>582</sup> Ibid p.276.

form of Diwan poetry comprising rhymed couplets written in Aruz prosody and taking the 'aa, bb, cc, dd' rhyme scheme. Rhymed words in the poem are usually interrelated and they emphasise the message of the couplet. For instance, while describing death, Ersoy uses the opposite words 'yer-beşer' (earth and human), which rhyme; while describing martyrs' eternity, 'makber-peygamber' (grave and prophet) which also rhyme, while describing the European outer and inner selves, 'asil-sefil' (noble and villainous), again rhyming. In all his poems, Ersoy uses Aruz prosody, which was often used in Islamic literature. Contrary to the claims of Turkist writers, literary critics argue that the Aruz prosody in Ersoy's poems is compatible with the Turkish language and can be successfully implemented in Turkish poetry.<sup>583</sup> However, just like Turkist writers, Ersoy believed in using simple Turkish in his poems as well. In his article 'Edebiyat' ('Literature'), Ersoy regards simple Turkish as his main principle and condemns its absence as a cause for national despair.<sup>584</sup> Despite this principle, Ersoy occasionally uses some Arabic and Persian words to retain the measure of Aruz prosody in his poems, including in his Gallipoli poem.

In his Gallipoli poem 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine' ('To the Martyrs of the Dardanelles'), Ersoy combines vivid and lyrical language with epic elements to revive the Muslim fighting spirit. In the poem, the Ottoman Empire which abandoned the path of real Islam and therefore lagged behind Europe is now doomed to struggle with European technology in the battlefield, facing its own collapse. Graphic images illustrate the horror of Gallipoli, which the Ottoman soldiers experience due to facing modern European weaponry: '[t]he weapons that the cursed [enemy] uses to vandalize' not only destroy the Ottoman homeland, but also cause 'thunders' that 'tear the horizon

---

<sup>583</sup> Mahir Ünlü, Ömer Özcan, *Yirminci Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı. V. 1* (İstanbul : İnkılap, 2003), p.125; Mehmet Doğan, *Mehmet Âkif: Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Gençlik: Bilgi Şöleni* (Ankara: Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği, 2007), p.174

<sup>584</sup> Original Text: 'Sade yazmak bizim için asıldır. Ne zaman bu asıldan ayrı düşmüşsek, mutlaka muhtar kalmışızdır.' Mehmet Akif Ersoy, 'Edebiyat', *Sebilü'r-Reşad*, 8.183 (1912), pp.9-10.

into pieces' and 'earthquakes' that 'regurgitate the dead bodies'.<sup>585</sup> 'The sky raining down' and 'the earth spouting the dead' create a blizzard, which 'tosses pieces of men into the air' and 'heads, eyes, torsos, legs, arms, chins, fingers, hands and feet' rain down 'heavily on ridges and valleys.'<sup>586</sup> However, it is still not too late for the Ottoman Empire, since 'the heroic army laughs at' the entire catastrophe.<sup>587</sup> These horrifying images aggrandize the bravery of the Ottoman army and lead to his idea that if the Ottomans follow real Islam and achieve the unity of Islamic communities, then they can overcome the technologically superior enemy at Gallipoli:

Ne çelik tabyalar ister, ne siner  
hasmından;  
Alınır kal'a mı göğsündeki kat kat iman?

Hangi kuvvet onu, hâşâ, edecek kahrına  
râm?  
Çünkü te'sis-i İlâhî o metin istihkâm.<sup>588</sup>

(Neither the steel shields nor the enemy,  
Can take the fortress of faith in their  
chests

What power can make them bow down?  
When their stronghold is the work of  
God.)

According to the poem, no matter what force opposes the Ottoman army at Gallipoli, Allah will never let his Islamic community 'bow down' to the oppressors. However, the sense of pure reliance on God does not accord with Ersoy's Islamism, as he believed that such an understanding was nothing but a justification for lazy Muslims holding God responsible for their own downfall. According to him, reliance on God and perseverance are an inseparable duo, referring to the idea that humans should first

---

<sup>585</sup> Original text: 'Sonra mel'undaki tahribe müvekket esbâb,/ Öyle müdhiş ki: Eder her biri bir mülkü harâb.

/Öteden sâikalar parçalıyor âfâkı;/ Beriden zelzeleler kaldırıyor a'mâkı;' Ersoy, 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', p.145

<sup>586</sup> Original text: 'Ölüm indirmede gökler, ölü püskürmede yer/ O ne müdhiş tipidir: Savrulur enkâz-ı beşer.../ Kafa, göz, gövde, bacak, kol, çene, parmak, el ayak,/ Boşanır sırtlara, vâdilere, sağnak sağnak.' Ibid p.

<sup>587</sup> Original text: 'Kahraman orduyu seyret ki bu tehdide güler.' Ersoy, 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', p.145

<sup>588</sup> Ibid p.145

work hard to achieve and then believe in God for achievement.<sup>589</sup> The following couplets refer to this idea and state that, even though the enemy has strong weaponry, if Muslims work hard and persevere Allah will give his permission for them to win the battle:

Sarılır, indirilir mevki'-i müstahkemler,  
Beşerin azmini tevkif edemez sun'-i  
beşer;

Bu göğüslerse Hudâ'nın ebedî serhaddi;  
"O benim sun'-i bedî'im, onu çiğnetme"  
dedi.<sup>590</sup>

Even the strongest places could be  
destroyed,  
However, human-made machines  
cannot destroy human perseverance;

Their chests are the eternal limits of  
divine structure;  
Allah said: 'they are my best creations,  
don't let them run down.)

In another couplet, Ersoy describes the Gallipoli campaign as a war of religions and compares the Ottoman soldiers to the army that fought with the Prophet Muhammad in the Battle of Badr:

Ne büyüksün ki kanın kurtarıyor  
Tevhid'i...  
Bedr'in arslanları ancak, bu kadar şanlı  
idi.<sup>591</sup>

(You are so great that your blood saves  
Islam...  
As glorious as the lions of Bedr.)

In the poem, Ersoy perceives the Gallipoli campaign as a survival of Islam rather than the survival of a nation or a conflict between the Allied Powers and the Ottoman Empire, both of which included Muslim and non-Muslim soldiers in their armies. The Ottoman army are considered to be soldiers of Allah, saviours of Islam and protectors

---

<sup>589</sup> Ersoy, *Safahat*, p.272.

<sup>590</sup> Ersoy, 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', p.145

<sup>591</sup> Ibid

of the Islamic prophet Muhammad. The association of the Ottoman Army with the lion refers to Ersoy's view that the Ottoman Empire had taken the leadership and bearership of Islam for centuries and represented it as one of the world's most formidable powers. However, this association does not only refer to the bravery of the Ottoman army but also refers to Ersoy's prominent idea that the only way to save the Ottoman Empire is by following the steps of the first Islamic states and first Muslims by learning and implementing Islam as they did. Accordingly, Gallipoli becomes the start of a new page for the Ottoman Empire to rid itself of its 'disease of laziness' and to work for the Empire's future with perseverance. The prominent Islamic leaders who fought against Christians also provide a model for the Ottomans to achieve this:

Sen ki, son ehl-i salibin kırarak salvetini,  
Şarkın en sevgili sultânı Salâhaddin'i,

Kılıç Arslan gibi iclâline ettin hayran...  
Sen ki, İslâm'ı kuşatmış, boğuyorken  
hüsran,

O demir çenberi göğsünde kırıp  
parçaladın;  
Sen ki, ruhunla beraber gezer ecrâmı  
adın;<sup>592</sup>

(You broke the last attack of the last  
Crusade,  
And Saladin, the dearest Sultan of the  
East,

Admired your greatness resembling Kilij  
Arslan.  
You, when defeat surrounded  
suffocating Islam,

Destroyed that iron ring on your chest;  
You, your name and soul wander  
around the stars)

Both Kilij Arslan and Saladin described in the poem were heroic figures in the Islamic history and they both fought against the greatest enemy of Muslims, the Crusaders. Kilij Arslan was the Seljuk Sultan of Rûm in the eleventh century, who

---

<sup>592</sup> Ersoy, 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', pp.145-146

fought against the first Crusades. Saladin, on the other hand, was the founder of the Sunni Muslim dynasty of Kurdish origin, Ayyubid, who captured most of the Kingdom of Jerusalem in 1187 and fought against the Crusaders following its capture. In the poem, Ersoy juxtaposes the first and last Crusades and suggests that, as Kilij Arslan and Saladin did at the Crusades, the Ottoman soldiers fought bravely for Islam at Gallipoli which, in his view, was 'the Last Crusade'. This suggests that the Ottoman soldiers at Gallipoli will end the Crusaders, which started during the time of Kilij Arslan and continued during the reign of Saladin, and thereby will achieve what even the greatest leaders such as Kilij Arslan and Saladin strove for but could not secure. In heroically sacrificing their lives for such a holy mission, the Ottoman soldiers earn Ersoy's gratitude, which he expresses by creating a symbolic tomb for them. However, the martyrs are so sublime that nothing is sufficient to cherish their memory; nothing, not even the whole glorious Islamic history, is vast enough to compensate for their sacrifice and bravery:

Sana dar gelmeyecek makberi kimler  
kazsın?  
"Gömelim gel seni tarihe" desem,  
sığmazsın.

Herc ü merc ettiğin edvâra da yetmez o  
kitâb...  
Seni ancak ebediyyetler eder istiâb.<sup>593</sup>

(Who could dig a grave that would not  
be too narrow for you?  
If I say, 'let's bury you in History', you  
will not squeeze in.

The history book is not large enough for  
the epochs you turned upside down.  
Only eternity can contain you.)

Ersoy consoles himself with the idea of eternity and suggests that martyrdom on the path to Allah is a transition to an eternal world achieving the blessing of God and the Prophet, rather than a definite end:

---

<sup>593</sup> Ibid



Vurulmuş tertemiz alnından, uzanmış  
yatıyor,  
Bir hilâl uğruna, yâ Rab, ne güneşler  
batıyor!

Ey, bu topraklar için toprağa düşmüş,  
asker!  
Gökten ecdâd inerek öpse o pâk alnı  
değer.

[...]

Ey şehid oğlu şehid, isteme benden  
makber,  
Sana âğuşunu açmış duruyor  
Peygamber.<sup>594</sup>

(Shot to death in his clean forehead, he  
lies,  
For the sake of a Crescent, oh God,  
what suns are setting!

Soldier, who has fallen on the ground for  
this land!  
It would be worth their while if our  
ancestors descended from heaven to  
kiss your clean forehead.

[...]

Oh martyr, the sons of martyrs, do not  
ask for a grave from me,  
The prophet awaits you, his arms flung  
wide open)

In the poem, Ersoy uses a literary device, “Hüsn-I Talil” (a form of euphemism), which was often used by Diwan poets. While ‘setting suns’ represent the fallen soldiers, the ‘crescent’ represents the Ottoman state. The crescent had been used to represent both Islam and the Ottoman Empire for centuries and it has remained as a symbol in the modern Turkish flag. According to the poem, the rise of Islam and the survival of the empire are dependent on the death of soldiers, since the moon or crescent is only visible towards sunset. The soldiers’ sacrifice is therefore so significant that they earn the affection of the Prophet who waits for them in heaven. Ersoy does not glorify the fallen soldiers simply because Ersoy justifies the war. The tone of the second line in the

---

<sup>594</sup> Ibid p.146.

exclamation 'Oh God' manifests Ersoy's indignation and resentment about the death of soldiers and illustrates the value Ersoy gives to human beings. Ersoy not only suggests that human beings exist for religion or that religion is worth dying for, but also acknowledges that religion exists for human beings. However, the idea of religious martyrdom dominates the rest of the poem, showing the urgency of defending Gallipoli.

Nicholas J. O'Shaughnessy suggests that 'martyrdom has historically helped to cement the relationship of nations to causes, and great religions to their adherents.'<sup>595</sup> Accordingly, as the idea of 'martyrdom creates cults', 'the most delinquent form' of propaganda occurs with 'homicidal nihilism' which, as explained above, Ersoy and Seyfettin – and to some extent Gökalg – promote in their Gallipoli writings not only to justify their ideologies but also to create a national consciousness.<sup>596</sup> Their ideological and propagandist writings link 'personal honour to national interest' in different ways, which, they believe, would lead the Ottoman Empire to eventual victory in the Gallipoli campaign.<sup>597</sup> In Gökalg's poem, national honour lies in achieving Turanist ideals by establishing one common language and gaining national, political, linguistic and religious independence from Eastern and Western powers, whilst Ersoy finds honour in Islamic faith. According to Seyfettin, the Ottomans could only achieve honour if they get rid of religious bigotry and national blindness and open the doors to nationalism. For Seyfettin, though, it is honourable to die for the country and nation even if it takes a child to blow himself up to kill the enemy.

As the previous chapter illustrates, appreciating the Ottoman perception of the enemy represented in Turkish literature requires an understanding of concepts such as nationalism, nation, civilisation and imperialism. The Ottoman intellectuals studied here, analysed in depth and re-defined these concepts based on their own

---

<sup>595</sup> Nicholas J. O'Shaughnessy, *Politics and Propaganda: Weapons of Mass Seduction* (Ann Arbor: Manchester University Press, 2004), p.151.

<sup>596</sup> Ibid pp.151-152.

<sup>597</sup> Leo Braudy, *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity* (New York: Knopf, 2003), p.xvi.

interpretations and ideological leanings, and criticised the Western Europeans whom they thought to be fraudulent representatives of these concepts. When concerns over the integrity of the Empire were deeply felt after the Balkan Wars, Ottoman intellectuals tried to adapt these concepts to Ottoman society and culture based on the different ideologies to which they subscribed. In this sense, the Ottoman perception of the enemy led to a self-critique which established the social, cultural, religious, economic and political weaknesses of Ottoman society. This self-critique illuminated the need for propaganda to educate the public against the dissolution of the empire and sparked with an underlying theme of unity war literature that contrasted reality. While in reality the Ottoman intellectuals criticised Ottoman society for its lack of awareness of or interest in the Empire's social, cultural, economic and political problems, in their literary works they portrayed a picture of a strong society which had already achieved solidarity and thereby could overcome every obstacle that stood before it, including in the defence of Gallipoli.

## BRITISH PERCEPTIONS OF THE GALLIPOLI LANDSCAPE

And we shall no more see the great  
ships gather,  
Nor hear their thunderings on days of  
state,  
Nor toil from trenches in a honest lather  
To magic swimmings in a perfect Strait;  
Nor sip Greek wine and see the slow  
sun dropping  
On gorgeous evenings over Imbros' Isle,  
While up the hill the maxim will keep  
popping,  
And the men sing, and camp-fires wink  
awhile  
And in the scrub the glow-worms glow  
like stars,  
But (hopeless creatures) will not light  
cigars;

Nor daylong linger in our delved lodges,  
And fight for food with fifty thousand  
flies,  
Too sick and sore to be afraid of proj's,  
Too dazed with dust to see the turquoise  
skies;  
Nor walk at even by the busy beaches,  
Or quiet cliff-paths where the Indians  
pray,  
And see the sweepers in the sky-blue  
reaches  
Of Troy's own water, where the Greek  
ships lay,  
And touch the boat-hulks, where they  
float forlorn,  
The wounded boats of that first April  
morn;<sup>598</sup>

[...]

The landscape of the Western Front has dominated the image of World War I in the British imagination, while the landscape of Gallipoli as well as the Gallipoli myth have been largely forgotten in Britain. Indeed, Gallipoli as well as other Eastern Fronts of World War I, as Winston Churchill titled his memoir of the Eastern Front, remained as 'the Unknown War' in the European imagination.<sup>599</sup> Although the 'tactical and strategic

---

<sup>598</sup> Sir Alan Patrick Herbert, *Half Hours at Helles* (Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1916), p.41.

<sup>599</sup> Winston Churchill, *The World Crisis: The Unknown War: the Eastern Front* (New York: Scribner, 1959), pp.vii–x.

conundrums of the campaign' have been a source of interest for historians, individual 'tragic episodes and [the perspectives of] heroes' in the Gallipoli landscape have not received the same attention.<sup>600</sup> This chapter aims to extend cultural perceptions of the landscape of World War I to the Eastern Front landscape of Gallipoli, by exploring various British literary perceptions of the landscape of Gallipoli within the context of war. It examines texts such as Ernest Raymond's *Tell England*, A. P. Herbert's *Half Hours at Helles*, Aubrey Herbert's *Mons, Anzac and Kut* and W. F. Rollo's *Stray Shots from the Dardanelles*. This aim is achieved through close readings of these texts that explore the strong connections between literary portrayals of the Gallipoli campaign and its landscape. These connections include how the selected authors recycle or subvert traditional views on landscape and how this allows them to perceive Gallipoli.

Many scholars agree on the difficulty of describing the horrors of World War I. According to Paul Fussell, this is due to 'the collision between events and the language available – or thought appropriate – to describe them.'<sup>601</sup> The events of war are so loaded with destruction, death and desolation that words are inadequate to describe them. In Kate McLoughlin's words, even though 'war [...] resists depiction' and 'representation', 'conflict demands [them]'.<sup>602</sup> Forms of expression to describe the landscape, in this case, could be argued to be one of the ways to break this resistance and language barrier.<sup>603</sup>

The idea of rural England, the importance of landscape and the earth, and the ideal relationship between man and nature have been staple preoccupations of the English literary tradition for centuries.<sup>604</sup> This tradition often has evoked a sense of Englishness in both war and peace: England was imagined and portrayed, in William Blake's words,

---

<sup>600</sup> Macleod, p.4.

<sup>601</sup> Fussell, p.170.

<sup>602</sup> McLoughlin, *Authoring War*, pp.6-7.

<sup>603</sup> Nosheen Khan, *Women's Poetry of the First World War* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988), p.56

<sup>604</sup> Christine Berberich, 'This Green and Pleasant Land: Cultural Constructions of Englishness', *Landscape and Englishness*, ed. by Robert Burden and Stephan Kohl (2006), p.207; David Matless, *Landscape and Englishness* (London: Reaktion Books, 1998), p.4.

as 'the green and pleasant land', which reflected widespread feelings of sentimental longing for the past, hope and despair, home and belonging.<sup>605</sup> Raymond Williams suggests that 'the idea of England as "home"' developed in the late nineteenth century in the sense that 'home [was] a memory and an ideal.'<sup>606</sup> This ideal image of England as represented in literature and art stemmed from 'the desires' of the minority nineteenth-century middle and upper classes, who 'actively manipulate[d] [the] presentation [of landscape] to fit their requirements.'<sup>607</sup> Accordingly, 'landscape became a means of depicting not just their control over space [...] but also a means of representing their status and wealth.'<sup>608</sup> This led to the exclusion of non-aesthetic industrial and mechanised worlds from art and literature and meant that the idyllic countryside came to 'stand for the identity of the nation as a whole' in the nineteenth century.<sup>609</sup> The ideal of rural England became a negative reaction to industrialisation and mechanisation, which to some extent continued to shape the literature that came out of the war itself as a reaction to 'industrialized murder'.<sup>610</sup>

The cultural connection between 'Englishness' and the traditional rural image of England continued to be emphasised during World War I; however, it became linked to the war itself. Winston Churchill, for instance, utilised this traditional connection to domesticise and naturalise the war, defining it as 'the normal occupation of man' alongside 'gardening'.<sup>611</sup> The idealised rural England was perceived to be threatened by the war and the English landscape became what the soldiers were fighting for.<sup>612</sup> This idea, however, could not be expressed straightforwardly in the traditional sense of defending the homeland, as Britain fought World War I entirely on foreign land.

---

<sup>605</sup> Ibid.

<sup>606</sup> Raymond Williams, *The Country and The City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), p.281.

<sup>607</sup> Ibid p.212.

<sup>608</sup> Don Mitchell, *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), p.119.

<sup>609</sup> Ibid p.116.

<sup>610</sup> Fussell, p.301.

<sup>611</sup> Quoted in Fussell, p.234.

<sup>612</sup> Giles and Middleton, p.10.

Northern France and Belgium were perceived as 'allies' yet othered as 'foreign' and the status of the British army in these regions remained as 'invaders' and 'guests'.<sup>613</sup> In this period, as the war wore on ideas about English landscape were replaced by a consciousness that linked landscape to the war dead and 'any sense of abroad' was associated with 'the seeding of the [foreign] terrain with the bodies of the nation's war dead', as in Rupert Brooke's 'The Soldier'.<sup>614</sup>

The Western Front battlefields were the main landscape that shaped the British imagination of World War I, which constructed some sense of Englishness during the war. Descriptions of the battlefield and images of trenches, barbed wire, fallen trees, clouds of poison gas, shell holes, mud, rats, corpses and scattered limbs constituted the landscape of hell on the Western Front and helped shape narrative and character in the British literature of World War I. Paul Fussell refers to these destroyed landscapes of the Western Front battlefields as 'anti-pastoral', since 'recourse to the pastoral is an English mode of both fully engaging the calamities of the Great War and imaginatively protecting oneself against them'.<sup>615</sup> The physical reality of the landscape of the battlefield was that it was not only destroyed by men but was also destroying men themselves, threatening the physical and psychological existence of the soldiers.<sup>616</sup> This fatal physicality of the muddy and horrific trench warfare is referred to as 'slimescapes' by Santanu Das, where Das explains that the soldiers felt the omnipresence of both death and the dead in the most horrifyingly intimate ways.<sup>617</sup> As a result, as Sandra M. Gilbert asserts, the pastoral landscape, which should have been 'a consoling home for the living and a regenerative grave for the dead' becomes 'a grave for the living, who were buried alive in trenches and ditches, and a home for the dead, who were often strewn unburied among the living' in the literature of the Western

---

<sup>613</sup> Sue Malvern, 'War Tourism: "Englishness", Art, and the First World War', *Oxford Art Journal*, 24.1 (2001) 45-66 (p.47).

<sup>614</sup> Ibid.

<sup>615</sup> Fussell, p.235.

<sup>616</sup> Santanu Das, *Touch and Intimacy in First World War Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p.37.

<sup>617</sup> Ibid p.39.

Front.<sup>618</sup> This was represented in a variety of ways depending on the author's perspective. As well as Biblical and apocalyptic landscape descriptions, secular and symbolic landscape traditions emerged and represented British cultural continuity and coherence; however, ironic descriptions of the landscape also remained in the British imagination.<sup>619</sup> Peaceful idyllic landscapes and the fatally destroyed landscapes of the battlefields were often juxtaposed to create an irony that mourned the destruction of England's idealised rural past. This is illustrated by Wilfred Owen in a letter to his mother: 'They want to call No Man's Land "England"', but it is 'pock-marked like a body of foulest disease and its odour is the breath of cancer'.<sup>620</sup> The physical destruction of one geographical space is mapped conceptually as if it were the destruction of Britain – imagined as England; however, 'England's idealised rural past' is not being subjected to the violence of foreign battlefields. According to Ann P. Linder, this juxtaposition expresses the gulf between Britain's historical and cultural past and present.<sup>621</sup> This gulf, Samuel Hynes explains, is the foundation of the British myth of World War I that was co-created by its literature and that has been symbolised by poppies as a symbol that represents the large scale of human loss, disillusionment and nature's ironic indifference to human suffering.<sup>622</sup> However, this cannot mean that the British myth is entirely isolated from its past since, as Fussell points out, poppies represent World War I not only because they grew in the landscape of the Western front but also because they were part of the landscape of English poetry pursuing 'the old delightful English pastoral usages'.<sup>623</sup>

---

<sup>618</sup> Sandra M. Gilbert, *Death's Door: Modern Dying and the Ways We Grieve* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007), p.373.

<sup>619</sup> Das p.39.

<sup>620</sup> Wilfred Owen, *The Collected Poems of Wilfred Owen* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1963), p.160.

<sup>621</sup> Ann P. Linder, 'Landscape and Symbol in the British and German Literature of World War I', *Comparative Literature Studies* 31.4 (1994), pp. 351-369, (p.352).

<sup>622</sup> Samuel Hynes, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (New York: Atheneum, 1991), p.423.

<sup>623</sup> Fussell p.295.



