Lest We Remember/"Lest We Forget": Gallipoli as Exculpatory Memory[1]

JOHN BEVAN-SMITH

> *All Nation-States are born and found themselves in violence. I believe that truth to be irrecusable. Without even exhibiting atrocious spectacles on this subject, it suffices to underline a law of structure: the moment of foundation, the instituting moment, is anterior to the law or legitimacy which it founds. It is thus outside the law, and violent by that very fact.... This foundational violence is not only forgotten. The foundation is made in order to hide it; by its essence it tends to organise amnesia, something under the celebration and sublimation of the grand beginnings.*
>
> Jacques Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*[2]

Abstract
Before the build-up to the centenary of the 1915 invasion of Turkey's Gallipoli Peninsula begins in earnest, I thought it might be timely to interrogate the notion that those of us who live in Australasia are confronted with every Anzac Day: that it was on April 25, 1915, the day the Australia New Zealand Army Corps (Anzacs) landed at Gallipoli as part of the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force, that the consciousness of nationhood was born in Australia and New Zealand, This foundational idea, with specific application to Australia, was first published nine years after the event by Charles Bean, the Australian Government's official World War I historian who is also regarded as having created the Anzac legend. On a broader view, World War I was, for Bean, about freedom, and more broadly still, about the survival of civilisation.

These often highly conflicted truth-claims are all part and parcel of the legitimising grand narratives deployed by settler societies, the teleologies of which are always already oriented towards the realisation of their civilising projects and the fulfilment of their idealised selves in 'the not-yet-now'. These narratives are not only self-authorising but are also able to negate competing indigenous narratives by dint of presenting themselves as superior by virtue of the progress they denote. However, just as 'the not-yet-now' cannot arrive and still be the future, so the goals of these narratives cannot be realized and still remain the focus of the collective progress to come. It is for these reasons that these goals are kept alive in the future anterior of their narratives and regularly updated. In the case of Australia and New Zealand, as this article has tried to show, an important part of that process is the annual re-staging of the quasi-religious spectacle of Anzac Day with its sacralization of the noble values 'discovered' in the carnage of Gallipoli and elevated in the national consciousness to the point where they effectively occlude, on the one hand, 'the criminality of the act of foundation of what became known as "Australia"', and, on the other, the brutality and betrayal by which an archipelago, called New Zealand by Europeans, was also taken over by the British. While this combined expropriation of around eight million square kilometres might seem of monumental proportions, it pales into insignificance, or so the Anzac legend would have us believe, compared with fighting and dying for freedom and saving civilisation itself. Such is the thin but glistening thread of exculpatory memory to which settlerism clings.

With the centenary of the 1915 invasion of Turkey's Gallipoli Peninsula fast approaching, it is timely to interrogate the notion that those of us who live in New Zealand are confronted with every Anzac Day: that it was on April 25, 1915, the day the Australia New Zealand Army Corps (Anzacs) landed at Gallipoli as part of the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force, that the consciousness of nationhood was born in Australia and New Zealand.[3] This foundational idea, with specific application to Australia, was first published nine years after the event by Charles Bean, the Australian Government's official World War I historian who is also regarded as having created the Anzac legend. On a broader view, World War I was, for Bean, about freedom, and more broadly still, about the survival of civilisation. As he wrote in "The Anzac Legacy," the chapter concluding his abridged version of the Great War published in 1946: "If the cause that led Australians to enlist can be reduced to a single principle, it is the principle of protecting their homes and their freedom by sustaining a system of law and order between nations."[4] This, Bean believed, was one of the "fundamental" "lessons of history," in that:

> only in conditions ensuring freedom of thought and communication can mankind progress; and that such freedom can be maintained only by the qualities by which from Grecian times it has been won—by such qualities as our own people managed to preserve through the first 126 peaceful years of their existence—the readiness at any time to die for freedom, if necessary, and the virility to struggle for it. In facing that necessity we now share with the New Zealanders one condition that was lacking to our young nations in 1915: we have passed through the test which until now, unfortunately, has necessarily been judged by mankind as the supreme one for men fit to be free; and we have emerged from that test with the Anzac tradition.[5]

Since its invention, Bean's Anzac tradition has been foundational to the collective memory of all of us who have no memory of this landmark event, and is widely appropriated for purposes of promoting national exceptionalism whenever the Gallipoli story is told from an Australasian perspective. For instance, on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the Gallipoli landings, New Zealand journalist Tim Watkin wrote that "increasingly, young Kiwis are coming to see Gallipoli as the defining moment in New Zealand's struggle for national identity," and that "most New Zealanders see Gallipoli as a place where our nationhood was forged in the heat of battle."[6] In his article, Watkin quoted three secondary school students—winners of the Government's Anzac Day essay competition whose prize was to accompany the then New Zealand Prime Minister, Helen Clark, to Gallipoli for that anniversary—all of whom believed that Gallipoli was central to New Zealand's sense of self. "Young New Zealanders" go to Gallipoli "in their thousands," added *The New Zealand Herald's* long-time columnist Garth George about the 90th anniversary, because "[t]hey want to connect with their nation's history, some with their family history too. They are not taken in by the milk-sop pacifism preached in their schoolrooms and lecture halls, or by the politically correct gaps in the laundered history they have been taught. They want to know where they come from because that helps them know where they are going."[7]

For settler Australasians, Gallipoli, in Pierre Nora's terminology, constitutes a *lieu de mémoire* (site of memory).[8] According to Nora, these sites "only exist because of their capacity for metamorphosis, an endless recycling of their meaning and an unpredictable proliferation of their ramifications."[9] It is *les lieux de mémoire* that historians colonise and where they incessantly overwrite the palimpsest of memory according to their own preoccupations, prescriptions and pre-selections.[10]

Before I begin my interrogation proper, I would like to discuss what I take history to be in the hope that we might better understand why Charles Bean's interpretation of this catastrophic event, although not uncontested, remains the dominant view.[11]

History is a self-referential discourse that presents itself in narrative form and originates its meaning in relation to an object, the past, which it purports to represent and explain. It rises out of the lack of coincidence between an event and our understanding of that event, which in turn is a consequence of the event's inability to be present to itself. Hence, all historical meaning is created retroactively in the face of what is known and/or believed, and with a not uncommon result: "the confusion of consecution and consequence, what comes *after* being read in narrative as what is *caused by*," or more prosaically, with effect being taken as the origin of the cause.[12] A further significant issue arises when those writing the past fail to distinguish between notional and tangible referents, thereby leaving unchallenged the commonly held but mistaken belief that the past is an accessible site sitting somewhere beyond the discourse. While Eelco Runia takes the view that the past is an "ontological twilight state," concluding that "[w]e historians are inclined to combine a half-hearted belief that the past exists with an equally half-hearted belief that the past does not exist—and so we can be said to be doubly wrong," Keith Jenkins argues the case more forcibly:

> we recognise today that there never has been, and that there never will be, any such thing as a past which is expressive of some sort of essence. . . . Consequently, the whole "modernist" History/history ensemble now appears as a self-referential, problematic expression of "interests," an ideological–interpretive discourse without any "real" access to the past as such, unable to engage in any dialogue with "reality." In fact, "history" now appears to be just one more "expression" in a world of postmodern expressions: which of course is what it is.[13]

Furthermore, because history situates itself between an event and our cognition of that event, it must rely for its authority on "a sort of fabulous retroactivity."[14] This self-authorisation—the confirming of *a priori* meaning created *a posteriori*—"is a movement of the *future anterior*," which is the trace of the irreducibility of the "now" or present, and is itself apparent in the lack of coincidence between *res gestae* and *historia rerum gestarum*, what happened and the account of what happened, even when both are taken to be discursive productions.[15]

However, despite these philosophical and methodological issues, neither History as orthodoxy nor the wider discourse of history can or should be read as myth or fiction, although either or both might enter the discourse during the incessant re-writing process. For as we know it today, history is peculiarly and particularly of itself, a nineteenth-century European invention that functions as "a perspective apparatus, a form of realism, a temporal counterpart of pictorial realism," the product of which, historiography, endeavours to present a comprehensible past and provide rational explanations for past actions.[16] Yet in performing this function, history must disguise its paradoxical ontology, its impossible possibility, which it accomplishes through the general deployment of metaphor and by believing that "it knows only a two-term semantic schema, signifier and referent."[17] Peter Hoffer explains the former:

> History is impossible. Nothing I have written or could write will change that brute fact. We cannot go back in time. But doing history, studying the past, is not impossible. . . . There is a striking scene near the end of the movie *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade* in which Indiana Jones must cross a yawning chasm to reach the cave that houses the Holy Grail. He must have faith in his quest, and that faith requires he take a step into what appears to be empty space. He does, and finds solid ground—a bridge to the other side. What we need to complete our philosophy is a step of faith onto the bridge we have constructed.[18]

