

Family History, Great War Memory and the ANZAC Revival

CAROLYN HOLBROOK

Various explanations have been given for the revival of ANZAC commemoration since the 1990s. Marilyn Lake, Henry Reynolds and others have identified the propagandising role of the state, while Christina Twomey has described the increasing salience of narratives of trauma and suffering, which allow war commemoration to 'speak' in the contemporary idiom. More recently, Jim McKay has detailed the inadequacies of the state-driven narrative and attributed the ANZAC resurgence to a complex set of transnational factors, including battlefield tourism. This article argues that none of these explanations reaches sufficiently far back to explain a revival whose origins are discernible in the 1970s. It shows how the international trend for genealogy and family history led Australians to take an interest in their soldier ancestors, and how these intimate and sympathetic histories from the Great War were the foundation stones upon which ANZAC 2.0 was raised. The article argues that the grounding of the re-born Anzac legend in the personal and prosaic offers some protection against the buffeting of political and commercial headwinds.

In 1965, a group of 300 Australian and New Zealand veterans of the First World War travelled to Turkey for the fiftieth anniversary of the Gallipoli landing on 25 April 1915. The 'Gallipoli pilgrimage', as it was known, was organised by the Returned and Services League and sponsored to the tune of £20,000 by the Menzies Government.¹ The late historian, Ken Inglis, travelled with the elderly men and wrote vivid reports for the *Canberra Times*. One of the most striking moments, Inglis later recalled, was when 'four young Australian hitch-hikers, two boys and two girls, in parkas and jeans' appeared at Anzac Cove to greet the old diggers. The backpackers were 'welcomed by the old men as unexpected evidence that some young Australians cared about the ANZAC tradition. They were the only people on the beach, moreover, who actually displayed excitement'.²

If the ageing travellers of 1965 could have returned three decades later, when thousands of globe-trotting backpackers huddled in the freezing dawn at Anzac Cove, they would have been in no doubt that 'young Australians cared' – though perhaps they would have been sceptical about the nature of the new-found interest. Such was the appetite to attend the centenary dawn service in 2015, that the Australian Government was compelled to limit attendees to 10,000 people, the majority of whom were chosen by public ballot. The winners of the ballot joined the prime minister and other dignitaries at Anzac Cove on 25 April 2015 for a dawn

service that was streamed live to an audience of millions back in Australia.³

From the perspective of 2018, one of the most enduring and significant legacies of the Great War is the role that its memory occupies in the national mythology. Australia Day is increasingly bedevilled by calls to change the date (#changethedate), given the difficulty its celebration on 26 January presents to Indigenous Australians. ANZAC Day on the other hand becomes ever more influential according to measures such as attendance at dawn services, battlefield tourism, commercial exploitation and political sponsorship. Australia is spending more than any other nation on Great War commemoration during the centenary, including the major combatants. The Honest History network estimates the Australian expenditure alone to be approximately \$552 million.⁴

This article focuses on what might be described as ANZAC 2.0; the transformed version of the ANZAC legend that emerged following the commemorative malaise of the 1960s and 1970s.⁵ It weighs the various explanations that have been given by scholars for the ANZAC revival, from political sponsorship and battlefield tourism to geopolitics and the rise of trauma culture. The article argues that insufficient credit is given in these biographies of ANZAC 2.0 to the role of family historians, and it seeks to reassert the ways in which the highly personal, sympathetic and multifaceted accounts of the war produced by family historians have influenced contemporary ANZAC commemoration.

Top-down Explanations for the Anzac Revival and their Limitations

The claim that the revival of ANZAC commemoration is due to political sponsorship and indoctrination – ‘the militarisation of Australian history’ has been highly influential. This explanation was most forcefully expounded by Marilyn Lake, Henry Reynolds, Joy Damousi, Mark McKenna and Carina Donaldson in *What’s Wrong with Anzac?*⁶ Published in 2010, the book argued that Australian history is overly weighted towards military themes, and that this martial bias comes at the expense of subjects such as the dispossession of Aborigines and late-nineteenth century and early-twentieth century achievements in social welfare and industrial arbitration. The authors claimed that government has been the prime mover behind this emphasis, principally through its funding of educational materials produced by the Department of Veterans’ Affairs, which have served to indoctrinate in young Australians a militaristic and politically conservative view of the past. The authors also argued that funding to institutions such as the Australian War Memorial and the National Archives for the digitisation of personnel records has created a nexus between family, military and nationalist history. Most alarmingly, *What’s Wrong with Anzac?* claimed that the obsession with military history was used by politicians to justify Australian incursions in Iraq and Afghanistan.

