'Gave His Life for the Empire': Memory, Memorials, and Identity in the British Empire after the First World War

Bryan McClure, The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor: Vance, Jonathan F., The University of Western Ontario
A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in History
© Bryan McClure 2023

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd

Part of the Canadian History Commons, Cultural History Commons, European History Commons, Genealogy Commons, Military History Commons, Public History Commons, and the Social History Commons

Recommended Citation
https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/9183

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlswadmin@uwo.ca.
Abstract

This dissertation examines the construction of personal memorials after the First World War across the British Empire nations of the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, to understand how individuals sought to make their own memorial to remember their loved one killed in the conflict. In comparison to other studies on the construction of national or other community memorials, this dissertation explores how individuals accepted or rejected dominant discourses in creating their own memorials that spoke to how they remembered the war. It is based on a large database of more than 2,000 private memorials to individuals that were erected in the nations being examined. National registries of war memorials created by museums, archives, and government agencies were mined to create the database.

The construction of personal memorials also revealed cultural influences that impacted the design of the memorials. The Empire governments’ decision to create and support the Imperial War Graves Commission that refused to repatriate the bodies and regulated the design of cemeteries and headstones, encouraged individuals to find their own ways of commemorating the war dead to meet their needs. The role of mourning and religion in commemoration reveals that these personal memorials were designed to function as sites for mourning at home and therefore fulfilled the necessary need of a grave site that was inaccessible.

In examining the design, language, and messages of personal memorials, we are able to see that rather than reject the messages of the state about the war, individuals used them to make sense of death of family and friends as a way to give their deaths some meaning. Using the Victorian mourning concept of the ‘good death,’ personal memorials strove to project the image that the soldiers died a good death in religious and secular
terms in the use of religious symbols, literary quotations, and nationalist language.
Drawing from the Anglican Church, British poets, and imperialist ideology, personal
memorials reflected the dominance of British worldviews on commemoration and
remembrance of the First World War.

**Keywords**

First World War-1914-1918, Great Britain, Ireland, Australia, Canada, New Zealand,
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Summary for Lay Audience

After the First World War, individuals sought to remember and mourn the dead by building memorials. People organized into groups on the local, and national level to build large civic and public monuments such as national war memorials and monuments in town squares. These memorials reflected how society wanted to remember the conflict as a group as they listed the names of soldiers killed in the war. This dissertation, rather than focus on the memorials made by communities, focuses on the memorials created by individuals to remember one person killed in the war rather than the collective.

In examining these personal memorials, this dissertation seeks to understand the ways individuals remembered and mourned the war dead. The dissertation does so by examining who the memorials were built for, the types of memorials constructed, and the design choices on the memorials by studying the language and the symbols used. The dissertation demonstrates the ways personal memorials were used as a way for mourners to display their grief, sorrow, and pride in locations close to home. The decision by governments to not allow the return of bodies from the battlefields forced mourners to create a space to grieve that normally would have been fulfilled at the graves.

This dissertation takes a comparative approach to understanding how personal memorials were used by examining memorials built in the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. Comparing these nations shows how widespread different ideas about mourning and the First World War were. As former members of the British Empire, each of the nations shared ideas about what the war was fought for, and social norms for mourning. A database of over 2,000 personal memorials from these nations was created to be able to explore the nature of personal memorials. National
registries of war memorials by museums, archives, and government agencies were mined to create the database of personal memorials.
Dedication

To family in the First World War who did not return:

Joseph Ernest Cloughley (47828), Private 15th Battalion CEF. He was born March 31st, 1893, in Colwell, Ontario, Canada, to Thomas and Anna Bella Parr Cloughley. A brick maker, he enlisted on June 7th, 1915, and died November 6th, 1915. Buried in Etaples Military Cemetery.

George Hostrawser (775495), Sergeant 116th Battalion CEF. He was born July 8th, 1897, in Malton, Ontario, Canada, to William and Jane Cameron Hostrawser. A farmer, he enlisted on December 18th, 1915, and died on October 31st, 1917. Buried in Oxford Road Cemetery.

William Beaton McGillivray (13219), Private Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry CEF. He was born November 15th, 1890, in Vaughan, Ontario, Canada, to William and Jane Laurie McGillivray. A farmer, he enlisted on November 16th, 1916, and died on September 28th, 1918. Buried in Mill Switch British Cemetery, Tilloy-Lez-Cambrai.
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Introduction

During research for my Master’s dissertation in 2015, I visited the Sandford Church of Ireland in the Dublin suburb of Ranelagh to see its war memorials. The first was the memorial to the parishioners, and the other was a plaque to Thomas J.E.B. Myles. The Myles’ memorial caught my attention due to the simplicity of the plaque; it was made from brass with no decorative features and only the text, ‘In ever proud and loving memory of Thomas J.E.B. Myles. 14th Canadians. Killed in Flanders. 25th June. 1916.’ (Image 1) Located at the back of the church, this plaque dedicated to an Irishman who fought in the Canadian army demanded more research. I learned that he had been born in Dublin, the eldest child of Henrietta Maude and John Myles. His father died in 1895 leaving his mother to raise him and his sister Catherine.² He left Ireland in 1908, settling in Montreal where he enlisted with the Canadian Expeditionary Force in the first wave of recruits on

---

September 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 1914.\textsuperscript{3} The memorial was erected by Maude and Catherine who both lived in Ranelagh and attended the church.

The investigation into the life of Thomas Myles marked the inspiration for this project, which evolved from an inquiry into one memorial to a Canadian soldier in a suburban church in Dublin, to an examination of how individuals across the British Empire built personal memorials. Based on my education in Canada, the lessons of the First World War were of celebration, the movement of the nation from subservience to self-confidence and independence from the Empire, colony to nation. Soldiers were Canadians. The Myles memorial throws such simple explanations into doubt. Myles may have fought with the Canadian army, but no one in Canada remembers Myles. Was Myles Canadian or British or Irish? Did his family really care about what he was? Was the memorial the assurance that he would be remembered?

Unlike collective memorials that commemorate groups and communities, memorials like Myles’ have received little attention by historians seeking to understand, categorize, and interpret the memory of the First World War. Individual memorials like Myles’ in the historiography were limited to those elevated by the governments of the day, such as Edith Cavell or Lord Kitchener, for propaganda purposes. The more elaborate memorials such as the memorial to Edward Horner in St Andrew’s Church in Mells, England, that features an elaborate bronze equestrian statue also caught historians’ attention simply due to the extravagance.\textsuperscript{4} (Image 2) The historiography focuses on the

\textsuperscript{3} LAC Incoming Passenger Lists, 1865-1935, Lake Manitoba arriving in St John from Liverpool, February 12\textsuperscript{th}, 1908, RG 76-C Microfilm Roll T-508 p. 4; LAC Myles, Thomas J E B, Personnel Records of the First World War, RG 150 Box 6558-37 Item Number 210860.

collective experience of remembrance at the expense of the private. Studies on collective remembrance provide insights into the development of social, cultural, and political ideas, but the focus on community hides the ways individuals developed their memory. Instead of exploring the diversity of experience, collective memory groups people together, sometimes in ways their subjects would agree with and sometimes in ways they would not. By turning to personal memorials, we are able to observe how individuals interacted with the memory of the war on their own terms. Personal memorials demonstrate how individuals used or rejected the collective memory, revealing the variances in the creation of memories.

The lack of historical studies on private memory is due to the nature of sources on which to base the analysis. Private memory is extremely varied and diverse, with no two people having the same experiences, education, or thought process to develop identical memories of the same event. Where collective memories are designed to be built through discussion, private memories are built on the experiences and decisions of a single person. Private memory is not meant to be open for discussion, whereas collective memory cannot function unless it openly debated. Sources that reveal private memory are rare as they are not typically meant to be open. Oral histories provide an insight to private memory but are coloured by the context in which they are given and the timelapse from the events being recalled.5

Research into personal memorials from the First World War reveals their presence into the thousands. Rather than being an exception, Myles’ memorial in a larger context is part of a trend of individual commemoration that operated at the same time as large-scale

---

collective remembrance. The commemoration of individuals was not restricted to a single country and can be found all over the world in every nation that participated in the war. The existence of these memorials provides a gateway into examining private memory as the thousands of memorials demonstrate patterns of commemoration that highlight the way individuals worked to remember the war. Personal memorials, rather than reject collective memories, used them to reinforce mourning practices, identity, and discussions of the war as a good and just conflict. In their quest to enshrine the memory of their loved ones, personal memorials drew upon the traditional concepts of war as honourable and patriotic, and death in such a conflict as both momentous and sorrowful. Shared memories between private and collective remembrance are not uniform as personal memorials demonstrate divergences and variations. Such differences show that private memory is hard to pin-point and defies generalizations.

This dissertation examines the production of personal memorials in the British Empire by examining them in Great Britain (England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland), Ireland, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. These memorials display how individuals mourned the war dead in ways not visible in collective memorials. Individuals used collective memorials to mourn, but due to the nature of their design and purpose community memorials cannot fulfil all the needs of the mourner. The remembrance of the individual on a community memorial sees them subsumed into the collective memory, turning acts of mourning into an act of collective remembrance. Private memorials separate the dead from the collective, giving the mourners the space to ensure that the individuality of the war dead, along with their own, is maintained.

The arguments of the dissertation contribute to our understanding of how memory functions as well as to the history of the First World War, the history of mourning, and
the history of the British Empire. To understand the place this dissertation has in the larger academic fields, it is necessary to view the wide range of historiographical fields to which these arguments contribute. The historiography on the memory of the First World War has been focussed on the identity creation of national, ethnic, and regional groups. These histories have concentrated on official memory and how the memory of the war has been used to build social constructs. The focus on the political identities simplifies memories of the war to a single narrative while ignoring the larger cultural influence of the war on society.

Cultural historians have sought to expand our understanding of the war by examining the emotional impact of the conflict through commemoration. Their work expands beyond the political legacy of the war to the cultural legacy through remembrance practices. Cultural histories have been restricted by their scope as they have concentrated on a single nation. The focus upon the nation-state has created an over-emphasis on the official memory of the war. Rather than demonstrating the complex understandings of the war, historians have reinforced official memory through their emphasis on the way memories are formed through a contest rather than a dialogue between multiple voices in society. The ‘people’ who are seen as either accepting or rejecting official memory of the war are generalized rather than viewed as having diverse memories. Individuals contested all elements of the collective memory being created by members of their own community and those outside it.
Memory Studies

The link between memory and history is complex, as the two are not mutually exclusive but rather operate in different manners. Historians often find memory something to push back against due to the way it evolves in the hands of non-historians, who often conflate memory and history. The difficulties in separating history and memory are rooted in our own cultural representations of them. Clio, the muse of history from ancient Greek mythology, is the daughter of Mnemosyne, the titan or goddess of memory. The familial relation in Greek mythology is a good metaphor for how academics understand the relationship between history and memory. They are not the same, yet they share many similar qualities in how they are created and how they are used.