In regard to the latter, history must suppose what Roland Barthes describes as "a double operation" in order to portray absence as presence and thereby disguise the

propositional or belief-based nature of its meaning and existence.[19] In its first phase, this "extremely complex" operation sees the referent (the past, more broadly, an event, more narrowly) detached from the discourse thereby giving the appearance that it controls the discourse; the second phase sees the merging of signifier and referent to the exclusion of the signified thereby creating what Barthes calls "the *referential illusion"* or "*reality effect*" (*effet de réel*).[20] As a result, historical discourse may be instructively described as "a fake performative discourse in which the apparent constative (descriptive) is in fact only the signifier of the speech-act as an act of authority. In other words, in 'objective' history, the 'real' is never anything but an unformulated signified, sheltered behind the apparent omnipotence of the referent."[21] Furthermore, because any "conceptual formation to be analysed" is necessarily delimited and in essence pre-predicative—"it has the form it will be revealed to have in advance of its exposure to view"—historical meaning will always already conform to the teleology of the narrative in which it is embedded while appearing to pre-exist the "reportage" of the event to which it is attached, as well as giving the (false) impression that it exists independently of the narrative.[22]

Thus, while we can say, after Elizabeth Deeds Ermarth, that history "is achieved not found," its "methodological accomplishments," on Ermarth's view, "are worthy of the reverence we pay them, so long as we remember that they are based on acts of faith."[23] They are so, not least, because "[h]istorical time is a fundamentally religious construction," a matter of great import that writers of the past tend to ignore.[24] Even the time series, past-present-future, that modernity invented in order to situate events, establish causality and both imagine and manage historical continuity against a limitless horizon, is, as John McTaggart explains, a contradiction of "incompatible determinations. Every event must be one or the other, but no event can be more than one. This is essential to the meaning of the terms."[25] Yet if time involves change, as historians concur when they speak of change over time, "the only change we can get is from future to present, and from present to past."[26] But if an event "is past, it has been present and future," and "[i]f it is future, it will be present and past," and "[i]f it is present, it has been future and will be past," in the result that "all the three incompatible terms are predicable of each event, which is obviously inconsistent with their being incompatible, and inconsistent with their producing change."[27]

Finally, we should note that in the very act of remembering history also forgets. That is, because history is essentially discursive and therefore selective, based as it is on "a relentless making of choices," it "organises amnesia" even as it ascribes and re-ascribes meaning to "the no-longer now."[28]

It is not surprising, therefore, that history was the ideal cultural instrument with which to underwrite the transition from sacred to secular political power systems in nineteenth-century Europe and the reason why it functions today, in religion's stead, as arguably "*the* metanarrative in Western discourse" in which the political order of nation-states is mandated and updated and "the presumed superiority of modern, industrial society" in relation to other civilisations and cultures is "retroactively substantiated."[29] It performs the selfsame function for all settlers societies, including the one we are most concerned with here, New Zealand, where "the white dream of a new country . . . requires that indigenous inhabitants be forgotten or constructed in terms of the vision of a bright future," one in which all inhabitants are considered to be more or less indigenous.[30] This is apparent in Michael King's truth-claim that "Pakeha New Zealanders who are committed to this land and its people are no less 'indigenous' than Maori", and in James Belich's use of "decolonisation" to describe changes in "1970's-90s" New Zealand, when, as Peter Gibbons points out, "the term 'decolonization' . . . is usually deployed to characterize a rather more significant transfer of power from imperial authorities to local peoples, especially in Africa and Asia, than has taken place in New Zealand."[31]

Before examining those cultural mechanisms by which "Gallipoli" is transformed into a transcendental signifier/signified that stands for the simultaneous birth of two settler nation-states, we should also consider the mechanics of language that make possible the euphoria of remembrance that accompanies every Anzac Day, or, as Jean-François Lyotard has it, "the *dementia* of enthusiasm" commonly associated with justificatory or exculpatory discourse.[32]

First, we should take into account Ferdinand de Saussure's counter-intuitive proposition that "in a language there are only differences, *and no positive terms*."[33] That is, words have no positive meaning in and of themselves and only attain to such through the differential functioning of language, following which they are stored in dictionaries and modified and preserved in our common usage. Put otherwise, words do not acquire meaning directly from the objects or ideas they signify; rather, they acquire meaning by a process of negative differentiation that establishes what they are not. Thus a dog is a not-god. As *Course in General Linguistics* explains: "There is no internal connexion, for example, between the idea "sister" and the French sequence of sounds *s-ö-r* which acts as its signal. The same idea might as well be represented by any other sequence of sounds. This is demonstrated by differences between languages, and even by the existence of different languages."[34] Ermarth elaborates: "To understand anything means to understand its function in a differential system of meaning and value, in other words, in terms of a code. Within that code the more we know about what something is *not*, the more we can understand how it functions and thus what it 'means.' Linguistic value arises not positively but negatively from a complex, largely subliminal system of differentiations."[35]

Hence Saussure's interpretation of linguistics not only overturns the West's traditional understanding that words are positive entities comprised of meaning derived from their referents, but also proposes more broadly that "[d]iscursive systems are the condition of consciousness and knowledge."[36]

Second, we should be mindful in our construction of the other of the significance of binary oppositions, in which one of the pairing is always dominant or privileged. For instance, without the idea of the civilised, believed, ironically, to succeed the savage chronologically, the savage could not be thought. That is, these two signifiers reference ideas, not tangible objects, and make sense only in relation to each other. Hence, the predicational basis of both savage and civilised does not preexist their binary relationship; each needs the other to be understood as itself, and thus each constitutes the other, gives the other "life" by way of differential negation. The same may be said of all binary oppositions—love/hate, good/evil, true/false, right/left, hot/cold, remembering/forgetting, and so on—the opposite existing as the trace or shadow of the word of which it is the reciprocating other. Even a transcendental signifier such as "Gallipoli," which sits as a function, not a geographical locus, at the (non-)centre of its own signifying system controlling that system's domain and play, "is never absolutely present outside a system of differences."[37] As such, it is dependent on the differential system for its "metaphysical reduction" to the point where it appears to transcend language and become untouchable and irreducible in its meaning.[38]

The principle of differential negation also applies to identity formation, both individual and collective: concepts of national identity, for instance, are predicated on what "we" are that "others" are not. Likewise, settler societies construct themselves in opposition to their binary other, the indigenous societies they supplant.[39] This process is further complicated by our language systems allowing meaning and value to be added to inexistent objects *as if* they were extant but without the corresponding requirement that such a distinction be made.

As a consequence, historians (and others), after Charles Bean, are able to make all manner of pronouncements about Gallipoli as if the meaning behind those pronouncements were extracted from the Gallipoli slopes themselves. Unsurprisingly, because these truth-claims serve a political agenda, they can sometimes make little or no rational sense but take on

the appearance of rationality within the rationalising function of the narrativizing process, contributing as they do so to a phallogocentric discourse that they themselves have helped to construct. For instance, according to Keith Sinclair, "W. P. Morrell, who in 1935 first interpreted the history of New Zealand as the growth of a nation, concluded that New Zealand announced its manhood to the world on the bloody slopes of Gallipoli in 1915."[40] Sinclair himself believed that "[a]fter the war there was a very general agreement among the New Zealanders that they were a new nation."[41] In citing John Masefield's description of "the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps and the Royal Naval Division"—"They were . . . the finest body of young men ever brought together in modern times. For physical beauty and nobility of bearing they surpassed any men I have ever seen; they walked and looked like the kings in old poems, and reminded me of the line in Shakespeare: 'Baited like eagles having lately bathed'"—Sinclair also suggested that "the high praise the troops received abroad boosted national pride."[42]

Christopher Pugsley's backwards causality performs the same function similarly, not only contributing to the masculinist values that underwrite the discourse but also proposing that those values are foundational to the settler nation-state, Pugsley's unproblematised "we" that serves as the discourse's compact but unlocatable referent:

> Gallipoli was a major step in our recognition of ourselves as New Zealanders. It is a process that continues today. . . . Every man who served on Gallipoli endured, and established a reputation and a sense of identity that is important to us today. Through it we can establish who we are. . . . Our society today has been moulded by the Gallipoli experience. This was when we began to think for ourselves and for the first time to put New Zealand's interests first. We are the sum of what our soldiers did, what they found, and what they lost. It was the loss of innocence.[43]

The New Zealand Government's Ministry for Culture and Heritage's Anzac Day website makes a similar claim, likewise in keeping with Bean's Anzac tradition: "After Gallipoli, New Zealand had a greater confidence in its distinct identity, and a greater pride in the international contribution it could make. And the mutual respect earned during the fighting formed the basis of the close ties with Australia that continue today."[44] As the site concludes: "Today, at a time when it seems New Zealanders are increasingly keen to assert and celebrate a unique identity, we recognise Anzac Day as a central marker of our nationhood."[45]