Similar to the centrality of landscape in the literature of the Western Front, evocations of the Dardanelles landscape were an important constituent part of British Gallipoli writings. Despite similar literary patterns such as juxtapositions of nostalgic visions of idyllic England with the anti-pastoral battlefield, a hitherto benevolent nature defined as oblivious to the bloodbath and human suffering and perverted 'natural' order, the landscape descriptions of Gallipoli were not simply a mirror of descriptions of the Western Front landscape. The peninsular landscape that met the British soldiers in Gallipoli was in stark contrast to what they were accustomed to back home or to the conditions on the Western Front. It was the antithesis of the 'green and pleasant' image of England, its narrow beaches surrounded by steep slopes, heavily dissected plateaus covered with dense vegetation, dry valleys, summer drought, thistles, dust, sand and flies. These alien and harsh conditions along with barbed wire, Turkish machine guns and snipers hidden in the hills turned the landscape of the enemy country into the enemy itself. To find comfort in this alien landscape, where the sea and the British navy were the only reminders of home, British writers drew on romantic, biblical and mythological traditions as an attempt to familiarise British soldiers and themselves with the Gallipoli landscape.

As this chapter asserts, the process of familiarisation with the Gallipoli landscape could be interpreted in two main ways: the landscape of Gallipoli as an extension of home, or as the antithesis of home. Home in this context might refer to the soldiers' homeland, Britain, or England, as well as its literal meaning of home as place of abode. In texts portraying Gallipoli as the antithesis of home, the authors subvert the pastoral tradition as a way to illustrate distance from England and the comforts of home. As mentioned above, traditionally, there has been a strong cultural connection between Englishness, England and the idyllic landscapes. Thus, the anti-pastoral landscapes depicted in World War I writings imply a sense of a threatened Englishness and a distant England. The analysis in this chapter also draws on Svend Erik Larsen's term

'guerrilla landscapes' to define such landscapes, since it provides a better understanding of the physical conditions in Gallipoli and of the 'indescribable' as a way to illustrate the how devastating the war was.<sup>624</sup> In instances where Gallipoli was interpreted as an extension of home, however, the landscape is either evoked by reference to idyllic scenes from the English countryside or by Victorian values, sets of ideas and ideals outlined in the previous chapter, 'British Perceptions of Themselves'. This type of landscape description offers 'comfort and hope [which] can be proffered to the bereaved'.<sup>625</sup> Both classifications also touch upon the idea that landscape descriptions could be used effectively to convey a sense of patriotism or to 'further the national cause'.<sup>626</sup> Both patriotism and nationalism appeal to one's sense of 'attachment towards the land', in some cases 'induc[ing] them to defend the nation'.<sup>627</sup> Larsen refers to this type of landscape description as 'national landscapes', a type of landscape which 'legitimises war' by being 'the peaceful home' for some but being 'a sign of foreignness and artificiality' for others.<sup>628</sup> Even though not all the selected texts promote national and patriotic feelings, they all in a sense fit into the category of national landscapes as they all reflect a sense of belonging to a certain national identity; Englishness.

### **The Gallipoli Landscape as the Antithesis of Home - Guerrilla Landscapes**

One way of defining the landscape observed in Gallipoli writings is portraying the landscape as an antithesis of home. The British authors on Gallipoli often used the ideas and feelings associated with home, such as, in A. P. Herbert's words, 'happy things', safety, liveliness, comfort, cleanliness, women, family and friends, to create a stark contrast with the landscape of Gallipoli. Their contrast not only led these authors to utilise the landscape as a 'means of measuring the destruction wrought by the war'

---

<sup>624</sup> Ibid p.296; Svend Erik Larsen, 'Landscape, Identity and War', *New Literary History*, 35 (2004), pp.469-490, (p.483).

<sup>625</sup> Quoted in Hopchet, p.16; Khan p.56.

<sup>626</sup> Ibid.

<sup>627</sup> McLoughlin p.87.

<sup>628</sup> Larsen p.482-483.

as Khan suggests, but also as an adaptation process to accept the new inhospitable situation that 'in the trenches [...] was home'.<sup>629</sup> Larsen's concept of guerrilla landscapes is used here to underpin this section as the term provides a better understanding of the British perceptions of the physical conditions at Gallipoli. The term 'guerrilla landscapes' by definition suggests an image that is an antithesis of home; Larsen defines it as 'the tactical counterpart to the national landscape' in which 'strike-and-disappear tactics' turn the physical and geographical landscape of the battlefield into an enemy.<sup>630</sup> According to him, this form of expression was largely used in colonial and post-colonial literatures in which the natives of the alien land 'possess an intimate knowledge of the place' that 'gives them a freedom of movement in spite of [...] oppression'.<sup>631</sup> As a result, in the context of World War I, '[t]he landscape [of the foreign land] more than the war itself is the ultimate test of the boundaries and the solidity of identity [and becomes the real enemy in the battlefield] – for the natives, for the observing administrator, and for the invading troops'.<sup>632</sup> As far as this chapter is concerned, descriptions of landscape as guerrilla landscapes in Gallipoli writings are used to convey the British soldiers' anxiety at being in an alien and hostile land, not only through the hostility and extensive knowledge of the land held by the natives as Larsen depicts, but also through the hostility of animate or inanimate objects that appear to wage war against British soldiers on the Gallipoli battlefields. In other words, animate and inanimate objects in the alien landscape act like guerrilla forces, making it difficult for the British soldiers to differentiate the real enemy.

However, Larsen's version of the guerrilla landscape can still be found in Gallipoli writings. Aubrey Herbert describes in his diary *Mons, Anzac and Kut* an increased number of rumours of spies and snipers among the Allied soldiers in Gallipoli:

---

<sup>629</sup> Quoted in Hopchet, p.3 ;Khan p.56, A. P. Herbert p.44.

<sup>630</sup> Larsen p.483.

<sup>631</sup> Ibid.

<sup>632</sup> Larsen p.484.

About this time the spy mania started, which is one of the inevitable concomitants of war. Spies were supposed to be everywhere. In the popular belief, that is "on the beach," there were enough spies to have made an opera. The first convincing proof of treachery which we had was the story of a Turkish girl who had painted her face green in order to look like a tree, and had shot several people at Helles from the boughs of an oak. Next came the story of the daily pigeon post from Anzac to the Turkish line; but as a matter of fact, the pigeons were about their own business of nesting.<sup>633</sup>

Snipers were used in Gallipoli and elsewhere for the purpose of demoralising the opposition, usually by hitting a commander to create psychological pressure, according to Aubrey Herbert. This idea seems to have worked, since the anxiety increased in the trenches over spies and pigeons (pigeons were used for espionage purposes to deliver messages) and over local women snipers using the features of the local landscape to shoot at British soldiers. Everything belonging to the alien landscape was perceived to be hostile and led to anxiety among British and Australian soldiers at Gallipoli. Considering that when the Allies first landed on the beach, they were surrounded by high slopes and hills where Turkish machine guns and snipers were hidden and shooting at them, the anxiety among Allied troops is more than understandable. Hidden in their defensive positions, Turks were part of the landscape of Gallipoli and the Allied soldiers could not locate them and target them.

### ***Inanimate Guerrilla Landscapes***

Recent studies suggest that the Gallipoli campaign was lost even before the soldiers' landed and that no leadership could have saved it, since the landscape of Gallipoli

---

<sup>633</sup> Aubrey Herbert, p.86.

already determined the nature of the battle.<sup>634</sup> British soldiers had to fight on unequal terms compared to Turks due to the high cliffs and slopes and narrow open beaches.<sup>635</sup> The Turkish guns and snipers were disguised on the high cliffs, which made it impossible for the Allied Powers to see and locate the number and positions of the machine guns firing at them, whilst the narrow open beaches where thousands of Allied soldiers were sent through the Turkish fusillade, provided no shelter and facilitated the slaughter.<sup>636</sup> As soon as they left their boats, the soldiers were rushing up and down gullies through the beaches amidst the Turkish fire and trying to find shelter or quickly digging in the sand to make shelter. According to Aubrey Herbert, 'the openness of the beach gave men a greater feeling of insecurity than they had in the trenches' after the landing, which made 'the seaside distasteful for the rest of [their] lives'.<sup>637</sup> As the surviving soldiers made it through to the slopes of the cliffs, they constructed dugouts and tunnels not only for shelter but also to blow up Turkish mines and to advance invisibly towards the Turkish lines. A. P. Herbert's poem 'A Song of the Spade' describes a group of men digging trenches at night in Gallipoli so that the soldiers would not be seen and shot at by the Turks:

Dig dig dig,  
 With every finger frayed,  
 Dig dig dig,  
 For so are Empires made.  
 Why did we leave the Tyne,  
 Where men were fairly paid,  
 If no one fights in the fighting-line  
 But only drives a Spade?

Dig dig dig,  
 Ever a job to do.  
 The mules must walk in a covered track,  
 The officer needs a nice new shack,  
 The parapet here is much too thin,  
 The General's roof is falling in,  
 And somebody wants a hundred men

---

<sup>634</sup> Peter Doyle and Matthew R. Bennett, 'Terrain and the Gallipoli Campaign, 1915', in *Fields of Battle: Terrain in Military History* ed. by Peter Doyle and Matthew R. Bennett (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2002) pp.149-169, (p.149).

<sup>635</sup> Ibid p.165.

<sup>636</sup> Ibid.

<sup>637</sup> Aubrey Herbert, p.90.

Up the gully to-night at ten  
And a hundred more at two.

[...]

Dig dig dig,  
And underneath the stones,  
Dig dig dig,  
You find a Frenchman's bones.  
Pick and shovel and sand,  
Shovel and sand and pick,  
Cover him there for a little yet,  
Man must sleep where his tomb is set.  
Quick, lad, cover him quick.

Dig dig dig,  
But turn some other sod.  
Leave him asleep where the maggots  
creep  
And an Army's feet have trod;  
But Oh, the awful smell!  
To think a thing so vile  
Went forth to war with a soldier's smile  
And wore the form of God!

Dig dig dig,  
Dig in the dark out there.  
Less noise somebody! God, what's that?  
Only the feet of a frightened rat.  
Dig, and be done before the moon.  
Dig, for the Turk will spot you soon!  
Lie down, you fools, a flare!

[...]

Dig dig dig,  
One of the section dead.  
Dig dig dig,  
For we must make his bed:  
Pick and shovel and sand,  
Shovel and sand and pick,  
Oh, God, to think it was for this,  
I learned the pitman's trick!

He was a mate of mine,  
And only yesterday  
We talked together about the Tyne  
We bathed in Marto Bay.  
Dig dig dig,  
Deep and narrow and neat,  
And I must write to a Tyneside town  
To say in a ditch we laid him down  
At the back of Mercer Street.<sup>638</sup>

---

<sup>638</sup> A. P. Herbert pp.14-17.

A. P. Herbert's poem is inspired by and written in the form of Thomas Hood's popular verse 'The Song of the Shirt' (1843), which depicts a seamstress's life of hard work. The poem addresses issues that still echo today such as labour exploitation and poor working conditions in factories. In Hood's poem, the seamstress is depicted to have a life of misery as she works from morning until late, exhausting herself, to show nothing for her industry but 'a bed of straw, a crust of bread – and rags'.<sup>639</sup> Similarly, in A. P. Herbert's poem, the soldiers are in a state of utter exhaustion at Gallipoli because of their physical work, sleeplessness and poor working conditions. They 'dig dig dig' with 'every finger frayed' for the cause of the British Empire, but the only things that come from their hard work are 'the awful smell' and decomposing dead bodies of the soldiers and comrades that lie 'asleep where the maggots creep'. Like many soldiers under A. P. Herbert's command, the speaker in the poem seems to be a peacetime miner from Tyneside, who regrets having 'learned the pitman's trick' only to go to war to dig graves for his comrades, whereas back at home, for equal amounts of hard work and poor working conditions men were at least alive. The repetitive phrase 'dig dig dig' as well as the length of the poem implies that the task of digging trenches is long and repetitive and its constant rhythm reflects the activity of soldiers in the trenches digging together as one.

As in A. P. Herbert's poem, where the decomposing landscape with dead bodies, 'maggots', 'rats' and 'sand' adds up to the 'sullen toil' that the soldiers go through in the trenches, in Aubrey Herbert's diary it is not only the landscape disrupting the soldiers but also the soldiers disrupting the landscape with their dugouts:

Three of us slept crowded in one dugout  
on Monday night. The cliff is becoming  
like a rookery, with ill-made nests.  
George Lloyd and Ian Smith have a  
charming view, only no room to lie down

---

<sup>639</sup> Thomas Hood, 'The Song of the Shirt', in *The Complete Poetical Works of Thomas Hood: with a Biographical Sketch and Notes* ed. by Epes Sargent (Boston: Phillips, Sampson, 1859), pp.147-149, p.148.

in. Everybody's dugout is falling on his neighbour's head. I went round the corner of the cliff to find a clean place to wash in the sea, but was sniped, and had to come back quick. The Gallipoli Division of Turks, 18,000 strong, is supposed to be approaching, while we listened to a great artillery duel not far off. An Armenian who was captured yesterday reported the Gallipoli Division advancing on us. On Tuesday night things were better. I think most men were then of the opinion that we ought to be able to hold on, but we were clinging by our eyelids on to the ridge. The confusion of units and the great losses in officers increased the difficulty.<sup>640</sup>

Living in such conditions, Herbert describes that 'the dust and heat' turning soldiers into 'scallywags', 'the smell of dead mules' filled the soldiers' 'nostrils', there was 'no shelter from the sun', and water shortages made men 'mad from thirst, cursing' and the wounded soldiers' 'faces caked with sand and bipod'.<sup>641</sup> Since being above ground on the beaches in the daylight meant certain death and being closer to the ground felt safer, all of the soldiers' senses were exposed to the earth, sand, dust and the dead. The battlefield of Gallipoli reduced the soldiers' lives to living like animals in dugouts full of dust and sand, as if appropriating for the soldiers at Gallipoli Fussell's term 'troglodytes'.<sup>642</sup> Comparing the soldiers to animals living in 'ill-made nests' suggests a natural alliance between nature and the soldier, illustrating how 'the fighting man allies himself with nature'.<sup>643</sup> This suggests that the war turns life into a vicious circle as the war invaded not only nature by turning the cliff into a 'rookery' but also invaded human life forcing them to live in 'ill-made nests'.

---

<sup>640</sup> Aubrey Herbert, p.85.

<sup>641</sup> Ibid.

<sup>642</sup> Fussell, p.39.

<sup>643</sup> Vandiver, p.75.



### ***Animate Guerrilla Landscapes***

The landscape of Gallipoli was not only inanimate but also animate with living creatures, which strengthens the idea that the landscape itself was the enemy of the British soldiers. A. P. Herbert's poem 'Dedication', which commemorates his fallen comrades, describes the horrible conditions of the peninsula in quite a serious tone compared to his other far more light-hearted poems:

The flies! oh God, the flies  
That soiled the sacred dead.  
To see them swarm from dead men's  
eyes  
And share the soldier's bread!  
Nor think I now forget  
The filth and stench of war,  
The corpses on the parapet,  
The maggots in the floor.<sup>644</sup>

A. P. Herbert introduces the notion of the anti-pastoral by focusing his attention on the landscape of the Gallipoli battlefield. By juxtaposing the liveliness of 'maggots' and 'flies' that 'swarm from dead men's eyes' with 'the corpses on the parapet', A. P. Herbert creates a paradoxical image of life and death. In this sense, the poem reminds the reader of Isaac Rosenberg's 'Break of Day in the Trenches' (1916) as it suggests that 'flies' and 'maggots' are the only profiteers from the Gallipoli campaign as they feed on the dead. Similarly, in Ernest Raymond's *Tell England*, flies are defined as hostile forces as well, but such uncomfortable conditions in the Gallipoli landscape are emphasised to enhance the valour of the British soldiers considering the dominant pro-war message relayed throughout the novel:

But bah! We went out of the dust into  
the flies. The mess was buzzing with  
them; and they were accompanied in  
their attacks upon our persons by bees,  
who hummed about like air-ships among  
aeroplanes. I dropped upon the table a  
speck of Sir Joseph Paxton's excellent  
jam, now peppered and gritty with dust,  
and in a few seconds it was hidden by a

---

<sup>644</sup> A. P. Herbert p.2.

scrimmage of black flies, fighting over it and over one another. Other flies fell into my tea, and did the breast-stroke for the side of the mug. I pushed the mug along to Jimmy Doon, and pointed out to him, with the conceit of the expert, that they were making the mistake of all novices at swimming; they were moving their arms and legs too fast, and getting no motive power out of their leg-drive. [...] "Don't talk to me about 'em," said Jimmy. "I'm fast going mad. I'm not knocking 'em off my jam, but swallowing the little devils as they sit there. If I didn't do that, they'd commit suicide down my throat. Every time so far that I've opened my mouth to inhale the breeze, I've taken down a fly. It's tedious."<sup>645</sup>

Similarly, Aubrey Herbert defines the absurdity of the conditions in Gallipoli with a humorous tone:

On board our ship there were piles of bread without any covering, but a swarming deposit of flies; good for everybody's stomach.<sup>646</sup>

[...]

The flies and their habits deserve to live in a diary of their own. They were horrible in themselves, and made more horrible by our circumstances and their habits. They lived upon the dead, between the trenches, and came bloated from their meal to fasten on the living. One day I killed a fly on my leg that made a splash of blood that half a crown would not have covered.<sup>647</sup>

Even cliffs and mules were causing death in Gallipoli:

He had been walking along the cliff at night with his mule, when the mule had been shot and had fallen over the cliff with Fritz Seemann. Together they had fallen upon an unfortunate soldier, who had been killed by the same burst.<sup>648</sup>

---

<sup>645</sup> Raymond, p.256.

<sup>646</sup> Aubrey Herbert, p.213.

<sup>647</sup> Ibid p.177.

<sup>648</sup> Ibid p.86.

The landscape of Gallipoli not only interferes with a soldier's ability to survive, but also with the military tasks and missions, as in Aubrey Herbert's description of mules at Gallipoli:

There were hundreds of them on the beach and in the gullies. Alive, they bit precisely and kicked accurately; dead, they were towed out to sea, but returned to us faithfully on the beach, making bathing unpleasant and cleanliness difficult. The dead mule was not only offensive to the Army; he became a source of supreme irritation to the Navy, as he floated on his back, with his legs sticking stiffly up in the air. These legs were constantly mistaken for periscopes of submarines, causing excitement, exhaustive naval manoeuvres and sometimes recriminations.<sup>649</sup>

In W. F. Rollo's poems, however, the endurance of the Gallipoli landscape transcends the physical reality of the battlefield in a romantic way of using idyllic landscape descriptions. The sense of 'foreignness and artificiality' that Larsen outlines could be applied to both inanimate guerrilla landscapes and national landscapes. In his poem 'The Landing', Rollo refers to Gallipoli as 'sullen Dardanelles' and similarly in 'The Naval Bombardment, preceding the Landing', the use of anthropomorphism emphasises the idea that the British soldiers are not welcome in Gallipoli:

Awake from sleep – awake! The day is  
breaking!  
A grim reveillé thunders forth the morn,  
The air with death is pregnant, and is  
shaking  
With salvos that from ships of war are  
born;  
The early mist is lifting in the distance,  
Disclosing frowning Turkish cliffs of  
grey,  
To grips at last with Ottoman resistance!  
[...]

---

<sup>649</sup> Aubrey Herbert, p.8.

For three hours the Turkish coast is hell  
To those who on the shelled scarred  
cliffs are pitting  
Their strength in vain the awful storm to  
quell;<sup>650</sup>

With the expressions of the 'sullen Dardanelles', 'frowning Turkish cliffs of grey' and 'the Turkish coast [being] hell', Rollo gives the landscape of Gallipoli an identity by investing it with distinctive features. This identity bears features of the unwelcoming enemy and merges the Turkish nation with the landscape of Gallipoli. In other words, the nature of this alien Turkish land is allied to the Turkish enemy, as the cliffs 'frown' upon the Allied powers, the air is about to bring 'death' to them and the mist opens the doors for the Ottoman resistance, which eventually turns the coast into 'hell' where the British 'pit their strength in vain'. This unwelcoming character of the landscape could be argued to be the antithesis of home, as a way to encourage the 'national cause' and soldiers' willingness to fight. Overall, no matter how realistic the battlefield descriptions were in describing the 'indescribable' horrors of war, it seems that the landscape of Gallipoli was emphasised by most British writers to enhance the valour of the British soldiers at Gallipoli. In this sense, as Larsen suggests, the landscape of Gallipoli 'can also be understood as a functional aspect of the movement of the army if a description is necessary to underline the heroic nature of the warriors, maybe as an insurmountable obstacle, which is, nevertheless, surmounted.'<sup>651</sup>

### **The National Landscape: the Gallipoli Landscape as an Extension of Home**

Another way of defining the landscape observed in Gallipoli writings is to define it as an extension of home. Home, in this context, could represent the landscapes of England as well as the ideas associated with home in contrast to the battlefield, such as safety, comfort, happiness, family and women. The idea of home represented through landscape provides a sense of encouragement towards 'life and its continual ability to

---

<sup>650</sup> W. F. Rollo, p.12-13.

<sup>651</sup> Larsen, p.473.

renew itself', either by concealing the realities of the battlefield to convey a political, ideological or religious message to the readers or by finding a textual comfort against the feelings of discomfort, fear and death that the battlefield incites.<sup>652</sup>

### **Idyllic Landscape and What Fussell calls the 'anti-pastoral'**

In Raymond's romanticised novel *Tell England*, the first sign of national landscapes in the context of war can be found in the juxtaposition of idyllic landscape with anti-pastoral landscapes of the battlefield. Fussell points out that the pastoral defined in war writing is 'a way of invoking a code to hint by antithesis at the indescribable'.<sup>653</sup> This occurs in the novel as idyllic images 'sandwiched between bouts of violence and terror' represent the idea of home and England not only to offer a symbolic and textual escape to a sense of comfort, safety and familiarity, but also to further the national cause.<sup>654</sup> Anti-pastoral landscape descriptions, however, both in a national and a physical sense, illustrate what is alien and unfamiliar, and thereby represent discomfort and death. Book I, which narrates the public school lives of the young boys before they join the war, is full of idyllic images of England, describing 'the loveliness [and the beauty] of England'.<sup>655</sup> It is filled with images of 'everlasting hills, the lakes, the trees', lambs 'rolling in the grass', 'singing' birds and screaming gulls, 'pleasing trees [...] massed into shady and grateful woods', 'gracious' waterways 'shudder[ing] in a gentle wind' and the air [being] 'all soft and sweet-smelling after rain'.<sup>656</sup> However, Book II mostly consists of anti-pastoral battlefield portrayals in Gallipoli, where 'the reflected coolness of the water desert[s] [the young soldiers]; the heady heat off the dusty land hit [the soldiers'] flesh like the hot air from an oven; and a glare from the white, trampled dust and the white canvas tents troubled [the soldiers'] eyes', while 'the rolling

---

<sup>652</sup> Khan, p.56; Quoted in Victoria Hopchet, 'The subversion of the pastoral mode in the First World War poetry of Charlotte Mew and Mary Borden' (unpublished master thesis, Universiteit Gent, 2014-2016), p.16.

<sup>653</sup> Fussell, p.296.

<sup>654</sup> Ibid; Hopchet, p.16.

<sup>655</sup> Raymond, p.25.

<sup>656</sup> Ibid p.5, p.20, p.24, p.23, p.67.

hills, empty of growth, except grass burnt brown and thistles burnt yellow, gave [the soldiers] a shock of depression'.<sup>657</sup> The idyllic images associated with England in Book I create a sharp contrast with the anti-pastoral descriptions of the battlefield in Gallipoli described in Book II rendering the idyllic images nostalgic about rural life in Britain. This suggests that the idyllic and innocent landscape that has been described in Book I has to be defended by the soldiers, the young boys whom England shaped and turned into the 'best generation'.<sup>658</sup>

In A. P. Herbert's 'The Soldier's Spring', the idyllic images are associated – if not with England or patriotism itself – with a sense of Englishness. In the poem, A. P. Herbert describes 'the hillside [as] so attractive' in Spring that he finds it difficult to 'concentrate on "spurs"' and sympathises greatly with a young scout who was sent forth to spy on the Turks, reporting back: 'The lilac's out!/And that is all I know.'<sup>659</sup>

When we extend and crawl in grim rows,  
I want to stray and wander free;  
I deviate to pluck a primrose,  
I stay behind to watch a bee;  
Nor have the heart to keep the men in  
line,  
When some have lingered where the  
squirrels leap.  
And some are busy by the eglantine,  
And some are sound asleep.

[...]

But, strange, I do not think the enemy  
In Spring-tide on the Chersonnese  
Was any whit less vile or venomy  
When all the heavens whispered Peace;  
Though wild birds babbled in the  
cypress dim,  
And through thick fern the drowsy  
lizards stole,  
It never had the least effect on him  
He can't have had a soul.<sup>660</sup>

---

<sup>657</sup> Ibid p.254.

<sup>658</sup> Raymond, p.138.