* Historians continue to associate themselves to Clio as seen in the titles of Tim Cook’s book *Clio’s Warriors* or that the British Commission for Military History’s magazine is titled *Mars & Clio* and the peer-reviewed blog on medical history is called *Nursing Clio*. ‘Muse’, Encyclopedia Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Muse-Greek-mythology.
Memory studies have focussed on the formation of group or collective memory. Maurice Halbwachs argues that the creation of memory takes two forms, individual and collective; the two are not separate but are co-dependent. The creation of memory is the negotiation of the individual with the collective; the individual is informed by the collective and chooses either to confirm or deny the collective memory. The result is that the individual uses memory to place themselves into a social group based on the collective interpretation of memory. Jan and Aleida Assmann argue that the creation of individual and collective memory, and the negotiation between them, comes from the cultural influences each develops. The role of culture in the creation of memory is to provide fixed points of understanding, a framework for interpretation.

Memory is the contemporary lens through which the past is viewed, making it elastic and able to be reformed based upon the needs of the present. History, according to Pierre Nora, is to create empirical ‘true memory’ that is controllable for individuals. The nature of history to have a desire for scientific empiricism creates a gulf between history and memory in their joint roles of viewing the past. The rigidity of this ‘scientific history’ denies the role of emotions in creating the elasticity of memory that influences the writing of history. The success or failure of emotional attachments to cultural memory allows certain histories to be prominent in the formation of identities and others to fall away.

---

11 An example of this is seen in the discussion of the Panthenon in Paris and the construction of Republican identity in France. The site was meant to be a site to embody the virtues of Republicanism but failed to attract the attention of the people due to its failure to properly justify the abstract notions of Republican virtue. In comparison to French war memorials of the First World War which were able to express more
The appeal of tradition and nostalgia to individual and collective memory is in its simplicity. The emotional simplicity, purity, and the creation of communal feelings that nostalgia and tradition evoke is appealing in contrast to history, which presents the past as complex, messy, and divisive. Histories that fail to understand the role of emotion in the creation of memory can fall into a nostalgia trap as they deliver memory as history.

The language of memory supports the simplification of history through its ease of access, but it also complicates it through its use of ambiguous symbols. Memorials, a site where memory is physically represented, are easily accessible and highly visible, allowing them to appear as historical truth. Yet they are abstract in their presentation, making them open to interpretation. Understanding the sub-text of the symbols relies upon sociological theories such as semiotics and Foucauldian discourse to determine how complex ideas are simplified for general consumption. The use of such scientific analysis is countered with analysis that seeks to understand the complexity of understanding based on the emotional attachment that the symbols evoke in the context of those interpreting it. Simply using sociological theories to analyse the symbols used to create memory is to buy into a political or popular memory that reveals what the intended memory was, not what the actual memory is. Historians have to resist the simple answers that commemoration and memorials seem to create as they only reinforce the act of

---

remembering the dominant and forgetting the other.\textsuperscript{16} Accepting that multiple interpretations can exist not only between different groups but also between individuals within the same community means that historians of memory must seek to understand how different views of the same event can develop.

**Cultural History of the War**

Historical analysis of the memory of the First World War highlights two interpretations of the war’s cultural legacy. One argues that the war was a watershed moment in history in the shift to modernism. The other takes the stance that the war was a continuation of the past and provoked an evolution that created the modern age after the Second World War. Paul Fussell began the study of the war’s memory through his work *The Great War and Modern Memory*. Fussell was not a historian but a literary scholar who sought to explore the ideas of the war through literature.\textsuperscript{17} Fussell’s work has come under criticism by those who argue against his development of the ironic style used in the literature he studied and his lack of historical context.\textsuperscript{18} Modris Eksteins and Samuel Hynes argue that the war was not the creator of modernism but rather the catalyst that made it dominant. Their work historicized Fussell’s argument that the war created a new means of cultural production. Eksteins argued that the failure of the war to deliver the future for Europe and the breaking of the old cultural ideals served to open the door to modernism, which focused on the individual and was nihilistic, allowing the

development of Nazi culture. Hynes argues in a similar vein in the context of Britain. The war allowed modernism in Britain to come to the fore through its destruction of what was imagined to be possible. Hynes also argues that the war for British culture was not just a clash against German ‘kultur.’ An internal conflict over British culture was waged on the battlefields of Flanders as well as on the home front. The internal conflict in Britain created the memory of the war as a generational conflict. The result was that the next generation, which had no experience with the war came to accept the modernist memory of the war as a break in the cultural production of Britain.

The arguments of Fussell, Eksteins and Hynes were questioned in the works of Jay Winter, Jonathan Vance, and George Mosse, who presented arguments that the war was not understood as a break in culture, but rather a continuation of older traditions. Winter’s work on European memory of the war has come to stand as the most influential text on the memory of the First World War. Winter challenges the argument that the war was a break, instead positing that established modes of remembering were still used and adapted to fit with new mediums and methods for remembering. Through a demographic study of Britain, Winter argues that due to the high percentage of young middle-class and upper-class British male youths who died in the war, the survivors of this group fashioned the memory of the war as one of general devastation to the population. Their position in society as the cultural elites and the highly educated enabled

them to dictate the memory of the war to exclude popular or working-class memory. Jonathan Vance has come to a similar conclusion about the nature of war in Canadian memory, arguing that the memory of the war was used to glorify the nation and create a unified national narrative. In the wake of war-time losses and divisions on the home front in Canada, the memory of the war was presented as an ideal for Canadian citizenship and society through traditional means of remembering. George Mosse argues that the memory of the war was fashioned out of older narratives that saw war as part of the national project to understand and justify what had happened. Mosse focuses on Germany as the myth of the war experience was used most sharply by right-wing elements of society to advance their ideals. Mosse argues that the memory of the war did not create radical right-wing groups or their ideologies, but like Hyne’s and Eskteins’ arguments for modernism, it served to amplify their message and legitimize them.

The Second World War played a massive role in shaping the memory of the First. Both Winter and Mosse argue that the arrival of the second conflict marked the real emergence of modernism in Europe. Sacred, heroic, and traditional imagery was hollow in the face of such hatred and global destruction. Vance argues that in the Canadian context, the Second World War was remembered through the language of the First. The post-war era had a brighter future (thanks to an economic boom), so the second global

---

27 Ibid, pp. 159-181.
conflict was less of a shock to the Canadian national psyche.\textsuperscript{29} Canada’s experience was reflected in Australia and New Zealand as Ken Inglis argues that the current basis of Australian national identity has come from the myth of the ANZAC or Digger ‘mateship’ that was cultivated in the inter-war years of Australia.\textsuperscript{30} In New Zealand, Chris Maclean and Jock Philips argue that the memorials to the first war display both national pride and national grief, while those to the second war were meant to herald the future and potential the war had revealed.\textsuperscript{31}

The difference in post-war memories has continued to play an important role in how historians have written on the memory of the First World War. Many historians have entered their study of the war with biases inherited from their youth or other histories that colour their interpretation of the war. Adrian Gregory in his cultural history of Britain during the war highlights the dangers of such biases influencing many historians in their attempts to understand and explain the actions of the British civilians during the war. Allowing the voices of the past to speak for themselves provides space for an analysis of historical memory and the motivations for why the memorials were constructed the way they were.\textsuperscript{32} Understanding how memory shifts is important for cultural historians, but not at the cost of losing the voices of the subjects being analysed.

National and Transnational Narratives of the War

As mentioned earlier, one constraint on memory studies has been the focus on the nation-state as the frame for analysis. Jay Winter and Antoine Prost in their historiographical review of the First World War argue that the national narratives continue to dominate the histories written about the war.\textsuperscript{33} Winter’s and Prost’s desire to move the field beyond the national narratives of the war arose out their attempt to tell a total history of a total war that encompasses both civilian and military experiences and memories. Their own work is limited in scope as they place priority on the European memory of the war over the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{34} Building on the work of Winter and Prost, Susan Grayzel and Tammy Proctor argue that new histories of the First World War have been transnational and global, evolving from earlier interests of the field. The new direction has been fuelled by the work of historians using other disciplines to explain global issues of race, gender, and politics that developed out of the war.\textsuperscript{35}

It is through the global approach to the war that historians have returned to examine its imperial elements.\textsuperscript{36} John Morrow Jr. argues that the war began due to imperial tensions, with empires contributing to the outbreak of war. The Entente Powers were victorious because they drew on imperial sources of manpower and natural resources that the Central Powers could not match.\textsuperscript{37}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid, pp.152-172.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
between empires but also sparked crises within empires. The interest in imperial aspects of the war is part of a return to imperial history in national historiographies that have previously focussed on decolonization and post-colonial questions. As Amitav Ghosh explains in relation to India, the war had been forgotten because it did not advance the development of Indian nationalism and the independence story. The memory of the war in post-colonial nations has proven not to be useful for present needs. In post-apartheid South Africa, the war is being forgotten as it does little to advance a unified racial community.

Interest in the experiences of non-white combatants in the war often comes from members of the diaspora living in Britain or the Dominions. Their work in commemoration is an attempt to participate in a national ritual that has been dominated by nationalist and white narratives. Historical work is undertaken both to show how their community was involved in the war and to highlight the way systematic racism was used to ensure they remained suppressed as tools for the imperial and colonial governments. David Olusoga’s book highlights different ways the war impacted colonial subjects and how they participated in the war as a way to encourage greater interest in their experiences. Kate Imy’s study of the Indian Army reveals the cultural legacy of British imperialism not just for soldiers, but for Indian society in the years around the First World War. These studies operate within the framework of post-colonial studies as they seek to
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understand the lasting impact of imperialism from the era of the First World War on post-colonial societies.

Increased attention to non-white soldiers came in 2021 when the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC) published the ‘Non-Commemoration Report.’ The report came in the wake of the documentary, *Unremembered-Britain’s Forgotten War Heroes*, which featured British MP David Lammy visiting CWGC graves sites in Africa and revealing that nearly 100,000 soldiers, porters, and others were denied individual graves or were not included on memorials. Lammy meets with historian Michèle Barrett who presents evidence of racist and discriminatory policies from the CWGC archives.

