“The Toast is Anzac”: Culture and the Creation of National Identity in World War One Australia

Madison Allen Sandy
Lexington, Virginia

Master of Arts, University of Virginia, 2009
Bachelor of Arts (Magna Cum Laude), University of Richmond, 2007

A Dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology

University of Virginia
May, 2014

Acknowledgements

Completing my dissertation was only possible with great support from my parents, a handful of close friends, and my patient committee. I cannot thank you all enough and I hope that someday I match your expectations. The last seven years have truly been a journey, and the written product is the culmination of hitherto unbeknownst effort and resilience. That story, however, must wait. This narrative, flaws and all, deserves its day. Lest we forget!

Chapter 1

> "Throughout history, there have been occasions when a vastly superior military force has managed, against all odds, to snatch defeat from all but certain victory. The phenomenon usually has root in one of three causes: arrogance, such a blinding belief in one's own military or cultural superiority as to fail to take the enemy seriously; political interference; or tunnel vision, that curious tendency among war planners and generals to believe a flawed approach might be rectified simply by pouring more men and firepower into the fray. In early 1915, the British military would navigate its way to a fiasco of such colossal proportions as to require all three of these factors to work in concert." (Anderson 2013:103)

> "It perceived its differences from others more readily, and it examined its own nature more closely even if that involved much bitterness. It is true that Australia did not yet know what sort of nation it was – the debate continues in fact. But that is not to say it did not know by 1918 that it was a nation: war abroad and conflict at home had seen to that." (Mandle 1978:23)

Introduction

Clouds obscure the Melbourne stars and the air is frozen still. People pour from the St. Kilda Road trams out onto the sidewalks, falling in line with those emerging from adjacent streets, descending from city lofts, and navigating the botanic gardens surrounding the Yarra River. Fifty thousand bodies march together to the hill on the edge of the city, following the breath of their neighbors and jamming their hands in their pockets. No one speaks. As the crowd begins to settle and the whispers start to grow, a low horn sounds, and a somber, clear voice echoes above everyone's heads. Some have tears in their eyes and tissues in their pockets. Some have a thermos of whiskey hidden in their sleeves. Some wear the medals of military service, whether theirs, their grandfather's, or their mate's. All are waiting for the light. It is Anzac Day, 25 April 2013, and the Dawn Service begins.

Australians of all ages gather across the Commonwealth each 25 April to remember the heroism of the soldiers on the shores of Gallipoli in World War I. They stand at public memorials to lay wreaths and sing against the background of a rising sun. They unfold afternoon picnics, pack into the cricket ground to watch Australian Rules Football, and dally with old mates in the local pubs. They also line streets to cheer morning parades of veterans, volunteers, and soldiers marching to the public memorials. Ninety-eight years ago, the actions by the young men of the First Australian Imperial Force (AIF), also known as the Australia and New Zealand Army Corps (Anzac), inspired a national holiday and a began an Australian story that would develop into a widespread shared identity. This project is an exploration of that creation, an excursion in time to explore the origin of the Anzac identity and its growth into a cultural bond for a country engaged in both war overseas and contentious politics at home.

Gallipoli and the Anzacs continue to be a prime and popular source of study in Australia. This is to be expected, given the ongoing output of support and participation in the Anzac Day holiday each year and the ubiquitous reminders of Anzac that tangibly express its links with Australian images and notions of identity. Anzac biscuits (cookies in American terms) adorn supermarket and bakery shelves. Monuments to the First AIF soldiers, nurses, and other volunteers of the First World War peek out from parks, public buildings, and schools. In Melbourne, prominent streets are named for Eastern and Western Front officers, such as Monash Street, for Sir John Monash, and Chauvel Street, named for General Sir Henry George Chauvel. These expressions of everyday nationalism, to invoke Michael Billig's concept, are tacit reminders of the importance of

World War I to Australia and the prominence the Anzacs played in building a shared identity of a young nation nearly one hundred years ago.

The lofty amount of national sentiment on display during Anzac Day is directly related to the ability of individuals to successfully identify and empathize with something larger than themselves (White 2010). Those unfamiliar with the Anzac legacy will ask: what are Australians connecting with, and what does Gallipoli have to do with it? The Gallipoli campaign was Australia's first official foray onto the global stage of modern warfare. The events over eight months gave reason for Australians to celebrate the efforts of their young soldiers, and many people came to see the courage and loyalty of the Anzacs as traits unique to and common amongst all Australians. They were a sporting people that loved to compete, a rugged people that conquered the harsh landscape, and a fiercely egalitarian people that earned respect as worthy partners of the British Empire (Mandle 1978). As World War I continued, drastically appalling events on the Western Front in France would cloud Australia's naïve glow of war, but Gallipoli had given something for Australians to celebrate alongside their mourning (Mandle 1978). Moreover, the infamous traits of the Eastern Front Anzacs appeared on other fields of battle and became the standard for subsequent young, Australian military recruits to emulate. Original Anzacs were known for their sardonic humor, their inventiveness, and their determination not to let the horror of war quell their spirits. In Pozieres, France, one of the worst killing fields of the Great War, the second wave Anzacs christened two surrounding valleys with the titles Sausage and Mash (Mandle 1978). It is these notable behaviors and memorable anecdotes, along with the legacy of thousands of soldiers killed

in action, which Australians gather to celebrate and remember each year through their somber, scripted rituals as well as their lighthearted festivities.

Reflection and celebration of Anzac and its namesake holiday will only continue to surge as the centennial of the Gallipoli landing approaches: 25 April 2015. Planes and hotels for modern pilgrimages to Turkey and the beaches of Gallipoli are booked solid. In Melbourne, the Shrine of Remembrance has been planning its centennial programs since 2012 at least. Second and third editions of foundational Gallipoli texts by scholars such as Ken Inglis, Bill Gammage, and Richard White are popping up in libraries and bookshops. New studies of Anzacs and the First World War are also gracing the pages of the latest books and journals, suggesting that for all the attention academics have lavished on Gallipoli over the last century, there are still lessons to discover from 1915. For example, Clare Rhoden suggests that the notions of leadership in Australia differed from those of its imperial allies during World War I. Australians enacted an egalitarian bargain with their military leaders, as opposed to a traditional, deference bargain based on a class society like those of Europe. Consequently, expressions of ill-discipline amongst Anzacs were the result of a cultural viewpoint that respect and responsibility were earned, not merely ascribed based on title (2012). Many other contemporary articles are keen to investigate meanings of Anzac and expressions of nationalism among Australians today. Jessica Pacella argues that Anzac is now a specific brand of identity that it legitimized by literally buying into its mythical elements through merchandise and event attendance. The branding also includes selling a part of oneself, such as getting a Southern Cross tattoo, in order to be an active and visible participant of the culture (2011). Graham Seal,

an academic authority on Gallipoli for decades, recently observed that Anzac continues to hold a "tenacious" grip on Australia (2012:58). Elements that used to be solely for Anzac remembrance, such as the Dawn Service, are being applied to other annual events that appear to have a connection to national identity (2012). Thus Anzac, and by relation Gallipoli and World War I, will soon mark one hundred years of captivating Australians and presiding as a powerful influence on their shared self-image. Just what is the source of Anzacs' power and endurance? Even by glancing only at the three aforementioned modern studies, one does not have to be a Gramsci aficionado to surmise their clear yet unspoken hint: the authority of Anzac is very much a dominance derived from culture.

As Sociologist Michael Mann notes, "to struggle successfully as a class or nation requires a meaning system embodying ultimate values, norms, and ritual and aesthetic practices" (1993:215). The events of Gallipoli and feats of Australian soldiers, wrapped conveniently in the picturesque symbol of the brawny, masculine Anzac, delivered an opportunity to a rather insecure and young colony to develop its own proud narrative. Through the case study of national identity development in World War I Australia, this project more broadly aims to better understand the nuances of cultural power in the creation of nations and nationalism. It will explore who was involved in the creation of the Anzac legend, what did Anzac mean to those various parties, what version or versions of Anzac were crystalized as the mainstream national symbols, and why. We can begin with the single question: how did Anzac become a core part of Australian identity? The following chapters lead us on a journey to the answers.

Chapter Two is a review of nations and nationalism in Sociological literature pertaining to the creation of national identity and recognition of culture as a critical factor in the unification of populations. Modern nations and nationalism literature stretches back to at least 1882 with Ernest Renan's essay, "What is a Nation?". Scholarship on the matter then journeyed through a long, and to a certain extent still continuing, debate over the ethnic versus civil typology of nationalisms. Benedict Anderson rather dramatically shifted the conversation in 1983 by declaring nations to be imagined communities, and the conversation has since evolved from his seminal work. Subsequent questions for today's students focus on how nationalism operates and expands, rather than solely what exactly is nationalism. Answering those questions involves a second foundational piece of the field, *Nations and Nationalism* by Ernest Gellner. Part of Gellner's brilliance was to recognize that culture is the social bridge for overcoming stubborn differences in heterogeneous populations.

Indeed, as both Lyn Spillman and Craig Calhoun claim, many areas in the broad field of Sociology have taken a so-called 'cultural turn,' and nations and nationalism scholars are certainly one of the groups embracing culture as a vital subject of study. A primary concern for nation scholars today then has become the meaning of membership. Another is to understand and explain the symbols that a national group chooses to adopt. The work of ethnosymbolist Anthony Smith is at the forefront of this wave. Smith builds upon Anderson's model of imagined community via instruments of mass text production and Gellner's conclusion that the desire to unite precedes the creation of a national group. Smith, in turn, studies the social and political origins of cultural unions by bringing in

elements of the subjective and the symbolic. One of the most powerful catalysts for social unification is the origin myth, which is also a basis for national sentiment. The myth creates group boundaries and images of selfhood by asking the question 'who are we?'. The characteristics identified in response become a source of common or shared identity by demarcating people with similarities from others who have ostensibly irreconcilable differences.

Exploring the nuance of nations and nationalism through ethnosymbolism brings the benefit of extending Hobsbawm's concept of invented tradition to envelop all involved parties, whether elite or common members of the population. National identity is a rich source of material in such an endeavor as it is an expression of shared characteristics and values within a particular group. To properly examine origin myths or to capture national identity, researchers use Geertz's thick description method, which emphasizes detail and context of data. In turn, the observations provided by the researcher may contribute to a better understanding of culture as a catalyst for national consensus. These efforts, as exemplified by this particular project, may also contribute to the assessment and explanation of cases hitherto classified as anomalies.

It is the aim of this project to enhance the process of examining and illustrating national identity by using Wendy Griswold's methodology for dissecting and examining cultural objects. The goal is informed by the broader trend in contemporary nations and nationalism studies to focus on institution building and to uncover previously masked contributors to their creation. Nestled within Burawoy's Extended Case Method then, Griswold's cultural object model will help to explain the connections between particular

nations and nationalism and the social world that created them. Repurposing cultural investigation tools for a comparative-historical endeavor will enable scholars to better deconstruct a shared identity and parcel out the multiple parties and numerous meanings encapsulated in deceptively simple packaging. The nuances that arise may further clarify existing knowledge of the development of nationalism. The particular myth in use here is the Anzac myth of World War One Australia, born on the shores of Turkey in 1915.

Chapter Three is a brief historical overview of the Gallipoli military campaign and its explosion as a popular piece of Australian public discussion from 1915 onward. The Gallipoli operation was a war defeat that Australians turned into a celebration of national character and used as a bonding mechanism during a time of great social division. At the outbreak of the First World War, Australia was part of the British Empire. As a white dominion, Australians considered themselves part of the esteemed, superior British race, and people from the pub regulars to the Prime Minister identified themselves as Australian Britons. The Australian population in its entirety had little or no experience in war prior to 1914 though. Anyone who participated in the late nineteenth century Boer War did so as a militia volunteer. Hence when Australia entered World War I, the men were eager yet naïve participants and they went to war to prove their loyalty and their worth as imperial partners.

Anzacs, the anagram-turned-nickname of the Pacific-dominion army troops sent overseas, were on the front lines of the 1915 Gallipoli campaign in the Turkish Dardanelles. The plan, created by British generals and politicians in London, was to capture Constantinople from the Ottoman Empire and dramatically shorten the war by

cutting off Germany from its allies. The Anzacs' training took place in the Egyptian deserts, and during this time Australian soldiers earned a particular reputation for debauchery and trouble among both the imperial armies and the residents of Cairo. The Australians' first taste of battle arrived on 25 April 1915 with the amphibious assault of the Gallipoli peninsula. The campaign was an absolute disaster from the start to nearly the finish. Thousands of Entente soldiers were killed on the first day as they attempted to land on beaches and charge up hills flanked with Turkish soldiers and machine guns. Australian death tolls alone reached sixty-five percent of participants as the months dragged on. Dead soldiers were buried or even left laying where they fell, their graves forever thousands of miles from home, marked at the time with makeshift wooden crosses if they were lucky.

Australia's Anzac recruits were young, fit, cheeky, and heroic. Their actions from day one of Gallipoli earned them a global reputation for their courage and sacrifice. They were also known for their loyalty, irreverence, and humor. In the trenches they developed a series of impertinent stories, known as 'yarns.' Tales and songs from Gallipoli later became the base of an Anzac culture for returned soldiers, which they also shared with their loved ones during the war through hand crafted publications mailed home. Soldier literature could also reveal glimpses of Anzacs' darker side, much explored by contemporary scholars. Sexism, racism, and brutality clung to the edges of the Australian aura. To homeland Australians at the time however, the soldiers immediately and predominantly became positive symbols of courage, mateship, and egalitarianism.

One of the earliest and largest influences of this symbolism was CEW Bean, the official Australian press representative, who was entrenched with the troops at Gallipoli. Through his newspaper articles and later his infamous *Anzac Book*, Bean idealized the characteristics of the bushman, though his depictions were not always an accurate reflection of the soldiers' traits and perhaps even actions. The spirit of Anzac quickly captured Australians back home though, with newspaper headlines glorifying the Anzacs and deeming Gallipoli the birth of a nation. The focus was on soldiers' valiant efforts and on Gallipoli as a crucible, not on the inevitable and crushing defeat. For the first time, Australians had reason to celebrate their uniqueness and the feats of their own men, and they connected these elements directly to their upbringing and experience on the harsh edges of empire's terrain. As the symbol of a nation though, Anzac was in its infancy. Anzac did not have the same meaning for everyone in a relatively diverse population nor could it. What were the versions of Anzac circulating, and who created them? The task of the researcher at this stage, implementing Griswold's methodology, is to identify the creators of Anzac and trace the early negotiations of its collective significance to Australians.

Chapter Four discusses the parties included and excluded from the social discussion of Anzac using Melissa Wilde's theory of organization and culture in public debate. Accordingly, the most organized groups and groups whose culture most closely mirrors the broader, mainstream culture will be the most successful in negotiations of public meaning. In the earliest discourse concerning the meanings of Anzac, the Returned Sailors' and Soldiers' Imperial League of Australia (RSSILA) and an amalgamation of

women's wartime organizations dominated any framing of Australian soldiers. Conversely, groups with little or no organization or whose cultural dynamics diverge from the larger public will not be successful in implementing their vision. In this case that would be to the detriment of both political minorities, such as the Industrial Workers of the World, and racial minorities, the whole of Australia's indigenous peoples.

The RSSILA was (and remains in contemporary times) a large, federated league of veterans with membership chapters and military clubhouses across Australia as early as 1916, merely months after the end of the Gallipoli campaign. Through regular meetings, formal events, and casual gatherings, RSSILA members fostered and maintained a culture of Anzac derived from their time together in the trenches of Middle Eastern and European battlefields. Their primary goal as a government-sanctioned organization was to aid returning soldiers through programs such as housing assistance, medical payments, and employment support. The RSSILA also worked to promote a positive, unspoiled image of returned soldiers in news media coverage despite some of the veterans' less savory behaviors. These attempts were largely effective.

Women's wartime organizations, whether for or against the war, were as organized as the RSSILA. Nonetheless, with the exception of nurses, women were prohibited from participating in military aspects of Australia's war efforts. During the early twentieth century, most of Australian society also subscribed to the popular ideology that motherhood was a vocation and that women reigned in the domestic sphere alone. As a result, women's endeavors were mostly toward assembling care packages, fundraising, and helping to encourage enlistment. Or, drawing a different conclusion,

groups such as the Women's Peace Army argued that mothers should nurture life and consequently opposed Australian participation in the war. Women also greatly contributed to the meanings of Anzac in another manner: writing. Women's poetry and songs mainly expanded perceptions of Anzacs' fame and glory while also denigrating eligible men who would not volunteer for military service. While quite successful, women's wartime programs usually remained second in appreciation to the men's. Furthermore, unlike in Europe, war had little effect on women's position in Australian society. Women were not encouraged to fill the jobs of absent men, and even women that directly contributed to the war effort as nurses were paid less than their male counterparts.

On the other hand, some groups were marginalized entirely due to the clash of their cultural values with the patriotic hysteria of mainstream British Australians. Socialist organizations such as the Industrial Workers of the World were targeted by powerful politicians attempting to squash anti-war voices in Australia. Additionally, the Aboriginal population was silenced almost entirely, though Wilde's model is certainly only a partial explanation for their exclusion. Factors such as organization and culture are second in explanatory power to outright racism and greed on the part of European settlers. Yet these blatant social differences, women and men, in support of war and against it, white skin and black skin, which resulted in unequal power in the negotiation of Anzac meanings, were not actually the primary source of wartime contention or even general social division in Australia. An entirely separate wedge threatened to permanently divide Australia during World War I. The issue of conscription, raised in

1916 and again in 1917, permanently altered the social and political landscape, and forced a conversation about the values of Australians.

Chapter Five provides a concise overview of the most contentious issue of World War I among Australians: mandatory conscription. In 1914, the union-heavy Labor Party held the majority in Parliament. When Australia joined the war effort under Prime Minister William Hughes, legislators also passed the War Precautions Act. The Act was designed to suffocate opposition to participating in World War I, but it also had the unintentional effect of stymying the free speech and strikes of labor unions. Rising tension among Labor Party members peaked when Hughes returned from a 1916 trip to Great Britain convinced that Australia should implement mandatory military service. He saw conscription as necessary to meet the demands of a bloody war and to prove Australia worthy as an equal partner of any eventual imperial military win. Unable to push his agenda through both houses of the federal government, an especially difficult task without the support of his own political party, Hughes introduced conscription as a popular referendum in 1916.

The issue divided Australia into two new camps: those supporting conscription, and those against it. The press and a great many Australians supported conscription. Conscriptionists included members of the Liberal Party, the Prime Minster, commercial and business professionals, newspapers in Melbourne, and members of the Anglican religion. Nonetheless, a vocal minority engaged in an intense campaign against conscription. Anti-conscriptionists included trade unions, members of the Labor Party, other political minorities such as Socialists, members of the Catholic religion, and anti-

war groups such as the Women's Peace Army. 1916 saw campaigns and disruptive tactics by both sides. Organizations such as the Universal Service League and the Australian Women's Service Corps petitioned, argued, and chanted on behalf of mandatory conscription. They couched their argument in loyalist terms: people who support Great Britain will support conscription in order to aid the Empire. In contrast, labor unions and organizations such as the Industrial Workers of the World claimed that conscription would hurt working class Australians by making business susceptible to cheap, foreign labor, and that mandatory military service was contrary to Australian morality. Somewhat surprisingly, mandatory conscription was narrowly defeated in the 1916 vote.

Appearing undaunted, Prime Minister Hughes introduced a second round in 1917. This time he pursued opponents even more aggressively. One prominent target was the Industrial Workers of the World, an anti-militarist and socialist political group with European Marxist origins. Hughes deliberately targeted the organization, such as blocking their ability to use the domestic postal service for their information campaign, eventually leading to prosecution in famous cases such as the Sydney Twelve. 1917 also brought increasing division among religious groups, already prone to distrust of one another. Anglican clergy preached in favor of conscription, while a few prominent Catholic leaders denounced it, especially in the wake of a brutal British response to the 1916 Easter Uprising in Ireland. Women's alliances too were greatly affected through two referendum rounds. Many supported conscription, but a prominent portion served as anti-conscription activists and even led events such as the Cost of Living Riots in Melbourne. Conscription was defeated again in 1917 by an even wider margin, but not

without creating serious fractures among Australians. By the end of the extended campaigns, it seemed Australians on the home front were as exhausted, tattered, and battle weary as the men overseas. They were also facing the wake of enormous and lingering social fractures.

Chapter Six changes perspective to look at what united Australians in spite of and throughout an intense and divisive war, and beyond. The chapter is a discussion of the Australian holiday in honor of Australian soldiers and their actions throughout Gallipoli events. It is also an exploration of the meanings of national identity extracted through Wendy Griswold's methodological process, and an example of the power of culture to build social bridges across extreme divides. 25 April is Anzac Day in Australia. Studying Anzac Day and national identity as a cultural object requires identifying the creators, illustrating the audience reception, and teasing out multiple meanings embedded in the object as a product of a particular time and place in society. Anzac Day today is inarguably the prime embodiment of Australian collective meanings and values, and during World War I these elements were the burgeoning foundations of a future national identity.

Certainly Anzac Day was not the only method of commemorating the soldiers of World War I by Australians. Numerous memorials sprang up, museums were built, and a few privileged people were wealthy enough to make the pilgrimage to the battlefields in Gallipoli. Still others exalted the Anzacs through songs and literature that drew connections to Greek gods and Biblical forefathers. Nonetheless Anzac Day was incredibly popular from its beginning and it clearly illustrates the strength of bonds

created by culture. The holiday encouraged widespread participation by men and by women, and included programs designed to teach children pride for the Gallipoli soldiers and their country. By 1920 Anzac Day was declared a federal holiday, with headlines declaring it Australia's national day.

The RSSILA led the formal planning of the initial Anzac Day holidays and instilled somber military marches and subdued religious ceremonies in order to properly honor the deceased soldiers. In many places, fundraising, gambling, and drinking alcohol in public were prohibited during the holiday. Within the first few years of observance however, everyday Australians expanded the holiday to include distinctly Australian events with a more festive atmosphere, such as sport. Over the years the result became a balance of formal and informal elements that mirrored the very nature of Australians themselves. Whether formal or informal, Australians considered Anzac Day to be a celebration of Australia's national birth in war and recognition of the glory and fame brought to Australians by the Anzacs. The significance and values expressed in the early years of Anzac Day would provide a common platform on which future Australians could build a sovereign nation.

The tale of Anzac is a fascinating, contingent, and paradoxical one. A war defeat turned national celebration, an exclusively male character supported by women, and a military symbol embraced by a naïve and untested society. Any one of the following chapters merits its own library of books, and this project could never aspire to pay proper homage to the people and stories involved. Its goal is merely to unfold some intricacies of Anzac in order to more clearly illustrate why Anzac appealed to Australians in 1915, who

contributed to the meanings of the budding symbol, and how the process of meaning negotiation created the first versions of a national identity still firmly in place today. Exploring the Anzac myth and its development into a common symbol reveals the power of culture in creating nations as well as the nationalism on which they are based. The elaborate process of building group identity is complex and iterative, but it is important to understand, for it contains the keys to successful, enduring social bonds.

Chapter 2

> "The mingled traditions of the bush and Anzac are, in many ways, all we have as usable materials for fashioning national identity. Understanding the cultural processes through which that identity was established and by which it is maintained is inseparable from discerning the forces through which a powerful state ideology was originated and sustained" (Seal 2004:169).

Nations and Nationalism in Sociological Literature

Nation-states are relatively new in world history, but they have become ubiquitous during the last two centuries. Nations, the communities of people within (or attempting to be within) governmental jurisdictions of nation-states, are often a catalyst for political and social movements, including those specifically labeled as nationalism. Nationalism, or the desire for each nation to have its own state, to use Ernest Gellner's definition, can be a frenzied, passionate, and extremely powerful force that leads to the creation and destruction of countries around the world. Indeed, the creation of nations via revolution or the development of common cultural identity is a fundamental feature of the modern era (Calhoun 2007). Despite existing contemporary arguments concerning a perceived decline in globalization and cosmopolitanism, the nation-state and the sentiment that each nation is self-sovereign remain powerful forces. Virtually no one is unaffected by local and small-scale affiliations like nationality. The idea that people live outside this condition is an illusion created by those in positions of relative privilege and dominant cultural orientations (Calhoun 2007). Overall, to wholly understand nations and nation-states is to understand the world we live in today and the path to our arrival.

Contemporary sociologists continue to recognize that nations, as well as their political counterparts, nation-states, require legitimacy in order to maintain a stable existence. The identity of the nation and its principles of government must resonate with the people they represent and maintain widespread support from them. Scholars have recently pointed out that any unification of peoples as a nation or the creation of a nation-state government is neither automatic nor necessary (Chernilo 2007). Fortunately, viewing the contingency of nation building has led to fresh and potentially fruitful questions regarding the particular and *multiple* ways in which communities are imagined, what symbols a group adopts, and how those symbols change over time (Spillman 1997, emphasis added). The issue then becomes less about the right to self-determination or national membership; rather, concern is over the meaning of membership, how to understand that meaning, and how national identity relates to other identities that members claim (Calhoun 2007). Consequently, historical sociologists today have been afforded an opportunity to reexamine the very foundations of the nation. Rather than focusing solely on self-sovereignty or institutional politics, a cultural spin and empirical emphasis in Sociology have brought other angles into the examinations of nations and nationalism.

Sociological literature on the nation is a landscape of contrasting viewpoints. Two broad, related debates influenced much of the early scholarly analysis: the division between ethnic and civic nationalism, and the classification of nations as essential or constructed. These categories reach back to at least the nineteenth century. Ernest Renan's foundational 1882 essay, "What is a nation?" characterized nations as the fusion of peoples. Nations, he argued, are not based on biological race but on common culture

and history, and the will to unite. As such, nations are a choice, and the choice is renewed by a referendum directly to the citizens: a nation's existence, he wrote, is a "daily plebiscite" (1882). Henceforth opposing camps of scholarship emerged: those who agreed that nations are a political choice and developed rather recently; and those who thought instead that nations are the culmination of biological and ethnic ties that date back to the origins of social life.

In the twentieth century, following World War I, Hans Kohn found it necessary to compartmentalize the extreme atrocities of Nazism, and attempted to tease out a typology of nationalisms (2008[1944]; Brubaker 1992). Kohn's contrast of civic versus ethnic nationalism, or West versus East nationalism, further entrenched dichotomous thinking by nation scholars. Ethnic nationalism was organic, meaning naturally occurring. It was based in culture and inherently reactionary, or anti-modern. The more prominent story of nationalism, on the other hand, was the story of the development of Western civilization and rational thought (2008[1944]). The narrative of social progress and continuous improvement paired well with arguments that nations arose during, or were even a product of, modernity. Literature espousing this point of view took center stage nearly four decades ago and continues to provide the central framework for nations and nationalism investigations today.

1983 brought two decisive accounts of the modern nation that saw its creation as an outcome of organizational change, in addition to being an intellectual sentiment. Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson illustrated the mechanics of the modern nation. Anderson published an account of the nation as an imagined community, though he also emphasized the nation's material foundations. National consciousness, he argued, was an

outcome of capitalism. Printers in the book publishing business increasingly expanded in search of new markets. Book distribution across a territory enabled the melding of local vernaculars into a unified language. Mass newspaper reports permitted people to be aware of the happenings around them much closer to real time than before. Although each citizen may never meet face to face, he could now envision himself as part of a community larger than his immediate neighbors. Print capitalism, for Anderson, enabled the imagining of the modern nation (1983).

Gellner attributed nations to the process of industrialization. In a decidedly material account, he explained that the increasing division of labor spawned a need for a great amount of interchangeable and mobile workers. The state was the only institution big enough to provide this basic training through mass education. State curriculum streamlined the variety of languages and culture, enabling people across a vast geographic area to communicate with one another. Industrialization and exo-education centralized the reproduction of society. As a population became more educated and culturally uniform, according to Gellner, the homogenous unit became the only one with which people willingly identified. Therefore, the sentiment of nationalism, that each nation should have its own state, is what creates nations, rather than vice versa (1983).

In sum, early nations and nationalism literature in historical sociology was primarily concerned with one ongoing debate: are nations old, and thus an essential part of human organization, or are they new, meaning the creations of modern societies. Quintessential works that have endured through contemporary discourse depict nations as products of modern processes like centralized education and industrialization, which engender a spirit of nationalism (Gellner 1983; Anderson 1983). Despite the debate over

origins, historical sociologists nonetheless agree that establishment of a nation is a rocky process at best. The key to overcoming pre-existing social differences in order to successfully establish a nation is, as Gellner espouses, culture.

Culture and Nations in Sociological Literature

Even with the perfunctory assembly of nations, Gellner stressed that their development was not smooth. Firstly, though the nation is ostensibly moving toward homogeneity of citizens, there remain differences among people that pose problems. Group classifications such as race and political views are unevenly dispersed throughout the population. They are entropy-resistant according to Gellner, meaning that they are likely to remain an obstacle to achieving uniformity in a larger society. Secondly, industrialization causes massive social and economic inequalities. Inequality is most pronounced during early the stages of industrialization. Thus the same process that engenders the sentiment of nationalism creates tangible differences in citizens' quality of life, which then become grounds in themselves for social division (1983).

A critical factor in overcoming differences, or at least disarming them, is culture. Whether it is a high culture that spreads to the masses through centralized education, or a low culture adopted by elites in order to promote tradition and a shared history among peoples, culture must be linked to the state in the era of nationalism. Due to industrialization's high demand for workers with basic training, the state becomes primarily responsible for the reproduction of its laborers through education. The centralized dispersion of education also enables a somewhat uniform version of culture to be disseminated across space and time. The state has an incentive to pursue cultural homogeneity because the overlap of political and cultural boundaries is an important

issue for social harmony, government stability and state survival. Moreover, as industrialization moves into later stages, and so egalitarianism and economic parity appear more widespread throughout society, culture becomes an increasingly prominent means for demarcating different, localized social groups within a nation. Whether or not counter-entropic features, as Gellner labels cultural traits that resist change, come to signify immutable differences and create a communication impasse between groups is a decisive factor in maintaining national unity (1983).

More recent analyses of nations and nationalism have recognized, and begun to seriously discuss, the explanatory power of culture. They are reintroducing the notion of culture, and quite importantly, using it as one strategy for moving beyond the dated dichotomy of analytical concepts in the field. A scholar at the forefront of this effort is Anthony Smith. Smith does espouse the novelty of modern nations, but he also has long been a proponent of viewing nations as the spawn of ethnies, or ethnic communities with historic, blood kinship ties (1987; 2004). For this reason, Smith has managed to maintain a rather precarious position on the border of the essentialist and constructivist viewpoints. His latest works have expanded the ontology and historical development of nations to include elements of culture (2008; 2009). Though Smith is not providing full support for unequivocally essentialist theories of the nation, such as Pierre van den Berghe's argument for its biological basis, he offers a framework to guide other scholars in bridging the gap between previously uncompromising viewpoints. He has deemed this approach ethnosymbolism.

Ethnosymbolists bring subjective and symbolic resources into the material and political discussions of nationalism. As such, ethnosymbolism helps nations and

nationalism scholars arrive at a healthy, though perhaps tentative, compromise. Nations, while existing in the modern world and developing in recent economic and political conditions, may also draw upon non-material or non-political elements of social life to establish unity. Cultural elements, such as symbols and myths, that have a rich history of their own may be weaved into the narrative of national unity. Ethnosymbolists search for the sociological foundations of nations: social and political origins of cultural unions that have come to be considered ethnic solidarities (Smith 2009).

A prime example of the sociological foundation of nations is the origin myth. A prerequisite of national emergence and development is an "aesthetically and emotionally satisfying" myth of origin (Grant 1997:95). Anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski brought myth to the forefront of empirical social science by depicting myth as a people's charter for action. A myth is a community's set of beliefs put into narrative form. Myths deal with power and morality, and supply people with identity criteria that shape images of selfhood (Overing 1997). As a result, myth helps to create boundaries for a group by offering an explanation of who they are and from where they come (Schopflin 1997).

Notably, myths can be perceptions more than historical truths (Schopflin 1997). Sociologists misunderstand myth if they think that a group's reality necessitates accuracy of self-representations (Calhoun 2007). At the same time, myths are rather difficult to instill through solely top-down mechanisms in society. A story must resonate with collective memory and seem to the group as a normal or natural position to take (Schopflin 1997). Therefore, while myth is one element in the birth of a nation, the group must also have a concern for its collective character traits and historical-cultural

contextual basis (Smith 2010). The durability of a myth and a nation rests upon the image of that nation striking a chord with the people (Smith 2010).