A variation of the political explanation for the revival of ANZAC emphasises Australia’s place within the global community over domestic political considerations. Scholars have noted the increasingly anti-British tone of representations of the Great War during the 1970s and 1980s. Daniel Reynaud, Jenny Macleod and others have written about the manifestation of this anti-British feeling in films such as Peter Weir’s acclaimed 1981 film, *Gallipoli*.⁷ According to James Curran and Stuart Ward, the cultural repudiation of Britishness evident in the ‘New Nationalism’ of the late 1960s and 1970s was a reaction to Britain’s pivot away from its former empire towards Europe.⁸ In Australia’s search for a post-imperial identity, this line of reasoning contends, the state crafted a new version of ANZAC drained of its former emphasis on loyalty to the British empire. As Mark McKenna has written:

With Anzac’s Imperial origins receding from public memory, the legend could now be refashioned as the Bastille Day or Fourth of July Australia never had, the day which cut Australia adrift from its Imperial past in one fell, heroic swoop...⁹

Andy Mycock, Shanti Sumartojo and Ben Wellings use a similar geopolitical analytic frame in the introduction to *Nation, Memory and Commemoration*. They argue that the social and political fragmentation caused by globalisation

have required the state to examine new means of binding state and citizen, and that ‘[r]emembrance and commemoration play a part in this renewal of national narratives’.¹⁰ In the Australian context, Wellings notes that ANZAC has proved a more effective unifying device than multiculturalism, republicanism and Reconciliation, while simultaneously supplementing Australia’s middle power diplomacy, given the growing trade in ‘trench tourism’.¹¹

State-driven explanations for the revival of ANZAC have not been without their critics. Graeme Davison has questioned the assumption by historians that the public rituals of ANZAC Day are a clue to private sentiments, given that people think ‘“upwards” only intermittently, and sometimes unwillingly from the private domain of home and family’.¹² Anna Clark’s recent work on the historical consciousness of ordinary Australians also casts doubt on ‘top-down’ accounts. In a series of conversations with community groups around Australia, Clark found that impressions of ANZAC are far from settled and uniform: she reported ‘considerable disagreement and debate about [ANZAC’s] meaning on the ground’. Her conclusion that ‘the Anzac legacy has generated a commemorative space more complex and uncertain than public and official demonstrations of Anzac pride’ suggests that official pronouncements are refracted through the subjective experiences of their audience.¹³ In the case of ANZAC, these subjective refractions might be the private family memories of a Great War descendant, or the grief of personal loss or misfortune transposed onto the tragedy of the Great War. Clark found that interest in ANZAC was mediated to a large degree by personal connections, though a personal connection did not necessarily indicate an uncritical engagement with ANZAC:

[M]oments of historical connection and inheritance are overwhelmingly personal. And they tend to occur when people can situate themselves and their own family or community stories within or alongside the public, national narrative in question. In other words, people’s engagement with the Australian story is framed by personal experience, rather than the overt presence of an innate, official, and abstract national history – hence the ancestral allure of Anzac.¹⁴

The self-interested nature of historical engagement reported by Clark suggests that there are limits to the effectiveness of state propagandising about matters such as ANZAC commemoration.

In questioning the veracity of ‘top-down’ explanations of the ANZAC revival, other scholars have highlighted the fallacy of assuming a direct line between the swathes of curriculum materials produced by the Department of Veterans’ Affairs and their use in the classroom. The

sociologist Jim McKay has written that 'teachers and students do not have messages about Anzac injected hypodermically into their brains from resources produced by the Department of Veterans DVA resources', while Richard White has described the scepticism with which official sources are regarded:

[W]e cannot assume that [information] is simply absorbed sponge-like by audiences. Schools, media, personalities, and politicians are the least trusted about the past ... Far more faith is placed in sources that are less likely to promote a singularly national past: in family anecdotes, or books.¹⁵

The observations above about the limitations of the state-driven thesis are reflected in the research of sociologists Timothy Phillips and Philip Smith into understandings of 'Australianness'. Phillips and Smith used data collected from six focus groups to show that Australians formed their understandings of national identity quite separately from official pronouncements. They found that 'Australian values and ideals seem to be grounded in, and shaped, by everyday life, in popular culture, real individuals, real places and real community groups, rather than by the abstract ideals of political discourse'.¹⁶ According to this logic, replicated in other studies, the ideas that people hold about the ANZAC legend are 'located in personal experience and popular culture'.¹⁷