The CWGC’s initial response was to deny charges of racial discrimination, but they set up a special committee to investigate. The findings acknowledged that somewhere between 45,000 and 54,000 soldiers were not commemorated anywhere, and somewhere between 116,000 and 350,000 were not commemorated equally or fairly by the Commission. The report placed responsibility on their workers for not being diligent, not sticking to the Commission’s principles of equality of treatment, and accepting racist thinking in not pursuing commemoration, while also placing responsibility on local imperial officials on whom the Commission relied for logistical support and record-keeping for purposefully leaving out names for commemoration and focusing on white
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soldiers who died in the African campaigns. The CWGC apologised for its historic failings in not commemorating the soldiers and for not acting sooner to correct the mistakes. Since the publication of the report, the CWGC has worked to improve commemoration by searching for names purposefully left out of commemoration and constructing new memorials across Africa to ensure that these individuals are commemorated. The response by the CWGC to the report has seen increased interest from the largest organization responsible for commemoration of the First World War to create a more diverse understanding of the war, helping to ensure greater interest among scholars in individuals outside the European theatres of war.

The white Dominions have, with the exception of South Africa, developed a different interpretation of the war from the rest of the empire, and their interest in the war has remained high since 1918. Mark Sheftall argues that the war came to be remembered differently in the Dominions as part of the progress narrative of the Dominions. Sheftall argues that the cultural narrative of the war needed to have more than just a defence of the imperial state for Dominion society; the Dominions could use the war to defend their advance to full statehood. Britain, on the other hand, failed to deliver a better society and had little to counter the disillusionment within British society. There are issues with Sheftall’s argument as it assumes that the Dominions desired to become fully independent nation-states and leave the imperial project. Studies of the Dominions of Canada,
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Australia, and New Zealand show a high level of imperial rhetoric, counter to Sheftall’s argument. Vance has argued that Canadian soldiers were remembered as symbols of Canada, the ideal colonial citizen-soldier answering the call of the motherland.\textsuperscript{48} Similarly in Australia, Inglis argues that the Australians viewed their soldiers as proving their worth and maturity to Britain.\textsuperscript{49} In the construction of New Zealand memorials, Maclean and Phillips argue that they were conveying the message of national and imperial pride in their service and sacrifices.\textsuperscript{50} Hanna Smyth in her Ph.D. dissertation demonstrates that even within the imperial organization of the Imperial War Graves Commission (IWGC) that all the nations bought into, divergences existed; these highlight how imperial co-operation was driven by shared goals but was also full of contests.\textsuperscript{51}

The official memories developed in the Dominions replicated imperial memories of non-white contributors to the war effort. Steve Marti in his study of voluntary mobilization during the war argues that colonial structures were used by the Dominions during the war to maintain control of indigenous populations and ensure that British settlers remained dominant. By doing so, British settlers were able to monopolize the economy of sacrifice, guaranteeing that their service was provided in a way that reinforced their power and legitimacy of the colonial state.\textsuperscript{52} The monopolization of sacrifice by British settlers in the Dominions can be seen in the exclusionary policies of the IWGC in the years after the war. Fewer memorials were erected to or by members of
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\textsuperscript{52} Steve Marti, \textit{For Home and Empire: Voluntary Mobilization in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand during the First World War}, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019), pp. 3-14.
minority ethnic groups in the empire. The memorials examined in this dissertation reflect the monopolizing of sacrifice as only a handful of memorials were not dedicated to Anglo-Celtic war dead across all the nations. Evidence of non-white soldiers serving in units exist, but due to their small number the majority of memorials display the way white British populations viewed the war and their service in it.

**Imperial Identity and Commonwealth History**

The IWGC commemoration of soldiers reflected the institution’s conception of a shared imperial identity that included the Dominions, and that associated Britishness with whiteness. The efforts and ideology of the IWGC was consistent with the work of other individuals and groups to perpetuate ties and to assert a shared identity at a time when discrete national identities were taking shape in the Dominions. The personal memorials reflect the conflicting identities of the Dominions with British imperial identity during this period. The memorials demonstrate the way cultural memories and symbols reinforced a shared Britishness across the Empire.

Before the war, the importance of cultural ties was advanced by British thinkers like Richard Jebb, who promoted imperial federation as the basis for any future co-operation between Britain and the Dominions. Cultural ties between the Dominions and Britain extended to a more practical level beyond political ties. Along with letter-writing and migration, other kinds of connections between the Dominions and Britain reveal the strong ties that linked them. Simon Potter argued that while imperial federation was a
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political decision, the cultural ties in the empire were strengthened by commercial interests in communications and the press. New technologies increased rather than decreased the spread of imperial identity.\(^\text{54}\) Tamson Pietsch came to similar conclusions when examining imperial links between universities across the empire. Pietsch argues that universities in the Dominions willingly established connections with institutions in Britain, allowing for the exchange of ideas and people between them. Academics in the Dominions were able to influence Britain with their own research and ideas.\(^\text{55}\) Pietsch concludes that the British identity and worldview promulgated by academics was exclusionary and much like the ideas about who was British, it emphasized white men with Anglo-Celtic middle or upper-class backgrounds. Pietsch argues that the universities symbolized the ideal of what the empire should be, not what it was in reality.\(^\text{56}\) The power of these cultural ties extended beyond the Second World War, as Antony Hopkins argues; the break between Britain and the Dominions took place in the 1950s and 1960s during the period of decolonization. Hopkins argues the racial ties that bound the Dominions to Britain were no longer compatible with decolonization, just as the maintenance of Britishness with imperialism was no longer beneficial for the Dominions.\(^\text{57}\)

The struggles to bind the Dominions and Britain together were not confined to the politicians and the political philosophers of the period. Expressions of national and imperial identities can be seen within war memorials. The examination of personal memorials in this dissertation provides a glimpse into the ways individuals, some with


strong ties to the political and social elites of British imperial society, and others from working-class backgrounds, viewed their place within the empire. Individuals replicated and propagated ideas about imperial citizenship and used the memorials to help present their understanding of imperial relations. To be able to understand how these memorials reflect the complexity of attitudes towards the empire, we must know how to read memorials.

**Interpretation of Memorials**

Community memorials, and the rituals surrounding them, are gateways to the emotional response to national memory. Alex King argues that memorials in Great Britain could unite social classes through their sentiment and lack of overt nationalism, allowing them to be built with elite language and with popular support. Memorials are not static symbols, and their ambiguous nature and varied interpretations allows them to become accepted and normalized as part of the cultural landscape. Angela Gaffney makes similar arguments about the use of memorials in Wales. They were similar to those in the rest of the United Kingdom as they also did not display significant signs of Welsh nationalism and were designed by the leaders of the community to meet the perceived needs of their community. In Northern Ireland, Catherine Switzer notes that the design
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of memorials showed little difference from mainland Britain and were not nationalist (or unionist in the context of Northern Ireland) in their language.\textsuperscript{63} The argument that memorials filled the needs of the communities that constructed them is not disputed, but the nature of the memorials as tools of propaganda for nationalism certainly is. King argues that memorials by their means of construction are inherently political symbols for they require political power and influence to be built.\textsuperscript{64} In France the political power of the memorial was seen through the links of the citizen to the republic.\textsuperscript{65} The result has been that French memorials exposed heroic ideals of glory as something that can be obtained in comparison to British memorials that has glory attached to the dead.\textsuperscript{66}

The display of national heroism was couched in symbols of Christianity as a means to associate glory with the dead. Inglis argues that Australian memorials were constructed to be holy ground and to inspire religious emotions of fear, wonder, and awe.\textsuperscript{67} Vance contends that the Canadian soldier was depicted as Christ, allowing the dead to be understood as sacrificing themselves for the greater good of society.\textsuperscript{68} Alan Borg holds that the use of religious symbolism was not new in the commemoration process. Christian imagery of martyrs, sacrifices, and Christ’s defeat of death have been staples of European constructions of the memory of war for centuries.\textsuperscript{69} Where it has shifted with the First World War has been in the national memory shifting from the great
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people of history, to the common person who stood in as a generic figure for the collective whole.\textsuperscript{70} The construction of the memorial as representing all people has allowed it to retain an ambiguity that has enabled it to remain popular with multiple groups in society.

National memorials are interpreted as the most political of memorials due to the dominance of government figures in their construction. Historians have challenged this simplification of national memory creation. Laura Wittman in her study of Unknown Soldiers argued that these sites of memory represent ‘anti-monument monuments’ in their creation of a new form of remembering while also recreating old forms of mourning.\textsuperscript{71} The memorial allowed for all the missing war dead to be represented in a single memorial, so that the grief and mourning of individuals and the nation could be enacted.\textsuperscript{72} At the same time, the memorial is able to evoke empathy from those without any dead as it displays the horrors of modern warfare through the image of mass death, the anonymity of modern war, and its physical rather than abstract presentation.\textsuperscript{73} The symbols surrounding the Unknown Soldiers allow it to take on the standing of a national memorial. For the British, the use of oak from Hampton Court and the crusader sword placed in the casket evoked the memory of medieval honour, bravery, and legend.\textsuperscript{74}

While Europeans used nostalgia for their national memorials, new nations such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand had few historical narratives upon which to draw for their national memorials. Their response was to mix their emerging national identity with
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the older imperial identity inherited from Britain. The national memorials of both Europe and the Dominions created an exclusive image of citizenship that not everyone could see themselves in. Due to their inability to participate in the war fully, non-British ethnic groups have different interpretations of national memorials. In the Dominions, British settlers were neighbours, displacers, and colonizers to Native populations, who have seen their places in the war hidden from national memory. As the war was used to help construct national myths, these communities are missing from the national narrative of citizenship.

Historians have argued that the location of the memorials contributes to their political power as well as their use in society. Stefan Goebel notes that the placement of the British Unknown Soldier in Westminster Abbey used the medieval imagery of the Abbey with knights and kings buried around him, a British Valhalla, to reinforce the image of bravery, sacrifice, and national heroics upon the dead. In France, the Unknown Soldier was buried under the Arc de Triomphe, thereby associating the dead with the glories of French military victories. The placement of memorials in central locations for local communities made them visible to people in their daily lives and turned them into traditional markers of civic life. Jenny Macleod argues that location plays a key role in expressions of national and imperial identity as seen in the construction of the national
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memorials across Great Britain.\textsuperscript{80} The placement of memorials can help reinforce or marginalize those who use the memorials.

