



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

[sent by email: fpa.sen@aph.gov.au]

Dear Ms Gell,

Gallipoli Inquiry

Attached is the submission of the Australian Council of National Trusts to the Gallipoli Inquiry.

The Australian Council of National Trusts

The Australian Council of National Trusts is the coordinating body for the National Trust movement. We represent the interests of the eight independent State and Territory Trusts.

Focus of this submission

While we note the Terms of Reference established for this Inquiry by the Senate Finance and Public Administration Committee, our submission is focussed only on item (c), the heritage protection of ANZAC Cove.

Our interest in this submission is to assist the Australian government to ensure that the arrangements recently announced by the Prime Minister to conduct historical and archaeological site surveys do in fact lead to the development of effective protection for the identified heritage values of all significant sites on the Gallipoli Peninsula.

We had recommended in our earlier letter to the Prime Minister (attachment 3) that he support the Turkish suggestion of nominating the Gallipoli Peace Park to be inscribed on to the World Heritage List, but only as a means to an end. We see no necessary value in Gallipoli being a World Heritage site; rather, we see the proposed nomination as a constructive means to achieving agreement for the development of an effective conservation management process, because inscription would require the Gallipoli sites to be managed through an agreed conservation management plan.

Key Recommendation

Australia is acknowledged as a world leader in conservation management planning, and we urge the Committee to recommend that a joint conservation management planning process, involving the Turkish, Australian and New Zealand Governments, should be undertaken as an urgent priority.

Other recommendations and attached are listed below.

We wish the Committee success in conducting this Inquiry into this critically important site, and look forward to positive outcomes for the long-term conservation and protection of the heritage values of the Gallipoli Peninsula.

We would be happy to support your work in any way we can and would be very pleased to provide further information to the Committee if required.

Yours sincerely,

Marie Wood
National Conservation Manager
for
Simon Molesworth AM QC
Chairman

Attachments to this submission:

- 1 Recommendations Concerning Conservation Management Planning
- 2 Recommendations concerning the Proposed Archeological Survey of Anzac Cove
- 3 Letter to the Prime Minister, the Hon John Howard MP, from Mr Simon Molesworth AM, QC, Chairman, Australian Council of National Trusts, date?
- 4 **Copy of article "Anzac Cove, a Road, and a Letter to the Prime Minister"** from the Winter edition of *Heritage in Trust* the magazine of the ACT National Trust.

Attachment 1

Recommendations concerning Conservation Management Planning:

We welcome the opportunity to forward several practical suggestions to the Senate Finance and Public Administration Committee.

We support the suggestions put forward by our Australia ICOMOS colleagues in their submission to this same Inquiry, which we believe will achieve improved conservation of the heritage of Gallipoli.

These are to:

- Undertake conservation management planning for Gallipoli; and
- Establish a task force to coordinate Australian stakeholders and expertise in the future of Gallipoli.

Undertake conservation management planning for Gallipoli

As we suggested in our letter to the Prime Minister of March 23, 2005 (Attachment 3) there is currently no effective conservation management plan in place covering the Gallipoli Peninsula as a whole, and Anzac Cove in particular.

While we fully acknowledge Turkish sovereignty and respect the sensitivities of negotiating with the Turkish authorities, the development of a conservation management plan is a well established, well documented and internationally recognised process which requires detailed consultation and dialogue. As our Australia ICOMOS colleagues explain in their submission to this same inquiry, conservation management *is the ideal process for engaging disparate interests in a productive dialogue, and for addressing complex issues such as physical conservation, visitor pressure and the provision of appropriate infrastructure* – precisely the issues which most urgently need addressing at Anzac Cove.

All significant Australian heritage sites are protected through conservation management planning. Commonwealth legislation (the 'heritage' amendments to the EPBC Act) require that all places listed on the new National Heritage List and the new Commonwealth Heritage List must have conservation management plans developed and regularly monitored, to ensure all significant heritage values have been identified, and are being properly conserved and protected as part of the management of the site.

The basis for all conservation management is detailed knowledge about the site. This provides the information base for the identification of the site's heritage values and for the site's significance to be assessed.