The circumstances of the ANZAC resurgence confirm this interpretation. The stirrings of ANZAC 2.0 are discernible in the 1970s, a period when politicians were careful to distance themselves from ANZAC commemoration, given its controversial nature. In an interview in 2012, former Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser expressed the lack of political interest in ANZAC: 'In my time as prime minister if I'd gone to Anzac Cove for ANZAC Day, people would have said "What on earth is Fraser doing?"'¹⁸

It was the decision of the Hawke Labor government to sponsor the 1990 return to Gallipoli by a group of elderly veterans that opened the floodgates of politically-sponsored commemoration of Australian war experience. That decision was only taken *after* it had become apparent that popular attitudes to ANZAC were changing.¹⁹ According to the Hawke Government's Defence Minister, Kim Beazley, the enthusiastic public response to the Vietnam Veterans' Welcome Home march in Sydney in 1987 provided an important signal that the antagonism towards ANZAC commemoration that had characterised the 1970s and early 1980s was fading.²⁰ Similarly, the great success of the 1990 pilgrimage to Gallipoli gave heart to Hawke's successors, Paul Keating and John Howard, as they carved out an increasingly prominent role for the political commemoration of war.

Paul Keating's prime ministership provides further evidence of the limits of 'top-down' explanations for the ANZAC revival. Keating sought to shift the emphasis of ANZAC commemoration from the Great War and Gallipoli, to the Pacific theatres of the Second World War. In a speech delivered in Port Moresby on Anzac Day in 1992, Keating claimed:

The Australians who served here in Papua New Guinea fought and died not in defence of the old world, but the new world. Their world. They died in defence of Australia, and the civilisation and values which had grown up there. That is why it might be said that, for Australians, the battles in Papua New Guinea were the most important ever fought.²¹

Keating succeeded in increasing public interest in the Pacific campaigns of the Second World War, especially Kokoda. He failed, however, in his attempt to supplant Gallipoli in the public imagination with Kokoda. This failure corroborates the findings of Clark and others that the Australian public has an agency in ANZAC commemoration that 'top-down' explanations do not account for.

Other Explanations

An alternative to these 'top-down' explanations for the resurgence of ANZAC was provided by the historian Christina Twomey who declared in 2014 that its popularity was not evidence of the militarisation of history. She wrote:

Australians will better understand the current embrace of ANZAC if we stop confusing it with a love of militarism. ANZAC is a mythology with its origins in the exploits of men at war, but there is little talk today of weakling enemies and soldiers as exemplars of military manhood.²²

Instead, Twomey linked the revival of ANZAC commemoration with the increased salience of trauma in Western cultures: by the 1980s 'the suffering of soldiers in war and the potential for them to be traumatised by it became a central trope in the public discussion of Anzac', she wrote.²³ By tempering tendencies towards glorification with reminders of the suffering caused by war, trauma culture has carved out an acceptable public 'space' in which ANZAC can be venerated.

Jim McKay has also been critical of the 'militarisation of history thesis', contesting its assumptions about the uninterrupted transmission of state propaganda to the public. McKay's recent book about *Transnational Tourism Experiences at Gallipoli* claims that Lake et al.'s thesis in *What's Wrong with ANZACc?* is ontologically, epistemologically and methodologically inadequate.²⁴ He

does not engage directly with Twomey's psychological thesis, but uses testimonies gathered from Australians and New Zealanders who have travelled to Gallipoli to argue that ANZAC is not a crude appeal to nationalism. Rather, its popularity is driven by a complex range of emotional motivations and transnational attitudes and interactions, complemented by the rise of 'dark tourism'.²⁵

Family History

While the trauma *zeitgeist* has provided a discourse within which the ANZAC legend can be accommodated into the cultural mainstream, the stirrings of the ANZAC resurgence were discernible *before* the language of suffering and vulnerability became commonplace.²⁶ Similarly, Gallipoli battlefield tourism is a phenomenon that dates from the 1990s, twenty years *after* the family history-driven resurgence began. In order to understand the origins of ANZAC 2.0, it is necessary to examine the family history boom.