The location of memorials is connected to the way they were used and the value they are seen to have. Memorials placed in public locations that are easily accessible become integrated into civic life. Others placed in buildings can provide important sentimental attachments and allow different forms of commemoration to take place. Mourning the loss of an individual can be performed in different ways but each is shaped by where the memorial is located. Those located in churches lean towards spirituality as a key component, while those in parks are more secular for they allow the public to engage in any rituals. Memorials erected in cemeteries next to other family member’s tombs demonstrate the importance of tradition and family. Finally, a memorial that has been moved to a museum no longer holds the same sentimental value as those that remain in churches.

\textbf{Veterans, Widows, and the General Public}

The placement of memorials was dictated by the wishes of those who built them rather than the desires of dead. It was the living, either their friends, family, or others, who built the memorials for their needs. Understanding how families, veterans, and other social groups reacted to the war helps demonstrate the importance of personal memorials. It is the memory of the memorial builders, not the war dead, that this dissertation examines. The personal memorials represent how individuals tried to shape the history and memory of the war they experienced with the death of loved ones.

Winter and Prost argue there have been three generations of historians of memory. The first were those who lived through the war: the veterans and the parents of the dead constructed histories that sought to understand the war as they experienced it. The second was in those who experienced the Second World War and attempted to place the war in the context of their conflict. Their use of social history and Marxist historiography for the common man was encouraged by the last veterans and new forms of media. The third was historians of the cultural turn as Marxist historiography fell from favour; they desired to see the war as part of the larger history of the twentieth century, particularly in the creation of the modern world.\(^\text{81}\) Other historians have worked to shape the memory of the war in each generation; Winter and Prost simply identify the most dominant historians and their ideological and theoretical approaches to the war. This dissertation is situated in the third group of historians, as part of the cultural history of the twentieth century. The focus, however, though is on the first group, the veterans and parents of the dead who created memorials as a record of their memory of the war. It is this group that we must examine to understand what influenced their memories.

Veterans have played a far greater role in the creation of the memory of the war than historians. Daniel Todman argues that the veterans as first-hand witnesses to history wielded the voice of truth and authority in their recollections. Todman argues that veterans’ memory of the war shifted over time as they were confronted with the contemporary needs of British society and the popular perceptions of the war.\(^\text{82}\) Stephane Audoin-Rouzeau and Annette Becker observe that veterans’ continued influence on the memory of the war has created a dilemma for historians. Rather than serving as the
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makers of true memory, historians have become trapped by a ‘tyranny of the witness’ in veterans as they fought to control the memory of the war. Winter and Prost agree that historians with no lived experience of war were only able to enter the field as voices of authority as the number of veterans declined, and the archives were opened. Audoin-Rouzeau and Becker argue that the war has only just started to be historicized due to the declining power of the veterans’ voices to create the memory of the war around victimization through the violence, the sentiment of participation, and the mourning of the war. Veterans’ actions in trying to shape the memory of the war have served to minimize others memories.

The focus on veterans over the families of the dead has created a gulf in understanding the memory of the war. Erika Kuhlman argues that war widows have been marginalized in the formation of the memory of the war due to the masculinity associated with war. The image of war as a male domain has left women on the side-lines as the memory of the war was constructed around the violent deaths rather than female grief. Joy Damousi’s study of Australian war widows advances this argument in studying the formation of organizations to defend the rights of widows to be part of the official memory of wars. They demanded recognition for sacrificing their husbands for the nation. Suzanne Evans’ study of the mothers of war dead places them in a hierarchy of grief above the widows. Her argument that mothers have been designated as the chief

mourners came from religion and was meant to display the best virtues for which men and women should strive, and which nations later appropriated. Evans and Kuhlman display the role women have in the memory process as living symbols of the cost of the war and the ideals of sacrifice for the nation. These historians all argue that grieving women in society were placed in abstract categories for national purposes.

The association of women with abstract ideals of sacrifice and service was born out of the memory of the violence in war as being primarily inflicted on male bodies in combat. Audoin-Rouzeau and Becker argue that the violence enacted upon (civilians constructed as primarily female) was regarded as less significant or powerful than the horrors of the battlefields and was overshadowed by the even greater number of civilian deaths coming out of the Second World War. In the teaching of the narratives of female involvement in the war, Todman argues that in Britain the memoirs of Vera Brittain stand as the feminine balance to the male war poets. Her experiences as a nurse and as a grieving fiancée and sister allowed her story to emphasize the male experience of war in a simplified manner. The focus on teaching Brittain and the war poets is not to deliver a nuanced view of the war but rather give a single voice to the war by providing a personal connection to the audience for their understanding. In this process, women’s memories of the war has been oversimplified and marginalized to deliver uniform collective memories.

The focus on individual experiences in the war represents a new direction for research into the First World War. Todman argues that the recent wave of interest has
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been driven by a desire to establish a personal connection to the war through museums and genealogy. The war as an event impacting everyone makes manifest the need for ‘real’ experiences that generate an empathetic regarding a distant relative who could have experienced the war.\(^91\) The Imperial War Museum’s First World War gallery is part of the growing trend to remember the war through individuals and the shared experiences of war.\(^92\) Attempts to understand how individuals interpreted the war has revealed the need to move away from conventional and regularly examined historical artifacts and documents. Italian historian Vanda Wilcox examined the various memories of the war in Rome during the inter-war years, revealing a divergence of thought and actions from Roman citizens to the Fascist Party. Wilcox based these conclusions on the cemeteries and memorials to the First World War.\(^93\) Ann-Marie Foster used bureaucratic paperwork to explore the way the individuals’ memories and experiences of the war were shaped by the state’s logistics of recording the war dead.\(^94\) This dissertation seeks to follow Wilcox’s and Foster’s use of under-studied material objects to understand how individuals interpreted the war. My work, in examining the social and cultural history of personal commemoration, strives to understand the relationship between people, society, and memory.

Mourning and Death Practices

Individuals mourning is central to this dissertation. The violence of death in war altered the way individuals comprehended death in their lives. Pat Jalland identifies the First World War as one of two major events that changed the understanding of death in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The other was the demographic shifts of the nineteenth century that saw a shrinking death rate and a higher life expectancy. The decline in the death rate over the nineteenth and into the twentieth century helped make the First World War a more traumatic experience. The elaborate Victorian and Edwardian death customs of bedside farewells, burials, and mourning rituals, rooted in the Anglican Evangelical movement, were on the decline by 1914. The massive casualties ensured the end to these rituals and the reshaping of how British society dealt with death. Jalland’s research is exclusively focused on the upper and middle-class families. Julie-Marie Strange examined working-class mourning, arguing that studies of death need to move beyond themes of consumerism and respectability to understand how the working-classes dealt with death. Strange argues that economic realities forced the working-classes to perform the emotional and sentimental effects of grief without the elaborate displays of mourning. The importance of social customs and rituals in dictating how individuals responded to death was evident in working-class families who used them for their needs. While death was expressed differently between social classes, social conventions spread to provide examples for individuals to follow.

One of the key points in Victorian mourning rituals was the concept of the ‘good death.’ The idea of the ‘good death’ came from medieval Christianity’s concept of the ‘ars morendi’, that at death a person’s soul was either saved or damned. Evangelicalism of the nineteenth century, which was focused on redemption through faith in Christ’s sacrifice, led many people to view the ‘good death’ as a deathbed confession, atonement, and acceptance of their faith. Ideally the ‘good death’ was long enough to allow the person and their family and friends to begin a pre-grieving process and reconciliation with God so that their peaceful passing also contained joy at the knowledge that they were saved.97 A ‘bad death’ by contrast was when a person died suddenly, violently, or through suicide. This manner of death hurt the family as it limited their ability to mourn and to believe that their loved one had found atonement at the moment of their death.

Notions of the ‘good death’ were not limited to the elites of British society. The Evangelical movement in the United States embraced the concept of the ‘good death’, although it was challenged with the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861. Drew Gilpin Faust argued that soldiers on both sides and from all classes desired a ‘good death.’ For the families the concept of the ‘good death’ shifted as soldiers did not have the peaceful death that it demanded. Families looked for comfort that the deaths of their loved ones were instead swift, that little pain was experienced, and that they died doing their duty acting with bravery.98 Faust points to attempts throughout the war by civilians, particularly women, to maintain some semblance of funerary mourning through the emphasis on returning the bodies home. Even with the establishment of national cemeteries, families

97 Jalland, Death in the Victorian Family, pp. 17-38.
were willing to pay for the transportation of bodies home, so that they could mourn according to social convention.⁹⁹

Studies of the First World War have only alluded to the ‘good death’, with few scholars discussing it directly. Historians have interpreted the wartime analogies of Christ-like sacrifices and support from the pulpits as displaying the importance of religion to understanding the conflict.¹⁰⁰ Religion continued to play a vital role in how individuals attempted to comprehend death during and after the war. While some elaborate Victorian rituals did not survive the war, others did, because women were reluctant to give up their social role in mourning during the inter-war period. They continued to advocate for the public mourning of the war dead even though they were side-lined in the large national commemorative projects. It was not the First World War, but the Second World War in England that saw a greater shift in mourning practices. The move to mourn privately instead of publicly came with post-war beliefs in the English “stiff-upper lip” in the face of loss and hardship.¹⁰¹ Jalland’s studies on mourning reveal that the inter-war period was a moment of transition in British mourning customs. By studying personal memorials, we can see the legacy of Victorian mourning culture interacting with new commemorative concepts in the national projects. The vital role of women in the maintenance of mourning rituals can be traced in the erection of personal memorials.

The desire to understand emotional responses to the war has pushed historical analysis of the war and mourning forward. Joy Damousi’s examination of mourning and
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memory in Australia after the First and Second World Wars argues that mourning practices were diverse, personal, and gendered as the reaction by mourners to the death was dictated by their relationship to the deceased. Damousi’s study is an attempt to reveal the emotional impact of war deaths on the bereaved, because such emotions have often been subsumed into the national and collective narratives of commemoration.\footnote{Joy Damousi, \textit{The Labour of Loss: Mourning, Memory and Wartime Bereavement in Australia}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 1-8.} Richard van Emden similarly focuses on the war’s emotional and psychological legacies for descendants dealing with the impact of a family member’s death even if they had never met that person.\footnote{Richard van Emden, \textit{The Quick and the Dead: Fallen Soldiers and Their Families in the Great War}, (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), pp. 1-8.} Ann-Marie Foster further explores how individuals dealt with the emotional losses of the war as they were confronted with the bureaucracy of death and mourning. Each of these historians uses personal memory to uncover different conceptions of the war and reactions to death in the conflict. By examining personal memorials, this dissertation will expand on their arguments by exploring the variations in mourning, remembrance, and commemoration in private memory.