The study of origin myths offers an example of how the combination of ethnosymbolic with seasoned sociological approaches may lead to a deeper understanding of the nation and its development. For example, beyond helping to temper the essentialist versus constructivist debate among scholars, cultural analysis pushes Hobsbawm's concept of invented tradition, which is fundamental in nations and nationalism literature, to deeper and continuously useful places. Nations have a "double historicity": they are embedded in historical context, and they are rooted in members' traditions and memories (Smith 2009:30). Including national identity alongside philosophical or political narratives of the nation enables a more flexible, dynamic, and meaningful analysis of the nation. Through the combined lens of culture and ethnosymbolism, it is much easier to see and to confirm that nations, and their traditions, are products of compromise, of elites *and* non-elites.

Emphasizing the interplay between elites and everyday people enables scholars to have a more nuanced view of nations by connecting 'nationalism from below' with the 'nationalism from above' of cultural and political leaders (Smith 2009). Ultimately this enables scholars to place nationalism in broad historical context without having to reject the notion that nationalism is also a banal, or every day, and ongoing production. The process of symbolic cultivation involves ethnic memories, symbols, myths and traditions that can grow locally or be adopted by elites as part of a common symbolic heritage. Social context affects which symbols become meaningful to the nation and have the power to represent global status and national integration (Spillman 1997). For example,

events such as war affect both elites and non-elites, mobilize large numbers of people, and generate battle myths of heroism and collective sacrifice (Smith 2009). The creation of meaningful national symbols is not an entirely one-sided process.

Additionally, the ethnosymbolism framework remains useful for understanding the development and profundity of a sense of kinship that a group cultivates beyond biological boundaries. Objects of analysis for the ethnosymbolist include the symbols, myths, memories and traditions of a group that help to form a bond of common heritage. These subjective and symbolic resources have a role in advancing ideologies of incorporation and collective action (Smith 2009). Oftentimes they espouse themes such as autonomy, authenticity, unity, and dignity (Smith 2009). The symbols of public culture help sociologists to understand the influence of multiple groups in shaping the nation, and also to illuminate the way a nation moves from an abstract concept to a visible, tangible creation (Smith 2009). Culture is not just a potential bridge between conflicting analytical viewpoints, then; culture is also a potential bridge in everyday society.

The focus here is on nationalism as an integrating force, but a glance at the bulk of today's literature on nations reminds us that deep bonds like nationality are a rich breeding ground for conflict. Visions of a homogenous nation and absolute control of the means of violence do not often match the reality of heterogeneous groups struggling over the same land and resources. Rather than a story of developing 'a' national identity then, it is often that one version wins over alternative visions of the nation or ways of imagining community (Billig 1995).

Recognition of nationalism as unifying and as divisive poses a problem, however. If the force of nationalism can go in opposite directions, then nationalism itself is less of

an explanation of integration and disintegration, and more a political rhetoric invoked in their pursuit (Calhoun 2007). So again we see that nations and nationalism are very much political, but they cannot survive apart from other social factors, such as culture. Social factors are required then in order to gain insight into the integrative or disintegrative trajectory of any nation. Thus culturally informed and empirical analyses of specific national cases, including this project, contribute to scholarly and practical understanding of the foundation and shape of contemporary nation-states and the nationalist sentiment on which they are based.

Culture and Nations in Sociological Practice

Though much of historical sociology, and nation studies in particular, is already qualitative in nature, there remains a continual need for comparative studies of different kinds of nations and national formation paths (Smith 2009). Yet how and when can you pin down national culture, which appears to be everywhere and nowhere? One answer is that central factors in the paradigm of ethnosymbolism, for example foundational symbols and myths, are ultimately expressed as national identity. A nation's identity is the culmination of its cultural characteristics and shared values. Indeed, it is the outcome of a variety of historical projects (Calhoun 2007). To explore national identity from the beginning is therefore to tell a tale of a nation's construction, representation through self image, and potentially enduring establishment.

The key to cultural comprehension of nations and nationalism begins with national identity. National identity is the culture laboratory of the nation. To understand the birth of the nation through its national identity is to link the concept of being a nation with the concrete social practices that engender it. National identity, with its symbolic

and material elements, helps to move groups along the spectrum of national formation, and if nationhood is achieved, toward certain types of nation-states and nationalist ideologies. Nationalism itself is neither inherently democratic nor violent. Rather, from the beginning, "there needs to be some culturally constructed identity behind the word 'self' in the idea of self-determination" (Calhoun 2007:96). Original distinguishing of member from foreigner, or us from them, is a social process initially based on identification of what traits and values constitute a unique nation. Subsequently, to effectively unify smaller groups around the chosen characteristics, both symbolic and material processes of national identity may often work more to surpass idiosyncrasies than express uniformity (Spillman 1997). Culture aids nationalism by building bridges across differences, not necessarily by avoiding difference altogether. Culture, and therefore national identity, is essential for facilitating any sort of enduring bond among the nation.

A way to capture the national development process, and thus to better understand the relationships of culture and nation, is to provide a thick description of social life. Elites and non-elites contribute to production of national sentiment and symbols, and in turn these expressions of the nation become part of citizens' everyday lives (Billig 1995). Hence researchers need to pay attention to a group's symbolic repertoire, the context in which symbols are produced, and the social groups and processes that contribute to the creation and reproduction of symbols (Spillman 1997).

Lyn Spillman offers a model of research that focuses on three keys to understanding cultural aspects of a nation. The first is thick description of a group's symbolic repertoire. The researcher must identify and document as many details as

possible of a group's symbols and their use (an anthropologist may liken these symbols to totems). The second research key is to understand the context in which social symbols are produced. Scholars should consider the time period, contributing parties, and social circumstances in which symbols arise and take on meaning. The third key is to illustrate the discursive field in which the symbols gained meaning at the national level. In other words, the researcher is piecing together the story of a symbol's increasing importance to a particular nation (1997).

To Michael Billig, the social processes at the heart of national reproduction are banal, everyday activities. Today the world of nations has become the everyday world (1995). Therefore cultural elements such as daily actions, languages, and symbols in use by the common public are important factors in the definition and reproduction of a nation. Banal reproduction means that people conduct practices and routines without necessarily having conscious awareness, which Billig likens to Bourdieu's concept of 'habitus'. Banal nationality consists of numerous "unsaluted," or formally unacknowledged, symbols of the nation, such as decorating money with the face of prominent leaders (1995). Nationality, as a result, can itself be considered a form of life and can be captured by thick description.

In addition to Spillman's three internally driven keys, a study of nations and nationalism must also consider that nations are reproduced in a wider world of nations. After 1789, many modernists concur, other places around the world drew upon the French Revolution as the model for nationalist movements and nationalism principles. Since then, nation-states have become products of a set of global norms, meaning they are cultural constructions rather than independent or rational beings (Meyer et al. 1997).

As such, established scholars such as Mann and Hobsbawm have been criticized for isolating their national construction models from historical thought (Chernilo 2007). Instead, it is necessary to have a Sociology of the *concept* of the nation-state, in which changes in overarching normative claims are more systematically linked with the social processes at their base (Wagner 2003, emphasis in original). As mentioned above, exploring national birth through collective identity answers this call by revealing the distinct self-images and shared interests upon which concrete social bonds of nations and states are built.

Consideration of a nation's symbolic repertoire and formal or informal expressions of nationalism, especially those which surround its origin myths, is necessary for an in-depth portrait of group culture. These specific factors are a step toward a culturally cognizant, empirical study of particular national identities. In turn, a study of nations through the cultural lens of national identity will help to illuminate the trajectories of unification or divergence that national development may travel. The following case maps how culture is a key factor in national consensus, that is, in overcoming differences between groups of people in order to form a united nation.

A Case Study of the Cultural Birth of a Nation

Much like the United States, Australia has a short but action-packed national history. The founding myth at the core of Australian national culture derives from Australian soldiers' conduct on the shores of Turkey during World War I. The transition of a soldier story into a nationwide icon and legend is the leading narrative of Australian national identity development. Investigating this military crucible enables the researcher to capture the origin myth of Australia in its infancy as well as the collective

development of identity in a time of war and high population mobilization, making it an ideal case study of culture and the nation. Following this, one of the main strategies of historical sociologists is to use conceptual case studies such as nationhood to develop meaningful interpretations of historical patterns (Skocpol 1984). While this project is not broadly comparative, exploring the Anzac myth of World War I Australia serves as a first step toward recognition and investigation of potential, general trends of national formation, especially under the increasingly popular British world-system perspective.

Australian national identity was born in the trenches of the Gallipoli Peninsula on the Eastern Front during World War I. Rather than focus on the devastating casualty rates and the campaign's bungled tactics under British leadership, Australians at the time highlighted the courage of individual soldiers and the newfound glory of Australia in the world spotlight. Anzac, short for Australia and New Zealand Army Corps, became a story of egalitarianism, courage, athleticism, friendship, and ruggedness. It took only months after news of the army's Gallipoli experience for the myth of Anzac to make waves in Australian society and to be institutionalized with a national holiday.

The importance of Anzac went well beyond the military setting. Its centrality to Australian history and identity is tough to overestimate (Hoffenberg 2001; McDonald 2010). Because Gallipoli was nearly sacred to Australians from the outset, today's scholars can use Australia's vast collections of World War I material to trace Anzac's journey from the battlefield to the homeland. What groups of people were involved in the creation and development of the Anzac myth in Australia? What are the multiple meanings infused in Anzac, and which parts of the Australian nation does it represent? How did Anzac set the course of development for Australia's national identity?

The case of Australia is an exemplar of culture's importance to the generation of a unique national identity. Not only can researchers create a picture of Australia's national identity from its point of origin through its bloom among everyday society, Australia is particularly fascinating because that portrait does not necessarily adhere to the expectations of existing sociological theory. For example, contrary to Gellner's model, reproduction of the Anzac myth across generations did not initially occur through state-centered educational curriculum. Instead, the original meanings and importance of Anzac, including to children, was primarily instilled through firsthand participation in war support efforts and holiday ceremonies, as well as modern (at the time) technology. Accordingly, the case of Australian national identity meets the criteria demanded by Michael Burawoy's Extended Case Method of sociological research.

Burawoy's Extended Case Method (ECM) is a model of reflexive science in which the researcher builds on existing theory by extending its explanatory power to irregular cases. The core postulates of the existing theory remain intact. In reconstructing a theory, however, the researcher adds postulates that enable the theory to absorb cases that previously appeared to be anomalies (1998). On a case by case basis, the researcher can then offer new ways of examining and contemplating existing sociological explanations of phenomena. The case of Australia adds nuance to existing theories of nations and nationalism through documentation of the ways in which culture and social discussion shaped what Gallipoli would mean within Australia.

ECM is a means of constructing new knowledge in which the product, or case outcome, governs the process, or reconstruction of a theory (1998). In order to accomplish rebuilding a theory, the observer has to move (virtually, in cases of historical

participation) through time and space with her participants (1998). This requirement pairs nicely with the goals of culture and nation literatures, particularly the suggestion that scholars provide a thick description of social context and processes surrounding the development of a nation's symbolic repertoire. What ECM creates then is not a sort of external truth but an improvement on existing explanations (1998).

Fitting in with Nations Literature of Today

Along with exemplifying the commands of ECM, the case study of Australia falls squarely within other contemporary approaches on the comparative-historical sociology research agenda. Firstly, the state is viewed as an institutional framework that is both an outcome of historical processes and a factor that explains subsequent processes (Adams, Clemons and Orloff 2005). As such, the development of a unique, shared Australian identity is treated as part of the process of Australian state development, located between forming the Commonwealth under Great Britain in 1901 and Australian government independence as a nation-state in 1986. The characteristics of national identity influenced the state's own path of development as well as the establishment of a particular version of an Australian nation. The Anzac myth heavily shaped the way Australians imagined their community in light of the existing world concept of the nation-state (though prior to any specifically nationalist sentiments in Australia, which adheres to Gellner's original logic of nation formation).

Secondly, on a related note, while prominent earlier scholars including Moore and Goldstone focused on breakdowns and failed challenges to political orders already in existence, recent research considers challenges that lead to the creation of new institutions (Adams, Clemons, and Orloff 2005). Investigating the origins, content, and

diffusion of the Anzac myth as part of a path to national unification, and eventually to an independent state based on this particular national identity, certainly emphasizes aspects of institution building. Moreover, Australia adds yet another distinct twist to national identity development: devotion to the British Empire via Britannic nationalism, as well as sharing in the British Empire's World War I victory, were heavy influences on Australian self-image alongside distinctly Australian narratives.

Thirdly, the creation of nations is a common characteristic of modernity, according to Calhoun, but the outcome is not inevitable and all nations are not the same. Historical sociologists today have the cultural tools to explore how factors such as race, religion, politics, and economics converge with nationalism in multiple and nuanced ways. For example, in attempting to tease out the complexities of nations and nationalism, recent scholars have sought to reconnect the central and periphery without favoring one over the other or dissolving their analytical differences. To accomplish this, many scholars trace the institutionalization of forms of rule and formations of subjects (Adams, Clemons, Orloff 2005). Many of these tactics are informed by Foucault, and they introduce specific benefits for historical sociologists. By focusing on the formation of subjects, or the institutionalization of identities, scholars can incorporate the voices of subaltern or previously oppressed groups into their analyses. Comparatively, the shared identity of Australia emerged through an iterative and exclusionary process involving both British and Australian elements.

The above point is particularly important given feminist academic advances in reversing the exclusion of women from privileged intellectual spaces. Contemporary historical sociologists can rise to the challenge of revealing the connections between

unmarked, dominant groups and genders, races, and further groups that are considered to be Others (Adams, Clemons, Orloff 2005). A case study of Australia illustrates which parts of the social symbol of Anzac resonated with which groups in the budding nation. While the myth had countrywide appeal, the symbol of the Anzac soldier by no means incorporated all types of Australians, then or now.

It is necessary to explore, then, how and why groups such as women, clergymen, and indigenous peoples interacted with the Anzac myth when it was a fledgling symbol of an Australian nation. According to Melissa Wilde's research, the type of organizations that groups form and their ultimate effectiveness in collective debate is deeply cultural (2004). The most successful groups in debates over shared meaning will be the ones that balance aspects of collectivism with aspects of traditional bureaucracy (2004). In other words, organization is important for a group to emerge victorious in a public debate over meaning. The fit between the culture of the group itself and the culture of the larger environment in which the group was created also greatly influences the success of a group (2004). Thus one would expect that the organization of groups is a heavy factor in determining whose meanings become institutionalized and whose meanings become marginalized. While this is mostly true, a case study of Australia again will show that the quirks of culture do not reproduce exact conditions across history, and will remind the reader that Australian national identity development is a prime model of Burawoy's ECM.

Adhering to Classic Standards of Nations Research

The case study of this project pushes toward questions of meaning and social unification that are at the forefront of research, yet the same time, the methods remain

true to the core of comparative-historical sociology. Firstly, for example, qualitative data best captures dynamic relations and unfolding processes (Mahoney 2004). A "thick theory," meaning an answer that requires an in-depth analysis of sequence and duration, is required to explain the development of the Anzac myth within Australian society (Mahoney 2004:90). The timing of Gallipoli, trajectory of the war, political and journalistic events in Australia, population demographics, and imperial membership are weighty factors that must be accounted for in the narrative of Anzac's rise to national significance. In general, and similar to the process of ECM, the construction of explanations in comparative-historical sociology is a fluid process that demands attention to the contexts of variables (Mahoney 2004).

Furthermore, the case of World War I Australia affirms that early events decisively shape subsequent trajectories of action. Events that appear relatively open or contingent are especially significant (Mahoney 2004). This Australian case study focuses on events that occurred in the early decades of the Australian Commonwealth. Though they were fighting under the British imperial flag, the Anzac soldiers helped the country of Australia establish its own place on the world stage. The catastrophic experience of Gallipoli early in World War I, the British Empire's eventual victory, and the spread of the Anzac myth in Australia led to a specific version of national identity and pushed Australia along the path to nation-statehood, none of which was predestined.

Thirdly, primary document research is necessary to capture the social context and numerous variables influencing the development of Australian national identity. Historical archives offer the greatest concentration of World War I information because through the 1920s, newspapers, pamphlets, and periodicals were Australia's main sources

of communication and information. At the start of World War I, overseas news reached Australia by cable and was reprinted in the press (Johnston 2987). Cartoons, novels, ballads, films, and magazines spread popular cultural motifs and characters (Tsokhas 2001; Seal 2004). Investigating such texts and material goods is therefore vital to understanding the arrival of the Anzac myth on the continent and its increasing importance to an Australian nation. Melbourne, the de facto capital of the Commonwealth of Australia during the First World War, houses a World War I primary document collection second to none. It is therefore a quintessential site to acquire firsthand accounts of war and to tease out the birth and growth of Anzac among Australian society.

Research in Melbourne, based in classic sociological research tradition while also pushing for answers to contemporary questions and problems, led this researcher to one additional proposition: that culture and nation scholars in Sociology can continue to work cooperatively and intricately together in increasingly useful and creative ways.

A Proposal to Nations and Nationalism Sociological Literature

Wendy Griswold developed the notion of cultural objects in her blueprint for methods of qualitative sociological analysis. Bringing her approach directly into nations and nationalism conversation introduces a powerful tool for examining meaning in a field bursting with newly overturned questions about the cultural basis of one of today's most popular forms of social organization. Given culture's centrality to national identity, in this case as seen through its influence during the formation of Australian Anzac, it follows that we can treat national identity as a "cultural object" and draw conclusions about its meaning and power accordingly.

By cultural object, Griswold means “shared significance embodied in form,” or any social meaning that is tangible or can be discussed (1987:4). Much like historical sociologists regard states as both influenced and influencing, cultural objects are treated as processes: they move through space and time. In order to comprehend them, therefore, analysts begin with what is known. They draw upon distinctions and comparisons made by academic experts and local informants with firsthand knowledge of the object in question (1987). For this reason, Griswold’s model of qualitative research goes hand-in-hand with nations research and ECM, which require the researcher to ‘travel’ with the participants in her case in order to develop a rich description of its development and to situate any discoveries in existing theory.

The goal of the cultural object analyst is to comprehend the object, to determine its internal structure and symbolic carrying capacity (1987). The analyst can then explain the connections between the cultural object and the external social world in which it was engendered. The same is true for national identity. The image of the nation is shaped by western molds and also shapes them in turn. One means of accomplishing that is to identify the agents who, as members of social categories or organized groups, contribute to the creation and incorporation of an object in particular cultural circumstances. This does not mean the researcher reduces meaning to what is inside agents’ minds; rather, the researcher is constructing probabilities to questions about the given cultural object (1987). For example, the researcher can observe agents’ interpretations of the object, the impact of the object on other cultural objects, the object’s endurance, and the object’s possible canonization among field specialists (1987). Favored cultural object analyses

are those that are the most simple, explain the most of the given object's characteristics, and apply to the greatest range of cultural objects (Griswold: 1987).

This case study of Australia utilizes Griswold's methodological blueprint in its effort to explore a central origin myth of Australian culture and document its development into a nationwide identity, which in turn contributes nuance to and extends existing explanations of how culture influences the establishment of nationalism and nations in general. The concept of local sensibility, discussed by Griswold and derived from Geertz, claims that particular groups' participation in a cultural object is influenced by their economic, political, and cultural experiences. Furthermore, the experience of the agents who are most immediate to the object in space and time is distinguishable from those who are distant. The relationship of multiple groups to the object and between the groups themselves sets the ideological context of the object's creation and incorporation (1987). This case study examines the multiple groups involved in the origin and spread of the Anzac myth across Australian society. Particular attention is paid, especially along Wilde's criteria, to groups' efforts and successes or failures in influencing the meaning of the cultural object, in this case the Anzac image as a symbol Australian identity.

At the same time, this case study draws upon Griswold's model to explore the meanings held by the cultural object itself. Characteristic of all cultural objects is their level of multivocality. Extending Griswold's concept of "cultural power" from literary works to all cultural objects, it follows that objects with the most cultural power are those that balance a consensus of what the object is with the object's ability to capture diverging interpretations (1987b). The endurance of the Anzac myth as the core of Australian national identity suggests that its meaning has enough ambiguity to encompass

different groups' interpretations and at the same time provide enough common ground to be considered a nationwide, or shared, symbol. Cultural power of an object, in this case Australian national identity, is recognized foremost by the people that its form represents (1987b). Looking at the groups who originally created and developed the Anzac myth therefore reveals not only who most influenced its meanings, it also illustrates how, as a national identity, Anzac contains a combination of meanings that supports diverse interpretations without shattering.

The importance of culture in establishing shared identity and building nations is no longer in question. From Gellner to Smith and many scholars in between, nations and nationalism literature has embraced the realization that culture is a means of bridging difference and creating shared meaning among diverse groups of people. Contemporary case studies, such as this one about Australian national identity, will offer empirical evidence to existing explanations of national development about the varied and intricate ways in which culture influences the creation and spread of national identity, a necessary precursor to any formal nation or nation-state. Without sacrificing existing knowledge or standards of research in nations and nationalism scholarship, explicitly bringing the cultural analysis methods of Wendy Griswold into the conversation further enhances our ability to account for and explain the production and power of national identity. Furthermore, examining national identity as a cultural object reveals the centrality of negotiation and flexibility in the collective production of symbols and the incorporations of their meanings. Australia in particular offers a fascinating glance into the birth and growth of national identity. A tragedy turned into celebration, and a unique character

born under a cloak of tradition, the story of Anzac and Australian identity offers a rich and somewhat surprising glance into the cultural stimulus of national birth.

Chapter 3

> "There is a paradox in Australia's national history. Australian society is essentially an anti-militaristic one. Australians traditionally have shown little reverence for military institutions. They have been suspicious of militarism, distrustful of the claims of the state on its citizens for compulsory military service and often ambivalent about their country's contribution to the wars of the twentieth century. Yet, war has been profoundly significant in shaping Australian public culture and popular perceptions about the national character and identity" (Beaumont 1995:xvii).

> "Though now we pass through the valley of the shadow of death, yet shall we be lifted to heights where, illumined by the spirit of self-sacrifice, we shall see a land more glorious than we have ever known, into which, if we prove ourselves worthy, we may enter" (William Hughes in Murdoch, 1917:60).

Answering the Call of Empire

Australia, along with the other major twentieth-century white dominions, New Zealand, Canada, and to a certain extent South Africa, was part of what John Darwin calls the "British world-system" (2009). Because the Empire stretched around the world, its fate and the fates of its colonies were subject to global events. Darwin's phrase emphasizes the collected, and at times ungraceful, efforts of Britain to integrate disparate parts of the world into a commercial, political, and cultural web centered around London[1] (Darwin 2009). Niall Ferguson calls this organizational process 'Anglobalization' (2003). The use of 'British World' includes more consensual associations of formal and informal arrangements, as with Britain's white settler colonies, rather than using compulsion as a blanket characterization (Bridge and Federowich 2003).

---

[1] To reiterate a point from the previous chapter, influence effectively went both ways in the Empire. For example, five Australian colonies adopted the secret ballot in the 1850s, nearly ten years before its introduction in Great Britain (Bridge and Federowich 2003).

Certainly the white dominions were a vital piece of any British system: most were "Britannic nationalists," meaning their settler inhabitants were devoted to empire and an idealized version of Britishness (Darwin 2009). They represented the "peopling" of a global Britain, which was the heart of imperial enterprise (Bridge and Federowich 2003). The dominions were also deeply connected to Britain commercially: as early as the 1870s, the dominions' burgeoning economies depended on Britain's infrastructure of secure sea lanes, shipping, and credit. In contrast to holdings such as India, the settler colonies popularly viewed themselves as partners in empire and were the most reliant and supportive overseas faction (Darwin 2009; Meaney 2003).

The official view was that the "British nation" and her power spread across the world, from the United Kingdom to the colonies (Andrews 1993). Australian leaders wholeheartedly acquiesced. Most of them viewed themselves as British and as Australian, with no clear division between the two, and called themselves independent Australian Britons (Andrews 1993). The Australian people, too, exhibited what Darwin deems "Britannic nationalism" (2009). This nationalism did not imply subservience to the British government; rather it was an affirmed equality with British peoples and the British nation. Similarly to Canada and New Zealand, Australia's strong and subtle nationalism emerged from a desire to model its public and private institutions on 'modern' Britain's success while adapting projects to the needs of local society (Darwin 2009). At the turn of the twentieth century, such notions of national character, as they often do, influenced how Australians thought they ought to behave when the motherland went to war (Ward 1978).

Prior to WWI, Australia as a whole had limited warfare experience. The Australian Defense Act of 1903 was contrary to the desires of the British government and only allowed conscription for the defense of Australia itself (Andrews 1993). Prior to the World Wars then, the most common response by Australians to battles overseas was "mild concern mixed with apathy." Australian participants in the Boer Wars, for example, consisted mainly of self-organized militia units (Andrews 1993:37). When the state governments of Australia did go to war in 1914, they did so in service of a British Empire under widespread attack. Prime Minister William Hughes stated in 1916, Australia was not entering the war for increased territory or wealth, but to help the Empire "ensure the peaceful nations of the earth absolute security from all who seek to disturb the world's peace" (Hughes in Murdoch 1917:60).

The end of the nineteenth century saw growth in British race patriotism, which is the belief in the superiority of white civility based on a linear model of human evolution, and a renewed loyalty to the monarchy in Britain and in Australia. In contrast to pessimism of European nations prior to war, Australia perceived itself as progressing: in 1900 the basis of Australian progress was in its ability to improve physical capacity of the British race through breeding and for its industrial relations to generate social reform (Maclean 1995). Alongside such patriotism was an Australian fear of invasion from Pacific Asian countries (Andrews 1993; Crotty 2006). Even though WWI initially continued in the 19th century tradition of limited warfare, meaning destruction was contained to armies on the battlefield, Australia and other emerging societies in the era of nationalism returned to a feeling of collective threat (Schivelbusch 2003). Combined, these conditions enhanced the likelihood for Australia's voluntary commitment to

imperial military support. Writing in 1918, one soldier explained that the imperial "call to arms" for Australia was reason enough to fight: "our existence was threatened; because we were in danger, our homes, our wives, our children; because England needed us, because we were Britishers, and stood as one" (Hanman 1918:2).

In light of the continued ties to Great Britain, Australian Prime Minister W.M. Hughes declared at the beginning of World War I in 1914 that "our business is to carry out the instructions of the Imperial Government, and to give that Government our hearty and enthusiastic support." The Commonwealth of Australia's duty to empire was to provide enough capable soldiers to meet the demand from London (Robertson 1990:16). Politicians were backed by popular will, leading Australia, as well as other white dominions, to commit to the war effort at their own expense (Darwin 2009). Posters in support of the war asked citizens to help save the Empire and to pray for the soldiers overseas.[2] Religious advisors too stressed the call to serve Britain. Anglican clergy, most of them English, stressed that "Empire is a trust for development from Almighty God himself" (Andrews 1993:35). The Anglican Church was unavoidably connected to the British government: the monarch was the head of the church and members prayed for the royal family daily. The moral obligation for self-sacrifice could therefore be seen to better the broader British world as well as Australians personally (Withycombe 2001). Loyalty to Great Britain, along with a desire to find a 'place in the sun' as a globally reputable partner of Empire, led the Australian state to willingly join WWI (Robertson 1990). To this day the subsequent impact of WWI on Australians and their national

[2] See Appendix A for images.

identity remains a large part of Australia's development and effective transition away from empire, to self-governance.

The Gallipoli Campaign

WWI was the first major military debut for Australian and New Zealand troops, often called by the acronym ANZAC (Australia and New Zealand Army Corps). Anzac consisted of six times as many Australians as New Zealanders. New Zealanders and Australians served as one corps due to the geographic proximity to one another, though the two countries' soldiers often did not meet until arriving in the Middle East. The Anzacs' first taste of battle came on the southern tip of the Gallipoli Peninsula, in the country of Turkey and facing the Aegean Sea. The military history of Gallipoli reveals a relatively minor battle of WWI, but a nonetheless gruesome one that resonated deeply with involved countries.

The Dardanelles Campaign was a joint British-French operation that sought to capture Constantinople in order to defeat Turkey, a German ally. The entire Middle Eastern Force (MEF) was under the command of Sir Ian Hamilton, who had served as the chief of staff for Secretary of State for War Kitchener during the Boer War. Hamilton is often criticized for providing overly optimistic outlooks for Gallipoli attacks and for always having an excuse prepared for the tactics' failure (Macleod 2004). In reality, Gallipoli shared characteristics of other floundered Eastern campaigns by Britain in 1915, including: unrealistic goals, negligible artillery support, inadequate medical arrangement, incompetent commanders, and disrupted communication (Hart 2011). Though Winston Churchill, at the time First Lord of the Admiralty, crafted the plan as a way to end the

war early, Gallipoli was a quagmire that dragged on for eight months and brought Churchill's demotion.

The Australian soldiers went first to Egypt, where they underwent training in preparation for their Eastern Front deployment. The terrain and climate were quite a contrast to Australia. The cloudless skies, endless dust, strong windstorms, and plagues of flies made camping difficult. The heat could reach over one hundred twenty degrees in the shade, and many soldiers resorted to wearing colored glasses to block the glaring sun (Doull 1916). A soldier's day included dawn drills and long marches in the sand, followed by friendly boxing rounds for entertainment, black eyes included ("An Anzac" 1916). However, if the soldiers thought they lived in harsh conditions, they only had to look to local residents to refresh their perspective. The army camp did not have an incinerator, so mule-pulled carts hauled away food scraps. People would descend on the wagons at the edge of camp, extracting every morsel of food to cook and then sell to the lowest classes of Egypt (Doull 1916). By the end of 1915, only the second year of the war, 116,986 soldiers of the Australian Imperial Force (AIF) had been put through the Cairo training camp experience (Robertson 1990).

The Dardanelles Campaign started on April 25, 1915, and from the start, the battle of Gallipoli was a disaster. The troops landed in the wrong place, found unexpected cliffs, and faced massive disorder in the distribution of supplies (Robertson 1990). As the first boat touched the shores of Turkey, a shingle shot broke the silence and was quickly followed by heavy Turkish fire. Commander Charles Dix of the 11th Australian Infantry Battalion turned to yell angrily, "Tell the colonel that the damn fools have taken us a mile too far north!" (Cameron 2013:15). Subsequently, beneath Turkish bullets and shrapnel,

many men did not make it to the beach. Some died trying to swim to shore, and others were even hit awaiting departure, spraying blood and body matter over the soldiers in line to disembark (Cameron 2013). Later waves of soldiers remarked that the front lines must have been “a combination of mule, goat and lion, to have succeeded as they did” (Robertson 1990:70).

The men spent the duration of the battle on an exposed beach encampment under constant bombardment from Turkish troops on higher ground. Stretcher-bearers, previously derided as “linseed-lancers” amongst army infantrymen, were now sworn to be the bravest of the brave (Cameron 2013:107). The lack of accurate maps or grid references meant that medical supplies and teams were not easily located. Without stable wireless communication, instructions and reports had to be manually carried along the beach by small boats. For the first forty-eight hours, there was only one hospital ship stationed nearby. Dead and wounded men were piled aboard transport ships. One ship recorded six hundred fifty-nine men, three doctors, and no sterile supplies (Tyquin 1993). The beach quickly filled with wounded soldiers and many were hit a second and even third time while waiting for medical assistance (Cameron 2013). At the “Hell’s Spit” point of Anzac Cove, at least twenty dead men, half in the water and half in the blistering sun, laid in a heap opposite a machine gun embankment. It would be three days before anyone moved them[3] (Tyquin 1993).

News of the reality of conditions was slow to reach England and Australia and bore only a “surreal and disjointed relationship to the war as it was experienced”

---

[3] For a detailed account of Anzac medical troops and conditions, see *Australian Army Medical Corps in Egypt* by James W. Barrett and Lieutenant P.E. Deane, 1918.

(Williams 1999:9; see also Crotty 2006). In reality, the eight months of the Gallipoli campaign brought many battles, many casualties, and little if any gained ground for the British and European troops. The survivors of the Gaba Tepe offensive had to be rescued by the navy. At Helles, soldiers were massacred as they attempted to rush across one thousand open meters, a feat they tried twice. The AE2 attack disrupted Turkish shipping but the attacking troops were captured and four men died in captivity. The long string of futile offensives, including Lone Pine, The Nek, Pine Ridge, Suvla Bay, Hill 60 and many others, were aptly summarized as "utter madness with no hope of success" (Cameron 2013: 260). Heightening the tragedy was that nearly all the men who died at Gallipoli remained there. Their tombs were far from home and many of their relatives did not have the means to travel to the gravesites. Many Anzacs were seen to have last "reunions" with their fallen comrades prior to leaving the peninsula for good (Cameron 2013). With the exception of two soldiers, General Thomas Bridges in 1915 and the unknown soldiers entombed in 1993, no bodies were repatriated to Australia (Crotty 2009).