<sup>659</sup> A. P. Herbert, p.55.

<sup>660</sup> A. P. Herbert, p.56.

The poem describes how A.P. Herbert as well as other British soldiers appreciate the beauty of the landscape in Gallipoli and how nature distracts them from waging war or fulfilling their soldierly duties. In the last verse, A.P. Herbert is astonished by the indifference of the enemy to the beauty of the landscape even though he did not believe that the enemy was 'any whit less vile or venomy'. In this case, the contrast between the British soldiers' appreciation of the landscape and the indifference of the enemy to the beauty of nature can only suggest that appreciation of landscape is an exclusively English quality. Appreciation of landscape, A.P. Herbert suggests by extension, not only makes an Englishman but also makes a human.

### **Englishness, the Sea and Naval Dominance**

The juxtaposition of English idyllic landscapes and Turkish anti-pastoral images, thus, gives a sense that the Gallipoli campaign threatens the rural and thus Englishness. The transition between Books I and II, that is, between peace and the start of the war, is established with a poem which indicates that the war is just about to break up an idyllic pastoral ideal of England:

Now Thames is long and winds its  
changing way  
Through wooded reach to dusky ports  
and gray,  
Till, wearily, it strikes the Flats of Leigh,  
An old life, tidal with Eternity.

But Fal is short, full, deep, and very  
wide,  
Nor old, nor sleepy, when it meets the  
tide;  
Through hills and groves where birds  
and branches sing  
It runs its course of sunny wandering,  
And passes, careless that it soon shall  
be  
Lost in the old, gray mists that hide the  
sea.

Ah, they were good, those up-stream  
reaches when  
Ourselves were young and dreamed of  
being men,

But Fal! the tide had touched us even  
then!  
One tribal God, we bow to, thou and we,  
And praise Him, Who ordained our lives  
should be  
So early tidal with Eternity.<sup>661</sup>

In the poem, English rivers such as the 'Thames' and 'Fal' 'meet the tide' that erodes ports and cities, and are '[l]ost in the old, gray mists that hide the sea' by eventually drifting into the sea. Just like English rivers, the young boys in the novel are 'so early tidal with eternity' that they encounter a deadly war that destroys lives and drift into eternity through death. From the Flats of Leigh in the north to the rivers Fal and Thames in the south, the landscape in question is undoubtedly England. The land that is described is the young boys' homeland, which is evoked by idyllic descriptions of the landscape of English countryside. McLoughlin states that the pastoral tradition that depicts the protection of 'innocent civil society' during wartime benefits 'propagandist constructions'.<sup>662</sup> In this case, 'innocent civil society' can also refer to the English countryside, which shows that 'land is what is fought for: conquered, defended, loved'.<sup>663</sup> Landscape symbolism in this poem thus justifies the war by suggesting that the soldiers reach eternity by dying for their country, and also reinforces the idea that pervades the rest of the novel; the beauty in sacrificing one's life for England. While the defence of the land becomes an important theme, patriotic duty gains importance. Khan asserts that the 'depiction of country sights and sounds in tellingly sentimental tones' is a way of 'inculcat[ing] awareness of the "value" of things preservation of which demanded sacrifice'.<sup>664</sup> According to Larsen, from antiquity until the nineteenth century, the concept of war validated cultural identity, but during World War I the destruction of landscapes became a synonym for the destruction of cultural and national identity.<sup>665</sup> In this case, it can be argued that, if the rivers Thames and Fal and 'the Flats of Leigh'

---

<sup>661</sup> Raymond, p.177.

<sup>662</sup> Quoted in Hopchet, p.22; McLoughlin, p.96-97.

<sup>663</sup> Quoted in Hopchet, p.22; McLoughlin, p.87.

<sup>664</sup> Quoted in Hopchet, p.22; Khan p.60.

<sup>665</sup> Ibid.



express a strong sense of patriotism and become symbols for every corner in England for which the young boys are about to fight, they can also be construed as a metaphor for English culture, society and values that need to be defended and preserved. As previously explained, when this poem was published in 1920, Christianity in Britain was undergoing a crisis over the issue of religious unity amid a questioning of dominant values. It is possible to argue that the poem emphasises the continuity of a perceived English set of values in relation to the protection and preservation of the landscape of England. Pastoral descriptions in this sense not only symbolise the process of war but also imply that the English landscape embodied everything for which English boys were prepared to fight.

In Raymond's poem, Englishness is not only imposed upon the British landscape but also upon the global sea. The use of the sea as a metaphor derives from a long tradition, which celebrates both defensive character of the sea as a 'congenial retreat' and aggressive aspects of the sea as in James Thomson's "Rule, Britannia, rule the waves" (1740).<sup>666</sup> In the nineteenth century, the sea as a metaphor becomes loaded with national or patriotic images intertwined with the idea of Englishness. Scottish author Robert Louis Stevenson claimed in his essay 'The English Admirals' (1878) that British patriotic glory and military success could be best symbolised by the image of the sea, since it had 'been the scene of [the] greatest triumphs and dangers'.<sup>667</sup> Linking patriotic glory and success to national identity, Stevenson further suggested that the British should consider themselves 'unworthy of [their] descent' if they did not 'please themselves with the pretension that the sea is English'.<sup>668</sup> Stevenson's comments on the British ownership of the global seas were also supported by other authors, such as the nineteenth-century English historian James Anthony Froude, who claimed in his

---

<sup>666</sup> James Anthony Froude, *Oceana, or, England and Her Colonies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p.18.

<sup>667</sup> Robert Louis Stevenson, *The English Admirals* (New York: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1932), p.87.

<sup>668</sup> Ibid.

travel writing that '[a]fter their own island, the sea is the natural home of Englishmen'.<sup>669</sup> Both authors considered the sea as an enabler of nationhood and thus of the British Empire through colonisation and expansion. According to Bernhard Klein, this approach, however, illustrates the paradox of 'a late imperial anxiety about the very possibility of the containment of home, self and nation.'<sup>670</sup>

Extending Stevenson and Froude's colonial mind-sets to the Gallipoli campaign, Raymond merges the eternity of the sea with the necessity to legitimise military expansion in Gallipoli. The use of the sea as a metaphor also provides an important link to the dominant idea in the rest of the novel, which suggests that the Gallipoli campaign across the global seas forms a crucial component of British empire-building. This can be seen in *Tell England* when Book I ends with a sentimental scene in which one of the young boys, Rupert Ray, and his headmaster, Mr Radley, have a bitter conversation about the upcoming war. Whilst Ray is excited about fighting against the Germans, Radley is deeply concerned over the young boys going to war and a generation which could be lost.<sup>671</sup> Having sensed the seriousness of the situation, Ray leaves Mr Radley, contemplating: 'Farewell, Radley, farewell. After all, does it matter to a strong swimmer if the wave beats against him?'<sup>672</sup> This is a sentence that Radley constantly repeats to Ray, who is the best swimmer in Kensington public school, to remind him of his capability to overcome every difficulty. At the end of Book I, it is now Ray's turn to comfort Radley, reminding his headmaster of his capability to overcome any difficulty, including the war. However, in the context of war, the sentence gains a double meaning. 'Strong swimmer' not only refers to Ray but also echoes the naval dominance of England itself. The global sea becomes the arena for the exercise of power by the British Empire, challenging its enemies, and illustrates the arrogance of

---

<sup>669</sup> Froude, p.18

<sup>670</sup> Bernhard Klein, "'The Natural Home of Englishmen': Froude's Oceana and the Writing of the Sea", in *Landscape and Englishness*, ed. by Robert Burden and Stephan Kohl (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), p.103.

<sup>671</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.176.

<sup>672</sup> Ibid.

the nineteenth century ethos of Empire that echoes the idea of the superior Englishman. Dr Chapman's statement earlier in the novel, 'there are three things old England has learnt to make: ships, and poetry, and boys', only reinforces this idea further, making the global sea a part of English identity. Even the above-mentioned nineteenth century ideal of holding the ownership of the global seas is pursued in the novel, which argues that 'England dominates Gibraltar and Suez, the doors of the Mediterranean' and that 'her constellation' will be completed 'by winning from the Turk the lost star of the Dardanelles, the only other entrance to the Great Sea.'<sup>673</sup>

In many Gallipoli writings, the battlefields of Gallipoli were defined as geographical and historical spaces parallel to the British landscape and history. They were alien and foreign in the geographical sense, but they were also mirrors of home. The image of the sea not only invokes a sense of imperial conquest, as stated above, but also acts as an extension or a reminder of home to convey the soldiers' search for familiarity and comfort during critical moments of anxiety and tension. In Raymond's novel, when the boys see the sight of Gallipoli for the first time from their ship, Doe associates it with England: 'Put trees on those hills [at Gallipoli] [...], you could imagine you were going out of the estuary of the Fal to the open sea.'<sup>674</sup> The sea is described as the only connection to home, either bringing a feeling of home and hope with new troop ships or echoing Froude's interpretation of the sea as 'the natural home of Englishmen'. In the novel, Ray describes 'the men of the 29th Division' landing at Gallipoli as 'a sea-breeze out of the sea' as they drove 'the Turks and Germans from their coastal defences', 'won a footing on Cape Helles' and 'planted their feet firmly on the invaded territory.'<sup>675</sup> In a moment of despair, seeing 'the fresh arrivals on the troopships', Ray feels that they bring 'from [the] homeland that atmosphere of glowing optimism which prevailed in England in the early August days'.<sup>676</sup> Raymond's association of the Gallipoli landscape

---

<sup>673</sup> Ibid p.195.

<sup>674</sup> Ibid p.276.

<sup>675</sup> Ibid p.194.

<sup>676</sup> Ibid p.262.

with the landscape of home through the image of the sea makes the alien landscape seem more hospitable, potentially providing comfort for the readers who had lost sons and husbands at Gallipoli.

In A.P. Herbert's poem 'The Bathe', the sea is considered as a comforting space as well, but is not used to encourage imperial thoughts and ideals as in Raymond's novel. The sea is defined as an ideal place for retreat from the horrors of the battlefield and probability of death:

But yonder, where the Indians have their  
goats,  
There is a rock stands sheer above the  
blue,  
Where one may sit and count the  
bustling boats  
And breathe the cool air through;  
May find it still is good to be alive,  
May look across and see the Trojan  
shore  
Twinkling and warm, may strip, and  
stretch, and dive  
And for a space forget about the war.

Then will we sit and talk of happy things,  
Home and 'the High' and some far  
fighting friend  
And gather strength for what the morrow  
brings,  
For that may be the end.  
It may be we shall never swim again,  
Never be clean and comely to the sight,  
May rot untombed and stink with all the  
slain.  
Come then and swim. Come and be  
clean to-night.<sup>677</sup>

In the poem, the image of the sea contrasts with the horrific images of the battlefield and incites positive feelings. If the Gallipoli battlefield is anti-nature, the sea represents nature; a safe space connected with 'happy things' such as 'home' and 'far fighting friends'. It becomes an extension of home compared to the hostile Gallipoli landscape associated with death and decay.

---

<sup>677</sup> A. P. Herbert, p.20.

The idea of sea as a safe place to bathe that emerges in A.P. Herbert's poem is also found in Raymond's novel through references to English naval dominance. Although seascape descriptions themselves do not include definitions of battleships in the poem, and Raymond's novel extends the idea of home to the belief in British naval dominance as reminders from home. In the novel, the British battleships provoke Ray and Doe's amazement at Mudros Bay, as Doe says 'I didn't know there were so many ships in the world' and Ray describes the 'wonderful revelation of sea power' as 'the pride of this watery planet':<sup>678</sup>

Like a duchess sailing into a ball-room  
came the *Mauretania*, making the mere  
professional warships and the common  
merchantmen look very small indeed.  
But even she, haughty lady, was put in  
the shade, when her young but  
gargantuan sister, the *Aquitania*, floating  
leisurely between the booms, claimed  
the attention of the harbour, and  
reduced us all to a state of grovelling  
homage. And then the *Olympic*, not to  
be outdone by these overrated  
Cunarders, would join the company with  
her nose in the air.<sup>679</sup>

The description of the warships is permeated with exalting references to women. Raymond reinterprets the stereotypes of women as *femme fatales* or seducers and destroyers of male vitality, attributing this attitude to Britain's battleships. However, the Allied powers' 'femme fatale' ships do not prepare to destroy all mankind in Gallipoli, but only the men of the enemy. Perhaps this sense of awe and admiration partly derives from the vital needs of the soldiers on the battlefield, such as of water, since Aubrey Herbert states that ships were the source of water in Gallipoli and the soldiers were '[s]hort of water' when they are 'gone'.<sup>680</sup> However, in Raymond's case, the glorification of the British naval power is used to reinforce Raymond's imperial ideals. In another instance, the British Navy is portrayed as 'the father and mother of the Army in

---

<sup>678</sup> Raymond, p.261.

<sup>679</sup> Ibid.

<sup>680</sup> Aubrey Herbert, p.105.

this Gallipoli stunt', who 'are proud of their children'.<sup>681</sup> Soldiers are portrayed as young boys and children who need mothering on the battlefield. Ray, for instance, feels 'about eight years old' whilst saying goodbye to his mother before setting out for Gallipoli, and Jimmy Doon, Officer on Submarine Watch, is described as a 'tediously homesick' young man who 'wanted his mother'.<sup>682</sup> The navy, in that sense, substitutes for family, which sustains and nourishes young soldiers. Invocation of the sea and British naval dominance can be interpreted as a strategy to make British soldiers feel more at home in Gallipoli or to provide consolation for the families that have lost sons and husbands at Gallipoli, by suggesting that Britons are at home anywhere by the sea.

### **Alien Land 'sown' with English Bodies**

Likening the alien landscape of Gallipoli with the landscape of home is not the only way to interpret Gallipoli as an extension of home. Raymond's novel portrays the Gallipoli campaign as a 'glorification of willing self-sacrifice and redemptive death'.<sup>683</sup> Through the idea of Christian self-sacrifice and the Victorian perception of war, which, as outlined in the previous chapter, expresses the romantic, heroic and patriotic ideals that encourage war, the physical reality of death is freighted with more meaningful significance for the fallen soldiers. Reminding us of Brooke's poem 'The Soldier', the novel romanticises the dead bodies of the young boys to give an implicit message that these dead bodies of the soldiers do not merely decay in a foreign land, but unite as one with nature and even transform the land into a part of England. Monty's epilogue addressed to Ray, who died at Gallipoli, delivers this message using the landscape images as a way to convey the value of his sacrifice:

Do you remember how I used to call you  
'my mountain boy'? The name has a  
new meaning now. Even if you are in  
danger at this time, I try to be proud. I  
think of you as on white heights.<sup>684</sup>

---

<sup>681</sup> Raymond, p.245.

<sup>682</sup> Ibid p.217.

<sup>683</sup> Vandiver, p.71.

<sup>684</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, pp.339-340.

With Ray's death at Gallipoli, the nickname 'mountain boy', as Monty calls Ray, suggests that Ray now becomes one with nature, with the mountains of Gallipoli. The image of 'white heights', on the other hand, as represented in Shakespeare's *King Lear*, 'There is a cliff, whose high and bending head looks fearfully in the confined deep' can be argued to be a traditional symbol of England.<sup>685</sup> This union of the fallen soldiers [Ray, Doe and other young boys] with their country for which they died not only provides 'consolation' for the bereaved but also promotes patriotism.<sup>686</sup> Indeed, Ray's patriotism is so strong that his body consecrates Gallipoli and he continues to live on in England for which he sacrificed himself. 'White heights' also conveys a sense of national protectiveness; the white cliffs of England stand blocking the outside world, and simultaneously imply a sense of imperial conquest as they also provide a link to the outside world. By physically lying on the mountains of Gallipoli and spiritually standing on the 'white heights' of England, Ray represents the dead soldiers who died in a foreign land to protect England and carry on her imperial project. The idea that the dead soldiers sustain England's ideals is more clearly understood as Monty continues his epilogue: 'we [the English] have sown the world with the broken dreams and spilled ambitions of a generation of schoolboys.'<sup>687</sup> The choice of the verb 'sown' indicates that the soldiers' death will sprout into something more beautiful and noble and gives the impression that England's sowing of dead bodies in foreign lands was only a beginning to create something bigger. In this sense, Monty's epilogue could be seen to exemplify the context of national landscape and the national landscapes could be argued to use the form of pastoral to 'further the national cause'.<sup>688</sup>

---

<sup>685</sup> William Shakespeare, 'King Lear', in *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*, ed. by Samuel Johnson (Leipsic: Fleischer, 1833), p.793.

<sup>686</sup> Khan, p.65.

<sup>687</sup> Raymond, p.339.

<sup>688</sup> Larsen, pp.481-483; Khan, p.52.

## Familiarising the Alien Landscape through Cultural Patterns: Classical and Biblical Allusions

Another way of interpreting Gallipoli as an extension of home is by defining the alien landscape of Gallipoli through the use of popular ideologies and cultural patterns that were constructed and encouraged back at home. As discussed in the previous chapter, in the nineteenth-century British Empire, classical discourse and the ideals of the chivalry of the knights of the Middle Ages formed an ethos influenced by the heavily Latin- and Greek-based syllabus of British public school education to encourage particular forms of masculinity in the upbringing of gentlemen. During World War I, this idea was revived to encourage fighting and to glorify death, and a British-inflected classical past was used to make sense of 'the war-torn present'.<sup>689</sup> Being a region replete with heroic stories of antiquity and the classical world as well as a site associated with the crusades, Gallipoli helped this understanding in nourishing the upper middle-class landscape descriptions of Gallipoli. The previous chapter illustrated that classical allusions that defined modern British soldiers were used to 'praise' them and 'glorify death and heroism' as well as to 'ennoble the [Gallipoli] campaign'.<sup>690</sup> This chapter concludes by illustrating that in providing a link between Britain's classical past, contemporary British culture and the future of the Empire, the classical allusions that define the Gallipoli landscape were used not only to encourage the British soldiers to fight but also to explain the disillusioning experience of modern British fighters. In Ernest Raymond's *Tell England*, the first point can be observed clearly as Ray explains the way in which the Colonel encourages the British officers by defining the Gallipoli landscape in classical and mythological terms:

the Dardanelles Straits were the Hellespont of the Ancient world, and the neighbouring Aegean Sea the most mystic of the "wine-dark seas of Greece": he [the Colonel] retold stories

---

<sup>689</sup> Goebel, p.1.

<sup>690</sup> Macleod, p.9.



of Jason and the Argonauts; of "Burning Sappho" in Lesbos; of Achilles in Scyros; of Poseidon sitting upon Samothrace to watch the fight at Troy;<sup>691</sup>

This paragraph epitomises the wartime effort to make sense of a war that takes place in foreign fields by making the alien landscape familiar to the British officers. Ray describes the Colonel preaching to young officers using classical references to keep alive their fighting spirit by establishing parallels between the classical past as taught in British public schools and the alien Gallipoli landscape. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the majority of young English officers had grown up within a public school culture dominated by the study of classical literature, and a speech like the Colonel's above helped English officers make sense of the war in a battlefield far from their homeland. The ordinary 'Tommy' may have heard of Homer and the Trojan War, but was far less likely to know Greek and Latin, or to be intimately familiar with the classical texts to which the Colonel refers; however, the retelling of classical stories such as the Trojan War was still a great source of inspiration for British soldiers. In his diary *His Life and Times*, A.P. Herbert illustrates how the story of the Trojan War encouraged his Tynesiders to fight at Gallipoli, as they 'thought it a sensible thing to go to a war if some something bastard kidnapped the Queen' and how they linked the story of Troy with themselves: 'some of them had girls or wives called Helen and they too were going to war to get them back'.<sup>692</sup> A.P. Herbert also describes their first encounter with Gallipoli as an inspirational experience:

I told the platoon-sergeant, and so he told the men. "Officer says that's the plain of Troy over there." It was bliss unbelievable to our hot and dusty bodies to swim. An occasional shell came from the gun called "Asiatic Anne", but nobody paid much attention. Afterwards, as we rested on the beach, democratically naked, it pleased me to think that I had been swimming in the

---

<sup>691</sup> Raymond, *Tell England*, p.195.

<sup>692</sup> A. P. Herbert, *A.P.H. His Life and Times*, p.40.

Hellespont, in the blue channel the  
Greek ships had sailed in the pursuit of  
Helen. [...] Across the Narrows on our  
left, Leander swam – and Byron too. I  
told the platoon sergeant: he told the  
naked men, and one or two, as if  
inspired, again plunged into the sea.  
Thus did dear Winchester and Oxford  
accompany and fortify me in my first  
encounter with the foe.<sup>693</sup>

Classical associations of the Gallipoli landscape, in this sense, illustrate the wartime effort to give the young officers a sense of belonging and a right of abode in the new remote land while simultaneously portraying the campaign as somehow defensive. Both Raymond and A.P. Herbert use the Gallipoli landscape as an access point to the history and mythology of ancient Greek civilisation; however, Raymond further places the British Empire within a Mediterranean continuum to emphasise that there is room for imperial conquest. If Raymond or A.P. Herbert had not romanticised the war, as discussed in the previous chapter, the war experience in Gallipoli would indeed have been ‘the ultimate disillusioning experience.’<sup>694</sup>

Although it has been argued so far that classical allusions were used as a ‘consolatory idealisation of the war experience’ to conceal the disillusioning experience of the modern war and to ennoble the Gallipoli campaign and modern fighters, this is not always the case when classical allusions are applied to the landscape itself.<sup>695</sup> As the war progresses and the Gallipoli campaign reveals its true colours, A.P. Herbert draws away from his initial inspirational experiences and expresses his disappointment at Gallipoli in his poem, ‘Through the Gate of Horn’. In the poem, the classical allusions are deliberately stripped out of their traditional romantic use to point out ‘the ultimate disillusioning experience’ and unheroic nature of the Gallipoli campaign:

---

<sup>693</sup> Ibid.

<sup>694</sup> Macleod, p.12.

<sup>695</sup> Ibid p.14.

But nigh to Troy, where men employed  
no vapours  
Nor made attacks at this unnatural time,  
And Troy's traditions shall forbid such  
capers  
While cultured Turks possess the classic  
clime:  
These haunts of chivalry shall still  
condemn  
The least activity at three A.M.<sup>696</sup>

As outlined above, on the way to fight at Gallipoli, A.P. Herbert used the image of Troy to evoke feelings of chivalry and bravery and to encourage the Tynesiders under his command to fight at Gallipoli. However, in the verse above, the contrast of the heroism and chivalry that being 'nigh to Troy' evokes and the expression that 'men employed no vapours' points out the reality of fighting at Gallipoli. Rather than the blood, glory and chivalry that the British soldiers and officers were promised at Gallipoli, the soldiers had a lot of time on their hands in their dugouts and the warring experience at Gallipoli turned into a state of boredom and sleep deprivation as the soldiers had to be awake and on the look out for constant bombardments. In this verse, through classical allusions, A.P. Herbert condemns the boredom of such nights with no attack and fighting. In the poem, the soldiers with 'no vapours' are described as 'capers' who should be forbidden by 'Troy's traditions,' and '[t]he least activity at three A.M' is defined to be condemned by the 'haunts of chivalry'. A.P. Herbert presents the idea that war does not turn men into heroes as told in the stories of Troy when he implies that the soldiers have to be spineless and lazy in their dugouts, anti-heroes rather than heroes.

Although Raymond's *Tell England* in general glorifies death and the heroism of the soldiers and seeks to ennoble the Gallipoli campaign, it occasionally describes similar views to A.P. Herbert's disillusioned thoughts in presenting the war from the perspectives of young soldiers rather than the author's. When Ray and Doe take a

---

<sup>696</sup> A. P. Herbert, *Half Hours at Helles*, p.28.

bird's-eye view of the naval and military base at Mudros, where they could see Achi Baba and Sari Bair from a distance, Doe contemplates their 'mighty campaign', which now looks 'even smaller and more toy-like to Poseidon, sitting on Samothrace' and then he adds: 'What insects we are! As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods; they kill us for their sport.'<sup>697</sup> Raymond directly quotes from the Duke of Gloucester's speech in Shakespeare's *King Lear* after he has been blinded by two of the king's enemies. As a cornerstone of English literary and cultural heritage, Shakespeare is another important reference point for the kind of national English identity Raymond propagates in his novel, and Shakespeare is also part of the standard public schoolboy repertoire. Contrary to what the overall novel does or what has been argued about classical allusions in the previous chapters, Doe begins to discredit the 'mightiness' of the campaign, as the very classical viewpoint reveals to him that what happens on the front at Gallipoli is not the making of heroes or the creation of new legends, but the diminishment of human life to insects.