**Terminology**

Collective memory and private memory are two concepts that require definition. For Maurice Halbwachs, collective memory is the memory of society or the community, while private is the memory of the individual. Jason Myers breaks collective memory down further into four different categories, official, vernacular, organizational, and scholarly, to describe the ways different groups within a collective have different
memories. The division of memory into these categories helps to explain the variances in actions and commemorative practices. Private memory has not been broken down into the same categorization. Instead, private memory has remained attached to the definition of Halbwachs as most historians have focused on defining collective instead of private memory.

This dissertation is focused on private memory, using memorials created to commemorate individual war deaths. The attention of these memorials was on a person, and the memory being examined belongs to those who commissioned the memorials as they helped design and paid for them. These memorials exhibit private memory instead of collective memory as community-built memorials required negotiation and the resources of a large group of people. While studies have shown that the creation of community memorials was not always a democratic process, the solicitation of funds and input into the design of memorials highlights how these memorials were reflective of collective memories.

As this dissertation examines private memory, personal memorials, and the actions of individuals it is important that the use of these three terms are laid out. Throughout the dissertation, the word ‘private’ will be applied to the memory, the word ‘personal’ will be used to describe the memorials, and the word ‘individual’ describes the actions of the creator of the memorial. These words will not be used interchangeably to ensure clarity. Alongside these terms, others such as official, collective, and community

105 Money is often the easiest example, but Catherine Switzer highlights the importance of names and the debates over whose name was included or excluded from memorials as being very contentious. Catherine Switzer, Unionists and Great War Commemoration in the North of Ireland: 1914-1939: People, Places and Politics, (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 2007), pp. 120-131.
need to be explained. These terms are focused on society rather than the individual and speak to different ways collective memory was expressed or represented. Official memory describes governments and political parties that worked to create a collective memory for their political needs. Collective memory is used in the dissertation to highlight the memory advanced by public memorials; these are the memories that society has agreed to express and what many histories of memorials speak of. ‘Community’ is used to describe sections of society that identify as a group representing part of the nation. Communities can be formed based on shared religious or ethnic identities as well as shared geographic spaces and other common factors.

Although every effort has been made to learn who created these personal memorials, there are times when it is not clear. Demographic research suggests that certain family members were involved in the creation of the memorial due to their residence in the location of the memorial. Determining who created the memorial can be as complex as finding out who the memorial commemorates. The memorial to Samuel Henry Courtney in Christ Church Cathedral in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, demonstrates the difficulty of finding the creator. The memorial is a cabinet built to hold regimental flags with a small plaque reading, ‘This cabinet for Vancouver’s Regimental Colours is a gift of the Rix Family Foundation in memory of Staff Sergeant Master Samuel Henry Courtney service # 30149 3rd Division, Trained Canadian Army Service Corp. Died: October 4, 1917. La Targett British Cemetery, Vimy Ridge.’

The memorial was gifted to the cathedral by the Rix Family Foundation, a private charity
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created by Dr Donald Rix, a leading British Columbia doctor, and is run by his daughter Laurie Rix after he passed away in 2009.107 His wife Eleanor was the daughter of Cecil and Eleanor Etta Horne née Courtney, who was the step-daughter of Samuel Henry Courtney.108 Eleanor Etta was born in 1905 to parents Edward Everton Enfield and Mary Grant in Quebec. Her father was a soldier in the Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery and died in 1908 of tuberculosis.109 Her mother remarried Samuel who was a fellow soldier in the Canadian military. By the start of the First World War the family had moved to London, Ontario.110 Eleanor took her stepfather’s last name and grew up in Ontario after he died in the war. The naming of Samuel on the regimental colour cabinet was done by the family to continue the remembrance of his life long after his death. The Samuel Courtney memorial provides a thread through which to explore who created the memorial, but other memorials have no identifying markers or clear evidence as to who erected them and why.

The use of the term ‘personal memorial’ needs more clarification due to the locations of the memorials being examined. The memorials examined were not designed to be hidden or solely used for private purposes. The placement of memorials in public spaces like parks, schools, and churches ensures that they can be viewed by more than

108 ‘Rix-Horne Wedding At St. John’s Church,’ The Vancouver Sun, July 14th, 1958, p. 28; Registration of Death Province of British Columbia for Horne, Eleanor, Royal BC Archives, Registration Number 1974-09-003621.
109 Quebec Church Records Anglican Saint Matthew’s Church, Baptism of Eleanor Etta Enfield, Drouin Collection, Institut Genealogique Drouin; Soldiers of the South African War Land Grant Applications for Edward Enfield, LAC RG 38 Vol 125 Grant 4129.
110 In the 1911 census, the family was still living in Quebec and Samuel was listed as being a soldier. On his enlistment papers he lists his wife as next of kin and that they are living in London Ontario and he is a clerk. Census of Canada, 1911 S H Courtney, LAC RG 31-C-1, District 189 Quebec, Sub-District 9 Montcalm West; Canadian Expeditionary Force Personnel Files, Samuel H Courtney no. 30149, LAC RG 150 Box 2053.
just their creators. The creation of shrines and memorials within homes was a regular occurrence after the First World War, using personal mementos, photographs, or military decorations that could be put on display. These memorials have either been lost to time, remain in the hands of the families, or have filtered into museums for preservation and posterity. The growing interest in these ephemera that survived the war and the decades of living on mantles, in attics, or in cabinets are of interest to historians of material culture. This dissertation examines memorials that exist outside the home, in areas where they can be seen by the public. These are not private memorials as they were not designed to be hidden from view, but they are also not for collective remembrance.

Not all the memorials are fully public. Those located in parks or other outdoor spaces are open to the public and were designed to be publicly accessible. The majority of the memorials are not located outside but are in buildings that are not fully. The two largest locations for personal memorials, schools and churches, had a particular public. Schools are primarily the preserve of the children enrolled in the institution. Adults, even alumni of the school, are rarely allowed access to the site in daily life. Churches are also reserved for members of the congregation for regular use. They are designed as places of worship, meaning that people of other faiths or denominations rarely enter outside of special occasions. Memorials in these institutions exist on the borders of the private and the public, accessible but still restricted. The place of these memorials between private
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and public means that they are excellent sources to engage with how private and collective memories interact.

Building the Database: Registers of War Memorials\textsuperscript{113}

For this project I needed to use online resources to locate war memorials that were erected privately to commemorate individuals. Government websites and registers were useful because typically they have sufficient funding for fact-checking to ensure the accuracy of the data. The registers were searched for memorials that were dedicated to a single person or a small group of people connected by family or friendship. Identifying these personal memorials required examination of the title of the memorial in the register, the text, and (where possible) a photograph. Memorials built by families were included, as were those built by friends. In cases where it was not clear who built the memorial, if it was commemorating one person it was included, but if more than one person was named, the relationship between those named was examined. In cases where it was clear that the people being commemorated knew each other as friends or family, the memorial was included. If there was no clear link between them other than they lived in the same place,

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{Image3.jpg}
\caption{Memorial Flag Cabinet to Samuel Henry Courtney in Christ Church Cathedral, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{113} Much of the research of this section was used and distributed in a paper for the International Society for First World War Studies conference in 2021.
the memorial was not included. If the memorial’s character was ambiguous, then it was simply excluded. The dedicatory text of the memorial often clearly articulated if it was designed as a personal or a community memorial. Community memorials clearly identified that the names listed were part of a group even if they only named a handful of people. The database is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather it is generally representative of the memorials that exist.

A factor that was considered in building my database was the date of the memorial’s construction. To limit the dissertation to only individuals with a lived experience of the war, memorials were chosen based on when they were built. Many of the memorials did not provide a date of construction and only a handful had any reports in newspapers on their unveiling. The majority of the memorials were constructed or ordered either during or just after the war with most of the memorials in the database built between 1915 and 1939. An example is the Ottawa Window in St Bartholomew’s Church in Ottawa, Canada. Ordered in May 1917 by the Governor General of Canada, the Duke of Connaught, to commemorate ten men who had worked for him, the window was not completed until May 1919 and was unveiled on November 9\textsuperscript{th}, 1919.\textsuperscript{114} The length of time to build the memorial demonstrates that individuals began thinking about personal commemoration during the war. Due to the ambiguities in records, there may be some memorials in the database that were built decades after the war by individuals who did not live through the war.

The centenary of the First World War has seen governments and museums take a greater interest in the commemoration process. The influx of government resources has

produced registers of war memorials in their country. The registers vary by country, but they all provide the same basic information in the form of memorial details, location, and verification of its existence. The level of detail is different per registry. The Imperial War Museum’s War Memorial Register is the largest of the memorial registers. Established in 1989 as the United Kingdom’s National Inventory of War Memorials, by 2009 it had recorded roughly 60,000 war memorials across the United Kingdom, the Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man.\textsuperscript{115} Renamed the War Memorial Register in 2014 the database was updated for the centenary of the First World War. The growth of the War Memorial Register with greater digital literacy amongst the public has seen the number of memorials in the register grow exponentially. In December 2022, the register has 99,452 memorials listed, of which 66,454 are memorials to the First World War.\textsuperscript{116} Run by the Imperial War Museum, the register is primarily updated by verified volunteers from around the United Kingdom. Volunteers confirm the location of the memorial, along with the designs of the memorial and any text on it. Many of the memorials in the register have photographs, but not all. Anyone can contribute to the register by providing a photograph, but only those who have been accepted as Imperial War Museum volunteers can update, remove, or add new memorials to the register.

