‘The Tragic Pageant of War’: ANZAC commemoration in 1917 and 1918

MARK CRYLE

Australia’s first ANZAC Day commemoration in April 1916 has attracted the attention of a number of historians and has been subject to a wide variety of interpretations. Rather less has been written about the subsequent commemorations during the war years. By 1917, public sensibilities were changing and social divisions were widening, especially in the wake of the conscription debates. ANZAC Day in 1917 and 1918 were less a salve to the wounds which fractured Australia, than it was a symptom of them. While the commemoration was rarely, if ever, critiqued, it lost meaning for that significant portion of the population who did not endorse conscription, resisted enlistment and who felt increasingly disillusioned, exhausted and ambivalent, not to say hostile, to the nation’s war effort and its effects.

It was January 1917, and the debate was lively – another meeting, another smoke-filled room, another failure to achieve consensus around the vexed matter of a national day of commemoration. Like their fellow Australians still in the grip of a long and bloody war, delegates at the Queensland Branch Conference of the Australian Meat Industry Employees Union were weighing up the merits or otherwise of endorsing one particular public holiday out of the many being mooted.

The debate, as recorded in the *Worker*, is enlightening insofar as it gives insights into the preferences and values of this sub-group of Australians. The celebration of Christmas and Easter presented no problem, and neither did New Year’s Day. Eight Hours Day (Labour Day) was, unsurprisingly for this group, strongly favoured, while the Irish heritage of many in attendance was underlined by the suggestion that St Patrick’s Day be a day of choice. As the debate ebbed and flowed, one voice was heard to propose ANZAC Day – first commemorated eight months earlier in April 1916. The suggestion was rejected by another delegate in no uncertain terms. For him, the celebration of ANZAC Day would serve to perpetuate the present war. He proposed, in its place, the commemoration of 28th October, the date in 1916 when Australians voted against the introduction of conscription – ‘Anti-Conscription Day’. Another spoke out saying that he had no intention of commemorating ANZAC Day ‘and had never encouraged anyone else to do so’ (*Worker* 25 January 1917: 15).

The debate, as recorded in the *Worker*, begs the question: How was it that this remembrance, conceived, according to one of its most prominent historians, as a day of mourning, an ‘ecumenical requiem’ for departed soldiers and ‘an act of piety to honour the nation’s fallen’ (Moses and Davis 2013: 34, 86) could be so controversial and spark such vigorous opposition?

In contemporary Australia, ANZAC Day is the pre-eminent national commemoration. It combines the reverent acknowledgement of a century of war service by the nation’s veterans with a celebration of those putative national characteristics which have, according to the national mythology, been demonstrated on the battle front – mateship, egalitarianism, courage, endurance and larrikinism. Yet ANZAC Day was not conceived in a neutral political space. Debates around the preferred date of any national day have always been inextricably linked to questions around the re-defining of national identity (Firth 1970: 21). Notwithstanding the *Barrier Miner’s* claims that ‘there is nothing political about the ANZAC service’, (28 April 1917: 4,) the day had quickly become an occasion to reinforce an ideological position around recruitment and conscription and to affirm the politics of what was to become the Nationalist Party. The commemoration was the work of influential groups of politicians, clergymen and military personnel whose purpose was twofold – to publicly acknowledge and manage the tragic human cost of the war and, somewhat paradoxically, to promote ongoing commitment to the struggle on the home front. By late 1916, the latter imperative had been increasingly thwarted in Australia. Since the outbreak of war in August 1914, public sensibilities had changed and social divisions had widened, especially in the wake of the conscription debates. As one newspaper noted in April 1918, the

nation's attitudes to war were no longer as they had been when 'the public mind ... was not … [yet] … dulled by the endless impressions of the tragic pageant of war' (The Leader, 27 April 1918: 33). Simply put, the years 1917 and 1918 did not see ANZAC Day commemorations attracting the kind of bipartisan support that they have since attained a century on.