Similarly, Aubrey Herbert benefits from the classical connotations of the Gallipoli landscape to illustrate the worthlessness of human life at Gallipoli, but he tackles it in a more humorous way:

I bathed. I was at the end of the pier; as  
I was beginning to dress a shell burst  
very close, the smoke and powder in my  
face. I fled half dressed; Colonel P. rose  
like Venus from the sea and followed  
with nothing.<sup>698</sup>

The image of the pier where Herbert bathes, seeking an escape to a sense of comfort, cleanliness and retreat, contrasts with the bursting shell that not only splashes smoke and powder onto Herbert's face but also threatens his life. However, the urgency and fatality of the situation is rendered through the incongruously humorous image of

---

<sup>697</sup> Ibid p.271.

<sup>698</sup> Aubrey Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut*, p.136.

beautiful female nudity, described with reference to the Roman goddess of love and beauty and conferred on the unlikely figure of a British Colonel.

### ***Biblical References***

Religious depictions of the alien Gallipoli landscape could also be seen as an extension of home and an attempt to familiarise British soldiers or readers with the alien landscape. As discussed in the previous chapter, the concept of muscular Christianity in the nineteenth-century British Empire was one of the factors that encouraged fighting during World War I. The military patriotism that emerged with the war paralleled with religion and quickly became intertwined in the practice of Christian faith.<sup>699</sup> By defining the Gallipoli landscape in Christian terms, authors such as Ernest Raymond promoted patriotic ideas to justify the failed campaign:

And the Big Rains were fast drawing due. The time was at hand when the ravines and gorges that cracked and spliced the Mudros Hills would roar to the torrents, and the hard, dust-strewn earth would become acres of mud, from which our tent-pegs would be drawn like pins out of butter. We remembered Elijah on Mount Carmel, and looked at the sky for rain.<sup>700</sup>

In *Tell England*, the heavy rain falling over the hills on Mudros reminds the British soldiers of the biblical story of Elijah, who challenges hundreds of prophets to a contest on Mount Carmel and, by bringing rain to end a long drought, proves that only his deity was genuinely in control of the Kingdom of Israel. By reminding them of the story of Elijah, the passage suggests that God is on the side of the British soldiers and, just as Elijah defeated hundreds of other prophets with his faith, the British soldiers will be able to defeat their opponents via their Christian faith. In another passage, the colonel tells the young British officers about ‘the stories of St. John the Divine at Patmos gazing up

---

<sup>699</sup> Hastings, p.132.

<sup>700</sup> Raymond, p.263.

into the Heavenly Jerusalem', which turns the alien landscape of Gallipoli into a Christian pilgrimage site.<sup>701</sup>

The conflicting texts discussed above offer us glimpses of multiple hidden landscapes at Gallipoli. World War I not only brought men to unfamiliar geographical landscapes like Gallipoli, but also led them to reflect their cultural and religious landscapes on those unfamiliar landscapes. The Gallipoli landscape in this sense was not only unreliable and deeply alien for the British soldiers, but also culturally and religiously familiar. The unfamiliarity and unreliability of the alien landscape of Gallipoli are explained using Larsen's term 'guerrilla landscapes', in which the landscape is defined as inhospitable, destructive and uncomfortable due to its animate and inanimate objects, yet depicted as becoming the soldiers' new home. Whilst there were cases where the alien and inhospitable nature of Gallipoli could be interpreted to act as extra motivation to fight for the more hospitable, comforting landscapes of Britain, as in Raymond's *Tell England* and W.F. Rollo's 'The Naval Bombardment', there were also cases where 'guerrilla landscapes' are simply used to express the discomfort and fatality of the trenches, as in Aubrey Herbert and A.P. Herbert's accounts.

However, in Gallipoli writings, the alien landscape is not only defined in unfamiliar terms but also familiar cultural, historical, traditional and religious terms. The landscape of Gallipoli becomes a reminder of home through these terms, particularly by reflecting traditional usages of landscape images and cultural and religious patterns. These reminders of home are used to provide a symbolic escape to a sense of comfort and retreat as explained in A.P. Herbert's poem about bathing in the sea, or to promote a sense of patriotism and to encourage imperial thoughts as in Raymond's depiction of the sea. A.P. Herbert and Aubrey Herbert's use of classical references, on the other hand, strengthen the sense of disillusionment by the experience of fighting at Gallipoli.

---

<sup>701</sup> Ibid p.195.

## OTTOMAN-TURKISH PERCEPTIONS OF THE GALLIPOLI LANDSCAPE

The Gallipoli campaign has been considered in modern Turkish history as the basis for the Turkish War of Independence and the establishment of the Turkish Republic by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, who gained his reputation after serving as a commander at Gallipoli.<sup>702</sup> Despite the dominance of Gallipoli in the Turkish national imagination, neither the landscape of Gallipoli nor World War I have ever become the focus of research in Turkish literature due to the arguable failure of Ottoman literary works to form a distinct body of war literature. However, there is a considerable amount of Turkish writing on the Gallipoli campaign, and representations of the Gallipoli landscape and nature play an important role in conveying efforts by Ottoman intellectuals to forge a Turkish sense of cultural and national solidarity. This chapter aims to establish a topography of various Ottoman literary perceptions of the landscape of Gallipoli within the context of war. It examines texts such as Mehmet Akif Ersoy's 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', Ziya Gökalp's 'Çanakkale' and Ömer Seyfeddin's 'Aleko' as well as work by other poets and writers such as Ahmet Nedim's 'Namaz' and Ibrahim Naci's diary 'Allahaismarladık'. This chapter explores the strong connections between literary portrayals of the Gallipoli campaign and its landscape. These connections include how the selected authors recover and revise traditional views of the landscape and representations of nature and how this allows them to perceive Gallipoli.

Similar to the British landscape descriptions, the idea of nature, landscape and the universe has been an important part of the Ottoman literary tradition. However, in Diwan literature, which dominated Ottoman literature between the thirteenth and nineteenth centuries, representation of nature and landscape took shape more in religious terms and in parallel with Islamic perceptions of nature, landscape and the

---

<sup>702</sup> Uyar, p.165.

universe.<sup>703</sup> Ali Yıldırım explains the Islamic understanding of nature in Diwan literature mainly in four categories through: (1) divine signs in nature, (2) humans ruling over/commanding nature, (3) the intertwined relationship between humans and nature, and (4) through the portrayal of idyllic landscapes as the Garden of Eden.<sup>704</sup> In Islam, 'all of the universe, including human beings' was considered to be 'a reflection of God' and thereby everything in nature 'has the signs of God'.<sup>705</sup> In the words of the famous Diwan poet Fuzulî, for instance, 'Bu bahr-ı nilgün biñ mevc her sâ'at ayân eyler/ Ûlû'l-ebsâra bir bir keşf-i esrâr-ı nihân eyler/ Nişân-ı kesret-i eşyâ dem-â-dem ehl-i taklîde/ Rümûz-ı nûkte-i tevhîd-i Hak hâtır-nişân eyler'.<sup>706</sup> (The blue sea reveals thousands of waves every hour/ This shows the right-minded the discovery of hidden secrets one by one/ The traces of a multitude of imitative entities/ Constantly reminding through subtle signs of the oneness of God). Therefore, it is not surprising that Diwan literature considered landscape and nature as something sacred, given as a loan to humanity by God.<sup>707</sup> This means that humans have command over nature, the landscape and the universe; however, they also have responsibility towards them. Respecting and protecting sacred nature, the landscape and the universe while making use of what they offer would be an Islamic behaviour, but damaging and abusing them would be contrary to the tenets of Islam.<sup>708</sup> As Fuzulî says in his poem, 'Tâ zarar yetmeye ednâlara a'lâlardan/ Eylemiş âleme fermân-ı hilâfet icrâ' (God validated the edict of the caliphate to humans/ So that the lowest in the realm of existence is not hurt by the highest).<sup>709</sup> In this sense, as reflected in Diwan literature, humans in Islam are the caliphs, or in other words protectors of nature, the landscape and the universe. Overall, humans were considered to be 'the essence of the universe', since it was believed that

---

<sup>703</sup> Ali Yıldırım, 'İslâmın Tabiat Anlayışı ve Divan Şirine Yansımaları' (Concept of Nature in Islam and Its Reflection to Divan Poetry), *İlmi Araştırmalar* 17 (İstanbul 2004), 155-173, (155).

<sup>704</sup> Ibid pp.155-170.

<sup>705</sup> Ibid.

<sup>706</sup> Ibid p.157.

<sup>707</sup> Ibid p.172.

<sup>708</sup> William Chittick, *Varolmanın Boyutları*, trans.by Turan Koç (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1997), pp.76-77.

<sup>709</sup> Yıldırım p.161.



'a human is a small universe and the universe is a big human'.<sup>710</sup> Everything in nature is considered to be a one-dimensional reflection of humans, as humans are seen to be the highest beings in creation and everything else is seen as lower. As can be seen, Diwan literature does not depict reality or nature itself; it narrates the story of the creator and creation. For this reason, it depicts nature as idealised idyllic landscapes reminding us of the Garden of Eden. Although Diwan poets have always been criticised for representing nature as 'abstract', 'too perfect', 'imaginary' and 'dissimilar to its original', the representation of idealised nature in Diwan literature is necessary due to its subject matter, creation and creator, which were perceived as abstract perfection.<sup>711</sup>

As the ideas of modernisation and westernisation of the Ottoman Empire gained momentum in the second half of the nineteenth century, Diwan literature, which was far removed from reality and daily life with its artificial and exaggerated expressions and metaphors, lost its influence. New literary movements centred on educating and civilising Ottoman society and aimed to produce comprehensible works based on the facts of society. With the start of World War I, as the previous chapters have already discussed, ideologies such as Ottomanism, Westernism, Islamism and Turkism led to debate among Ottoman intellectuals on how to save the Ottoman Empire. However, although these ideologies rejected each other as well as certain aspects of the past, the Ottoman literary past inevitably constituted the bedrock of cultural patterns and thoughts, and thus the nation itself. Particularly on the subject of landscape and nature, the influence of Diwan literature on Ottoman culture can be clearly observed in Turkish Gallipoli writings. In other words, these dual influences shaped intellectuals' references to the Gallipoli landscape in their writings. On the one hand, their respective ideological approaches and contributions to Turkish nation-building shape the way landscape is seen and used, and on the other, Diwan literature is influential as a literary precedent.

---

<sup>710</sup> Ibid p.160.

<sup>711</sup> Ibid p.155.

As can be seen above, in the British Gallipoli writings, landscape means both the surface of the earth and a visual scene with natural or unnatural, animate or inanimate objects. Irrespective of whether or not the texts justify or criticise the war, or are infused with mythological, religious and imperialist allusions, portrayals of the landscape as guerrilla landscapes are omnipresent and suggest that the landscape of Gallipoli is the landscape of hell. In Turkish Gallipoli writings, however, the landscape of hell represented in British writings, with Gallipoli's barbed wires, thundering ships, dead mules, fatal cliffs, the smell of corpses, blinding dust and sand, pestering flies and the soldiers' unsafe swimming is almost invisible apart from a few soldiers' accounts which were not published until the beginning of the twentieth-first century. Even in soldiers' accounts, they are not presented in as horrifying or disturbing a manner as in British writings. Apart from concerns about censorship as well as their concern to fix the situation the 'sick-man of Europe' was in, this could also be because Ottoman intellectuals did not know how it felt to be a combatant on the battlefield. Portraying the landscape of battlefields as horrifying (as they were), would not help recruiting in Ottoman soldiers or creating national solidarity to save an Empire which was being invaded. In this sense, writing on World War I as well as the Gallipoli campaign itself were means to build a possible Ottoman collective unity as the war created a common enemy as well as necessitating self-definition, which have already been discussed in the previous chapters as being the foundations of nation-building. Under these conditions, the part that the landscape should play would have been a romanticised one, complete with either historical, mythical, cultural or religious allusions, to support patriotic claims.

Insufficient descriptions of the landscape in Ottoman-Turkish literary representations of Gallipoli yields insight into how Ottoman-Turkish society has come to terms with

violence and tragedy, which are 'closely aligned with cultural values'.<sup>712</sup> The role of violence in Turkish history (such as the Armenian Event) is a contested issue, and therefore it is reasonable to look at these literary portrayals of the landscape for evidence about attitudes towards violence. The lack of descriptions of the landscape in war writings or a romanticisation of the landscape of the battlefield blur the violence at Gallipoli. References to how horrific and physical the war was are occasionally present, as in Ersoy's Gallipoli poem, but these are not included to criticise certain aspects of the war or to emphasise the physicality of the experience of warfare as in British perspectives, but to justify and reinforce the defensive idea of collective solidarity and unity in more romantic and propagandist terms. The imperative of individual subordination to the community is of such significance in Ottoman-Turkish writings that the figure of the 'broken' man, besides the man protecting his homeland, is rare in the Turkish literature of Gallipoli apart from a select few accounts by soldiers' which were not published at the time.

### **The National Landscape**

In the majority of Turkish Gallipoli writings, descriptions of the landscape are used to convey a sense of patriotism or to 'further the national cause'.<sup>713</sup> As outlined in the previous chapter, both patriotism and nationalism are strongly linked to pastoral images which appeal to people's sense of 'attachment towards the land', in some cases 'induc[ing] them to defend the nation'.<sup>714</sup> Larsen refers to this type of landscape description as 'national landscapes', a type of landscape which 'legitimises war' by being 'the peaceful home' for some but being 'a sign of foreignness and artificiality' for others.<sup>715</sup> This is a common motif observed in Turkish Gallipoli writings; the landscape of Gallipoli, above all, constitutes the sacred Ottoman homeland which therefore should

---

<sup>712</sup> Kenneth Foote, *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997), p.7.

<sup>713</sup> Ibid.

<sup>714</sup> McLoughlin, *Authoring War*, p.87.

<sup>715</sup> Larsen, pp.482-483.

be protected. Mustafa Keskin argues that, for centuries, Turks have considered the homeland as more than just a geographical area, but as a space that merges with national memories and ideals, the spirituality and sacredness of the nation, national culture, past and future.<sup>716</sup> In this sense, for Turks, the notion of homeland not only refers to a significant piece of land but is also loaded with collective sentimentality. This patriotic sentimentality can already be seen before the Turks accepted Islam when the emperor of the Hunnic Empire, Mete Khan, refused to give a piece of land to the Tungusic peoples and identified the protection of one's homeland with the concept of honour, stating that 'Horses and queen were my personal property, I gave them for this reason. The land, on the other hand, is the property of the state. Who can give away the property of the State to someone else?'<sup>717</sup> With the acceptance of Islam in the Ottoman Empire, the concept of the homeland was sanctified and not only loaded with historical and cultural elements, but also assigned with religious significance. This justifies Larsen's argument that 'the development of the relation between war and landscapes' is 'embedded in' the nation's 'overall cultural developments'.<sup>718</sup> According to Carl Sauer, '[c]ulture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape [is] the result' and '[t]he shaping force [...] lies in the culture itself'.<sup>719</sup> Since the Gallipoli campaign represents the early nation-building process of the Turks as outlined in the previous chapters, Gallipoli writings therefore illustrate the process of how the Turks nationalised the geography of the battlefield and how the idea of homeland was used to bring out the nation's common sense of belonging.

Representing the Gallipoli landscape as a part of the 'sacred' Ottoman homeland can be seen as a strategy that Ottoman intellectuals adopted in order to build collective

---

<sup>716</sup> Mustafa Keskin, 'Ziya Gökalp'te Vatan Kavramı', *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1 (1991), 443-452 (444).

<sup>717</sup> Original Text: 'At ile hatun kendi şahsi malımdı, onları bu sebeple verdim. Toprak ise devletin malıdır. Devletin malını başkasına kim verebilir?' Ibid p.444; Bahaeddin Ogel, *Dünden Bugüne Türk Kültürünün Gelişme Çağları* (İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1988), p.49.

<sup>718</sup> Larsen p.471.

<sup>719</sup> Carl O. Sauer, 'The Morphology of Landscape', *University of California Publications in Geography*, 2 (1925) 2000, 19-53, (49).

solidarity by constructing a collective identity – national or religious – that is self-consciously aware of place. With this strategy, the Turkish authors attempted to create, in Simmel's words, an 'awareness of belonging' in the Ottoman mindset.<sup>720</sup> In this sense, the Ottoman authors discussed in this chapter can be argued to have laid the foundations for turning the Gallipoli landscape into a 'mnemonic device' for Turkish 'national narratives, shared values, and putative hopes for the future' as the current nationalist myth of Gallipoli in Turkey considers Gallipoli to be a the symbol of Turkish nationalism.<sup>721</sup> In other words, the landscape of Gallipoli as depicted in the Ottoman writings 'creat[ed] an emotional bonding' with the history of Gallipoli and its geography, which is typical of 'nationalizing states', and this bonding throughout history is, constantly 'reconstituted according to a presentist agenda'.<sup>722</sup>

In Ziya Gökalp's Gallipoli poem 'Çanakkale' (The Dardanelles'), the landscape itself has nothing to do with nature or the origin of the war, but with the cultural identity of the belligerents. As the rules that govern fighting derive from cultural identity, the idea of homeland in the poem is emphasised through the ownership of land with a distinction between Allied Powers' lands and Ottoman or Turkish national land. The English come from 'an island that is far away' with the French and Russians, who aim to reach the 'Red, Black and Mediterranean Seas' by invading 'Gallipoli'.<sup>723</sup> The distance of the English 'island' from Gallipoli as well as from the three aforementioned seas in the poem is highlighted deliberately to convey the message that the Allied Powers do not

---

<sup>720</sup> Quoted in Benno Werlen, *Society, Action and Space: An Alternative Human Geography* (London: Routledge, 1993) p.169.

<sup>721</sup> Ibid.

<sup>722</sup> Brian Osborne, 'Landscapes, Memory, Monuments, and Commemoration: Putting Identity in its Place', *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 33 (2001), 39-77 (43).

<sup>723</sup> Original Text:

Uzaklarda bir ada var,  
Halkına derler İngiliz,  
Hem medeni, hem canavar,  
Fendinden emin değiliz.

Doğrulukta Rus Kazağı,  
Onun yanında sofudur.  
Topu tutar dört bucağı  
Denizlerin Moskofu'dur.  
Gökalp, 'Çanakkale', p.34.

belong in the Dardanelles, which are part of the Ottoman homeland. This distance between geographical places also emphasises Gökalp's Turanist propaganda which held that, contrary to the Allied Powers who come from distant lands to exploit the lands of others, the national land of Gallipoli brings 'liberty' to 'hundreds of Tsarist slaves' and even saves 'Africa' and 'Asia' from being 'colonies' through the Turkish fight against the Western Allies.<sup>724</sup> His conclusion is contradictory in the sense that Gökalp condemns England for straying too far from home but at the same time feels that Gallipoli and the Ottoman army have a far-reaching influence beyond their own borders. Gökalp's Turanist ideal itself includes the meaning of expanding Turkish geography towards other Turkic people's countries. However, in the poem, all the cruelty and destruction are shown to be committed by the Allied Powers, while the Turks are exonerated; thus, cultural identity defines Gökalp's portrayal of the Gallipoli campaign, the combatants' behaviour and its results.

In Nedim's Gallipoli poem 'Namaz' ('The Prayer'), Islamic identity defines the war, represented through his portrayal of the landscape of Gallipoli. The poem describes an Ottoman soldier who fearlessly prays to Allah on the Gallipoli battlefield regardless of

---

<sup>724</sup>Original Text:

Çanakkale dört devlete,  
Galebeye sen çevirdin!  
Çar kölesi yüz millete,  
İstiklali sen getirdin!

Senden ötürü bilsen daha,  
Kurtulacak nice ülke...  
Ne Afrika, ne Asya'da,  
Kalmayacak müstemleke...

(Gallipoli, you defeated  
All those four nations!  
You brought liberty to  
Hundreds of Tsar slaves!

If you knew, because of you,  
How many countries will be saved...  
Neither in Africa nor in Asia,  
There will be no more colonies...)  
Ibid p.34.

the hazardous mechanised warfare taking place around him, and the landscape of Gallipoli is shown to collaborate with him:

Kuru toprak üzerinde, kundurasız kılınan  
Bu namazın, pek uygun bir kubbesiydi  
âsmân!  
Bir çam, ona gölgesinde yapmış idi  
seccade.  
Sanki tekbir alıyordu vakit vakit top  
sesi...

[...]

Ey medenî İngilizler! Daha varsa getirin  
İnsanları, göme göme öldürecek şeyleri:  
Getirin de bu cenneti, cehenneme  
çevirin  
Bakın onlar korkutur mu, bir Müslüman  
neferi

Bunu, hala anlamıyor ne (Hamilton) ne  
Garey  
Müslüman'ı korkutamaz Allah'tan başka  
şey.<sup>725</sup>

(For the prayer performed on the dry soil  
without boots  
The sky was the most suitable dome!  
A pine tree provided him a prayer rug  
with its shadow  
As if cannons were shouting Takbir  
every now and then

[...]

Oh civilised English! Bring more of  
The things that bury and kill people:  
Bring them so that you turn this heaven  
into a hell  
And observe, if they will scare a Muslim  
soldier

Neither (Hamilton) nor Garey yet  
comprehend this  
Nothing but only God can scare a  
Muslim.)

In the poem, nature creates an ideal environment for praying; 'the sky' forms 'the most suitable dome' while the shadow of a pine tree 'provide[s] him a prayer rug'.<sup>726</sup>

---

<sup>725</sup> Ahmet Nedim Servet Tör, 'Namaz', *Harp Mecmuası* 4 (1915), 56-57 (56).

The idea of the landscape being safe is so strong that even ‘cannons’ feel like they were ‘shouting Takbir every now and then’ for the Muslim soldier.<sup>727</sup> After all the landscape of Gallipoli is ‘heaven’ that is forcibly being turned into ‘a hell’ by the Allied powers but still manages to protect the praying Muslim soldier from the threat of the guns. What is important here is that the natural landscape of Gallipoli is defined as inanimate, whereas the weaponry that blends into nature during warfare is defined as animate. This might not seem important at first glance; however, when applied to the idea of homeland, the inanimateness of the landscape is suggestive of confinement, vulnerability and dependency whilst the animated description of weaponry reinforces the concepts of destructiveness, strength and hostility. This strengthens the overall message of the poem that the homeland, which has always been protective of its inhabitants, is now in danger and needs to be protected in turn. While in British Gallipoli writings, natural features and weapons fuse to become one hostile environment, a distinction is maintained in Ottoman-Turkish writings.

The idea of homeland depicted in combatants’ accounts seems to parallel civilian authors’ accounts. In the diary of Ibrahim Naci, a twenty-one-year-old Turkish lieutenant who fought and died at Gallipoli, the urgency of protecting the homeland is made clear through illustrations of the destructive effects of war on Ottoman towns and villages. As Naci and his company were marching towards the battlefield, they passed through a destroyed and vacated Turkish town in Eceabat (Maidos) where Naci thought that:

Here the effects of the war were more explicit, especially in Maidos [...] This small and pretty town was presenting a lamentable view. Almost all buildings were destroyed and burned by the enemy’s cannonballs. There was no one in the town.<sup>728</sup>

---

<sup>726</sup> Ibid.

<sup>727</sup> Ibid.

<sup>728</sup> Naci, *Farewell*, p.101.



As Naci's company continued towards a Turkish village, Erenköyü, '[t]he view was getting worse' as 'inauspicious deathly silen[t]' towns were 'full with the plague of jaundice'.<sup>729</sup> The destroyed, burnt and vacated villages and towns led Naci to contemplate the region, to which he gives a religious identity: 'Rumelia had been experiencing so many disasters for two years and it continued to do so. What was the fault of these poor Muslim lands?'<sup>730</sup> Since Gallipoli is situated in a strategically important place that separates Asia and Europe, it had been the site of many wars and battles in Turkish history that opened the gates of Rumelia to the Ottoman Empire. Reminiscing about one of those wars that took place only a few years prior to the Gallipoli campaign, the Balkan Wars, Naci amalgamates the landscape with religious identity. By giving a cohesive meaning to the traces of former wars in the landscape, Naci tries to restore the collective identity of the Ottomans as 'Muslim' and defines the Gallipoli campaign and its events in religious terms. Such reminders of a religious identity or patriotism often repeat themselves in the diary in between Naci's contradictory and fearful thoughts of death and kept him motivated to fight against the enemy as well as to remain strong in the face of the terrible conditions at Gallipoli. This can be seen more explicitly when Naci's contradictory and fearful thoughts increased as the soldiers kept walking through mountains near high cliffs where 'smashing on to the ground seemed so easy with the slip of the foot'.<sup>731</sup> Although the landscape of Gallipoli as well as the idea of death frightened him greatly, Naci 'did not stop or turn back, because the mission was a matter of the country'.<sup>732</sup> He 'had so many people left behind', who 'entrusted [his] chastity and courage' and 'had made a commitment to their protection'.<sup>733</sup> As can be seen, Naci cultivated Ottoman values and virtues such as the idea of homeland and patriotism, arguably not because he was actually dedicated to such thoughts but certainly to resist the fear of death. In this sense, in combatants

---

<sup>729</sup> Ibid.