By the time London based Commander Lord Kitchener, Secretary of State for War, ordered a retreat in December, Australia had lost around eight thousand men. Britain, in comparison, had four times as many soldiers killed at Gallipoli, and the Turks lost over eighty-six thousand. While Australia did suffer the highest ratio of casualties to embarkations at Gallipoli (64.98, or about sixty-five percent), in deaths as a proportion of the total home population they were third behind Great Britain and New Zealand (Andrews 1993; Darwin 2009). As it turned out, Australian casualties at Gallipoli were small even compared to later Australian deaths. Six times as many Australian soldiers

died in France on the Western Front between 1916 and 1918 (Andrews 1993), and Australia has more memorials in France than any other British dominion (Gammage 2007). In total, sixty thousand Australians died in WWI and more than one hundred fifty thousand men returned home with injuries (National Archives of Australia 2009). It would be understandable then for later World War I battles to overshadow the deaths and failure of Gallipoli. Yet the experience at Gallipoli was unequivocally important to the country of Australia, even when compared to the impact of war subsequently felt by other white dominions: Gallipoli in particular launched a myth that profoundly altered the way Australians defined themselves.

Australian Soldiers at Gallipoli: The Original Anzacs

Australia was the *only* country in World War I to have an army entirely comprised of volunteers. Along with Canada and New Zealand, Australia's commitment to the war came fundamentally from its settlers' shared sense of British identity (Darwin 2009). At the same time, historians may have overstated the initial rush to enlist for WWI in Australia. In fact, only 6.4 percent of the eligible population enlisted by the end of 1914 (Andrews 1993). This is not surprising given Australians' past apathy for military affairs overseas. What is surprising is that a relatively small percentage of the population forever changed an entire continent's imagination.

Eventually physical requirements for recruits were relaxed[4], but at the outset, the myth of the strapping, tan young digger was no myth at all. Members of the First Australian Imperial Force (AIF) had to be between the ages of nineteen and thirty-eight,

---

[4] Inadequate physical screenings would become a problem for the army. Physical deformity of hands, cataracts resulting in near blindness, and major dental issues rendered many soldiers practically useless (Tyquin 1993).

at least five feet, six inches tall, with a chest measurement of thirty-four inches (Macdougall 1991). Approximately eighty-two percent of the First AIF soldiers were unmarried, forty-two percent were labor workers while just ten percent were from professional classes, and two-thirds came from Victoria or New South Wales (Beaumont 1995). They were young, brawny, and eager to serve, but it was their collective inexperience and loyalty to one another that left the greatest stamp on Australian history: they lost on the battlefield, after all, but their spirit of camaraderie and determination under duress became the "real" legacy of Anzac (Hart 2011:453).

The most easily identified aspects of Anzac soldiers, or diggers as they were often called after 1917, were anti-authoritarianism (particularly toward army officers), irreverence and arrogance, cynicism, nonchalant attitudes toward death, and by later accounts, aggression and racism. At the same time, Anzac tradition also contained elements such as sentimentality and pity, which are often overlooked (Seal 1991:2004). One of their most infamous traits by far, however, was their clever and rowdy sense of humor. Never was this more on display than in the trenches, in the soldier tales known as yarns. Yarns, like soldier songs, touted male bravado while underlying human desires for home, family, and familiarity (Seal1991). Originally told as oral anecdotes to pass the time, yarns later became "capsules of nostalgia" for returned soldiers and subject of popular print in Australia (Seal 2004:85).

During World War I, some soldiers went as far as publishing yarns in troopship literature on the boats between military bases. The majority of troopship papers were published on jelly copiers, but on many occasions soldiers created handwritten copies because they could not locate a typewriter. The papers' gossip, notes, news, and literature

provided a welcome distraction from the monotony of ship life. They also provided a safe outlet for minor grievances arising from life in tight quarters (Kent 1987). One publication, called the *Aussie*, aimed to boost morale and called for each issue to be "a cheerful storyteller, a good humorist, a clever wit, a cobber worth having. In short, make him a dinkum Aussie" (A.S.H. Gifford Papers January 18, 1918). Oftentimes soldiers created souvenir editions of these magazines that were sent home to loved ones with personalized inscriptions and contained advertisements for products that loved ones could purchase for the troops (Kent 1987; A.S.H. Gifford Papers 1916). Thus troopship literature helped to reinforce the notion that Anzac soldiers were the personification of the Australian war and was "an important instrument in the conditioning process that turned citizens into soldiers" (Kent 1987:9).

Australian yarns were frequently ways of conveying the distinctiveness of the Australian soldiers, especially in their wit and humor, from their British and French counterparts in the trenches. One popular yarn tells how an Australian used differences in cultural expression to win the hand of his fellow soldier's sister: the Australian wanted to meet "ze tart" so the Frenchman brought him pastry. Laughing, the Australian said, "No, ze girl," which led the Frenchman to introduce him to his sister. The Australian proposed to her, but the Frenchman never understood the somewhat lewd meaning of the Australian's original request (Mills 1917). Of course Australians were also keen to find humor at their own expense as well, such as singing, "We are the Ragtime Army - The ANZACS, We cannot shoot, we won't salute, What bloody good are we?" (*Sunday Times* 1915 in Seal 1991). The Australians' military inexperience and disregard for the discipline of army life stood in stark contrast to the professional soldiers from Europe.

Other yarns displayed how Anzac humor often developed into characteristic larrikinism or even outright subordination, especially toward British officers:

> One Digger, straight from the trenches, arrived at an English railway station just as the train was pulling out. He dashed along the platform, flung open a door and jumped inside, not realizing it was a first-class compartment. Two English majors were the only other occupants, and they glared with distaste at the disheveled colonial. The train rattled on in silence for a while, then one of the officers leaned forward and introduced himself to the other. "Major Ponsonby-Fanshawe, Royal Artillery," he announced. "Married, two sons, both at Eton." The other man shook his hand. "Major Brinkley-Smythe," he said. "Royal Fusiliers. Married, two sons, both at Harrow." And with that, they both turned and stared at the upstart Australian private who had dared to enter an officers-only compartment. "G'Day!" he said cheerfully. "Bluey Johnson of the AIF. Not married, two sons – both majors in the British Army" (Fields 1990:19).

Anzac humor was certainly cheeky and rather entertaining, though soldiers' jokes and behavior could take on a crude, and even sometimes sinister hue that was often overlooked until several decades after the experiences of the First AIF. While such behavior was not characteristic of all Australian soldiers, it is important not to overlook the darker elements that lingered in the Anzac character. The ramifications of these strains for a burgeoning sense of Australian national identity will be discussed in forthcoming paragraphs. Again, some of it was rather harmlessly vulgar, such as the verse, "Here's to the Kaiser, the song of a bitch; May his balls drop off with the seven year itch; May his arse be pounded with a lump of leather, Till his arsehole can whistle 'Britannia' forever (Private Notebook 1916 in Seal 1991, original spelling). On the other hand, the humor of yarns could convey more harmful sentiments than distaste for Germany. For example, some jokes revealed masculine aggression, even sexism, that likely underpinned western patriarchal notions of gender in the early twentieth century:

"An Australian, Scotchman, and an Irishman were walking along a street in Boulogne. A pretty French girl passed them. 'Oh,' said the Scotchman. 'I wish 'twas wee Mary.' 'I wish it was Bridget,' said the Irishman. 'Um,' said that Australian, 'I wish it was dark'" (Wells 1920). The line between youthful friskiness and sexual assault remains ambiguous in printed form.

Oscillation between light and dark elements characterized more of the Anzac experience than soldiers' jokes and comical anecdotes. On the actual battlefield, the issue of race, especially the notion of supremacy of the white British people, could manifest itself in rather ugly expressions. One soldier did not understand what he called the "queer" sense of Australian humor. Anzacs joke in the midst of danger, they swear often, and they will "inflict all the Arabic [they] knew (picked up in Egypt) on the feeling Turk" (Anzac 1916:122). In some cases, yarns became hushed tales of the menacing side of the carefree, charming Australian soldiers. The same soldier wrote in his diary that at one point, "Strange yarns going the rounds that some of our chaps have been indulging in reprisals. 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' is the motto of the men from Australia and New Zealand, so if the enemy has been playing up in a way of that kind he'll get his own back—with interest" (Anzac 1916:143). Such episodes occurred before any strategic "peaceful penetration" tactics by Australians on the Western Front in 1918, meaning in all likelihood that they were not officially sanctioned missions.

That said, there is also documentation that by the end of the Gallipoli campaign the Australians had developed a sort of reverence for their Turkish counterparts in the trenches. The Anzacs could respect the bravery and determination of the enemy soldiers. On 24 May, both sides of the military honored an armistice in order to bury their dead,

some of whom had lain uncovered since falling on the first day of battle. During this moment it was noted than in many places, such as Quinn's Post, the enemies' trenches were so close to each other that they could reach out and shake hands (Cameron 2013). One time the Anzacs threw chocolate over the trenches instead of grenades, offering some Turkish soldiers their first taste of the sweet. The Turks responded with tomatoes and apples. There was also a series of days when Turkish soldiers dropped off tobacco in exchange for scrap paper from the Anzacs (Lindsay 2006). At the end of the day, it seems, outback sentiments of egalitarianism and brotherhood ruled, and certainly it was the better traits of Anzacs that demarcated their legacy beyond the battlefield in the years after World War I.

The overwhelming majority of yarns and soldier documentation is in regard to the courage and heroism of the Australian Anzacs. These were men who stayed in the trenches to shoot the enemy despite two broken legs. Men who "lived hard, fought hard, and died hard" (Anzac 1916). Yarns spoke specifically about the significance of Gallipoli and the grandeur of those who died on Turkish soil. An Irish Australian soldier at Gallipoli, writing under the name Anzac-Aussie-Franco (1918), used verse to mourn the dead and to compare the Anzacs to heroes of the Greek battle of Troy, which occurred on the same soil:

> Oh! many a home is desolate,
> And many a heart is sore
> Away beneath the Southern Cross,
> That far Australian shore.
> Their loved ones lie a-sleeping now
> Where Grecian heroes lie;
> The same pale moon looks down at them,

The same stars in the sky (July 1915).

Later on, others declared the uniqueness, even almost sacred quality, which distinguished the original soldiers of Gallipoli from later recruits inspired by their actions. Others, the poem "The Real Anzac" declares, may claim the zeal and spirit of the original soldiers, but never their name (1918).

Gallipoli and the Anzacs would hold a special place in the Australian imagination. Gallipoli was Australia's first major military undertaking, on foreign soil with places named Gaba Tepe and Sari Bair, and ended as a crushing loss of life for such a young and zealous country. Merely four months after retreat from Gallipoli, and one year from the official beginning of the campaign, Australian Prime Minister William Hughes spoke to soldiers of the infamy of their fallen brothers. Telling them their names would be "household words," Hughes avowed that "the deathless story of the Gallipoli campaign will yet be sung in immortal verse, inspiring us and generations of Australians and New Zealanders yet unborn with pride of race, courage, tenacity of purpose, endurance, and that casting out of fear without which men, though boasting themselves free, are but wretched slaves" (Murdoch 1916:70). And Anzac came to be just that in the post-war years: an infamous symbol in Australia filled with notions like courage under fire, pride in a white British race, and respect for those who answered the call of empire and country.

On May 17, 1915, the soldier Ellis Silas wrote in his war diary that his dead comrades "have handed future generations a fuller, deeper meaning of the word Patriotism" (Robertson 1990:93). Silas could have added that the Anzacs established a

deeper meaning to the word Australian. Certainly Australians valued their allegiance to Britain, but Gallipoli also enabled Australians to begin to display pride in characteristics they could consider uniquely theirs. The Anzac soldier embodied the courage, egalitarianism, and rugged nature of the people of the 'outback'. For example, Anzacs despised rigid class divisions and the distance between British military officers and the men (Andrews 1993). Anzacs were self-reliant, athletic, they had a relaxed attitude, and dry sense of humor (Macleod 2004). Anzacs gained positive attention within the military for their bravery and persistence from the first days of Gallipoli, and it was not long before the Anzac idealization travelled back to Australia.

Charles Bean and the Anzac Myth Blueprint

The foremost individual in the development and distribution of the Anzac myth on Australian soil is Charles Edwin Woodrow (CEW) Bean[5]. Bean, the war correspondent for *The Sydney Morning Herald*, traveled with the Australian troops to Egypt and was one of very few reporters allowed on the Gallipoli Peninsula during the fighting. In contrast to cut-and-dry military historical records, journalists like Bean offered an interpretation and a sense of meaning about unfolding events on the battlefield (Macleod 2004). Bean considered himself as writing the "national" history, in contrast to military history, and thought his version would be read "by my nation as long as it exists" (CEW Bean in Macleod 2004:67). For Bean, Gallipoli also restored the good image of Australian soldiers, who had earned a reputation for leave-breaking and debauchery while stationed in Egypt (Thomson 1994). His sentiments were echoed by another author at the

[5] Bean wrote a 'popular' history of New Zealand at Gallipoli. It was three volumes and not as heavily documented as the six volume 'official' history of Australian troops, suggesting New Zealanders did not see war history as a memorial to men in the trenches (Inglis 1998).

time, Chaplain Guy Thornton. Thornton denounces the cheap liquor and saloons that sprang up in the wake of the troops' arrival, which constantly tempted soldiers into immorality. Thornton declared, "To deny the existence of unspeakable vice and grossly open immorality in Cairo is unhappily impossible, but I do deny, and deny most emphatically, that the majority of our splendid soldiers were guilty of the various excesses which have been attributed to them" (1916). He goes on to detail the underside of The Fishmarket, Cairo's most notorious slum at the time, but much of his writing was excised at the 'suggestion' of the censors (1916).

Like many World War I authors and journalists, Bean too followed censorship rules and did not publicly criticize the army or political authorities. In his writing, Bean instead focused on his fascination for soldiers' individual heroism (Andrews 1993). Bean characterized Australian soldiers as the most loyal on earth. Furthermore, he believed that the Australian army was good because of its character, especially its egalitarianism, and he wrote his history based on that belief (Inglis 1965). Bean considered Australian soldiers "bushmen in disguise," and during the earliest days of Gallipoli, claimed that "the wild pastoral life of Australia, it if makes rather wild men, makes superb soldiers" (CEW Bean in Andrews 1993:62).

Bean's references to bushmen and the outback drew on existing Australian images of its white residents and the ways in which their toil in a harsh environment uniquely shaped their characters. At the turn of the twentieth century, bushmen were seen to exhibit "manly independence" while also being unequivocally egalitarian and devoted to one's mates. The concept of mateship was so well established by the 1880s that to refuse a drink invitation was to instead invite one's peril (Ward 1978:216). Subsequently,

in the twentieth century, one identified being an Australian with reference to the trait that distinguished him from his European counterparts: being a frontiersman (Ward 1978). The ubiquitous bush values of brotherhood paired with social reformist visions of class cooperation and economic progress surrounded the development of the Australian self-image, which became embodied in the tale of the Australian soldier and in turn contributed to the construction of the Anzac myth of WWI (MacLean 1995; Seal 2007).

Though Bean wrote his official history of Australia in WWI after 1918, during the war Bean compiled *The Anzac Book*, which shared battlefield stories and illustrated army camp conditions. Bean solicited writings from soldiers in the trenches for the book. 150 made submissions, but that is a fraction of the thirty-six to forty-one thousand soldiers that served on Gallipoli, which means much of the content is Bean's own writing. He excluded material that was different from his personal vision of Anzac (Andrews 1993). For example, later interviews with veterans of Gallipoli revealed soldiers' scorn for their ill treatment on the peninsula (as well as in Australia, after the war) despite their reputation as heroes (Thomson 1994). Bean himself treasured *The Anzac Book* because its contributions "articulated the Anzac philosophy" of these untried colonial sons (Miller 1987:33).

The Anzac Book and Bean quickly become foremost authorities on the Anzac soldiers and their experience at Gallipoli. He intended for his book to inform people of his vision of Anzac and also to commemorate the soldiers, which at times gives the text a romantic tint (Macleod 2004). The national government of Australia consented to Bean's depiction of himself as "Official Historian" of the war though, and agreed not to alter his accounts (Macleod 2004). The book sold an astounding one hundred thousand copies in

its first year of publication. In 2010, the 3rd edition of *The Anzac Book* was published. This set contained material deemed unsuitable in 1916, such as soldiers' cynicism and criticism of authorities, further suggesting the tailored nature of the original Anzac literature and popular myth.

Contemporary scholars have criticized Bean for dictating an idealized, and often unrealistic, version of Anzac. Bean simplified and generalized the Anzac experience, leading some to argue he created a hegemonic legend that does not capture Anzac or Gallipoli complexity (Thomson 1994). Indeed, several of Bean's claims about the soldiers stand in contrast to official records. Nearly forty percent of the Australian Imperial Force (AIF), of which Anzac was a part, was actually British, not Australian born (Andrews 1993). Less than fourteen percent were from bush country, even though Bean considered the wild spirit of the bushman to be quintessential to Anzac (Andrews 1993). Furthermore, the romanticized version of Australian character ignored traits such as alcoholism, crudity, and criminality (Seal 2004). Nonetheless, his version of the Anzac myth became widespread and celebrated in the months following Gallipoli.

Bean created an early and influential version of Anzac and provides the most prominent example of the way in which printed publication drove Anzac myth creation and growth. In addition to Bean, newspapers declared April 25 to be the "national baptism of fire" and proof of Australia's worthiness to Britain (Thomson 1994). Publications such as the *Aussie* made it a policy to reprint prose, poetry, and cartoons from soldiers' trench journals[6] (Seal 2004). In this way, the development of the Anzac into a shared myth and a fledgling national identity follows the stages of national

[6] See Magazine cover photo in Appendix A.

development outlined by Anderson. Print capitalism, such as books and newspapers, enabled Australian residents to identify similarities between people of different regions in the country. The texts also enabled Australians to begin imagining themselves as part of a unified federation, rather than residents of individual states.

In general, despite the myth's inaccuracies or inadequacies, Anzac became crucial to contemporary Australia, and the Gallipoli experience turned the peninsula into "a country of the mind" (North 1936:17). For the Anzacs, the harsh weather and sparse vegetation reminded them of the Australian outback, which enabled them to draw a direct link between fighting in the Middle East and on their homeland frontiers[7]. For Australians who had never seen Gallipoli, highlighting the topographic similarities in letters and newspapers allowed people to imagine Gallipoli as a world stage that stretched across borders and directly connected Australia to the battlefield (Hoffenberg 2001).

Rather than focus on the failed Dardanelles Campaign itself, CEW Bean and Australians glorified the individual soldiers, whom they viewed as acting heroically in battle under bungled British leadership and tactics (Macleod 2004; Robson 1969). This is not an unheard of tactic. The shock of defeat increases in direct proportion from the site of defeat, and in its wake a philosophy of empathy can develop that tries to identify and explain the defeat's significance (Schivelbusch 2003). Instead of a blow to country and empire, Australians identified Gallipoli as the unveiling of the true Australian nature and spirit. According to the newspaper *Brisbane Courier,* "national qualities were revealed at

[7] To reiterate, cultivation of wild land was a prominent theme in Australia, enhancing the importance of pioneers, pastoralists, and shearers in local lore (Tsokhas 2001). Recognizing the transferal of elements between the romanticized bush and WWI soldiers is necessary to better understand the resonance of the Anzac myth (Seal 2004).

Anzac," including "to dare to the uttermost, and to count life as nothing compared with the performance of duty" ("The Celebration of Anzac." *Brisbane Courier* 8 March 1916:6). Even the aforementioned soldier with misgivings about his fellow Australians' penchant for revenge commended their bravery in the face of certain defeat. He writes:

> Has a single instance ever come to light in which even a platoon of Australian or New Zealand troops abandoned their trench and bolted? No, even when out of ammunition and unable to reply to a murderous fire. What was it that cause first one line and then another of those big Australian Light Horsemen to charge to certain death at Quinn's post? Discipline! War discipline! The kind that counts. They didn't salute much (except when in an unusually good humour—or outside a big drink), even their own officers, but they would follow those officers to certain death—and well the officers knew it (Anzac 1916: 76-7).

Anzac and the Battle of Gallipoli have retained importance in Australia for nearly a century, which suggests they have deep roots and gather renewed significance from Australians. Indeed, the strength of the Anzac holiday continues to galvanize national institutes and icons (Seal 2004). In 1993, an unknown soldier from WWI received a state funeral in Canberra on live television. The soldier symbolized all Australians who died in military service and became a permanent monument of remembrance (Curran and Ward 2010). Prime Minister Keating remarked that original Anzacs of WWI embodied the tolerance and youth of the "young nation" (Curran and Ward 2010:3). The impact of Anzac, then, clearly spread beyond the battlefield (see also Page 2010). The Anzac story grew to become a vital means with which Australians identify themselves: who they have been, who they are now, and what they want to become (Thomson 1994). The story of Anzac, in short, is a vision of an Australian nation.

Anzac Myth in Australia

The myth of the rugged, brave comrades on the shores of Gallipoli traveled across the Indian Ocean and spread throughout Australian society. Its notoriety grew at an incredible pace for the time period: by 1 July 1916 the Commonwealth Government enshrined the term Anzac in order to protect it from commercialization, an act which furthered the ascent of the term to a sacred status (Seal 2007). Anzac offered a glorified version of people from Australia, and for arguably the first time enabled inhabitants to link their unique traits with the influence of their geographic homeland. To be sure, the version of Australians that Anzac offered could be quite at odds with real life on the continent. Australian society was not as homogenous in the WWI years as it tends to be depicted. While the population was ninety-seven percent British, this obscured different traditions between English, Scots, Welsh, and Irish Catholics in the country. Moreover, on top of unequal economic wealth between classes, most power belonged with recent migrants to Australia, rather than seasoned inhabitants (Andrews 1993). For Australia, as well as New Zealand and Canada, it was ‘Britannic nationalism’ that kept alive the vision of social cohesion at the start of the war (Darwin 2009). Prior to Gallipoli, Australians were not widely considered distinguishable from the “British race” that circulated the globe.

Gallipoli, however, was the beginning of the end of any Australian youthful whims of glory and empire (Lewis 1980). First, faith in British leaders’ wisdom and the glamour of war could not last under fierce conditions on the peninsula and mounting death tolls (Andrews 1993). Second, while Gallipoli, as mentioned above, did not become a rallying cry for Australian independence, the Anzac myth introduced a uniquely Australian element to the commonwealth’s narrative. For decades Australian teachers had

taught British history in schools because Australia had such a short history of white inhabitants. Schools taught children "proper" conduct and attitudes that instilled a sense of patriotism and duty to the British Empire (Andrews 1993:32). In contrast, the Anzac myth began outside of the centralized education curriculum and offered Australians of all ages the chance to relish a unique sense of pride. In somewhat of a modification of Gellner's account of national development then, uniform education was not the predominant means by which Anzac was first cultivated. In order to better understand the development and significance of Anzac, we must also explore the basis of the myth in broader popular culture.

We can ask why the Anzac myth took root and endured as the main source of Australian national identity rather than a reiteration of British heritage. For example, the British Empire's World War I victory enabled it to stay alive while other empires crumbled. The Empire lost less and won more than any other war party, which kept London and its colonies afloat and united under the British flag through subsequent financial and political turbulence around the world (Darwin 2009). In addition, military history and Bean's volumes alone cannot capture the importance of the Anzac myth to the narrative of Australian social and political development. Today's scholars must conduct their own research so as to avoid re-filtering secondhand versions or acutely romanticized viewpoints. Thirdly, given the seemingly slapdash cohesiveness of the earliest versions of the Anzac myth, there is a need to investigate the multiple available meanings of Anzac in its early years. Which versions appealed to which groups of people and how did these accounts solidify into a broader vision? This is especially important to

consider for women and other minorities, whose war efforts were overlooked and who were initially barred from participating in Anzac Day (Davies 1996; Seal 2004).

In the end, exploring questions of identity enables innovation in the ways we think of what binds people together, where conflicts emerge, and how we identify constraints and possibilities in social relations (Spillman 1997). Anzac is an incomparable influence on the way in which Australia imagines itself. Its importance for Australian identity was recognized almost immediately after the 25 April, 1915 landing on Turkish shores (McDonald 2010). Today, Australia (and New Zealand) may well be the only country whose most popular national day commemorates the death of soldiers in an overseas war (Inglis 1965). Gallipoli was Australia's first experience on the world stage, and provided the foundations for a national identity that celebrated Australian courage and comradeship. To understand how and why Anzac became the core of Australian identity, we must inquire into the ways that it captivated and inspired an assortment of groups within the Commonwealth.

Chapter 4

> "Though born from the doomed campaign at Gallipoli, the spirit of Anzac is not really about loss at all. It is about courage and endurance, and duty, and love of country, and mateship, and good humor and the survival of a sense of self-worth and decency in the face of dreadful odds." (Sir William Dean, Governor General of Australia 1996-2001, in Parliament of Victoria 2002)

> "Our duty to them is quite plain. Wherever you meet a returned solider, drop all party politics, religious arguments, and be as we were abroad; no States, no parties—simply Australians fighting for the Empire." (McKenzie, RSSILA 1918)

Anzac quickly became the zeitgeist of Australia once word of the Australian soldiers' courageous effort reached home shores. With news of fatalities and gruesome conditions lagging behind, the images of daring young men donning khaki, braving enemy fire and conquering foreign lands captured the imagination of the Australian population. Discussion over the meaning of Anzac to Australia at home and in the global spotlight came quickly to the public sphere once newspaper reports started rolling. A main thread that emerged from the chatter espoused the heroism of the soldiers. The strapping, easygoing mates of the outback fought for the life of the Empire and the future of the white race, and as such were granted a grand pedestal and an air of infallibility. This golden, glorified version of Anzac came at the reigns of two prominent social groups: the league for returned soldiers, and women's organizations.

These two bodies were the largest and most well organized factions in Australia at the time. For this reason, in support of Melissa Wilde's notion, veterans and women led the conversation about what Anzac meant both as a body of men and as a partner of empire. Wilde argues that groups that balance a feeling of collectiveness and

participation with a traditional sense of bureaucracy will be the most successful in promoting their message (2004). The Returned Soldiers' and Sailors' League and the wartime organizations of women, particularly the Red Cross and the Women's Peace Army, sprang to life as vast networks of local clubs that federated under central leadership at astonishing speed and efficiency. Certainly this process was as culturally driven as Wilde would predict. The self-reliant and egalitarian spirit highly regarded by Australians cultivated groups with goals to aid their fellow man and provide second-to-none support to the cause of empire despite their distance and inexperience.

In contrast, groups with less centralized organization or cultural cache barely entered public consideration regarding Anzac, let alone had any measurable influence on its crystalized meaning. Some groups like the International Workers of the World certainly had opinions regarding Australian war participation and soldiers, but were relatively small and eventually prohibited outright from public discussion due to their political beliefs. As most of their attention came during the conscription debates, they will chiefly be discussed in the next chapter. The indigenous peoples of Australia also failed to register in public discussion, though it is very clear that organization and cultural resonance are only part of their story. The Aboriginal population of Australia was much more concerned with survival and self-defense than with overseas issues. The thousands of tribes of indigenous people had suffered brutal treatment, complete disenfranchisement, and institutional discrimination at the hands of white settlers. While some Aboriginal people did serve in the Australian military during World War I and died alongside the white soldiers, they were rarely acknowledged or rewarded with lasting

records of their service (National Archives Australia 2009). Consequently, they were omitted from the earliest considerations of Anzac images.

In the case of World War I Australia, the dominant group in the discussion of Anzac was the Returned Soldiers' and Sailors' League. As Wilde states, the most successful groups in a public debate will have their meanings and values institutionalized to the greatest degree. In addition to the level of organization, the success of a group also depends on the fit between the culture of the group and the culture of the larger environment (Wilde 2004). Australian ideology at the time mirrored western European notions of patriarchy and gender segregation of labor. Men ruled the public domain, including politics and finance, while women were relegated to the private domestic sphere. The notion that women were called to be mothers shaped the messages that their organizations put forward, sometimes to the extent that they unintentionally impeded their own efforts toward public leadership. Consequently, Australian veterans' whitewashed portion of Anzac dominated discussion and would ultimately win institutionalization through holiday rituals. In turn, the impression of courage, mateship and honor that the veterans managed reinforced the vision of a young, virile, strong Australia from which the soldier image came.

RSSILA Leads the Way

The Returned Sailors' and Soldiers' Imperial League of Australia (RSSILA, later renamed the Returned Services League) led efforts to shape the meaning of the Anzac myth and its subsequent institutionalization as Anzac Day. The latter will be discussed in forthcoming sections. The following paragraphs discuss RSSILA attempts to shape the public image of returned servicemen and to keep alive the post-battle spirit of Anzac.

RSSILA had approximately one hundred sixty-seven thousand members by the end of 1919 and provided a loud voice for veterans in Australia. Compared to returned servicemen groups in other countries, the RSSILA established itself quite early. The British Legion formed in 1921, and the Canadian Legion in 1925. New Zealand also created their league for returning soldiers in 1916 but only had to organize one state versus Australia's six (Crotty 2007). Due to its early start and stated non-partisan political stance, the RSSILA was able to cover the entire market for returned service groups, and no major rival to its power ever emerged (Crotty 2007).

At first however, the RSSILA was far from unified. Debates continued over the extent of involvement in political and industrial issues; keeping numbers on record for non-dues paying members proved difficult; and organizing rural areas, major cities, and state branches into a functioning federation was an enormous task (Crotty 2007). Yet the RSSILA had a huge advocate that helped the group gain traction: the commonwealth and state governments. The federal government treated the RSSILA as the official representation of the views of returned servicemen. It benefitted the government to have returned soldiers organized, rather than perhaps unconnected or undisciplined, so government provided aid such as financial assistance and privileges for membership recruitment (Crotty 2007). By the late 1920s, the RSSILA had smoothed over most internal ideological differences and was able to continually find success in aiding veterans[8].

---

[8] For example, in 1936 the RSSILA secured an extension for old age and invalid pensions on more generous terms than originally allotted (Crotty 2007). The group continues to operate, though they changed their name in 1965.

Along with the privileges of the RSSILA, military clubhouses and annual reunions helped veterans to continue their soldierly traditions even after the end of World War I: oral and literary songs and tales became means to the perpetuation of Anzac culture (Seal 2004). The Melbourne RSSILA published its own magazine, called *The Duckboard*, beginning in the early 1920s[9]. The masthead stated, "When war is here and danger nigh, God and the soldier is all the cry, When war is o'er and wrongs are righted, God is forgotten and the soldier slighted." *The Duckboard* devoted its pages to poems, tales, and speeches about World War I and life afterward because, "It will be a bad day for Australia and New Zealand when the sun arises upon lands from which the spirit of Anzac has departed, for there will have departed with it the soul of a people" (1925).

To an extent then, returned servicemen's reproduction of Anzac myth resembles Hobsbawm's theory of invented tradition. As an exclusive group, RSSILA members influenced which one of competing Anzac versions would prevail in Australia when World War I memory began to fade (Crotty 2007). For example, any veterans not adhering to RSSILA majority opinion, such as veterans who were anti-war, were excluded from clubhouses and from the League. Such soldiers lost access to financial and social RSSILA membership benefits, were no longer considered part of the Anzac culture, and they were marginalized or omitted from Anzac stories and publications ("Special Congress Minutes" 1919; Thomson 1994). These men then found themselves up against an organized majority in the discursive battle over the meaning and worth of Anzac service.

[9] See pictures, Appendix A.

The RSSILA had help in promoting their version of Anzac from the press and from conservative politicians despite the group's official stance as non-political and non-partisan. Two major political opinions drove Australian policy debates during World War I, which will be discussed in greater detail in upcoming paragraphs. In short, conservatives relished the chance to prove themselves as a valuable British colony and to celebrate being on the victors' side. In contrast, labor activists and left-leaning citizens voiced their dissatisfaction with the devastating number of deaths from the war and the increasing instability of conditions within Australia, such as the growing rate of unemployment. Labor unions found a loud partner in political radicals, whose social reform agenda included trade unionism, and in the radical republican newspaper the *Bulletin* (Tsokhas 2001).