The interest of family historians in the Great War is part of a broader phenomenon, which saw a boom in the popularity of genealogy and family history beginning in the 1960s. The burgeoning Australian interest in family identity was manifest in membership of genealogical societies, which grew tenfold during the 1970s and 1980s.²⁷ Historical societies also prospered. In South Australia, for instance, 36 new historical societies were established in the 1970s and a further 54 in the 1980s.²⁸ Interest has not declined: the 'Unlock the Past' website lists more than 400 Australian family history societies and organisations in 2018.²⁹ In a reflection of the post-imperial, new nationalist mood of the 1970s, Anglo-Australians began revising their traditional reluctance to discuss the convict phase of their history: the success of contemporary Australian society could be submitted as evidence that the 'birth stain' of convictism was no more than a temporary blot. Family historians consulted transportation records and announced proudly the discovery of convict ancestors.

The attention of family historians soon turned to their relatives from the Great War, about whom a similar bounty of records awaited. Many of the 330,000 men who served overseas, most of whom were born in the 1880s and 1890s, were dead by the 1970s; those who remained were elderly and often frail. The records of the National Library of Australia catalogue attest to the fact that increasing numbers of descendants from the 1970s took the step of publishing – often self-publishing – the war experiences of their relatives. Twenty-five books under the category of 'personal narratives' of the Great War were published during the 1970s, compared to fifteen the previous decade. That number grew to 44 during the 1980s, 73 during the 1990s, and 76 during the first decade of the twenty-first century. Based on the 105 personal

narratives published during the 2010s, the family history phenomenon continues to wax.³⁰

ANZAC in Family History

The family history phenomenon began when the ANZAC legend was at its lowest ebb. In the wake of widespread opposition to the Vietnam War and in the midst of controversial feminist protests on Anzac Day, many Australians came to associate the commemoration of war with its glorification. Heroic or celebratory language was frowned upon, as were the attitudes towards race, gender and empire that sustained the Great War generation and the original form of the ANZAC legend. In the words of a correspondent to the *Canberra Times*, Anzac Day was 'the one day of the year for the glorification of war and the poisoning of children's minds with war pictures and heroes' stories'.³¹ The modest and introspective family histories that began appearing in the 1970s did not challenge the atmosphere of apathy and hostility towards ANZAC.

Many of the early family historians were women who were motivated by an interest in genealogy, rather than an abiding interest in the Great War. They sought to leave a legacy of information for future generations. Claire Skelton, for instance, was motivated to self-publish *In My Own Shadow* because she believed that her grandfather's war diary had become 'a family treasure and a lasting gift to his descendants'.³² Narelle Wynn recorded her grandfather's war experiences during a trip home from Britain in 1982. After self-publishing *Behind the Lines* in 1991, Wynn felt confident that her grandfather's war stories 'were now part of the Kerr/Wynn family history'; they would 'be handed down from one generation to the next, and the memory of these courageous men will never die'.³³

On occasions, the Great War was incidental to family historians' desire to write an affirming history of their ancestor, in which the war was but one phase. *A Letter From my Father* emerged from Marcia Tanswell's investigations into her family history: 'Since retiring to Phillip Island (Victoria) I've been frantically busy with historical societies, research, writing, travelling and enjoying my son, four daughters, three grand-daughters and three grandsons'.³⁴ The book is a record of her father's life, rather than just his experience of war. It is replete with photographic records of Eric Carroll's school years and family life, as well as his war service. Elizabeth Elson similarly painted on a broader canvas than the Great War. *Dear Annie* is an illustrated history of the Taylor family, a portion of which reprints correspondence between Jack and George Watson, both of whom were killed in France, and their cousin Annie Taylor in Melbourne.³⁵

Implicit within family histories is an intimate and inward-looking account of the war; readers witness events from the perspective of the diaries, letters and recollections of men who were most often ordinary soldiers. Accounts are often mundane or prosaic. Frank Heerey's involvement in a failed attack on Mouquet Farm on 2 September 1916 is described summarily in his diary: 'Large number of casualties in brigade. Fritz put a lot of big stuff down the gully through the day'.³⁶ The attack had devastated the 52nd Battalion, which lost one third of its men to death and injury. A couple of days later, Heerey wrote: 'Stayed all day in Albert, very quiet. Went over to find out about the boys in 62nd, no bon, several killed & missing. Played bridge during the day, very quiet'.³⁷ Heerey's son observed of his father's taciturn attitude: 'To a reader from our self-obsessed age, it is startling how brief notes of YMCA concerts, cards and just "loafing" are interspersed unremarkably with references to heavy shelling by "Fritz" and the death of mates'.³⁸

Apart from their tendency towards the prosaic, another defining feature of family histories is their highly idiosyncratic perspective on the Great War. The letters and diaries on which they are typically based contain very little military history. Censorship, as well as the emotional predilections of the soldiers, demanded that the letters include scant information about where soldiers were stationed, what action they were involved in and how the war was progressing. Family histories are anathema to traditional, martially-focused war history. There is little reference in family histories of what fine fighting men the Australians were, nor what marvellous victories they achieved – central tenets of the traditional ANZAC legend. Rather, family histories encourage the forging of an empathic connection between subject and reader.

