

Damian X. Powell

---

*I. Issues and Historiography*

How do we, as Australians, remember our wars? Bound by common cause to our allies, what makes our memories different from those of other nations? How have we grafted our national, and individual memories of the Armistice which ended the ‘war to end wars’, onto the subsequent military conflicts? And what hold does Remembrance Day still have upon a nation in which the last Great War veterans, and their personal memories of war, are all but extinguished? One of the greatest commemorative historians, Jay Winter, has struggled to pinpoint the ongoing significance of Remembrance Day.<sup>2</sup> In a world now aware of the full horrors of general warfare, Winter reflects, ‘there is an overwhelming difficulty about trying to establish what is the purpose of commemoration... 1918 is a long way from now, but it’s still a puzzle. What was it for?’ Winter concludes that the question is of ‘iconic’ importance in understanding ‘what the 20<sup>th</sup> Century is all about’. ‘We have’, he says, ‘to go back every 11<sup>th</sup> of November and tell the story... It’s a question that we still have to resolve’.<sup>3</sup> This paper questions the legacy of war for Australia in terms of national memory centred upon one day, and one event – that event being remembrance originally derived from the Armistice which formally brought the Great War to a close.

A great deal has been written on the relationship between memory and history in wartime remembrance. At heart, one can identify two broad streams in the growing historiographical discourse which concerns wartime commemoration. One stream focuses upon commemorative symbolism and its ‘invented traditions’ as a vehicle for shaping national identity; the other stresses an ‘existential’, personal function of mourning and meaning in commemoration, as public ritual has served to focus and ameliorate personal and collective trauma.<sup>4</sup>

Both streams converge in the Australian commemorative tradition: as Alistair Thomson brilliantly demonstrated in his *Anzac Memories* (1994), private memory and what one might call

'national' memory are always in interplay, as public rituals contribute to re-interpretation and modification of private thought. It is hardly surprising that, given such major themes as the cost and obligation of nationality and the ennobling and degrading forces of wartime sacrifice and death, Remembrance Day is a contested site of memory. Jay Winter's *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning* (1995) articulates a tension at play between what he calls 'traditional', and 'modern' commemorative traditions. The first embraces patriotic sentiment; the latter rejects religious or romantic images in favour (in Samuel Hynes' words) 'the aesthetics of direct experience'.<sup>5</sup> What I see in Australia over the last eighty years evidences no easy delineation between the two. I see rather an interplay between public and private commemorative symbol and practice, shifting over time. What does change, I think, is the place of personal memory in national commemorative mythology. Broadly speaking, one can identify a long period in Armistice (and subsequently Remembrance) Day commemoration when personal memories of the Great War, the 60,000 Australian dead, and the burdens of the living, dictated what was said in public, what was done in private, and what was not discussed at all. As personal memory of the Great War has faded in Australia, public mythology has been contested. In the late 1960s the Vietnam moratorium triggered public debate on the the role of Remembrance Day in national identity. From the 1980s, as the ranks of the First AIF and the Second AIF began to thin out dramatically, Remembrance Day commemoration has been transformed from 'the memory I have', to 'the memory we have of them'.

Historians concerned with the role of public ritual as a vehicle for shaping and controlling political interests and ideologies have noted that those with the greatest access to the agencies of the state and press have had the greatest public say in shaping the place of Remembrance Day in national memory. They have noted, in particular, the role of the Returned Sailors' and Soldiers' Imperial League of Australia and its successor the Returned and Services League (RSL) in defining the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion within Australian commemoration of war.<sup>6</sup> Since the Armistice the RSL has served as a powerful, and at times controversial advocate of a traditional and conservative view of commemoration, and of the central importance of commemoration in national affairs. Dissenting 'left-wing' and the more extreme 'right-wing' views which surfaced in the 1920s found no official voice as fledgling alternative veterans' organizations were, in Alistair Thomson' words, 'ideologically and politically outmanoeuvred by the RSL'.<sup>7</sup> However, as Stephen Garton has rightly noted, the RSL was, for the period between the wars and some period after 'in the mainstream of Australian politics'. As such it

was a powerful barometer of broad public opinion until at least the 1960s - and not, as it has come to seem for some in more recent years - merely representative of 'a sectional interest group'.<sup>8</sup>

It is also clear, as Stephen Garton has noted, that Australians have demonstrated 'a powerful cultural imperative to memorialize bravery, sacrifice, courage, fortitude and mateship rather than the underside of war experience - death, crippling injury, bitterness, dependency and discontent'.<sup>9</sup> Here shifting emphases in, for example, newspaper editorials hint at a more complex relationship between 'dominant' and 'marginal' readings of war than one might at first expect. An article from the *Age* on the Shrine Remembrance Day Ceremony in 1998, for example, contrasts the tears of a young woman for soldiers she had never known with the detached participation of a 'dazed' and 'battle-scarred' Vietnam veteran.<sup>10</sup> As Adrian Gregory points out, ritual 'may be defined by those who invent it as having a certain significance and a certain meaning, but it is not always going to mean exactly the same thing to those who practice it'.<sup>11</sup>

Surprisingly, Remembrance Day remains virtually a *tabula rasa* for Australian historians. My own survey draws natural comparison with another commemorative ritual – Anzac Day – which, in contrast, has received considerable historical attention in recent years. What is the relationship between Remembrance Day and Anzac Day in national consciousness? How does Australia's tradition of commemoration compare with the national traditions elsewhere developed for Remembrance Day? What does our engagement with Remembrance Day tell us about our place in the world and how we imagine it to be? These are, I think, important questions worthy of fuller discussion than this paper, which draws heavily upon the perspective offered within Victoria by the print media, can offer. A survey of attitudes towards Remembrance Day suggests firstly that, for Australia, an idea was quickly developed, and has largely been sustained, that the sacrifices of the Great War set us apart, rather than brought us together, with those other nations who had lost so much in that conflict. Beyond this, Australian attitudes towards Armistice/Remembrance Day changed with changed circumstances. In the 1920s, Australians remembered in the genuine hope that the lessons of the Great War would 'end war', and usher in a new period of social improvement. As the crucible of war failed to purify a path to lasting international peace, social tensions within Australia also threatened the idea that the war had been fought to safeguard decency, order, fairness and social harmony. In recent decades, reflections upon Remembrance Day have placed emphasis upon individual memories of

soldiers and the sacrifices they made. At the same time, observance of public commemorative ritual has shifted from being a matter of public importance to one of individual choice.