The ANZAC commemoration event itself was bedevilled by its multiple and often inherently contradictory imperatives, the most palpable of which was its commemoration of the war dead at the same time as promoting recruiting. Australian politics and society during this period was characterised by increasingly disparate and irreconcilable voices (Beaumont 1995, 2013; Evans 1987; Lake 1975) which ANZAC Day failed to accommodate. Its effect on Australia was more divisive than unifying, in that commemoration served to *widen* the political and social fissures in Australian society caused by the war rather than to heal them.

It is hardly surprising that historians have given more critical attention to the very first ANZAC Day than to the second or the third. John Moses, the most prolific author on the organisational origins of the first commemoration in April 1916, has, in a number of publications, stressed the role of Queensland's ANZAC Day Commemoration Committee (ADCC) led by Anglican clergyman Canon David Garland (Moses 1993, 1999, 2002, 2008; Moses and Davis 2013). Moses says little about what happened at the 1917 and 1918 commemorations, however, other than noting that ADCC continued to make recommendations and to record the conduct of the ceremonies and that the day continued to gain traction nationally (2013: 177, 285).

The misleading idea that continuity of commemorative practices was a feature of the last two years of war is evident elsewhere. John Robertson, while outlining some features of the 1917 and 1918 commemorations, emphasises their continuity of purpose with the inaugural one, noting the 'momentum' which the commemoration acquired, while asserting that its 'pre-eminence as a national event had yet to be charted'(1990: 248). Tanja Luckins, too, has addressed the psycho-social aspects of the 1917 and 1918 commemorations, focusing on the events as occasions for the expression of public grief and arguing that 'mourning continued to be the dominant tone of the day'(2004: 95). Joan Beaumont has widened the focus, examining both ANZAC rhetoric and rites in 1917 to conclude that the former was 'a similar mix to 1916: triumphalism and exhortations to the population for ongoing sacrifice, intertwined with individual grief', while the latter 'seem still to have been fluid and improvised at the local level'. Beaumont then emphasises recruiting initiatives at the 1918 event, going on to describe that commemoration as 'especially sober because of events on the Western front' (2013: 307-8, 421).

Other studies, by contrast, have suggested that the dynamics of ANZAC commemoration *did* shift in significant ways after 1916. Stephen Garton, for example, notes that enthusiasm for ANZAC Day waned after the Armistice (1996: 67). Alastair Thomson makes a similar point, arguing that it was not until the mid-1920s that the commemoration began to re-establish itself and regain national prominence (2013: 150). It is Raymond Evans's study of the Queensland home front, however, which most clearly asserts that it was not simply a case of 'business as usual' in 1917 and 1918. Evans notes waning enthusiasm for ANZAC Day earlier than Garton or Thomson suggest – in the remaining war years in fact – citing an eye-witness account of the 1918 Toowoomba commemoration and noting that 'loyalist enthusiasm had fallen to the level of mere pantomime' (1987: 40, 143).

ANZAC Day speakers delivered a clear message that all 'eligibles' should enlist and that the vote against conscription was a disloyal travesty – two sides of the same rhetorical coin. The 'loyalist' message, voiced by those who urged total commitment to, and greater sacrifice for, the war effort was central to commemoration in 1916. In the following years however, that rhetoric lost its power to engage the broad sweep of the Australian public, with the effect of 'un-fixing' ANZAC as a discursive rallying point. Thus ANZAC Day in 1917 and 1918 were less a salve to the wounds which fractured Australia than it was a symptom of them. While it is rare to discover the type of public critique recorded in the pages of the *Worker* as noted above, ANZAC Day lost meaning for that significant portion of the population who did not endorse conscription, who resisted enlistment and who felt increasingly disillusioned, exhausted and ambivalent, not to say hostile in relation to the nation's war effort and its effects.