Family histories of the Great War are almost universally sympathetic. The immense effort involved in transcribing letters and diaries and recording interviews, not to mention the expense of self-publication, is an act of love and dedication. The family histories that began appearing in the 1970s challenged understandings of the Great War determined by the carping elderly leaders of the Returned and Services League and the drunken old diggers disparaged in Alan Seymour's influential play, *The One Day of the Year*. In the hands of family historians, the anachronistic old diggers were transformed into young men innocently caught up in a tragic situation – the young men whom Peter Weir personified as Archie and Frank in the film *Gallipoli*.

It is possible to discern what Michael Roper and Rachel Duffett have called 'national frames of memory' within Australian family histories of the Great War, though their outlines are typically faint.³⁹ Janette Rogers felt that her

ancestor's war documents, published as *For King and Country*, were of national historical significance:

A decision came about to reproduce the diaries, firstly to ensure that a valuable and historic story will be further preserved and to introduce the reader to an account that will guarantee their memories of a great task done under difficult conditions by those gallant sons of Australia.⁴⁰

Similarly, Monica Sinclair, the author of *Dear Ad ... Love Ron*, believed that the stories of Great War soldiers were worth preserving because: 'They are part of our historic literature. Their story is part of our story as a young nation concerned about values of justice, freedom and independence'.⁴¹

As historians including Alistair Thomson, Bruce Scates and Rebecca Wheatley have shown, references to the national significance of their ancestors' war experiences do not mean that family historians are undiscerning receptacles of state propaganda.⁴² Monica Sinclair was full of admiration for the soldiers of the First AIF:

Men, like Dad, often at great cost to themselves for the rest of their lives, were heroes in a very real way, because they were prepared to take on what they perceived to be a serious responsibility, the defence of their country, and to live with the consequences of their decisions.⁴³

Yet Sinclair's characterisation of men like her father did not equate to a belief that the cause they fought for was worthwhile. Writing in 1990, she explicitly distinguished between contemporary views about the war and what young men believed at the time:

History may condemn the 'Great War' as the greatest and most expensive blunder of the century. Some of those who enlisted formed this opinion for themselves as they witnessed the senseless deaths of their friends on front after front. Be that as it may, I believe that this in no way detracts from the greatness of the young Australians, like Dad, who believed they acted for a noble cause and were prepared to risk their life in its pursuit.⁴⁴

Julie Cattlin, who self-published *The World War I Diaries of Sergeant Jim Osborn* in 2010, came to revise her opposition to ANZAC commemoration through writing family history. As a university student, Cattlin marched in protest against the Vietnam War and, in common with many other baby boomers, she broadened her opposition to Vietnam into a condemnation of war in general: 'I was incredibly anti-war', she recalled. Cattlin began transcribing Osborn's war diaries for her cousin and

quickly became convinced of their historical significance: 'I felt that he was such an extraordinary man, his diary is full of such beautiful descriptions and he is so non-judgemental. I really felt that it was my duty to have his story out there'. The intense admiration that Julie Cattlin developed for Jim Osborn caused her to reconsider her attitude to the Great War. She came to believe that the hostile attitude to all aspects of war and soldiering that she held as a young woman was ignorant and arrogant: 'I didn't think too deeply about it. I think we were just brainwashed to hate war.' Though her father had fought in the Second World War, she knew little about that conflict and very little about the Great War: 'especially the Western Front, because we all heard about Gallipoli'.⁴⁵

The woman who once marched in protest against the Vietnam War began marching on Anzac Day. Julie Cattlin believes that the Anzac Day march strikes a good balance between commemoration of Australian achievement and recognition of the suffering of ordinary soldiers: 'It's not so much about allies and enemies, but more about human beings who have been destroyed by war'. She feels that her participation in the march is a reflection of her fondness for the memory of Jim Osborn and other ordinary soldiers like him, more than any nationalistic impulse. Cattlin recoils from overt displays of nationalism, such as have become common among young Australians: 'I don't have an Australian flag and I hate Australia Day', she says. She grants that her strong connection to Jim Osborn

must have something to do with him being family and Australian. But somehow my love for him was due to him being an outstanding human being. His qualities really impressed me ... The smaller our world gets, the more I think of people belonging to the 'the world' more than I do to a country.⁴⁶