## *II. Making Sense of Loss: 1918 – 1939*

On 11 November 1918, following an period of intense anticipation, Australians encountered the first Armistice Day through a mixture of relief, joy, and reflection. As large crowds gathered in cities around the nation, local civic bodies and church leaders prepared for events which ranged, in Victoria, from a thanksgiving evensong at St Paul's to a 'monster picnic' in the Dookie showgrounds.<sup>12</sup> The *Sydney Morning Herald* reflected on the following day that this was an event 'so much greater in importance than any within the experience of the modern world that it is impossible to grasp its full significance. The most tragic chapter in the history of mankind', it said,

is at last at an end. Hundreds and thousands of men will to-day be relieved of a constant burden of mental and physical suffering, hundreds and thousands of their kinsfolk will at last be free of the daily anxiety which has been theirs ever since their sons and brothers went into the firing line. There will be many whom this news of victory will not save from personal grief.

Facing a question that would haunt discussion of the war ever after – could be the appalling cost in human lives be explained or redeemed - the editor looked for words that would justify and ameliorate the suffering - with the admonition to his readers that 'Peace that has been won by so much suffering and so many tears must be honoured by a new spirit of fraternity and public service. The flower of this generation has perished... Their loss is irreplaceable, but their sacrifice makes an unanswerable appeal for the democracy they have honoured and preserved.'<sup>13</sup> A recurring tension has been at work in writings on Armistice/Remembrance Day in Australia ever since between two perspectives on war, one noble and uplifting, the other tragic and unendurably sad.<sup>14</sup>

In 1919, drawing upon British example and the instruction of the King George V, a pattern of Armistice Day observance was established for Australia which has been embellished, but of which the central core remains unchanged. Locally it is widely held that London-based

Australian journalist Edward Honey, appalled by the rowdy celebrations of the Armistice the year before, inspired the key aspect of the commemorative ritual - 'the Silence' - in a letter published in the *London Evening News* on 8 May 1919.<sup>15</sup> In contrast, Adrian Gregory sees the genesis of the Silence in a memorandum from Sir Percy Fitzpatrick, South African High Commissioner during the war, to the British Cabinet, proposing adoption of a South African wartime custom to observe three minutes' silence to 'concentrate as one in thinking of those – the living and the dead –who had pledged and given themselves for all that we believe in'.<sup>16</sup> In a letter from George V circulated throughout Australia in the week before the anniversary, all were asked to 'perpetuate the memory of the Great Deliverance, and of those who have laid down their lives to achieve it' through 'for the brief space of two minutes a complete suspension of all our normal activities'. This two minutes' silence would be observed at the time of day when the Armistice had taken effect – thus leading to the readily taught and easily learnt 'eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month', when for 'the space of two minutes the daily life of the nations will be suspended.'<sup>17</sup>

As a public ritual, the Silence had enormous symbolic power. Firstly, it readily drew participation from anyone who had sense of the time and date – thus linking people around Australia together in their mind and their immediate surroundings. It was simple to observe the key aspect of the ritual without elaborate props or large numbers of participants. Beyond the official ceremonies, in streets and buildings around Australia, veterans and civilians shared in ritual not as observers and participants, but in a way that stressed the shared burden of war. And people were given space, in silence, to pause to reflect upon their own thoughts and memories. As one Armistice Day reflection noted, 'Each must attend to his own inner shrine in to-day's solemn two minutes' silence'.<sup>18</sup> The Commonwealth Government's 1919 ceremony was scheduled to last just 13 minutes - from 10.49am, when the Governor General delivered the King's message outside Parliament House, until 11.02am, when buglers sounded the Last Post to end the silence and bring the ceremony to a conclusion. The *Age* reported that while 'no formal invitations had been issued', it was hoped by the authorities 'that the public will attend in large numbers'.<sup>19</sup> In the current day milieu of media-driven commemorative nostalgia, it is difficult to imagine the establishment today of a commemorative ritual so simple and sincere in its ambitions.

Subsequent additions since the 1920s have added ceremonial layers onto this original ceremony. In Victoria, in the 1930s, the official ceremony shifted to the massive and inspiring Shrine of Remembrance, built through public subscription between 1928 and 1934. Designed by two Melbourne architects, the Shrine has always been tied, in public memory, to the Armistice in which it has its genesis.<sup>20</sup> Its foundation stone was laid on Armistice Day 1927, and a crowd of around 300,000 gathered to observe the Silence as it was dedicated on Armistice Day 1934. One of the great war memorials of the world, among its manifold symbolic elements was the engineering arrangement whereby a ray of light falls upon the inscription 'Greater Love Hath No Man' on the Stone (or Rock) of Remembrance at 11 a.m. on the 11th of November each year (necessarily re-engineered in 1971 with the advent of daylight savings).<sup>21</sup> From the 1930s, as now, numbers gathered outside and within the Shrine's inner sanctuary on the day to pause and reflect. It was reported that after the 1940 ceremony 'there was hardly a person in the crowd who did not climb the stone steps and stand silent for a few seconds before the Rock'.<sup>22</sup> With the relocation of the national capital and the completion of a national War Memorial in Canberra, the national ceremony complemented state ceremonies in Victoria and elsewhere. The current National Remembrance Day ceremony is conducted on the steps of the Australian War Memorial; it includes a guard of honour, a Catafalque party, hymns, speeches, epitaphs and wreath laying ceremonies.

Newspaper editorials in the first decade after the Armistice emphasise four themes which characterise the public aspect of national memory on Armistice Day. First, they stress the strong links at work between national commemoration and national mourning. As Professor Winter has noted, commemoration 'was a universal preoccupation after the 1914-1918 war. The need to bring the dead home, to put the dead to rest, symbolically or physically, was pervasive'.<sup>23</sup> The *Last Post*, it was said in 1919, brought to Australia's 'silent crowds memories of loved ones – relatives, friends, comrades – whom they would see no more'.<sup>24</sup> At a time when everything 'continues to remind us of those terrible years of war and death', wrote one writer, a daily need to reflect upon the legacy of the war culminated in the two minutes' silence.<sup>25</sup> There was a 'long period of remembrance leading up' to 11 November, it was noted elsewhere, as the 'people of Australia remember the dead all the year round'.<sup>26</sup> Remembrance in the 1920s was not, then, disconnected from, but part of daily life.