At the time of the above-mentioned debate, the nation was riven by deep social and political divisions, with commemoration failing to unify its people. Rather, commemoration had become symptomatic of those divisions, providing an outlet for the rhetoric of loyalist pro-war conservatives increasingly embittered by the defeat of the conscription plebiscites in 1916 and 1917 and the virtual collapse of voluntary enlistment. While the pews at ANZAC Day church services remained filled to overflowing, the attendance at civic commemorations fell in comparison with 1916 – a signal that, by 1917, a significant portion of the population had felt alienated from ANZAC Day events. Put another way, the fault lines created by ideological, class and sectarian tensions were not repaired, but rather *reinforced* by ANZAC

commemoration. The galvanising of the nation in the struggle to win the war remained a primary message of the commemoration. ANZAC Day rhetoric came as a package. It allowed no space for those who needed to grieve for and honour lost loved ones and yet were exhausted by, sceptical of, or disillusioned about the nation's role in the war.

At commemorations in 1917 and 1918 ANZAC Day's 'healing' imperatives were frequently trumped by the perceived need to boost enlistments. Despite the inordinate degree of social pressure placed upon 'eligibles' to rally to the flag and replace the casualties, voluntary enlistment maintained a consistent downward trajectory throughout 1916, 1917 and 1918. As they had done in 1916, recruiters used ANZAC Day as a tool, evidenced in the familiar eulogising of the achievements of the Australian Imperial Force and ongoing mobilisation around the war effort. A significant addition, however, was the chimera of unity behind the cause and an entreaty to the populace to do 'nothing unworthy' of the ANZACs.

The rhetorical edifice was beginning to show cracks – fault-lines of contestation – central to which was the implication that voting against conscription had, in fact, been an act 'unworthy' of the Australian troops at the front – the diggers as they were popularly known. Speaking at the Brisbane ANZAC Day meeting in Exhibition Hall, Governor-General Ronald Munro-Ferguson told his audience: 'A nation will go up higher or go down lower by the simple test of the response made by her sons to the tap of drum and by her daughters to the call for national service' (Brisbane Courier, 26 April 1917: 9). In neither Munro-Ferguson's ANZAC Day proclamations nor those of Prime Minister William Hughes was there recognition of loss and trauma, though in 1918 Hughes did request that churches conduct services on the day.

After a second electoral defeat for conscription in 1917, the calls from the federal government and the military for more recruits became increasingly urgent in the wake of the success of the German Spring offensive in March 1918. The timing, for ANZAC Day, was propitious. Both Defence Minister, George Pearce, and Recruiting Minister, Richard Orchard, released ANZAC Day statements in 1918 stressing the need for more men and eschewing any reference to remembrance of lives lost in the cause (Age, 26 April 1918: 17). Once again Munro-Ferguson, in his message, made a call to arms, devoid of any expression of lament or of any acknowledgement of the pain of loved ones. The bereaved were merely enjoined to continue their efforts towards ongoing mobilisation at the home front. The Governor-General stated outright that ANZAC Day would be an 'empty celebration, unworthy of the day we commemorate if unattended by a great improvement in recruiting' (*Age*, 25 April 1918: 6).

In their urgency to deploy ANZAC Day in the work of enlistment, it was as if the nation's political leaders had forgotten one of the commemoration's fundamental imperatives. Unsurprisingly, local ANZAC Day speakers echoed the same sentiments at their events. In 1917, prominent Cairns lawyer, A.J.P. MacDonnell, told his audience: 'We should not lament for the dead. We should lament for those people who are fit to go and who are lagging behind their mother's apron strings' (*Northern Herald*, 27 April 1917: 54). New South Wales's champion recruiter, Captain Ambrose Carmichael, spoke at the Tamworth ANZAC Day event in 1918, telling the audience that:

> His sympathies did not go out so much to the men and women who had sent their boys and had lost them. His sympathies were with those who had sons who could but did not go. He congratulated the parents of those boys who had fallen at the front (*Daily Observer*, 26 April 1918: 5).