<sup>730</sup> Ibid p.102.

<sup>731</sup> Ibid p.88.

<sup>732</sup> Ibid.

<sup>733</sup> Ibid.

writings of Gallipoli, patriotic messages including the idea of protecting the homeland function as a buffer against the fear of death. Overall, the idea of the Gallipoli landscape as a part of the homeland represents the continuity of the Turkish and Islamic warrior ethos, the validity of the mythological Turkish past and the assurance of nation-building.

### **Guerrilla Landscapes: The Homeland under Attack**

As explained in the previous chapter, the term guerrilla landscape refers to an understanding of the landscape of war where ‘the landscape more than the war itself is the ultimate test of the boundaries and the solidity of identity’, and becomes the real enemy in the battlefield.<sup>734</sup> In British writings on Gallipoli, the idea of the guerrilla landscape meant that not only the Ottoman enemy was foreign, dangerous and brutal but also the Gallipoli landscape itself. With its inanimate and animate objects, it created a contrast to what home was or meant for the British soldiers. However, it is important to stress that almost all British authors of Gallipoli served at Gallipoli in one way or another and thereby were in close contact with the physical realities of its landscape. In contrast, the majority of Turkish Gallipoli authors were civilians who did not experience the conditions of the trenches at Gallipoli. They defined the landscape of Gallipoli not from actual experience, but only their desire to create a mixed epic, mythical and divine narrative. For this reason, in civilian accounts of Gallipoli, the landscape was part of the homeland, the anti-thesis of foreignness, and therefore represented a more pleasant, safe and collaborative nature. However, in some Turkish civilian writings about Gallipoli, Western weaponry turns Gallipoli into a guerrilla landscape as an outcome of the invasion of the Allied Powers, particularly of the technological warfare that they brought to the Ottoman homeland, and that represented the antithesis of home. Thus, the idea that the safe, peaceful and beautiful Ottoman homeland is purposely

---

<sup>734</sup> Larsen, p.483.

destroyed by the enemy and is transformed into a hell and deathbed for Ottoman soldiers through Western weaponry prevails in Turkish writings.

Although detailed descriptions of Gallipoli as a guerrilla landscape are rarely observed in the Turkish civilian writings on Gallipoli, weaponry and landscape unite as one in existing narratives of guerrilla landscapes or weaponry becomes the new landscape, representing a new type of landscape that is different to the inherent nature of the homeland. As portrayed in Turkish writings, inanimate and pleasant nature intertwines with animate weaponry. In this sense, as discussed in the previous chapter, the animate and inanimate objects belonging to the Gallipoli landscape act as guerrilla forces for the Turkish against British soldiers in the British writing; whereas, in Turkish writings the hostile forces are the mechanised weapons of the West that negatively transform the nature of the homeland. The natural landscape of Gallipoli, however, remains resistant to the enemy or suffers the consequences of war along with humans, sometimes even collaborating with humans to ease the catastrophic results of warfare. A damaged homeland also represents the future of the nation and of Turkish liberty, as they both are dependent on the existence of a national landscape.

The trope of Western weaponry destroying the Ottoman homeland in Turkish Gallipoli writings gains added significance given the earlier Ottoman belief that Western Europeans were the representatives of civilisation.<sup>735</sup> In the early twentieth century, the Ottoman Empire was fundamentally underdeveloped compared to the technological and scientific advances in Europe. Western European nations were superior in technological advances and were admired by many Ottoman intellectuals.<sup>736</sup> However, this admiration turned into concern and Western culture to be seen as 'a threat to [the] identity that [the Young Turks] wanted to create around a concept of Ottomanism' and, with the start of the war, it was not only Ottoman ideology that was threatened by the

---

<sup>735</sup> Kant, p.151; Shaw, p.49.

<sup>736</sup> Ibid.

West but also the future of the nation and Turkish liberty.<sup>737</sup> In Mehmet Akif Ersoy's poem, 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine', this thought is clearly expressed as the 'European' enemy invades Gallipoli, leading to 'violence' and the deployment of Western weaponry that destroys the Ottoman homeland:

Maske yırtılmasa hâlâ bize âfetti o  
yüz...  
Medeniyyet denilen kahbe, hakikat,  
yüzsüz.  
Sonra mel'undaki tahribe müvekkel  
esbâb,  
Öyle müdhiş ki: Eder her biri bir mülkü  
harâb.

Öteden sâikalar parçalıyor âfâkı;  
Beriden zelzeleler kaldırıyor a'mâkı;  
Bomba şimşekleri beyninden inip her  
siperin;  
Sönüyor göğsünün üstünde o arslan  
neferin.

Yerin altında cehennem gibi binlerce  
lağam,  
Atılan her lağamın yaktığı: Yüzlerce  
adam.  
Ölüm indirmede gökler, ölü püskürmede  
yer;  
O ne müdhiş tipidir: Savrulur enkaaz-ı  
beşer...

Kafa, göz, gövde, bacak, kol, çene,  
parmak, el, ayak,  
Boşanır sırtlara, vâdîlere, saĖnak  
saĖnak.  
Saçıyor zırha bürünmüş de o nâmerd  
eller,  
Yıldırım yaylını tûfanlar, alevden seller.

Veriyor yangını, durmuş da açık  
sînelere,  
Sürü hâlinde gezerken sayısız tayyâre.  
Top tüfekten daha sık, gülle yağın  
mermîler...<sup>738</sup>

[...]

---

<sup>737</sup> Caryl Bertram, *Imagining the Turkish House: Collective Visions of Home* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008) p.127.

<sup>738</sup> Ersoy, p.146.

(Had the mask not been torn, that face  
would still be dazzling to us...  
The bitch called civilization is indeed  
impudent.  
The tools of the damned to destroy and  
burn,  
Are so horrendous that they tear up  
every country.

Thunderbolts smash the horizons from  
one side  
Earthquakes regurgitate dead bodies  
from the other  
Bomb lightnings pierce brains in each  
trench,  
And rupture the breasts of those lion  
soldiers.

Thousands of underground tunnels  
writhe like hell  
Full of hundreds of men, who the mines  
burnt.  
The sky raining down death, the earth  
spewing out the dead;  
What a terrible blizzard tosses wrecks of  
men into the air.

Heads, eyes, torsos, legs, arms, chins,  
fingers, hands, feet ...  
Rain down onto ridges, valleys.  
Cowardly strangers encased in armour  
scatter  
Floods of thunderbolts, torrents of fire

Keep firing flames to open chests  
Whilst numerous airplanes flying around  
in flocks.  
Missiles splattering cannonballs fly as  
frequently as bullets

As mentioned in 'Ottoman-Turkish Perceptions of the Enemy', as opposed to the Young Turks, Ersoy did not agree with being a part of the same civilisation that Western Europe represented. According to Ersoy, civilisation consisted both of technological and scientific advancements and of moral values, but Europe lacked the latter as no moral values, religion, culture and traditions could have justified the damage they inflicted not only upon human beings but also upon nature.<sup>739</sup> In the

---

<sup>739</sup> İmamoğlu, p.166.

poem, this idea is emphasised through the image of the destroyed landscape of Gallipoli as well as destroyed bodies. There is a sense in the poem that if ‘cowardly strangers encased in armour’ had never scattered ‘[f]loods of thunderbolts [and] torrents of fire’ – the devastating effect of their mechanised warfare – on the Ottoman land, the Ottoman sky would never have ‘rain[ed] down death [and] the earth spew[ed] out the dead’, hence ‘wrecks of men’ would have never been ‘toss[ed] into the air’ to ‘[r]ain down onto ridges, valleys’.<sup>740</sup> As can be seen, the Western weaponry interferes with the natural environment by altering the inanimate and natural Gallipoli landscape and transforming it into an unnatural, deadly environment. This type of expression helps to strengthen the poem’s message that both men’s bodies and the landscape together suffer the consequences of technological warfare.

This view of nature could also be argued to be an extension of established religious ideas on nature, for which Diwan literature had laid the foundations. According to Islam as represented in Diwan literature, the universe and nature are created for humans and choosing between good and evil while using them is the responsibility of humans.<sup>741</sup> Ersoy explains this view in his poem ‘İnsan’ (‘Humans’), stating that the value of humans is ‘more sublime than angels’, which is why ‘nature is [their] slave’, ‘the natural assets are under the influence of [their] power’ and the world itself ‘is submissive to [their] judgement, [their] captive’.<sup>742</sup> However, although there is no doubt that humans are ‘a great example of creation’, they should ‘stop and think’ before they ‘rule’ the

---

<sup>740</sup> Ersoy, p.146.

<sup>741</sup> Chittick, p.77; Yıldırım, p.172.

<sup>742</sup> Original Text:

Senin mahiyetin hatta meleklerden de ulvidir  
Esirindir tabiat, dest-i teshirindedir eşya,  
Senin ahkâmının münkadıdır, mahkûmudur dünya.

(Your quality/value is more sublime/supreme than angels

The nature is your slave, the commodity/all the assets is/are in the influence of your power/ at your disposal,

The world is submissive to your judgement, your captive.

Mehmet Akif Ersoy, “İnsan”, *Safahat*, ed. by M.Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987) p. 64.

universe because God created nature and God's creation should be respected.<sup>743</sup> In his Gallipoli poem, Ersoy conveys the idea that the Western nations use their supremacy in the fields of science and technology to destroy the landscape of Gallipoli, which implies that by destroying nature, the Western Europeans defy the Islamic perception of nature and disrespect God's creation. In this sense, the function of guerrilla landscapes is to 'other' the enemy as non-Muslims so that the 'use of the counter-type' in the poem 'sharpen[s] [the Ottoman] sense of community.'<sup>744</sup>

A similar approach can be observed in another famous Gallipoli poem, Nedim's 'Namaz' ('The Prayer', 1915) discussed above. Compared to Ersoy's poem, Nedim holds the English (and vaguely the Australians later on) responsible for the ravages at Gallipoli:

İngiliz'in, vakit vakit gemilerden,  
siperden...  
Yine bolca gülle, bomba savurduğu bir  
gündü.<sup>745</sup>

(It was again a usual day when the  
English occasionally  
Threw cannonballs and bombs from the  
ships and the trenches)

The poem goes on to describe the destruction caused by 'the English' to emphasise the bravery and faith of a Muslim soldier:

Ateşlerin yaladığı bu düzlükten geçenler  
Güllelerin cehennemlik yağmurundan  
kaçarken..  
Yolun biraz kenarında, tek başına bir  
nefer,

---

<sup>743</sup> Original Text:

Senin bir nüsha-i kübra-yı hilkat olduğun elbet  
Tecelli etti artık; dur, düşün öyleyse bir hükmet.

(It is certain that you are a great example of creation  
It has been revealed; stop and think first then rule.)

Ibid

<sup>744</sup> George Mosse, *The Fascist Revolution: Toward a General Theory of Fascism* (New York: H. Fertig, 1999), p.64.

<sup>745</sup> Nedim p.56.

Pervasızca bombalardan, ateşlerden,  
her şeyden..

Kendisine, süngüsünden bir mihrabcık  
kurmuştu,  
Sonra onun karşısında namazına  
durmuştu.

Ne, havada ısıık çalan.. ve düştüğü  
yerlere  
Kızgın çelik dahmelerle ölüm saçan  
gülleler...  
Ne, semâda ifrit gibi, vızıldayan  
tayyâre...  
Ne dünyalık bir düşünce, ne bir korku,  
ne keder

Onun demir yüreğini oynatmaktan  
âcizdi,  
Sanki toplar, şarapneller tehlikesiz..  
sessizdi!<sup>746</sup>

(Whilst passers-by in the plain that the  
flames lick  
Escaped from the hellish rain of  
cannonballs.  
On the edge of the road, a soldier on his  
own,  
Blatantly from the bombs, fires and  
everything.

Had set up a mihrab from his bayonet,  
And he stood in front of it in prayer.

Neither the cannonballs that whistle in  
the air and  
Scatter death where they fall with hot  
steel rods...  
Neither airplanes humming like demons  
in the sky...  
Nor a worldly thought, nor a fear, nor a  
grief

Helpless to play with his iron heart  
All those guns and shrapnel were  
harmless, quiet!)

Similar to Ersoy's poem, Nedim's Gallipoli poem depicts Western weaponry as part of the animate landscape, which is actively threatening, whilst the inanimate landscape of Gallipoli is under attack in the same way the soldier is. 'Plains' at Gallipoli are 'licked'

---

<sup>746</sup> Ibid.



by 'the flames', 'the hellish rain of cannonballs [...] whistle[s] in the air [...] scatter[ing] death' and 'airplanes are humming like demons in the sky'.<sup>747</sup> Mechanised warfare that is used in the battlefield is depicted to distort the natural dimensions of the landscape of Gallipoli. Under such otherworldly conditions, the landscape is depicted to be both a platform for the unfolding of individual human bravery and Islamic faith and to be sublime by the use to which it is put in divinely protecting the soldier, since the praying soldier does not care about 'worldly thought[s]' such as 'fear' and 'grief', but only about his faith.<sup>748</sup> The basic constituent parts of the landscape are depicted to be distorted by technology, and therefore they are no longer natural places but divine intentions and signs. In the poem, the inanimate and real nature of Gallipoli collaborates with men and protects the praying Muslim soldier as outlined above. In this sense, if Edmund Blunden's words 'dangerous safety' could define the British definition of guerrilla landscapes, then the Ottoman definition of guerrilla landscapes could be its opposite, 'safe danger'.<sup>749</sup> This can also be seen when the poem challenges the English to 'bring more of / The things that bury and kill people' and 'turn [...] heaven [Gallipoli] into a hell'.<sup>750</sup> The landscape descriptions in Nedim's poem, therefore, underline the heroic nature of the Ottoman army through a praying soldier pitched against a mechanised warfare which is formidable, yet nevertheless surmounted. This creates a dual perception of the Gallipoli landscape, in which it is protective and comforting at the same time as being deadly. This dual perception could be read as a strategy to reconcile the difficult nature of the terrain, which was taxing for Turkish soldiers (as explained below in soldiers' diaries), with the need to show that it was a landscape of home. Nedim and others wish to show that Gallipoli is home and belongs to the Ottomans as well as that the battle taking place is terrible and destructive.

---

<sup>747</sup> Ibid.

<sup>748</sup> Ibid.

<sup>749</sup> Edmund Blunden, 'Gouzeaucourt: The Deceitful Calm', in *Undertones of War* (London: R. Cobden-Sanderson, 1928), p.225.

<sup>750</sup> Nedim, p.56.

However, in the diary of Ibrahim Naci, who served and died at Gallipoli, this destructive battle with its deadly weapons is not defined as surmountable as suggested in Nedim's poetry:

Now my brain is experiencing nervous  
impacts. There is such hellfire in my  
eyes. I see a feeling in myself as if  
wanting to tear to pieces everything that  
makes humankind suffer such disasters.  
Tearing them to pieces, breaking them  
down, I bear such a painful grudge  
against these cannons and guns  
exploding with ear-shattering sounds  
and booms.<sup>751</sup>

Although in his diary Naci did not give detailed information about the 'disasters' that 'humankind suffer' at Gallipoli, his anger at the weaponry for killing humans was reflected in his writing. In such conditions, it is not surprising that Naci defines the landscape of Gallipoli as an antithesis of home, as did the British writers. Whilst Ersoy and Nedim pacify the difficult nature of the terrain to show that it is a landscape of home, Naci cannot ignore this difficult nature which exhausted, frightened and angered him. At nights, he could not sleep because '[t]he cold was sneaking through the holes'.<sup>752</sup> During the days, '[t]he weather was hot as hell' which 'felt as if a severe fire was burning above [his] head' and made him so 'weak' that he 'could hardly keep [his] eyes open'.<sup>753</sup> The lack of water was also making the hot weather unbearable for Naci and his fellow soldiers:

Yet, the soldiers were suffering from  
thirst. Understandably their discipline  
was broken. They were rushing for  
water wherever they saw a fountain or a  
stream. We were having difficulty pulling  
them back.<sup>754</sup>

---

<sup>751</sup> Naci, p.119.

<sup>752</sup> Ibid p.75.

<sup>753</sup> Ibid p.58.

<sup>754</sup> Ibid p.64.

Given constant difficulties and challenges that the soldiers faced, it felt to Naci as if the landscape of Gallipoli was mocking the soldiers:

The road from Kısıkkaya was longer than it seemed. I was staring at the peninsula, which could hardly be seen in the darkness. However, it was mocking and timid as it was getting [more] distant as we came closer. We had walked for hours. I was suffering from nausea, which would get better and then worse again.<sup>755</sup>

All difficulties aside, the landscape of Gallipoli frightened Naci and reminded of him that he could die at any moment. At his post, he thought 'seeing heads rising from holes within the darkness was so frightening' and felt fearful, which he described as 'a sudden anxiety in [his] heart, which was stoic and careless'.<sup>756</sup>

I suppose that this was the weight of the great responsibility on my shoulders; difficult to carry out and necessary to impose a sacrifice. It was grinning at me from all corners like a traitor. The darkness of the night, every place seemed scary. The crashing of the waves at the shore, a boat, reefs, which looked like humans or monsters, touched me deeply. Yet it was just a road near a rocky crag [along] which I was moving [...]. Falling down the cliff and smashing on the ground seemed so easy with [a] slip of the foot.<sup>757</sup>

Whilst in Nedim's poem the demonic descriptions of Western weaponry highlight the bravery of fearless Ottoman soldiers, in Naci's diary demonic descriptions of the dangers of this natural environment illustrate the horrors of war and tell the reader what it felt like to live as a soldier, constantly haunted by fear of death. It is horrifying because dying meant '[b]eing confined to getting crushed under the feet of animals'

---

<sup>755</sup> Ibid p.60.

<sup>756</sup> Ibid p.87.

<sup>757</sup> Ibid pp.87-88.

and '[s]taying apart and [i]solated from everything, from all your beloveds forever'.<sup>758</sup> Even becoming a martyr did not appeal to Naci any more, as he had already seen the graves of martyrs whose bodies were once 'fed with the love and mercy of a determined mother and father' yet now were 'left and forgotten under such foreign and dry soil with such [great] disloyalty and indifference'.<sup>759</sup> After all, Naci was thrown 'into the desolateness of some strange cities with no return' either.<sup>760</sup> Away from the safety, familiarity and comfort of his hometown, Istanbul, Naci was all alone in Gallipoli's 'desolate' and 'nameless mountain[s]'.<sup>761</sup>

Alas! How lonely, how miserable I am,  
they left me unfortunate under endless  
horizons, in the middle of black and dark  
thorny patches, malicious and bloody  
deserts... now I do not see anything  
else but a wide field of full of dead  
bodies in front of me and in the back, a  
dream that does not appear to me  
anymore, and dark fields, which is only a  
dream. I strive on a terrible cliff which  
my eyes cannot distinguish; no one to  
save me; I am screaming. All ears are  
closed. I am crying, groaning.  
Nevertheless, there is no one to show  
mercy. What a pity!<sup>762</sup>

Gallipoli felt so lonely that when new soldiers arrived from Istanbul, Naci's hometown, Naci 'felt a joy and relief': 'O, great Istanbul, who knows how many people's hearts you have captured. Thus, you make those hearts cry when you are away and apart from you'.<sup>763</sup> For a soldier from a metropolis with its streets busy with carriages and trams and its seaside swarming with fishermen's boats, Gallipoli must have seemed a bleak backwater, with little in common with the urban environment Naci associated with home. The idea of a greater Turkish homeland that the Ottoman intellectuals sought to promote seems to be rather abstract to him at Gallipoli. The wild

---

<sup>758</sup> Ibid p.118

<sup>759</sup> Ibid.

<sup>760</sup> Ibid p.71.

<sup>761</sup> Ibid.

<sup>762</sup> Ibid p.97

<sup>763</sup> Ibid p.94.

Gallipoli landscape, full of 'black and dark thorny patches, malicious and bloody deserts', covered with 'dead bodies', contrasts with the urban refinement of Istanbul, and thus Gallipoli feels 'foreign' to him. This clashes directly with the idea of Gallipoli as part of the homeland expressed in civilian intellectuals' writing, raising questions about the definition of the landscape during the Gallipoli campaign: whether the landscape of Gallipoli was part of a heavenly homeland which needed heroic protection by Ottoman soldiers or a horrifying, hellish battlefield full of death and suffering, killing innocent youths disguised as soldiers.

As can be seen, in Ersoy's and Nedim's poems, the landscape of Gallipoli was nationalised and considered as part of the Ottoman homeland by the Ottoman intellectuals writing about the battle from a distance and with ideological goals in mind. In Ersoy's poem, the landscape and soldiers which were being destroyed alongside each other at Gallipoli embody the nation, whilst in Nedim's poem the heavenly landscape of the homeland was being turned into a hell by enemy weaponry, yet resisted this onslaught to an extent in sheltering the soldiers. In both poems, enemy weaponry is shown to alter the landscape by force and is considered as entirely alien, Western and therefore hostile, turning a landscape belonging to the homeland into a guerrilla landscape for the civilian writers. However, in Ibrahim Naci's account, the guerrilla landscape was the natural landscape of Gallipoli itself, regardless of the intervention of Western weaponry. Just like the British writers, Gallipoli was an alien landscape for Naci, away from Istanbul which represented the antithesis of home, the antithesis of safety, comfort and familiarity, constantly evoking the feeling of fear of death in him.

## The Sea in Ottoman-Turkish Gallipoli Writing

The sea as a symbol has been used in Turkish literature since antiquity, as the sea of love, the sea of beauty, grief and mercy or in terms of a poet's desire to drown in the sea of poetry in Diwan poetry.<sup>764</sup> The image of the sea has been used as a measurement of emotions which, according to poets, were abundant, infinite and inexhaustible. In more epic narratives, the ownership of both land and sea was used as a measurement of power.<sup>765</sup> Since World War I, however, this image has turned into one of a sea of blood as represented in the Turkish folk song of the Gallipoli campaign, 'Çanakkale Türküsü' as 'the waters of Gallipoli are blood-red, cannot be drunk, oh, my youth, alas!'.<sup>766</sup>

Unlike the British writers explored in this thesis, the Ottoman authors neither claimed ownership of the global seas for their Empire nor associated the sea with their sense of national identity. On the contrary, ownership and dominance of the seas were attributed to the Western nations, particularly the British. This not only suggests an awareness of the aforementioned naval weakness of the Ottoman Empire but also, more importantly, aimed to alert the Ottoman reader to the urgent need to defend their country. For this reason, the sea is depicted in the civilian accounts of Gallipoli in a political context, either as the passageway for the enemy to occupy the Ottoman homeland or as the imperialist and expansionist target of the enemy. In his Gallipoli poem, Ersoy states that the Gallipoli campaign is '[s]uch a shameless invasion that horizons are blocked' to illustrate the Allied powers' ownership of the global seas.<sup>767</sup> The Gallipoli campaign is so 'shameless', desperate and uneven, in acting against the Ottoman Empire that the horizon cannot be seen beyond the abundance of enemy war

---

<sup>764</sup> Esra Karabacak, 'Deniz Kavramı Üzerine', in *KIBATEK Uluslararası Türk Kültüründe Deniz ve Deniz Edebiyatı Sempozyumu Bildirileri Antalya 27 Nisan - 2 Mayıs 2008: (Şiir, Öykü ve Deneme)*, ed. by Metin Turan and Mustafa Oral (Antalya: Kibatek, 2008), pp. 19-22, (p.19).

<sup>765</sup> Betül Mutlu, 'Divân Şiirinde Deniz İmgesi Ve Şiir Öğretiminde Kullanılması' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, 2012), p.52.

<sup>766</sup> Original Text: 'Al kan olmuş suları bir taş içilmez, off, gençliğim eyvah!': Cemil Yener, *Türk Halk Edebiyatı Antolojisi* (İstanbul: Bateş Yayınları, 1973), p.404.