Second, official writings on Armistice Day in the 1920s underlined solidarity with the King and the peoples of the British Empire. The *Age's* 1920 Armistice Day editorial noted, as was to become standard, the 'wish expressed by the King that at 11am all work, business and locomotion should be suspended for a period of two minutes in order that the minds of all might be concentrated upon reverent remembrance of the glorious dead who fell in the great war'. It reflected that 'in common with their kinfolk' in all parts of the British Empire, Australians were drawn to reflect upon the 'hundreds of thousands of gallant men who lay down their lives in order that such a victory should be possible'.<sup>27</sup> I note here that our Australian dead are included in the wider sacrifice of Empire.

Third, the death of Australia servicemen was linked with political freedom, and an ongoing political and social obligation to build upon their sacrifice. Prime Minister Stanley Bruce's 1928 Armistice Day made this connection explicit. 'We can measure', he wrote, 'the great sacrifices of the war only by the extent to which we have achieved all the things for which we fought... To do this is to build a worthy and lasting monument to their memory'.<sup>28</sup> The Revd J.H. Cain, President of the Methodist Conference, preached at as his 1928 Armistice Day theme in Melbourne's Wesley Church that 'Our remembrance, too, should be of such a nature that we should follow in their steps, and work for the realisation of the same high ideals which spurred them on while they were with us'.<sup>29</sup>

Fourth, a link was quickly established between Armistice Day and the needs of the dead, the maimed, and their loved ones. Inspired by the link established between death and regeneration in the poetry of John McCrae, the poppy was quickly taken up, here as elsewhere, as a symbol of remembrance. Silk poppies were sold, from the early 1920s, by the Returned Sailors' and Soldiers' Imperial League to raise money for those who had been incapacitated by the war. The Poppy that 'flourished in the meadows of Flanders' was often reflected upon in Australian commemorative writings of the 1920s as symbolic of death and re-birth. Through the ongoing work of Legacy and the RSL, it remains an ongoing reminder of the need to support all Australians whose lives have been irrevocably altered by war. In 1933, the *Age* reported on Armistice Day that proceeds from the sale of 80,000 poppies would contribute to the welfare work of the RSL in alleviating 'distress among soldiers and their dependants'.<sup>30</sup> In the first months of the Second World War, it reflected that the two minutes' silence 'goes out to those whose lives continue on in this world, but will never be the same again – the parents, the widows

and the orphans... Armistice Day may well raise in our hearts the question whether we have done justice to widows and orphans'.<sup>31</sup> Reflecting on Remembrance Day in 1998, a woman whose father died on the Thai-Burma railway, and whose grandfather died from gas in the Great War, spoke of Legatees as 'her surrogate dads' whose ongoing support through her childhood had been fundamental to her emotional and financial wellbeing.<sup>32</sup>

Judith Allen suggests that:

The interpersonal brunt both of the First World War and of the inadequacies of public provision for this population of disturbed young men fell disproportionately on Australian women.

Women's bodies and minds absorbed much of the shock, pain and craziness unleashed by the war experience.<sup>33</sup>

Beyond Legacy and Poppy Day, the place of women who had suffered from rather than served in war has remained problematic in terms of commemorative ritual. Occasional articles focusing on women as wives, nurses and workers published on Armistice/Remembrance Day in every decade have emphasised ways in which the experience of war for Australian women was different from that of returned servicemen.<sup>34</sup> Joy Damousi reflects upon the important role played by women in the 1920 Armistice Day commemorations, in which the Centre for Soldiers' Wives and Mothers organised the route of the procession crowded with widows and bereaved mothers.<sup>35</sup> She notes the 'indignation' of the organization in 1928 'at the action of returned men's organizations in not having invited a representative of the association to take part in public ceremonies connected with Armistice Day'.<sup>36</sup> The integration of women's experiences of war in Remembrance Day, placing as it does great sacramental force in the 'mateship' of Australian servicemen, remains insecure; the occasional protests of groups such as 'Women against Rape' at commemoration services is an extreme example of one group's perceived exclusion from a shared national meaning.

Throughout the 1920s, the Silence appears to have been observed by most Australians wherever they were on Armistice Day. The historical record preserves traces of the gratitude, pride, and sorrow felt on the day. At times, it hints at the psychological trauma, associated with personal memories of war, which surfaced on Armistice Day in what I will call the 'close years' of collective national memory. Much remains private and hidden in the silence – the bond between the living and the dead, between those soldiers who survived and those who did not return. Recalling her childhood, Patsy Adam-Smith wrote of a 'wrenching dichotomy' in the twenties



and thirties between ‘deep pride and bewildering discomfort’; children wore their father’s medals to school but saw also horrors of the Somme personified in the ‘faceless bundle in a hospital bed when we were taken to visit’. It was in this world of light and shadow, within what she describes as an ‘ordinary world shot across with mysterious, disturbing spectres’, that public rituals of commemoration took place at the eleventh hour.<sup>37</sup> Armistice Day focused the thoughts of civilians upon the dead, as well as those removed from families in other ways through wartime trauma and disfigurement. It is hardly surprising that there were great personal ambivalences at work between public pride and personal pain, as well as a desire on the part of some veterans and families to forget disturbing memories and withdraw from public commemoration.

In *The Silence of Memory*, Adrian Gregory argues that for the British ‘Armistice Day was inherently idealistic. Sacrifice implied that the war had been purposeful. The problem was that the signs of valid purpose became increasingly difficult to find. There was no “land fit for heroes” in the 1920s and by the middle 1930s “the war to end war” was becoming an implausible proposition’.<sup>38</sup> In Australia, alongside patriotism, pacifism and social activism also found a voice in Armistice Day reflections of the 1920s and 1930s. H.B. Higgins wrote on the tenth anniversary of Armistice day ‘Now, now is the time to act... now before the generation passes which felt what modern war means... Let us unite to save from the horrors of war that which is the most precious asset of the world – human life’.<sup>39</sup> Preaching on ‘the peace that lasts’ as his 1928 Armistice Day address, one Presbyterian minister urged his congregation to do their best to ensure that newly built memorials to the war dead were ‘the last the world will ever know’.<sup>40</sup> The Revd C.C. Watts of the Collins Street Independent Church preached to the Legacy Club in 1924 that while during the war years ‘it had been hoped that all class distinctions would be abolished, and that the sacrificial spirit of returned men would alter the life of the community’, since the war ‘there had been disillusion[ment], and social evils were still rampant’.<sup>41</sup> A particularly striking cartoon for Armistice Day 1937 depicts a soldier’s tomb, bathed in sunlight, with the epitaph ‘Will the Nations Learn the Lesson?’ Governor-General Alexander Hore-Ruthven’s message for the day, reflecting upon fading hope that with the sounding of the 1918 cease-fire ‘all nations had realised the utter futility of war’, wondered how they could be ‘drifting towards another and more ghastly struggle?’ He urged his readers to ‘dedicate ourselves to the task of devising some better and more humane means of settling our international differences than by international slaughter’.<sup>42</sup>