Therefore we welcome the proposed historic and archeological surveys of Anzac Cove, but only if they are to be carried out by experts, and only if the information gathered is then used to develop an effective management instrument designed to protect the significant parts of the site.

We had recommended in our letter to the Prime Minister that he support the Turkish suggestion of nominating the Gallipoli Peace Park to be inscribed on to the World Heritage List, but only as a means to an end. We see no necessary value in Gallipoli being a World Heritage site; rather, we see the proposed nomination as a constructive means to achieving agreement for the development of an effective conservation management process, because inscription would require the Gallipoli sites to be managed through an agreed conservation management plan.

Australia is acknowledged as a world leader in conservation management planning, and we urge the Committee to recommend that a joint conservation management planning process, involving the Turkish, Australian and New Zealand Governments, should be undertaken as an urgent priority.

Coordination of Australian stakeholders and expertise

We support the Australia ICOMOS recommendation that the Australian Heritage Council be requested to coordinate Australian efforts, stakeholder views and expertise regarding the long-term conservation and protection of the Gallipoli area.

The Council should be asked to establish a working group to advise the government regarding long-term protection of the Gallipoli sites.

Members should include:

- the RSL
- the Australian War Memorial
- Department of Veterans' Affairs
- the Office of War Graves
- the National Maritime Museum
- Department of Environment and Heritage

as well as individuals and representatives of professional associations of

historians and archaeologists with specialist knowledge of Gallipoli (including its underwater heritage), and heritage conservation management experts, including:

- The National Trust and
- Australia ICOMOS.

Achieving a coordinated conservation management planning approach would be an urgent matter for this group to address.

Attachment 2

Recommendations concerning the Proposed Archaeological Survey of Anzac Cove

These recommendations have been provided by Dr Peter Dowling, Archaeologist and Biological Anthropologist, Vice President of the ACT National Trust, and Board member of the Australian Council of National Trusts.

Dr Dowling has twice visited the Gallipoli area in a professional capacity in the past two years, and would be very happy to provide the Committee with copies of his recent photographs taken at Anzac Cove

Recommendations concerning the Proposed Archaeological Survey

In the recent debates over the road issue there was mention by the government and media of an archaeological survey done by the Turks but I have not seen anything published or any unpublished report of this survey. Presumably it is written in Turkish and has yet to be translated and distributed outside of Turkey.

So we do not know how comprehensive this report was, what areas it covered (did it include all of the Anzac area that is under the Treaty of Lausanne? - was it confined to the Turkish side? - did it include the Suvla Bay areas and the Helles areas?).

Any archaeology survey of Gallipoli should include all these areas as they were part of the same conflict albeit in different areas of the peninsula and Australian and New Zealand service men were involved in them all.

Also we do not know in any great detail what Anzac sites are remaining and what they contain other than the large sites which contain cemeteries. This became apparent to me when I went there in 2003.

There is therefore an urgent need for a comprehensive archaeological survey of the Gallipoli battlefields:

- The survey should be done jointly by Turkish, Australian and New Zealand archaeologists.
- The survey should use the most up-to-date methods and technology in order to gather as much data on the physical remains of the 1915 battle.
- It should include precise locations of identified sites using global positioning system technology.
- Identification of each site using historical documentation

- Detailed descriptions: written, photography, drawings of sites including type & number of identified artefacts; provenance of artefacts (eg Turkish, Australian, New Zealand) if possible; geographical extent of site; other sites nearby; associations with other sites
- Assessment of the likelihood of sub-surface material associated with surface remains
- Preservation assessment of the site
- Conservation methods which could be applied to assist the long-term preservation

An example of the need for detailed archaeological investigation and assessment can be seen at North Anzac. In 2000 Mr Les Carlyon (author of *Gallipoli 2001*) together with Mr Kenan Çelik and Mr Ahmet Çelik (certified guides and experts on the Gallipoli battle fields) discovered a series of shallow scrapes, dozens of British issue ammunition clips, a small metal buckle (probably from a wrist watch), and spent Turkish bullets on the south shoulder of Hill 90. Amongst these artefacts were slivers of human bone. Together these artefacts and human bone represent a fire fight, with Allied troops firing from the scrapes and Turkish bullets being fired at them. They are most likely from the last stand by men of Monash's 4th Brigade who became lost during the first night of the ill-fated August offensive. But what more do we know of this isolated site in Anzac North or of the incident it represents?