Yet anti-war activists, and other groups such as radical syndicalists, were demonized and imprisoned under the War Precautions Act of 1916, which outlawed any behavior deemed in threat or contrast to imperial loyalty (Beaumont 2007). Conservative politicians and media portrayed anti-war and labor activist veterans as "hoodlums" and "revolutionaries" (Thomson 1994:121). Labor activists' attempt to frame authentic diggers[10] as egalitarian democrats lost to conservatives' successful fusion of Anzac discipline and patriotism with the notion of unquestioned loyalty to King and country. Ultimately, Anzac congealed in the early post-war years mainly as a celebration of soldier heroes and as a rallying cry for World War I supporters.

RSSILA and the Image of Veteran Anzacs

---

[10] A synonym for an Anzac soldier, made popular in World War I France by the Australians' expertise in digging trenches, which they gained from their experience on the hillsides of the Gallipoli Peninsula.

The RSSILA began as an intensely masculine collective and mainly concerned itself with two goals: securing economic and medical aid for veteran servicemen and managing the public image of returned Anzacs. Minutes from official meetings of the Victorian Branch of the RSSILA from predominantly 1915 to 1920 illustrate such actions in detail and serve as a representation of RSSILA local and regional level activities. The first Annual General Meeting of the Victorian Branch was on November 8, 1916 (Franzac 1937). By 1919 the Victorian Branch had nearly twice as many members as the next biggest branch (New South Wales), and had set up headquarters in Melbourne, which was the wartime capital of the Commonwealth. It was concerned with the day-to-day affairs of returned servicemen and their families. While their records suggest they did not do much blatantly measurable work at the outset, as the years progressed the Victorian Branch and the entire RSSILA stood at the center of the campaign for soldier support and war commemoration.

In 1937, an author called Franzac re-published a selection of Victorian RSSILA notes, in which he aptly describes their state:

> Fortunately the minute books of the early meetings have been kept. Badly written, full of errors, they reflect the happy-go-lucky spirit of the period. Gaps are numerous in the story. The Minute Secretary apparently worked on the principle that as everybody would remember the business of the meeting, it would only be a waste of time to put it down to read at the next meeting. The troops might think he was showing off, and who'd introduce formality into the meeting anyway, when everybody was so happy and general business was opened with a corkscrew, and meetings were invariably closed with those present drinking the loyal toast: 'O' for the days that are gone'.

Indeed, the earliest Victorian RSSILA minutes are haphazardly hand-written and have little official business in them. Instead of being simply a case of bad writing, however,

the state of the minutes perhaps suggests that at first the RSSILA was more about being a club for men than an institution to advance the social wellbeing of veteran servicemen.

Women had very little to do with the RSSILA, with the exception of supporting roles such as raising funds to buy furniture and decorations for the Club Room ("Minutes: January 1916 – December 1918"). Nurses that served overseas sometimes received honorary membership by vote. Accordingly, the RSSILA initially showed little interest in including or assisting civilian women's war efforts. In 1916, the Victorian RSSILA sent a letter to a Mrs. Woolcott claiming that Button Day, on which women and youth sold goods to benefit returned servicemen, was a matter for the government and the RSSILA would not provide support ("Minutes 15 August - January 1917, Victorian Branch"). Nonetheless the branch later voted to send members to a conference planning distribution of the Button Day funds. In contrast, the Victorian RSSILA worked rather closely with the Father's Association. RSSILA created a joint committee with the association and referred to them when dealing with returned men's "emergencies" ("Minutes December 1918 – November 1919").

By no means did the RSSILA continue on as some lackadaisical, reclusive cult of patriarchy though. As the war progressed, the RSSILA increased its public efforts to acquire financial aid and find employment for returned servicemen. Early in 1917 the Victorian Branch urged the Commonwealth Government to provide temporary work to discharged men until they could secure regular employment. This would help men to provide for themselves and their dependents, and it would also enable men to feel independent ("Minutes January 1917 – 1918"). By 1919 the RSSILA had gone a few

steps farther in their campaign. In March, the Victorian Branch took a list of unemployed men to the Defense Department. They urged officials to give veterans positions that were currently held by women and military-eligible men who had not enlisted ("Minutes December 1918 – November 1919"). In May, the Victorian RSSILA took a wider view and asked the Prime Minister to discourage immigration until all soldiers had transitioned back into society[11] ("Minutes December 1918 – November 1919"). Then in August they began a publicity campaign "with a view of impressing upon the public the duty they owe to Returned Soldiers" ("Minutes December 1918 – November 1919"). The RSSILA continued on to make its central agenda aiding servicemen's transitions back into Australian society, and pushed against citizens' war weariness and politicians' domestic issue amnesia in order to keep soldiers at the forefront of any social agenda. With the focus on the returning Anzacs though, the RSSILA also had to ensure the veterans themselves remained worthy receivers of their countrymen's aid.

Alongside economic and medical advocacy, the bulk of early RSSILA action pertained to maintaining a positive image of returned Anzacs in the eyes of everyday citizens. Mostly their efforts addressed public drunkenness and arrests for petty crimes, problems which grew in scale as the number of returned soldiers increased and the state of the Australian economy faltered. The Victorian RSSILA became concerned that a few instances of bad behavior would tarnish the heroic, golden boy reputation of Anzac, stating, "One swallow doesn't make a summer, and one inebriated soldier doesn't make a

[11] This relates to an RSSILA fixation with German Australians. Immigration restriction was but one part of a campaign to pressure governments to close German churches and schools, which they mistrusted and suspected of providing war support for Germany ("Minutes December 1918 – November 1919"; "Special Congress Minutes" 1919).

drunken army. But lots of people think they do" (Franzac 1937:13). Instead of identifying public intoxication as a psychological or social problem, the RSSILA described the offending soldiers as "suffering from the unwise generosity of friends." The problem was that too many admirers were buying the heroes drinks, not that the heroes chose to imbibe or perhaps came to depend on alcohol after they served in the war overseas. In order to solve the problem, the Victorian RSSILA recommended that the federal Repatriation Department provide nightly accommodation for inebriated soldiers ("Minutes December 1918 – November 1919"). At the very least, this would help to remove drunken or raucous behavior from social space and public observation.

Similarly, the RSSILA expressed particular anger at newspaper coverage of veteran arrests. They argued that journalists should not refer to a man as a "returned soldier" when he committed a crime because no one else was ever identified with a specific section of society (Franzac 1937). At a Special Congress for Victoria in 1919, a Mr. Blackburn told his fellow members that returned soldiers should receive "special and very specific consideration" not due to "ordinary civil offenders" because they brought peace to Australia and the Empire. Given that the federal government had already agreed with that stance, the Congress chose to send telegrams to state governments to request consideration on *all* offenses, not simply civil cases, including ones for which men were already serving time[12] ("Special Congress Minutes" 1919, emphasis added; see also "Commonwealth. Sentences on Soldiers." *West Australian* 19 March 1917:7).

---

[12] The rare exception is sexual assault, in which case the public was somewhat less forgiving ("Serious Offenses. To the Editor." *West Australian* 12 April 1916:4).

Moreover, this was not the only instance of the Congress in which RSSILA members chose to pursue an improvement of Anzac image through their privileged relationship with government. A 'Mr. Lee' proposed a successful motion to request that the Commonwealth return all money deducted from the wages of soldiers who contracted venereal disease while on active service, especially because Australia was the only Imperial Force to make that deduction ("Special Congress Minutes" 1919). Venereal disease was a particularly nasty sore on the Anzac image because it suggested immoral behavior and lack of discipline among Australian soldiers. At the beginning of World War I, diseased men sent home from Egypt were often quarantined in areas called "special camps" and newspapers declined to report on their affliction in order to avoid tarnishing the "immaculate" image of Anzacs (Lewis 1980).

There is no reason to believe that any RSSILA actions were intended as a widespread cover-up. RSSILA officers and members deeply believed in the heroism, courage, and patriotism of their fellow soldiers and worked diligently to ensure that veterans and families of men killed in action received all the aid to which they were entitled by their country. To the RSSILA, Gallipoli and the Anzacs should be "the Mecca of the true Australian people, and the greatest tribute to their memories should be that the dependents of our fighting men are well provided for" (RSSILA 1918). The RSSILA also worked to develop a physical presence of Anzac in Australia through their organization headquarters and public monuments to the soldiers. In 1918, the Victorian Branch recommended that all sub-branches dedicate ten percent of their raised funds to the creation of a state memorial building ("Minutes December 1918 – November 1919"). The

RSSILA was also instrumental in the establishment of Victoria's largest war memorial, the Shrine of Remembrance, dedicated in 1934 in Melbourne to those that served and their families. The RSSILA appears second to none in their devotion to safeguarding the Anzac imagery of heroism and brotherhood in Australian society after Gallipoli and in decades beyond.

The 1921 Annual Report of the RSSILA opened by saying, "Much has been done, but greater work still lies ahead. With the waning enthusiasm for the soldier of Australia, the convenient public memory often chooses to steel itself against his noble work where it clashes with self-interest. It is ours to meet this ungrateful spirit with stern reminders of a saved country's duty." The RSSILA certainly put forth great effort and resources to aid returning servicemen and their families after Gallipoli and through the wake of the Great War. The organization pushed for medical care access, government employment benefits, and social recognition for the Anzacs. In turn, the RSSILA fostered and grew an image of Anzac based on the brotherhood of the trenches, courage in the face of gunfire and defeat, and heroism of the young men from the Outback. This is not to say that the lives of men and their families post-war were easy or that everyone was treated well. There is ample documentation of the social and economic difficulties of returning Anzacs[13]. Rather, the focus here has been on the association between RSSILA attempts to serve and honor veterans and the particularly unblemished, positive image of Anzac soldiers that the organization successfully put forward into society. Yet the RSSILA is not entirely

---

[13] Some excellent examples include: *Shattered Anzacs* by Marina Larsson, *The Cost of War* by Stephen Garton, *The Great War: Gains and Losses* edited by Craig Wilcox, and Rutherglen Repatriation files at Victoria State Library.

responsible for the meanings and images of Anzac adopted by a budding nation. A great part of society was excluded from the front lines and from the RSSILA but managed also to have a lasting influence on Anzac myth. For that discussion, we turn to the women.

The Home Life: Women and the Soldiers They Loved

Women in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Australia were saturated by the ideology that a woman's calling was to be a mother. Women identifying themselves as feminists during this time period primarily argued for legal aid and social recognition that would help them to fulfill their motherhood role more effectively (Summers 1975). Motherhood as a vocation was related to a surge in domesticity discourse spawned by fears of racial deterioration, which grew steadily in the 1890s. Women were encouraged to become mothers in order to secure the future of a 'pure' white British stock (Trainor 1994). World War I did little to undo the existing gender (and racial) ideology. In fact, it extended and enshrined the traditional dichotomy of the sexes: men as warriors and women as passive, meaning as nurturing mothers (Shute 1995). Whether for or against Australian participation in the war then, women drew upon the image of themselves as natural caregivers in order to influence and justify the actions they took.

Most women favored Australia's war efforts and worked in highly organized groups to boost domestic support. From the infamous Red Cross to local volunteer groups like the Busy Bees in Melbourne, women created a vast web of wartime 'comforts' production. They made and collected items such as clothing, medical aid supplies, books, and food which they sent to soldiers overseas or recently returned veterans. One of the

most famous First World War homemade goods, the Anzac biscuit, was created by women who wanted their baked treats to be fresh when they reached the war front. Most boats did not have refrigeration units, so women came up with a golden syrup cookie that could keep for at least two months. Anzac biscuits not only linked soldiers to women and women to the home hearth, it became so embedded in the Australian cultural narrative that the product was the only one never required to receive government permission to use the term Anzac in its name (Supski 2006).

A small portion of women were less gung-ho about Australia's participation in World War I. Rather than putting their motherhood vocation to use by sending their sons to enlist and by collecting domestic war supplies, they argued that women should use their naturally peaceful disposition to keep Australians from fighting and dying on foreign soil. The war was a waste of young, virile sons and husbands. Women with this viewpoint were also highly organized, albeit in smaller numbers. Groups such as the Sisterhood for International Peace held public speeches and rallies and distributed paraphernalia arguing that women's duty was to save lives. They drew upon the same gender ideology as their pro-war counterparts though, effectively keeping soldiers' lives as the main issue rather than any sort of social cache increase for women's opinions. In the face of overwhelming support for World War I and the Anzac troops, anti-war women's organizations often found only ridicule and rejection in their early days.

World War I affected gender ideology very little and it also did not provide many practical means for women to step into positions outside of domestic boundaries. Unlike Britain, Australia did not mobilize women to take up occupations held by men who were

currently on active military service. Those that did secure public work, including nurses that served overseas and in Australian military hospitals, found that their wages and benefits were vastly less than those of men. Ultimately then, whatever side they chose, women were highly motivated and often as organized as male groups, but their actions were not in the service of ideological change and did little to affect the lower social standing of women. Part of the reason for ideological stasis will be discussed in the next chapter. First one must explore the internal content of women's work and its meaning for Australia during World War I. The war effectively cemented the notion that women's function was to bear children and create a nurturing home (Summers 1975). The wartime actions of women from 1914 onward reflect this.

Women's Wartime Organization: The Supporters

Women in Australia displayed favor for World War I through their support for the husbands and sons that served overseas in the military. Women themselves were heroes insofar as they were willing to send sons to the imperial cause (Shute 1995). Many women also publically encouraged young men to enlist in the army. For example, *The Western Star* reported in April 1917 that the Perth Women's Recruiting Committee would "don the khaki" to encourage enlistment[14]. These women "will be on duty at all times, whether shopping, at the seaside, or in the street, tram or train. When they see a man who appears to be an eligible, they will hand him a card on which is printed, "Our brothers at the front need help! Will you enlist?" ("Recruiting. Anzac Day.") In the 1917 May Day parade, the Australian Women's Service Core held rifles out to men that

[14] Anzac military uniforms were a light tan, or khaki, color. See picture, Appendix A.

appeared eligible to serve. Given Australia's aforementioned notions of progressivism, such as the superiority of its social institutions and morals, and its fears for the survival of the white British race, women faced pressure to give up their sons to imperial defense forces or be perceived as contributing to the degeneration of democratic values and white racial purity (Shute 1995). As a soldier's sister stated, "Would you call them true Australian women if they attired neither hand nor foot to help reinforce their husbands, sons, sweethearts, or brothers, by appealing to all that is good and noble in your manhood?" ("Recruiting Campaign. In Defense." 24 May 1917). Thus efforts by female supporters of Australian war participation was unparalleled on the home front, as suggests the vast network of groups that sprang up to support Australian soldiers and veterans.

During World War I there were approximately ten thousand patriotic clubs and societies for women that were created in order to provide comforts to Anzac soldiers. They knitted winter clothing, baked homemade treats, and packed boxes with cigarettes and magazines to mail overseas (Scates and Frances 1997). The biggest group, the Australian Women's National League, had fifty-four thousand members at its peak and was the largest non-Labor organization in Australia (MacLean 1995). The League was coordinated and focused. They held soldier recruitment drives and raised funds for the troops. As early as 1915, less than one year into the war, they had collected gifts for packages including soap, toothbrushes, scarves, crutches, and books (Bassett 1983). The abilities of women to organize themselves and quickly accomplish their goals were truly on display.

The Red Cross was the most visible of the wartime organizations. Staffed almost entirely by women, the Red Cross had a sophisticated network of departments that included a jam factory, pickle factory, spinning department, toy-making department, tobacco depot, clothing distribution depot, and motor service (Bassett 1983). By December 1915, the Sydney branch alone had sent troops over eighty-three thousand shirts, eighty-six thousand pajamas, and other goods reaching a count over six hundred and five thousand (Bassett 1983). Women's efficiency was matched by their creativity. They learned to spin their own wool, made needles from bicycle spokes, and blended dyes from onion skins and wattle bark (Bassett 1983; "Women's Thrift Campaign…" *Argus* 27 March 1917:8). Concerning patriotism and support for Anzac soldiers, there is no question that women were as resourceful, skilled, and organized on the home front as their fellow male Australians, including the RSSILA.

Localized women's groups also put forth a great effort to support the husbands and sons they sent to the battlefields. Sewing was a huge enterprise because it was one of the few things women were allowed to do for the military (Lewis 1980). Women at the Commonwealth Clothing Factory in South Melbourne volunteered to work extra hours two nights per week sewing for the soldiers. They formed a group called the Khaki Girls and had their own bugle band (Bassett 1983). Other types of volunteer groups also arose. Snapshots from Home League took pictures of soldiers' families to send in care packages because many people did not own cameras. Women's pages in the newspapers published suggestions for gift packages and advertisements calling on women to urge enlistment. Female entertainment groups such as Forbes Follies, Murrumburrah Magpies, and The

Girls Who Stayed at Home raised money for the war through their performances. In Melbourne, Middies Costume Comedy Co. held a concert titled, “Music, Mirth and Melody” to raise money for the local Wounded Sailors and Soldiers’ Club (Bassett 1983). There was little women did not do for the war in terms of time, devotion, and domestic duties.

In addition to nationwide soldier support organizations and local volunteer groups, women expressed their advocacy, sorrow, and love for the Anzacs through verse. The words recorded on paper by mothers, sisters, and wives are a lasting expression of the significance of Anzacs to their families and to Australia. For example, one of the most common references when describing the soldiers is to their fame. Women considered their husbands and sons as heroes, not only for protecting their loved ones, but for bringing glory to Australia through their actions on the battlefield. In her poem “Heroes of Anzac,” Mrs. G.R. Coxhead referred to the soldiers as undaunted, willing to sacrifice themselves, and possessing unswerving fortitude. After these claims, the verse closes by stating, “With heroism thrilling, They fought the foe that day, Australia’s sons were willing ‘Their little part’ to play” (191-). The boys who landed at Gallipoli on 25 April should be considered heroes, and Australia as a whole should be proud of the “sons” of the outback. Furthermore, by putting quotations around “their little part,” Coxhead suggests that the Anzacs’ feat was anything but small or merely supplementary to the cause of Britain.

Coxhead continues these claims in her poem “Australia’s Heroes.” Here, she calls the Anzacs “noble, dauntless heroes” and celebrates “the glory and the splendor of the

name that they have won" (191-). The name in reference is Anzac. Yet it is also Australia. Women like Coxhead are declaring that the country can be proud that it produced such brave and valiant soldiers. May Kidson provides a summary of this sentiment as well in her 1918 poem, "Anzac Day and What It Means." She writes, "Our little lives—our Country's life, shall be the purer, larger, for the travail of these splendid souls—Australia, a Nation born." Australia entered the Empire's war partly in search of global glory and to prove itself worthy of the mother country, Great Britain. The writings of many women suggest that from the landing at Gallipoli, Australians considered the soldiers to have achieved that goal for the Commonwealth.

It was incredibly important that the soldiers successfully earned glory and fame for young Australia. In "Lads o' the Southern Cross[15]", Janie F.L. King cheered the Anzacs who were "giving their all in their country's name, striving to keep it from breath of shame" (1916). Consequently, another main theme of women's verses emerged in contract: the dishonor that befell Australians who shirked their duty, meaning boys that did not enlist and women that did not encourage men to serve. "The South Australian Mothers' Call to Arms" includes a direct plea to eligible men: "You strong lads of Australia, and men of fighting age, don't let your mothers kneel to you—pick up the battle gage! Our hearts are aching quite enough for those who had to go, don't let them break for those who won't. Spare us that shameful blow" (Firenze 1917). For an Australian mother, it was thought to be just as horrid to raise a son who would not defend Australia as it was to lose a son on the battlefield. The greatness of the sacrifice was to be

[15] The name of a constellation seen in the Southern Hemisphere and appearing on the Australian flag.

put above personal loss. “Remember, we are women, with heroes for our men; Ah! Mothers in the shadows, we’ll be heroic then!” wrote May Kidson in her 1918 poem, “The Mother’s Battalion.” The Anzacs were responsible for the reputation of Australia in the Empire. Their mothers, in turn, earned their own repute as patriots by sending their sons and husbands to battle.

Of course, the nobility of sacrificing a son for Australia and for the Empire could not always outweigh the emotions of a soldier’s mother. Women mourned for sons who died or returned wounded, indeed it would have been un-motherly in early twentieth century Australia to be unmoved by the death of a child. To reiterate, a woman’s calling during this time period was to be a mother. For the one third of Australia’s population that inhabited the urban capitals, children and domesticity essentially were a woman’s life. Women thus carried a dual duty: to their country and to their feminine calling. They did not willingly send men to their death (see “She Who Gives” by Stephen Raffo, 1915 for an example of a women’s dilemma). In a note included along with wool socks to an overseas soldier, one woman wrote that they ceaselessly prayed “that kind Heaven your lives will spare, and to us, with honour glowing, send you back” (Anzac-Aussie-Franco 1918). Following the expected altruism of their sex, women’s focus centered on the men, not the glory or grief of the mother. Women often expressed mournfulness in verse by praising the actions of their sons rather than expressing their personal pain. The tragedy was the death of a great man, not the sadness of a mother.

The characteristics about which women wrote echoed the traits which the soldiers themselves cherished. In 1916, Nellie Risley expressed pride in her son’s faith and duty

to others, even though it saddened her to send him, "my heart enshrined" as she called him, into battle. She was proud that he answered the call to "fill up the ranks, boys, the ranks of the free." The Anzacs were fighting for Australia, and they were fighting for the future of the Empire and its virtues. Lillian Wooster Greaves urged everyone to "wear white" in her 1920 hymn because the Anzacs died for truth, for what is right, and they died "for their fealty to comrade and friend." Indeed mateship and moral righteousness, esteemed with groups like the RSSILA, were also espoused by women as central components of what it meant to be an Anzac.

Young soldiers, boys who fought and died on the front lines, were the heroes of Anzac. They were emblematic of the glory of the British bloodlines and the greatness of growing up on Australian soil. Supporting this sentiment was the notion that a devout mother's focus was entirely on her children. To adhere to the ideology about women of the time meant that a mother would send her son into the army, provide comforts to soldiers at war, and publically praise her son, the Anzac, as the greatest treasure of Australia. After all, as the *West Australian* stated, "the hand that rears the child still rules the world. Every male animal on this earth fights for the weaker sex" ("A Force in National Life. To the Editor." 16 May 1917:8). While the majority of women practiced such gender prescriptions, there were dissenting voices nonetheless.

Women's Wartime Organization: The Dissenters

Not all women had the same views about the service of Australian sons and husbands. A small minority viewed the deaths of Anzacs as a waste of life and instead

called on women as natural peacemakers to help end Australia's participation in an overseas war. Arguably the most prominent group in this camp was the Women's Peace Army (WPA). It began in Melbourne on July 8, 1915, under the leadership of Vida Goldstein, Adela Pankhurst, Cecilia John, and Jenny Baines. WPA members sang banned songs like "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier" and published anti-war material such as *Put Up the Sword* by Adela Pankhurst (Bassett 1983). They were also one of the most radical women's organizations. The WPA's platform addressed social inequality, and stressed support for trade unions, equal pay, and advancement of women's public sphere roles (Damousi 1992). However, they based their anti-war stance on the notion that a "universal feminine temperament" had the ability to "harness male aggressions" (Shute 1995: 29). The WPA argued women's natural disposition as nurturers and peacemakers meant that they should temper male tendencies toward violence. This was their main claim. As such, any simultaneous campaigning for social and economic advancement of women was lost in the din of the dominant issue: losing Anzac lives in a war overseas.

The women of the WPA were incredibly brave to voice their opinions publically and they endured many insults and even physical attacks (See "Miss Pankhurst and Soldier" 10 May 1916 for an example). Yet they did not appear to recognize the irony that their paradigm of femininity worked against their progressive platform (Summers 1975). Women, the WPA argued, were biologically programmed to oppose war because they gave life to and cared for the next generation. Women were obligated as mothers to defend life (Damousi 1992). Thus the appeal against war was couched in the same ideology as the appeal for women's war support. Consequently, social progress for and

by women would face a double hurdle. Even if women used the gender ideology of the time as a means of unifying themselves into a sort of sisterhood, the ideology itself espoused that women primarily focus on children and domestic life. Overall though, it was the motherhood ideology that ruled. Women centered their arguments for or against war on the lives of their sons, and they found little reason during this time to put their organized efforts toward improving women's social and economic rights. Particularly during the anti-conscription campaigns, the WPA's radical stance against war further extended division among women. The recurring issue of conscription greatly inhibited any potential wartime opportunity to generate female cohesiveness and is discussed in sections below.

What is important to note here is that the presence of highly organized, passionate women's groups in itself did not affect the social situation of women in Australia or contemporaneous ideology about the female gender. Women's activities focused on the lives of men and how, as mothers, they should support their sons. Women's groups focused on war and how the death of their sons would reflect upon Australia, rather than the collective identity and social standing of women, and very little changed in Australian gender relations from four years of combat.

Women and the Traditional Sphere of Men

The ideology of women as mothers very much in tact, Australian women were neither asked nor permitted to perform many war related duties for which some actively volunteered. In contrast to Great Britain, the Australian government did not mobilize

women to fill in vacant jobs of men serving overseas. Instead, women formed their own organizations in order to provide support to soldiers overseas and to veterans, as illustrated above. Others worked to slow what they perceived to be decay in the moral order from the war. Some women, such as nurses, did secure an opportunity to do public work previously reserved for men. However, wages and benefits were often half of what their male counterparts earned. At the end of the war, social and economic advances for women were few and far between, especially with the eyes of Australia so focused on the service and repatriation of Anzac soldiers.

The only Australian women allowed to serve overseas were nurses. Overall, two thousand one hundred thirty-nine nurses served Australia during World War I, including twenty-two masseuses (Bassett 1983). The closest they came to the battlefield on the Eastern Front were hospital ships docked in the Aegean Sea. To be a nursing trainee at that time, a woman needed to have another source of income aside from the minute nursing salary, meaning most nurses were from middle class business or farming families. Nursing then was not designed to provide financial independence. To be nurses in the army moreover, women had to be between twenty-one and forty years of age and unmarried (Scates and Frances 1997). Over six hundred, or one third, of nurses serving in the military had to resign from public service during or soon after the war due to marriage (Harris 2007).

For women that remained unmarried, army service made little difference to their monetary situation. For example, while overseas, nurses were paid less than men though they were ranked as officers held and had the title’s privileges (Williams 2007). Their

post-war pensions were not on parity either. Again, despite their rank as officers, nurses' pension rates remained at a private soldier's rates (Harris 2007). Nurses also found economic disadvantages in post-military employment. According to a 1907 judicial decision, women were entitled to only fifty-four percent of male basic wages because it was believed unmarried women did not have dependents. Moreover, regardless of their rank overseas, nurses found their wages reverted to a staff nurse upon return to Australia. It was not until 1921 that service abroad counted toward qualification for promotion. It was not until 1958 that World War I nurses were able to receive medical treatment in repatriation hospitals (Williams 2007).

Differences between nurses and soldiers went beyond wages too. Nurses received public commemoration at a much lower rate than soldiers and often their recognition site was a hospital rather than a specially designated, highly visible area (Harris 2007). Letters to *The Sydney Morning Herald* protested against selling Anzac badges to the public because "women have been seen wearing the colors" and therefore anyone could "purchase the honor of the Anzacs" ("1914-1915 War Ribbon. To the Editor of the Herald." 14 March 1919). In response, Sisters such as N.A. Laffin wrote replies noting that the women wearing badges were nurses who had served overseas, but that did not end the debate (see "Anzac Ribbon. To the Editor of the Herald" 19 March 1919; "The Anzac Ribbon. To the Editor of the Herald" 31 March 1919; "Mons-Gallipoli Ribbon. To the Editor of the Herald" 10 April 1919).

While there were certainly public calls to properly commemorate nurses, people often expressed their gratefulness to nurses because the soldiers relied upon them, not

because their military service or medical work itself was heroic. *The Brisbane Courier* stated in 1916 that contributions should be made to the Nurses' Fund because "The feeling which the soldier on active service bears towards the nurses of the A.I.F. is a particularly strong and tender one" ("Tribute to the Nurses. Fund for Recognition of their Services." 8 March 1916; "The Nurses. Appreciation of Grand Work…" *Brisbane Courier* 24 May 1917:7)[16]. So while women were allowed to serve in the war and paid for their service, they were relegated to roles reflecting the caretaker ideology of women at the time and were not granted social status or wages equal to the male soldiers.

Women offering to serve the army in areas other than nursing were rejected entirely. The Australian Women's Service Corps (AWSC), the official military body for Australian women, prohibited female doctors from service. Women could not hold paid positions as cooks or drivers, nor did the Defense Department accept them as volunteers for laundress, clerk and munitions jobs during World War I (Bassett 1983). Furthermore, though women autonomously formed countless volunteer agencies to serve soldiers and veterans, only the AWSC and the Red Cross were permitted to adopt a uniform (Summers 1975). As far as female leadership is concerned, women's agencies were often officially under male leadership despite the bulk of the networking and donations being spearheaded by women. The Anzac Club in Brisbane for example, a rest home for soldiers established by the female members of the Church of England Help Society, operated under male management ("The Anzac Club." 24 May 1917).

---

[16] See also the poem "The Women Who Pulled Us Through" by Hunt Coleman, *The Brisbane Courier* 24 May 1916.

Beyond the military sector, the picture of women's public employment was not much better. Women expanded from twenty-four percent of the workforce in 1914 to thirty-seven percent in 1918. Yet the added jobs were in traditionally female, low wage areas such as clothing and food sectors. Many traditionally male jobs were never filled. Australia lost twenty thousand male manufacturing jobs during World War I but added only four thousand female ones (Maclean 1995). When women did fill positions left vacant by men, it was often performing clerical work at banks and insurance companies for half the wages of the previous employee (Bassett 1983). In fact, during the war, the average female wage fell from 49.4 percent to forty-eight percent of the male wage (Damousi 1992).

Besides women's volunteer organizations, another popular recourse for women seeking a wartime occupation was to join what Anne Summers calls "God's Police" (1975). Women serving as God's Police aimed to keep social morality high, to patrol houses of ill repute, and to keep children off of the streets at night. While the first policewomen in Australia were hired by the police department during World War I specifically to perform this duty, most of God's Police were volunteers (Bassett 1983). Many came from the Women's Christian Temperance Union. These women, members of Protestant churches, followed Dr. Henry Sutton's message that the war was giving people the proper perspective on the "real enemy" ("The Liquor Problem. Discussed by Women. Doctor's Condemnation." 24 April 1915). They saw alcohol as the source of moral and social decay. God's Police led successful movements in states such as New South Wales and Victoria to reduce the opening hours of bars and hotels for drinking in order to

decrease the frequency of disorderly veterans on city streets. God's Police found support for their cause from the WPA, who considered high concentrations of soldiers dangerous to women (MacLean 1995).

Another pillar of support came from local and state governments, which bolstered the temperance efforts in order to protect the health and safety of the returning Anzacs. In introductory remarks to Young Women's Christian Association, Governor Sir Arthur Stanley stressed the importance of providing proper accommodation for soldiers alongside reduced public drinking hours, "in order to keep them from disorderly conduct." He said, in a manner reminiscent of the RSSILA's argument, that citizens had a responsibility to create alternatives and solutions "to the extravagances which were leading soldiers astray" ("Australia and the War. Our Great Peril." 19 March 1915).

Much like other female organizations during World War I, women in God's Police set out to enforce a standard of morality that they themselves had little influence in creating. They had little social or economic opportunity to determine acceptable ideological parameters for behavior and morality (Summers 1975). For example, many women were alarmed at the rate venereal disease spread in urban areas. Yet their concern was based upon eugenics, the concept that only the 'fit' should procreate, rather than on women's health. Venereal disease rates instigated fears that the strong, masculine soldier was vulnerable to bodily threats and that the future of a healthy, virile white race was at stake (Damousi 1992). And the role of women in the security of racial purity continued long past World War I. The decimation of the young male population gave rise to an enormous pro-birth movement. Women were told to raise a new battalion of babies to

protect undefended land in Australia. Yet at the same time, the health of women remained a non-issue: more women died in childbirth during the decade after World War I than did Australian soldiers at Gallipoli (Scates and Frances 1997).