Nearly two decades on from the Armistice, the *Age*'s editorial noted the impact of time upon remembrance. Acknowledging the 'still vivid memories' of the day for those who 'have ever since lived shadowed lives', it acknowledged, that for more and more Australians, the 'soldier dead' were now 'distant but still dear'. 'Concerning events which are summed up in to-day's impressive ritual', it concluded, 'a vast number of participants can have no memory. Increasingly young Australians must be dependent upon hearsay'.<sup>43</sup> For generations of Australians born in the 1930s and after, understanding of Armistice/Remembrance Day began in school ceremonies around the nation. Two historians who have done as much as anyone to discern shifting patterns of Australian wartime commemoration stress altered emphases on Remembrance Day and Anzac Day, within the 'broad church' of state and independent schools which incorporated the day into their annual ritual, in their own reflections from a Melbourne childhood. For Alistair Thomson, educated at Scotch College, an elite private school with strong cultural ties to Great Britain, 'imperial Remembrance Day was still given precedence over the national Anzac Day' in the 1960s and 1970s.<sup>44</sup> Ken Inglis recalls, from the perspective of a state school boy from Preston, that to school children 'as to everybody else' in the 1930s, Anzac Day 'meant more than Armistice Day'.<sup>45</sup> He remembers how, two months into the Second World War, school children around Australia were marshalled, on the Friday before Armistice Day, 'to wear red poppies and be silent for two minutes at eleven o'clock'. At Tyler Street School Inglis and his classmates stood in the sun as 'one child, then another, and another, fell down in a faint. By the time the bell rang [to bring to an end the seemingly endless two minutes], more than 30 children were lying as if dead, and teachers moved among the ranks like ambulance men.' Professor Inglis recounts, from Bernard Smith's memory as a teacher in Sydney on that same day, how the Headmaster read 'the Armistice message from the Minister to the children, saying that we must bring the war to a just conclusion. We are fighting for civilisation and a lasting peace'.<sup>46</sup> From 1 September 1939 a new set of meanings would have to be found for Armistice Day as the 'Great War' became the 'last war' for Australians.

### *III. Making sense of new wars: 1939 - 1967*

Between 1939 and 1945, as the First World War was passing from the personal memory of many Australians, the Second World War forced new meanings upon the Armistice and a new debt of remembrance upon the nation. With the failure of the sacrifice of the Great War to ensure a

lasting path to peace, wartime writings on Armistice Day during World War II displayed a sense of regret that ‘the world was not renewed’.<sup>47</sup> For those charged with maintaining national morale, the Armistice was trumpeted as an important chapter in the unfinished struggle for freedom, linking the sacrifice of both world wars to a common cause. Prime Minister Menzies wrote, in his 1939 Armistice Day address, that while ‘the peace of which we shall think at the eleventh hour to-day turned out to be merely a respite’, ‘we are fighting for the same principle now as then’. He urged the steeling of national resolve so that the ‘lives of the men and women who died in the last war’ – along with the lives of those which had been given and would be given through the current war – ‘will not have been given in vain’.<sup>48</sup> The *Age*’s 1943 Armistice Day editorial urged that ‘For each worker or fighter Armistice day must be a re-dedication of mind and purpose to press on without flagging till peace has been won and our title as a free people vindicated’.<sup>49</sup>

As the ceremonial aspects of Armistice Day were stripped back in deference to wartime austerity and security, air raid sirens now signalled the Silence. In the minds of both veterans of the Great War as well as a new generation facing the cost of a new world war, the day held a complex and at times ambivalent place. General Sir Harry Chauvel wrote in 1939 that ‘one cannot help feeling very distressed that all our efforts and sacrifices, the results of which we annually assembled to celebrate, seem to have gone for nought, and that we, or our sons, should have to tackle the same thing over again’.<sup>50</sup> ‘With a war in progress’, the 1940 *Age* Armistice Day editorial noted, ‘many of those who are younger may feel there is something incongruous in celebrating an armistice’. It proposed that Armistice Day ceremonies be combined with religious observances on the nearest Sunday in order to remove ‘that suggestion of anomaly associated with the celebration of a former armistice while a fresh war is being waged’. While Armistice Day remained a ‘precious memory’, Anzac Day was cited as of Australian heritage and ‘unique significance’ – and as such fitting as ‘the supreme commemorative day in Australia’. Perhaps Anzac Day would suffice in allowing ‘mingled memories of the Armistice’ to blend in ‘an altar of personal emotion and national commemoration’?<sup>51</sup> The Reverend T.C. Rentoul, Chaplain-General of the Methodist Church, preached in his 1940 Armistice Day sermon that ‘it appeared to be an anomaly to be celebrating the armistice of the 1914-18 struggle when the British Nation was again at war’.<sup>52</sup> Another preacher more forcefully accused Australians of clinging somewhat ‘pathetically to the observance of Armistice Day’, urging them to focus their energies upon ‘the fight against the beast of Berlin’.<sup>53</sup>

In 1945, as the Governor-General urged Australians to join in ‘remembrance of the men and women of the Services who gave their lives in the war of 1914-1918, and the one which has just ended’, the *Age* suggested a need to bind the sacrifices of the ‘two tremendous wars’ more meaningfully if Armistice Day was to survive in national memory.<sup>54</sup> Urging Australians to remember, it suggested that only ingratitude and callousness could justify a lack of ‘deep devotion’ on the day; ‘national self-respect’ was explicitly linked to ongoing concern for remembrance. From 1945, if Armistice Day was to survive in national memory, it would have to become a proper compound of wartime sacrifice in a new and more complex mythology of wartime memory. While Australia has never again suffered the horrendous casualty rates of the Great War, nearly thirty thousand more joined the ranks of Australia’s soldier dead in the Second World War, and in subsequent wars in Korea, Malaya, Borneo and Vietnam. Others have died in peace keeping operations around the globe. From 1946, changes to the name and commemorative structure of Armistice day, sanctioned in Britain and adopted in Australia, reflected attempts to invest the day with broader meaning. By changing the name of the day to ‘Remembrance Day’, the explicit link was removed with the Armistice which had ended the Great War. Following the example of Britain, it was decided to observe the day on the Sunday before November 11 unless that date or November 12 should fall on a Sunday. Thus, in the wake of a second world war, explicit ties were loosened with the Armistice as an historical event, and a broader theme of wartime remembrance was emphasised, although the central ceremonial aspects remained.