Clearly the Day's imperatives had shifted from where they were in 1916. The needs of the bereaved were largely ignored here. This was almost exclusively about mobilisation of the home front and a far cry from Garland's grand vision of an 'All Souls Day' to which John Moses refers (2008: 5-6).

At recruiting rallies during 1917 and 1918, Gallipoli remained an instrument of political rhetoric invoked as the *cause célèbre*, with a call to arms continuing to be the primary message of most wartime ANZAC Day events. National recruiting conferences were held in Melbourne in April 1917 and again in April 1918, each producing declarations of the importance of ANZAC Day in the national recruiting endeavours (Register, 5 April 1917: 8). Commemorations in 1917 and 1918 were an occasion for the familiar parade of recruiting appeals witnessed in earlier times. In Brisbane, a 'recruiting tramcar' followed the march in 1917 bearing the messages '100 Passengers Wanted' and 'Coo-ee – All Men This Way' (*Daily Mail*, 26 April 1917: 7). At other events, horses were led with empty saddles, sometimes by women, while men were invited to fill them (Argus, 28 April 1917: 18; *Geelong Advertiser*, 13 April 1917: 2; *Queanbeyan Age* and *Queanbeyan Observer*, 18 May 1917: 2). It was an invitation that many continued to feel free to refuse.

Some ANZAC Day rallies had all the hallmarks of revivalist evangelical gatherings. An account of the event in Maitland in 1918 is particularly instructive in this respect. The *Maitland Weekly Mercury* reported that, after an introduction by the mayor and the singing of patriotic songs, Miss Evans was given the platform. 'Do you know that we have the enemy in our midst to-day', she

trumpeted. ‘Let us wake up and face these people. We cannot prevent the war but we can prevent defeat’. The next speaker was Private McFarland, who noted that he had been a union organiser before the war but now, as ‘repentant sinner’, had shifted his loyalties:

> ‘Is there an eligible in the crowd’, he appealed, ‘who will come along and help my mates on the other side’. Immediately there was a response, amidst a scene of great cheering. Mr. Bradshaw, who was seated at the piano, struck up a patriotic tune, and during the excitement, another young man stepped forward towards the platform (4 May 1918: 9).

The inclusion of a female speaker at this event is telling. Typically, women were conspicuous by their absence from the speakers’ platform at ANZAC Day commemorations, yet the influence of attractive young females in getting young men to don the uniform was well-appreciated by recruiters. It was an indication that recruiters were prepared to pull out all stops to boost their figures. Moreover, it was a sign that the distinctions between ANZAC Day and any other recruiting rally had become increasingly blurred.

Elsewhere, rejected volunteers were asking to be allowed to march with the soldiers. One correspondent wrote to the *Brisbane Courier* in April 1917: ‘If the authorities will grant us this small favour, the general public will be able to see who are the real shirkers, as no doubt, on such an occasion, even men who have volunteered are looked on with much scorn’ (*Brisbane Courier*, 13 April 1917: 7). Implicit in this request is an appreciation that the ‘eligibles’ were likely to be ‘looked on with scorn’ at an ANZAC Day commemoration. As a loyal supporter of the war, the correspondent in question needed to identify himself clearly at an ANZAC Day parade as one who was a ‘supporter’ of the event and not an ‘opponent’. In similar vein, the Mayor of Wagga Wagga, Alderman Oates, while recruiting at an ANZAC commemoration in Sydney in 1917, vigorously confronted, berated and harangued ‘eligibles’ in the crowd because they declined to enlist immediately. The situation almost descended into violence and recruiters had to be restrained (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 27 April 1917: 8).