Australian participation in World War I did almost nothing to advance the social, economic, or ideological status of women in Australia in the early twentieth century. Gender ideology during this time dictated that a woman's purpose was to be a mother, and the great majority of women adhered to that idea. With their sons away at war, motherhood as a vocation expanded, but only to the limits of motherhood as homemaking. Their glory and reward was to create a retreat from the harshness of the outside world while they waited for up to four years for the soldiers to return (Summers 1975). Undeniably it was the soldiers that were the focus of mothers' efforts, as individuals and as organizations. Generally, whether for or against Australian participation in World War I, women based their arguments on their duties to their children and the value of their sons to King and country. Women expressed their hope and sorrow through their organizational activities and through their writing, but the focus was always on the life of the soldier.

So yes, women did miss an opportunity to use their rapid and newfound organizational skills and networks to advance the general cause of women in Australian society. Yet they did not organize with this aim, thus it is not surprising that the whole of Australian society maintained the gender status quo during World War I. Everyone was focused, especially after Gallipoli, on the glory and courage of the Anzacs overseas. This would not change in the decade following World War I. The Australian War Museum,

which became the Australian War Memorial in 1923, illustrates the reality that the national memory was shaped around soldiers and they were the center of the visual archive (Speck 2007). The War Memorial collected works almost wholly of men. It only accepted works from women artists, such as Dora Meeson's paintings of injured and disabled soldiers, to fill in collection gaps (Speck 2007). While women's work and organization were no small feat in Australia during World War I then, the ideology that women belonged in the private sphere relegated their efforts and opinions to the background. They could not serve overseas, rarely secured a job in Australia left vacant by a man, and did little to alter social and behavioral standards about gender duties and morality. Women remained in the "age-old abyss" of powerlessness and waiting (Shute 1995:31). Still they clearly had much to do with valorizing young male soldiers, espousing their courage and ethereal qualities, and recording their bravery in song and verse. Therefore, they may have remained dispensable to their own society at the time, but they are indispensable to the birth of the Anzac legend in World War I Australia.

Marginalized Groups

At the same time, there were groups who were relegated to the margins of Australian society and their public opinions were contained there. The main group in this category was the International Workers of the World (IWW). In 1914, IWW had had a brief but distinct presence in Australia. A development of early socialist movements, the IWW rose from the Marxist political tradition in Europe and spread around the globe, particularly to manufacturing and unskilled work sectors of capitalist economies. IWW was not welcomed by Australian politicians and during World War I the organization's

anti-war stance earned it a spot on the government's list of enemies. IWW protests and propaganda were banned soon after the war outbreak and it was not long before membership in the group itself became a political and legal risk. Thus, while the IWW was highly vocal at the start of the conscription debate, its early organization attempts were no match for a bureaucracy and public culture that supported both capitalist economic endeavors and defense of the British Empire. A more detailed discussion of the IWW is located in the next chapter.

The most prominent group, if the term can be used, to suffer marginalization if not outright mistreatment was the Aboriginals, the English name for the indigenous peoples of Australia. Through Wilde's framework, it is unsurprising that Aboriginal voices were unheard in mainstream, meaning white, Australian society during World War I. Their cultures and systems of organization differed greatly from British immigrants' and consequently were disregarded entirely by settler economic, legal, and social practices. Any sociological interpretation of Aboriginals' status in wartime Australia is grossly inadequate though without acknowledging the decades of violent and brutal treatment of the thousands of indigenous tribes at the hands of the colonial inhabitants. So-termed organizational hierarchy in this case is a direct product of clashes in fundamental social values and the deep rooted presence of racism in British society. As a consequence at the time, Aboriginals that served in Australian armies were both rare and rarely acknowledged. As a consequence, today's scholars are only beginning to unveil the depth and intricacies of Aboriginal military service and opinions of war in Australia prior to 1944.

The latest and most thorough work on Aboriginal volunteers for World War I military service, by Philippa Scarlett, records eight hundred thirty-four enlistments or attempts and notes that one hundred fifty-two of these men did not serve overseas. The total figure of indigenous volunteers is likely over one thousand (2012). On a positive note, by applying, even those who were not accepted were creating a record of themselves and their families, which became invaluable due to family disruptions such as state removal of children from homes (Scarlett 2012). There remains speculation about why men enlisted. Perhaps some joined the military hoping to gain rights through war service (which would bring only disappointment), and others may have volunteered as a response to prominent questioning of indigenous peoples' loyalty[17] (Scarlett 2012). One of the great difficulties in compiling accurate histories is that originally Australian service forms did not ask for race. Instead, they may contain descriptions of complexion or have race listed under the conditions and disabilities section. For example, one applicant was deemed "unsuitable" for the English climate due to his physique. Additionally, "not of substantial European origin" was often scrawled across unsuccessful applications (Scarlett 2012). Without uniform regulations, acceptance of indigenous applicants varied by state and even by recruitment station. Some men were rejected at one station only to be accepted by a different location on their second attempt. That there were multiple attempts at all speaks to the remarkable response of Indigenous men to serve a country that facilitated a climate of racism (Scarlett 2012).

[17] For example, a 1908 article titled "The Commonwealth Crisis" by Charles H. Kirmess linked Aborigines to a story of Japanese invasion, and a 1915 *Argus* piece claimed Australian troops were needed at home in case of an indigenous rebellion (Scarlett 2012).

Despite the presence of indigenous soldiers, the version of Anzac that has been adopted by Australian society as a whole is a tanned and golden, white myth (Stanley 2011). The reasons for this are twofold. The first is the physical composition of the imperial military force. Approximately five hundred known Aboriginal soldiers served in the AIF during World War I, compared to the fifty thousand white Australians that landed on Gallipoli shores alone. Aboriginal Australian soldiers did not have their own units and were seen only sporadically. According to 1916 *The British Australasian* they could be counted with one's fingers (Stanley 2011). Regardless, there was never a point made to highlight their presence in the armed forces. As a product of a racist Australia, white pride "occupied an unspoken centrality in the AIF's identity" (Stanley 2011:219). Aboriginals and other racial minorities failed to gain recognition for their service due to this outlook. India sent three thousand troops to Gallipoli and eighteen hundred people in non-combatant support. They lost 1,624 or nearly fifty percent, the highest casualty rate of all countries involved. Despite this, Prime Ministers Deakin and Hughes continuously praised soldiers for fighting to keep Australia 'white and free'.

The second reason for the whitewashed image of Anzac lies in the literature and eventual analysis following the events of Gallipoli. Much like the "imperial portion" of Anzac that had been written out until recently, great distortion of realistic Anzac images can also be seen in the omission of race as a factor (Stanley 2011). As mentioned prior, Charles Bean was central to the creation Anzac imagery by what he chose to emphasize and revere and what he chose to downplay (Stanley 2011). Additionally, during the war, little official effort was put into learning the backgrounds and identities of the Aboriginal

soldiers. To be sure, there are exceptional cases. For example, in 1929 former soldier Douglas Grant wrote an article for the ex-servicemen magazine *Reveille*, titled "The Broken Pledge," arguing for Australia to treat all of its soldiers justly regardless of race. Grant, who was adopted by a white family as a baby, served in the 13th battalion (Stanley 2011). Nonetheless, documentation of the identities of Aboriginal soldiers and their service remained almost non-existent until the renewed interest of scholars in the 1970s and of Aboriginal genealogy in the 1990s.

Melissa Wilde's theory of organization and cultural influence in public discussion over meaning provides a marvelous lens for exploring and explaining the social groups surrounding the creation of Anzac's significance to Australian society. Returned soldiers, by way of the RSSILA, were the predominant voice in the discussion due to their vast, federated network of branches and the import relegated to men's voices in the public sphere in the early nineteenth century. Women were not far behind. They too had great numbers participate in wartime organizations, and alongside their poetry and prose, their efforts contributed largely to instilling notions such as sacrifice and masculine heroism in Anzac discourse. At the same time, their words did not hold the same weight in the public sphere given the patriarchal gender ideology in World War I Australia. To an even greater extreme, political minorities like socialists and racial minorities such as the Aboriginal peoples were pushed to the edge and beyond of legitimized public discussion. Groups in opposition to Australia's participation in the war faced heavy political and legal barriers, while Aboriginals were entirely excluded from the discussion of Anzac and the symbol itself due to the color of their skin. Those who contributed to Anzac's

meaning and those who did not can be seen as an outcome of both organizational structure and broader cultural value factors.

The social divisions created by organization and cultural hierarchy could have been breeding grounds for tension among Australians during World War I. Women's voices were considered less important than men's, war supporters and those opposed to war faced off daily, and political and racial minorities illustrated the blatant exclusion and oppression of white colonial settlers. However, the larger social cracks that appeared in Australia as the war continued did not occur on the fault lines of war and peace or social inequality. Instead, these issues took a backseat to a larger, more explosive issue raised in 1916 and again in 1917: mandatory military conscription. The debate concerning whether the Australian government could and should force men to serve in the armed forces superseded existing public issues and cut through many hitherto united groups to create new social allegiances. The political conflagration of conscription divided Australians across existing borders of class, gender, race, or religion. The conscription debates changed the social landscape of Australia while making explicit the predominant values and significance Australians granted to the heroes of Gallipoli and to their self-image at the time.

Chapter 5

> "The 'righteous cause' in the present war will win so far as the world becomes more righteous. Men are on God's side just in so far as they become more noble and God-like, and are brought to follow a true idea and not a false one." (Barry 1915:22)

> "We're here
> Because
> We're here
> Because
> We're here
> Because we're here…"
> (Anzac soldier song, tune of Auld Lang Syne; words in Fair 1965)

World War I brought a boost in Australian federal government authority over the continent's six partitioned states. Had Australia abstained from participating, the centralized governing body would have remained must less important until the 1940s (Blainey 1995). Leading up to World War I, the federal government, much like the states, was divided between two main political parties: Liberal, which merged with conservative politicians to form a ruling body in 1909; and Labor, consisting of a partnership between political and industrial activists concerned over wages and working conditions (Beaumont 1995). The ensuing battle between these two factions over mandatory military conscription was an enormous test of the fledging federal government. Conscription was, in the terms of Michael Mann, a cross-cutting ideological issue, taking precedent over existing sources of differences such as economic class or religious sect (1986; 1993; Souter 1992). In the midst of war, both the public and the state aligned themselves into pro-conscription and anti-conscription camps, creating hitherto unseen social bedfellows while threatening to permanently fracture the Commonwealth. Even today, attention to

Gallipoli continues to obscure domestic accounts so that many do not know the full extent of the political violence that divided the Labor Party and the population in 1916 and 1917 (Bollard 2013).

The Labor Party was clearly the most affected of the two main political camps. The conscription controversy split the party internally in 1916, and Labor only held on to parliamentary control in one of the seven following decades, making the debate one of the most significant political events in Australia to the current day (Blainey 1995). In 1914, at the start of World War I, Labor had just come into power under the leadership of Prime Minister Andrew Fisher. The party had every reason to be optimistic. Their comeback had been building for a generation, and nearly one-third of Australian workers were in trade unions, the highest level in the industrialized world (Bollard 2013). The confidence and cohesiveness was not to last, however.

Upon Australia's entrance into the First World War, the Labor-dominated Commonwealth Parliament passed the War Precautions Act in the least amount of time legally possible in order to enable the federal government to "take executive action for the defense of the Commonwealth" (Beaumont 1995:38). The government could legalize censorship, control the newspapers, penalize the spreading of alarming reports, and prosecute anyone who publically assisted the enemy or prejudiced recruiting. While the legislation was meant to dispel opposition to war participation, the law generally curtailed free speech and effectively worked against the union-based groups of the Labor Party, which were prone to demonstration tactics (Smart 1995). The last straw within the Labor Party was a split over food staple price regulations. Inflation at the time was

dramatic: between 1914 and 1915, for example, the price of food in Melbourne and Sydney rose thirty-four percent. At the same time, wages over the past four years in Australia had fallen fifteen percent and unemployment was rising (Bollard 2013). Prime Minister Fisher promised a referendum to increase the ability of the federal government to control pricing, but reneged on the offer and passed the leadership reigns to William Hughes, who promptly tabled the issue in 1915. Some Labor members were outraged and viewed the move as a sellout to business and dominant economic groups, leaving the party with tenuous internal alliances as World War I continued.

In the first half of 1916, Prime Minister Hughes traveled to Britain, where he saw the need for soldier reinforcements amongst the carnage in France. The trip also heightened his desire that Australia support the Empire enough to procure representation at end-of-war talks, which would affect Japan, and therefore would be important to Australian security. Hughes decided that mandatory conscription in Australia was necessary. The notion was meant to strike a chord with the unionism amongst the Labor Party, in which the need of one was subsumed to the need of all. However, Hughes could not push conscription through both houses of the federal government, so he put it to the people in a referendum and inadvertently ignited a monumental argument amongst both the political leaders and residents of Australia (Beaumont 1995).

Two opposing camps subsequently developed. The conscriptionists, those in support of mandatory conscription, included people from every political party and religion, members of commercial organizations, women's wartime societies, all branches of the Australian Natives' Association, *Melbourne Age* and *Melbourne Argus*

newspapers, and a significant portion of the Liberal party (Basset 1983). The anti-conscriptionists, those against mandatory conscription, contained most trade unions, labor newspapers such as *Brisbane Worker*, members of Catholic and Quaker churches, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), anti-war organizations such as the Women's Peace Army, and remaining members of the Labor party (Basset 1983). Over the next year, Australians slogged through two grueling rounds of campaigning and voting that were punctuated by commotion and violence. In Queensland, an October meeting against conscription saw participants attacked by soldiers while the military police stood by. In South Australia, it became popular to throw rotten eggs at conscription supporters. In Tasmania, several people were injured when someone threw a bomb at an electrical tower attempting to cut power to a political meeting. In Western Australia, both sides had to run from mobs so often that the only peaceful meetings were held out of populated areas, in the goldfields (Bollard 2013). The rallies, protests, arguments and accusations spread to all corners of the Commonwealth, culminating in 1917 when voters narrowly yet definitively rejected the Prime Minister's call for mandatory conscription for the second time.

Round One: Opposing Camps Emerge

The Universal Service League, formed in Sydney in 1915, led the mandatory conscription movement and gained the support of Prime Minister Hughes despite the official anti-conscription stance of his own Labor party (Bassett 1983). The Universal Service League claimed that voluntary enlistment deprived the country of its physically fittest young men, resulting in what they referred to as unnatural selection (Beaumont

1995). Alongside the Universal Service League, the Australian Women's Service Corps formed in 1916 as a response to the conscription campaign. Women volunteered for clerical, nursing, and auxiliary field work so men would be free to serve on the front lines. By the end of World War I, the women had uniforms, ran drills, and held swimming lessons. Despite their organized efforts, the Australian military continuously rejected their offer to serve (MacLean 1995). The RSSILA and many returned soldiers supported conscription as well. They sang songs about the "cold-footed cobbers", also called shirkers, meaning the men who did not enlist (Skeyhill 1915; Wells 191-). One song, titled "Me Brother What Stayed at 'Ome (Dedicated to my Coldfooted Cobbers)" ends profoundly with the lines, "But if I do get shrapnelled, Though I die without a groan, Well, the one who's really killed me is Me Brother Wot Stayed at 'Ome" (Skeyhill 1915). To them, it was dishonorable not to enlist.

In the wake of declining volunteer numbers, the pro-conscription body of middle class residents, state governments, and media outlets viewed mandatory conscription as a moral crusade against disloyalty. They argued that Britain must win the war or Australia would be vulnerable to an invasion by Asian countries. Prime Minister Hughes was so adamant that conscription would prevail that he called up men between ages twenty-one and thirty-five before the first referendum had ended. Nonetheless, those supporting conscription faced a heterogeneous crew of oppositional campaigners whose increasing voice and strength belied their minority numbers.

The anti-conscription campaign formed under the unlikely partnership of male-dominated labor unions, socialist parties, and women's anti-war groups. Prior to the

conscription campaign, women were excluded from membership of industry unions in the interest of preserving male jobs. The union members in particular argued that sending men to war would leave Australian industry vulnerable to Asian immigrants. Generally speaking, women's anti-conscription organizations were opposed to the war more broadly, believing it was immoral to ask a man to kill and viewing mandatory enlistment as an erosion of human rights (Beaumont 1995). In particular, the Sisterhood of International Peace aimed "to bring the humanizing influence of women to bear on the abolition of war" (Scates and Frances 1997:72)[18]. Groups such as the Women's Peace Army argued that women were intrinsically opposed to war because of their biological function to create and nurture life. Their propaganda appealed to women in terms of their obligation as mothers of the Australian race (Damousi 1992). Some women's groups relied less on emotional appeal. In the bi-weekly publication *No!* by the Anti-Compulsory Service League, an appeal to women insisted that conscription was not a matter of sentiment. Rather, it was 'common sense' to Australian women that Australia had proportionally already given more men than any part of the Empire (Scates and Frances 1997).

The third player in the anti-conscription campaign had the largest, longest investment in campaigns opposing military and the war. The first IWW Australian chapter was founded in Sydney in 1907 by the Socialist Labor Party. They based their actions on news of IWW activities in the United States, particularly the work of Daniel de

[18] Certainly not all members believed women were more peaceful than men. Eleanor Moore stated that it was rash to believe women were more merciful and less quarrelsome than men. Many women urged men on to slaughter (Scates and Frances 1997).

Leon, and desired to get Australia back to the goals of socialism and cooperativism on which the Labor Party was founded in the late 1800s. The local Melbourne branch formed in 1915 under its most active member, Percy Laidler, from the Victorian Socialist Party. Given its socialist roots, the IWW held an anti-militaristic stance from the start, which would eventually lead to its suppression during the war. Prior to the First World War, in 1907, the IWW had opposed Australia's compulsory military training for boys. The proposal had been pressed in government since 1903, especially by Prime Minister Hughes, and was adopted in 1911 (Cain 1993). The IWW denounced the passage, calling it a product of the clique of capitalism and military.

The IWW emerged from European Marxism and primarily saw itself as a catalyst for the rights of the laborer. The IWW was against conventional trade unionism as well as arbitration courts, which they viewed as a trick on workers. In a similar vein as syndicalists, the Australian IWW wanted an industry-wide labor union rather than separate unions by trade. The trade unions, however, remained unconvinced. The Australian Labor Party under Fisher in 1908 viewed the IWW as anarchists and wanted them to stay out of politics. In turn, the IWW remained antagonistic to parliamentary government, which they claimed deluded people into thinking of it as the only avenue for social change; and against the Labor Party, for abandoning its radical platforms once elected into office (Cain 1993).

The best method to achieve its goals was a source of constant debate within the organization. Australian IWW chapters fought internally over issues such as the use of violence in activism. The IWW worldwide had three stated aims: education, organization,

and emancipation. Australia added a fourth element, sabotage, to its slogan in November 1915, which then led to the arrest and seizure of IWW press members. The greatest reaction to the IWW by the Australian public came in response to its ideology of sabotage. The actual method espoused by the IWW was not about machine breaking or Luddism. Rather, IWW members wanted to create sub-standard products in order to create leverage when bargaining with owners of production. Nonetheless, both media and government assailed the IWW for the danger that acts of sabotage posed for Australia. Australian IWW chapters also debated their role in military and political campaigns. Norman Rancie, a future editor of the IWW newspaper *Direct Action*, argued in 1915 that the IWW would be better off to attack capitalism than condemn Britain's war. He wrote that anti-conscription would be as well received among a highly patriot public as "telling a politician to resign his job and go to work" (in Cain 1993:174). When the IWW's anti-war message grew louder, the organization went from being labeled criminals to being portrayed as increasingly disloyal.

The IWW believed that war and fighting benefitted arms manufacturers and international financiers while ridding the world of its surplus worker population. The IWW argued that workers were dispossessed: they had no wealth; therefore they had no reason to fight. The lone exception to this was Tom Glyn, an activist in Canada and South Africa who became the first editor of *Direct Action* in 1913. He saw war as a Marxian 'locomotive for change' where the working class had an opportunity to overthrow the owners by force (Cain 1993). Otherwise, and certainly under later editors, the IWW spoke loudly and clearly against World War I. Its most effective attack, meaning the one

that drew the biggest government response, was to emphasize the cost of the war and the huge business profits from it. When army recruits ran short in 1915, the IWW noted that the government did not increase soldier wages as an incentive to enlist. Rather, money instead went to conscription campaigns and an increase in creation of patriotic societies (Cain 1993). Moreover, argued the IWW, Australian conscription would contribute little compared to other countries, such as Russia's eligible population of twenty million young men.

The IWW joined other groups such as the Australian Peace Alliance and the No-Conscription Fellowship in its efforts to resist compulsory conscription "to the last man and the last shilling," as a twisted use of the famous phrase by Prime Minister Hughes. IWW was by far the most prominent of the opposition groups during the 1916 conscription campaigns though. Some, including political socialists, became muted as the war continued (Cain 1993). Others, such as Labor Party members, were alienated by IWW protest tactics, as mentioned above. For example, Tom Barker, a *Direct Action* editor from Sydney, battled with the *Bulletin* over slow-down practices by workers until he was jailed for posting anti-conscription posters in Sydney's Domain Gardens. As early as August 1914 the IWW Sydney chapter had been told by police not to speak against the impending war. The response, a foreshadowing of its future efforts, was for leaders such as John Benjamin King to publicly denounce the threat and for Donald Grant to give speeches that attacked both the Prime Minister and conscription.

Subsequently, Prime Minister Hughes linked the entire anti-conscription movement to the IWW and gained the sympathy of the press, who called the IWW

criminals and rebels (Cain 1993). Soldiers too attacked IWW leaders and interrupted speeches, finding support among conservative politicians for their actions. By September 1916 members were being prosecuted for conspiracy against government. Some IWW members, nicknamed the Sydney 12, were blamed for devastating city fires, and were convicted due to testimony from police officers who were paid to act as witnesses. In truth the two leaders, Grant and Larkin, were not involved in the arson. Many others had no idea what the few involved members were doing, as the IWW had grown so quickly that many young men could be found carelessly discussing security and sabotage (Bollard 2013).

Ultimately, after the failure of his 1916 compulsory conscription campaign, Prime Minister Hughes moved to ban the IWW outright. Hughes split from the Labor Party on November 14 and his new controlling faction in parliament passed the Unlawful Associations Bill that prohibited IWW association on December 18. Being a member of the IWW by itself was not illegal, but being a member and advocating against the war brought a six month jail sentence (Cain 1993). In 1917, because the IWW was still attracting crowds of more than ten thousand for its political speeches and rallies, Hughes suppressed the organization completely. In June 1917, the IWW was prohibited from sending their newspaper through Australian Post, a huge blow for their circulation numbers. Hughes left no loopholes to allow the IWW to remain in function, though he never explained why existing measures such as the War Precautions Act were not enough to deal with this particular opposition (Cain 1993). By the end of 1917, the IWW had been “effectively silenced” (Bollard 2013:107).

The IWW's socialist origins led activists to establish local chapters in Australia dedicated to improving the lives of workers. The IWW opposed Australia's participation in World War I on the grounds that it exploited workers to the benefit of business owners and parliamentary leaders. While its labor campaigns earned it few friends in Australia, the IWW's anti-conscription campaigns earned it many outright enemies. IWW drew the direct criticism of the Prime Minister and the media, who painted the organization as a dangerous bunch of anarchists and criminals who threatened the stability and safety of Australia. Despite some grassroots support, the size and scope of a young IWW was no match for the reach and influence of Australian government and press. It attracted early attention of powerful war supporters and as a consequence was squashed without providing more than nominal influence on Australian society during World War I. Following this, the briefly loud raucous of the IWW cannot be said to have measurably influenced the referendum outcome. While the IWW was an important factor for the negative perspective in the conscription debate, given their relatively small numbers and limited resources, there is no measurable evidence that their literature and speeches persuaded a significant number of voters (Cain 1993). The IWW was dedicated and organized, but its viewpoints clashed with mainstream Australian views of politics and patriotism, thus it lived and died at the edges of wartime culture.

Alongside IWW efforts, labor unions, socialists, and women's groups united at this moment solely for the cause of defeating mandatory conscription: the increasing force and ruthlessness of military recruiting committees motivated the formal organization of the opponents of conscription (Beaumont 1995). In 1916, several

organizations including the No-Conscription Fellowship and the Melbourne Trades Hall were raided by the military. Speakers criticizing the war came under surveillance and had meeting places denied to them. On multiple occasions speakers were disrupted by returning soldiers, who tarred and feathered speakers without fear of punishment (Smart 1995). Nonetheless, the anti-conscriptionists prevailed. On October 28, Australian voters defeated conscription by thirty-six thousand votes (Beaumont 1995).

Round Two: Driving in the Wedge

Prime Minister Hughes faced a vote of no confidence following the 1916 conscription referendum. He walked out of the hearing with twenty-three supporters, saying, ‘Those who are prepared to stand by the British Empire and to see the war through to the end, please come with me’ (Inglis 1998:1). In January 1917, while continuing to serve as the interim Prime Minister, Hughes switched political parties and made a deal with the opposition to form the Nationalist Party. Also called the “win-the-war” party, the coalition won the May election and Hughes continued in his role as Prime Minister (Beaumont 1995). This suggests feelings about conscription did not necessarily match feelings about participating in the war. Next, seeing that military recruitment levels were inadequate to replace Australian war losses overseas, Hughes introduced a second conscription referendum for December, charging the politicians and the public with a second battle over the life and death of their young men.

For the initial two years of the war, misgivings about it had rarely been expressed. This was due to a combination of aforementioned factors, including legal discouragement

with the War Precautions Act, a lag in news of death and destruction from Gallipoli, and the desire for Australia to earn respect and glory amid the partners of Empire. Then in 1916 the first round of conscription campaigns split the ruling political party and introduced open debate in Australian society over profound values of loyalty and morality. The bitterness continued into the second conscription referendum. While a popular majority continued to support the war effort, 1917 further solidified the split among Australians concerning mandatory military service.

As was pointed out during the war with some pride, Australia was the only participating country in World War I in which the issue of conscription was put directly to the people (Mandle 1978). Yet conscription divided the nation in a way that the conduct of the war itself, or even the dislocation within Australia caused by war, could never have done. In Australia, the war had thus far produced a strange contradiction between acceptance of the war against Germany (as demonstrated by Hughes's electoral triumph) and rejection of mandatory military conscription (Mandle 1978). Perhaps if, as mentioned previously in this paper, the Australian public sentiment was flexible enough to accommodate both imperial and national loyalties, it could also accommodate seemingly opposite pro-war and anti-conscription attitudes as well. The two dualities were likely related. While the British portion of social consciousness conceded the grim necessity defeating Germany, the section of Australian origin refused to compel participation in something that had resulted in massive overseas slaughter (Souter 1992). The tension from contradictory views of conscription proved unsustainable, however. At

the end of 1917, the second attempt by Prime Minister Hughes to mandate military service failed by a greater margin than the first.

The Prime Minister was an adamant advocate for conscription to the end. He retained further opposite due to the resolution of the enormous railroad strike that had greatly weakened unions that year (Bollard 2013). His speeches cast votes against conscription as votes against Australia. To vote yes, he said, brings fame and success; to vote no, means dishonor and woe (Australia in World War I Film). Despite his passion, and despite closing the voter rolls two days after announcing the second referendum, leaving many voters disenfranchised, mandatory conscription was finally defeated in December 1917[19] (Beaumont 1995). On January 8, 1918, Prime Minister Hughes resigned, as he had vowed to do if conscription failed. Fortunately for Hughes, his Nationalist Party held a two-thirds majority at that time, and they swore in Hughes again as their leader. He continued his tenure as Prime Minister through the end of World War I and well after.

Wartime Social Divisions

Conscription was the preeminent source of social division in Australia as the First World War continued. Conscription dividing lines did not necessarily fall along the same pattern of existing political, economic, gender, or religious borders. Rather, conscription severed groups internally, leaving the public landscape a different shape than it may otherwise have been. Some aforementioned groups that were major players in the

---

[19] It has since been revealed in Hughes' papers that just over seven hundred voters decided the position of the men overseas. Thus is was Hughes and homelanders, not people currently serving on the Eastern or Western war fronts that had actually been the main supports of mandatory conscription (Bollard 2013).

negotiation of Anzac meanings, such as returning soldiers or the Labor party, had existing defaults that conscription exacerbated. Others however, particularly women, experienced a new and profound split that ended up aligning a significant portion of them with previously hostile parties. In the end, voters against conscription won, but not before engaging a great number of the Australian public and significantly testing social boundaries and values.

The majority of returned soldiers shared the RSSILA support of the war and subsequently favored mandatory military service. Anyone found with anti-conscription material could be removed from RSSILA club premises ("Minutes 15 August - January 1917, Victorian Branch"). Shirking, or neglecting to join the military, was even worse. Signs with slogans such as 'Are U Satisfied To Remain A Loafer in Australia?' peppered towns (Souter 1992). Many people publically expressed their support for the soldiers by denouncing those who turned away from the call of duty. For example, a man calling himself "The Soldier's Pal" warned people in a newspaper letter that returning soldiers were going to form a union after the war and take away jobs from shirkers. Moreover, if conscription were not soon introduced, Australia would be left with a worthless, miserable mob of men ("Warning to Shirkers. To the Editor of the Argus" 15 May 1916).

Yet at the same time a growing number of servicemen became dissatisfied with their treatment upon return to Australia and their disillusionment led to protest. Despite the threat of arrest, many soldiers disrupted speeches and events supporting conscription. Archbishop of Brisbane James Duhig wrote a scathing letter to the editor condemning the military veterans who interrupted Anzac Day celebrations. Duhig saw Anzac Day as a

sanctified celebration of the dead rather than a political stage, and he urged the press not to reward similar action by granting it attention ("The Anzac Night Incident. To the Editor." Tuesday 29 April 1919 page 8). To reiterate, however, the split opinion of returned soldiers was lopsided. Most returning soldiers sided with the RSSILA, proclaiming their support for the war in public and stimulating a culture of veterans in Australia in private. Men who disagreed with the war likely had already left or failed to join the RSSILA, though conscription campaigns and high unemployment certainly did exacerbate the existing rift. The dissenters turned their voices to the public, but with small numbers, they were more of a nuisance than a social movement.

Similarly, in the realm of religion, internal disagreements already in existence between Christian factions by 1916 were further irritated by the conscription campaigns. Generally speaking, in the early twentieth century, Christian religions viewed war as part of a natural cycle of history. War tested Christian faith but it was necessary for reforming corrupt societies and renewing morality (Maclean 1995; McKernan 1980). Theologians argued that the world would become more righteous, and then men who were on God's side would become nobler and lead others to follow true ideas. As the German saying goes, "Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht," or "World History is World Judgment" (Barry 1915). Despite the loftiness of these ideals, and the stated intention that war draws Christians together, during World War I the conscription campaigns in Australia only intensified sectarian divisions (Maclean 1995). Catholics and Protestants were already uneasy neighbors, and the fervor of conscription campaigns brought their tensions into the open.

Protestant groups were highly enthusiastic about the war at the beginning. They sounded a call to arms, though few thought Australians would play a significant part in the war (McKernan 1980). One of the most prominent religious supporters was the Methodist Church. The editor of the *Australian Christian Conference*, the Reverend Octavious Lake from Wales, passionately denounced enemies of the Kingdom of God and the King of England. In 1915, after the Dardanelles campaign failure, some Methodist churches began to press men to enlist (Hunt and Thomas 1979). In 1916 and 1917, South Australian churches in particular were advocates for a yes-vote in both rounds of conscription. They were confident that Evangelical Christianity would not suffer because of the war, as opposed to Romanism, which harbored some traitors (Hunt and Thomas 1979). Across the country though, few other clergymen spoke in public for or against conscription. When Protestant leaders did speak to their congregations, they argued that moral obligations compelled them. Leaders concentrated their attention on the moral duties of not deserting the men at the front, of repaying Australia's debt of gratitude to the Empire, or ensuring Australian freedom. The result was more of a civic morality than one of a Christian religion (McKernan 1980).

In contrast, with the exception of a few notable archbishops, Catholic clergyman argued that the war was political and thus the church should have no official view. Catholic parishioners joined the army in proportion to their population share throughout the extent of the war (Bollard 2013). Catholics were more concerned with establishing themselves as second-to-none citizens in a majorly Protestant society, or to be seen as an important block of voters, rather than supporting a particular perspective of the war (Hunt

and Thomas 1979). There were 1.25 million Catholics in Australia during World War I, or twenty-one percent of the population, the majority of which were Irish and working class. They had arrived in poverty and entered a British society that maintained the oppressive rule of the European homeland: for example, the commercial and manufacturing leaders were almost exclusively Protestant (Bollard 2013).