As Australians moved from ‘just war’ to ‘cold war’ in the 1950s and 1960s, concerns were expressed that Australian support for Remembrance Day might no longer be ‘wholehearted’.<sup>55</sup> Constant reference made in newspaper reports to the numbers attending official ceremonies, and to general regard or disregard for the Silence, suggests that for some conservative elements within Australian society, Remembrance Day came to serve as a barometer of Australian moral purity and national will to resist the undermining influence of Soviet power. Speaking at the 1948 Kew Remembrance Day service, Councilor W.J. Hambley argued that Australians ‘are not worthy of the brave men and women who paid the supreme sacrifice unless we keep the country free and democratic’, admonishing his audience that they were ‘letting down our dead of two world wars if we do not take steps to rid ourselves of people preaching the doctrine of a foreign Power’.<sup>56</sup> Preaching in the Trinity College Chapel in Melbourne, Mr Justice Sholl used his 1953

Remembrance Day address to look for meaning in the ‘crazy world’ of the cold war: he felt sure that it would ‘astound’ those who had sacrificed their lives for Australia if they could see the ‘apathy of so many in this country today’ towards the ‘vast danger’ of the Soviet threat.<sup>57</sup>

No better example might be found of the ‘traditional’ ideological forces at play in the Australia of the 1950s than the ‘Call to the People of Australia’ on Remembrance Day 1951. Fearing a moral decay aided and abetted by communist subversion, Lieutenant General Sir Edmund Herring, a leader of the ‘White Army’ in the 1930s, had met with a committee of the Victorian Chamber of Commerce early in 1951 to explore ways of restoring national morale through a public reaffirmation of national values.<sup>58</sup> Backed by four church leaders and seven State Supreme Court judges, Herring’s message, broadcast on more than 100 radio stations, told listeners that they had a ‘duty to defend the community against evil designs... and to preserve for our children that which was given to us’, reflecting upon ‘those who died in battle for us, bringing splendour to Australian arms’.<sup>59</sup> Clearly and plainly aligned to the messages preached in Remembrance Day sermons and newspaper editorials, the ‘Call’ was reprinted in the majority of newspapers the following day, serving as the theme of sermons in pulpits around the nation, and being distributed in one-and-a-half-million copies. All the major public religious denominations along with the Prime Minister and hundreds of other organizations pledged support. The evanescence of a conservative political vision for Remembrance Day, the ‘Call’ is perhaps the most overt example of the deployment of the day as a vehicle for shaping public debate on national values. It reflected fear about social and moral decline which reached a crescendo, for many older Australians, in the ambivalent attitudes of many Australians towards the war in Vietnam.

#### *IV. Conflicting values, contested meanings: 1967 to 1990*

An *Age* ‘Saturday reflection’ for Remembrance Day 1967 suggested that it was an one of the ‘unavoidable facts of life’ that ‘difference in age and outlook’ between generations became ‘more marked on special occasions like the Day of Remembrance’. While some in the sixties and seventies dismissed the day’s importance and ‘many forgot to remember’, others openly challenged its traditional, sacramental view of war. In particular, open debate on the necessity and cost of of the Vietnam War injected public discussion of Remembrance Day with new, conflicting and contested historical meanings. This debate was conducted in the last stages of

living memory for the majority of those who had fought in the Great War. It deployed, on one side, a new, non-sacramental language to question the political motives of wartime remembrance. It collapsed a relatively coherent 'meta-narrative' of redemptive sacrifice that had - albeit at times with strain - sustained public discourse surrounding Armistice/Remembrance Day since the 1920s.

Grace Perry's poem 'Armistice 1967' turned traditional imagery deployed in such poems as 'Armistice Day' - published in 1937 - on its head, as new words and new meanings were juxtaposed with the traditional language of the day.<sup>60</sup> The poems suggest, in their differences, a vast challenge to the redemptive view of war caused by dissatisfaction and disillusionment with Australian involvement in Vietnam.

The 1930s poem 'Armistice Day' begins

A calm descends, hushing the city's heart,  
As once, upon a war-scarred world a silence came,

This image of peace and stillness in a smaller, more intimate Melbourne turns to the great sacrificial importance of the day:

For Death's enshrouding silence, handing on  
A splendid triumph by their valour won...  
To-day the blood-red poppy shows again...

'Armistice 1967', in contrast, plays upon traditional language of commemoration, mixing it with a graphic, visceral language of suffering and the death of innocence:

We shall not forget as long as television  
Coughs up blood-streaked gobbets on the screen.  
A smell of smoke and death is in the room.  
Masefield's words no longer cushion dreams...

Following on with images of graphic death and dismemberment hidden and obviated by the screening force of the media - 'imagined dragons or toy arks on the flood' - it concludes:

We have endured generations of entrenchment.  
It is too late to move, too late to speak.  
Repeated batterings lacerate the brain.  
In a lightless house, a child cries in his sleep.