Chris Maclean and Jock Phillips also rely on predication to promote homosociality as the basis of national identity in their government-sponsored *The Sorrow & the Pride*: "During the war itself many New Zealanders came to believe that the performance of the soldiers on foreign fields had established the country's 'manhood' in the eyes of the world. The war was considered the birth of national identity. At welcome-home receptions, and in Anzac Day speeches, the Kiwi soldier was praised for his physique, his courage, his ingenuity – and the plaudits of foreign observers were endlessly rehearsed."[46]

After stating that "[t]he cost to New Zealand was 2721 dead and 4752 wounded out of a total of 8450 men – a staggering 88 per cent casualty rate," Michael King notes that in Australia and New Zealand "[t]he necessary myth evolved quickly in both countries that they had 'come of age' on the slopes of Gallipoli. Fred Waite, official historian of the New Zealand contribution, put it this way: '[Before] the war we were an untried and insular people; after ANZAC, we were tried and trusted.'"[47]

Philippa Mein Smith, who endeavours in her national general history "to unravel the way in which key moments and episodes in New Zealand history contribute to the country's national myths," writes that "Gallipoli became the defining moment for both New Zealand and Australia in 1915 because Gallipoli was the site where their representatives of the 'coming

man' were subjected to their first – global – test and proved their manhood. The Anzacs represented the highest form of citizenship: soldiers who passed the test of war."[48]

Russell Ward ascribes a similar significance to Anzac Day for Australians: "Since the slaughter at Gallipoli the anniversary of the Landing has become not only a day of Australian mourning and remembrance for the war dead, but also the Australian national day above all others."[49]

In 2008, on Anzac Day, Australia's then Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, harnessed Bean's Anzac tradition to eulogize his fellow citizens by claiming:

> That we are a good people who want for the good of others. That we stand for a deep sense of liberty for which our forebears fought and which should never be surrendered – whatever the cost. That we are a people who by instinct cannot stand idly by and be indifferent to the suffering of others. A people with a sense of a fair go for all carved deep into our national soul. A people also alert to the needs of our friends and allies. These are the values which summoned forth the sons and daughters of ANZAC over the last 100 years from our smallest towns, our greatest cities and our most remote outback. It is this, I believe, that touches us afresh each ANZAC morning – the fresh voices of those who have indeed not grown old because their voices still whisper to us amid the quiet reflections of this sombre day . . . [c]ausing us to remember afresh . . . that . . . freedom is always purchased by sacrifice. Lest we forget.[50]

What, then, apart from the apparently inexhaustible rhetoric, are the linguistic and cultural devices and strategies that enable the violence and slaughter of this large-scale military misadventure to be transformed into "a central marker" of nationhood for Australia and New Zealand?[51]

First, in order to become *the* icon of Australasian settlerism, "Gallipoli" required a radicalized theology with a verifiable backstory of epic proportions—that is, it needed to be repackaged as a new kind of narrative in which the sacred and the secular co-existed. This meant a melding of two great traditions: Christianity and empiricism. Hence, we find the empirical history of the Gallipoli campaign, along with all its grim accoutrements, adorned with quasi-religious symbolism, the apogee of which is its own religious relic: the remains of an unidentified combatant, the Unknown Soldier, enshrined within a tomb. Conjoined, the sacred and secular provide a seemingly unassailable sense of certainty to the improbable idea that the national consciousness of Australia and New Zealand was conceived during the invasion of a distant foreign land. Indeed, such is the potency of this sacred/secular narrative that it has largely seduced two settler populations into believing that it defines and legitimates their exceptionalised selves and their civilising destinies.

Second, the legend needed staging as a spectacle. This occurs every April 25th when the discourse of Gallipoli is theatricalised through a nation-wide performance of remembrance broadcast on radio and television from locations around Australian and New Zealand and packaged in patriotic terms by the nation's leading "actors," who, in the major urban centres, are typically surrounded by a large supporting cast of representatives from the armed forces and central and local government.

The 25th of April 2009 in New Zealand was exemplary in this regard. That day there were three principal actors who took to the national stage as part of this complex choreography: the Right Honourable Sir Anand Satyanand, Governor-General of New Zealand, the Right Honourable Dame Sian Seerpohi Elias, Administrator of the Government of New Zealand and Chief Justice, and the Right Honourable John Phillip Key, Prime Minister of New Zealand.

Satyanand travelled to Turkey to attend the Anzac Day Dawn Service at Anzac Cove, where, echoing Christopher Pugsley, he told the gathering of 7,500 that "New Zealanders lost

their innocence at Gallipoli but from that loss of innocence, and from deep grief at the loss of so much life, New Zealanders also came to see their nation as more than just an adjunct to Great Britain."[52] Later in the day he delivered his Chunuk Bair Address. "[T]his battle," he said, "has a wider significance for New Zealand and New Zealanders. Like the splitting of the atom and the conquering of Mt Everest, the story of Chunuk Bair has become a legendary part of what it means to be a New Zealander."[53] Although Satyanand used the referent Chunuk Bair to anchor his speech, he was really talking about national exceptionalism and identity and notions of cultural difference on which they are based. We know this because two of the notable events he referenced—Ernest Rutherford's splitting of the atom (1917) and Edmund Hillary and Tensing Norgay's ascent of Everest (1953)—occurred after the battle for the Chunuk Bair summit in August 1915. While these events have no logical connection to each other outside of Satyanand's speech, their connection appears indissoluble because the speech was made while Satyanand was standing on the spot, a literal merging of signifier and referent at the moment he ascribed meaning to the nominal designator, Chunuk Bair. Even the sense of his statement is dependent not on the existence of the place, Chunuk Bair, but on Chunuk Bair having been invested with particular meaning within the Anzac tradition. In other words, Satyanand was not extracting meaning from the geographical location Chunuk Bair but applying meaning to it from New Zealand's settler historiography that supports the originary fiction of New Zealand's national birth. Having offered his audience a retroactive fantasy, Satyanand then produced his counterfactual moment in which he claimed that "failure to press home" the advantage of the winning of Chunuk Bair by the New Zealanders "doomed the Gallipoli campaign and led eventually to the evacuation of Allied troops just before Christmas 1915."[54] But that was not before the New Zealanders, while briefly in possession of Chunuk Bair, were purportedly shelled by an Allied warship, for which Satyanand relied on British historian Robert Rhodes James quoting Captain Hastings fourteen years after the incident.[55] That was the cue for Satyanand's "*incorporated fiction*": "In his play, 'Once on Chunuk Bair,' New Zealand playwright Maurice Shadbolt recounted the taking of the summit. He imagined the following response by New Zealand's Colonel to a British general's enquiry about progress:

> '*Tell him some scarecrows called Wellington Infantry have taken Chunuk Bair. No. Tell him, God damn it, that New Zealand has taken Chunuk Bair. Tell him New Zealand is holding Chunuk Bair*.'"[56]

In the National War Memorial in Wellington, Elias gave "the oral history reading"—part of an interview in 1982 by Shadbolt of Dan Curham, the only survivor of sixteen companions who had set out together on the Chunuk Bair offensive:

> By some miracle I was the only one who got anywhere near the summit of Chunuk Bair. I never saw or heard of my companions again. I don't even know what happened to their bodies. I didn't weep physically. I was not a weeping chap. I wept in my heart. I have felt their loss very deeply for the rest of my life. Talking about Gallipoli, especially about Chunuk Bair, brings sorrow to my heart, even as I talk to you now.[57]

Elias's rendition of sacrifice and stoicism was followed by Key's Anzac Day address, which includes the now familiar truth-claim that "both New Zealand and Australia emerged with a new sense of certainty about our place in the world" from Gallipoli.[58] Key continued:

> Anzac Day unites generations of Kiwis and binds us to our history as a country. Today we mark our proud history of sacrifice and heroism, we remember those men and women who put their lives on the line for our country, and who fought for a better world. . . . Let us celebrate the Anzac spirit we continue to share with our Australian neighbours. For we who were brothers in arms are brothers still. Finally today let us salute the Anzacs who fought for us . . . to preserve our freedom and

> humanitarian ideals . . . who rose to heights of sacrifice and, in doing so, preserved the living standards of all of us, for generations to come. They fought for each and every one of us, they fought for New Zealand, and they fought for our world.[59]

While this address may have struck a patriotic chord with many who heard it, it was, in effect, a violation of the chronology on which it depends. Those in the Gallipoli campaign could not have been fighting for "our" freedom because most of "us" in 2009 were not alive in 1915; they, the "brothers in arms," had no concept of "our" living standards, and, more likely than not, were having an overseas adventure on the politics of empire, fighting not for their country, let alone "our" nonexistent world, but for the British Empire.[60]