At the outbreak of the war, the Catholic press was occupied covering the death of Pope Pius X and educational inequality in Australia. They saw the war as a short affair and withheld commitment. Then in 1916, the suppression of a Catholic-led rebellion in Dublin, Ireland, at Easter outraged the Catholics in Australia. If the event did not diminish the loyalty of the Irish in Australia to the Anglican Empire, it certain made their loyalty suspect in the eyes of others (Beaumont 1995). Only one bishop, Bishop Cline, came out strongly for conscription. However, many people, including Prime Minister Hughes, saw Archbishop Mannix as the architect of the anti-conscription movement. Mannix however, much like the wider Irish-Australian public, had reacted to the Easter Uprising with a mix of shock and disapproval, at least until the brutality of the English response was brought to light (Bollard 2013). In reality Mannix only gave two public speeches regarding conscription and was mostly undecided about the war (Hunt and Thomas 1979). Officially, the Pope and the Catholic Church remained neutral. While tempers among neighbors may have run high, the broader tension over World War I participation and mandatory conscription between Catholics and Protestants never sparked a full on feud over religion. Rather, influence flowed in the other direction:

differences in religion could be means to escalate already fierce debates over mandatory military service.

The largest and most profound social division over conscription occurred amongst the population of women in Australia. Conscription severed friendships, becoming a petty and bitter affair despite public pleas by women to surrender personal differences to the welfare of the country ("Women to Women. National Service. The Approaching Elections." By Vesta. Wednesday 14 March 1917 page 10). Some women, as previously discussed, took up the war support cause, raising funds and making soldier care packages. Nonetheless, a significant and vocal amount of women were against conscription. Their opinion landed them squarely in a camp with labor unions and socialists, allowing for an alliance that would have been impossible to imagine in previous circumstances.

Australia tended to follow the Victorian ideology of gender division, where men dominated public space and women were relegated to private spheres. Women were not political speakers and leaders, nor were they allowed in labor unions, which feared losing jobs to them (among other groups such as immigrants). Even groups that were open to female members, such as the IWW, exhibited masculine and fraternal atmospheres that did not attract many women. The IWW in particular was a loosely organized, anti-hierarchy group that appealed mostly to single, migrant men (Damousi 1994). The Victorian Socialist Party (VSP), the largest socialist party in Australia, was unique in its attempt to integrate women and actively recruit female workers. The number of women members of VSP reached its peak during World War I (Damousi 1994). Not everyone followed suit. The Australian Socialist Party remained skeptical of the VSP throughout

the war. The ASP argued that women leading an anti-man crusade would not solve the plight of workers (Damousi 1994).

However, women were not completely absent from public politics and organizations prior to conscription campaigns. For nearly two decades women participating in socialist organizations had campaigned for women's rights, free speech, and the poor and unemployed (Damousi 1995). Within socialist parties like the VSP, ASP, and Socialist Labor Party, women's political work was observable but was still also largely confined to private-like space. Men were primarily public speakers and leaders, while woman were organizers, fundraisers, and decorators (Damousi 1995).

Socialism did offer a promise of empowerment to women though. It was ahead of most people in discussing women's issues, such as severely depressed wages. For example, in 1915, as prices of household staples rose, women's wages did not. Furthermore their wage averaged less than fifty percent of men's (Damousi 1994). In 1917, women of the VSP led campaigns against decreasing living standards and increasing food prices. More than fifteen thousand people participated (Damousi 1994).Women, as the primary consumer in early twentieth century families, were highly concerned with stretching money for family survival. Thus is makes sense that they would take a leadership position in cost-of-living issues (Scates and Francis 1997). As members or affiliates of socialist organizations, women were also highly active in the campaign against conscription. Women in the VSP, for example, conducted house-to-house visits, held cottage parties, and spoke to workers at lunch breaks (Damousi 1994). On 21 October, 1916, members of socialist groups, the Women's Peace Army, and the

Labor Party united to hold a march in Melbourne called the Women's No Conscription Demonstration. Ten thousand women march from Swanston Street in the city center to the Yarra River, where they joined with more than fifty thousand spectators (Damousi 1994).

For all their successes, women's participation in anti-conscription events was not all golden glory. Women aligned with socialists and laborers were as brave and dedicated as the women donning khaki and baking Anzac biscuits. Members of the Women's Peace Army, for example, endured a great amount of insult and even jail time as the vitriolic anti-conscription campaign developed (Summers 1975). They faced backlash from both conscription advocates and male chauvinists. All women were subject to this, including women from esteemed families like Mary Grant, who was physically attacked after her speech in May 1916. The negative response could be seen as an assertion of masculine values. Men, soldiers in particular, may have seen socialists, women in particular, as undermining manly ideals of violence by promoting pacifism and anti-conscription. Whatever the case, the fact that socialist messages blamed commercialism for the war rather than military aggression was lost on the opposition (Damousi 1995)[20].

It is noteworthy though that just like their pro-conscription counterparts, women against conscription considered contemporary gender issues within the light of conscription campaigns. Women rallied for increased control of staple food prices, rather than for equal wages to men, so they could feed their children in the absence of their

[20] Economic class was understandably a big component of anti-conscription and anti-war action by socialists. Feminist Annie Golding from Sydney pointed out that pro-conscription groups were dominated by middle class people, who could afford to find loopholes to protect their own children from military service (Argus 1 March – 31 May 1919).

husbands. Internally, anti-conscription groups argued over feminism and feminist issues, such as the use of violence and sabotage in campaigns. However, during the 1916 and 1917 conscription campaigns, such issues and in-fighting were put aside in order to present a united front (Damousi 1994). There were things more important than gender ideology at stake.

Though there was minimal bloodshed and few public disorder injuries, on the Australian home front, the 'war' was really between Australians. Contention was more widespread during the conscription debates than any time previously, including the industrial strikes of the nineteenth century (Souter 1992). Australia, hitherto a tenuous cohesion of distinguishable social, political, and religious groups, morphed into two camps predominantly defined by their stance on military conscription, less so their stance on war with Germany more broadly. The Prime Minister went against his own party's platform on the basis that the British Empire desperately needed bodies for the Western Front. Members of the Liberal Party agreed with him, along with many others, including the Anglican clergy, prominent media and business organizations, and war support groups such as the Universal Service League. The push for conscription was twice blocked however by organized and vocal activists from labor unions, minority political parties such as the Socialists, and women's organizations vying to end Australian participation in World War I altogether. By the end of 1917, amidst federal political restructuring, religious feuds renewed, and massive upheavals by everyday men and women, the previously flexible, mutable boundaries separating Australians appeared to be massive gulfs. The picture of Australia was not entirely bleak, however, and the

obstacles to unification in the wake of conscription were not insurmountable. Since 1915, and through the conscription debates, a small shared notion, a source of pride, steadily grew in Australian hearts and minds. On one day of the year, Australians demonstrated that they were indeed able to move past their differences. Each 25 April, Australians of all religions, races, class, and genders gathered to commemorate the most valued product of their young country: the Anzac.

Chapter 6

> If Australia had been given an impossible task on that field, had she not reaped in it the first-fruit of her valor, of her determination, of all her best qualities—had she not gathered from it, even at a price so bitter, a glory great enough to herald her place to the world, great enough to confirm her place in it? (Blocksidge 1921:287)

> "[The Anzac Legend] is non-threatening, glorifies national achievement and plays a role in the 'birth of the nation', but has nonetheless encouraged Australians to view their war in an unrealistic manner. And why? — since there is little need to inflate Anzac achievement." (Williams 1999:7)

A Day for Australia

The shared meanings of Anzac and its importance to World War I Australian society crystalized in the form of an annual celebration that brought the population together both figuratively and literally. In the wake of dual conscription battles, Australian residents were on the threshold of fracturing to an extent never before experienced in the young Commonwealth. Nevertheless, beginning 25 April 1916 and following annually after its inception, Australians paused arguments and came together across social differences to honor the soldiers of Gallipoli and to reflect on the importance of the Anzac story to the reputation of the country. Anzac Day embodied the collective meanings of Anzac put forward by major social groups, including returned soldiers, women, and politicians, during and immediately following World War I. It is through the early celebrations of Anzac Day that shared meanings, burgeoning traditions, and a sense of collectiveness were expressed. In turn, the annual celebration of the holiday entrenched the stories, meanings, and characteristics of Anzac as a distinctly Australian ritual. Anzac Day was a remembrance of what the Anzacs did, and quite

importantly, who they were and from where they came. Hence examination of initial Anzac Day celebrations is an observation of how Anzac brought people together through its shared meanings and significance, as well as an illustration of the origins of a shared social character that would become the cornerstone of national identity.

Because Anzac Day is a singular, concrete example of the collective creation, celebration, and meanings of Anzac to Australians, the annual holiday can be examined using the methodology of Wendy Griswold's cultural object model. To Griswold, a cultural object is "shared significance in embodied form," explained as "an expression of social meanings that is tangible or can be put into words" (1987:4). Together the many internal components of Anzac Day capture the meanings and spirit of Anzac and create a microcosm of shared Australian sentiments at a given moment, particularly in this case the formative period of the Anzac myth. Furthermore, in Griswold's analytical model, tangible artifacts are no different than systems of ideas, values, and practices (1987). In its infancy, Anzac Day was a mixture of the empirically observable and the verbally expressed. Anzac Day celebration included military marches, civilian parades, religious services, and social events; but it also involved intricate planning by local and state-level participants and intensive negotiation among common citizens regarding the holiday's practices and prohibitions. Following Griswold's model then, the construction of Anzac Day as a cultural object can be systematically analyzed in order to map the pathway of its collective creation and reception, and to identify the meanings of its central figure, the Anzac, according to local sensibility and comprehension within a particular moment in Australian history.

RSSILA and local government committees primarily planned the formal Anzac Day activities, though open participation in Anzac Day events and opportunities to contribute to public discussion via newspaper publication enabled a broad section of Australians to have a say in the creation of a national holiday. The intention, to use Griswold's term, of the soldiers' league and Anzac committees was to honor the men who died at Gallipoli and to emphasize the glory they bestowed upon Australians as part of the Empire. Subsequently, the way the public received and locally adapted Anzac Day expanded its purpose, as well as the meaning of Anzac. Rather than strictly religious or solemn tones, many places also practiced Anzac Day as a festive occasion and a celebration of Australian courage. Anzac Day was a highly participatory and well attended event. It physically brought people of all ages together for the same purpose and to express shared values. The common ground Anzac provided was critical to sustaining social unity during the divisiveness deriving from the conscription campaigns of 1916 and 1917.

Anzac Day encapsulated many elements of Australian sentiment at the time: formality of service to the Empire, informality of cheeky young men from the bush, grief and loss of loved ones, and a celebration of the glory that thrust Australia onto the world stage. The power of the Anzac myth came in its abstractness, or from what Griswold deemed multivocality: what can be described as flexibility, almost an ambiguity, in the meanings contained by the general symbol of Anzac[21]. The expansive scope of Anzac helped to ensure that the holiday was, again in Griswold's words, a market success,

[21] See also Seal 2004 on the ability of Anzac to balance British and Australian identity components.

becoming instantly popular and almost immediately formalized as a Commonwealth-wide holiday after its primary celebrations. While the Anzac myth and Anzac Day certainly did not encompass all of Australian society, the importance of the holiday to crystalizing shared meanings of Anzac and instilling a collective sense of pride and membership in Australia during World War I is difficult to underestimate, especially as it remains the largest public observation of the country nearly one hundred years later.

Anzac Day Creation

The RSSILA and local governments dictated much of the formal program for Anzac Day observation and attempted to instill a solemn, sacred tone to the official proceedings. During the initial five years of Anzac commemorations, 1915 to 1920, veterans and politicians created a holiday blueprint featuring military processions and church services. At times the RSSILA and the churches disagreed over the character of events, arguing about which party should lead, though these groups did agree that the holiday should not serve a commercial or festive purpose (Inglis 1998b). They intended Anzac Day to focus on the heroism of the fallen soldiers and the so-called baptism by fire of the young country. Anzac Day was one of many ongoing efforts to memorialize and honor the soldiers at Gallipoli, though its participatory nature invited the most open public discussion and debate concerning the meaning of Anzac and how the Gallipoli battle should be remembered.

In 1916, during the initial months of creating an Anzac holiday, it remained up to local authorities to decide the date of commemoration. While 25 April was the day of the

actual landing on the shores of Gallipoli, some chose other dates, including existing holidays such as Empire Day, to mark the occasion. The *Sydney Morning Herald* reported on 17 March that the War Chest Committee decided to move the "patriotic effort" to June, "when the Returned Soldiers' Association will cooperate" ("Anzac Day" 1916:5). Whatever the date, the earliest Anzac Day commemorations contained many similar elements across the six Australian states. The mayor of Brisbane and governor of Queensland declared that "the chief object of the day should be the commemoration of our fallen and for the honor of our surviving soldiers." Fundraising and any jubilation were prohibited. Rather religious services would be held and a one minute standstill would take place at nine o'clock in the morning to "preserve the character of the day" ("Anzac Day. Movement to Commemorate." 7 March 1916:5). Similarly, in Perth, West Australia, military troops held a morning parade, followed by a luncheon at the Town Hall and church services ("Anzac Day. The Perth Celebrations…" 18 April 1916:6). The most important focus, as the *Northern Territory Times and Gazette* of Darwin, Northern Territory, proclaimed, was that the holiday "stand out in the minds of Australian people as the day on which a new nation came of age." Australia was baptized under fire in 1915, and "for ever will the glorious deed of that day remain in our memories as an inspiration of all that is noble, heroic, and self-sacrificing" ("St. Mark's Day, April 25th." 20 April 1916:12).

In 1917, the second year of Anzac Day efforts, veterans and politicians worked to increasingly formalize and systemize elements of the holiday. While holiday organization remained a matter for "concerted State action," at the behest of the Western Australia

Premier, the Prime Minister urged Eastern States to declare Anzac Day a public holiday. Western Australia had already placed Anzac Day on par with Empire Day. The Education Department arranged school lessons and public transportation was halted at one o'clock in the afternoon for a minute of silence ("Anzac Day. Question of Public Holiday. The Government's Attitude." 30 March 1917:7). All six states came to agree that Anzac Day deserved its own holiday and the appropriate date of commemoration was 25 April, the day Australians first landed on Turkish soil and the official start of the Empire's Gallipoli campaign, or the nearest Sunday. The *Brisbane Courier* stated it was the "day when flesh of her flesh, blood of her blood, laid down its warm young life on a foreign strand; and from the seed of self-sacrifice sown sprang a nation growing stronger, more earnest, and more self-reliant each day." Furthermore, 25 April would be an opportunity to bring Australians together with a clear, powerful sense of purpose. The article continued, declaring that just two years after Gallipoli, "gathered in spirit around the graves of her heroes…Australia stood united in a very real sense. Australians shared one common feeling of deep gratitude and tender affection for her brave youth who fought and died" on 25 April and each day since then ("The Day of Anzac. A Glory that Never Fades…" 26 April 1917:9).

With the recognition of Anzac Day as an official, state government-sanctioned holiday, soldiers' organizations and capital city governments increasingly cooperated with state officials and the Prime Minister with the result of standardizing fundamental Anzac Day practices across vast geographic regions. In Sydney, New South Wales, the State War Council dictated that all churches would hold services at noon on Anzac Day

in 1917, with a military parade following at four o'clock. People working could also stop for one minute at noon to mark the occasion ("Anzac Day." 11 April 1917:10). Prime Minister Hughes urged churches to cooperate by holding special services. He stated that in addition to each state capital holding a military procession, "it is all important that the religious note should be struck on a day consecrated through all time by the devotion of the sons of Australia unto death at the call of the Empire" ("The Churches…" 14 April 1917:8; "Anzac Day. Procession of Soldiers." 17 April 1917:10). The military procession had a second importance, as the *Sydney Morning Herald* noted. The parade was part of an effort to secure new military recruits, "it being felt that the spirit of emulation of the deeds of the Anzac heroes will be a strong incentive to enlistment" ("Anzac Day." 25 April 1917). The mood and structure were similar in Melbourne, Victoria. The Melbourne branch of the RSSILA appointed a committee in March to plan Anzac Day events, such as the public speeches and procession through the city streets ("Minutes January 1917 – January 1918 Victorian Branch, General Committee"). The outline of holiday arrangements came from Melbourne's Lord Mayor, who received them from Prime Minister Hughes. Members of all branches of the AIF and other military forces were to march, brass bands would play, and religious leaders would hold special, themed services ("Anzac Day. Commonwealth Celebration." Argus. 17 April 1917:10).

1918 and 1919 continued to consolidate the elements of Anzac Day and maintain the focus of the formal events on military honor and the deceased soldiers. In Sydney, organization for the holiday was granted entirely to the New South Wales branch of the RSSILA, who dictated that processions in urban locations would be only for returned

men ("Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald*. 8 April 1918:8). Church services carried on the message of courage and endurance. The *Sydney Morning Herald* reported that "powerful lessons were drawn from the epic landing, bearing on the essential need for whole-hearted unity and sacrifice" in the cause of war ("Anzac Day Services." 29 April 1918:8). Churches in Melbourne also reflected this sentiment. In St. Paul's Cathedral, prayers and sermons emphasized the solemnity of Anzac day and "the gravity of the national situation," deeply affecting those in attendance ("Anzac Day. Honoring the Fallen." 26 April 1918:6). Outside of the inner-city church, six thousand returned men paraded through the streets. For the first time, police officers and hospital workers had a role, and tramway employees erected kiosks to sell goods to spectators ("Anzac Day." 20 April 1918:16). The only major disruption to the established routine occurred in Brisbane, the capital of Queensland. Returned soldiers who were angry at their treatment by the Labor government disrupted official proceedings with shouting and protests. A member of the Anzac Day Committee, Archbishop James Duhrig, wrote to the *Brisbane Courier* to denounce the protestors' actions which "disfigured" the "sacredness of the occasion." Bishop claimed his words were not political, rather they were "an appeal for the worthy celebration of a day that is above all politics and parties—a day sanctified by solemn religious celebrations in memory of the immortal dead" ("The Anzac Night Incident. To the Editor." 29 April 1919:8). Ultimately though the outburst was contained to the single incident and the Duhrig's remarks sparked only a short-lived series of letters to the editor discussing appropriate public behavior.

1920 brought the five year milestone of the landing at Gallipoli and saw the continued increase in size and scope of Anzac Day observations. An Act of Parliament made Anzac Day a federal holiday too, leading one newspaper to announce that 25 April "is really a national Australian holiday" ("Anzac Day." 30 March 1920:2). In Melbourne, holiday activities commenced on Friday, 23 April with kiosks, bands, and a torchlight procession in the city. On Sunday, the RSSILA held a memorial service for three thousand five hundred people of all religions on the grassy oval of the Melbourne Cricket Club ("Anzac Day. To the Editor of the Argus." 8 April 1920:7). Chaplain-General J.L. Rentoul praised the soldiers, claiming that even the Germans viewed troops of the Empire's white dominions as the best fighters. Echoing such sentiments of country and racial pride, House of Representatives member Fleming told attendees at Wesley Church that the world would not forget Gallipoli. He continued, "That was what men of pure race were capable of" ("Anzac Day. Memorial Services Held." 26 April 1920:7). Similar to Melbourne, Darwin, Northern Territory supplemented established Anzac Day routines with more cheerful elements. In addition to the outdoor memorial service on Sunday, the Sports Committee planned fourteen events including races and pillow fights ("Anzac Day Celebrations." 6 April 1920:3). Sydney, on the other hand, retained the traditional solemnity, which may have been influenced by the "special importance and significance" of General Birdwood's presence at the helm of the military march that year ("Anzac Day. General Birdwood to Lead Troops." *Sydney Morning Herald* 30 March 1920:8). One spectator commented that the procession was not militarized enough. He bemoaned the presence of civilian clothing and the lack of arms, claiming that Europeans had seen the

Australian army in full trim, while Australians had not ("Our Citizen Army." *Sydney Morning* Herald 26 April 1920: 6).

To the holiday's leading organizers, "in the evolution and sustaining of a national pride and consciousness, a national day is essential as a crystallizing point" (Hills 1927:57). Thus despite the limited appearance of officially-sanctioned sporting events on Anzac Day, the veterans and politicians dictating holiday plans attempted to maintain the reserved tone and the military focus into the new decade. The RSSILA even requested that states pass legislation banning any raising of funds on Anzac Day except by their league or for soldier memorials ("Anzac Day Holiday Sought." *Argus* 24 May 1920:6). As the 1920s continued though, the RSSILA remained dissatisfied with the perceived lack of uniformity in celebration between states. It argued that, "from the point of view of national development, the day and the circumstances surrounding it was too valuable an asset to be treated other than in an arresting and comprehensive manner" (Hills 1927:57). The league claimed that Anzac Day should be observed for a single day, 25 April, with memorial services in the morning and events to inculcate national pride in the afternoon. Races and gambling should not be allowed. Any sports should help children to develop clean minds and bodies (Hills 1927). The federal government did not have authority to force state complicity in the RSSILA's plan however, so the league continued on its state-by-state mission to implement its vision as the 1920s continued.

Anzac Day was certainly not the only way Australians chose to commemorate the landing at Gallipoli on 25 April, 1915. Deceased soldiers' bodies were not repatriated, so in the absences of graves, one option was for families to order large bronze plaques,

known as a "dead man's penny" to individually honor a loved one. Tokens like these were incredibly important because few families at the time could afford a journey to Gallipoli to visit the grave (Gammage 2007). Kin also participated in horticultural exchanges: just as soldiers brought Australian flowers to Gallipoli in order to claim the battlefield as their own, their families now planted Turkish flora in Australia to symbolize the ongoing presence of the deceased at home (Zino 2007). Erection of physical memorials to the men, and occasionally women, who served on the Eastern Front was arguably the most popular activity in the years immediately following the failed military campaign[22]. In Perth, Western Australia, for example, the Mount Hawthorn Progress Association created Anzac Cottage "with the two-fold object of perpetuating the name 'Anzac' in the district and providing a home for the first wounded soldier" ("Anzac Cottage Monument. To-day's Opening." *West* Australian 15 April 1916:8). On the other side of Australia, in Brisbane, Queensland, the Minister for Education envisioned an Anzac Square. A draftsman's reproduction included dual towers, a garden, fountain, and giant archway leading to the central train station ("The Vision of an Anzac Square." *Brisbane* Courier 28 May 1917:6). One of the largest enduring tributes to the Anzacs also took shape in the waning years of war: the National War Memorial in Canberra, the capital of the Commonwealth.

The original notion for an Australian war memorial can be traced to November 1916, when CEW Bean wrote of the need to preserve air photographs from Pozieres, France. He wrote to Senator Pearce, "These photos will no doubt eventually find a place

---

[22] See Ken Inglis's book *Sacred Places* (2008) for a complete review of Anzac memorials in Australia.

in our national Museum, when a national Museum exists" (in Miller 1987:34). The RSSILA also supported the project. The "Federal Executive Minutes" mention the league's "appreciation of the Government's determination to complete the National War Memorial at Canberra" (1920 - 1930). Items for display had been collected since 1916, when the British War Office agreed to allow Australia to keep its own records. On 11 May 1917, Lieutenant John Linton Treloar of the AIF took charge of the Australian War Records Section in London. The AIF extended his role to include collecting trophies and encouraging donations, effectively turning the War Records Section into a broad organization that would develop into a museum (Miller 1987). When the British decided to establish a war museum and assumed that they themselves would have the first choice of war trophies, the Australian Federal Cabinet quickly followed suit. The Australian museum was to be a federal responsibility, with national requirements coming ahead of state demands. For example, the nine battalion's request to send its machine gun back to Brisbane was rejected, as all military paraphernalia would be housed in Canberra. Treloar went on from the Australian War Records to serve as the second director of the Australian War Memorial for thirty-two years (Miller 1987).

Despite the popularity of physical memorials, and their tendency to become objects of political discussion (see Catherine Speck's 2007 work on women artists, for example), the process of memorial construction did not invite the same volume of clearly observable meaning negotiation as did the national observation of Anzac Day. Anzac Day had to be recreated each year and the flourish of speeches and spectacles invited verbal and concrete expressions of the holiday's significance. The main agents directing

the formalities of the holiday, namely the league of returned soldiers and their state and local political allies, pushed the rhetoric of "triumphalism and sacrificialism" into the mainstream commemorative arena (Melrose 207:37). Anzac Day for them was designed to honor the fallen soldiers and to glorify their actions as a triumph for the young country (Melrose 2007).

The soldiers who first landed on Gallipoli in 1915 were second-to-none in the eyes of the great majority of Australians. The Governor of Brisbane remarked that their efforts had become the standard to which future military endeavors would be compared, saying, "The manhood of Australia has every incentive that honor and patriotism can give to follow. Hereafter, Australia will be measured by the whole-heartedness with which she fulfills the original promise" ("The Example of Anzac." *Brisbane Courier* 26 April 1917:6). The first Anzacs were revered for their masculine qualities of courage and endurance, as well as for their morale. Furthermore, they proved themselves and the Commonwealth of Australia to be valuable assets of Empire. As the *West Australian* reported, "Stern in battle, or gay and debonair in moments of rest, the Australians at all times were an advertisement to the rulers and statesmen that the best product of a country is men" ("Anzac Day." 25 April 1919). As both a legacy of the British race and a product of the rugged outback terrain, the Anzacs embodied everything sacred and strong about Australia. During a 1919 Anzac Day ceremony in Sydney, Chaplain McKenzie stated, "We glory in their service, and in the great sacrifices they made with a cheerfulness and a splendor that are the wonder of the world. They went forth in the spirit of crusaders, determined to do service because of the great principles that were at stake" ("Service in

the Domain. Message of Anzac." *Sydney Morning Herald* 26 April 1919:17). The soldiers' actions overseas provided material for Australians to conjure a self-made image and introduced Australia to the world stage in grand and seemingly righteous circumstances.

Anzac Day provided a forum for returned soldiers, political officials, and clergymen to sing the praises of Australian soldiers and also to emphasize the significance of the Gallipoli landing. Once word of the campaign reached Australian shores, they were not shy about espousing the importance of Gallipoli to the reputation and development of Australia. The *Argus* identified Gallipoli as "the foundation upon which our military prestige rests…In military life, in the sphere of national achievement and in personal effort, it sets a standards. Nothing that falls short of this standard can be regarded as satisfactory" ("Gallipoli. Its meaning to Australia…" 25 April 1919:6). Archbishop Donaldson of Brisbane remarked on the first anniversary of the Gallipoli landing that the Anzacs "have strung Australia into manhood. They have given us a new vision of the meaning of our national life and destiny" ("Anzac Day. *Brisbane* Courier 26 April 1916:6). The theme of maturation to manhood through a life-and-death test of strength and courage wove through many of the grandiose statements. In 1916 the *Sydney Morning Herald* wrote that "Anzac Day will go down to posterity as the day in which Australia cast on one side the ideas and ideals of adolescence, and assumed the more serious responsibilities of man's estate" ("Anzac Day." 25 April 1916:8). The following year, the same newspaper called the Gallipoli landing "Australia's red-letter day," stating that "the history of Australia in the epoch that represents its growth to manhood and

maturity dates from April 25, 1915" ("Anzac Day." 25 April 1917:7). There was an Australia in existence prior to World War I and Gallipoli, but to official conductors of Anzac Day, "that Australia disappeared on the morning of April 25, 1915, and a new and a greater nation rose before the world's eyes" ("Anzac Day. Widespread Celebration…" *Sydney Morning Herald* 26 April 1918:7). Through solemn military processions and distinctive church ceremonies, the RSSILA and state politicians sought to instill these notions, the pain of sacrifice and the pride of triumph, into the hearts and minds of Australians at home.

Anzac Day: Reception and Negotiation

The biggest formal champions of Anzac Day created its ceremonies and holiday mood to balance honoring the deceased young men of Australia and inspiring the home population with the fame and glory achieved for the young country by the Anzacs at Gallipoli. Just three weeks after the landing, the official Australian press representative at Gallipoli, CEW Bean, reported to newspapers that the soldiers' feat was "fit to rank beside the battle of the heights of Abraham" ("Gallipoli. How the Australians Fought. *Sydney Morning Herald* 15 May 1915:14). The RSSILA carried the message of glory and sacrifice through the initial years of Anzac Day celebrations. A.M. David, Secretary of the RSSILA, wrote in a piece titled "Heroes of the Southern Cross" that Anzacs "have caused this outpost of Empire to bound into universal prominence, and call down encomiums from all civilization." In turn, Australia should "Honour the brave dead! Keep green their memory! ...Perpetuate in the Empire those high ideas for which they

have fought in the maintenance of a nation's honour" (Victorian Branch of the RSSILA 1917).

For the most part, messages such as these resonated highly with Australians, many of whom expressed similar sentiments and significance regarding Anzac in their own poetry and prose, published as well as personal. In a contradictory mix of anger, acceptance, pride, and grief, Australians reacted to Gallipoli through "nationalist interpretations of war" which argued that the fallen soldiers helped to save civilization and had proved Australia's mettle among the greatest of European countries (Melrose 2007:243). G. Ethel Martyr opened her poem in the *Brisbane Courier*, "In Memory April 25, 1915," by claiming that physical monuments were no match for the memorials in the hearts of Australians, which the Anzacs greatly deserved: "No wreathed stone, engraven with noble name And deed, is worthy to record the part They played. Some better tribute we should give, Their lives within the nation's life should live—Their deeds be graven on the nation's heart—Their spirit burn within us like a flame" (1917:5). In a similar vein, J. Pascoe's 1918 poem in the *Argus* claimed the same honor for all veterans of Gallipoli, writing "Glory to the God of Nations, For the men who fought but live, Who upon their country's altar Offered all they had to give" ("Anzac Landing. Third Anniversary…" 1918:4). Early public expressions of praise for the Anzacs suggest that to many Australians, Gallipoli brought the greatest glory that Australia had ever worn.

Some authors raised Anzacs to an even higher level. Echoing the Biblical references in Bean's initial press report, the writers placed Gallipoli on par with great battles in Greek mythology, said to be fought on the same peninsula thousands of years

prior. Myra Morris wrote in the 1919 *Argus*, "In ancient days upon the Trojan plain They warred—Homeric men of whom the breeze Aegean-born croons yet. Not less than these Are they who stormed mid ruthless death and pain The ridged front, and struggling to attain The towering heights, piled by the strange old seas, Fresh glories for the Golden Chersonese—The heaped-up hecatombs of countless slain?" (Morris 1919). Many of the first AIF, whose practically impossible task was to conquer the steep beach encircled by the Turkish army, earned a place among the ranks of legendary Greek warriors and were entombed alongside them in Trojan soil. In order to properly honor the valor of Australian Anzac deeds, in his lengthy verse "An Anzac Aeropagus," George Black called on Australians to "build a Valhalla" for the fallen soldiers of Gallipoli (1923):

> This holy ground shall know the rev'rent tread of mourning comrades of our
> Glorious Dead;
> Here mates shall meet who suffered side by side And in war's crucible were
> purified
> Here shall the people troop on Anzac Day To pledge themselves to Liberty, to
> pray
> For selfless service, that such sacrifice Shall evermore repay its heirs their price.
> Aye shall this temple stand, the outward sign Of nationhood-Australian
> pilgrim's shrine;
> A Mecca where full tribute shall be paid To deathless souls – the bravest God
> hath made![23]

The calls to unceasingly honor the soldiers of Gallipoli and references to the mythological stage upon which Anzacs proved their honor and glory clearly illustrate that

[23] Gallipoli did become a pilgrimage site for Australians, and still is today. See *Return to Gallipoli* (Scates 2006).

Australians shared many of the meanings of Anzac put forward by the RSSILA and other central holiday organizers. From the first battle reports from the Eastern Front by CEW Bean, the landing at Gallipoli undoubtedly established its place in Australian history and memory. In 1916 the *West Australian* aptly summarized public sentiments that would dominate Anzac commemoration for years to follow, stating, "May those who mourn their loss find comfort in the conviction that they did not die in vain, but that their sacrifice has drawn our peoples more closely together and added strength and glory to the Empire." Furthermore, in a mirror to the twin goals for Anzac Day of the RSSILA, the article says, "If Gallipoli had its tragic side, it had, as well, its immortal and heroic side — an aspect which showed to the world the courageous, daring, and aggressive spirit of Australian manhood along the path of duty" (Anzac Day. First Anniversary of Landing…" 26 April:7). Thus in commemorating Anzacs and in observing Anzac Day, a great portion of Australians adhered to the foundations of sacrifice and glory laid by Anzac Day's official military and political creators.