By the 2000s, it is possible to discern the traces of 'trauma culture' leaching into the work of family historians. Lynette Oates grafted post-Holocaust and post-Vietnam insights about trauma to more traditional, nationalism-based understandings about Australian involvement in the Great War in her book about her uncle, *With the Big Guns*, published in 2006. Hence her dramatic conclusion that death was perhaps Uncle Ernest's best destiny: 'When one considers all that is now known about Post Traumatic Stress Disorder'.⁴⁷

Elizabeth Whiteside also integrated psychological perspectives into her understanding of the Great War. She recorded in *A Valley in France* her regret that she did not read her father's letters while he was alive: 'There may have been a better understanding of him as a person. It may have been beneficial, perhaps even therapeutic for both of us, to have talked of those times.' Prior to

the 1990s, when insights drawn from psychological investigations into the function of trauma began to filter into popular culture, Australians might have understood that returned soldiers 'bottled up' their feelings; they may even have believed that repression had negative implications for ex-soldiers' mental health. However, they would not have expressed these concepts as Elizabeth Whiteside did in 1999, when describing her father:

Like most others he had returned a changed man, tense and highly strung. The disturbing effect of war on sensitive men was very great, and the hardships and horrors experienced in the extreme cold, the mud and slush of the trenches as bloody battles raged, could not be shared with loved ones at home. They did not speak of these traumas but instead suppressed them.⁴⁸

Whiteside's observations about the psychological effects of the Great War on its participants were coupled with an emphatic opinion about the war itself: 'The absolute futility of war comes home when research is made into the period of the 1914–1918 Great War. It has been called the world's greatest disaster'.⁴⁹

While family histories have been contaminated by discourses of nation and trauma, there was a crucial phase in the history of ANZAC 2.0 that preceded the rise of political commemoration, trauma culture and 'trench tourism'. During this phase, the tomb of imperialist loyalty and outdated attitudes towards race and gender in which ANZAC was sealed became its chrysalis. Two factors combined to regenerate the ANZAC legend: the new interest in family history and the nostalgia induced by the passing of the Great War generation. The intimate and sympathetic tone of the family histories was reinforced by the work of Bill Gammage in *The Broken Years* (1974), and subsequently by Patsy Adam-Smith in *The Anzacs* (1978). Peter Weir's film *Gallipoli* (1981) played perfectly to the sense that Australia needed a new identity and that the reimagined ANZACs could be the poster boys of this post-British nation.⁵⁰ From the 1990s, ANZAC began to accumulate elements of the emerging trauma narrative, and thus found ways to resonate with many of those who were averse to its martial underpinnings. When politicians jumped on the bandwagon after 1990, the celebratory, nationalist rhetoric that had been discarded during the 1960s reappeared, albeit in more muted form. The battlefield tourism that is the luxury of prosperous Western nations provided a further boost to popular interest in ANZAC. In the eye of the Anzackery that accompanies the Great War centenary, it is important to remember that the provenance of ANZAC 2.0 lies in the family history boom that began in the 1970s. This grounding in the personal and prosaic offers some protection against the buffeting of political and commercial headwinds.