We can see, then, a clear correspondence between the actors' rhetoric and the work of the historians and writers on which their speeches are based. Part of a deceased author's research material for his 1982 play was rendered as a "sacred" reading in Wellington's "cathedral of death" on the same day an extract from his play was read at Gallipoli, thereby turning absence into presence by collapsing chronological time on which their narratives are based: a performance by government "actors" in 2009, an interview from 1982, and a military invasion in 1915. Importantly, the extract from Shadbolt's play was immediately preceded by the ostensive phrase, "once on Chunuk Bair," the "cognitive pretensions" of which were realised, as we have seen, by it being read at the geographical locus to which it refers.[61] In this way the imaginative referent of the phrase and play ("Chunuk Bair") attains an apparent tangibility and its attendant meaning is transformed into an apparent reality cognised through Satyanand's performance. Hence, the meaning attributed to the nominal designator "Chunuk Bair" in Wellington was carried to the geographical location Chunuk Bair by the country's nominal head where it was delivered to an expectant audience for whom, in that physical setting, it made sense, despite that same nominal designator holding quite different meaning for those who actually live nearby. Thus because of the rigidity of the nominal designator, which permits the attachment of different meaning in different discourses to its unchanging name, and through the conflation of the ostensive and the cognitive in the narrative, the notional attained the status of the tangible thereby enabling the transformation of wholesale death into the imaginary moment of collective birth.

Self-evidently, however, there is nothing real about any of this except for the performances themselves, the carefully choreographed spectacle of government representatives circulating a nationalistic theology, "designed," as George Orwell puts it, "to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind."[62] For while we might set foot on the Gallipoli Peninsula, even stumble across the detritus of war—bullets, shrapnel, human remains—we cannot best the Grandfather Paradox and travel back in time. Indeed, all that remains visible at Gallipoli are the names of the missing and the dead, names that have no meaning, only a function to which can be attached "an indefinite number of unpredictable descriptions."[63] Thus, the Anzac legend, with Gallipoli as its central motif, remains the principal foundational discourse of Australasian settlerism, a totalising fiction that allows the settlers' world to be placed "under a description which then acts *as if* it were real."[64] Put otherwise, the meaning of Gallipoli is not extracted from the place called Gallipoli but is added to it by way of an elaborate rhetorical and metaphorical operation that not only retroactively supports the idea of Gallipoli as a sacred site of national nativity but also acts as a collective pedagogy offering one of the central names and stories that facilitate entry into Australasian settler culture for both the child and the immigrant, through an apprenticeship in proper names, heroes, places and dates.[65]

What, then, might be the reasons for attaching this fabulistic meaning to "Gallipoli" and how might we account for its astonishing success as arguably the central sign of Australasian

settlerism? While we can only speculate and, like the historian, not escape history's impossible possibility, what we can say from the historiographical making over of settler sites and the way linguistic systems function is that all settler societies construct their originary selves in opposition to the indigenous societies they displace. That is why the Gallipoli discourse performs such a vital double function for the Australasian settler nation-states: it not only acts as "the moment of foundation," the moment of "real" national birth that supersedes the "unreal" originary myths and traditions of tāngata whenua but also acts as "the instituting moment" that introduces and extols "superior" settler values and related benefits, which in turn legitimate the prior settler acts of expropriation.[66] Hence the extraordinary investment by Australia and New Zealand in the Anzac legend may be considered more or less commensurate with the level of violence and deception visited on their indigenous populations and the correlative need to forget the associated acts of dispossession and displacement. That is, because these settler societies cannot squarely face what they have done, because they cannot square their need to belong with the cost of that belonging, they facilitate, in their annual re-staging of this spectacle of remembrance, this "instituting moment" that doubles as an exculpatory myth, a spectacular forgetting that situates their crimes, at least temporarily, beyond their collective consciences.[67] Remembering *is* forgetting on Anzac Day. As Ani Mikaere has it in regard to non-indigenous New Zealanders: "One barely has to scratch the Pākehā surface to find the guilt lying immediately beneath, guilt which manifests itself as denial, self-justification, defensiveness and, incredibly enough, a sense of victimhood. . . . The cost to Pākehā . . . is a burden of shame that they cannot escape."[68] Across the Tasman, Marilyn Lake considers that Anzac "serve[s] as White Australia's creation myth," and Martin Ball that it "is a means of forgetting the origins of Australia. The Aboriginal population is conveniently absent."[69] In other words, the expropriation of both geographical domains has left an ethical deficit of such monumental proportions that it must be exchanged for an equivalent benefit if these settler societies are to maintain belief in their legitimacy and their civilising destinies.

To elaborate, the Anzac narrative of national nativity both *remembers* the imperial violence of the Gallipoli invasion and *forgets* the imperial violence used to dispossess the Australian and New Zealand indigenous populations of their land, along with the ignoble values associated with the brutality, deception, murder, greed, ruthlessness and treachery that accompanied those acts of dispossession but for which these societies would rather not be known or remembered. In this regard, Anzac Day, as a day of national theatre, works a treat. With its eerie mix of faux religion and military rehearsal, it acts out a notional exchange in which the colossal loss of life that occurred during the Gallipoli campaign (and the wider cataclysms of World Wars I and II) is exchanged for the perceived benefits of nationhood and the masculinist values that underwrite it: courage, duty, endurance, honour, mateship, self-sacrifice.

Congenital to this process of constructing settler nation-states as a collective and progressive good is the savage/civilised binary opposition that establishes the settler story as hegemonic and the settler as the civiliser of the savage. It also underwrites settler ideology and acts as settlerism's mythopoeic trope. As a result, settler violence is valorised as epic, sacred and rules-based while indigenous violence is demonised as hypersavage, barely human and irrational. This is apparent in New Zealand's early settler literature as well as its contemporary settler historiography. For example, when James Belich, after demographer Ian Pool, realised that an 80,000 fatalities figure for the Musket Wars, inter-iwi battles fought from the early 1800s to the 1830s, "would have left few Maori alive," he pulled that figure back to Arthur Thomson's original 20,000, but in the process made the following claim: "The Musket Wars were the largest conflict ever fought on New Zealand soil. They killed more New Zealanders than World War One – perhaps about 20,000."[70] Gavin McLean picked up this alarm bell and rang it even harder: "The butcher's bill for these wars is as hazy as many of the events, but

even if scholars now discount an earlier estimate of 80,000 deaths from fighting or disease, the lowest recent guestimate, 20,000 plus, exceeds the New Zealand casualties in either of the two world wars; and if measured in terms of casualties per head of population, they were even worse."[71] According to McLean: "On a per capita basis that would equate to about 200,000 deaths in World War I instead of the 18,000 lives actually lost."[72] While space does not permit a demonstration of the implausibility of this extrapolation or that when applied in the reverse it produces a fatalities figure for the Musket Wars of less than 2,000, it should be noted that it has the same effect as Michael King's labelling the Musket Wars a "'holocaust'": it denigrates tāngata whenua to the benefit of the settler population.[73] As does the version of it published on the Ministry for Culture and Heritage's website *New Zealand History Online*: "Tens of thousands of Māori died in the intertribal Musket Wars of the opening decades of the 19th century. On a per capita basis the estimated casualty figures for these wars are equivalent to around 200,000 New Zealand deaths in the First World War (in which 18,000 lives were actually lost)."[74] In comparison with the 200,000, the estimated 3,000 fatalities of the so-called New Zealand Wars, wars of dispossession fought mainly between British imperial troops and Māori between the 1840s and early 1870s, seem like small change indeed.[75]

Likewise, Peter Hawes, in his review of Ron Crosby's *The Musket Wars*, deploys hypersignification to much the same effect:

> The Musket Wars is an account of the Maori utu campaigns between about 1807 and 1840, and depicts a barbarous frenzy of ethnic cleansing on a greater relative scale than anything between Tutsi and Hutu or that [which] occurred last century in Kosovo. . . . What happened in musket war aftermaths . . . had been unknown in Europe since the days of Neanderthal Man: kai tangata. "[They] were to eat on the remains until the stench of putrefaction drove them away." There are about five such cannibal feasts to a chapter, involving a menu of thousands. . . . It's a salutary read. Unfortunately, it must be read, for the effects of those dreadful times are, as Mr Crosby proves, with us today, and will be here again tomorrow.[76]