At the same time, throughout Australia many localities added structured and unstructured events to Anzac Day that brought a distinctly 'Aussie' spirit to the holiday, but also deviated somewhat in focus and tone from the more reserved, solemn program created by the RSSILA and state governments. The biggest debate over personalizing Anzac Day events concerned the celebratory nature of social gatherings and sport. No disagreement about Anzac Day caused more uproar than whether or not people could enjoy themselves while paying proper homage to the deceased soldiers (Inglis 1998b). From the outset, the RSSILA had not opposed upbeat or festive events in theory. The

Sydney Morning Herald reported in 1917 that sadness was not the main theme of Anzac Day. Just as soldiers did not let the sight of fallen comrades dissuade them from their mission, the article went on, “so the nation at war may not let the thoughts of its losses outweigh its rejoicings in glorious achievements” (“Anzac Day Celebrations.” 26 April 1917:7). Celebrating the grandeur Anzacs brought to Australia was part of the commemoration and national recognition that the soldiers deserved. However, the league drew the line when spontaneous or grassroots social elements including imbibing in alcohol, gambling, and dancing arose, particularly in the afternoons of Anzac Day. Near the end of the 1920s, the Federal Executive branch of the RSSILA revealed strict guidelines for proper, respectful Anzac Day observation. These included Anzac Day being a “close holiday,” in which hotels, theaters, and other public entertainment were prohibited; only essential business services could operate; and any organized competitive sport was banned (“Federal Executive Minutes 1920 – 1930”).

In the earliest years of Anzac Day, a significant number of Australians shared the view of the RSSILA that the holiday was predominantly a somber day of ceremony, and were willing to express their opinions on the matter to the public. Appeals were made with a range of reasoning, from public decency and morality to purposeful construction of a serious, perhaps sacred national identity. For example, in 1916, the Secretary of Queensland’s Anzac Day Commemoration Committee said anything “approaching jubilation or carnival” would be avoided because “there were other things of importance in the creation of national character” (“Anzac Day. Suggested Commemoration.” *West Australian* 14 March 1916:7; see also “Anzac Day.” *Sydney Morning* Herald 1 March

1916:14). In Brisbane, Queensland's capital, fundraising for any purposed would not be allowed, "the idea being that the features of national character which will be drawn out will be a factor of more real value than the mere raising of money, for which they are plenty of other opportunities and occasions" ("Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 9 March 1916:5). Similarly, in Sydney that year, the RSSILA insisted on the serious character of Anzac Day. The holiday "is to be set aside simply for and solely for commemoration and recruiting…It will comfort all of us to see the boys who have died fittingly remembered ("Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 31 March 1916:8). Civilian residents wrote letters to newspaper editors in favor of prohibiting festivities, such as the reader signed "Gallipoli" who argued that it should be done "if only out of the respect to the hundreds of whom the day will perhaps be the saddest in their lives" ("To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 March 1916:13). Others protested proposed fireworks and other electric displays ("To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 March 1916:13b). Such ideals often held sway in the formative years of Anzac Day commemoration and the RSSILA continued to lead the organization of formal events. In 1918, the Perth RSSILA ran a campaign to have Anzac Day be a solemn celebration "on the only day that soldiers recognize as the anniversary," 25 April, rather than the nearest Sunday, which was also still popular during the first few years following Gallipoli ("Anzac Day. Perth Celebrations." *West Australian* 19 April 1918:8). In 1920, the only spinning wheels allowed in Melbourne on Anzac Day by the Premier and the police were for deciding raffle winners ("Anzac Day. No Gambling in the Streets." *Argus* 22 April 1920:7). The RSSILA message was loud and clear, and many Australians received it wholeheartedly.

Nonetheless, several notions of celebration and festiveness regarding Anzac Day were present from its first observance and only gained traction as the years passed. These occasions were also important because they brought a human element to the ethereal tone of the holiday and created personalized links to the broader narrative of Anzac (Mayes 2009). Afternoon picnics, sporting events, and other spontaneous activities, nearly always involving alcohol, sprang up organically alongside, yet in contrast to, formal morning programs. Some people argued that a national holiday was not truly Australian if it did not reflect the complete character of the Anzac soldiers, cheekiness, merriment and all. The foundational *Anzac Book* by CEW Bean itself mentioned the humor and shenanigans of the men in the trenches. A review of Bean's book in a 1917 *Brisbane Courier* article noted that, "as befits the buoyant spirit of the Anzac hero, humor is broadly splashed on almost every page." This was not a criticism, rather the review claimed that the book "should find a place in every home where the great deeds of our boys are honored" ("The Anzac Book." 6 March 1917:8). Others made a religious appeal for jubilation on Anzac Day, interpreting exultation as a proper method of Christian commemoration: "we can with perfect propriety rejoice as Christians because [Anzacs] fought and fell, and falling kept the faith" ("Anzac Day. Spirit of Celebration." *Sydney Morning Herald* 21 April 1916:8). The most prevalent and powerful argument for Australian-themed on informal events on Anzac Day came in the form of a self-identified national trait: so-called real Australians played sport[24]. To many, honoring the fallen and glorifying the nation did not necessarily preclude favorite local pastimes, such as races, rugby, and Australian Rules

---

[24] For further discussion see Australian War Memorial exhibition (https://www.awm.gov.au/exhibitions/sportandwar/) or *Sport in Australian National Identity* (Ward 2010).

Football, colloquially known as "footy." Donald MacDonald argued moreover that the spirit of Anzac itself was born from Australian sporting character. Because men at Gallipoli were not fighting for an immediate threat to their home soil, MacDonald believed something else beyond love of King and country was motivating the Anzacs. "For it is not always the gain of the game, but the manner of playing that is best remembered," he writes, continuing on to say "that is the legacy and message which the Anzacs have handed on, that under all horrors, all trials, the game must be played, and while men may still pay Death the compliment of fearing him, to yield to fear of Death when Duty calls 'Play!' is the unforgivable sin" (MacDonald 1917). Whether sad or cheerful, somber or jubilant, the majority of Australians overall recognized the profound importance of Anzac Day to the spirit of the up-and-coming nation, and all Australians were encouraged to take part in its observance.

Anzac Day: Participation and Education

While involvement in the formal events of Anzac Day was predominantly limited to returned servicemen and religious officials, there were many opportunities for Australian audiences to participate in the observation of the holiday. Widespread participation was encouraged and expected. As the *West Australian* stated, "The day does not concern a few; it is rather one of significance for every Australian man, woman, and child, and as such should be duly treated…A merely formal interest in such a day would be an insult to the brave men who made the day possible, and who is there who would care to insult those men?" ("Anzac Day. The Second Anniversary…" 25 April 1917:6). Even more than newspaper submissions or public discussion over the planned elements

and significance of Anzac Day, the actual day physically brought residents together with the particular goal of recognizing and honoring the courage and splendor seen as unique to the soldiers and people of Australia. Widespread participation boosted the validity of the holiday as a national event. Open participation resonated with existing Australian cultural values including egalitarianism and the opportunity for every person to have a 'fair go.' For this reason, from the outset Anzac Day operated as a Durkheimian event designed to create a collective conscience, to instill a group spirit. Though everyone did not necessarily agree with all celebratory expressions of Anzac Day, on April 25 neighbors came together to observe Australia's national crucible and to teach the youngest members of society the importance of Gallipoli and the Anzacs.

Prior to even the first en masse 25 April observance in 1916, the Premier of the state of New South Wales called on all of Australia to observe Anzac Day. "It is in celebration of the one day in which every State, and not only every State, but every town and village, almost every family, is indissolubly interested," he said ("Anzac Day. Government proposals…" *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 March 1916:10). Women in particular answered the call, though there were many different ideas of what participation meant. Some women favored a more passive observance, befitting the gender ideology of the time. One woman said to the *Sydney Morning Herald* that "women were out to see—not to be seen." They wanted to express their pride in Australian men. "We looked at them with proper respect," she stated, "for although they are our own boys…they are glorified and on a pedestal" ("Women on Anzac Day." 26 April 1916:5). For several years in a row, the *Brisbane Courier* printed the same statement regarding women's role

in Anzac Day: the women of Queensland earned a share in Anzac Day by their sacrifices. It was appropriate then for them to crowd into churches and streets "for the spectacular ceremonies in commemoration of the glorious deeds of the men of their race. If Queensland men have died gloriously, women have lived gloriously, their decorations have been misty eyes, silvered hair, and unanswered longings" ("Woman's World. Anzac Day." 26 April 1917:11; see also "Woman's World. Anzac Day…" 25 April 1919:9 among others).

Some women took a more active stance toward Anzac Day observation, and along with others prohibited from military service, jostled to be a featured part of the holiday. The Perth Woman's Recruiting Committee devised a plan for a woman's khaki defense corps. The women "will be on duty at all times, whether shopping, at the seaside, or in the street, tram or train. When they see a man who appears to be an eligible, they will hand him a card on which is printed, 'Our brothers at the front need help! Will you enlist?'" ("Recruiting. Anzac Day." *West Australian* 16 April 1917:6). On the other hand, men who had volunteered but were rejected from the army wanted to be recognized and participate in Anzac Day as well. As one man wrote to the *Brisbane Courier*, "I am sure there are many who, like myself, have tried to do their bit for the Empire and her Allies who would be glad to do honor to the memory of the brave boys who went out to fight for us and ours" ("Rejected Volunteers and Anzac Day." 13 April 1917:7). The desire for ubiquitous participation also extended across age groups. One reader reminded the public that initial emotional outpouring is exciting and natural, but "patriotism is not a thing of mushroom growth. The kind worth having takes years to mature, and the seed should be

sown early in life" ("To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 25 May 1916:10). Hence next to the returned soldiers, no group was the focus of more attention and careful planning concerning Anzac Day in Australia than school-aged children.

In the initial years of Anzac Day, most education and experiences involving children came through firsthand participation in holiday events. There was some focus on classroom curriculum, for example, schoolbook producers were often caught between the custodians of Gallipoli tradition and those who were pacifist protestors. They compromised by focusing on generally approved stories of mateship like Simpson and his donkey (Inglis 1998b). The great majority of children's exposure to Anzacs and Gallipoli though came through holiday events and memorials designed to illustrate the significance of 1915 to the youngest members of the Australian nation. As the *Sydney Morning Herald* stated, "the memory of Anzac Day is not to be allowed to face from the minds of the Public School children," as Australians now stood on equal footing with other partners of Empire. Moreover, Anzac Day celebrations for children were to be of equal "national importance" as Empire Day ("Anzac Day. Celebrations in Schools." *Argus* 30 April 1919:9). "We want our Australian children to remember not only the heroism of their countrymen at Gallipoli, but the sacred cause in which that heroism was displayed," declared the *Herald* ("School Celebrations. 17 April 1917:10). The focus for children was less on learning military battles or war politics and more heavily on engendering feelings of Australian pride and importance.

For the years immediately following the Gallipoli landing, such educational commemorative events often occurred in the form of school-wide assemblies with

speeches, music, and specially prepared bulletins with narratives of soldier feats at Gallipoli ("Anzac Day. State School Arrangements." *Brisbane Courier* 1 April 1916:5; "Anzac Day. Commemoration in Schools." *Argus* 18 April 1916:8; "Anzac Day." *Brisbane Courier* 17 March 1917). The programs were planned "with the object of impressing upon the children the heroism and self-sacrifice of the Australian soldiers, Australia's pride in them, and, most important of all, Australia's debt to them" ("Anzac Commemoration…" *Argus* 22 April 1916). Children wore red, white and blue ribbons and held Australian flags throughout the ceremonies. They were joined by parents, members of Parliament, and school committees to sing songs such as Kipling's poem, "Recessional," with the popular phrase "Lest We Forget." Maps were displayed showing the beaches where the soldiers landed and the heights they reached, and the Australian flag was flown atop buildings alongside the Union Jack ("Anzac Day in Schools." *Argus* 9 April 1917:4; "Anzac Day in the Schools." *Brisbane Courier* 11 April 1919:6; "Celebration in Victoria…" *Argus* 29 April 1919:5). Particular schools embellished these rituals to their fancy. In Melbourne, for example, the army recruiting minister requested that all schools light bonfires at seven-thirty in the evening "to assist in arousing fresh war spirit throughout Australia and to emphasize the commemoration of Anzac Day" ("Commemoration of Anzac Day..." *Sydney Morning Herald* 13 April 1918:14). Whatever the form of elaboration, Anzac Day children's programs were purposefully designed to instill an enduring sense of dignity and self-esteem in Australia and the Anzacs. Messages stressed sacrifice, loyalty, and "the heroism with which so many of them laid down their lives for their country" ("Anzac Day. Honoring the Fallen…" *Argus* 26 April 1918:6).

Children's programs continued beyond the boundaries of the schoolyard. One of the most popular ways of incorporating children into public religious and military settings was the laying of wreaths. Using flowers and laurel leaves, children either made the display themselves or collected penny contributions in order to purchase the arrangement. On Anzac Day, the children then marched to a central site such as town hall to lay the wreaths next to local honor rolls of the fallen ("Anzac Day. To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 19 April 1917:8). Another option for children was special religious services in which the story of Anzac was recited ("Anzac Day. Celebration on Friday." *Sydney Morning Herald* 23 April 1919:11). At home, parents were encouraged to "take down their Shakespeare" and read the speech of King Henry V prior to the Battle of Agincourt. Similar to the courage and valor of the Anzacs, King Henry's troops marched into battle facing an enemy five times as large ("Anzac Day. Friday's Celebration." *Sydney Morning* Herald 24 April 1919:8). Anzac commemoration spread beyond official Anzac Day events as well. In the state of New South Wales, it was proposed that Arbor Day include planting Australian trees in memory of the fallen soldiers. The memorial would be "distinctively Australian," and would be "enduring, inexpensive, and altogether lovely" ("To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 6 April 1916:6). Just as the trees would grow, so would the children's reverence for the Anzacs and appreciation of Australia increase over time.

From the start, Anzac Day in Australia was purposefully created to bring Australians together to recall the events of Gallipoli and emphasize the fame and glory the Anzacs bestowed on young Australia. The official leaders of the holiday, the returned

soldiers, and their political partners designed solemn military processions and subdued religious services to honor the fallen soldiers of Anzac, many of whose bodies lay in unmarked tombs thousands of miles overseas. True to their larrikin nature, meaning their disregard of leadership and orders, Australians adapted Anzac Day events to local desires, often adding celebratory elements such as sport and drink. They interpreted Anzac Day as a celebration of Australian uniqueness and balanced the formality of the morning with gaiety and jubilee in the afternoon. Children were also called to participate. They sang in schools and marched in parades, learning for the first time to be proud of their countrymen for their own feats, apart from being members of a great Empire.

The great significance of Gallipoli and Anzac Day to Australia was clear the moment Bean's reports reached the newspaper presses. Though the Eastern Front campaign toiled on and the death toll rose through the end of 1916, Australians were able to assert from the beginning that Gallipoli was a victory by focusing on the soldiers themselves and the first day's events: storming the beach and establishing an immobile trench under heavy enemy fire. The virtues of the young, golden Anzacs, their courage, determination, and sacrifice, became the basis of a national legend (Melrose 2007). World War I Australians hailed the glory and fame of the Anzacs. Furthermore, they celebrated what they saw as the birth of a nation, a baptism in fire of a hitherto untried race. Prior to 1914, men wondered how colonial conditions affected the "old stock" of Britain, but after 1915 it was clear the "broad arrow blot of England's savage convict system" had cleared, washed away by "the pure blood of free manhood" (Inglis 1998b:2). It was with great enthusiasm that Australians canonized Anzac Day before the end of

World War I, never doubting that Anzac would endure as an unequaled moment in Australian history.

Celebration of Anzac Day began as and still is a bittersweet moment for Australia. Despite its sorrow, Gallipoli granted Australia a platform for fame and gratification. Yet creating Anzac Day from the stories of the trenches and drawing up blueprints for what would become the mainstream national identity was neither easy nor automatic. For more than a century Australians considered themselves no different than the British. It would take deliberate thought and effort to separate Australia as a self-evident nation, as well as to move on from their convict laden origins (Tsokhas 2001). Formal organizers in the realms of military and politics endeavored to make the day a solemn, reverent observance of fallen soldiers. While Australian audiences accepted this meaning, they added to the holiday distinctly local, Australian components that celebrated the humor and spirit of the outback. The result was a balance of many elements, serious and joyous, formal and spontaneous, traditional and original, that appealed to a broad range of the Australian population. The foremost celebrations of Anzac Day, as the expression of multiple public meanings and common authorship, encapsulate the shared celebration of an entire Commonwealth's effort and the genesis of an Australian national image inspired by their feats. Anzac Day is thus prototypical cultural object and archetypal representation of Australian identity, yesterday as well as today.

Conclusion

> "It is inevitable that the study of Gallipoli will continue for years to come as each generation seeks to resolve the conundrum of how something so stupid, so doomed from the outset, can remain so utterly fascinating." (Hart 2011:462)

Anzac Stories: Legends for the Ages

Lance Corporal Francis Curran was born in 1887 in New South Wales, Australia. In 1914 he enlisted in the Australian Imperial Force and was assigned as a reinforcement of the 7th Light Horse Regiment due to his riding skills. In late May 1915, he was sent instead to Gallipoli as an infantryman, as horses were rarely useful on the steep, sandy hills. During Gallipoli he encountered a weapon of war that neither he nor the other Anzacs had experienced prior to facing their Turkish enemies: hand-thrown missiles. These small bombs, about the size of a cricket ball, had a fuse of a few seconds and had to be thrown back over the trenches or smothered with sandbags before they exploded. Shortly after arrival at Gallipoli, Anzacs were making bombs of their own to send over to the other side as well from jam tins and scrap metal.

Curran developed a reputation for his ability to catch and re-launch Turkish hand missiles. His deadly accuracy was "legendary" and many of his mates wrote home about his accomplishments (Kelly 2004:68). One of his most famous endeavors came at the Lone Pine trenches. When fellow soldiers attempted to help with the bombs, he asked that they stand back and merely keep him supplied with ammunition. He would light a fuse with one hand and hurl it over the top with the other. Curran survived the Gallipoli

campaign and later served on the Eastern Front in Egypt. Lacking a rifle, he snuck to the front lines and conducted single-handed missions to rescue injured soldiers from no-man's land. On his fifteenth rescue, he was shot in the heart by a Turkish sniper and killed. Lance Corporal Curran's grave lies in Kantara War Memorial Cemetery near the Suez Canal to this day (Kelly 2004).

Curran's story of heroic deeds is one of the thousands of examples of Australian soldiers performing courageously, even flourishing, under the extreme demands of military service during World War I. In the face of mounting death tolls and fading misconceptions of war's glories, it was to these stories that Australians clung. The tales of Anzac bravado, sacrifice, and loyalty provided Australians with a sense of pride and perhaps even optimism as the bloody days of an overseas war dragged on. This was never more true than for the case of Gallipoli. Australian military leaders, federal politicians, newspaper editors, and everyday populace shunted the overwhelmingly dismal defeat on the Turkish peninsula in favor of a focus on the Anzacs' courage under fire in their first test of war. Alongside their mourning rituals bloomed poetry and prose of unyielding praise for the young men. Only a few months after the Gallipoli campaign ended in a secret nighttime withdrawal, Australians had created a holiday to honor the service and deaths of their brave young soldiers on foreign soil.

Today, in 2013, the 25 April commemoration remains the most popular annual Australian holiday. Across the Commonwealth, the day often starts with the Dawn Service, a sunrise gathering filled with somber hymns and poetry that concludes with the laying of wreaths on public memorial sites. Spectators young and old then fill the

remaining day with a mixture of formal and informal events, church services and afternoon picnics, military marches and sporting matches. As we approach 2015 and the hundred year anniversary of the Gallipoli landing, there is a renewed interest both academically and popularly in the meaning of the holiday and the Anzac myths on which it is based. This is only the latest example of a spike in Anzac inquisitiveness, however. Over the decades, with the known exception of the 1960s and 1970s, Anzac Day has consistently rallied millions of people and spawned countless works of art and literature. A main claim of this project has been that culture is behind this enduring draw of Anzac. Through the previous six chapters chapters we have explored who helped to instill Anzac within the cultural repertoire of Australian imagery and how they accomplished such an extensive feat.

The First Anzacs and their Meaning to Wartime Australia

Chapter Two revealed the rich, longstanding body of literature on the subject of nations and nationalism. Building predominantly on the works of Benedict Anderson and Ernest Gellner, nations scholars over the past few decades have increasingly acknowledged the role of culture in building as well as breaking intense social bonds. It is Gellner's claim that culture ultimately overcomes stalwart differences among a diverse population (1983). Accordingly, contemporary ethnosymbolists such as Anthony Smith have made culture an object of study in itself, paying due attention to the symbols and subjective elements that foster a fictional kinship among nations which feels anything but. By harnessing the investigative tools of cultural scholars along with their objects of

study, nations and nationalism students can better unpack the dense and loaded symbols that bear the meanings of shared identity. This is discussed more fully in Chapter Six.

Furthermore, continuing to explore culture in cases of nation building and national identity formation, as this project has attempted, brings nuanced understanding to the myriad of ways in which cultures create and sustain collective self-images. Case studies such as the Anzacs of World War I Australia allow scholars to tweak our existing theories to encompass phenomena perhaps otherwise viewed as anomalies. Burawoy has titled this quest the Extended Case Method. For example, the Anzac analysis suggests that Gellner's claims of spreading culture through centralized, state education may need modification as cases move beyond the industrial revolution time period. While spreading uniform knowledge and values is still absolutely critical in terms of creating the desire among people to unify as a nation, the primary methods of accomplishing this can change with time, especially for younger generations. Exploring the power of culture in national identity formation through the Australian case study overall has the potential to reveal rich insight into how people are amassed into nations and why the glue tends to persevere once set.

Chapter Three briefly covered the historical context of Gallipoli and the aspects of Anzacs that captured Australian attention by the end of 1915. At the outbreak of the First World War, Australia remained a relatively new settler colony on the fringes of the British Empire. At the same time, as a white dominion like Canada and South Africa, Australian residents both embraced their British heritage while wholeheartedly believing that their living conditions created members of a race equal to or surpassing the English

in strength and self-sufficiency. Their beliefs were largely untested in the global arena, however, as vast geographical distance and sheer apathy for military endeavors relegated Australia to the margins of any war efforts. Subsequently any eagerness on the part of politicians and young soldiers to join Great Britain's cause in World War I emerged mostly from the desire to prove their worth as equal partners of the British civilization as well as the sheer lack of understanding of the horrors of mass warfare.

It is true that any great rush to enlist has been overstated in various accounts of Gallipoli, nonetheless several hundred thousand Australian men volunteered for the First AIF by the end of the war. The first wave of volunteers dispatched in 1915 believed they were going to Europe but instead found themselves in the harsh deserts of Egypt. They camped and trained outside of Cairo for months, enduring long marches and escaping camp when possible to indulge in the sins of the exotic city. In April, they shipped out across the Mediterranean Sea, heading toward the Dardanelles, a long, narrow strait leading to Constantinople. As part of a British military plan to end the war early, men such as Secretary of State for War Herbert Kitchener and First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill crafted an overly ambitious and misguided plan to capture the capital of the Ottoman Empire and isolate Germany along its Eastern borders. Consequently, the Anzacs and other members of the Gallipoli campaign faced a nearly impossible task and conditions that quickly went from bad to worse. Erroneous maps, disorderly supply lines, and inadequate clothing for the weather conditions were only some of the major problems experienced on the shores of Gallipoli. For eight months, soldiers faced constant bombardment from Turkish soldiers on higher vantage points, and any forward

campaigns resulted in many deaths and little gained ground. The remaining men were finally evacuated in a nighttime withdrawal beginning 18 December 1915.

Despite the disastrous results of Gallipoli, or perhaps especially because of the inevitable doom facing the soldiers, Australians felt great pride in the efforts and courage of their young men during the first overseas military test of the Commonwealth. Thanks greatly to embedded reporter CEW Bean, news of the Anzac feats reached Australian shores before many of the mounting death tolls arrived. Bean emphasized the candor, humor, and unyielding loyalty of the Australian soldiers, embellishing their bushman qualities and praising their buoyant spirits among deteriorating conditions. The awe of Anzac quickly grew into patriotic fervor on the shores of Australia. With headlines exclaiming a national birth by fire and public commemorations springing up across the continent like wildflowers, it did not take long for Australia to hold up Anzac as a nearly sacred symbol of its newfound prominence.

Chapter Four discussed the most predominant parties included and excluded from public discussion and negotiation over what Anzac and the events of Gallipoli meant to Australians. Drawing upon the work of Melissa Wilde, one would expect the most organized groups and parties whose internal dynamics mirrored the broader culture in which the conversations took place to be the most successful in establishing their meanings over any competition. In the case of World War I Australia, these groups were the returning soldiers, collectively known as the RSSILA, as well as a multitude of women's wartime groups, the majority of which were in favor of Australian participation in imperial military endeavors abroad. Conversely, disorganized parties or groups whose

internal dynamics diverged greatly from the broader public culture would be much less successful in negotiations of meaning. In this particular instance the main groups were political minorities such as the Industrial Workers of the World, and racial minorities, meaning almost entirely the indigenous population of Australia. As a result, the symbol of Anzac would emerge as a brawny, masculine warrior whose prowess was a positive attribute for a population trying to establish itself on an aggressive world platform.

The RSSILA, established across the Commonwealth and federated by 1916, blazed the main trail of Anzac's rise in reputation. In addition to lobbying for veterans' medical and financial aid, the RSSILA worked to foster a clean, wholesome image of returned soldiers in the news media. This could be a difficult task, given spectacles such as the multitudes of intoxicated soldiers roaming city streets on any given night, or the special, isolated camp for veterans with sexually transmitted infections residing just outside of Melbourne. The RSSILA argued that newspaper journalists should omit mentioning an offender's military status from reports, and that alcohol and violence problems were the result of unsupportive or inhospitable communities rather than a lack of discipline or responsibility by the veteran. On a more positive note, the local clubhouses and regular meetings of RSSILA chapters provided a measure of support to returning soldiers and enabled them to keep alive the brotherhood and loyalty established in the trenches of World War I.

Women also played a major role in elevating Anzac to its respected status. Tens of thousands of women's wartime organizations were created during the First World War. Though women were prohibited from military service except as nurses, they

contributed significantly to the literal and moral support of the soldiers serving overseas. Efforts ranged from local groups who collected clothing or performed recitals to raise money, to vast organizations such as the Red Cross which ran entire factories the produced supplies from soap to jam. These efforts did not result in the social advancement of women in Australia, however. Women were not encouraged to fill vacant male jobs in the public, nor were they paid as much as their male counterparts. Despite their incredibly high level of organization, their voices were often afforded a lower status than men's. The dominant ideology of the time presupposed a woman's vocation to be a mother, and a great many women viewed their wartime contributions through that paradigm. They lavished their praises on the efforts of their sons and husbands, who were the saviors of civilization and the great defenders of Australia.

One group that had practically no say at all in establishing the meanings or images of Anzac were the Aboriginal peoples. Scholars today are realizing that at least one thousand Aboriginal men may have served in the AIF between 1915 and 1918, with many attempting two or three enlistments in different locations before being accepted by the military. During World War I however, being of a non-white race was mostly an obstacle to service, and those who did serve received little or no recognition as a special category of soldier. Exclusion from the imagery of Anzac and conversations of its meaning in the early twentieth century was simply one more example of their general marginalization from British society. The racism of British settlers and their brutal treatment of the indigenous peoples of Australia is a dark cultural legacy in itself, and one that remains present in Anzac by the symbol's overt omission of nonwhite peoples. At

the time, however, race was not actually the preeminent social division of Australian society. Neither were gender nor unequal rights between the sexes. Instead, the conversation of what Anzac and Gallipoli meant to Australians was taking place in the context of another major social and political rift: the issue of mandatory conscription.

Chapter Five outlined the most contentious social issue that Australia had experienced to date. The battle over mandatory conscription split the ruling Labor Party permanently and created unforeseen partnerships among previously unconnected groups. After Prime Minister Hughes returned from a trip to Europe in 1916, he wasted little time putting forth a public referendum on mandatory conscription, arguing that the Empire was in dire need of support from its dominions. This move completely isolated him from his own political party however, and further split a Labor cohort already at odds over domestic issues such as price regulations. In October of 1916, Hughes' first attempt to gain approval for conscription failed by a narrow margin. He formed a new political coalition named the Win-the-War Party and pressed again for mandatory conscription in a second round in 1917. In December conscription was again blocked at the polls, this time by a wider margin, but the damage to relations between Australians had been done.

A great many prominent groups supported conscription, and upon first glance, should have had the means to pass Hughes' referendum. Liberal Party politicians, business and commerce sectors, members of Protestant religions, and several widely syndicated newspapers argued for conscription. With the help of the War Precautions Act, which nominally prohibited speech against the war and literally prohibited free speech in general, the conscriptionists controlled the most powerful sectors of society. In

contrast, the anti-conscriptionists consisted of many smaller groups who had never cooperated with one another before. Members of male dominated trade unions, women's anti-war groups, Socialist Party associates, and many adherents to religions such as Catholicism and Quakerism found themselves in a motley alliance. While the debates and arguments over conscription were not pleasant for anyone involved, the Industrial Workers of the World in particular suffered for the anti-conscription stance. Hughes singled out the Socialists, playing on fears of the Bolshevik revolutions spreading from Russia, and effectively shut down the organization and prosecuted its leaders by the end of 1917. Catholics too garnered significant attention from pro-conscription parties. After the Easter Uprising in Ireland in April 1916, the loyalty of Irish-Australian Catholics to the British Empire came into question, and the existing religious rivalry between Catholics and Anglicans steadily escalated. Thus due entirely to the two arduous rounds of conscription, the Australian population, whether religious, social, or political, was virtually in a state of dissolution as 1917 came to a close.

Chapter Six addressed the most prominent unifying factor within Australia in the latter half of the First World War, Anzacs and their dedicated holiday, and applied Wendy Griswold's methodology to study them as a cultural object. Anzac was quickly becoming the self-appointed image of Australia as elites and everyday citizens strove to connect the characteristics of the military soldiers to the society that remained at home. Taking it a step further, by 1920 the entire Commonwealth recognized 25 April as Anzac Day, a national holiday to honor the deeds of the First AIF and to commemorate the fallen soldiers. As an observable expression of the sentiment and importance of Anzac to

Australia, Anzac Day may be considered a cultural object imprinted with the values and characteristics Australians hold most dear. Its formal rituals and informal merriments are created and re-created each year, offering a snapshot of Australian national self-image at a particular moment. From the first Anzac Day celebrations in 1916, multiple stakeholders contributed to the basic blueprints of the holiday, ensuring its appeal to a broad sector of the mainstream Australian population.

Similarly to the establishment of the public meanings of Anzac to World War I Australia, the RSSILA also spearheaded the majority of initial Anzac Day programs. The RSSILA intended Anzac Day to be a solemn occasion. Formal morning services would be tinted with religion and involve rituals to properly acknowledge the honor of the Australian soldiers and the debt to which society would forever owe to them. In practice however, Australian residents implemented Anzac Day somewhat differently than the veterans' group intended. In addition to formal morning ceremonies such as the Dawn Service, Australians added more lighthearted events to their holiday afternoons. These included uniquely "Aussie" activities such as Australian Rules Football or the popular betting game Two-Up. The ability of Anzac and Anzac Day to encompass formal and informal elements, British tradition and Aussie invention, illustrates its potential to be a multivocal cultural object, in Griswold's terms. By have shared features but retaining flexibility in their meaning, Anzac and Anzac Day can appeal to varying groups while still outwardly serving as a single point of focus. Multivocality lends an enormous amount of power to Anzac as a collective symbol and Anzac Day as an expression of

those shared characteristics and values, which is attested to by its continuing existence and popularity today.

Moving Forward

Exploring the influence of culture in building national bonds and molding national images could extend for a lifetime, just for the case of Anzac in Australia alone. This project has excised one critical period of time, the origins of Anzac and its first years as a social phenomenon, in order to illustrate the myriad of contributors, meanings, and sentiments embedded in the national symbol. This period is especially important as it precedes explicit expressions of nationalism or the official independence of Australia from the British Empire. Anzac is the cornerstone, the first building block of a uniquely Australian identity upon which notions of national pride and self-sovereignty would be built. By discussing the parties involved in Anzac discourse, laying bare the social circumstances of division and tension in Australian society during the First World War, and parceling out the principal meanings of Anzac and rituals of Anzac Day, this project has attempted to make explicit the collective, contentious, and deeply cultural process of creating a common national image. Moreover, by introducing the methodology of Wendy Griswold to the analytical journey, this project suggests there is great potential in an ongoing partnership of historical and cultural studies. To study national identity and its crystalized expressions as cultural objects places culture directly in the limelight and

offers it rightly as an active force and an important component to consider in itself, rather than relegating it as a backdrop or consequence of human action throughout history.