ANZAC Day commemoration was clearly no place for those who might feel in any way ambivalent about rallying to the flag. That said, the question of whom or what Australians should ‘recognise’ as an enemy was a vexed and divisive one. The notion of the ‘enemy in our midst’, as espoused by the speaker in Maitland, shatters any illusion of national unity around ANZAC commemoration. Speakers at these events acknowledged division. Participants recognised it and indeed, it seems, enforced it with moral coercion. ANZAC Day in 1917 and 1918 were no place for a fit-looking, healthy male out of uniform or one who did not wear his badge of allegiance in one form or another.

Gallipoli continued to be mobilised in a political struggle against those who had opposed conscription. The debates around two failed conscription plebiscites in 1916 and 1917 polarised the nation and descended into rancour, hysteria and public violence. The legacy of this polarity was such that the cause of voluntary enlistment could no longer be espoused in anything approaching a milieu of respect and tolerant acknowledgement of political difference. Rather, it turned into a witch hunt, with ANZAC Day becoming a strategic weapon in that rhetorical assault. The day was now an occasion for public recriminations and the passing of moral judgments about the nation’s choices on that issue in 1916 and in 1917.

Most ANZAC Day spokespersons adopted an unequivocal position on conscription. From the editorial column, the platform and the pulpit, conscription’s advocates hurled invective at those who had chosen to actively oppose it and, by implication, all of those who had voted against it. For loyalists, the memory of conscription’s defeat was etched indelibly in their political consciousness. One Melbourne newspaper, in its ANZAC Day editorial, sought to analyse the causes of the defeat of the conscription plebiscite in these terms: ‘We know that the cause was due to political prejudices, to selfish unconcern, to covert and active disloyalty, and to the craven fear of those who dreaded the personal risks of war’ (*Leader,* 4 May 1918: 31). Those who had trailed the Australian flag in the ‘mud of shame’ or who felt ‘craven fear’ of the risks that fighting involved (*National Leader*, Brisbane, 20 April 1917: 5), would likely be absent from any event in which they were so castigated.

Such invective, of course, made no allowance for the fact that a significant proportion of serving men in the AIF voted against conscription. Indeed, Keith Murdoch reported to Hughes that voting on the front of Europe was three to one against conscription and that the army’s majority had been carried by troops in the Middle East, further behind the lines in Europe and in training in England (Robson 1970: 119). The high-handed moral judgements around conscription passed down by ANZAC Day speakers made no allowance for the complexities of the issues which informed the votes in 1916 and in 1917. Nor did they allow for expressions of compassion or support for those who grieved for loved ones killed and maimed in battle.

ANZAC Day attacks on anti-conscriptionists were more than matched by censorious moral judgements about the ‘cold-footed slackers’ and ‘selfish, soulless

degenerates' who chose not to volunteer (Reverend J.H. Somerville in *Young Witness*, 27 April 1917: 3). Politicians and preachers metaphorically linked arms in their determination to occupy the moral high ground of righteous indignation about the nation's seeming lack of ardour for the struggle. At an event in Kalgoorlie Town Hall, Anglican Archbishop Cyril Golding-Bird told his audience of a female parishioner who had fainted when he had come to visit her, expecting that he brought dire news about her son at the battle front. 'Recovering, she said that she thought he had come to tell her of the death of her son, but that she would rather hear, that her boy had been killed than lived to think he had not gone to the war' (*Western Argus*, 1 May 1917: 8). This was a moral tale. A decision not to partake fully in the prosecution of the war was deemed to be a moral failing and an abrogation of all that ANZAC had come to represent.

The decision to vote against conscription and/or not to enlist was held to be a disavowal of all that was righteous and decent about the ANZACs' achievements. Such pronouncements continued to be delivered at ANZAC Day events in 1918. In Adelaide, Senior Chaplain Ashley Teece repeated what was by now a familiar theme when he told the audience at the commemoration that: 'He did not mourn with those whose relatives were dead; he rather mourned with those who, having sons with no legitimate hindrance, refused the challenge of their country and declined to serve her' (*Advertiser*: 26 April 1918, 7). Thus dismissed, those less than fully committed to the nation's war aims could be castigated while their families were pitied.