That is, by denigrating indigenous violence while valorising settler violence, the settler society is able to retroactively legitimate its tenuous moral and legal claim to the expropriated geography it now controls by promoting the positive values it has attached to the heroic and epic deeds of its progenitors. Thus, what is on display every Anzac Day is not so much a collective mourning as an economy of desire expressed in quasi-religious terms backed by the power of the state. In this "civil religion," or "cult" as Belich has it, which supplants but not entirely replaces the de facto state religion, Anglicanism, the proper names "Australia" and "New Zealand" substitute for the Supreme Being, "God."[77] Sian Elias's oral history substitutes for the Gospel reading as does John Key's address for the sermon, both of which tell of past heroic actions and articulate a creed based on the values believed to be inherent in those deeds. Dedicated spaces, such as the altar in the World War I Sanctuary at the Auckland War Memorial Museum and the Hall of Memories that serves as the commemorative chapel of the National War Memorial in Wellington, substitute for the sacred space of churches. Golgotha, the Biblical site of crucifixion, becomes, for New Zealanders, Chunuk Bair, the elevated site of death. The Bible's Good Samaritan is, for New Zealanders, the medic Richard Henderson and his donkey Roly, and for Australians, Simpson and his donkey Murphy.[78] Christ, who died "for everyone," becomes the Unknown Warrior who "represents all New Zealanders who were never to return from war," and "the life everlasting," from the Apostles' Creed, becomes "Lest we forget," Anzac Day's appeal for collective rememoration, which in turn facilitates the "secular transformation of fatality into continuity."[79]

Fittingly, it was the Governor-General, Silvia Cartwright, as representative of New Zealand's Head of State, Queen Elizabeth II, who delivered the eulogy at the interment

ceremony of the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior in 2004, and, in the process, confirmed that this discourse of the dead is a safe one indeed. For while Cartwright subsequently wonders in her eulogy who this soldier might be, in the following extract she conjures up a sense of certainty about him that seems impolitic to question, not least because his memory has been installed "as remembrance within the sacred":

> He died wearing a New Zealand uniform, and shared with those he had left on the other side of the world his belief that the lives of many might be better, by risking his own. His was the hope that when the days, the years, of fighting were done, and the troop ships sailed south, he would return to what mattered most. To be with the people he came from. To live again with the coasts of his own country around him, among the hills he knew as a boy, in the streets where he had grown up. These are the simple things he left and gave his life for. And now we have brought him home.[80]

Although much contested during its early development, "Gallipoli" is now a sign that functions synecdochally: it stands for all *our* war dead; it stands for *us*. In this theatre of desire there is no excluded middle: you are either a believer or you are not, either for us or against us, either an apostle or an apostate. With an extensive record of photographs, official despatches, personal letters and journals "to signify that the event represented has *really* taken place," it not only meets the criteria for being a proper object of historical study, it also satisfies modernity's taste for the verisimilar and for sacralized relics of war.[81]

February 6, New Zealand Day or Waitangi Day, the day in 1840 when the British Crown and Māori first signed te Tiriti o Waitangi, the te reo version of The Treaty of Waitangi, provides an arresting counterpoint to Anzac Day. For while Waitangi Day "is recognised as New Zealand's national day," it is still too heavily contested to comfortably fulfil that role.[82] It is a day when Pākehā are too readily reminded of the "long history of place," as Stephen Turner describes it, that precedes their "conquest by contract," migratory invasion and war by which their progenitors converted their status as guests or visitors (manuhiri) to that of owners and governors.[83] That is why, concluded and largely uncontested, Anzac Day, unlike Waitangi Day, provides an annual occasion during which those ignoble values characteristic of European settler societies can be overwritten by noble ones. Thus sense trumps senselessness, and Anzac Day becomes the de facto national day. Furthermore, Waitangi Day as a national day is problematic for Pākehā in that they have already realised the benefit in this notional exchange of savagery for civilisation, of tribalism for nationhood: economic and political control of the expropriated geography.

Similar comments may be made about the official national day in Australia, Australia Day, January 26, that marks the arrival in Sydney Harbour in 1788 of the First Fleet of eleven British convict ships. As with Māori on Waitangi Day, Australia Day sees significant protests from Aboriginal people (First Australians) and their supporters, most notably the "Invasion Day" protests begun in 1988. This should not surprise. By treating Australia "as *terra nullius*—land owned by no one, and therefore available for the taking"—a notion based on the concept of *res nullius* or nobody's property, Britain "vested ownership of the entire continent in" its "government," despite it being inhabited shore to shore by a population estimated at "300,000" belonging to "more than 250 tribes, each with their own language, laws and territorial boundaries" that had lived there for at least 40,000 years or 1200 human generations.[84] But such is the utility of this legal doctrine, according as it does with settler Australia's belief in itself and its progressive destiny, that Australia's current Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, an author and former Rhodes Scholar, could claim that Australia was "unsettled or scarcely

settled" before the First Fleet's arrival, despite *terra nullius* having been overturned by the High Court of Australia in 1992.[85]

We should not be surprised, then, that New Zealand's principal "actors" on Anzac Day 2009 failed to mention that the imperial violence used against the Turks in 1915 had been used against Māori some fifty years earlier in the New Zealand Wars. Likewise, Charles Bean, in his claim of "126 peaceful years" of existence in Australia prior to World War I, elides from his narrative the purportedly numerous First Australian frontier deaths at the hands of settlers.[86] We might also take it that Kevin Rudd's description of his fellow Australians as wanting "for the good of others" did not apply to the Turks during the Gallipoli invasion, nor that it has any real compensatory application for Aborigines today despite his apology on 13 February 2008 for the Stolen Generations (Aboriginal children taken from their families between 1910 and 1970), an apology, despite its plea for reconciliation, still firmly imbedded in the progressive narrative of Australia and predicated on, as Rudd put it, "a core value of our nation—and that value is a fair go for all."[87]

These often highly conflicted truth-claims are all part and parcel of the legitimising grand narratives deployed by settler societies, the teleologies of which are always already oriented towards the realisation of their civilising projects and the fulfilment of their idealised selves in "the not-yet-now."[88] These narratives are not only self-authorising but are also able to negate competing indigenous narratives by dint of presenting themselves as superior by virtue of the progress they denote. However, just as "the not-yet-now" cannot arrive and still be the future, so the goals of these narratives cannot be realized and still remain the focus of the collective progress to come.[89] It is for these reasons that these goals are kept alive in the future anterior of their narratives and regularly updated.[90] In the case of Australia and New Zealand, as this article has tried to show, an important part of that process is the annual re-staging of the quasi-religious spectacle of Anzac Day with its sacralization of the noble values "discovered" in the carnage of Gallipoli and elevated in the national consciousness to the point where they effectively occlude, on the one hand, "the criminality of the act of foundation of what became known as 'Australia,'" and, on the other, the brutality and betrayal by which an archipelago, called New Zealand by Europeans, was also taken over by the British.[91] While this combined expropriation of around eight million square kilometres might seem of staggering proportions, it pales into insignificance, or so the Anzac legend would have us believe, compared with fighting and dying for freedom and saving civilisation itself. Such is the thin but glistening thread of exculpatory memory to which Australasian settlerism clings.

Lest we remember/"Lest we forget".[92]

---

[1] I would like to thank the early readers of this article, Associate Professor Kim Phillips and Dr. Stephen Turner of the University of Auckland for their encouragement and advice, my anonymous peer reviewers for their insights and suggestions, and Associate Professor Anna Green for her editorial wisdom.

[2] Jacques Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, trans. Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes (London: Routledge, 2001), 57.

[3] C. E. W. Bean, *The Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-1918: Volume II – The Story of Anzac: From 4 May, 1915, to the Evacuation*, 11th ed. (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1941, first published 1924), 910: http://www.awm.gov.au/histories/first_world_war/volume.asp?levelID=67888.

[4] C. E. W. Bean, *ANZAC to Amiens* (Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 1983, first published 1946), 533-4: http://static.awm.gov.au/images/collection/pdf/RCDIG1069800--1-.PDF.

[5] Ibid., 538-9.

[6] Tim Watkin, "Forever Young," *New Zealand Listener*, Issue 2289 (23 April 2005): 26, accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.listener.co.nz/issue/3389/features/3829/forever_young.html.

[7] Garth George, "Long May Our Young Make a Pilgrimage," *The New Zealand Herald* (23 April 2009), accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.nzherald.co.nz/opinion/news/article.cfm?c_id=466&objectid=10568050&pnum=0.
[8] Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*," trans. Marc Roudebush, *Representations*, 26 (1989), 7-24.
[9] Ibid., 19.
[10] Ibid., 9.