End Notes

1. '£20,000 Grant for Anzac Pilgrimage', *Canberra Times*, 23 May 1964, p. 1.
2. K.S. Inglis, 'Gallipoli Pilgrimage, 1965', vol. 18, *Journal of the Australian War Memorial*, 1991, p. 24.
3. 'Australians Commemorate Anzac Day with the ABC', ABC, 26 April 2018, <http://about.abc.net.au/press-releases/australians-commemorate-anzac-day-with-the-abc/>. Accessed 2 August 2018.
4. David Stephens and Alison Broinowski, 'Introduction', *The Honest History Book*, NewSouth, Sydney, 2018, p. 2.
5. See Carolyn Holbrook, *Anzac: The Unauthorised Biography*, NewSouth, Sydney, 2014, pp. 116-143.
6. Marilyn Lake, Henry Reynolds, Joy Damousi, Mark McKenna and Carina Donaldson, *What's Wrong with Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History*, NewSouth, Sydney, 2010.
7. Joy Damousi has written about the 'post-imperial' generation of filmmakers, among whom she includes Peter Weir and Bruce Beresford, who made *Breaker Morant*. These directors 'cinematically restaged' Australian involvement in war, such that the 'Empire and the British [were] positioned as the villain', 'War and Commemoration', in Deryck M. Schreuder and Stuart Ward (eds), *Australia's Empire*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008, pp. 308-09; Mark McKenna, 'How Did it Become Australia's National Day?', Lake et. al., *What's Wrong with Anzac?*, pp. 110-34; Jenny Macleod, *Reconsidering Gallipoli*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2004; Daniel Reynaud, *Celluloid Anzacs: The Great War through Australian Cinema*, Australian Scholarly Publishing, Melbourne, 2007, pp. 192-4.
8. James Curran and Stuart Ward, *The Unknown Nation: Australia After Empire*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 2010.
9. Mark McKenna, 'How did it Become Australia's National Day', in Lake et. al., *What's Wrong with Anzac?* p. 122.
10. Andy Mycock, Shanti Sumartojo and Ben Wellings, 'Introduction: The Centenary to End all Centenaries: The Great War, Nation and Commemoration', in Shanti Sumartojo and Ben Wellings (eds), *Nation, Memory and Commemoration: Mobilizing the Past in Europe, Australia and New Zealand*, Peter Lang, Bern, 2014, p. 7.
11. Ben Wellings, 'Lest You Forget: Memory and Australian Nationalism in a Global Era', in *ibid.*, p. 59.
12. Graeme Davison, 'The habit of commemoration and the revival of Anzac Day', *Australian Cultural History*, vol. 23, 2003, p. 75. See also Jim McKay, *Transnational Tourism Experiences at Gallipoli*, Springer, Singapore, 2018, pp. 75-79.
13. Anna Clark, 'The Place of Anzac in Australian Historical Consciousness', *Australian Historical Studies*, no. 1, vol. 48, 2017, p. 25. See also, Anna Clark, *Private Lives, Public History*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 2016.
14. Anna Clark, 'The Place of Anzac in Australian Historical Consciousness'. *Australian Historical Studies*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2017, p. 26. Michael Roper and Rachel Duffett have made a similar observation in relation to British interest in the Great War in 'Family Legacies in the Centenary', *History and Memory*, vol. 30, no. 1, p. 77.
15. Jim McKay, 'Anzac Battlefield Tourism', *Portal*, no. 1, vol. 10, 2013, p. 10; Richard White, 'National Days and the National Past in Australia', *Australian Cultural History*, no. 23, 2003, p. 56.
16. Tim Phillips and Philip Smith, 'What is 'Australian'? Knowledge and Among a Gallery of Contemporary Australians', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2000, p. 220.
17. Phillips and Smith, 'What is 'Australian'?', pp. 221-22.
18. Author interview with Malcolm Fraser, 16 June 2012.
19. Carolyn Holbrook, 'Commemorators-in-Chief', in Tom Frame, ed., *Anzac Day: Then and Now*, UNSW Press, Sydney, 206, p. 221.
20. Author interview with Kim Beazley, 15 May 2012.
21. Mark Ryan, ed., *Advancing Australia: The Speeches of Paul Keating, Prime Minister, Big Picture*, Sydney, 1995, pp. 279, 280.
22. Christina Twomey, 'Anzac Day: Are We in Danger of Compassion Fatigue?', Conversation, 24 April 2014, <http://theconversation.com/anzac-day-are-we-in-danger-of-compassion-fatigue-24735>. Accessed 3 August 2018.
23. Christina Twomey, 'Trauma and the Reinvigoration of Anzac: An Argument', *History Australia*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2013, p. 106.
24. Jim McKay, *Transnational Tourism Experiences at Gallipoli*, Springer, Singapore, 2018, p. 75.