The Canadian Military Memorials Database, formerly the National Inventory of Canadian Memorials, is run by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Formed as part of its remembrance services, the database lists over 7,500 memorials in Canada.\textsuperscript{117}


\textsuperscript{116} These numbers were recorded on December 14\textsuperscript{th}, 2022. The filter for the First World War was applied to see the number of memorials in the register to the conflict. \url{https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/search}

\textsuperscript{117} Canadian Military Memorials Database, \url{https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/memorials/national-inventory-canadian-memorials?session}. 
database is open to public contribution at any time, though a photograph of the memorial is required to contribute. The database is designed for the exploration of memorials in geographic locations. Memorials are only filtered by province or territory, the municipality, and a general keyword search. The database needs updating as it is clear large swaths of the country are not represented. The need for more research can be seen when comparing the number of memorials amongst the provinces of Canada. Ontario has 3,125 memorials listed while Nova Scotia has 853, British Columbia has 839, and Quebec has 820. Demographics and regional histories can provide an explanation for the lack of memorials identified outside of Ontario, but one consistent element is the need for volunteers to record the memorials. Quebec’s relationship with the memory of war, particularly the First World War as an ‘English’ war, continues to discourage remembrance.\footnote{For more information on Quebec’s memory of the war see, Mourad Djebabla-Brun, \textit{Se Souvenir de la Grande Guerre: La Memoire Plurielle de 14-18 au Quebec}, (Montreal: VLB Editeur, 2004).}

The database is capable of showcasing memorials and tracing the memory of the war in Canada, but other sources are needed to support any research. One valuable tool from the Department of Veterans Affairs is the Canadian Virtual War Memorial. The memorial lists the names of over 118,000 individuals who have given their lives whilst in uniform since Confederation.\footnote{Canadian Virtual War Memorial, \url{https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/Remembrance/memorials/canadian-virtual-war-memorial}.} It uses the names from the Books of Remembrance where over 120,000 individuals are listed, and the memorial is the digitization of seven of the eight books.\footnote{The eighth book for the War of 1812 was commissioned most recently in 2012 and has yet to be added to the virtual war memorial. History of the \textit{Books of Remembrance}, \url{https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/Remembrance/memorials/books/history}.} The Books of Remembrance first began as a national memorial to the First World War. The virtual memorial has more details on individuals named as
Canadians are invited to include biographical details and photos. These photos often include memorials they are named on, including those not in the Canadian Military Memorials Database. An example is the memorial to Arnold Logan, a Private in the 1st Canadian Infantry who was killed on April 26th, 1916. A member of the Musee-Delaware Nation, a statue of him in uniform was erected in the St George’s Churchyard in Lower Muncy, Ontario. Photos of his memorial were uploaded to his page on the Canadian Virtual War Memorial. The memorial is not on the Canadian Military Memorials Database. Considering Arnold Logan was one of the few Indigenous soldiers to serve on the front lines of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, his memorial represents an important marker of memory.

In New Zealand, a list of memorials in the country was undertaken by NZ History. Created in 1999, NZ History strives to create history content that is more accessible to New Zealanders by combining primary sources from Archives New Zealand, analysis from professional historians, and curriculum lessons from teachers. The site functions as part of the Research and Publishing Group in the Ministry for Culture and Heritage of the New Zealand government. One of its major databases, the Memorial Register was created to locate and inform visitors about memorials across New Zealand. Not specifically geared to war memorials, the first memorials to be recorded on the register included memorials to the First and Second World Wars, along with the New Zealand

---

122 Information about this website Page 2-About this site, NZ History, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/about-this-site.
Wars and the South African War. The smallest of all the databases being explored, the Memorials Register currently records over 1,000 memorials.

A common denominator in the databases of the United Kingdom, Canada, and New Zealand is their origin in the First World War which in each of these nations, provided the incentive to create registries of memorials. The Imperial War Museum first tried to record war memorials around Britain and the Empire, including battlefield memorials, shortly after the end of the First World War. An exhibit in 1925 showcased thousands of photographs and models of war memorials to visitors of the museum. The Books of Remembrance which serve as the basis for the Canadian Virtual War Memorial began after the First World War. They were originally intended to be part of the national memorial to the war and new books were created for later and earlier wars in Canadian history. For New Zealand, the first register included in the Memorials Register was from the work of Jock Phillips and Chris Maclean who created a list of 453 public First World War memorials for their book, The Sorrow and the Pride: New Zealand War Memorials.

The Australian memorial register is the most recent to be developed. Created by the Australian War Memorial, Places of Pride was announced in November 2018 and

---

became active a year later. Since its creation, it has grown rapidly, quickly surpassing 10,000 memorials in the register. Primarily focused on memorials in Australia, the register does include several outside of the country that were created by Australian forces abroad. When I began this dissertation the Places of Pride website had just come online and was sparse. To find an adequate number of Australian memorials, registers established by various state governments and other organizations were examined. In New South Wales, the state library and branches of the Returned and Services Leagues started the registry in 2002; it currently features over 3,000 memorials. The state of Victoria created its own war memorial inventory as well, run by the Heritage Council Victoria as part of the Victorian Heritage Database. The state of South Australia and the territory of Western Australia supported a registry website set up by the Returned and Services League of South Australia. The site became the Virtual War Memorial Australia (VWMA) and continues to have the support of South Australia. The Queensland War Memorial Register was created by the state government in 2009 and is run by the department of public works along with the Returned and Services League of Queensland. Its more than 1,300 memorials are searchable by location. The Tasmania war memorial register was started in 1996 when the state hired Fred Thornett to conduct a physical survey of the state’s war memorials. Thornett’s four-volume book is currently available

---


131 To search only the war memorial register, you must do an advance search and type war memorial inventory into the heritage listings box: https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/.


through the Tasmania State Library online. It provides basic information on the memorials but has no photographs.\textsuperscript{134} Many of Thornett’s findings are being added to the Places of Pride registry. The territory of North Australia has no register but is featured in the VWMA as it shifted to include more memorials across the country.

In Ireland, the Inventory of Irish War Memorials has been operating since 2004 to provide a database covering both the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland. The inventory is unique amongst all the registries as it is the only privately-run registry. Created by Michael Pegum, the site has continued to grow on the strength of volunteer contributions.\textsuperscript{135} The database so far has recorded 713 sites with 1,298 memorials.\textsuperscript{136} The Inventory of Irish War Memorials is the only registry that overlaps with another, the Imperial War Museums War Memorials Register. The overlap only occurs in Northern Ireland and reveals the degree to which both of these registers are incomplete. Memorials in the Inventory of Irish War Memorials are not in the War Memorials Register and vice-versa. There is overlap, but the fact that some memorials are in one and not the other highlights the continuing process of recording these memorials for posterity and research. These databases must always be used with the knowledge that they are never comprehensive but provide a pool of data for research.


\textsuperscript{135} Using This Site, Irish War Memorials, http://www.irishwarmemorials.ie/using-this-website.

\textsuperscript{136} As of June 10\textsuperscript{th}, 2021, Home Page, Irish War Memorials, http://www.irishwarmemorials.ie/.
Building the Database: Recording the Data

Using each of the national registers I built a database of specific information from personal memorials. The memorial location included the town or city, along with the building or institution it was located in. If the register provided an address, it was included to ensure the location could be found accurately on a map. Along with the location, the design of the memorial was recorded. The design was a simple categorization of the memorial such as plaque, stained-glass window, park, organ, stone of remembrance and others. The text of the memorial was recorded to allow for an analysis of the language used. If no inscription was included or could not be found in the registry, a brief description of the memorial was included. By collecting this data on personal memorials, I was able to build a qualitative base to find patterns in the design, messages, and location of memorials.

The memorials provided the start to researching demographic information needed to analyze the individuals being commemorated and those doing the commemorating. The demographic information identified military details and details about their pre-war life including rank, unit served with, date of death, birthdate, age at death, birthplace, date enlisted, address upon enlistment, pre-war occupation, previous military service, next of kin, and religious affiliation. Many of the memorials record some of this information, but they are not always accurate. To confirm details each individual was entered into the CWGC database of war dead. The CWGC archive has digitized the burial, concentration, and headstone records of every individual commemorated in its cemeteries and on the memorials to the missing. From the CWGC the location of the cemetery where
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137 Commonwealth War Graves Commission war dead database: https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/.
the individuals were buried or the memorial on which they are listed was recorded along with any personal inscription.

To confirm the demographic information, the service files of the soldiers were located. The national archives of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom digitized the service files as part of the growing interest in genealogy and the First World War. Access to the files varied by nation. Library and Archives Canada only completed the full digitization of First World War service files in 2018, coinciding with the centenary of the war.\textsuperscript{138} The National Archive of Australia and Archives New Zealand both had the service files put on earlier as part of the remembrance of the First World War.\textsuperscript{139} For these three nations the service files were free to access and download.

However, British service files presented greater limitations. The destruction of British service files during the Second World War limited the ability to confirm demographic information. The records office was damaged during the Blitz of London when the storage facilities housing the service files was hit. Nearly two-thirds of the service files were destroyed by fire or damaged by water. The files, known as the Burned Documents, were first micro-filmed and digitized.\textsuperscript{140} The Burned Documents cover enlisted men, but they are in better condition than the service files for officers. The service files of officers were badly damaged or lost in the same bombing attack in 1940, but surviving records were also culled during the 1940s by army staff members, leaving

\textsuperscript{138} Information on the resources that Library and Archives Canada have, including the service files can be found here: https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/military-heritage/first-world-war/Pages/introduction.aspx.
\textsuperscript{139} For Australia, the sight has resources here, including the service files: https://www.naa.gov.au/explore-collection/defence-and-war-service-records. For New Zealand, the resources and service files can be found here: https://www.archives.govt.nz/find-a-record/world-war-one-service-records.
\textsuperscript{140} The Burnt Documents are in the National Archives at Kew. WO 363. https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C14567.
fewer and incomplete records for officers.\textsuperscript{141} In addition, the British National Archives at Kew has placed all digital records behind a pay wall but has also made them available through the major genealogical research company Ancestry.

Ancestry provided the necessary resources for confirming the demographic details needed to complete the database. When service files were lost or incomplete, demographic information came from census records, medal records, birth and death indexes, probate records, and the biographical information in \textit{De Ruvigny’s Roll of Honour 1914-1918}. The \textit{Roll of Honour} was the most detailed thanks to biographical information provided by families. Created by the Marquis De Ruvigny in 1914 to commemorate the fallen, the project soon grew too large to complete as the casualties mounted. The roll of honour was first published in 1922 and consisted of five volumes with over 25,000 biographies.\textsuperscript{142} The \textit{Roll of Honour} was most useful for officers in my database due to the social and financial resources needed to participate in it. The entirety of the roll of honour was digitized and placed on Ancestry.

Census records provided information on the individual before the war, along with their next of kin. These details could be confirmed if they had a will probated by the government as the probate would include the last residence of the individual and the executor of their estate. The probate also allowed for those with no known pre-war occupation to be roughly placed into a social class based on the value of the estate.


census and probate records for England and Wales are kept in the National Archives at
Kew and are available on Ancestry.\textsuperscript{143} The census and probate records for Ireland have
been digitized by the National Archives of Ireland and are available for researchers free
of charge.\textsuperscript{144} The census records for Scotland are kept by the National Records of
Scotland; the digital versions have been placed on the website Scotland’s People. Unlike
England and Wales, the Scottish census records of 1911 have not been made available to
Ancestry and all earlier census records are transcriptions only. Because of another, more
expensive paywall, Scottish soldiers for this project have the least amount of
demographic information. Canadian soldiers proved to be the easiest to research, as
Canadian service files and census records are freely available. In both Australia and New
Zealand, the decision was made to destroy the census returns, leaving the service files as
the most reliable sources for demographic information. Where possible, other sources on
Ancestry were used such as education, birth, or travel records.