[11] For an instructive discussion of this contestation see Scott Worthy, "Communities of Remembrance: The Memory of the Great War in New Zealand 1915-1939," MA thesis (University of Auckland, 2001), Chapter Two. Also see *Paradise Reforged* in which James Belich suggests that April 25th became the sacred day of the Anzac cult that grew up around those who had died in World War I, the "18,000 Kiwi Christs," as he describes them, whose "sacrifice had not been for much." This cult, according to Belich, did not reflect an emerging or independent nationalism because the men "had not died in a cause that could be easily or directly related to separate New Zealand national interests." Rather, "[t]he nobility of their sacrifice depended on the conceptual merging of British and New Zealand interests" expressed through "dominionism." In support of his argument, Belich points to the many "imperial and classical images" and the corresponding scarcity of "ferns, kiwi, and New Zealand flags" used in war memorial iconography, as well as to the 1920s New Zealand published textbook, *Our Nation's Story,* from which, for several decades, New Zealand's primary school children learned their history but in which "'Our Nation' was Britain, not New Zealand" (James Belich, *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000* [Auckland: Allen Lane, 2001], 116-8). Ron Palenski has also challenged the Anzac legend as the central marker of national identity in New Zealand. Palenski postulates "a process of osmosis," or "an accumulation and aggregation of events" that both preceded and included Gallipoli in the awakening of national consciousness that made New Zealanders aware of what they already knew: that they were New Zealanders and that New Zealand was "different and distinct" (Ron Palenski, "The Making of New Zealanders: The Evolution of National Identity in the Nineteenth Century," PhD thesis [University of Otago, 2010], 315, 319).

[12] Roland Barthes, *Image-Music-Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Yang, 1978, first published 1977), 94.

[13] Eelco Runia, "Spots of Time," *History and Theory*, 45/3 (2006), 306; Keith Jenkins, *On "What is History?": From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White* (London: Routledge, 1995), 9.

[14] Jacques Derrida, "Declarations of Independence," *New Political Science*, 7/1 (1986), 10.

[15] Richard Beardsworth, *Derrida & the Political* (Abington: Routledge, 1996), 100; Derrida, "Declarations of Independence," 10; Luisa Passerini, "History and Semiotics," *Historein*, 1 (1999), 13-14.

[16] Elizabeth Deeds Ermarth, *History in the Discursive Condition: Reconsidering the Tools of Thought* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), 21. History as it is widely known—variously described as empirical, positivist, scientific, or evidence-based—and as it is still widely practised, may arguably be traced to the publication in 1824 of Leopold Ranke's first book of history, *Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations from 1494-1514*, in the Preface of which Ranke famously declared it "wants only to show what actually happened (*wie es eigentlich gewesen*)" (Leopold von Ranke, "Preface: *Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations from 1494-1514*," Fritz Stern [ed.], *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present* [London: Macmillan, 1970], 57). While Ermarth regards the nineteenth century as "the apogee of history as an explanatory system," she also argues more broadly for its emergence as "a

temporal variant" of "neutral space" produced by "single-point perspective systems" developed during the Quattrocento (*History in the Discursive Condition*, 29, 19, 23, 16).

[17] Roland Barthes, *The Rustle of Language*, trans. Richard Howard (Berkley: University of California Press, 1989, first published 1986), 139.
[18] Peter Charles Hoffer, *The Historians' Paradox: A Study of History in Our Time*, (New York: New York University Press, 2008), 179.
[19] Barthes, *The Rustle of Language*, 138-9, 148.
[20] Ibid., 148, 139.
[21] Ibid., 139.
[22] Joanna Hodge, *Derrida on Time* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 8.
[23] Ermarth, *History in the Discursive Condition*, 98.
[24] Ibid.
[25] J. Ellis McTaggart, "The Unreality of Time," *Mind*, New Series, 17/68 (1908), 468.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.

[28] Passerini, "History and Semiotics," 14; Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, 57; Simon Critchley, "Heidegger's Being and Time, Part 8: Temporality," *The Guardian* (27 July 2009), accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/belief/2009/jul/27/heidegger-being-time-philosophy.

[29] Elizabeth Deeds Ermarth, *Sequel to History: Postmodernism and the Crisis of Representational Time* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 20; Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 2.

[30] Stephen Turner, "Settlement as Forgetting," Klaus Neumann, Nicholas Thomas and Hilary Ericksen (eds), *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1999), 22.

[31] Michael King, *Being Pakeha Now: Reflections and Recollections of a White Native* (Auckland: Penguin, 2004), Front Cover. This appears to be a reworking of the following: "People who live in New Zealand by choice as distinct from an accident of birth, and who are committed to this land and its people and steeped in their knowledge of both, are no less 'indigenous' than Maori" (King, *Being Pakeha Now*, 235); Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 12; Peter Gibbons, "Reviews: *Paradise Reforged*," *The New Zealand Journal of History*, 36/1 (2002), 98. A speech given in 2004 to the Stout Research Centre for New Zealand Studies, Wellington, by the then Coordinating Minister, Race Relations, the Hon. Trevor Mallard, exemplifies how this belief in settler indigeneity is rationalised and promulgated: "Maori and Pakeha are both indigenous people to New Zealand now. I regard myself as an indigenous New Zealander - I come from Wainuiomata. . . . Indigeneity is about the diversity of ways in which we belong and identify with our country. There are Chinese and Indian New Zealanders who have become deeply indigenous too, just like other kiwis whose forbears come from a huge range of other countries. Michael King was passionate about New Zealand and about the emergence of a unique New Zealand identity. He rightly pointed out that for most New Zealanders, regardless of their ethnicity, home is here, Aotearoa New Zealand. He argued that just because one group has been here longer than another does not make its members more New Zealand than later arrivals, nor does it give them the right to exclude others from full participation in national life" (Trevor Mallard, "We Are All New Zealanders Now," The official website of the New Zealand Government (28 July 2004), accessed July, 24 2014, http://www.beehive.govt.nz/node/20451). According to the *Māori Dictionary/Te Aka Māori-English*, Pākehā means "New Zealander of European descent" and was "probably originally applied to English-speaking Europeans living in Aotearoa/New Zealand." For a discussion of its etymology see the *Māori Dictionary/Te Aka Māori-English*
http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/search?idiom=&phrase=&proverb=&loan=&keywords=Pakeha&search= ,

http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/search?idiom=&phrase=&proverb=&loan=&keywords=tūrehu&search=, and Michael King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand* (Auckland: Penguin Books, 2003), 168-9.

[32] Transcendental signifiers or transcendental signifieds, as Jacques Derrida terms them, are effectively control words such as "God," "truth," "justice," "evidence," that call a halt to the regress of meaning within a discourse by bringing "a reassuring end to the reference from sign to sign" (Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, corrected edn, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak [Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997, first published 1974], 49); Jean-François Lyotard, "The Sign of History," trans. Geoffrey Bennington, Derek Attridge, Geoff Bennington and Robert Young (eds), *Post-structuralism and the Question of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, first published 1987), 174.
[33] Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. Roy Harris (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1993, first published 1983), 118 [166].
[34] Ibid., 67 [100].

[35] Ermarth, *History in the Discursive Condition*, 38.

[36] Ibid., 39.

[37] Jacques Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), 280.

[38] Ibid., 281.

[39] We should note, as a consequence of cultural shifts and the inherent instability and dynamism of language, that an alternate term, concept or subject may join or replace the initial one in the minor binary oppositional role as the latter's ability to assist the dominant or more privileged of the pairing constitute its changing self diminishes in effectiveness. We can see this occurring in New Zealand historiography when the British begin to supplant Maori in that minor binary role so that the original colonisers, the settlers, become, in effect, the colonised. James Belich introduces this modified differential relationship by way of his "recolonisation" and "decolonisation" theses, the former of which he describes as "inverse colonialism" and "the backbone of this book" (*Paradise Reforged*, 12).
[40] Keith Sinclair, *A History of New Zealand*, New Edition, (Auckland: Penguin Books, 1991, first published 1959), 232.

[41] Ibid., 233.

[42] Keith Sinclair, *A Destiny Apart: New Zealand's Search for National Identity* (Wellington: Allen & Unwin in association with Port Nicholson Press, 1986), 171; John Masefield, *Gallipoli* (London: Heinemann, 1918, first published 1916), 19.

[43] Christopher Pugsley, *Gallipoli: The New Zealand Story* (Auckland: Reed Publishing, 1998, first published 1984), 23, 27, 357.

[44] Ministry for Culture and Heritage/Manatu taonga, "Significance of Anzac Day," accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.anzac.govt.nz/significance/index.html.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Chris Maclean and Jock Phillips, *The Sorrow & the Pride: New Zealand War Memorials* (Wellington: Historical Branch and GP Books, 1990), 71.

[47] King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand*, 300-1.

[48] Philippa Mein Smith, *A Concise History of New Zealand*, 2nd edn, (Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2012, first published 2005), xix, 130.

[49] Russell Ward, *The Australian Legend* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2003, first published 1966), 233.

[50] Kevin Rudd, "Text of Prime Minister Kevin Rudd's Speech at the Anzac Day Dawn Service in Canberra," *The Australian* (25 April 2008), accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.theaustralian.com.au/archive/news/pms-speech-to-anzac-day-dawn-service/story-e6frgd0o-1111116162856.