The impact of the Vietnam War, and the disconnection of Vietnam from the narrative of Australian wartime myths and ‘the Anzac legend’ until at least the mid-1980s, played a decisive role in fuelling critical reflections upon the Remembrance Day tradition. Stephen Mills wrote on Remembrance Day 1981 that ‘I am from a generation which has not lived through a war – except for the Vietnam war. Most people my age were involved in that only as moratorium marchers’.<sup>61</sup> That same year Midnight Oil – one of Australia’s most politically motivated and influential rock groups - published the song ‘Armistice Day’, interrogating the political motivation at work in the day.<sup>62</sup> The song asks its listeners to reflect on the nature reality and myth in popular images of wartime commemoration:

you’re watching people fighting you’re watching  
people losing on armistice day...  
the watchers do the wincing reporters so convincing  
but the tv never lies...  
the fixers do the fixing the locals do the lynching  
the papers deny

The press was singled out in this song as a medium of distortion and distrust, just as the poem ‘Armistice Day 1967’ singled out television. Both works underline a movement away from direct experience of war in Australia towards vicarious and ‘constructed’ memory. By the late 1970s the Great War had become distant enough from personal memory to be comprehended primarily through books such as Patsy Adam Smith’s *The Anzacs* (1978) and films such as Peter Weir’s ‘Gallipoli’ (1981) – both reviewed in the *Age* on Remembrance Day 1981, as it passed from the editorial pages of the *Age* to the ‘features’ section. This move to reflect upon Remembrance Day within the broader framework of ‘popular culture’ created new and distorted historical analogies. Michelle Grattan’s *Age* editorial for 1978 - ‘November 11: anniversary of a trauma’ - referred not to the millions of war dead, but rather the dismissal of the Whitlam

government. Brian Lang's angry 1991 letter to the editor attacked Roland Gough's depiction of an 'indelible trauma' which 'endowed it [Remembrance Day] with a new meaning' in 1975, contrasting the 'sour faces and self-indulgent crying' of the Dismissal with 'tens of thousands of mangled human bodies'.<sup>63</sup> It is impossible to say whether the Armistice or the Dismissal played more upon national consciousness in the 1980s, as Australian historians raced to capture the personal reminiscences of 'the last Anzacs'. In 1981, the *Age* listed the Shrine Remembrance Day Ceremony alongside other 'events of the day' including a film screening and a requiem mass for 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Ned Kelly's death. Like Ned Kelly himself, Remembrance Day was history rather than memory for most Australians. With the integration of Vietnam into the 'Anzac legend' in the late 1980s, and the passing of the Anzacs, Remembrance Day now focussed attention on competing ideas about the meaning and lessons of war.

#### *V. From memory to mythology: 1990 to the present*

Since the 1990s, in the growing absence of personal memory of war, Remembrance Day has received ongoing exploration of symbolic potential in Australia from the major political parties. Over the last decade in particular, as the last few Great War veterans have entered great age, successive Australian governments have made major efforts to reinstate the importance of Remembrance Day in national memory. Their efforts have been carried out within the milieu of what has been described as an 'anniversary boom, fuelled and amplified by the public communications media' as commemorative ceremonies are 'reported in – and increasingly staged for – the news media' as 'contemporary meaning is scrutinized as well as celebrated in special publications'.<sup>64</sup> A 1994 Remembrance Day article reflected: 'Australia's and New Zealand's commemoration of World War I will always be bound up with the events of Gallipoli and the annual observance of Anzac Day, but Remembrance Day is the one day when the world recalls the sacrifices made during the years of war.'<sup>65</sup> The extent to which Australians have felt bound to the suffering of other nations on Remembrance Day remains problematic. Speaking on Remembrance Day at the 2003 dedication to a new memorial to Australia's war dead in London, Prime Minister John Howard – almost certainly among the last generation of Australian politicians with profound respect for the British alliance under which Australians served in two world wars – underlined the tensions at work in national consciousness as he attempted to tread a delicate line between shared interests between traditional allies, such as Britain and the United States, and the the abiding theme of national difference made manifest in the Anzac legend.<sup>66</sup>



From the beginning it had not always been clear, to those charged with carrying the torch of public memory, what purpose Remembrance Day should serve in consolidating the ‘Anzac legend’, and what place there was, within Australia, for a broader interpretation of the day. From the first, some features distinguished Australian responses to Remembrance Day from those of other nations. Australia shared Armistice Day with Britain - where it was observed as ‘the national day of importance’ - and with other allied nations such as New Zealand, Canada and the United States.<sup>67</sup> Yet Australians had already embraced, from its first celebration in 1916, Anzac Day – a day also reflecting upon wartime sacrifice but explicitly tied to national pride in Australian wartime achievement. Anzac Day has itself seen varied cycles of strength and decline, but by 1927 it had emerged as perhaps the key national day and day of public holiday – embracing somewhat aggressive national patriotism nested both within and beyond traditional empire loyalism.<sup>68</sup> The *Age* noted, on Armistice Day 1928, the ‘official view of the Returned Soldier’s League is that although Armistice Day should be observed with fitting solemnity, it should not be permitted to take the place of Anzac day, which marks the commemoration of the birth of Australia as a nation. City and suburban voluntary church parades will be allowed, and in all cases uniform is optional’.<sup>69</sup> While it is true that at the end of the twentieth century great interest has been shown towards the men of the First AIF on Remembrance Day, national attention to wartime commemoration remains now as ever with Anzac Day, and Remembrance Day as ‘always of secondary importance’.<sup>70</sup>

For many Australians, the Anzac legend says less about the values which bind us to our wartime allies – including the New Zealanders with whom we share the Anzac name - and more about what we admire about ourselves in distinction to them. To me, such distinction has combined, at times, a narrow, ungenerous patriotic sentiment with a seeming amnesia concerning broader wartime contributions and losses. On the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Armistice in 1993, Australia ‘broke ranks’ (in Jay Winter’s words) with New Zealand and Canada, all of whom could be the country of origin of the Unknown Warrior interred in Westminster Abbey, along with Ireland or the United Kingdom.<sup>71</sup> In the most conspicuous attempt in the last thirty years to reinvest Remembrance Day with national symbolism, an unknown Australian soldier from a European grave was reinterred in the Australian War Memorial’s ‘Hall of Memory’ in a full military funeral. While the idea of a separate, national memorial to Australia’s unknown dead had been mooted as early as the 1920s, it found fruition among Australian historians, politicians and journalists showing distinct ambivalence towards historical ties with Britain, and willingness to deploy remembrance in order to emphasise national distinction and difference. Ken Inglis has

written that bringing home and reburial of an unidentified Australian soldier would be ‘a ritual of national valediction to the old AIF’.<sup>72</sup> For Prime Minister Paul Keating - whose telling eye always discerned those symbolic gestures which might remove Australia from its historical ties to Empire – the body of the unknown Australian soldier, returned to Australian soil, represented the loss of all Australians in war, embodying our national identity. ‘He is all of them’, Keating declared, ‘and he is one of us’.<sup>73</sup>