ANZAC Day was thus an occasion to deliver and reaffirm moral lessons about appropriate forms of patriotic behaviour. Had they attended ANZAC Day commemorations – either civil or in church services – the sixty percent of eligible Australian men who chose not to volunteer could expect to be subject to censure and derision. There was nothing inviting or inclusive about this discourse. ANZAC Day was an occasion for the articulation of an unmitigated and definitive political and moral binary. Fighting for the nation and the empire was virtuous and noble. Not doing so was cowardly, selfish, indulgent and immoral. There were no grey areas and little space discursively for consoling the bereaved or managing the grief of any whose ideological position was not firmly aligned with the pressmen, preachers, teachers and politicians delivering the judgements. In other words, ANZAC Day in 1917 and 1918 were thoroughly appropriated by the forces of pro-war loyalists to pursue their own ends.

The bipartisan political support which ANZAC Day attracts now was conspicuously absent a century ago. After the failure of the first conscription plebiscite, the Labor Party split in January 1917. Hughes took twenty-three of his parliamentary supporters with him, joined with the conservatives and formed the National Party, which he led to the polls four months later. As a consequence, ANZAC Day 1917, which preceded the federal election by less than two weeks was much more a 'Nationalist' event than it was a national one. The day lacked a convincing, affirming rhetoric of national cohesion. As the self-proclaimed, 'win-the-war party', the Nationalists saw and took an opportunity to campaign for the electoral defeat of Labor from the podium at ANZAC Day events. In Fremantle on 25 April 1917, Defence Minister George Pearce made the day the centrepiece of a campaign speech. Now, like other conservatives, he insisted that Labor was responsible for the 'party politics' which impeded the nation's full commitment to the war (*Daily News*, 26 April 1917: 6). Manifestly, neither Pearce nor his Nationalist colleagues had sought an end to party differences. Rather, they sought the defeat of Labor at the polls and invoked and appropriated the ANZAC story to achieve that end.

Condemnation of Labor was not limited to Nationalist candidates. The conservative press also used ANZAC Day to point accusing fingers at the labour movement, with many ANZAC Day editorials in 1917 featuring stinging attacks (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 April 1917: 10; *Cairns Pos*t, 25 April 1917: 4; *Daily Advertiser* 26 April 1917: 2). Clergymen speaking at ANZAC Day events likewise joined in the campaign to impugn Labor's role during the conscription campaigns. (*National Leader* 27 April 1917: 5).

While its opponents sought to position the labour movement as oppositional to ANZAC, labour and the working class had to deal with the difficult matter of how they positioned themselves. The labour movement, along with Australian society in general, polarised during the 1916 conscription referendum, and the gap widened further throughout 1917. Mounting working-class radicalisation and militancy brought even greater division between the parliamentary and industrial wings of the movement (Bollard 2006: 77). While some Labor politicians continued to speak on ANZAC Day platforms and endorse the day's values, most did not. Trade union representatives too, absented themselves.

In some working-class areas, the turnout at commemorations was minimal. In Port Adelaide, in 1917, the Mayor complained about the poor attendance at the town hall for the civic commemoration. He then went on to heavily endorse the 'win-the-war' Party for the forthcoming election, stating that 'if the opposition had nothing better to advance than their anti-conscription ideals, they should be anti-conscripted out of the state' (*Advertiser*, 26 April

1917: 9). However, Labor was well-supported in the Adelaide electorate which retained this district in the 1917 federal election, despite losses at the polls elsewhere. In a working-class area with such political leanings, many chose to 'vote with their feet' when their local conservative mayor was known to be running the ceremony.