[51] Ministry for Culture and Heritage/Manatu Taonga, "Anzac Day Today."

[52] New Zealand Press Association, "Gallipoli Sacrifice a Gift to Us – Governor-General," (25 April 2009), accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/2363570/Gallipoli-sacrifice-a-gift-to-us-Governor-General.

[53] Anand Satyanand, "Chunuk Bair Address," accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.gov-gen.govt.nz/node/1740.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid. Christopher Pugsley offered his version of the story as follows, based on two letters, the first being from Major W. H. Hastings, Indian Army, dated 5 November 1929 (Malone papers): "A shell, most probably from the New Zealand 4.5 howitzers firing from within the Anzac perimeter, burst above Malone's headquarters trench about 5.00 p.m. Swish swish came the shrapnel and all except two in our little trench were killed or wounded. Col. Jordan (Commanding Officer of the 7th Gloucesters) got a bullet through the mouth . . . Col. M[alone] was killed on the other side of me . . . he collapsed into the Adjutant's [Harston] or Cunningham's arms [Wellington Second in Command]"(Pugsley, *Gallipoli*, 300-1). In Pugsley's version, it is Captain E. S. Harston, the Adjutant, in a letter dated 5 March 1942 (Malone papers), or twenty-seven years after the event, who, as Pugsley recorded it, suggested that a warship was responsible for the shelling: "'I have always believed it was the destroyer as I saw her swing broadside on and the puffs of smoke from the gun as she fired'" (Pugsley, *Gallipoli*, 301). Les Carlyon offered his version as follows: "About 5 pm Malone was hit by a misdirected shrapnel burst fired either from an Anzac battery or a warship. According to an officer present, the shrapnel made a swishing noise. 'Col. M was killed the other side of me . . . he collapsed into the adjutant's [Harston] or Cunningham's arms.' Harston thought the shell came from a destroyer. He had seen the puffs from her guns just before Malone was hit" (Les Carlyon, *Gallipoli* [Sydney: Macmillan, 2001]), 440.

[56] Nancy F. Partner, "Historicity in an Age of Reality-Fictions," F. R. Ankersmit and Hans Kellner (eds), *A New Philosophy of History* (London: Reaktion Books, 1995), 31; Satyanand, "Chunuk Bair Address". The words in full that Maurice Shadbolt attributes to his character, Colonel Connolly, towards the end of Act One are: "Say we seem to have the war by the throat. History by the balls. Tell him some scarecrows called Wellington Infantry have taken Chunuk Bair. No. Tell him, God damn it, that New Zealand has taken Chunuk Bair. Tell him New Zealand is holding Chunuk Bair. Give me that thing [a field telephone]. I'll tell him myself" (Maurice Shadbolt, *Once on Chunuk Bair* [Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton, 1982], 68). In his review in *ACT Magazine* of the play's first production in 1982, Michael Neill notes that "*Once on Chunuk Bair* revives one of the oldest tragic forms – the play-as-monument . . . old myths are not merely refurbished, they are reinterpreted" (*Once on Chunuk Bair*, 3). Mervyn Thompson's 1982 review in *The Auckland Star* has this to say: "*Chunuk Bair* is about the birth of a nation. It salutes the dawning of the consciousness which tells us that authenticity for New Zealanders is not found clinging to apron strings . . . The great pity is that 67 years after Gallipoli theatre audiences should still need to hear the message Shadbolt so powerfully untangles from that tragedy" (*Once on Chunuk Bair*, 4). Frances Edmond, in concluding her review of The Auckland Theatre Company's 2014

production of *Once on Chunuk Bair* at The Maidment, Auckland, writes: "The play is 30 years old, and although a slightly dated feel occasionally emerges, the question of national identity, how we define it, is relevant today. The opening night audience gave this significant production a well-deserved standing ovation: this is our history, our national story" (Frances Edmond, "Once on Chunuk Bair – Review," *Metro* (16 June 2014), accessed 22 July 2014, http://metromag.co.nz/culture/stage/once-on-chunuk-bair-review/.

[57] Sian Elias, "Oral History Reading at National Wreath Laying Ceremony," Wellington, 25 April 2009, accessed January 7, 2014, http://tvnz.co.nz/national-news/anzac-day-wellingtons-wreath-laying-ceremony-0-35-2673896.

[58] John Key, "Anzac Day Address at National Wreath Laying Ceremony," Wellington, 25 April 2009, accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/anzac+address+national+wreath+laying+ceremony.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Jean-François Lyotard, *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*, trans. Georges Van Den Abbeele (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007, first published 1988), 42 §64.
[62] George Orwell, *In Front of Your Nose 1945-1950*, Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus (eds) (London: Secker & Warburg, 1970, first published 1968), 170.

[63] Geoffrey Bennington, *Lyotard: Writing the Event* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008, first published 1988), 121.

[64] Keith Jenkins, *Why History?: Ethics and Postmodernity* (London: Routledge, 1999), 86.

[65] Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Explained to Children: Correspondence 1982-1985*, trans. Don Berry and others, translations edited by Julian Pefanis and Morgan Thomas (Sydney: Power Publications, 1992), 42.

[66] Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, 57. Tāngata whenua means people of the land/placenta. It is also sometimes used by Māori to refer to other indigenous peoples.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ani Mikaere, "Are We All New Zealanders Now? A Māori Response to the Pākehā Quest for Indigeneity," Bruce Jesson Memorial Lecture 2004, 10-11. Available at: http://www.brucejesson.com/?page_id=349.

[69] Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds with Mark McKenna and Joy Damousi, *What's Wrong with ANZAC?: The Militarisation of Australian History* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010), 1; Martin Ball, "What the Anzac Revival Means," *The Age* (24 April 2004): http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2004/04/23/1082616327419.html, accessed July 16, 2014.

[70] James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders From Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century (*Auckland: Allen Lane, 1996), 157; Arthur S. Thomson, *The Story of New Zealand: Past and Present—Savage and Civilized* (London: John Murray, 1859), 261. The 80,000 fatalities figure first appeared in print in S. Percy Smith, *Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century: The Struggle of the Northern against the Southern Maori Tribes Prior to the Colonisation of New Zealand in 1840* (Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs, 1910), 476, was repeated in Elsdon Best, *Maori: Volume II* (Wellington: Board of Maori Ethnological Research, 1941, first published 1924), 285, and in W. H.

Oliver, *The Story of New Zealand* (London: Faber, 1960), 40. Ian Pool's "best estimate" for the entire Maori population at 1840 is 80,000: Ian D. Pool, *Te Iwi Maori: A New Zealand Population Past, Present & Projected* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1991), 58.

[71] Gavin McLean, "When Worlds Collide, 1642-1839," Bronwyn Dalley and Gavin McLean (eds), *Frontier of Dreams: The Story of New Zealand* (Auckland: Hatchette Livre, 2005), 78. Contrary to McLean's assertion, the original "guestimate" of 20,000 was the first to appear in print and did so in Thomson's *The Story of New Zealand* in 1859, with Smith's 80,000 not appearing in print until 1910 in his *Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century*.

[72] Gavin McLean, "New Zealand's Internal Wars – an Overview," Gavin McLean and Ian McGibbon (eds), *The Penguin Book of New Zealanders at War* (Auckland: Penguin Books, 2009), 28.

[73] King, *The Penguin History of New Zealand*, 134. Briefly, McLean's 200,000 fatalities figure is highly improbable for a country with a population of just over one million in 1914. Furthermore, when McLean's fatalities-to-population formula is applied in reverse using the WWI figures, it produces a Musket Wars fatalities figure that is more in keeping with the estimated 3,000 fatalities of the New Zealand Wars. That is, the 18,500 WWI deaths equate to approximately 1.75 per cent of New Zealand's then total population, and when that percentage is applied to the total population of pre-Treaty New Zealand relied on by McLean,100,000, it produces a fatalities figure in the order of 1,750 for the Musket Wars (100,000 x 1.75 / 100). Alternatively, based on the number of fatalities (18,500) New Zealand sustained in WWI as a percentage of the number of military personnel (103,000) it sent overseas to fight in WWI, for McLean's 200,000 to have any plausibility, New Zealand needed to mobilise 1,113,586 or 55,274 more personnel than its total population of 1,058,312 (at the 1911 Census).

[74] "Writing About New Zealand's Internal Wars," URL: http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/photo/writing-about-new-zealands-internal-wars, (Ministry for Culture and Heritage), updated 20-Jun-2014.

[75] *New Zealand History online*, "New Zealand's 19th-century Wars – Overview," accessed January 14, 2014, URL: http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/war/new-zealands-19th-century-wars/introduction, (Ministry for Culture and Heritage), updated 20-Dec-2012. *New Zealand History Online*/Nga korero a ipurangi o Aotearoa "is produced by the History Group of the New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage."

