

Duncan Marshall  
29 Angophora Street  
Rivett ACT 2611

Telephone 02 6287 1027  
Fax 02 6287 1665  
E-mail marsd@ozemail.com.au  
ABN 68 098 445 824

5 June 2005

Louise Gell  
Secretary  
Senate Finance and Public Administration Committee  
Department of the Senate  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600



Dear Ms Gell

### **Gallipoli Inquiry**

I write regarding this inquiry and in particular the reference relating to,

(c) the heritage protection of ANZAC Cove, including the proposed joint historical and archaeological survey of ANZAC Cove and proposals for the establishment of an international peace park, as well as national and world heritage listing for the area

### **Summary of Key Points**

While the terms of reference for the inquiry include a range of matters relating to past actions, I would strongly urge the Committee to give adequate consideration to the future of Gallipoli, and those things the Australian Government should be doing in the future. The future for Gallipoli is the focus of this submission.

1. The Australian Government should be offering the best Australian heritage expertise to assist in a multi-lateral conservation management planning process for the Gallipoli sites. Who should lead this process is a matter for negotiation and agreement amongst the stakeholders.
2. The interests of Turkey, Australia and other countries (such as New Zealand and Britain) should be fully considered as part of this process.
3. The conservation management planning process should consider all heritage values including the significance of the sites to Turkey, Australia and other countries. In particular, the process should consider the full history of Gallipoli, not just that related to World War I.
4. The process should be adequately resourced by the Australian Government and engage the best Australian heritage expertise in recognition of the importance of Gallipoli to Australia.

5. The conservation management planning process may take some considerable time. The Australian Government should acknowledge the process may be a long-term one, while still seeking to make reasonable progress.
6. The possible National or World Heritage listing of the Gallipoli sites should be put to one side pending satisfactory progress with the conservation management planning process.
7. The Australian Government should indicate its in-principle willingness to contribute substantial and ongoing funding for conservation and related works, if needed.
8. The Department of the Environment & Heritage should facilitate ongoing discussions amongst key Australian stakeholder groups and organisations to promote a coordinated view, if possible, about the future for Gallipoli. This task should be resourced, including periodic meetings of stakeholders.

### **Background – Duncan Marshall B.Arch (Hons), BA, MICOMOS**

I am a Heritage Consultant with 22 years experience in heritage conservation, including six years with the former Australian Heritage Commission, two years with the National Trust and 14 years in private practice. I have extensive policy and program experience at senior levels in Commonwealth agencies and the voluntary conservation movement related to heritage conservation matters.

While I have a broad knowledge of heritage issues and sites in Australia and overseas, I have no direct experience of Gallipoli, yet.

### **Discussion of Issues**

#### ***Significance of Gallipoli and Australian Heritage Expertise***

There is no doubt Gallipoli is a place of considerable heritage value to Australia. And while there are many war sites of high heritage value, Gallipoli probably is of outstanding heritage value to Australia and a worthy contender for National Heritage listing. World Heritage listing is a much tougher question and, on current knowledge, the case for Gallipoli would be much harder to make. These questions need to be addressed in context through thorough professional heritage assessments which look at the broad historical themes to which Gallipoli relates.

Having suggested that Gallipoli is of considerable heritage value, the next question is how to achieve protection. Australia is a world leader in heritage conservation. Its heritage people, skills, philosophies and practices are amongst the best in the world. One particular document, the Australian *Burra Charter*, is held in very high regard internationally. It is probably the most widely accepted charter guiding heritage conservation in the world today. A core part of this charter is conservation management planning.

Ironically, despite this great expertise and the importance of Gallipoli to Australia, to the best of my knowledge there has been no conservation management planning undertaken at Gallipoli, none has been offered by Australia in the past, and the current proposals make no reference to this planning process which is absolutely fundamental to every heritage site within Australia. Australia has great heritage conservation expertise and this should be applied at Gallipoli.

### ***Many countries and layers of heritage value***

The history of Gallipoli involves many countries including Turkey, Australia, New Zealand and Britain. In line with good heritage practice, all of these countries and possibly others should be regarded as stakeholders and involved in the conservation management planning process.

Gallipoli is a place with layers of history, some stretching back far beyond World War I. Again, good heritage practice requires conservation management planning to consider all heritage values including the significance of the sites to Turkey, Australia and other countries. The process should consider the full history of Gallipoli, not just that related to World War I.

### ***Resourcing and timing***

Gallipoli is an important heritage site, and ensuring its good conservation is an important matter. The Australian Government needs to devote adequate and ongoing resources to this task. This will involve conservation management planning, stakeholder consultation and probably on-ground works.

The Australian Government should indicate its in-principle willingness to contribute substantial and ongoing funding for conservation and related works, if needed.

Part of resourcing this effort will be to ensure the *best* Australian heritage expertise is involved, commensurate with the significance of Gallipoli. This is not a case where an average or ordinary level of skill, chosen on the basis of the lowest tender should be selected.

Another dimension to resourcing the Gallipoli conservation effort will be to recognise this will be a long-term project. Not just because the sites are extensive and complex, and will require ongoing attention over forthcoming years but because achieving an agreed heritage conservation program amongst the range of interested countries and Australian stakeholders may require considerable time. The Australian Government should recognise the conservation management planning process may take quite some time to achieve a satisfactory outcome.

### ***National and World Heritage listing***

The possible National or World Heritage listing of the Gallipoli sites should be put to one side pending satisfactory progress with the conservation management planning process. I am personally doubtful that Gallipoli merits World Heritage listing.

The Turkish Government is apparently unwilling to accept National Heritage listing. It seems possible that stepping back from this listing objective to the broader objective of achieving the good heritage conservation of Gallipoli through effective conservation management planning may be a more acceptable path to listing. If the real basis for long-term conservation can be agreed through a conservation management planning process, then maybe the prospect of listing will appear less of a problem to Turkey. Especially if the process recognises, acknowledges and deals with Turkish interests in Gallipoli in a holistic approach, rather than a narrowly focused approach which just considers Australian interests.

### ***Coordination of Australia interests***

There appear to be quite a range of Australian stakeholders in Gallipoli. This includes government agencies like the Department of Veterans Affairs, Office of Australian War

Graves, Department of the Environment & Heritage, Australian Heritage Council and Australian War Memorial in addition to the RSL, historians, archaeologists and heritage groups like the National Trust and Australia ICOMOS. Currently there seems to be no coordination amongst these stakeholders, and no attempt to foster a coordinated Australian approach to the conservation of Gallipoli.

The Department of the Environment & Heritage should facilitate ongoing discussions amongst key Australian stakeholder groups and organisations to promote a coordinated view, if possible, about the future for Gallipoli. This task should be resourced, including periodic meetings of stakeholders.



I would be happy to provide further information if requested.

Yours sincerely

Duncan Marshall  
Heritage Consultant  
B.Arch (Hons), BA, MICOMOS