- What other artefacts associated with this incident are nearby?
- What other Turkish artefacts can be found in this area?
- Can any individuals taking part in the fight be identified?
- What is state of preservation of the artefacts?
- This site had survived 85 years of weathering by the time it was relocated. How can it and the remaining artefacts and human remains be preserved?
- Can more information be acquired by careful and detailed examination of the artefacts which can then lead to a reconstruction of the battle?
- And, are there anymore such sites as this representing a single conflict elsewhere in the Anzac area?

These are just broad questions to which a detailed archaeological examination could offer important information which in turn would provide answers to the nature of the battles between the two forces not only from this area but from the entire Gallipoli battle fields.

Dr Peter Dowling, Archaeological & Historical Consultant
 National Trust of Australia (ACT)
 PO Box 1144 Civic Square ACT 2608
 (02) 6230 0533

Attachment 3

**The Prime Minister
The Hon Mr John Howard MP
Parliament House
Canberra, ACT**

March 23rd, 2005

Dear Prime Minister

I am writing in response to the recent controversy concerning road works in Anzac Cove.

The Australian Council of National Trusts shares your concern for the protection of this nationally significant site, a place of deep meaning and value to all Australians, but also a site of great significance to Turkey, New Zealand, indeed to all Gallipoli campaign combatant nations.

While we Australians tend to focus on the sites of particular value to us, the Trust recognises that Australia does not have authority over the management of Gallipoli, even over those sites in the Anzac Cove area of highest significance to us.

The National Trust is therefore acutely aware of the security and sovereignty implications of Gallipoli for the government of Turkey, and of the sensitive nature of negotiations with the Turkish government.

Within this context, the key problem, it seems to us, is that there is no overarching management plan focussed on protecting the significant values of the whole site.

You will be visiting Anzac Cove for the Anzac Day commemoration, and meeting with your Turkish counterpart. My purpose in writing, is to suggest you consider indicating to him that Australia would welcome and support re-activation of the very constructive Turkish proposal to nominate the Gallipoli Peninsula Peace Park being developed on the Gallipoli site, to the World Heritage List.

This proposal, promoted over many years by the deeply respected, and, I understand, now deceased, Prof Dr R Raci Bademli, has many advantages, primarily, that it would ensure international conservation management arrangements would be enacted, providing protection for the whole site, including Anzac Cove.

Australians have shared Anzac Cove in a remarkably constructive way with Turkey since the 1920s, and continuing this partnership with Turkey is critical to the development of long-term conservation solutions necessary to protect the sites of special significance to Australia and to Turkey, as well as those of other combatant nations.

Turkey now has a problem working out how best to manage the ever increasing numbers of people trying to visit the site. The long-term consequences of increased visitor impact clearly need to be addressed in ways which do not damage or degrade the heritage values of the site, including appropriate access for Anzac Pilgrimage crowds to those sites most significant to Australia and New Zealand.

International heritage management practice would normally manage these impacts through the development and administration of a conservation management plan, but there appears to be no such conservation management plan for Gallipoli.

There does not appear to be an authoritative management structure which has the protection of the specific sites of significance as its key objective. Without such clearly agreed overarching management objectives and supportive administration arrangements, the sites of special significance to Australia, indeed all sites, will remain vulnerable to the kind of damage which has occurred in the recent road building at Anzac Cove.

Re-activating discussions with the Turkish government concerning the inscription on the World Heritage List of the Gallipoli Peninsula Peace Park seems to offer the most diplomatically acceptable means of bringing the site management within international conservation and heritage protection norms.

It would ensure that visitor management, site protection, and conservation of all site relics, human and material, would all be managed within an agreed conservation and protection framework.