At the same time, this project is just that: a suggestion, a treatise of potential. By no means did the author have the time or resources to capture every essence of early Anzac, nor does she claim to have created the definitive analysis of the early national image. Furthermore, as mentioned throughout the chapters, there are many factors that deserve more consideration than the narrow cultural vision prescribed in this exercise could afford. The foremost is race and the deep, enduring ideology of cultural superiority held by many British and European settlers. The neglect of Aboriginal soldiers' service and the omission of their voices from public discourse over national images exist alongside the bigger, nastier experience of indigenous peoples at the violent hands of white conquerors. Those stories are without a doubt part of Australia's history and trajectory as a nation, as is the similar tragedy of indigenous peoples and imported minorities in other colonies such as the United States, yet their full resonance must be shared on the pages of other scholars to be properly appreciated and understood.

That is not to say that this project's inadequacies outweigh its analytical progression or its potential as a starting point for future studies. To reiterate, many questions of Anzac remain, and the conversation can continue for a long time yet. For instance, how did the Second World War alter the image of Anzac? More contemporary military campaigns such as Afghanistan? Is Anzac truly still the central piece of Australian national identity, or is a discernible shift away from the soldier hero occurring in the new millennium? Moreover, this project has aspired to raise questions of import for

the field of Sociology and our wider understanding of nations and nationalism. Is Australian Anzac a typical story of building modern national images? What differences do alternative outcomes of war experience, such as overall defeat or fighting in one's own country, make to the process and outcome of collective image construction? In what other beneficial ways can the methodologies of Griswold and other cultural scholars be applied to nations and nationalism studies and to historical Sociology more broadly? There is much to be done, yet it is worth pausing for a moment to grasp the value and the splendor of the First World War Anzacs' and their march to infamy.

The story of Gallipoli was somewhat of an overnight sensation in World War I. From the moment CEW Bean's reports rolled hot off the press, Anzac feats captured Australian imaginations and became a self-appointed source of pride for the white dominion. It took months, not years, for Gallipoli to be proclaimed the birth of a nation and the Anzacs the treasure of Australia. Returned soldiers and politicians pounced on the opportunity and painted an image of the Anzac as a strapping, golden young man with a maverick attitude and undying loyalty to his mates. Before the first anniversary of the Gallipoli landing a holiday was created to honor the fallen soldiers and to celebrate the worldwide fame they bestowed upon Australia. Anzac Day's first years involved much negotiation over the program and the behavior of participants, and they illustrated the formation of a shared Australian identity. The characteristics of Anzac were praised on Anzac Day and were seen as quintessentially Australian: egalitarianism, mateship, and unyielding courage.

To be sure, as a symbol of a budding Australian nation, Anzac was limited in its demographic scope, especially in terms of race and gender. At the same time, Anzac was and still is embraced by the great majority of Australians, suggesting that for its limitations it is also an encompassing and profound expression of identity. The case of World War I Australia and the origins of the Anzac myth bolster arguments espousing the power of culture in uniting populations as nations. It also reveals the nuance of negotiated meaning, from two neighbors arguing over firework displays to state level officials attempting to harness the image in support of their political agenda. The success of Anzac Day came from its ability to balance oppositional elements, such as somber reflection and jubilant celebration, or duty to Empire with pride in one's own country. The same is true for the symbol of Anzac itself. In the midst of a society nearly torn apart over the political issue of mandatory conscription, peoples on both sides of the debate could celebrate the feats at Gallipoli and the valor of the Anzacs. As such, people of all religions, races, and classes could suspend their conflicts for one day each year and unite to celebrate the best of themselves and their country.

Anzac has had nearly a century of development and change in Australia, starting as early as the fallout of the First World War. The myth of Anzac was powerful, but it could not always match the confronting reality of death and destruction caused by four years of war. Tattered veterans stood in stark contrast to the idealized version of Australian soldiers. Over three hundred thousand soldiers served overseas, comprising about two-fifths of the military aged population in Australia, and over one hundred thousand of them returned maimed or wounded. Australia faced an enormous cohort of

you men who whose families would carry the burden of care for the rest of their lives (Smith 1995). Along with the withering notion of war glory was the unquestioning adulation of Great Britain. In the coming years, Australians were left with the question of whether or not self-sacrifice in the name of imperial duty was justified (Gammage 2010). What the future would contain for the legend of Anzac and Australians themselves was far from uncertain, especially as the desolate and hard decades of the 1930s was approaching.

At the same time, true to its ability to capture contrarieties, Anzac seemed to be a fountain of eternal hope and inspiration. Impressive memorials built in the wake of World War I still stand to remind Australians of Gallipoli. Plans for the Shrine of Remembrance in Melbourne began in 1921, and in 1934, the Greek-inspired building was dedicated "To the glory of service and sacrifice" (Inglis 1965:42). Similarly, in the Australian capital, Canberra, the Australian War Memorial contains a Hall of Memory dedicated to "the outstanding qualities of Australian servicemen and women," including comradeship, loyalty, audacity, and endurance (Inglis 1965:43). At the time of this writing, Australia is approaching the centennial of the landing at Gallipoli, and preparations are in full swing. The Shrine of Remembrance is undergoing extensive external restoration, tourist treks to Gallipoli have waiting lists, and appetite for Anzac can be seen across libraries and museums. Anzac has weathered many decades of peace, war, and change in Australia, but that is the crux: Anzac has endured. The embodiment of Australian collective identity and its crystalized expression in an annual holiday continue to stand as evidence of the power of culture in bringing people together as a nation.

Works Cited

"1914-1915 War Ribbon. To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 14 March 1919:4.

"A Force in National Life. To the Editor." *West Australian* 16 May 1917:8.

Adams, Julia, Elizabeth S. Clemons and Ann Shola Orloff. 2005. "Introduction: Social Theory, Modernity, and the Three Waves of Historical Sociology", pp 1-74 in *Remaking Modernity: Politics, History, and Sociology*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Revised Edition*. New York: Verso.

Anderson, Scott. 2013. *Lawrence in Arabia: War, Deceit, Imperial Folly and the Making of the Modern Middle East.* New York: Double Day.

Andrews, E.M. 1993. *The Anzac Illusion: Anglo-Australian relations during World War I*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

"Annual Report 1921." 1921. RSSILA Victorian Branch. RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

Anzac. 1916. *On the Anzac Trail: Being Extracts from the Diary of a New Zealand Sapper*. London: William Heinemann.

Anzac, An. 1916. *Twelve Months with the Australian Expeditionary Force*. London: George Newnes, Ltd.

Anzac-Aussie-Franco. 1918. *Songs of an Anzac*. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd.

"Anzac Commemoration. Observance in Schools. Impressive Ceremonies." *Argus* 22 April 1916.

"Anzac Cottage Monument. To-day's Opening." *West Australian* 15 April 1916:8.

"Anzac Day." *Brisbane Courier* 26 April 1916:6.

"Anzac Day." *Brisbane Courier* 17 March 1917:7.

"Anzac Day." *Northern Territory Times and Gazette* 30 March 1920:2.

"Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 1 March 1916:14.

"Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 9 March 1916:5.

"Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 17 March 1916:5.

"Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 31 March 1916:8.

"Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 25 April 1916:8.

"Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 11 April 1917:10.

"Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 25 April 1917:7.

"Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 8 April 1918:8.

"Anzac Day." *West Australian* 25 April 1919.

"Anzac Day. Celebration on Friday." *Sydney Morning Herald* 23 April 1919:11.

"Anzac Day Celebrations." *Northern Territory Times and Gazette* 6 April 1920:3.

"Anzac Day. Celebrations in Schools." *Argus* 30 April 1919:9.

"Anzac Day Celebrations. Inspiring Scenes in Australia. Nation Honors Her Heroes." *Sydney Morning Herald* 26 April 1917:7.

"Anzac Day. Commemoration in Schools." *Argus* 18 April 1916:8.

"Anzac Day. Commonwealth Celebration." *Argus* 17 April 1917:10.

"Anzac Day. First Anniversary of Landing. Commemoration in this State. Message from the King. The People's Solemn Tribute." *West Australian* 26 April 1916:7.

"Anzac Day. Friday, April 26." *Argus* 20 April 1918:16.

"Anzac Day. Friday's Celebration." *Sydney Morning Herald* 24 April 1919:8.

"Anzac Day. General Birdwood to Lead Troops." *Sydney Morning Herald* 30 March 1920:8.

"Anzac Day. Government Proposals. Recruiting Effort." *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 March 1916:10.

"Anzac Day Holiday Sought." *Argus* 24 May 1920:6.

"Anzac Day. Honoring the Fallen. Impressive Services." *Argus* 26 April 1918:6.

"Anzac Day in Schools." *Argus* 9 April 1917:4.

"Anzac Day in the Schools." *Brisbane Courier* 11 April 1919:6.

"Anzac Day. Memorial Services Held." *Argus* 26 April 1920:7.

"Anzac Day. Movement to Commemorate." *Argus* 7 March 1916.

"Anzac Day. No Gambling in the Streets." *Argus* 22 April 1920:7.

"Anzac Day. Perth Celebrations." *West Australian* 19 April 1918:8.

"Anzac Day. Procession of Soldiers." *Sydney Morning Herald* 17 April 1917:10.

"Anzac Day. Question of Public Holiday. The Government's Attitude." *West Australian* 30 March 1917:7.

"Anzac Day Services." *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 April 1918:8.

"Anzac Day. Spirit of Celebration." *Sydney Morning Herald* 21 April 1916:8.

"Anzac Day. State School Arrangements." *Brisbane Courier* 1 April 1916:5.

"Anzac Day. Suggested Commemoration." *West Australian* 14 March 1916:7.

"Anzac Day. The Perth Celebrations. Official Announcements." *West Australian* 18 April 1916: 6.

"Anzac Day. The Second Anniversary of a Great Achievement. To-day's Celebrations." *West Australian* 25 April 1917:6.

"Anzac Day. To the Editor of the Argus." *Argus* 8 April 1920:7.

"Anzac Day. To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 19 April 1917:8.

"Anzac Day. Widespread Celebration. The March of Gallipoli Heroes." *Sydney Morning Herald* 26 April 1918:7.

"Anzac Ribbon. To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 19 March 1919:10.

"Australia and the War. Our Great Peril." *Argus* 19 March 1915:8.

Australia in World War I: At Home and Over There. [Film] Moving Images from the Collections of the Australian War Memorial and the National Film and Sound Archive.

Barrett, James W. and P.E. Deane. 1918. *The Australian Army Medical Corps in Egypt: an illustrated and detailed account of the organization and work of the Australian medical units in Egypt 1914-1915*. London: Lewis.

Barry, F.R. 1915. *Religion and the War*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Bassett, Jan. 1983. *The Home Front: 1914-1918.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Beaumont, Joan. 2005. *Australia's War 1918-1918.* Ed. J. Beaumont. St. Leonards, New South Wales, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Beaumont, Joan. 2007. "Australian Citizenship and the Two World Wars," *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 53(2): 171-182.

Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Black, George. 1923. *An Anzac Areopagus and Other Verses.* Sydney: Tyrrell's Ltd.

Blainey, Geoffrey. 1995. "If Australia had not participated in the Great War, what kind of society would have emerged?" pp 171-78 in *The Great War: Gains and Losses – Anzac and Empire.* Ed. C. Wilcox. Canberra: Australian National University.

Blocksidge, William. 1921. *An Anzac Muster*. Privately Printed.

Bollard, Robert. 2013. *In the Shadow of Gallipoli: The hidden history of Australia in World War I*. Sydney: New South Publishing.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bridge, Carl and Kent Fedorowich. 2003. "Mapping the British World", in *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity*. Eds. C.Bridge and K.Fedorowich. Portland: Frank Cass.

Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Burawoy, Michael. 1998. "The Extended Case Method" *Sociological Theory* 16(1):1-30.

Cain, Frank. 1993. *The Wobblies at War: A History of the IWW and the Great War in Australia*. Melbourne: Spectrum Publications.

Calhoun, Craig. 2007. *Nations Matter: Culture, History, and the Cosmopolitan Dream*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, David W. 2013. *Shadows of Anzac: an intimate history of Gallipoli*. Newport, New South Wales, Australia: Big Sky Publishing.

"Celebration in Victoria. Demonstrations in Schools To-day." *Argus* 29 April 1919:5.

Chernilo, Daniel. 2007. *A Social Theory of the Nation-state: The political forms of modernity beyond methodological nationalism*. New York: Routledge.

Coleman, Hunt. 1916. "The Women Who Pulled Us Through." *Brisbane Courier* 24 May: 3.

"Commemoration of Anzac Day, Melbourne, Friday." *Sydney Morning Herald* 13 April 1918: 14.

"Commonwealth. Sentences on Soldiers." *West Australian* 19 March 1917:7.

Coxhead, G.R. 191-. *Lost a Continent! Heroes of Anzac and Other Verses.* Melbourne: Modern Printing Company Proprietary Ltd.

Crotty, Martin. 2006. "Naïve Militarism: Australia's World War I Generation." Pp 108-122 in *The Great Mistakes of Australian History*. Ed. M. Crotty and D. A. Roberts, Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Crotty, Martin. 2007. "The Anzac Citizen: Towards a History of the RSL", *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 53(2):183-193.

Crotty, Martin. 2009. "Australian Troops Land at Gallipoli: Trial, trauma, and the 'birth of the nation'". Pp 100-14 in *Turning Points in Australian History*, Ed. M. Crotty and D.A. Roberts, Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Curran, James and Stuart Ward. 2010. *The Unknown Nation: Australia After Empire*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press.

Damousi, Joy. 1992. "Marching to Different Drums: Women's Mobilizations 1914-1939" in *Gender Relations in Australia: Domination and Negotiation*. Ed. K. Saunders and R. Evans. Sydney: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Damousi, Joy. 1994. *Women Come Rally: Socialism, Communism and Gender in Australia 1890-1955*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Damousi, Joy 1995. "Socialist women and gendered space: Anti-conscription and anti-war campaigns 1914-18," pp 254-73 in *Gender and War: Australians at War in the Twentieth Century.* Ed. J. Damousi and M. Lake. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Darwin, John. 2009. *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-System, 1830-1970.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, Susanne. 1996. "Women, War, and the Violence of History: An Australian Perspective," *Violence Against Women*, 2:359-379.

Doull, David. 1916. *With the Anzacs in Egypt*. Sydney: J.A. Packer.

Durkheim, Emile. 1972. *Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings.* Ed. Tr. A. Giddens. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fair, Roger. 1965. *A Treasury of Anzac Humor*. Brisbane: Jacaranda Press Party Ltd.

"Federal Executive Minutes: April 1920 – July 1930." RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

Ferguson, Niall. 2003. *Empire: The Rise and Demise of the British World Order and Lessons for Global Power.* New York: Basic Books.

Fields, Maurie. 1990. *Dinkum Aussie Yarns: Tall Tales from the Bush.* Melbourne: Southdown Press.

Firenze, F. Hayward. 1917. *Old Blues and Reds*. Adelaide: Pritchard Brothers.

Franzac. 1937. *Early Days of the League in Victoria*. RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

"Gallipoli. How the Australians Fought. Imperishable Fame." *Sydney Morning Herald* (Captain C.E.W. Bean) 15 May 1915:14.

"Gallipoli. Its Meaning to Australia. The Immortal Landing." *Argus* 25 April 1919:6.

Gammage, Bill. 2007. "The Anzac Cemetery". *Australian Historical Studies* 129:124-40.

Gammage, Bill. 2010 [1974]. *The Broken Years: Australian Soldiers in the Great War*. Carlton, Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press.

Garton, Stephen. 1996. *The Cost of War: Australians Return.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Gifford, A.S.H. "Papers 1916-18." State Library of Victoria Special Collections.

Grant, Susan-Mary. 1997. "Making History: Myth and the Construction of American Nationhood", pp 88-106 in *Myths & Nationhood*. Eds. G. Hosking and G. Schopflin. New York: Routledge.

Greaves, Lillian Wooster. 1920. *Let Us Wear White*. Melbourne: W.R. Furlong Music Studio.

Griswold, Wendy. 1987. "A Methodological Framework for the Sociology of Culture," *Sociological Methodology* 17:1-35.

Griswold, Wendy. 1987b. "The Fabrication of Meaning: Literary Interpretation in the United States, Great Britain, and the West Indies," *American Journal of Sociology* 92(5):1077-1117.

Hanman, E.F. 1918. *Twelve Months with the "Anzacs."* Brisbane: R.G. Gillies & Co. Ltd.

Hart, Peter. 2011. *Gallipoli.* London: Profile Books.

Harris, Kirsty. 2007. "Work, Work, Work: Australian Army Nurses after the First World War." *When Soldiers Return: November 2007 Conference Preceedings* 183-93.

Hills, Loftus. 1927. *The Returned Sailors & Soldiers' Imperial League of Australia: Its Origin, History, Achievements and Ideals*. Melbourne: Southland Press.

Hobsbawm, E.J. 1990. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffenberg, Peter H. 2001. "Landscape, Memory and the Australian War Experience, 1915-18", *Journal of Contemporary History*, 36(1): 111-31.

Hunt, Arnold and Robert Thomas. 1979. *"For God, King and Country": A study in the attitudes of the Methodist and Catholic press in South Australia to the Great War 1914-1918*. Salisbury, South Australia: Salisbury College of Advanced Education.

Inglis, Ken. 1998. “C.E.W. Bean, Australian Historian,” pp 40-60 in *Anzac Remembered: Selected Writings by K.S. Inglis.* Ed J. Lack and K.S. Inglis. Melbourne: University of Melbourne Department of History.

Inglis, Ken. 1998b. “Anzac Day: The One Day Will Endure,” pp 11-13 in *Anzac Remembered: Selected Writings by K.S. Inglis.* Ed J. Lack and K.S. Inglis. Melbourne: University of Melbourne Department of History.

Inglis, K.S. 1965. “The Anzac Tradition,” *Meanjin Quarterly* March.

Inglis, K.S. 2008 [1998]. *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape*. Carlton, Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press.

Johnston, Susan. 1987. *Experiences of the Great War 1914-1918.* Melbourne: Longman Chesire.

Kelly, Darryl. 2004. *Just Soldiers: Stories of ordinary Australians doing extraordinary things in time of war.* Aspley, Queensland, Australia: Anzac Day Commemoration Committee.

Kent, David A. 1987. “Troopship Literature: ‘A Life on the Ocean Wave,’ 1914-19,” *Journal of the Australian War Memorial* April(10):3-10.

Kidson, May. 1918. *Memory’s Voices (A Souvenir): War Days, 1915-18.* RSA.

King, Janie F.L. 1916. *Lads ‘O the Southern Cross and Other Verses.* Hobart: Monotone Art Printers.

Kipling, Rudyard. [2012] 1897. “Recessional,” *Recessional and Other Poems.* Hardpress.

Kohn, Hans. 2005[1944]. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Larsson, Marina. 2009. *Shattered Anzacs: Living with the Scars of War.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Lindsay, Patrick. 2006. *Spirit of Gallipoli: Birth of the Anzac Legend*. Prahan, Victoria, Australia: Hardie Grant Books.

Lewis, Brian. 1980. *Our War: Australia During World War I*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

MacDonald, Donald. "Second Anniversary. Playing the Game. The Anzac Spirit." *Argus* 25 April:7.

MacDougall, A.K. 1991. *ANZACS, Australians at War: A Narrative History Illustrated by Photographs from the Nation's Archives.* Sydney: Reed Books.

Maclean, Pam. 1995. "War and Australian Society," pp 64-92 in *Australia's War 1914-1918.* Ed. J. Beaumont. St Leonards, New South Wales, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

MacLeod, Jenny. 2004. *Reconsidering Gallipoli*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mahoney, James. 2004. "Comparative-Historical Methodology," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30: 81-101.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1926. *Myth in Primitive Psychology.* New York: W.W. Norton, Inc.

Mandle, W.F. 1978. *Going It Alone: Australia's National Identity in the Twentieth Century.* Ringwood, Victoria, Australia: Allen Lane The Penguin Press.

Mann, Michael. 1986. *Sources of Social Power Volume I: A History of Power*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, Michael. 1993. *Sources of Social Power Volume II: The rise of classes and nation states.* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Martyr, G. Ethel. 1917. "In Memory April 25, 1915." *Argus* 21 April:5.

Mayes, Robyn. 2009. "Origins of the Anzac Dawn ceremony: spontaneity and nationhood." *Journal of Australian Studies* 33(1):51-65.

McDonald, Matt. 2010. "'Lest We Forget': The Politics of Memory and Australian Military Intervention", *International Political Sociology*, 4: 287-302.

McKenzie, J.W. 1918. *For the Flag.* Victoria: D.W. Patterson and Co. Party Ltd.

McKernan, Michael. 1980. *Australian Churches at War: Attitudes and Activities of the Major Churches 1914-1918.* Canberra: Australian War Memorial.

Meaney, Neville. 2003. "Britishness and Australia: Some Reflections", in *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity*. Eds. C.Bridge and K.Fedorowich. Portland: Frank Cass.

Melrose, Craig. 2007. "Triumphalism and Sacrificialism: Tradition in the Public Memory of the First World War In Australia, 1919-39." *When Soldiers Return: 2007 Conference Proceedings* 236-47.

Meyer, John et al. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-State," *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1): 144-81.

Miller, Ann. 1987. "Gallipoli to Melbourne: The Australian War Memorial, 1915-19," *Journal of the Australian War Memorial.* 10:33-42.

Mills, Frederick A. 1917. *Square Dinkum: A Volume of Original Australian Wit and Humor*. Melbourne: Melville & Mullen Party Ltd.

"Minutes: 15 August – January 1917, Victorian Branch." RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

"Minutes: December 1918 – November 1919." RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

"Minutes: January 1916 – December 1918." RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

"Minutes: January 1917 – January 1918." RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

"Minutes: January 1917 – January 1918, Victorian Branch, General Committee." RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

"Miss Pankhurst and Soldier." *Argus* 10 May 1916:5.

"Mons-Gallipoli Ribbon. To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 10 April 1919:9.

Morris, Myra. 1919. “Remembrance. Anzac Day.” *Argus* 25 April 1919:6.

Murdoch, Keith A. 1917. *“The Day” – and After: War Speeches of The Rt. Hon. W. M. Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia*. Melbourne: Cassell and Company Ltd.

National Archives of Australia. 2009. “Shell-Shocked: Australia After Armistice.” *Memento* 36:44-7.

North, John. 1936. Quoted in Macleod, Jenny. 2004. *Reconsidering Gallipoli*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

“Our Citizen Army.” *Sydney Morning Herald* 26 April 1920:6.

Overing, Joanna. 1997. “The Role of Myth: An Anthropological Perspective, or: ‘The Reality of the Really Made Up’”, pp 1-18 in *Myths & Nationhood*. Eds. G. Hosking and G. Schopflin. New York: Routledge.

Pacella, Jessica. 2011. “Crikey, it’s Commodified! An Investigation into ANZAC Day: The next Nike?” *Social Alternatives* 30(2): 26-9.

Page, James. 2010. “Making Sense of Australia’s War Memorials”, *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, 22: 276-79.

Parliament of Victoria, Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee. 2002. *Anzac: Parliamentary Review of Anzac Day Laws.*

Pascoe, J. 1918. “Anzac Landing. Third Anniversary. Story of Achievement.” *Argus* 25 April 1918:4.

Raffo, Stephen. 1915. “She Who Gives Her Son.” Sydney: Sydney Music Publishing Co.

Renan, Ernest. [2001].1882 “What is a Nation?” pp 162-176 in *Nations and Identities*. Ed. V. Pecora. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

“Recruiting. Anzac Day.” *West Australian* 16 April 1917:6.

“Recruiting Campaign. In Defense. (By a Soldier’s Sister).” *West Australian* 24 May 1917:6.

"Rejected Volunteers and Anzac Day. To the Editor." *Brisbane Courier*13 April 1917:7.

Rhoden, Clare. 2012. "Another Perspective on Australian Discipline in the Great War: The Egalitarian Bargain." *War in History* 19(4):445-63.

Risley, Nellie. 1916. *My Anzac Hero*. Melbourne: Dinsdales' Party Ltd.

Robertson, John. 1990. *Anzac and Empire: The Tragedy & Glory of Gallipoli*. Port Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Hamlyn.

Robson, L.L. 1969. *Australia and the Great War.* South Melbourne: MacMillan of Australia.

Rutherglen Repatriation Committee. 1920. "Inwards Correspondence." State Library of Victoria Special Collections.

Scarlett, Philippa. 2012. *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Volunteers for the AIF: The Indigenous Response to World War One.* Canberra: Indigenous Histories.

Scates, Bruce. 2006. *Return to Gallipoli: Walking the Battlefields of the Great War*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Scates, Bruce and Raelene Francis. 1997. *Women and the Great War*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Schivelbusch, Wolfgang. 2003. *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovering.* London: Granta Books.

"School Celebrations." *Sydney Morning Herald* 17 April 1917:10.

Schopflin, George. 1997. "The Functions of Myth and a Taxonomy of Myths", pp 19-35 in *Myths & Nationhood*. Eds. G. Hosking and G. Schopflin. New York: Routledge.

Seal, Graham. 1991. *Digger Folksong and Verse of World War I: An Annotated Anthology*. Perth: Antipodes Press.

Seal, Graham. 2004. *Inventing Anzac: the digger and national mythology.* St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Seal, Graham. 2007. "ANZAC: The Sacred in the Secular." *Journal of Australian Studies* 91:135-44.

Seal, Graham. 2012. "'…and in the morning…': adapting and adopting the dawn service." *Journal of Australian Studies* 35(1):49-63.

"Serious Offences. To the Editor." *West Australian* 12 April 1916:4.

"Service in Domain. Message of Anzac." *Sydney Morning Herald* 26 April 1919:17.

Shute, Carmel. 1995. "Heroine and heroes: Sexual Mythology in Australia 1914-18," pp 23-42 in *Gender and War: Australians at War in the Twentieth Century.* Ed. J. Damousi and M. Lake. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Skeyhill, Tom. 1915. *Soldier Songs from Anzac.* Melbourne: George Robertson and Company Proprietary Ltd.

Skocpol, Theda. 1984. "Emerging Agendas and Recurring Strategies in Historical Sociology," pp 356-391 in *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*, Ed. T. Skocpol. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smart, Judith. 1995. "Was the Great War Australia's War? A domestic perspective with particular reference to Victoria" pp 15-65 in *The Great War: Gains and Losses – ANZAC and Empire* Ed. Craig Wilcox. Canberra: Australian National University.

Smith, Anthony D. 1987. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Smith, Anthony D. 2004. *The Antiquity of Nations.* Malden, MA: Polity.

Smith, Anthony D. 2008. *The Cultural Foundation of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, and Republic.* Carlton, Victoria, Australia: Blackwell Publishing.

Smith, Anthony D. 2009. *Ethno-symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, Anthony D. 2010. *Nationalism: 2nd Edition*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Smith, F.B. 1995. "If Australia had not participated in the Great War? An essay on the costs of war" pp 179-195 in *The Great War: Gains and Losses – ANZAC and Empire* Ed. Craig Wilcox. Canberra: Australian National University.

Souter, Gavin. 1992. *Lion and Kangaroo: The Initiation of Australia*. Sydney: William Collins Publishers Party Ltd.

"Special Congress Minutes" 1919. RSSILA Adelaide. RSL Melbourne Anzac House Library.

Speck, Catherine. 2007. "The Australian War Museum, Women Artists and the National Memory of the First World War." *When the Soldiers Return: 2007 Conference Proceedings* 277-90.

Spillman, Lyn. 1997. *Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

"St. Mark's Day, April 25th." *Northern Territory Times and Gazette* 20 April 1916:12.

Stanley, Peter. 2011. "'He was black, he was a White man, and a dinkum Aussie': race and empire in revisiting the Anzac Legend." *Race, Empire and First World War Writing*. Ed S. Bas. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Summers, Anne. 1975. *Damned Whores and God's Police: The Colonization of Women in Australia.* Ringwood, Victoria, Australia: Allen Lane.

Supski, Sian. 2006. "Anzac Biscuits – A Culinary Memorial." *Journal of Australian Studies* 87:51-60.

"The Anzac Book." *Brisbane Courier* 6 March 1917:8.

"The Anzac Club." *Brisbane Courier* 24 May 1917:7.

"The Anzac Night Incident. To the Editor." *Brisbane Courier* 29 April 1919:8.

"The Anzac Ribbon. To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 31 March 1919:10.

"The Celebration of Anzac." *Brisbane Courier* 8 March 1916:6.

"The Churches. Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 14 April 1917:8.

"The Day of Anzac. A Glory that Never Fades. Commemoration in Brisbane. Church Services and Military Parade. Demonstration at the Exhibition." *Brisbane Courier* 26 April 1917:9.

"The Example of Anzac." *Brisbane Courier* 26 April 1917:6.

"The Liquor Problem. Discussed by Women. Doctor's Condemnation." *Argus* 24 April 1915:20.

"The Nurses. Appreciation of Grand Work. Contributions to Equipment Fund. Another Encouraging Day." *Brisbane Courier* 24 May 1917:7.

"The Vision of an Anzac Square." *Brisbane Courier* 28 May 1917:6.

Thomson, Alistair. 1994. *Anzac Memories: Living with the Legend*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thornton, Guy. 1916. *With the Anzacs in Cairo*. London: H.R. Allenson Ltd.

"To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 6 April 1916:6.

"To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 25 May 1916:10.

"To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 March 1916:13.

"To the Editor of the Herald." *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 March 1916:13b.

Trainor, Luke. 1994. *British Imperialism and Australian Nationalism: Manipulation, conflict and compromise in the late nineteenth century*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

"Tribute to the Nurses. Fund for Recognition of their Services." *Brisbane Courier* 8 March 1916:7.

Tsokhas, Kosmas. 2001. *Making a Nation State: Cultural Identity, Economic Nationalism and Sexuality in Australian History*. Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Tyquin, Michael B. 1993. *Gallipoli: The Medical War* Kensington: New South Wales University Press.

Van den Berghe, Pierre. 1987. *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Wagner, P. 2003. "As Intellectual History meets Historical Sociology: Historical Sociology after the Linguistic Turn", pp 168-80 in *Handbook of Historical Sociology*, Eds. G. Delanty and E. Isin, London: Sage.

Ward, Russell. 1978. *The Australian Legend*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

"Warning to Shirkers. To the Editor of the Argus." *Argus* 15 May 1916:8.

Wells, E. 191-. *The Landing at Gallipoli and Australian Stunts in France*. State Library of Victoria Special Collections.

Wells, E. 1920. *Fragments from Gallipoli and France*. Melbourne: Mitchell & Casey.

White, Leanne. 2010. "ANZAC Day and Nationalism: The Sacred Place of this 'One Day of the Year' in Contemporary Australia," pp 31-46 in *Reflections on ANZAC Day: from one Millennium to the Next*. Ed. A.M. Hede and R. Rentschler. Heidelberg Press, Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia.

Wilde, Melissa J. 2004. "How Culture Mattered at Vatican II: Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 69:576-602.

Williams, John F. 1999. *Anzacs, the Media and the Great War*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Williams, Selena. 2007. "Soldier Settlement for Returned Army Nurses Post First World War." *When Soldiers Return: 2007 Conference Proceedings* 175-82.

Withycombe, Robert S.M. 2001. "Australian Anglicans and Imperial Identity, 1900-1914", *The Journal of Religious History*, 25(3): 286-305.

"Woman's World. Anzac Day." *Brisbane Courier* 26 April 1917:11.

"Woman's World. Anzac Day—The Women's Part." *Brisbane Courier* 25 April 1919:9.

"Women on Anzac Day." *Sydney Morning Herald* 26 April 1916:5.

"Women to Women. National Service. The Approaching Elections." *Argus* 14 March 1917:10.

"Women's Thrift Campaign. Inaugurated in Sydney." *Argus* 27 March 1917:8.

Zino, Bart. 2007. "Bringing Back the Dead: Mourning and Symbolic Return." *When the Soldiers Return: 2007 Conference Proceedings* 248-54.