<sup>767</sup> Original Text: 'Ne hayâsızca tehaşşüd ki ufuklar kapalı!' Ersoy p.146.

ships. Even though not directly mentioned in the poem, the sea represents the gateway to the Marmara Sea in Turkey, and thus to the imperialist ambitions of the Allied powers:

En kesif orduların yükleniyor dördü beşi,  
-Tepeden yol bularak geçmek için  
Marmara'ya-  
Kaç donanmayla sarılmış ufacık bir  
karaya.<sup>768</sup>

[...]

(Four or five of the toughest armies are  
embarking  
Trying to find a way to cross Marmara  
Surrounding a tiny land with an  
outnumbered navy)

The juxtaposition of the vast sea and small land mass of Gallipoli illustrates how desperate the situation was for the Ottomans, since the enemy was seen as the invader of the Ottoman homeland and a threat to Turkish liberty. The use of comparative adjectives and the choice of verbs illustrate this difficulty and give a sense that all odds were stacked against the Ottomans: the Turks are defined as 'outnumbered' by the navy that 'blocked' the 'horizons' of the seas, whilst the landscape of the battlefield is depicted as 'tiny'.<sup>769</sup> In this sense, the sea represents the Allied powers, as they had strong navies and the sea-power to 'block' the 'horizons', whereas the 'tiny' land represents the weak Ottoman Empire. In other words, the Western allies are represented as bullies attacking a weaker and smaller nation. This portrayal parallels the British propaganda narrative that cast Germany as the bully invading the small nation of Belgium. Within the concept of the landscape, this portrayal could be argued to be rather laboured, given the vast size of the Ottoman Empire as well as the Gallipoli terrain favouring Turks as outlined in the previous chapter on British perceptions of the Gallipoli landscape.

---

<sup>768</sup> Ibid.

<sup>769</sup> Ibid.

Similarly, Ibrahim Naci uses sea imagery as a measurement of the weakness of the Ottoman Empire:

Our friends have found a newspaper.  
We gathered around them like bees to  
honey [...] How weak our poor country  
was. We could not send a daily  
newspaper to a city at a distance of 6-7  
hours from Istanbul. We have no  
command of even our seas.<sup>770</sup>

Naci complains about the difficulty of getting a newspaper in the trenches at Gallipoli and decries the fact that the Ottoman Empire was so weak that it could neither afford to send newspapers to Gallipoli from Istanbul nor defend or utilise its national seas as routes for trade. Gökâlp's Gallipoli poem, likewise, suggests that the imperialist Western powers race each other to seize the ownership of the global seas, whereas the Ottoman Empire cannot even hold ownership of her national seas:

Moskof dedi İngiliz'e:  
"Çanakkale aşılmalı;  
Kızıl, Kara, Akdeniz'e  
Hakimiz, anlaşılmalı..."

İngiliz, Fransalı'yı,  
Aldı beyaz kotrasına...  
Tutmuşum sandı yalıyı,  
Geldi Boğaz sefasına.<sup>771</sup>

(Moskof told the British:  
"Dardanelles should be crossed;  
Red, Black, Mediterranean Sea;  
Dominated by us, must be  
understood..."

English took the French  
To their white warship...  
Assuming that it seized the Mansion,  
Came to enjoy the Bosphorus)

Due to his Turanist ideals, Gökâlp perceived the Gallipoli campaign within the framework of Russia's historical ambitions over the seas under the command of the

---

<sup>770</sup> Naci p.66.

<sup>771</sup> Gökâlp, p.34.



Ottoman Empire and British naval dominance. In the poem, 'Moskof', in other words, Russia tells the British that the Dardanelles must be conquered so that Russia can dominate the warm seas, the 'Red, Black and Mediterranean Sea', which could only be accomplished by capturing Gallipoli. The British, on the other hand, are described as having ambitions over the Marmara Sea in Istanbul. In the poem, the British are enjoying a moment of 'Bosporus pleasure', thinking that they have seized the 'Mansion' (the name given to both shores of the Bosphorus where luxurious mansions were built during the Ottoman Empire and which were often associated with the Bosphorus itself). The British are accused of assuming that they will easily get hold of the Marmara Sea through the Bosphorus, to the extent that its capture would be a pleasure cruise rather than a serious war effort. This parallels the British depiction of the seas in Gallipoli writings as the global seas forming a crucial component of British Empire-building. Whilst this idea reflects the historical reality that the Ottoman Empire was incapable of protecting its strategic importance through its national seas as opposed to the British dominance over the global seas, it is used by Gökalp rather to emphasise the prowess of the Turkish soldiers and the miraculous victory of the Turks at Gallipoli despite the Ottoman weaknesses and a formidable enemy.

In Ibrahim Naci's account, his consciousness affects his emotions as he constantly fears the possible dangers coming from the sea:

I leaned out of the window. The running of the ship on the sea like a fugitive rather excited me. I was making out submarines from the shadows at a distance, which was worrying me. [...] I, who had feelings of love for my country all these years and come up with many ideas for it to rise... I checked my heart. I wonder whether this love would die away. No!...I found it to be overflowing even with more affection. However, what was this fear?  
I get it! I was afraid of dying without seeing the enemy, without striving for my country and for the nation. Now, my eyes were open. I saw a darkness

nearby which seemed to be coming  
toward the ship. I broke out in cold  
sweat! Suddenly I got short of breath!  
Oh! I wondered if I had lived my last  
moment.<sup>772</sup>

The sea evokes in him paranoia about an imagined submarine that can fire a torpedo at his ship. He is haunted by the fear of death so much that he even feels guilty for it; for not feeling brave or reckless with the love of his country. As outlined above, once again, the feelings of patriotism emerged in a moment of panic over the fear of death, which illustrates that he uses patriotic feelings as a tool to get over his fear of death. As can be seen in the passage above, his 'overflowing' patriotism is outweighed by his fear of death upon his imagined sighting of a submarine. However, his fear is not unfounded, as he first witnesses the horrors at the sea before even reaching the battlefield:

Going side by side with Bandırma ferry,  
a submarine came up offshore Silivri  
and fired a torpedo. The poor ferry sunk  
within two minutes together with 600  
land-transported soldiers. 251 soldiers  
survived by jumping into ship no.70. The  
submarine shot another torpedo at the  
ship no.70 as it passed from two meters  
away. And the ship escaped.<sup>773</sup>

The sea passage, however, was not an entirely negative experience as it reminded Naci of his home town, illustrates his longing for home and providing him with momentary mental comfort:

the bluish still waters of the Dardanelles  
deeply touched my soul... the beat of  
little, off-white foamy waves reminded  
me of Istanbul, of the beautiful Sarıyer,  
which made a deep impression on me.  
Oh Lord!... How happy and exciting days  
I had lived and how happy moments I  
had there. But what happened  
afterwards? A dream, a mirage. Now

---

<sup>772</sup> Naci p.72.

<sup>773</sup> Ibid p.73.

these times have come and an  
abandoned grave lies in my heart!<sup>774</sup>

For Naci, as someone who had grown up in a coastal city, the sea constituted a link to home, however tentative. However, the momentary nostalgic comfort that Naci felt cannot compare to the British soldiers' association of the sea with home as this was quickly replaced by grief:

What a bizarre world! Where was this  
ship taking us? [...] Oh! For all I know, it  
was going to throw me into strange  
cities with no return.<sup>775</sup>

Aware of these contradictory feelings that the sea evokes in him, whether it reminds him of his home town or of the desolate foreign land that it takes him to, he compares his journey to Gallipoli to a journey that he once took from Istanbul before the war:

This ship was the same, but there was a  
huge difference between these two  
journeys. As if fortune was comparing  
happiness and disaster in me through  
the same place and ship.<sup>776</sup>

Naci's perception of the sea reflects mixed emotions: on one hand, he perceives the sea as an extension of his homeland, reminding him of his happy days before the war, similar to some representations of British writers, on the other hand, the naval weakness of the Ottoman Empire compared to the Western Allies frightens him, giving him a sense of insecurity. In contrast, the Ottoman intellectuals narrate the sea from a similar political angle as Ernest Raymond, yet they neither claimed ownership of the global seas for the Ottoman Empire nor associated the sea with their sense of national identity. The sea is rather depicted as the passageway for the enemy to occupy the Ottoman homeland in pursuing their imperialist and expansionist interest, and dominance was attributed to the Western nations, particularly the British. This portrayal

---

<sup>774</sup> Ibid p.65.

<sup>775</sup> Ibid p.71.

<sup>776</sup> Ibid pp.71-72.

not only enhanced the idea of an immediate need to protect the Ottoman homeland surrounded by the sea, but also the idea of the Western Allies as bullies coming from vast seas to trap the Ottomans on a small piece of land.

### **Classical and Historical References**

As outlined in the previous chapters, Gallipoli is a location replete with heroic stories of antiquity and the classical and biblical world, associated with the Trojan War and the crusades. In British writings of Gallipoli, the use of classical and historical references in describing the Gallipoli landscape can be seen as an attempt to familiarise the British soldiers with the alien landscape via established British cultural patterns. In Ottoman Turkish writings, however, this strategy seems to only apply to soldiers' writings, in an attempt to remember the reasons why they were fighting and to encourage themselves to fight. In Ottoman intellectuals' writings, on the other hand, the past is used to ennoble the present; historical references are romanticised to emphasise the heroism of the Ottoman soldiers involved in the campaign and to illustrate the importance of the Ottoman homeland. Depending on the authors' respective ideological leanings, however, these references are deployed differently; for instance, whilst Turkist Ömer Seyfeddin turns his back on Western literature and pays attention to national history and heroes, Westernist Celal Nuri İleri utilises classical references, which have had a great influence on Western literature and culture, to praise the victory of Gallipoli.

Although the Ottoman intellectuals and elite had known about classical antiquity for a long time, it was not until 1885 that Homeric literature attracted their attention.<sup>777</sup> While Heinrich Schliemann's archaeological findings in Troy in the late nineteenth century drew attention to Homer in the Ottoman Empire, the aforementioned modernisation attempts and efforts to keep up with the West led to a rise in print media, and innovations in literature and public education in the Ottoman Empire.<sup>778</sup> All of these

---

<sup>777</sup> Günay Uslu, *Homer, Troy and the Turks: Heritage & Identity in the Late Ottoman Empire 1870-1915* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2015) p.168.

<sup>778</sup> Ibid.

developments 'created suitable conditions in which Homer and mythology could enter Ottoman art, culture and literature.'<sup>779</sup> The penetration of Western literary works into Ottoman literature and culture during the Tanzimat Period also contributed to the emergence of 'translation attempts of the *Iliad* into Ottoman-Turkish, biographical notes on [Homer], informative articles in Ottoman periodicals and newspapers on Homeric literature and the topographical characteristics of Homeric locations.'<sup>780</sup> While some Ottoman authors such as Na'im Fraşeri and Selanikli Hilmi attempted to translate Homeric poems such as the *Iliad*, prominent Ottoman intellectuals Yakub Kadri (1889-1974) and Yahya Kemal (1884-1958) initiated a neo-Hellenist literary movement in 1912 which expressed admiration for classical antiquity and considered the classics as a model for Turkish literature and culture.<sup>781</sup> As outlined in the previous chapters, educating the public with Western and modern ideas was the main concern of the Ottoman intellectuals during this time and some Ottoman intellectuals used Homeric literature and ideas as an instrument for public education. Selanikli Hilmi, for instance, stated in the preface of his translation of the first book of Homer's *Iliad* that, with his translation, he desired to improve public education.<sup>782</sup> Neo-Hellenist Ottoman intellectuals were mindful about Homer's polytheism and mythological narrative due to their contradiction with Islamic beliefs, yet they recognised Homer's significance and the place of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the history of literature.<sup>783</sup> The rivalries between Muslim Ottomans and Christian Greeks and Macedonians, on the other hand, were irrelevant to their neo-Hellenist movement as they adopted Bergson's philosophy which was based on the idea of reconciliation with the past and tradition whilst being western or westernised.<sup>784</sup> They associated this 'past and tradition' with national

---

<sup>779</sup> Ibid.

<sup>780</sup> Ibid p.169.

<sup>781</sup> Ibid p.227.

<sup>782</sup> Ibid p.175.

<sup>783</sup> Ibid p.183.

<sup>784</sup> Emre Yıldırım, 'The Definition Of Turkish Identity in The Context Of "Neohellenism" and "Mediterranean Identity": Yahya Kemal Beyatlı And Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* *The Journal of International Social Research* 6 (2013), 624-642, (630).

identity and sought the Turkish past in Hellenism and Greek antiquity, as they considered Turks as Mediterraneans first ,and hence the heirs of the Ancient Greek and Roman as well as the Byzantine Empires.<sup>785</sup> Accordingly, this view provided the Turks not only with a deep understanding of Europe (they considered ancient Greece as the root of Europe), but also with a national literature.<sup>786</sup>

After the successive military losses in previous wars with Balkan neighbours, the victory of the Gallipoli campaign thrilled some of the Ottoman authors precisely because the Ottomans won where the Trojans had lost. In his essay 'Gelibolu'da Türkler ve Homeros' (1918) (Turks at Gallipoli and Homer), prominent Westernist intellectual Celal Nuri Ileri (1881-1938), compares the Battle of Gallipoli with the Trojan War and identifies the Turks with the Trojans, claiming that Homer would have turned his back on the warriors of the Trojan War. In his essay, the victory of Gallipoli was so great that Homer, whom Ileri ventriloquises, speaks to the legendary heroes of the Trojan War:

I have decided that from now on both the Iliad and the Odyssey are not valid anymore. My main works should not be read anymore. Here, in the old country of Dardanos [...], I witnessed such a glorious and honourable event, such a great war, such a marvellous defence; Oh famous warriors of Troy! Although your attacks are so brilliant, so lovely, they are dull compared to the struggles and efforts of the Turks, who shouted Allahu Ekber Allahu Ekber! and scattered the largest armies of the world [...] and forced the troops to flee, bewildered and ashamed. Oh, come all gods, oh, all the most prominent people from the epics, oh, men of Troy! Let us view the success of Gallipoli [...]. Due to my efforts, centuries later, your heroic

---

<sup>785</sup> Ibid p.628.

<sup>786</sup> Original Text by Yahya Kemal: 'Bütün Avrupa'yı anlamak için ancak Yunanlılardan başlamak lazımdı. Biz coğrafyaca, kısmen de medeniyetçe Yunanlıların varisiyiz. ... Bütün Fransızların ve onlarla beraber Avrupalıların menbaı olan Yunanlılara dönmeliyiz ki, tam manasıyla bir edebiyatımız olabilsin.' Hasan Ali Yücel, *Edebiyat Tarihimizden*0( İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1987), pp.255-256.

story reached future generations. After a while, certainly another epical genius will give this praiseful panorama to the future. When that happens, both you and me, your poetical servant, Homer, will be forgotten.<sup>787</sup>

As can be seen, the heroic location of Gallipoli not only inspired the British but also the Ottoman-Turkish authors to engage with the campaigns of antiquity in their interpretation of Gallipoli in the present. The nature of the campaign as a conflict between East and West prompted some Ottoman authors such as Celal Nuri to portray the campaign as a modern Trojan War. His comparison suggests that, just like the legendary heroes of the Trojans, the Ottoman soldiers who fought at Gallipoli defended their country on the Asian shore of the peninsula against their Western enemies. However, by managing to stop the enemies unlike the Trojans, Celal Nuri suggests that the Ottoman-Turks have become the new heroes of Gallipoli, overshadowing the legendary heroes of Troy. According to Günay Uslu, 'Troy received a new dimension' after the Gallipoli campaign as 'it became a strong component of the heroic story of a new nation, the Republic of Turkey (1923), and its founder and first president, Mustafa Kemal Pasha, who is reputed to have said to a retired colonel at the last battle of the Greco-Turkish War in 1922 – Turkish War of Independence – 'We avenged Troy'.<sup>788</sup>

The heroic landscape of Gallipoli evoked not only the legendary story of the Trojans, but also turning points of national history. This choice often depended on the ideology of the Ottoman authors. Whilst the Westernist author Celal Nuri utilised Homer to emphasise the heroic nature of the Ottoman soldiers, Turanist Ziya Gökalp and Turkist Ömer Seyfeddin turned their attention towards Turkish national and cultural history instead. In his short story, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', for instance, Seyfeddin made use of the proximity of Gallipoli to Istanbul and subtly linked the Gallipoli campaign to Fatih Sultan

---

<sup>787</sup> Quoted and translated in English in: Uslu, p.245.

<sup>788</sup> Seyfettin, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', p.248.

Mehmet's conquest of Istanbul in 1453, as Aleko imagines what Turks had done to 'conquer Çanakkale and Istanbul' in the past.<sup>789</sup>

Ottoman heroes of cultural and national importance that influenced the Gallipoli region also attracted the attention of Ibrahim Naci. Naci encountered the grave of Gazi Süleyman Paşa in Bolayır, 'the elder son of Orhan Gazi' and 'the pioneer of the passage of the Ottomans to Europe', which was 'damaged due to bombardments by the British ships during the Gallipoli campaign'.<sup>790</sup> Thinking that 'venerable Martyr Süleyman Pasha deserve[d]' better for his sacrifice and martyrdom, Naci compared the Gallipoli campaign with the battles he fought against the Byzantine Empire to capture Gallipoli,<sup>791</sup> as '[t]he place that [Gazi Süleyman Pasha] had passed over with forty people, [Naci and his company were] entering with forty thousand people'.<sup>792</sup> The holy site thus becomes a place for reflection on both past triumphs and past defeats:

How great was the holiness of this place, where the graves of Süleyman Pasha and [Namık] Kemal are found. These places in former times trembled with Turkish valour and greatness, and had experienced how many disasters and how many humiliating events. These lands filled with the grandeur of our ancestors, with their glory of courage and justice, were trampled down just a short time ago by the Bulgarians' unwelcome and dirty feet.<sup>793</sup>

The graves of heroic commander Gazi Süleyman Pasha, who played an important role in the early Ottoman expansion into Thrace, and famous poet Namık Kemal who is considered to have a great influence on the formation of the Turkish national identity due to his patriotic ideals, turned the Gallipoli landscape into a holy destination for Naci. The fact that both historical figures served their country ennoble the idea of the

---

<sup>789</sup> Ibid p.152.

<sup>790</sup> Naci pp.58-59.

<sup>791</sup> Ibid.

<sup>792</sup> Ibid pp.58-59.

<sup>793</sup> Ibid p.63.



homeland, which, according to Naci, was associated with 'Turkish valour and greatness' and the 'glory of [the Ottoman ancestors]' courage and justice'.<sup>794</sup> Historical references made to the Gallipoli landscape thus enhance the importance and value of the homeland, which had not only been nourished with the greatest thinkers' efforts and intellect, but also defended by the ancestors' blood, which brings us to the next section.

### **A Homeland Fertilised with Turkish Blood**

In British writings of Gallipoli, the dead bodies of British soldiers scattered in alien lands turn the alien land into England. In Turkish writings of Gallipoli, the landscape of the homeland is already made of the dead bodies of martyrs and heroes such as Süleyman Pasha and Namık Kemal, which is why the homeland should be defended through the Ottoman soldiers' 'willing self-sacrifice and redemptive death'.<sup>795</sup> As can be observed from Ibrahim Naci's diary, the holiness of the Gallipoli landscape to him derived from historical reflections on Gazi Süleyman Pasha sacrificing his life for those lands. This not only foreshadows the possible martyrdom of the contemporary soldiers but also enhances the worth of the homeland, which has been washed with the blood of Turkish soldiers not only for the safety of the Empire, but also for the continuity of the generations. The idea of national martyrs lying down in the soil of Gallipoli strengthens Turkish justifications of the Gallipoli campaign as being defensive, which Ibrahim Naci occasionally made use of to counteract the consistent fear of death that he experienced at Gallipoli. In civilian writings on Gallipoli, however, this idea is used not for individual but collective gain. By saying that 'Şûhedâ gövdesi, bir baksana, dağlar, taşlar' (Look, the mountains and stones are made of the bodies of the martyrs), Ersoy converts the physical reality of death into a more meaningful significance of fallen soldiers.<sup>796</sup> The dead bodies of the soldiers do not merely decay in the soil, but unite as

---

<sup>794</sup> Ibid.

<sup>795</sup> Quoted in Hopchet, p.30; Vandiver, p.71.

<sup>796</sup> Ersoy, p.146.

one with nature, making the landscape of the homeland more worthwhile for future generations to protect at the cost of their own lives, as those lands were not won easily. The same situation now occurs at Gallipoli, as Ersoy calls upon God and says that, '[f]or the sake of a crescent, oh God, what Suns are setting!'<sup>797</sup> Whilst the 'crescent' represents the Ottoman flag, which represents the nation and homeland, 'Suns' represent the soldiers fighting at Gallipoli. This idea in Ersoy's poem not only encourages the Ottoman soldiers to fight against the enemy to protect the precious homeland, but also to awaken the patriotic spirit in Ottoman Turks' national consciousness. The very same idea is written on the hills at Gallipoli, and recurs in Turkish memory of Gallipoli:

Dur yolcu! Bilmeden gelip bastığın  
Bu toprak, bir devrin battığı yerdir.<sup>798</sup>

(Stop wayfarer! Unbeknownst to you this  
ground  
You come and tread on, is where a state  
collapsed)

Although Necmettin Halil Onan did not write the poem above, entitled 'Dur Yolcu!' (Stop Traveller) (1922) specifically for the Gallipoli campaign, its first two lines of the poem were engraved on the hills in 1960 at Gallipoli as a reminder of the ideas explained above for future generations. The verse continues by claiming that the silent hills of this country are 'the place where the heart of a nation sighs.'<sup>799</sup> The poem suggests that new generations should stop and think about the value of the land that they otherwise never contemplate. In the poem, the Turkish lands are the 'heart' of Turkish nationalism; thus 'liberty' and 'honour', for which the ordinary Turkish soldier – 'Mehmet' in parallel to the British 'Tommy' – 'laid down his life' for the freedom of

---

<sup>797</sup> Original Text: 'Bir hilal uğruna ya rab ne güneşler batıyor!' Ibid.

<sup>798</sup> Ibid.

<sup>799</sup> Original Text:

'Eğil de kulak ver, bu sessiz yığın

Bir vatan kalbinin attığı yerdir.'

Necmettin Halil Onan, 'Dur Yolcu', in *Kahramanlık Şiirleri Antolojisi*, ed. by Mehmed Gökalep (İstanbul, Varlık Yayınevi, 1961)

Turkish lands and built the landscape of Turkey with his 'consecrated blood and flesh and bone'.<sup>800</sup>

Onan's post-war poem is a good example of how the 'lesson in heroism' and the Ottoman soldiers' 'sacrifice for community' reflected in the Gallipoli writings of the civilian authors written during the war have come to 'hold some lasting positive meaning that [Turkish] people wish to remember' and which, as a result, have led to Gallipoli memorials and monuments in the Gallipoli Peninsula.<sup>801</sup> Kenneth E. Foote calls this process 'sanctification' and, according to him, 'sanctified places arise from battles [...] that mark the traumas of nationhood and from events that have given shape to national identity'.<sup>802</sup> In this sense, the examination of landscape in Ottoman Gallipoli writings demonstrates how the Gallipoli campaign is sanctified in Turkish history and Gallipoli as a geographical location has become a significant part of Turkish national identity.<sup>803</sup> By 'presuppos[ing] a particular relationship between the assumed identity of a place and its history', it also reminds us that, as Doreen Massey points out, '(implicitly or explicitly) internalist and essentialist constructions of the character of places' like Gallipoli fail to recognise the long history of interconnectedness with elsewhere (the history of the global construction of the local).<sup>804</sup> Civilian authors of Gallipoli, such as Ersoy, Gökalp, Seyfeddin and Nedim, but with the exception of Celal Nuri, recognise in

---

<sup>800</sup> Original Text:

'Bu ıssız, gölgesiz yolun sonunda  
Gördüğün bu tümsek Anadolu'nda,  
İstiklal uğrunda, namus yolunda  
Can veren Mehmed'in yattığı yerdir.

Bu tümsek, koparken büyük zelzele,  
Son vatan parçası geçerken ele,  
Mehmed'in düşmanı boğduğu sele  
Mübarek kanını kattığı yerdir.

Düşün ki, haşrolan kan, kemik, etin  
Yaptığı bu tümsek, amansız, çetin  
Bir harbin sonunda bütün milletin  
Hürriyet zevkini tattığı yerdir.'

Ibid.

<sup>801</sup> Foote, p.7.

<sup>802</sup> Ibid p.10.

<sup>803</sup> Kant, pp.155-156.