It should also facilitate Turkish government acceptance of National Heritage Listing of Anzac Cove, as the national heritage system operates within a similar framework of heritage values identification and protection to the World Heritage system.

Australia has long experience in the nomination and management of complex world heritage sites, and we suggest that you could re-issue your existing invitation to responsible Turkish ministers and officials to visit Australian World Heritage sites.

We also urge you to seek specific arrangements for better management of Gallipoli relics.

Gallipoli is a dynamic geological area, where it can be assumed human remains are likely to be situated. Any disturbance, mechanical or natural, can expose relics. There does not appear to be an active management arrangement on site for ensuring such relics are always appropriately conserved.

The recent controversy suggests that a program of professional site management needs to be developed immediately, based on accepted international archeological practice. That is, there needs to be agreed arrangements put in place to ensure that any relics, human or material, will be immediately, and professionally, identified, recovered, and respectfully disposed of or properly conserved.

The National Trust recognises that much effort is being expended to achieving the best possible protection for Anzac Cove.

We believe however that a renewed commitment to achieving World Heritage status for the whole site offers the best possible approach to ensuring the long-term conservation and protection of this nationally and internationally significant site.

We urge you to give detailed consideration to this suggestion. I would of course be very happy to discuss these matters further with you.

Yours sincerely

signed

Simon R. Molesworth AM QC

**Chairman,
Australian Council of National Trusts**

Anzac Cove, a Road, and a Letter to the Prime Minister

Peter Dowling

Anzac Cove has been in the news lately for both the right and wrong reasons.

The right reason of course was the recent 90th anniversary celebrations of the first landings on 25th April 1915. On that day, clear and calm in the early morning hours, blood red and horrific in the later hours, young Australian and New Zealand men faced a determined enemy on his own territory; and while they did not realize it as they fought for the scrubby heights, they wrote themselves into the history, hearts and minds of subsequent generations.

The Gallipoli battlefields have now become a place of pilgrimage for Australians, particularly young Australians. Attending the services on April 25th, sleeping on the cold grass over night and waking up to dawn rising over the imposing Sari Bair Range overlooking the battlefields has almost become a rite of passage for Australians and New Zealanders alike. This year saw between 15,000 and 20,000 people, young and old gathered to commemorate the deeds and deaths, which occurred there in 1915. Along with them were Prime Minister Howard of Australia, Prime Minister Clark of New Zealand, Prime Minister Erdogan of Turkey, HRH Prince Charles and a gaggle of other politicians and dignitaries. At home in Australian and New Zealand cities, towns and villages, larger than ever crowds gathered to mark this special day. The Anzac legend, the Anzac spirit, meaning a lot of different things to different people are firmly embedded in our national psyches and will certainly grow as we approach the centenary of the landings.

Most Australians now see the Anzac battlefields of Gallipoli, and in particular, Anzac Cove, as a deeply sacred place. One only has to walk quietly among the neat gravestones, reading the names and inscriptions in any of the cemeteries scattered across the heights to realise that this place is special. I have seen tears in the eyes of the young and even the hardest of adults as they contemplate what happened there in 1915.

But what of the wrong reason for Anzac Cove being so prominently in the news over the last three months? It is of course the vexing issue of the recent road works above the landing places at Anzac Cove and the adjacent North Beach area. In 2003 the Australian government, well aware of the growing number of Australians attending the Anzac Day celebrations asked Turkey to improve the access road to Anzac Cove. Along with the Turkish and New Zealand governments they were concerned with the health and safety of those attending the ceremonies, particularly during the 90th anniversary. Access to and from Anzac Cove and North Beach was becoming a

serious problem, which would surely escalate as the 100th anniversary approached. So, as part of an ongoing road development programme in the Gallipoli battlefields, the Anzac Cove road was scheduled to be re developed in time for the 90th anniversary. This narrow road winding above the Anzac Cove and North Beach areas was subsequently widened and re-laid. The former cliff face was cut back and sealed parking and turning areas were also incorporated to allow for better access and flow of vehicle traffic.