Port Pirie was another Australian Workers Union-dominated, industrial town with a population of over nine thousand in 1917 and an 'honour' list which included eighty 'fallen' men (Eklund 2012: 143-4). Yet, there was little effort to enact a commemoration there in 1917, apart from a small memorial service held in the town hall (*Port Pirie Recorder and Northwestern Mail*, 26 April 1917: 1). *The Kalgoorlie Miner*, which served a town with a similar demographic, noted that (a mere) several hundred gathered for their 1918 commemoration, from a total population of close to eight thousand. In Broken Hill the conservative daily, the *Barrier Miner,* passed ironic comment on the lack of numbers at the 1917 commemoration (*Barrier Miner*, 29 April 1917: 3). Five hundred were in attendance, including school children who had little choice in the matter, from a town with a population of over 27,000 (Smith 1920: 110). Put simply, ANZAC Day commemorations, when they took place in mining towns and port areas, often lacked community and trade union support and appear to have been the preserve of a minority of loyalist pro-war conservatives who chose to defiantly fly their flag of allegiance in the face of local apathy or even hostility.

Others were half in the embrace of ANZAC Day without committing to all that it encompassed. Some smaller labour groups organised their own separate commemorations on ANZAC Day in 1917 and 1918. They did not ignore the commemoration but rather chose to engage with those elements in it which matched their needs. Unionists had lost friends and loved ones on the killing fields and they shared that grief communally. Doubtless these occasions were devoid of the loyalist hoopla which accompanied the 'official' events. Adelaide's labour newspaper, the *Daily Herald*, recorded a small ANZAC Day gathering of clerical and labouring staff in the Government Stores in 1917 (*Daily Herald*, 26 April 1917: 7). Likewise, railwaymen in Petersburg, South Australia, took part in a small commemoration in the locomotive sheds on the same day (*Petersburg Times*, 4 May 1917: 2). In 1918, South Australian railway workers held a similar event at Wallaroo (*Register*, 27 April 1918: 9). They had their heroes to honour and their dead to mourn. By virtue of its overt politicisation, however, official ANZAC Day ceremonies held no appeal to citizens who sought a community of the like-minded with whom to share their grief and to honour and to pay their respects to the dead. Such a community was not to be found within the increasingly shrill pro-loyalist camp. Public engagement with ANZAC Day, as *the* national day, actually declined after 1916. On the whole, the numbers attending fell in comparison with 1916 (Cryle 2016). Crowds tended, understandably, to be less enthusiastic about the patriotic pomp and ceremony and more reflective on the damage done. The event did not attain a primacy on the commemorative calendar nationally, nor did governments endorse it as a public holiday. Moreover, many sought their own smaller memorial observances away from the dither of heavily-orchestrated official pro-war civic events, showing a preference for forms of ANZAC commemoration and memorialising of the war dead in which loyalist pro-war oratory was conspicuously absent. It follows that, despite the rhetoric which surrounded it, the commemoration lost impetus as a genuinely national civic event through 1917 and 1918 as it struggled to meet the demands placed upon it by the mounting stresses of war. While it may have remained an occasion for the public acknowledgement of grief and loss, ANZAC commemoration was viewed by many as just another in a range of patriotic events organised by those who sought to promote an increasingly politically divisive war.

ANZAC Day, by 1918, would continue to be a work in progress. While 25 April's status as an iconic date in Australia was well-established, the occasion was no closer to being a cohesive national observance than it had been in 1916. Indeed, in the years since the commemoration's inception, it had shifted further from that point rather than closer to it. Thus while ANZAC Day was not peripheral by 1918, it was certainly multi-faceted and increasingly divisive. In combining solemn acknowledgement of the war dead with recruiting, underpinned by unapologetic militarism and frequently leavened with carnivalesque fund-raising, ANZAC Day failed to bind the nation's wounds. Many circled the day on their calendars and acknowledged its significance, commemorating it in their own way. Still others were alienated from the patriotic clamour and obsequious deference to empire which surrounded the occasion. They were alienated too by the recrimination and bickering around conscription and enlistment that were pervasive at the time. By 1918, then, 25 April had morphed from an occasion that embraced a range of constituencies to one more narrowly committed to a particular ideology around the war. As a national unifier, the 'one day of the year' was still awaiting its day of arrival.