<sup>804</sup> Doreen Massey, 'Places and Their Pasts', *History Workshop Journal*, 39 (1995), p.183.

their writings neither the interconnectivity of the historical past of minorities such as the Greeks who fought at Gallipoli nor the physical and moral losses of the Allied Powers, and Onan did not recognise the other nationalities who fought at Gallipoli either. In this sense, as Doreen Massey points out, '[t]he description, definition and identification of a place' is not only a '(re)telling of the historical constitution of the present', but also 'inevitably an intervention [...] into geography'.<sup>805</sup>

### **Religious References and Otherworldly Depictions**

In British writings of Gallipoli, religious references to the landscape of Gallipoli can be explained as an extension of home in an attempt to familiarise British soldiers and readers with the alien landscape of Gallipoli. Similarly, in civilian Ottoman-Turkish writings on Gallipoli, religious references to the landscape were frequently made to encourage the Ottoman-Turkish soldiers to protect the Ottoman homeland or to praise the martyrs, either way contributing to the idea of patriotism and, in nationalist accounts, even of nationalism. The religious references to the landscape in civilian accounts often describe a landscape that is collaborating with humans (and specifically soldiers) during the fighting. In combatants' accounts, however, religious ideas are less likely to be associated with the landscape itself, although the horrific depictions of the landscape could be interpreted as hellish or otherworldly in general terms. The image of 'Muslim lands', as Ibrahim Naci referred to the Ottoman homeland, with its 'endless horizons', 'black and dark thorny patches, malicious and bloody deserts', and 'dark fields' which are 'full of dead bodies in front of [Naci] and in the back' certainly remind the reader of the landscape of hell.

In Ersoy's poem, on the other hand, references to the natural landscape are used to form a 'türbe' for the Ottoman-Turkish martyrs, an Ottoman tomb for royalty and notable religious persons, which is considered sacred and significant in Ottoman-Turkish culture:

---

<sup>805</sup> Ibid p.190.

'Bu, taşındır' diyerek Kabe'yi diksem  
başına  
Ruhumun vahyini duysam da geçirsem  
taşına;

Sonra gök kubbeyi alsam da ridâ  
namıyla,  
Kanayan lâhdine çeksem bütün  
ecrâmiyle;

Mor bulutlarla açık türbene çatsam da  
tavan,  
Yedi kandilli Süreyyâ'yı uzatsam oradan;

Sen bu âvizenin altında, bürünmüş  
kanına;  
Uzanırken, gece mehtâbı getirsem  
yanına,

Türbedârın gibi tâ fecre kadar  
bekletsem;  
Gündüzün fecr ile âvizeni lebriz etsem;

Tüllenen mağribi, akşamları sarsam  
yarana...  
Yine bir şey yapabildim diyemem  
hatırana.<sup>806</sup>

(If I erected Kaaba saying 'this is your  
stone'  
If I heard the inspiration of my soul and  
wrote it on your stone

Then, if I took the dome of the sky as a  
cover  
And laid it with all its stars over your  
bleeding grave

If I built up a ceiling over your open tomb  
from purple clouds  
And extend the seven-candelabrum-  
pleiades from it.

Under this chandelier, whilst you,  
covered in your own blood  
Lied down, if I brought moonlight next to  
you

If I kept it, as your tomb guard, until  
sunrise  
And the daytime filled your chandelier  
up with the sunlight

---

<sup>806</sup> Ibid.

If I wrapped the sunset veil on your  
wounds at nights  
I could not say that I did much to honour  
your memory)

In the poem, Ersoy's poetic voice wishes to turn 'Kaaba', which is considered to be the first House of Worship in Islam which has been the focal point of Islamic pilgrimages, into a 'grave stone' for the martyrs, lay the 'sky dome' with 'all its stars' like a cover over their graves, build 'the [tomb's] ceiling' with 'purple clouds' and use 'the pleiades' as its 'chandelier'.<sup>807</sup> Even so, according to Ersoy, the martyrs' tomb would not be sufficiently illuminated, and therefore he would fill their star-made 'chandelier' with the 'moon light' at night and 'the sunlight' during the day.<sup>808</sup> However, no matter how hard the speaker tries to accomplish the impossible for them, he would still feel he has done nothing for the memory of the martyrs. In the poem, the natural elements that make up the martyr's tomb represent the impossible, which emphasises the uniqueness and heroic significance of the unnatural sacrifice of the martyrs who deserve the best for their memory. In the poem, even the most impressive natural structures could not be enough to build a 'türbe' for the martyrs, and even though Ersoy wanted to make the martyrs' grave a religious tomb where they could be commemorated as significantly as Ottoman royalty and notable religious persons, the level of martyrs is not earthly but divine; they would neither fit into 'all the stars' nor 'the horizons' but they are awaited in heaven by 'the Prophet' instead.<sup>809</sup>

Another notable Ottoman poet, Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, turns the landscape of Gallipoli into a tomb as well as an Islamic pilgrimage site. Yurdakul claims that the

---

<sup>807</sup> Ersoy, p.146.

<sup>808</sup> Ibid.

<sup>809</sup> Original Text:

'Sen ki, bütün yüzyıllara gömülsen taşacaksın... Yazık!  
Sana gelmez bu ufuklar, seni almaz bu savaş...

Ey şehit oğlu şehit, isteme benden mezar,  
Sana kucağını açmış duruyor Peygamber'  
Ersoy, 'Çanakkale Şehitlerine, p.146.

'bloody trenches on every hill' at Gallipoli are 'the tombs of [the Prophet's] Companions' and says that.<sup>810</sup>

Bundan sonra Gelibolu  
Bize yeni bir hac yolu.  
Her İslâm'ın bu yüce yer  
Bir ikinci Kabe'sidir;<sup>811</sup>

(After this, Gallipoli  
Is the new path for pilgrimage for us  
This place belongs to every Muslim  
It is its second Kaaba)

Both authors associate Gallipoli with the most sacred site in Islam, Kaaba, to highlight the importance of Gallipoli both in Ottoman culture and in the Islamic religion. Whilst Ersoy focuses on the martyrs' memory, Yurdakul turns Gallipoli into Kaaba for the next generation, who he hopes will worship and perpetuate Islam.

As can be seen, in Ottoman-Turkish writings, landscape descriptions are not as detailed, horrific and violent as in the British writings on Gallipoli. This illustrates how Ottoman-Turkish intellectuals came to terms with violence and tragedy in the light of their ideological mission to save the Ottoman Empire. In most of their Gallipoli writings, there is a sense that the landscape and geography of Gallipoli are given a particular national or religious identity and that the Ottoman-Turkish held the ownership of those lands. The Gallipoli campaign however, threatened the Ottoman ownership of the Turkish homeland, and therefore the landscape of Gallipoli is portrayed as having an inanimate, vulnerable and even sometimes benevolent nature. As opposed to British Gallipoli writings in which natural features and weapons fuse to become one hostile environment in portrayals of the Gallipoli battlefield, in Ottoman-Turkish writings a

---

<sup>810</sup> Original Text:

Her tepede kanlı siper  
Sahâbeler türbesidir.

Mehmet Emin Yurdakul, 'Orduya Selam', *Harp Mecmuası*, 4 (1915), pp.52-53 (52).

<sup>811</sup> Ibid.

distinction is maintained and it is Western weaponry that is defined as evil. This strengthens the core patriotic message that the Ottoman intellectuals agreed upon in their writings; namely, that the homeland, which has always been protective of its inhabitants, is now in danger and needs to be protected in its turn.

This patriotic message is strengthened by historical, cultural and religious references that were evoked by the landscape of Gallipoli itself. Whilst Turkist writers turn away from Western literature and focus on national history and heroes, Westernist writers utilise classical references evoked by the location at Gallipoli. Religious references to the landscape were employed to encourage Ottoman-Turkish soldiers to protect the Ottoman homeland or to praise the martyrs, either way contributing to the idea of patriotism or even nationalism. However, in writings by combatants, represented here by the diary of Ibrahim Naci, although the idea that the homeland should be protected persists, the Gallipoli battlefield does not feel like home for the soldiers and the landscape of Gallipoli as well as the sea are defined in terms of a constant reminder of death and a source of danger. In civilian accounts, by contrast with combatant accounts, the sea is defined either as the passageway for the enemy to occupy the Ottoman homeland or as the imperialist and expansionist target of the enemy.



## CONCLUSION

The study of the literature of the Gallipoli campaign has not only mostly been insular, but also British and Turkish perspectives on the campaign tend to have been overshadowed by the nation-building experience of Australia and New Zealand. This thesis redresses the balance by undertaking a comparative study of literary representations in British and Turkish writings on Gallipoli. It has explored as wide a range as possible of the ways in which the Gallipoli experience could be expressed and interpreted in the written work of both civilians and combatants. The comparison of British and Turkish perspectives questions prejudices derived from any possible propaganda intent, since even the most innocent forms of wartime propaganda are likely to distort particular interpretations of history as well as having documentary value. Examining the similar and distinct ways in which British and Turkish writers developed and expressed their responses to the Gallipoli campaign, the thesis has tested the hypothesis that the Gallipoli campaign formed a turning point for identity for both the Ottoman-Turkish and British writers. The comparison of British and Turkish literary representations illustrates that the writings on Gallipoli perpetuate many myths about the First World War, yet at the same time often break free of the stereotypes one would usually associate with war literature.

The thesis is divided into three symmetrical pairs of chapters to allow cross-references for a smooth comparison between the British and Turkish perspectives. The first two chapters on British and Ottoman-Turkish perception of the enemy have explored the ways in which the Gallipoli campaign shaped the perceptions of the enemy in British and Turkish writings and how these individual responses compared to state propaganda at home. Most Ottoman-Turkish writers vilified the Allied Powers in their writings for the territorial integrity and the very existence of the Ottoman Empire as well as its Islamic faith to meet their own imperial ambitions, yet at the same time the Allied Powers were inspirational for the Ottoman Empire as they were representatives

of an advanced Western civilisation. For some writers such as Ömer Seyfettin, Ottoman minorities such as the Greeks were also perceived as a threat to Ottoman territory and identity, yet their loyalty to their national identity was portrayed as a source of inspiration for Turks. Contrary to Seyfettin, Lieutenant Ibrahim Naci appreciated the Greek minorities for helping the Ottoman war effort and Ottoman-Turkish soldiers more than the Turks themselves yet did not show any form of either sympathy or particular hostility towards the Allied Powers. The British writers had more diverse views in their representations of the enemy. Some British writers such as Aubrey Herbert and A. P. Herbert sympathised with the Turkish defensive cause and appreciated the Turkish soldiers, thus questioning the British imperial identity that had been promoted since Victorian times, whereas writers such as Ernest Raymond and W.F. Rollo perceived the Muslim Turks as a threat to British imperial identity as well as Christianity.

The perceptions of the enemy led to a re-evaluation of identity on both sides and the following symmetrical chapters concerning British and Ottoman-Turkish perceptions of themselves illustrated that national or individual identities perceived during the Gallipoli campaign were constructed in relation to their perceptions of the 'other'. Whilst the role of the enemy led to contradictory responses regarding state propaganda and British imperial identity in British writings of Gallipoli, it pointed the way toward constructing a more homogeneous collective identity in Ottoman-Turkish writings, which later led to the formation of a new Turkish nation. Some British writers such as Ernest Raymond supported wartime propaganda and promoted a sense of Englishness in his novel with British elements of Victorian sentimentality, public school culture, patriotic self-sacrifice, imperial expansion and religious redemption. British writers such as Aubrey Herbert and A. P. Herbert, on the other hand, challenged these concepts as well as state propaganda. Aubrey Herbert criticised British politics, military strategy and the Allied soldiers' perceptions of the Turks yet he used the idea of heroic self-sacrifice to elevate his fallen comrades, whilst A. P. Herbert used sarcasm and humour to criticise Allies'

high command and soldierly duties such as killing. The perception of self represented in the Ottoman-Turkish writings, however, both elevated and harshly criticised the Muslim-Turks. Contrary to the criticism directed at politicians or high authorities who sent the soldiers to die at Gallipoli in the British writings, in Ottoman-Turkish writings self-critique was directed at the indifference of the Turkish population to the problems of the Ottoman Empire as well as Muslim religious bigotry. Self-appreciation, on the other hand, was focused on the concept of victory in war and used for the promotion of religious martyrdom. Both self-criticism and self-appreciation were used as strategies to dissolve the indifference of the Ottoman population so as to encourage involvement in fighting, and to provide unity in a more homogeneous nation.

The last two symmetrical chapters on British and Ottoman-Turkish perception of the Gallipoli landscape examined how the Ottoman-Turkish and British writers came to terms with violence and tragedy and illustrated the interconnectedness between landscape and the struggle for identity and understandings of the war. In British writings of Gallipoli, the Gallipoli landscape not only constitutes the English literary tradition of peaceful countryside but also the disturbing landscape of battlefield with horrific images. In the Ottoman-Turkish writings, the landscape of the battlefield is observed in the combatant writers' accounts such as those of Ibrahim Naci, whereas in the accounts of intellectuals, graphic images of battlefield are rare and ideas of landscape are intertwined with the idea of a homeland which needs to be protected.

As can be seen, although Gallipoli constituted a challenge for all writers on all sides in terms of how they perceived themselves, others, and the world around them, this challenge was negotiated and expressed in various different ways. For this reason, Gallipoli writings cannot easily be reduced to particular national stereotypes.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aksakal, Mustafa, 'Perspectives on the Ottoman First World War', *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 14 (2014)
- Aksakal, Mustafa, *The Ottoman Road to War in 1914: The Ottoman Empire and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Aldridge, David, 'How Ought War to be Remembered in Schools?', *Impact: Philosophical Perspectives on Education Policy*, 21 (2014), pp.1-45
- Alper, Emin, 'Ömer Seyfettin', in *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Cumhuriyete Devreden Düşünce Mirası, Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyetin Birikimi*, ed.by Tanıl Bora & Murat Gültekinil (İstanbul: İletişim, 2009) pp.186-196
- Alpers, Paul, 'What is Pastoral?', *Critical Inquiry*, 8.3 (1982), 437-460
- Anonymous, 'Harp Edebiyatımız', *Tanin*, 2755 (1916)
- Anonymous, 'Cumhurbaşkanı Erdoğan Afrin Müjdesini Çanakkale'den Verdi', *Milliyet*, 18 March 2018, Çanakkale Haberleri < <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/cumhurbaskani-erdogan-afrin-mujdesini-canakkale-yerelhaber-2666975/> > [accessed 25 April 2018].
- Ansari, K. Humayun, 'The Muslim World in British Historical Imaginations: "Re-thinking Orientalism?"', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 38.1 (2011)
- Ariotti, Kate, 'Australian Prisoners of the Turks: Negotiating Culture Clash in Captivity', in *Other Fronts, Other Wars?: First World War Studies on the Eve of the Centennial*, ed.by Joachim Bürgschwentner (Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp.146-166
- Aşar, Servet, 'Çanakkale Savaşlarında İstihbarat ve Propaganda', *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yılığ*, 1 (2003), 64-102
- Atia, Nadia, *World War I in Mesopotamia: The British and the Ottomans in Iraq* (London: Tauris, 2015)
- Avis, Paul, 'Anglicanism and Christian Unity in the Twentieth Century', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume IV*, ed.by Jeremy Morris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) pp.186-214
- Baden-Powell, Robert, *Quick Training for War* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1914)
- Bangash, Salman, 'Tribal Belt and the Defence of British India: A Critical Appraisal of British Strategy in the North-West Frontier during the First World War', *India and World War I: A Centennial Assessment*, ed.by Roger D. Long & Ian Talbot (London: Routledge, 2018), pp.100-120
- Bateman, Anthony, *Cricket, Literature and Culture: Symbolising the Nation, Destabilising Empire* (London: Routledge, 2016)
- Bell, Duncan, *Victorian Visions of Global Order: Empire and International Relations in Nineteenth Century Political Thought* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Berberich, Christine, 'This Green and Pleasant Land: Cultural Constructions of Englishness', *Landscape and Englishness*, ed.by Robert Burden and Stephan Kohl (2006)
- Bertram, Carel, *Imagining the Turkish House: Collective Visions of Home* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008)
- Beşikçi, Mehmet, *The Ottoman Mobilization of Manpower in the First World War: Between Voluntarism and Resistance* (Leiden: Brill, 2012)

- Bhabha, Homi K., 'Dissemination: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation', *Nation and Narration* (London: Routledge, 1990)
- Bertram, Carel, *Imagining the Turkish House: Collective Visions of Home* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008)
- Beyhan, Mehmet Ali, 'Ziya Gökalp'in Tarih Anlayışı ve Türk Medeniyeti Tarihi Adlı Eseri', *Turkish Journal of Sociology*, 3 (2006), pp.47-61
- Bell, Stuart, 'The Church and the First World War', in *God and War: The Church of England and Armed Conflict in the Twentieth Century*, ed.by Stephen G. Parker and Tom Lawson (Surrey: Ashgate, 2012) pp. 33-59
- Biggar, Nigel, *In Defence of War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p.83; Alan Moorhead, *Gallipoli* (London: The New English Library, 1956)
- Bontrager, Shannon Ty, 'The Imagined Crusade: The Church of England and the Mythology of Nationalism and Christianity during the Great War', *Church History*, 71 (2002), 774-798
- Boyar, Ebru, *Ottomans, Turks and the Balkans: Empire Lost, Relations Altered* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2007)
- Braudy, Leo, *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and the Changing Nature of Masculinity* (New York: Knopf, 2003)
- Blunden, Edmund, 'Gouzeaucourt: The Deceitful Calm', in *Undertones of War* (London: R. Cobden-Sanderson, 1928)
- Brooke, Rupert, 'The Soldier', in *Rupert Brooke: Collected Poems*, ed.by Lorna Beckett (Cambridge: Oleander Press, 2010)
- Bryce, James, *Transcaucasia and Ararat: Being Notes of a Vacation Tour in the Autumn of 1876* (London: Macmillan, 1970)
- Bryce, Viscount, 'Preface', *The Murderous Tyranny of the Turks*, ed.by Arnold J. Toynbee (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1917), 4-6
- Canatak, A. Macit, *Ömer Seyfettin'den Seçmeler* (İstanbul: Nesil Yayınları, 2015)
- Canny, Nicholas, 'The origins of Empire: an introduction', in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Volume I: The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- Carter, Violet Bonham, *Winston Churchill: An Intimate Portrait* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1965)
- Cassese, Emilio, 'Kazakhs during the Great War: The Case of an Uprising in Central Asia (1916)', in *The First World War: Analysis and Interpretation, Volume 2*, ed. by Antonello Biagini, Giovanna Motta (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), pp.67-73
- Chapman, Mark, 'The Evolution of Anglican Theology, 1910-2000', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume IV*, ed.by Jeremy Morris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) pp.25-50
- Chittick, William, *Varolmanın Boyutları*, trans.by Turan Koç (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1997)
- Churchill, Winston, *The World Crisis: The Unknown War: the Eastern Front* (New York: Scribner, 1959)
- Çakır, Ömer, *Türk Şiirinde Çanakkale Muharebeleri* (Ankara Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Başkanlığı Yayınları, 2004)

- Cotterell, Laurence, 'Introduction', in *A Pilgrim's Song: Selected Poems to Mark the Poet's 100th Birthday* (London: John Murray, 1993), pp. xi-xiii
- Das, Santanu, *India, Empire, and First World War Culture: Writings, Images, and Songs* (Cambridge: Dawson, Christopher, *Beyond Politics* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1939)
- Das, Santanu, *The Cambridge Companion to the Poetry of The First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)
- Das, Santanu, *Touch and Intimacy in First World War Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Dearmer, Geoffrey, *Poems* (New York: Robert M. McBride, 1918)
- Delaney, John J., *Dictionary of Saints* (New York: Doubleday, 1980)
- Delanty, Gerard, *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995)
- Dodd, Philip, 'Englishness and the National Culture', in *Englishness: Politics and Culture 1880–1920*, ed.by Robert Colls & Philip Dodd (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp.25-52
- Doğan, Mehmet, *Mehmet Akif, Dönemi ve Çevresi: Vefatının 71. Yılında Mehmet Akif Ersoy: Bilgi Şöleni* (Ankara: Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği, 2008)
- Doğan, Mehmet, *Mehmet Âkif: Türkiye'de Modernleşme ve Gençlik: Bilgi Şöleni* (Ankara: Türkiye Yazarlar Birliği, 2007)
- Doyle, Brian, 'The Invention of English', in *Englishness: Politics and Culture 1880–1920*, ed.by Robert Colls & Philip Dodd (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp.89-115
- Doyle, Peter and Bennett, Matthew R., 'Terrain and the Gallipoli Campaign, 1915', in *Fields of Battle: Terrain in Military History* ed.by Peter Doyle and Matthew R. Bennett (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2002) pp.149-169
- Düzdağ, Ertuğrul, *Mehmet Akif Hakkında Araştırmalar 1* (İstanbul: Mehmet Akif Araştırmaları Merkezi Yayınları, 1989)
- Ekins, Ashley, *Gallipoli: A Ridge Too Far* (Auckland: Exisle Publishing, 2013)
- Erdagöz, Hakan, 'Reading the Eastern Question through the Prism of Orientalism: Hubris, Founding Genealogy and James Bryce', *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* (2019), 1-26
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip, 'Çanakkale Zaferi konuşması', 18 Mart Stadyumu ve Şehitler Abidesi, 18 March 2018.
- Ercilasun, Bilge, *Türk Roman ve Hikâyesi Üzerine* (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2013)
- Erişirgil, Mehmet Emin, *Bir Fikir Adamının Romanı: Ziya Gökalp* (İstanbul: Atlas, 1984)
- Ersoy, Mehmet Akif, 'Asım'dan Bir Parça (Çanakkale Şehitlerine)', *Sebilürreşad*, 24 (1924) pp.145-146
- Ersoy, Mehmet Akif, *Düzyazılar, Makaleler, Tefsirler, Vaazlar*, ed.by A. V. Akbaş (İstanbul: Beyan Yayınları, 2011)
- Ersoy, Mehmet Akif, 'Edebiyat', *Sebilü'r-Reşad*, 8.183 (1912), pp.9-10
- Ersoy, Mehmet Akif, 'Hasbıhal', in *Kuran'dan Ayetler ve Nesirler*, ed. by Ömer Rıza Doğrul (İstanbul: Yüksel Yayınevi, 1944) pp.292-295
- Ersoy, Mehmet Akif, "İnsan", *Safahat*, ed.by M.Ertuğrul Düzdağ (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1987)

- Ersoy, Mehmed Akif, *Safahat*, ed. by Haz. M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (İstanbul: Şule Yayınları, 1999)
- Ersoy, Mehmet Akif, *Safahat: Safahat'ı Teşkil Eden Yedi Kitabın Tam Metni ile Safahat Dışında Kalmış Bir Kısım Şiirleri*, ed. by M. Ertuğrul Düzdağ (İstanbul, İnkılâp Kitabevi, 2003)
- Erişirgil, Mehmet Emin, Kazancıgil, Aykut, *İslamcı Bir Şairin Romanı: Mehmet Akif* (Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2006)
- Evans, John, 'The Use of "Othering" in the Formation of a Nationalist Society', <[https://www.academia.edu/1338990/The\\_Use\\_of\\_Othering\\_in\\_the\\_Formation\\_of\\_a\\_Nationalist\\_Society](https://www.academia.edu/1338990/The_Use_of_Othering_in_the_Formation_of_a_Nationalist_Society)> [accessed 05 Sept 2018]
- Falls, Cyril, *War Books: A Critical Guide* (London, Peter Davies 1930)
- Filizok, Rıza, 'Ziya Gökalp', in *Şiirimizde Halk Edebiyatı Tesirleri Üzerine Notlar* (İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1991), pp.25-39
- Finlay, Katherine, 'British Catholic Identity during the First World War: The Challenge of Universality and Particularity' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2004)
- FitzHerbert, Margaret, *The Man who was Greenmantle: A Biography of Aubrey Herbert* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985)
- Friedman, Isaiah, *The Question of Palestine: British-Jewish-Arab Relations, 1914-1918* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1992)
- Foote, Kenneth, *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997)
- Froude, James Anthony, *Oceana, or, England and Her Colonies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
- Fuad, Köprülüzade Mehmed, 'Hayat ve Edebiyat', *Tehvid-i Efkar*, 18 March 1922.
- Fussell, Paul, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1977)
- Gamble, Richard, 'Was World War I the last crusade?', *American Conservative*, 13 (2014), 53-56
- Gilbert, Sandra M., *Death's Door: Modern Dying and the Ways We Grieve* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007)
- Giles, Judy, Middleton, Tim, *Writing Englishness, 1900-1950: An Introductory Sourcebook on National Identity* (London: Routledge, 1995)
- Girouard, Mark, *The Return of Camelot: Chivalry and the English Gentleman* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981)
- Goebel, Stefan, *The Great War and Medieval Memory: War, Remembrance and Medievalism in Britain and Germany, 1914-1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Asker ve Şair', *Harp Mecmuası*, 14 (1916)
- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Çanakkale', *Yeni Mecmua* 5-18 Mart *Çanakkale Nüsha-i Fevkalade* (Special Issue), (1918), pp.33-34
- Gökalp, Ziya, *Hars ve Medeniyet* (İstanbul: Toker Yayınları, 2012)
- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Hocamın Vasiyeti', *Küçük Mecmua*, 18 (1922), pp. 1-5
- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Kızıl Elma', in *Kızıl Elma*, ed. by Yalçın Toker (Toker Yayınları), pp.1-3

- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Lisan', in *Yeni Hayat-Doğru Yol*, ed.by Müjgân Cumbur (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1976)
- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Pirimin Vasiyeti', *Küçük Mecmua*, 19 (1922), pp. 1-5
- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Siyasi Garp Meselesi-1', in *Küçük Mecmua* –iii, trans.by Şahin Filiz (Antalya: Yeniden Anadolu ve Rumeli Müdafaa-i Hukuk Yayınları, 2009) pp.52-53
- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Tevfik Fikret ve Rönesans', *Muallim dergisi*, 2.14 (1917)
- Gökalp, Ziya, 'Turan', *Genç Kalemler*, 1.6-14 (1911), 167
- Gökalp, Ziya, *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (Istanbul: Inkilap, 2004)
- Gökalp, Ziya *Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak* (Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları, 2006)
- Gökçek, Fazıl, 'Mehmet Akif'te Millet Kavramı', *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim: Mehmet Akif*
- Ersoy Özel Sayısı*, 73 (2006), pp. 69-73
- Grunebaum, Gustav Edmund Von, *Classical Islam: A History, 600 A.D. to 1258 A.D.*, trans. by. Katherine Watson (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2009)
- Grimley, Matthew, *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State Between the Wars* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- Grimley, Matthew, 'The State, Nationalism, and Anglican Identities', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism, Volume IV*, ed.by Jeremy Morris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp.117-137
- Gullace, Nicoletta F., 'Allied Propaganda and World War I: Interwar Legacies, Media Studies, and the Politics of War Guilt', *History Compass* 9.9 (2011), 686-700
- Gürsoy, Şahin and Çapcıoğlu, İhsan, 'Bir Türk Düşünürü Olarak Ziya Gökalp: Hayatı, Kişiliği ve Düşünce Yapısı Üzerine Bir İnceleme', *AÜFD* 47 (2006), pp. 89-98
- Hagerman, Christopher A., *Britain's Imperial Muse: The Classics, Imperialism, and the Indian Empire, 1784-1914* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)
- Hall, Richard C., *The Balkan Wars 1912-1913: Prelude to the First World War* (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Hanioğlu, M. Şükrü, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008)
- Harries, Richard, 'The De-romanticisation of War and the Struggle for Faith', in *The Straits of War: Gallipoli Remembered*, ed.by Martin Gilbert (Stroud: Sutton, 2000), pp.180-195
- Hastings, Adrian, *History of English Christianity 1920 -1990* (London: SCM Press, 1991)
- Herbert, Alan Patrick, *A. P.H. His Life and Times* (London: Heinemann, 1970)
- Herbert, Alan Patrick, *Half Hours at Helles* (Oxford: B.H. Blackwell, 1916)
- Herbert, Aubrey, *Ben Kendim: A Record of Eastern Travel* (New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1925)
- Herbert, Aubrey, *Mons, Anzac and Kut by an MP: Aubrey Herbert*, ed.by Edward Melotte (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2009)
- Herbert, Aubrey, 'R.B.', in *The Lost Generation of 1914*, ed.by Reginald Pound (New York: Coward-McCann, 1965), p.124.



- Heyd, Uriel, *Foundations of Turkish Nationalism: The Life and Teachings of Ziya Gökalp* (London: Luzac & Company Ltd and The Harvill Press Ltd, 1950)
- Hill, Leonard Raven. 'Realization', cartoon from *Punch Magazine* (1915), *WW1 Great War Cartoons*, [http://punch.photoshelter.com/image/I0000KDp\\_kljUp3k](http://punch.photoshelter.com/image/I0000KDp_kljUp3k) [last accessed 22 August 2016]
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., *The Age of Empire 1875-1914*, (London: Abacus, 2012)
- Hocaoğlu, Durmuş, 'Çağdaşlaşma, Modernleşme ve Batılılaşma Kavramlarının Yeniden Formatlanması Hakkında', *Türk Yurdu*, 109.16 (1996)
- Hood, Thomas, 'The Song of the Shirt', in *The Complete Poetical Works of Thomas Hood: with a Biographical Sketch and Notes* ed.by Epes Sargent (Boston: Phillips, Sampson, 1859), pp.147-149
- Hopchet, Victoria, 'The subversion of the pastoral mode in the First World War poetry of Charlotte Mew and Mary Borden' (unpublished master thesis, Universiteit Gent, 2014-2016)
- House of Commons, House of Commons Debate (17 November 1919, vol CXXI col 742) <<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1919-11-17/debates/59df291c-17ab-4c2d-9026-4a0e7a02dd2a/MotionForAdjournment>> (accessed 19 September 2017).
- Hynes, Samuel, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture* (New York: Atheneum, 1991)
- İleri, Celal Nuri, 'Müslümanlar, Türkler, Kalkın, Gecikdiniz', *İctihad*, 86 (1914), pp.1902-1904.
- İleri, Celal Nuri, *Tarih-i İstikbâl Münasebetiyle Celâl Nuri Bey*, (Istanbul: Yeni Osmanlı Matbaa ve Kütüphanesi, 1913)
- İmamoğlu, Abdulvahit, 'Mehmet Akif'te Medeniyet Kavramı (Mehmet Akif's Concept of Civilization)', *Journal of Islamic Research*, 21(3), (2010), 165-71
- Jarstad, Anna, *Changing the Game: Consociational Theory and Ethnic Quotas in Cyprus and New Zealand* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2001)
- Jenkins, Philip, *The Great and Holy War: How World War I Changed Religion For Ever* (Oxford: Lion Books, 2014)
- Jenkyns, Richard, 'The classical tradition', in *A Companion to Victorian Poetry*, ed.by Richard Cronin, Alison Chapman and Antony H. Harrison (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), pp.229-246
- Jukes, Geoffrey, Simkins, Peter, Hickey, Michael, *The First World War: The Eastern Front, 1914-1918*, (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002)
- Kant, Vedica, 'Çanakkale's Children: The politics of Remembering the Gallipoli Campaign in Contemporary Turkey', in *Remembering Gallipoli in Contemporary Turkey*, ed. by Bart Ziino (London: Routledge, 2015), pp.146-164
- Kafesoğlu, Ibrahim, *Türk Bozkır Kültürü*, (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü, 1987)
- Kahraman, Mehmet, *Divan Edebiyatı Üzerine Tartışmalar* (Istanbul: Beyan yayınları, 1996)
- Kanter, M. Fatih, 'Ziya Gökalp'in Çanakkale Şiirinde Benlik Algısı ve Kimlik Kurgusu', *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yılığ*, 13.18 (2015), pp. 551-562
- Karabacak, Esra, 'Deniz Kavramı Üzerine', in *KIBATEK Uluslararası Türk Kültüründe Deniz ve Deniz Edebiyatı Sempozyumu Bildirileri Antalya 27 Nisan - 2 Mayıs 2008*:

- (*Şiir, Öykü ve Deneme*), ed.by Metin Turan and Mustafa Oral (Antalya: Kibatek, 2008), pp. 19-22
- Karakoç, Sezai, *Mehmet Akif*, (İstanbul, Yağmur Yayınevi, 1968)
- Kelly, Andrew, *Cinema and the Great War* (London: Routledge, 1997)
- Keskin, Mustafa, 'Ziya Gökalp'te Vatan Kavramı', *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1 (1991), 443-452
- Khan, Nosheen, *Women's Poetry of the First World War* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988)
- Kirakosian, Arman Dzhonovich, *British Diplomacy and the Armenian Question: From the 1830s to 1914* (Princeton: Gomidas Institute Books, 2003)
- Klein, Bernhard, "'The Natural Home of Englishmen": Froude's Oceana and the Writing of the Sea', in *Landscape and Englishness*, ed.by Robert Burden and Stephan Kohl (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006)
- Köroğlu, Erol, *Ottoman Propaganda and Turkish Identity: Literature in Turkey during World War I* (London: I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd, 2007)
- Kramer, Alan and Horne, John, *German Atrocities, 1914: A History of Denial* (New Haven: Yale University Press 2001)
- Kumar, Krishan, 'Greece and Rome in the British Empire: contrasting role models', *Journal of British Studies*, 51 (2012) 76-101
- Kuntay, Mithat Cemal, *Mehmed Akif: Hayatı, Seciyesi, Sanatı, Eserleri, Ek Kitapta Bahsi Geçen Muharrirlerin Eserleri*, (İstanbul: S. Lûtfi Kitabevi, 1939), pp. 181-182
- Larsen, Svend Erik, 'Landscape, Identity and War', *New Literary History*, 35 (2004), pp.469-490
- Lee, Stephen J., *Aspects of British Political History 1815-1914* (New York: Routledge, 1994)
- Levine, Philippa, *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset* (London: Routledge, 2013)
- Lewis, Bernard, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Linder, Ann P., 'Landscape and Symbol in the British and German Literature of World War I', *Comparative Literature Studies* 31.4 (1994), pp.351-369
- Linley, Margaret, 'Nationhood and empire', in *A Companion to Victorian Poetry*, ed.by Richard Cronin, Lootens, Tricia, 'Victorian poetry and patriotism', in *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Poetry*, ed.by Joseph Bristow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.255-280
- MacCarthy, Desmond, 'Aubrey Herbert', in Aubrey Herbert, *Mons, Anzac and Kut* (London: 1925) <<http://www.gwpda.org/wwi-www/Mons/mons.htm#intro>> [accessed 21 October 2016].
- McGarry, Fearghal, *The Rising: Ireland, Easter 1916* (Oxford: Oxford university press, 2010)
- Mackenzie, Compton, *Gallipoli Memories* (New York: The Country Life Press, 1930)
- Macleod, Jenny, *Reconsidering Gallipoli* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004)
- Malvern, Sue, 'War Tourisms: "Englishness", Art, and the First World War', *Oxford Art Journal*, 24.1 (2001) 45-66

- Mangan, J. A., 'Noble Specimens of Manhood: Schoolboy Literature and the Creation of a Colonial Chivalric Code', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 27 (2010), 389–408
- Massey, Doreen, 'Places and Their Pasts', *History Workshop Journal*, 39 (1995)
- Matless, David, *Landscape and Englishness* (London: Reaktion Books, 1998)
- Melson, Robert, *Revolution and Genocide: on the Origins of the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996)
- Marrin, Albert, *The Last Crusade: The Church of England in the First World War* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1974)
- McCarthy, Justin, 'The Bryce Report: British propaganda and the Turks', in *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*, ed.by Kemal Çiçek (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2000) pp.504-512
- McCarthy, Justin, *The Turk in America: The Creation of an Enduring Prejudice* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2010)
- McLoughlin, Kate, *Authoring War: The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Mitchell, Don, *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000)
- Monger, David, *Patriotism and Propaganda in First World War Britain: The National War Aims Committee and Civilian Morale* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012)
- Mosse, George L., 'Racism and Nationalism', *Nations and Nationalism*, 1.2 (1995), 163-73
- Mosse, George, *The Fascist Revolution: Toward a General Theory of Fascism* (New York: H. Fertig, 1999)
- Mutlu, Betül, 'Divân Şiirinde Deniz İmgesi ve Şiir Öğretiminde Kullanılması' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, 2012)
- Naci, İbrahim, *Allahısmarladık: Çanakkale Savaşı'nda Bir Şehidin Günlüğü*, ed.by Seyit Ahmet Sılay, Lokman Demir (İstanbul, Yeditepe, 2013)
- Naci, İbrahim, *Farewell: A Turkish Officer's Diary of the Gallipoli Campaign*, ed. by Seyit Ahmet Sılay, Lokman Demir, trans.by Nilüfer Epçeli (Çanakkale: Gallipoli Peninsula Historical National, 2013)
- Norris, Mavis, Norrie, Ian, *The Book of Hampstead* (London: High Hill Press, 1968)
- Nüzhet, Ali, *Ziya Gökalp'in Hayatı ve Malta Mektupları* (İstanbul: İkbâl Kutuphanesi, 1931)
- Ogel, Bahaeddin, *Dünden Bugüne Türk Kültürünün Gelişme Çağları* (İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1988)
- Okur, Mehmet Akif, 'The Meaning of Gallipoli in Turkish National Identity', in *The Gallipoli Campaign: The Turkish Perspective*, ed. by Metin Gürcan, Robert Johnson (Oxfordshire: Routledge Studies in First World War History, 2016), pp.173-180
- Osborne, Brian, 'Landscapes, Memory, Monuments, and Commemoration: Putting Identity in its Place', *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 33 (2001), 39-77
- O'Shaughnessy, Nicholas J., *Politics and Propaganda: Weapons of Mass Seduction* (Ann Arbor: Manchester University Press, 2004)
- Owen, Wilfred, *The Collected Poems of Wilfred Owen* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1963)

- Özil, Ayşe, *Orthodox Christians in the Late Ottoman Empire: A Study of Communal Relations in Anatolia* (London: Routledge, 2013)
- Paddock, Troy R. E., *World War I and Propaganda* (Leiden: Brill, 2014)
- Parla, Taha, *The Social and Political Thought of Ziya Gökalp, 1876-1924* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985)
- Peaple, Simon, *European Diplomacy: 1870-1939* (Oxford: Heinemann, 2002)
- Pehlivanlı, Dr. Hamit, 'Çanakkale Muharebeleri Sırasında Müttefiklerin Propagandası ve Karşı Propaganda', *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 7.21 (1991), 535-552
- Pound, Reginald, *A. P. Herbert: A Biography* (London: Joseph, 1976)
- Powell, Christopher, *Barbaric Civilization: A Critical Sociology of Genocide* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011)
- Protheroe, Ernest, *A Book About Cricket* (London: J. Alfred Sharp, 1924)
- Raymond, Ernest, *Good Morning, Good People: An Autobiography – Past and Present* (London: Cassell, 1970)
- Raymond, Ernest, *Tell England* (London: Cassell, 1922)
- Raymond, Ernest, *The Story of My Days: An Autobiography 1888-1922* (London: Cassell, 1968)
- Raymond, Ernest, *Through Literature To Life: An Enthusiasm and an Anthology* (London: Cassell, 1928)
- Renan, Ernest, 'What is a Nation?', in *Nation and Narration*, ed. by Homi K. Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990)
- Richards, Jeffrey, *Happiest Days: The Public Schools in English Fiction* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988)
- Robb, George, *British Culture and the First World War*, (London: Pelgrave, 2015)
- Rollo, W.F., *Stray Shots from the Dardanelles* (Carlisle: Chas Thurnam & Sons, 1916)
- Roberts, James, '"The Best Football Team, The Best Platoon": The Role of Football in the Proletarianization of the British Expeditionary Force', 1914–1918, *Sport in History*, 26 (2006), 26-46
- Rogan, Eugene, *The Fall of the Ottomans: The Great War in the Middle East, 1914-1920* (London: Allen Lane, 2015)
- Root, Laura, '"Temporary Gentlemen" on the Western Front: class consciousness and the British Army officer, 1914-1918, *All Volumes*, 5 (2006) <[http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/ojii\\_volumes/72](http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/ojii_volumes/72)> accessed [accessed 10 May 2017]
- Safa, Peyami, *Objektif 2: Sanat - Edebiyat – Tenkit* (Istanbul: Öküten yayınları, 1990)
- Said, Edward, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994)
- Salt, Jeremy, 'Johnny Turk Before Gallipoli: 19th Century Images of the Turks', in *Before and After Gallipoli: A collection of Australian and Turkish Writings*, ed.by. Rahmi Akçelik (Melbourne: Australian-Turkish Friendship Society, 1986), pp.15-27
- Sâmi, Banarlı Nihad, *Resimli Türk Edebiyatı Târîhi II* (Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 2004)
- Sanders, Michael, 'Wellington House and British propaganda during the First World War', *The Historical Journal*, 18.1 (1975), 119–146

- Sanders, Michael and Taylor, Philip M., *British Propaganda during the First World War, 1914–18* (London: The Macmillan Press LTD, 1982)
- Sauer, Carl O., 'The Morphology of Landscape', *University of California Publications in Geography*, 2 (1925) 2000, 19-53
- Seyfettin, Ömer, *Balkan Harbi Hatıraları* (İstanbul: DBY, 2011)
- Seyfettin, Ömer, 'Bir Çocuk Aleko', in *Ömer Seyfettin'den Seçme Hikayeler: Yazarın Yaşamı ve Hikayeciliği*, ed.by Kemal Demiray (İstanbul: İnkılap ve Aka, 1977), pp.144-169
- Seyfettin, Ömer, 'Büyük Türklüğü Parçalayan Kimlerdir?', *Bütün Eserleri 16 Türklük Üzerine Yazılar*, ed.by Muzaffer Uyguner (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993) pp.107-112
- Seyfettin, Ömer, 'Milli Tecrübelerimizden Çıkarılmış Ameli Siyaset', *Bütün Eserleri*, ed. by Muzaffer Uyguner (Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993)
- Seyfettin, Ömer, 'Tuhaf Bir Zulüm', *Ömer Seyfettin: Hikayeler 3*, ed.by Hülya Argunşah (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1999), p.38.
- Seyfettin, Ömer, 'Turan Devleti', *Ömer Seyfettin Bütün Eserleri: Makaleler*, ed.by Hülya Argunşah (İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2001)
- Seyfettin, Ömer, 'Türklük Mefkuresi', *Türklük Üzerine Yazılar* (Ankara : Bilgi Yayınevi, 1993)
- Seyfettin, Ömer, 'Yeni Lisan', *Genç Kalemler*, 2.1(1911) pp.1-7
- Shakespeare, William, 'King Lear', in *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*, ed.by Samuel Johnson (Leipsic: Fleischer, 1833)
- Shaw, Stanford J., Shaw, Ezel Kural, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey: 2. Reform, Revolution and Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)
- Smith, Angela K., *British Women of the Eastern Front: War, Writing and Experience in Serbia* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).
- Smith, Angela K., *Women's Writing of the First World War: An Anthology* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)
- Snape, Michael, *God and the British Soldier; Religion and the British Army in the Era of Two World Wars* (London: Routledge, 2005)
- Stevenson, Robert Louis, *The English Admirals* (New York: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1932)
- Spuler, Bertold, 'Persian Historiography Outside Iran in Modern Times', in *Persian Historiography and Geography : Bertold Spuler on Major Works Produced in Iran, the Caucasus, Central Asia, India and Early Ottoman Turkey* (Singapore: Pustaka Nasional, 2003), pp.59-70
- Sonyel, Salahi R., *Minorities and the Destruction of the Ottoman Empire* (Ankara: Turkish Historical Society Printing House, 1993)
- Triandafyllidou, Anna, 'National Identity and the "Other"', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21 (1998)
- Steel, Nigel, "The Dead Turk", Geoffrey Dearmer (1916): Echoes of Calvary in Gallipoli', *The Telegraph: Inside the First World War Part Six: Redrawing the Middle East*, 2 February 2014
- Tansel, Fevziye Abdullah, *Mehmed Akif Hayatı ve Eserleri* (Ankara: Mehmet Akif Ersoy Fikir ve Sanat Vakfı 1991)

- Tansel, Fevziye Abdullah, *Ziya Gökalp Külliyyatı-1, Şiirler ve Halk Masalları* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1989)
- Tauber, Eliezer, *The Arab Movements in World War I*, (London: Routledge, 2014)
- Taylor, Philip M., 'The Foreign Office and British Propaganda during the First World War', *The Historical Journal*, 23.4 (1980), 875-898
- Townshend, Charles, *Easter 1916: The Irish Rebellion* (London: Allen Lane, 2005)
- Tör, Ahmet Nedim Servet, Nevhiz'in Günlüğü: Defter-i Hatırat (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000)
- Tör, Ahmet Nedim Servet, 'Namaz', *Harp Mecmuası* 4 (1915), 56-57
- Trott, Vincent, *Publishers, Readers and the Great War: Literature and Memory since 1918* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017)
- Tunaya, Tarık Zafer, *Türkiye'nin Siyasi Hayatında Batılılaşma Hareketleri* (İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi yayınları, 2010)
- Tuncay, Hasan, *Ziya Gökalp* (İstanbul: Toker Yayınları, 1978)
- Uçman, Abdullah, 'Mehmet Akif ve Milli Mücadele', *Ölümünün 50. Yılında Mehmet Akif Ersoy*, 439 (1986)
- Uslu, Günay, *Homer, Troy and the Turks: Heritage & Identity in the Late Ottoman Empire 1870-1915* (Amsterdam, 2015)
- Uyanık, Necmi, 'Siyasi Düşünce Tarihimizde Batıcı Bir Aydın Olarak Celal Nuri', (unpublished doctoral thesis, Selcuk Üniversitesi, 2003), pp.39-42
- Uyar, Mesut, 'Remembering the Gallipoli campaign: Turkish official military historiography, war memorials and contested ground', *First World War Studies*, 7.2 (2016), pp.165-191
- Üngör, Uğur Ümit, *The Making of Modern Turkey: Nation and State in Eastern Anatolia, 1913–1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Ünlü, Mahir, Özcan, Ömer, *Yirminci Yüzyıl Türk Edebiyatı. V. 1* (İstanbul: İnkılap, 2003)
- Vakkasoğlu, Vehbi, *Tarih Aynasında Ziya Gökalp* (İstanbul: Cihan, 1984)
- Vandiver, Elizabeth, *Stand in the Trench, Achilles: Classical Receptions in British Poetry of the Great War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- Vasunia, Phiroze, *The Classics and Colonial India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)
- Veitch, Colin, "Play up! Play up! And Win the War!" Football, the Nation and the First World War 1914-15', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 20 (1985), 363-378
- Walsh, Oonagh, *Ireland's Independence, 1880-1923* (London: Routledge, 2002)
- 'Wellington House and British propaganda during the First World War', *The Historical Journal*, 18 (1975) pp. 119–146
- Werlen, Benno, *Society, Action and Space: An Alternative Human Geography* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- Weston, Frank, *Conquering and to Conquer* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918)
- Wickham, E.R., *Church and People in an Industrial City* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1957)
- Wilkinson, Alan, *The Church of England and the First World War* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2014)

- Williams, Raymond, *The Country and The City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975)
- Wilson, J., 'It Still Goes on: Football and the Heritage of the Great War in Britain', *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9 (2014), 197-211
- Winter, Jay, 'British National Identity and the First World War', in *The Boundaries of the State in Modern Britain*, ed.by S. J. D Green & R. C Whiting (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 261-277
- Winter, Jay, *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006)
- Yener, Cemil, *Türk Halk Edebiyatı Antolojisi* (İstanbul: Bateş Yayınları, 1973)
- Yıldırım, Ali, 'İslamın Tabiat Anlayışı ve Divan Şirine Yansımaları' (Concept of Nature in Islam and Its Reflection to Divan Poetry), *İlmi Araştırmalar* 17 (İstanbul 2004), 155-173
- Yıldırım, Emre, 'The Definition Of Turkish Identity in The Context Of "Neohellenism" and "Mediterranean Identity": Yahya Kemal Beyatlı And Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu', *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi (The Journal of International Social Research)* 6 (2013), 624-642
- Yurdakul, Mehmet Emin, 'Orduya Selam', *Harp Mecmuası*, 4 (1915), pp.52-53
- Yücel, Hasan Ali, *Edebiyat Tarihimizden*0 (İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1987)
- Yücebaş, Hilmi, *Ömer Seyfettin; Hayatı, Hatıraları, Şiirleri* (İstanbul: A.H. Yaşaroğlu Kağıtçılık ve Kitapçılık, 1960)
- Zürcher, Eric J., *The Young Turk Legacy and Nation Building: From the Ottoman Empire to Atatürk's Turkey* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2010)
- Zücher, Eric J., *Turkey: A Modern History, Revised Edition* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2017)