The whole process leading up to and including the initial road excavation work was carried out without any publicity. The Australian public only became aware of the road work when the media began to report on it in late February 2005. But by then the cliff above Anzac Cove was cut back, forever reshaping the landscape above the original landing place. To make matters worse (in the short-term at least) some of the excavated cliff spoil was dumped on the sea side of the road over the narrow beach of Anzac Cove right up to the shoreline. It covered an extensive part of the beach where the Anzacs had landed.

The Australian media was deeply incensed at this work and we all read headlines trumpeting, "New roadworks threaten to plough into Anzac Cove" (*The Bulletin* 23rd February), "Grave Insult" (*The Bulletin* 23rd February), "Road of Shame" (*The Bulletin* 2nd March), "PM accused of destroying our heritage" (*Canberra Times* 22nd April), "Anzac Cove once again a battle site: (*Canberra Times* 12th March) "Lest we forget those whose remains are degraded for and Anzac legend" (*Sunday Age* 13th March). The emotion and indignation in these headlines is clear and it relates directly to our perceptions of the Anzac legend and our sensitivities towards the sacred place of Anzac Cove.

Along with the transformation of the landscape came the awful thought that the remains of the soldiers were being disturbed as well. While the road excavations were well clear of the existing cemeteries and there was no direct threat to them, there was another troubling issue to be considered. Did the excavations into the cliff face disturb any human bones that had been undetected since the end of the conflict? There were claims made by Turkish and Australian observers that this could well be the case. Although to my knowledge no human bones were found during the road excavations these claims are not without substance. In 2003 a colleague and I discovered an almost intact human femur (thigh bone) on the edge of the road directly across from the south end of Anzac Cove. It had apparently been washed down from the steep slope above the road during recent rains. The bone was photographed and reported to the Commonwealth War Graves Commission. Human bones eroding to the surface are not uncommon on the battlefields but the very position of this bone, on the side of the now former road, and right where the cliff cutting excavations have occurred, lends strength to the fear that there may have been others disturbed during the road works. This question has not been resolved.

It was this issue of undetected bones together with the seemingly lack of any heritage related control during the progress of the road works that prompted the ACT National Trust through the Australian Council of National Trusts to contact the Prime Minister of Australia and express our concerns. This letter, signed by the Chairman of the Australian Council of Nation Trust is produced in full below.

There is little to be gained now by pointing the finger of blame for what we have lost or may have lost at Anzac Cove. What the letter argues is that such a situation should not happen again. It strongly urges for specific arrangements to be put in place for better management of Gallipoli relics, human and cultural, particularly those that still lie undetected on or underneath the surface of the battlefield. The Turkish Government and the Governments of the Anzac countries should take on this responsibility jointly. After all the battlefields of Gallipoli are a big part of our shared history and heritage. This point is no more poignantly stated than on a monument at Anzac Cove in the words of Kemal Attaturk:

Those heroes who shed their blood
And lost their lives...
You are now lying in the soil of a friendly country.
Therefore rest in peace.
There is no difference between the Johnnies
And the Mehments to us where they lie side by side
Here in this country of ours.
You the mothers,
Who sent their sons from far away countries
Wipe away your tears;
Your sons are now lying in our bosom
And are at peace.
After having lost their lives on this land they have
Become our sons as well.

**The Prime Minister
The Hon Mr John Howard MP
Parliament House
Canberra, ACT**

March 23rd, 2005

Dear Prime Minister

I am writing in response to the recent controversy concerning road works in Anzac Cove.

The Australian Council of National Trusts shares your concern for the protection of this nationally significant site, a place of deep meaning and value to all Australians, but also a site of great significance to Turkey, New Zealand, indeed to all Gallipoli campaign combatant nations.

While we Australians tend to focus on the sites of particular value to us, the Trust recognises that Australia does not have authority over the management of Gallipoli, even over those sites in the Anzac Cove area of highest significance to us.

The National Trust is therefore acutely aware of the security and sovereignty implications of Gallipoli for the government of Turkey, and of the sensitive nature of negotiations with the Turkish government.

Within this context, the key problem, it seems to us, is that there is no overarching management plan focussed on protecting the significant values of the whole site.