My database records the location of 410 memorials in Australia, 256 in Canada,
116 in New Zealand, 179 in the Republic of Ireland, 70 in Northern Ireland, 282 in
Scotland, 200 in Wales, and 3,453 in England, bringing the total to 4,966. This total is not
representative of all personal memorials in each nation. Using so many memorials for
analysis, particularly to retrieve demographic information for English memorials, was not
feasible, so the total number of memorials and individuals with complete demographic
information was reduced for England. Those memorials that stood out as unique or
different were chosen for closer examination. These could include those dedicated to

\textsuperscript{143} The main census used for was the 1911 census. General Register Office: 1911 Census Schedules. RG 14.
\textsuperscript{144} Census of Ireland 1901/1911 and Census fragments and substitutes, 1821-1851.
http://www.census.nationalarchives.ie/.
women, civilians, members of non-British military units (such as those in Canadian or Indian services), and memorials that featured interesting texts or design. To ensure that not just unique memorials were selected, every fiftieth memorial was included to achieve diversity. Of the 3,453 memorials found in England, a more reasonable 810 memorials were selected for demographic examination, resulting in 2,323 individuals as part of the demographic analysis. When analysing the text, design, and burial of individuals being commemorated, these are being drawn from the total of 4,966. Discussion of demographics such as occupation, social class, birth, and next of kin is being drawn from the smaller total of 2,323.

Structure of the Dissertation

Analysis of the database forms the core of this dissertation. Each of the chapters in the dissertation focuses on different aspects in the development of private memory and how it was expressed on personal memorials. They reveal the ways in which individuals strove to present the individuality of the war dead and their own personal memory of the war.

The first chapter looks at the relationship of individuals with the largest commemorative organization, the Imperial War Graves Commission. The IWGC regulated, controlled, and sought to dictate the collective memory of the conflict in ways that emphasized imperial unity, pride, and sorrow at the losses. The centre of the IWGC’s power to regulate the memory of the war was its possession of the bodies of the war dead. The chapter will explore how individuals interacted with the IWGC, some through acceptance and participation in their projects, others through resistance. The chapter will demonstrate that the IWGC’s policies limited individuals’ ability to express the ‘good
death’ as they had before the war. Such restrictions encouraged personal memorialization because the IWGC limited people’s ability to mourn to their satisfaction.

The second chapter examines the demographics of those who were commemorated. The analysis reveals which parts of society were most active in personal commemoration. Using the information from the database on employment, military service, and any family history that could be found, the chapter looks at the dominance of specific sections of society that were commemorating. The database highlights a diverse range of experiences in the war, but general patterns and trends are identified. Middle and upper-class members of society purchased more memorials and helped to propagate a specific memory of the war. Important trends in commemoration such as design and location of personal memorials reveals the function they were meant to have as alternative gravesites. The memorials were spaces for mourning away from where the bodies were actually located.

The next three chapters focus on the language and symbols in the memorials to express remembrance of the war dead. The third chapter examines the religious language and imagery of the memorials, building on the purpose of the memorials as sites of mourning. Providing religious context to the construction of the memorials, the chapter reveals the political and religious considerations behind building memorials in churches. The use of specific imagery on windows and Biblical quotes helps to highlight how individuals constructed the personal memorials to fit the requirements of the ‘good death’.

The fourth chapter examines secular remembrance in the use of literary quotes on memorials. Analysing quotations shows that memorials expressed not just a spiritual ‘good death’, but also a secular one. The use of literary quotes reveals the cultural milieu
in which these memorials were erected. Rather than use modernist language, the individuals building the memorials were from an older generation that emphasized Victorian ideals of military service and the importance of service to their country.

The final chapter turns to expressions of political identity on the memorials by looking at national and imperial language and imagery. The chapter demonstrates the predominance of Englishness in understanding the empire in England, while other nations took a broader interpretation of Britishness through the memorials. The different national identities set against an imperial identity highlight that while nationalism was evolving, it was still in the minority amongst most of the population. The personal memorials challenge the conception that the war was a defining event in the pursuit of nationhood.

Finally, the conclusion seeks to examine how personal memorials are used now that the living memory of the war has passed. By examining the evolution of memorials to the war dead commemorated after the war, the commemoration of individuals remained strong in the centenary. Instead of searching for the ‘good death’, new memorials to individuals meet the needs of the collective to create connections to the past. The continued commemoration of individuals reflects a continued desire to ensure that the collective does not cause the individual to be lost in the formation of new myths about the conflict.
Chapter 1: ‘Their Glory Shall Not Be Blotted Out’: The Imperial War Graves Commission

At the conclusion of the First World War, the problem of dealing with the war dead came to the fore. Founded in 1917 the Imperial War Graves Commission began work on creating cemeteries in every major battlefield. By 1920 the Commission was under fire for its policies and decisions, leading to an open debate in the British House of Commons. The debate centred on whether the Commission had the moral and legal right to dictate how the dead were to be treated over the wishes of their next-of-kin. During the debate Lord Robert Cecil stated, ‘It has never been said that the State has a right to turn the individual memory to individual persons into a national memorial against the will and against the desire of their relatives.’

Lord Cecil’s speech highlighted the tension between the work of the Imperial War Graves Commission (IWGC) and the conventional understanding of how the dead were to be mourned by their next-of-kin. The interests of the state overruled the wishes and beliefs of individuals when it came to commemorating the First World War. In this chapter, the origins of the Imperial War Graves Commission and their policies of equality of treatment in uniform commemoration will be examined. Episodes of resistance and tension with individuals who opposed its actions will be explored to reveal the stress that developed between collective and private memory. The actions of the Commission in regulating and controlling the bodies of the war dead challenged established mourning practices that placed family at the centre. The success of the Imperial War Graves Commission in its pursuit of an imperial and national memorial revealed the limits of
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individuals in shaping collective memory. The collective memory of the war dead was regulated by a select group of artistic advisors and bureaucrats who sought to represent the public and the greater good.\textsuperscript{2} The underlying tension revealed clearly in the debate in Westminster was never fully subdued and demonstrates the consistent push of personal memory against the collective.

Leading the IWGC was Sir Fabian Ware, who pushed for its creation in the Imperial War Conference of 1917. He saw the IWGC as more than just a military cemetery and memorial service. For Ware, the IWGC would be a symbol of imperial unity, a monument to the glory and greatness of the British Empire. To realize his vision of the IWGC, Ware needed to control the physical remains of the war dead. Having control of the bodies gave the IWGC the power to dictate how the dead were to be remembered and mourned. Resistance to IWGC policies was centred on dissatisfaction over the family’s ability to mourn as they desired. Many families agreed with the political ideals and principles of the IWGC, but they believed the messages of imperial unity could still be made if they possessed the bodies. Ware was not convinced and fought in opposition to the people he was serving to ensure the IWGC regulated and controlled the commemoration of the war dead.

**The Founding of the Imperial War Graves Commission**

As creator and head of the IWGC, it was Ware’s vision of what the Empire should look like that drove the IWGC’s actions in controlling the war dead. Ware’s understanding of the British Empire came from his past as an Imperial public servant and

\textsuperscript{2} For more on the trouble of bureaucracy in memory, see Ann-Marie Foster, ‘The Bureaucratization of Death: The First World War, Families, and the State,’ *Twentieth Century British History*, (2022), pp. 1-23.
newspaper editor. In 1900 he was recruited by Lord Milner to serve as assistant director of education in the Transvaal and by 1903 was the director of education.³ When Ware left South Africa in 1905 he was part of the Milner “kindergarten” that used South African reconstruction as a model for larger Imperial reforms. Individuals with whom he worked went on to establish the Round Table movement for imperial federation.⁴ Back in Britain, Ware was hired in 1905 to serve as the editor of the conservative newspaper, The *Morning Post*. He made it his mission to advance imperial ideas and news through the paper. One of his first moves was to hire Richard Jebb, an advocate for imperial unity who helped Ware hire correspondents from the dominions to provide articles on imperial and colonial issues. Some of the correspondents including Canadian Stephen Leacock, Australian prime minister Alfred Deakin, and fellow South African kindergartener and founder of the Round Table, Lionel Curtis.⁵ Ware’s push for imperial coverage in the paper met with resistance after the death of the proprietor Lord Glenesk in 1908, and his heir Lady Bathurst fired Ware in 1911.⁶ Ware had been frustrated and pushed out of a position to influence imperial policy.

Ware was working as an education reformer when the First World War began. He attempted to enlist with the British Army but was deemed too old for field service. Instead, he joined the Red Cross as an ambulance driver and was put in charge of a team of ambulances.⁷ During his time in France and Belgium, Ware and members of his Red

⁶ Ibid, p. 117.
Cross team began recording information on burials they encountered at hospitals and in the field. Encouraged by his superiors, Ware maintained a database of the burials that he and his fellow Red Cross workers found in their work. As the size of the war became apparent, the British Army realized the need to have an official unit organizing and cataloguing the war dead. Because Ware had the largest database of burials and had been pushing the army for more action, he was appointed the head of the Graves Registration Commission in March 1915 and was commissioned into the army as a Major. The work of Ware and his team expanded as the war progressed and they soon found themselves working with French authorities to acquire cemeteries and fielding questions from concerned families about the war graves. By the spring of 1916 the unit had been renamed the Directorate of Graves Registration and Enquiries (DGRE).

Ware’s advocacy alone was not enough to motivate the British army and government to begin registering graves. Growing public concern on the treatment of the graves was the real drive behind the development of the DGRE and later the IWGC. Newspapers published letters from grieving families who reported difficulty determining the fate of their loved one’s body. Ware used these letters and the failure of the army to respond to them as a justification for the DGRE and later the IWGC. In 1916 the government created the Prince of Wales’s Committee for the Care of Soldiers’ Graves to allay public concerns by promising to take over the maintenance of British war graves after the war. Ware, who was a member of the Prince of Wales’s Committee, argued
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that a unified, imperial organization was needed because the DGRE was being asked by the Dominion and Indian governments to record their soldier’s graves as well. The result was the establishment of the IWGC, which combined the work of the DGRE and the Prince of Wales’s Committee.