[76] R. D. Crosby, *The Musket Wars: A History of Inter-Iwi Conflict 1806-45*, 2nd ed. (Auckland: Reed, 2001, first published 1999); Peter Hawes, "Review of The Musket Wars by R. D. Crosby," Massey Extramural Student Review, September 2000: Massey University Extramural Students' Society Inc.: http://exmss.massey.ac.nz.

[77] Simon Critchley, *Infinitely Demanding: Ethics of Commitment, Politics of Resistance* (London: Verso, 2012, first published 2008), 140; Belich, *Paradise Reforged*, 116-7.

[78] Glyn Harper, *The Donkey Man* (Auckland: Reed Publishing, 2004). "Henderson" is cited by Harper as being Soldier 3/258, Richard Alexander Henderson, a teacher from Auckland. See also "Simpson and his Donkey, Gallipoli Painting," accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/photo/simpson-and-his-donkey. John Simpson Kirkpatrick, a.k.a. "Simpson," is described by Peter Cochrane as a "Pommy, a 'new chum' in Australia," who "was planning to return home before the war broke out and enlisted to get back to England on the cheap, where he hoped to join the English army" (Peter Cochrane, *Simpson and the Donkey: The Making of a Legend* [Carlton: Melbourne, 1992], 6). According to Cochrane, "he was a political radical; he was hardly the willing solider; and he saved few, if any, lives" (Cochrane, *Simpson and the Donkey*, 6). He was first compared with the Good Samaritan by Irving Benson in 1965: "The setting for Simpson's fame," on Cochrane's view, "was not the battlefield but the recruitment crisis on the home front" (Irving Benson, *The Man with the Donkey: John Simpson Kirkpatrick, the Good Samaritan of Gallipoli*

[London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965], 4), and Simpson's "deeds" became part of the "spin" around the drive for volunteers. With so little known about him at the time, "Simpson" was effectively a blank canvas on which could be painted the ideological brushstrokes required for the early circumstances of World War I and "conservative politics thereafter" (Benson, *The Man with the Donkey*, 5). The illustration by Bruce Potter of Henderson and his donkey in Harper's *The Donkey Man*, 22, replicates the famous painting, save for the position of the soldier's head that, in the original by Moore-Jones, is resting without a helmet on "Simpson's" shoulder.

[79] Hebrews 2:9, "The New Testament," *Good News Bible: Today's English Version*, 22nd print (Wellington: The Bible Society in New Zealand, 1984, 273); The Royal New Zealand Returned and Services' Association, "Return of the Unknown Warrior," accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.mch.govt.nz/nz-identity-heritage/national-war-memorial/tomb-unknown-warrior http://www.rsa.org.nz/return-unknown-warrior; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised Edition (London: Verso, 2006, first published 1983), 11. "Lest we forget," based on Deuteronomy 6:12, comes from Rudyard Kipling's poem "Recessional," first published in *The Times* on July 17, 1897, towards the end of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee celebrations. In "Recessional," Kipling's imperialism is tempered by "a certain optimism that scared me," as he put it, arising from those celebrations (Rudyard Kipling, *Something of Myself: For My Friends Known and Unknown*, Robert Hampson ed. [Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1987, first published 1936], 120). It has been argued that the poem's warning of arrogance at a time of patriotic fervour is the complicating factor that adds power to its verse. On Angus Wilson's view, "The White Man's Burden," possibly begun by Kipling in June 1897 during the Diamond Jubilee but not published in *The Times* until February 4, 1899, "was the positive side of . . . [Kipling's] Imperial creed, as 'Recessional' was the negative side of the coin" (Norman Page, *A Kipling Companion* [London: The Macmillan Press, 1984], 184).

[80] Nora, "Between Memory and History," 9; Silvia Cartwright, "Eulogy for the Unknown Warrior," 11 November 2004, accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.gg.govt.nz/node/560. See Laura Wittman, *The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Modern Mourning, and the Reinvention of the Mystical Body* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), for a comprehensive discussion of the invention and subsequent reception of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

[81] Barthes, *The Rustle of Language*, 139.

[82] *New Zealand History Online*, "Waitangi Day," updated 1-Feb-2013, accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/treaty/waitangi-day. Waitangi Day has been a public holiday since 1974.

[83] Stephen Turner, "The Public Intellectual is a Dog," Laurence Simmons (ed.), *Speaking Truth to Power: Public Intellectuals Rethink New Zealand* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2007), 94; Stuart Banner, *Possessing the Pacific: Land, Settlers, and Indigenous People from Australia to Alaska* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 47-127.

[84] Banner, *Possessing the Pacific*, 2, 13; Kate Fullagar, *The Savage Visit: New World People and Popular Imperial Culture in Britain, 1710-1795* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2012), 173-87, 244 notes 18 and 22. See also Critchley, *Infinitely Demanding*, 109; Narrator, "Episode 1 'They Have Come to Stay': Sydney & New South Wales (1788-1824)," *First Australians: The Untold Story of Australia* (Blackfella Films/First Nation Films, 2008), Rachel Perkins and Beck Cole dirs; "Aboriginal Occupation," *Atlas of South Australia*, accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.atlas.sa.gov.au/go/resources/atlas-of-south-australia-1986/the-course-of-settlement/aboriginal-occupation; Stuart Macintyre, *A Concise History of Australia*, Third Edition (Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2009, first published 1999), 8-9.

[85] Tony Abbott as quoted by Andrew Greene, "'Prime Minister Tony Abbott's Comments on British Settlement Highly Offensive', Says Nova Peris," (ABC, 5 July 2014), accessed July 16, 2014, http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-07-04/pms-british-settlement-comments-highly-offensive-peris/5572718; *Mabo v Queensland (No 2) [1992] HCA 23; (1992) 175 CLR 1 (3 June 1992)*, accessed July 16, 2014, http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/cth/high_ct/175clr1.html. While, as the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation notes, the Australian "High Court's Mabo judgment in 1992 overturned the terra nullius fiction . . . the same judgment . . . accepted the British assertion of sovereignty in 1788, and held that from that time there was only one sovereign power and one system of law in Australia." Accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/orgs/car/docrec/policy/brief/terran.htm. Although the notions of *terra nullius* and *res nullius* are less apparent in New Zealand, traces of them may be found in William Hobson's May 1840 declaration of sovereignty "over the southern islands by right of discovery," in the reasoning behind the 1877 *Wi Parata* judgement that declared the Treaty of Waitangi "a simple nullity" (8), in the Foreshore and Seabed Act (2004) that vested ownership of the foreshore and seabed only in the Crown (4[a]), and in the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011, which, in its repeal of the Foreshore and Seabed Act, states: "Neither the Crown nor any other person owns, or is capable of owning, the common marine and coastal area" (11[2]). See Robert J. Miller, Jacinta Ruru, Larissa Behrendt, and Tracey Lindberg, *Discovering Indigenous Lands: The Doctrine of Discovery in the English Colonies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 261-2.

[86] Bean, *ANZAC to Amiens*, 538; Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark, *The History Wars* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2004, first published 2003), 129, 161. The estimated frontier fatalities of 20,000 Aborigines during 140 years of frontier conflict (1788-1928), arrived at by several historians including Henry Reynolds, but now considered by Reynolds to be "well beyond" 30,000 (*Forgotten War* [Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2013], 123, 134), along with the idea of frontier massacres of Aborigines, is vigorously disputed by Keith Windschuttle in various issues of *Quadrant* and in *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History: Volume One: Van Diemen's Land 1803-1847* (Paddington, NSW: Mcleay Press, 2002) (*The History Wars*, 161-70); Narrator, "Episode 2 'Her Will to Survive': Tasmania (1803-1880)," Beck Cole dir., *First Australians*. Also see Tracey Banivanua Mar and Penelope Edmonds, "Chapter 14 – Indigenous and Settler Relations," Alison Bashford, Stuart Macintyre (eds), *The Cambridge History of Australia* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

[87] The complete text of the Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd's apology to the Stolen Generations, "Apology to Australia's Indigenous Peoples," accessed January 7, 2014, http://www.dfat.gov.au/indigenous/apology-to-stolen-generations/rudd_speech.html.

[88] Bennington, *Lyotard*, 115; Critchley, "Heidegger's Being and Time, Part 8: Temporality."

[89] Ibid.

[90] According to my count, 32 national general histories of New Zealand were published between 1859 and 2009, with 22 of those since 1959.

[91] Critchley, *Infinitely Demanding*, 109.

[92] Rudyard Kipling, *Recessional*, June 22, 1897, Helen Gardner (ed.), *The New Oxford Book of English Verse: 125-1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 815-6.