You will be visiting Anzac Cove for the Anzac Day commemoration, and meeting with your Turkish counterpart. My purpose in writing, is to suggest you consider indicating to him that Australia would welcome and support re-activation of the very constructive Turkish proposal to nominate the Gallipoli Peninsula Peace Park being developed on the Gallipoli site, to the World Heritage List.

This proposal, promoted over many years by the deeply respected, and, I understand, now deceased, Prof Dr R Raci Bademli, has many advantages, primarily, that it would ensure international conservation management arrangements would be enacted, providing protection for the whole site, including Anzac Cove.

Australians have shared Anzac Cove in a remarkably constructive way with Turkey since the 1920s, and continuing this partnership with Turkey is critical to the development of long-term conservation solutions necessary to protect the sites of special significance to Australia and to Turkey, as well as those of other combatant nations.

Turkey now has a problem working out how best to manage the ever increasing numbers of people trying to visit the site. The long-term consequences of increased visitor impact clearly need to be addressed in ways which do not damage or degrade the heritage values of the site, including appropriate access for Anzac Pilgrimage crowds to those sites most significant to Australia and New Zealand.

International heritage management practice would normally manage these impacts through the development and administration of a conservation management plan, but there appears to be no such conservation management plan for Gallipoli.

There does not appear to be an authoritative management structure which has the protection of the specific sites of significance as its key objective. Without such clearly agreed overarching management objectives and supportive administration arrangements, the sites of special significance to Australia, indeed all sites, will remain vulnerable to the kind of damage which has occurred in the recent road building at Anzac Cove.

Re-activating discussions with the Turkish government concerning the inscription on the World Heritage List of the Gallipoli Peninsula Peace Park seems to offer the most diplomatically acceptable means of bringing the site management within international conservation and heritage protection norms.

It would ensure that visitor management, site protection, and conservation of all site relics, human and material, would all be managed within an agreed conservation and protection framework.

It should also facilitate Turkish government acceptance of National Heritage Listing of Anzac Cove, as the national heritage system operates within a similar framework of heritage values identification and protection to the World Heritage system.

Australia has long experience in the nomination and management of complex world heritage sites, and we suggest that you could re-issue your existing invitation to responsible Turkish ministers and officials to visit Australian World Heritage sites.

We also urge you to seek specific arrangements for better management of Gallipoli relics.

Gallipoli is a dynamic geological area, where it can be assumed human remains are likely to be situated. Any disturbance, mechanical or natural, can expose relics. There does not appear to be an active management arrangement on site for ensuring such relics are always appropriately conserved.

The recent controversy suggests that a program of professional site management needs to be developed immediately, based on accepted international archaeological practice. That is, there needs to be agreed arrangements put in place to ensure that any relics, human or material, will be immediately, and professionally, identified, recovered, and respectfully disposed of or properly conserved.

The National Trust recognises that much effort is being expended to achieving the best possible protection for Anzac Cove.

We believe however that a renewed commitment to achieving World Heritage status for the whole site offers the best possible approach to ensuring the long-term conservation and protection of this nationally and internationally significant site.

We urge you to give detailed consideration to this suggestion. I would of course be very happy to discuss these matters further with you.

Yours sincerely

Simon R. Molesworth AM QC

**Chairman,
Australian Council of National Trusts**

Post script

During his visit to Turkey Prime Minister Howard discussed the road works issue with Prime Minister Erdogan. In a media release from his office on 26th April Mr Howard stated that they both agreed there should be a joint historical survey of the Anzac area (including archaeological aspects) to provide a clear basis for balancing

future development with the preservation of key sites. They also agreed to ensure the road works in the Anzac Cove area are completed in a way as sympathetic as possible to the landscape. If this cooperation is to take place on the ground now and in the future then it will be the first step in addressing the concerns which the National Trust has raised. More importantly it will be the first step in ensuring sound management of our shared history.

Dr Peter Dowling is an archaeologist and Vice-President of the ACT National Trust. He visited Gallipoli in 2003 and again in 2005 when he led a National Trust tour to Turkey