Adrian Gregory has suggested that as Remembrance Day ‘no longer carries the mystical conviction that it should be a transforming experience’. It is, he says, ‘increasingly the memory of a memory... the language which surrounds the ritual is dead’.<sup>74</sup> Writing in 1996, barely three years after the 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Armistice and the internment of the Australian unknown soldier, Stephen Garton noted that while ‘Anzac Day still holds commanding national attention’ alternative celebrations, ‘such as Armistice Day, have faded in significance’.<sup>75</sup> Today the Great War floats between two distinct and disconnected contexts in Australian national memory. In the first the Great War is a distant historical event of little relevance to contemporary life. In the second it serves as a central historical and psychological plank in national identity, an identity centred not on wartime loss *per se* but upon the ‘nation building’ impetus provided by the sacrifice of the Anzacs. In the context of ‘a resurgence of interest in that war and its meanings, and fresh imaginative responses from the grandchild generation, often explicitly addressing the question of cultural memory and the complexity of relations between past and present’, continuing interest in Remembrance Day in Australia seems increasingly tied, as with Anzac day, to the projection of vast political and cultural meaning onto ‘the Anzac legend’.<sup>76</sup> However, while Anzac Day has revived, and more and more young Australians with a solely vicarious (or perhaps ‘vicariously virtual’) experience of war look to it as a source of national meaning, it is to be doubted if Remembrance Day will survive into the next century in Australia if it merely becomes a second Anzac Day, in which a national mythology built on the Anzac legend is celebrated in contradistinction to other nations. In order to survive into the next century in Australia, the custodians of public memory must broaden their preoccupation with Australian wartime sacrifice to count the cost of war – the highest cost of nationhood – from the perspective of one nation among many.

## VII. Conclusion

At Anzac Cove Australians claimed the right to participate as a nation on the world stage. From the time of the Armistice, Australians began to reflect formally upon the cost of this participation. The Great War did much to shape Australia's national identity, just as it established our place on the international stage. For the generation of Australians which had to pick up the pieces left by the unparalleled carnage of the Western Front, making sense of the loss became an abiding, compelling force in their lives. Their tragedy was the subset of a much wider tragedy in which millions perished, as simple patriotic ideologies were tested and in some cases failed to sustain national resolve. The consequences of that tragedy drove national and international aspirations through a Second World War, the destruction of Imperial Russia and rise and fall of communism, the end of colonial empires, and more recently in the challenge of new ideologies locked in conflict with a perceived Western imperialism.

In 1939, as Australia prepared for a second world war, the *Age's* Armistice Day editorial suggested that 'The two minutes of silence should lead us all to think of years of intense study and careful organization for universal peace. We do nobly to pay our tribute to the fallen: we shall best honor [sic] them by doing our utmost to provide a new world state in which war will become impossible through the development of a spirit of friendliness among all nations'.<sup>77</sup> Drawing Australians as it does into communion with other nations, Remembrance Day lends itself less readily than Anzac Day to a particular view of national identity, binding us as it does to a greater, international tragedy. Jay Winter has noted that for many nations, 'memory and identity are based on the need to celebrate a kinship rooted in difference'.<sup>78</sup> He challenges his readers, reflecting upon the impact of wartime commemoration, to 'leave behind national boundaries and to keep searching beyond them'.<sup>79</sup> This is a fitting challenge for those Australian journalists, politicians, and writers of history who will shape Australian national memory and remembrance in the future. As an editorial written 75 years ago for the tenth Anniversary of the Armistice put it, 'Whether Armistice Day... be regarded nationally or internationally, it is still a day of profoundly solemn meaning'.<sup>80</sup> Remembrance Day stands to remind Australia of the courageous sacrifices made in war, and of the destructive forces of war across nations. Our dead soldiers share the soil of Flanders Field with those of New Zealand (with whom we share the Anzac memory), Germany, France, Belgium, Great Britain, Ireland and Canada, and with the dead of colonial levies drawn from across the globe. In our minds, very often, our Australian fallen stand alone in their sacrifice. It is not to dishonour them to place their sacrifice in context.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the edited text of a paper read to the Royal Historical Society of Victoria on 18 November 2003; for their helpful suggestions in its revision would like to thank Professor Ken Inglis, Mr Geoffrey Browne, Mr Tony Bowers, and the anonymous reviewer for the *Victorian Historical Journal*.

<sup>2</sup> Most Australians alternately use the term Armistice Day – by which the anniversary was known until 1946, and Remembrance Day – its subsequent official name in Australia.

<sup>3</sup> ‘Jay M. Winter, Cambridge University on the Great War Today’ from *The Great War And the Shaping of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Website*, [www.pbs.org/greatwar/interviews/winter16.html](http://www.pbs.org/greatwar/interviews/winter16.html) (November 2003)

<sup>4</sup> For an introduction to the sources cf. *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration*, eds T.G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson & Michael Roper, London, 2000, ch. 1 esp. pp. 7-8; Joy Damousi, *The Labour of Loss: Mourning, Memory and Wartime Bereavement in Australia*, Cambridge 1999, n. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*, Cambridge 1995, p. 2, quoting Samuel Hynes from *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture*, London 1990.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Damousi, *The Labour of Loss*, p. 44; Ashplant *et. al.*, *Politics of War Memory*, p. 21; Alistair Thomson, *Anzac Memories: Living with the Legend*, Melbourne 1994, pp. 120-8.

<sup>7</sup> Thomson, *Anzac Memories*, p. 124.

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Garton, *The Cost of War: Australians Return*, Oxford 1996, p. 66.

<sup>9</sup> Stephen Garton, ‘Longing for War: Nostalgia and Australian returned soldiers after the First World War’ in Ashplant *et. al.*, *The Politics of War Memory*, p. 236.

<sup>10</sup> *Age* 12/11/98, pp. 1-2.

<sup>11</sup> Adrian Gregory, *The Silence of Memory: Armistice Day, 1919-1946*, Oxford 1994, p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> *Age* 11/11/18, p. 7.

<sup>13</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12/11/18, p.6.

<sup>14</sup> These motifs are derived from Winter, *Sites of Memory*, p. 85.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Eric Harding, *Remembrance Day Silence*, Melbourne, 1965; W.B. Russell, *We Will Remember Them: the story of the Shrine of Remembrance*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1988, p. 67; *Age* 12 November 1958 p. 1; *Australian War Memorial website*, [www.awm.gov.au/commemoration/remembrance/remembrance\\_tradition.html](http://www.awm.gov.au/commemoration/remembrance/remembrance_tradition.html).