25. Jim McKay, 'A Critique of the Militarisation of Australian History and Culture Thesis: The Case of Anzac Battlefield Tourism', *Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies*, no. 1, vol. 10, 2013, <http://eprint-dev.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/portal/article/view/2371/0>. Accessed 2 August 2018. On battlefield tourism see also, for example, Bruce Scates, *Return to Gallipoli: Walking the Battlefields of the Great War*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006 and Bart Ziino, *A Distant Grief: Australians, War Graves and the Great War*, UWA Press, Perth, 2007.
26. See Frank Furedi, *Therapy Culture: Creating Vulnerability in an Uncertain Age*, Routledge, New York, 2004, and for an Australian context, Katie Wright, *The Rise of the Therapeutic Society: Psychological Knowledge and the Contradictions of Culture Change*, New Academic, Washington, 2011.
27. Richard Waterhouse, 'Locating the New Social History: Transnational Historiography and Australian Local History', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, vol. 95, no. 1, 2009, p. 8; Graeme Davison, 'The Broken Lineage', in Donna Merwick, ed., *Dangerous Liaisons: Essays in Honour of Greg Denning*, History Department, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, 1994, p. 334.
28. Graeme Davison, *The Use and Abuse of Australian History*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 2000, p. 197.
29. 'Unlock the Past', list of family history societies and organisations in Australia, <http://www.unlockthepast.com.au/directory/Societies-family>. Accessed 6 August 2018.
30. The category of 'personal narratives, Australian, World War, 1914-1918' includes books published by family descendants. There is, however, no means of distinguishing descendants from other authors.
31. *Canberra Times*, 28 April 1967, p. 2.
32. Claire Skelton, *In My Own Shadow: Including the War Diary of W.B. Wilson and Memoirs of L.E. Wilson*, self-published, Ascot, Qld, 1999, p. 5, cited in Bart Ziino, "'A Lasting Gift to His Descendants": Family Memory and the Great War in Australia', *History and Memory: Studies in Representation of the Past*, vol. 22, no. 2, p. 131.
33. Narelle, I. Wynn, *Behind the Lines: War Time Stories from 1914-1918 with the 5th Light Horse Brigade as told by Peter William Kerr, 1896-1984*, self-published, Brisbane, 1997, p. 10.
34. Marcia E. Tanswell, *A Letter From My Father: Through the Panama Canal to France-1918*, self-published, Melbourne, 1991, back cover.
35. Elizabeth Elson, *Dear Annie*, self-published, Mornington, Vic, 1994.
36. Peter Heerey, *F.X. Heerey: A Tasmanian's Story of the Great War*, self-published, Melbourne, 2004, p. 23.
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*, Foreword.
39. Roper and Duffett, 'Family Legacies', p. 79.
40. Janette G. Rogers, ed., *For King and Country: The War Diaries of J.M. Laidlaw*, self-published, Moe, Vic, 1985, Foreword.
41. Monica Sinclair, Dear Ad...Love Ron: *The Complete Collection of the Handwritten Letters and Diary Entries of Ronald Augustine Sinclair, Australian Imperial Forces, Fifth Division Artillery, 14th Field Army Brigade, 114th Howitzer Battery on Active Service in Egypt, France and Belgium 1915-1919, Sisters of Mercy*, Singleton, NSW, 1996, pp. vii.
42. For further examination of these themes, see Alistair Thomson, *Anzac Memories: Living with the Legend*, Monash University Publishing, Melbourne, 2nd edn, 2013, p. 282, Bruce Scates, Rebecca Wheatley and Laura James, *World War One: A History in 100 Stories*, Viking, Melbourne, 2015, and Carolyn Holbrook and Bart Ziino, 'Family History and the Great War in Australia', in Bart Ziino, ed., *Remembering the First World War*, Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon., 2015, pp. 39-55.
43. Monica Sinclair, *Dear Ad...Love Ron*, p. xi.
44. *Ibid.*
45. Interview with Julie Cattlin, 13 March 2012. The diaries are published as Julie Cattlin, ed., *The World War I Diaries of Sergeant Jim Osborn*, self-published, Melbourne, 2010.
46. *Ibid.*
47. Lynette Oates, *With the Big Guns: An Australian Artilleryman in the Great War*, Shannon Books, Melbourne, 2006, p. 173.
48. Elizabeth Whiteside, *A Valley in France: World War I Letters to His Parents and Sister While on Active Service from Egypt, France and Great Britain, 1915-1918*, self-published, Melbourne, 1999, Preface.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 180.
50. The New Nationalist mood was not solely a top-down phenomenon, see Holbrook, *Anzac: The Unauthorised Biography*, pp. 121-26.

Author

Carolyn Holbrook is an Alfred Deakin Post-Doctoral Research Fellow in the Contemporary Histories Research Group at Deakin University and chair of Australian Policy and History. She is the author of *Anzac: The Unauthorised Biography* (2014) and is currently researching the history of policy decision-making in Australia since 1945 and the history of attitudes to the federation since 1901.