References

Beaumont, J. 1995 'The politics of a divided society', in J. Beaumont (ed.) *Australia's War, 1914-18*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

—— 2013 *Broken Nation: Australians in the Great War*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

Bollard, R 2006 'The "active chorus": the Great Strike of 1917 in *Victoria', Labour History,* 90, May: 77-94.

Cryle, M. 2016 'Making "the One Day of the Year": a Genealogy of Anzac Day to 1918', PhD thesis, University of Queensland https://doi.org/10.14264/uql.2016.933 (accessed 24/08/2018.

Eklund, E.C. 2012 *Mining Towns: Making a Living, Making a Life*, NewSouth, Sydney.
Evans, R. 1987 *Loyalty and Disloyalty: Social Conflict on the Queensland Homefront, 1914-18*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.
Firth, S. 1970 'Social Values in the New South Wales Primary School, 1880–1914: an Analysis of School Texts', *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 12, 1: 123-59.
Garton, S. 1996 *The Cost of War: Australians Return*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
Lake, M. 1975, *A Divided Society: Tasmania during World War I*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
Luckins, T. 2004 *The Gates of Memory: Australian People's Experiences and Memories of Loss in the Great War*, Curtin University Books, Fremantle.
Moses, J.A. 1993 'Canon David John Garland and the ANZAC tradition', *St. Mark's Review*, 154: 12-21.
—— 1999 'Canon David John Garland (1864-1939) as architect of Anzac Day', *Royal Historical Society of Queensland Journal*, 17, 2 (May): 49-64.
—— 2002 'The struggle for Anzac Day 1916-1930 and the role of the Brisbane Anzac Day Commemoration Committee', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, 88, 1: 54-74.
—— 2008 'Anzac Day as Australia's All Souls' Day: Canon David John Garland's Vision for Commemoration of the Fallen', paper presented to Christian Mission in the Public Square, Australian Centre for Christianity and Culture Canberra
Moses, J.A. and Davis, G.F. 2013 *Anzac Day Origins: Canon D J Garland and Trans-Tasman Commemoration*, Barton Books, Canberra.
Robertson, J. 1990 *Anzac and Empire: the Tragedy and Glory of Gallipoli*, Hamlyn, Port Melbourne.
Robson, L.L. 1970 *The First A.I.F.: a Study of its Recruitment, 1914-1918*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
Smith, H.A. 1920 *Official Year Book of New South Wales 1918*, New South Wales Government Printer, Sydney.
Thomson, A. 2013 Anzac *Memories: Living with the Legend*, Monash University Publishing, Clayton, Vic.

Newspapers,

Advertiser	*Leader (Melbourne)*
Age	*Maitland Weekly Mercury*
Argus	*National Leader* (Brisbane)
Barrier Miner	*Northern Herald*
Brisbane Courier	*Petersburg Times*
Cairns Post	*Port Pirie Recorder and Northwestern Mail*
Daily Advertiser (Wagga Wagga)	*Queanbeyan Age* and *Queanbeyan Observer*
Daily Herald	*Register*
Daily Mail	*Sydney Morning Herald*
Daily Observer	*Western Argus*
Daily News	*Worker* (Brisbane)
Geelong Advertiser	*Young Worker*
Kalagoorlie Miner	

Author

Dr Mark Cryle is a published historian, presenter and teacher. In 2015 he completed a PhD on the origins of ANZAC Day to 1918. In 2016 he was awarded a Q ANZAC 100 Fellowship from the State Library of Queensland. He was formerly the Manager of the Fryer Library at the University of Queensland. Mark has researched, written and presented on aspects of both Australian and British history and literature. In another life, Mark is a musician and songwriter.

The pain of war of war is communicated from these Somme survivors to another generation of soldiers (Photo by David Newell-Smith/GNM Archive/*The Observer*/*The Guardian*).