<sup>16</sup> Gregory, *Silence of Memory*, pp. 9-11.

- 
- <sup>17</sup> *Age* 11/11/19, p.7.
- <sup>18</sup> *Age* 11/11/43, p. 2.
- <sup>19</sup> *Age* 11/11/19, p. 7.
- <sup>20</sup> For the history of the Shrine cf. Russell, *We Will Remember Them*; Andrew Gay, *National War Memorial of Victoria: Shrine of Remembrance*, 1970 Melb. Uni. Hons. Thesis (Melb. Uni. Arch. Lib.)
- <sup>21</sup> Russell, *We Will Remember Them*, pp. 64-5.
- <sup>22</sup> *Age* 12/11/40, p. 6.
- <sup>23</sup> Winter, *Sites of Memory*, p. 28.
- <sup>24</sup> *Age* 12/11/19, p. 9.
- <sup>25</sup> *Age* 12/11/19, p. 9.
- <sup>26</sup> *Age* 12/11/24, p. 13.
- <sup>27</sup> *Age* 12/11/20, p. 7.
- <sup>28</sup> *Age* 10/11/28, p. 24.
- <sup>29</sup> *Age* 12/11/28, p. 8.
- <sup>30</sup> *Age* 10/11/33, p. 12.
- <sup>31</sup> *Age* 11/11/39, p. 26
- <sup>32</sup> *Age* 12/11/98, p. 8.
- <sup>33</sup> J.A. Allen, *Sex and Secrets: Crimes Involving Australian Women Since 1880*, Melbourne, 1990, p. 131.
- <sup>34</sup> See, for example, 'Since... the Armistice: War Nurses' Peace-Time Jobs', *Age* 11/11/37, p. 3; 'Remembering the war effort' *Age* 11/11/88, p. 22.
- <sup>35</sup> Damousi, *Labour of Loss*, p. 34.
- <sup>36</sup> Damousi, *Labour of Loss*, pp. 43-4, quoting from the *Sydney Morning Herald*, 14 November 1928, p. 9.
- <sup>37</sup> Patsy Adam-Smith, *The Anzacs*, Melbourne 1978, p. 13.
- <sup>38</sup> Gregory, *Silence of Memory*, p. 226.
- <sup>39</sup> H.B. Higgins, 'Eleventh of November 1928', Folder 2, Higgins Papers, quoted in Damousi, *Labour of Loss*, p. 54.
- <sup>40</sup> *Age* 12/11/28, p. 9.
- <sup>41</sup> *Age* 12/11/24, 13.
- <sup>42</sup> *Age* 11/11/37, p.11.
- <sup>43</sup> *Age* 11/11/37, p. 10.

---

<sup>44</sup> Thomson, *Anzac Memories*, p. 4.

<sup>45</sup> K.S. Inglis assisted by Jan Brazier, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape*, Melbourne 1998, p. 3.

<sup>46</sup> K.S. Inglis, 'At War' in *Australians From 1939*, eds Ann Curthoys, A.W. Martin & Tim Rowse, Broadway NSW 1987, p. 2.

<sup>47</sup> Quoted from Gregory, *Silence of Memory*, p. 226.

<sup>48</sup> *Age* 11/11/39, p. 29.

<sup>49</sup> *Age* 11/11/43, p. 2.

<sup>50</sup> *Age* 11/11/39, p. 29.

<sup>51</sup> *Age* 9/11/40, p. 20.

<sup>52</sup> *Age* 11/11/40, p. 13.

<sup>53</sup> *Age* 11/11/40, p. 13.

<sup>54</sup> *Age* 10/11/45, pp. 1-2.

<sup>55</sup> *Age* 8/11/48, p. 3.

<sup>56</sup> *Age* 8/11/48, p. 3.

<sup>57</sup> *Age* 9/11/53, p. 2.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Stuart Sayers, *Ned Herring: A Life of Lieutenant-General the Honourable Sir Edmund Herring K.C.M.G., K.B.E., D.S.O., M.C., K.St J., M.A., D.C.L.*, Melbourne 1980; Andrew Moore, *The Right Road? A History of Right-wing Politics in Australia*, Melbourne 1995, pp. 60-2.

<sup>59</sup> Sayers, *Ned Herring*, p. 313. 'The Call' is reprinted in full on pp. 313-4.

<sup>60</sup> K.C.C., 'Armistice Day', *Age* 11/11/37, p. 11; Grace Perry, 'Armistice 1967', *Age* 12/11/69, p. 22.

<sup>61</sup> 'The human voice of the Memorial', *Age* 11/11/81, p. 11.

<sup>62</sup> 'Armistice Day', Midnight Oil, *Place Without a Postcard*, 1981, and released as the single in 1982.

<sup>63</sup> *Age* 11/11/91, p. 12.

<sup>64</sup> Ashplant *et. al.*, *Politics of War Memory*, p. 4.

<sup>65</sup> Gary Walsh, 'Thousands more people are eligible for RSL membership', *Age* 11/11/94, p. 12.

<sup>66</sup> 'War helped us separate from Britain, says PM', *Age* 11 November 2003, pp. 1, 4.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Thomson, *Anzac Memories*, p. 134.

<sup>68</sup> Garton, *Cost of War*, p. 67.

<sup>69</sup> *Age* 10/11/28, p. 24.

---

<sup>70</sup> Thomson, *Anzac Memories*, p. 134.

<sup>71</sup> Winter, *Sites of Memory*, pp. 27-8.

<sup>72</sup> Inglis, *Sacred Places*, p. 453.

<sup>73</sup> P.J. Keating, 'Funeral Service of the Unknown Australian Soldier', *Journal of the Australian War Memorial* 24 (1994), p. 6.

<sup>74</sup> Gregory, *Silence of Memory*, pp. 226-7.

<sup>75</sup> Garton, *Cost of War*, p. 66.

<sup>76</sup> Ashplant *et. al.*, *Politics of War Memory*, p. 4.

<sup>77</sup> *Age* 11/11/39, p. 26.

<sup>78</sup> Winter, *Sites of Memory*, p. 265.

<sup>79</sup> Winter, *Sites of Memory*, p. 11.

<sup>80</sup> *Age* 12/11/28, p. 9.