

to the Australian custom of assigning contrary nicknames.

Something of a loner, Murray was known for his custom of carrying out lone reconnaissance patrols in No-Man's Land but was also renowned as a careful and thoughtful commander who could nevertheless react rapidly and effectively when plans went wrong.

After the war and an unsuccessful marriage, Murray remarried and worked his own sheep properties in Queensland. He eschewed publicity and, apart from a number of thoughtful articles in the RSL paper *Reveille*, remained out of the public eye. Despite persistent trouble from old wounds, he lived an active life until his death following a car accident when he was 85.

Apart from normal training within his unit, Murray never undertook any training course either in his machine gun specialisation or for promotion to any rank. He was not well educated in a formal sense but was extremely well read. There is one comment in the book that suggests that administration was not his long suit but the record suggests a man who was supremely physically fit, intellectually adaptable, sober in his personal habits and always dedicated to the task in hand.

In many ways, the legend of the Australian soldier is based upon people like Harry Murray. One can argue whether the legend has as much validity in modern warfare as it did in the world wars but there is little doubt that the best soldiers are those who possess the strength of character of people like Murray. As long as the ethos of the Australian Defence Force is based upon such traits as initiative and fortitude as much as on professional skill, then the legend will be maintained and reinforced.

Franki, G. & Slatyer, C. 2003, Mad Harry, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 276 pp, soft cover, \$29.95.

Gallipoli: The Turkish Story

Kevin Fewster, Vecihi Ba[[arin and Hatice Hürmüz

reviewed by Michael O'Connor

The relationship between Australia and Turkey is perhaps one of the more intriguing of the modern world. Born in war as adversaries, it gained strength from a mutual respect between fighting men. To some degree it was strengthened in Korea where units from both countries fought in the United Nations force.

Since that time, the relationship has been reinforced with the addition of thousands of Turkish migrants seeking a better life in Australia. Two of the authors of this book came to Australia in the 1970s.

In recent years, what might be called Australia's rediscovery of the Gallipoli legend has led thousands



of young Australians on pilgrimages to Gallipoli. In the process, Australians and Turks have found each other once more.

Australian history has focused on the Australian experience at Gallipoli. This book sets out frankly to tell the Turkish story of what is regarded by the Turks as an unwarranted invasion of their country and their defeat of the

invader.

One could argue endlessly about the issue of who won and who lost. In reality, the result of the campaign was essentially a stalemate; the Allies could make no headway against the dogged and sacrificial Turkish defence while the Turks were unable to dislodge the Allied bridgeheads. No doubt, the outcome was a strategic defeat for the Allies because they were unable to attain their objectives.

This most interesting book not only outlines the campaign through Turkish eyes but also provides a valuable background of Turkish history and social structure, especially that of the army.

The disappointing feature of the book is the tone of moral superiority that emerges from the authors who boast of their anti-war convictions. This is overdone and we have had too much of it in recent years. Only lunatics are pro-war but most people accept that sometimes war is the only way to restore peace or to establish justice. A pretentious and delicate revulsion only encourages aggression and oppression. In the context of World War I, Turkey did not have to ally itself with Germany. Once it did, however, the consequences were inevitable.

One of those consequences, however, was the rise of Mustapha Kemal Ataturk, the founder of modern Turkey. This man, at the time a relatively undistinguished officer, was more than anyone responsible for holding the line against the Anzacs and, after the war, the founding of modern Turkey. Can anyone claim that a German victory would have been good for Turkey?

This is a most interesting and valuable book, not least for its insight into the thinking of Turks whose legend of Gallipoli is not very much different in its essentials from our own. Turkey's major, perhaps only, victory of the war provided the basis for a strong national identity that emerged from internal collapse and the loss of an empire. In the Gallipoli experience, Turks celebrate a military victory, whereas we celebrate a military defeat and a victory of a different kind. Both countries now celebrate a friendship founded in war but one which transcends that bitter experience.

Fewster, K., Ba[[arin, V. & Hürmüz, H. 2003, Gallipoli: The Turkish Story, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 166 pp, soft cover, \$29.95.