The structure of the IWGC reflected the imperialist principles of Ware and his associates who sought to create a confederation between Britain and the Dominions. The Royal Charter of the IWGC gave it unique powers to operate outside the boundaries of traditional government frameworks. The British government would have four members as commissioners, the secretaries of war, colonies, India, and office of works, while the dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Newfoundland would each have their own commissioner. The make-up of the IWGC saw Britain having more representatives, but each of the Dominions had voice and vote on the actions of the IWGC. What made the IWGC unique was the financial situation. The IWGC received funds from each government based on the number of graves under IWGC care from their forces. The IWGC could use these funds as it saw fit, freeing them from the rules and regulations of the treasury or other government departments in Britain. Annual reports and financial statements were not only sent to Britain but to every Dominion, thereby ensuring that the IWGC accommodated the needs of every nation not just Britain.

The success of the IWGC as an imperial organization lay in the support it had from every member. During the Imperial Conference of 1917 the discussion between the
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11 Fabian Ware, ‘Memorandum by the Director of Graves Registration and Inquiries,’ March 7th, 1917, in Imperial War Conference, 1917: Extracts from Minutes of Proceedings and Papers Laid Before the Conference, pp. 133-135, CWGC 1/1/2/4-Imperial War Conference 1917.
12 Newfoundland would lose their seat when they ceased being a Dominion and after Indian independence, both India and Pakistan gained seats on the commission.
representatives revolved less around if the IWGC should be created, and more around the scope of the IWGC’s mandate. The New Zealand representatives of William Massey and Sir Joseph Ward feared that the IWGC would be too narrow and ignore battlefields outside of Europe, particularly Gallipoli. Ward argued, ‘there is a very strong desire there (the New Zealanders took their full share in the fighting at Gallipoli), and a strong sentimental feeling-and a sentimental feeling is a very powerful one-that care should be taken of the graves of the men dear to people who are thousands of miles away from Gallipoli.’

Although Canadian Prime Minister Sir Robert Borden and South African representative Sir Jan Smuts both resisted and objected to Ward’s arguments, they all saw the IWGC as a useful public relations tool to show the spirit of imperial co-operation and that the sacrifice of their citizens was being taken seriously.

Having the Dominions support the IWGC was vital for Ware as resistance to its creation came from the British government. Objecting to the creation of the IWGC, the head of the Office of Public Works Alfred Mond wrote to Prime Minister David Lloyd George arguing against the creation of new bureaucracies. Mond rejected the need for an imperial organization believing that, ‘a permanent Committee or Commission including representatives of the Dominions and India (and, therefore, of an imperial character) should be formed as an advisory or consultative Committee, and that the carrying out of the policy of this body should be entrusted to the Department which already has the care of the existing military cemeteries in Foreign Countries.’

Ware criticized the suggestion that the Dominions should act only in a consultive committee stating, ‘That this

14 Imperial War Conference, 1917: Extracts from Minutes of Proceedings and Papers Laid Before the Conference, p. 27, CWGC 1/1/2/4-Imperial War Conference 1917.
15 Alfred Mond to the Prime Minister, March 19th, 1917, CWGC 1/1/2/1-Imperial Commission.
Commission should be really Imperial and satisfy the Colonies and Dominions. They will not be caught with the old bait of an advisory or consultative Committee as suggested by the Commissioner of Works.’¹⁶ Ware had little faith in the ability of the Office of Public Works to properly maintain war graves. In a memo distributed during the Imperial Conference he stated, ‘If arrangements can now be made to ensure that the cessation of hostilities does not cause any break in the continuity of this work, the Empire will be spared the reflections which weighed on the conscience of the British nation when, nearly twenty years after the conclusion of the Crimean War, it became known that the last resting places of those who had fallen in that war had, except in individual instances, remained uncared for and neglected.’¹⁷

**Equality of Treatment**

Ware was always concerned about the public perception of the IWGC. As Bart Ziino argued, ‘The Commission craved, above all, sentimental authority for its work, deriving from the relatives of the dead.’¹⁸ Rather than seeking the input of grieving families, Ware and the IWGC sought to push their ideals upon the public by claiming to represent a ‘silent majority of the bereaved’ in its work. The IWGC used the rhetoric of wartime sacrifice and universal struggle to override and ignore claims by the bereaved for their involvement in burial of the dead.¹⁹ Ware and the IWGC had to show that there was

---

¹⁶ Memo dated March 27th, 1917, CWGC 1/1/2/1-Imperial Commission.
¹⁷ Fabian Ware, ‘Memorandum by the Director of Graves Registration and Inquiries,’ March 7th, 1917, in *Imperial War Conference, 1917: Extracts from Minutes of Proceedings and Papers Laid Before the Conference*, p. 134, CWGC 1/1/2/4-Imperial War Conference 1917.
an imperative need to create an imperial system of commemoration based on sentimentality that allowed them to silence critics. It was the principal of equality of treatment that Ware and the IWGC would use to justify their existence to the public.

The concept of equality of treatment emerged early in the war when Ware was still working with the Red Cross. In March 1915 the French military commander Marshall Joseph Joffre banned the repatriation of bodies from French battlefields, and the British army issued its own repatriation ban the following month. In Philip Longworth’s official history of the IWGC argued that it was the return of Lieutenant William Gladstone’s body to Britain in April 1915 that motivated the British repatriation ban. Lieutenant Gladstone, a grandson of former Prime Minster William Gladstone, was killed during the Second Battle of Ypres and his body was recovered from no-man’s land by his men so that his family could bury him at home. 20 Ware fundamentally disagreed with an action that he believed was only possible because of Gladstone’s social standing. In contrast, Ware himself was motivated by a sense of esprit de corps, and the breaking down of traditional social barriers in British units when developing the principle of equality of treatment. He also believed that most soldiers would want to be buried next to their comrades where they fell in battle.21

The policy for the equality of treatment was laid out in the first meeting of the IWGC in November 1917. The IWGC recruited Sir Frederic Kenyon head of the British Museum to lead an advisory committee that would determine the artistic and architectural designs for cemeteries and memorials. It was here that equality of treatment was formally outlined: ‘The Commissioners are of opinion that no distinction should be made between

21 Ibid, pp. 13-14; Summers, Remembered, p. 15.
officers and men lying in the same cemeteries in the form or nature of the memorials.’  

The policy was published in newspapers shortly after the meeting, ensuring that the policy was public knowledge. However, the wording of the policy was focused on the design of cemeteries and memorials, and failed to mention that it also included the repatriation of bodies.

The desire for repatriation was wanted by a portion of the population. There has been no definitive count of the bodies repatriated to Britain before the ban was instituted. The database created for this dissertation contains a handful of individuals who were repatriated before the ban. Most of them confirm Ware’s fear that it was the wealthy who were using their money and influence to have their loved ones returned. One such example is Vernon James Austin, the son of Herbert Austin, founder of the Austin Motor Company. Vernon was killed in action on January 26th, 1915, and his father had his body returned to Britain shortly after. Vernon was buried in Canterbury, but his family lived in northern England as the Austin Motor Company was based in Birmingham. He had a memorial plaque erected in the local Legion hall in Birmingham and in St Martin’s Church in Canterbury. After the ban on repatriation, several illegal repatriations were undertaken. A career soldier, Captain Sir John Edward Fowler owned an estate in the highlands of Scotland where the Fowler family lived. He was killed in action on June 22nd, 1915, in France and was quickly returned home to be buried in the family cemetery.

---

22 Resolution no. 5, Commission Meeting No. 01-Nov. 1917, CWGC 2/2/1/1-Commission Meeting Minute Files.
23 ‘Graves of British Soldiers,’ The Times, November 24th, 1917, p. 5.
in Foich Burial Ground on his estate.\textsuperscript{26} His will stated that he wanted to be buried in Scotland and efforts were made to fulfil his wishes even with the repatriation ban.\textsuperscript{27} The cases of Austin and Fowler reveals the desire of individuals to have the dead buried at home. Such repatriations were rare due to the cost and logistics, but they do reveal that the concept of equality of treatment was not the convention early in the war.

After the war, the IWGC began to receive demands from the bereaved to return the bodies home; in the months after the fighting ended, the IWGC received an average of ninety such letters. The IWGC pushed back, arguing that, ‘One could never explain to a person why Lord or Lady this was able to have a body [brought] home while plain Mrs. Smith, a labourer’s wife or widow could not, though anyone aware of the conditions would know quite well.’\textsuperscript{28} The IWGC was deluged with such requests due to the failure in 1917 to clearly articulate that the ban was to remain in effect after the war. A significant number of files on the First World War in the IWGC archives contains either a letter or a reference to a request for repatriation. The file that outlines the stance of the IWGC during the Paris Peace Talks includes correspondence with a George Murray about the repatriation and treatment of former prisoner of war graves in Germany. Murray was writing because his son was reported to have died in a POW camp; he claimed to speak for many people when he raised the issue of POWs and repatriation for the IWGC to deal with.\textsuperscript{29}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} 'Court Circular' \textit{The Observer}, July 4\textsuperscript{th}, 1915, p. 5; Captain Sir John Edward Fowler-Casualty Details, CWGC Find War Dead, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/casualty-details/667928/sir-john-edward-fowler/.
\item \textsuperscript{27} 'Court Circular' \textit{The Observer}, July 25\textsuperscript{th}, 1915, p. 5.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Longworth, \textit{The Unending Vigil}, p. 47.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Letter from Rev. E.D. Harvey to the IWGC, December 19, 1918; Letters from George M. Murray to the IWGC, January 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 1919 and February 14\textsuperscript{th}, 1919, CWGC 1/1/2/7-Peace Conference
\end{itemize}
Repatriation remained an ongoing issue for the IWGC throughout the interwar decades. The *Sunday Express* published an article in May 1931 claiming to have interviewed a Belgian smuggler who had helped repatriate bodies to Britain. The article claimed that the Belgian had been paid between £250 and £500 by wealthy widows and mothers in Britain for the return of bodies over the past ten years.\(^{30}\) The IWGC placed multiple articles in papers across Britain and with international press agencies denying the claims. Ware ordered an investigation into cases of illegal repatriation to determine if the claims by the article were true. After interviewing members of the *Sunday Express*, employees in Belgium, and a former journalist, the IWGC concluded that the claims were false; unable to uncover the names of soldiers whose remains were supposedly repatriated, the Commission could find no proof of any wrongdoing.\(^{31}\) The story forced the IWGC into a flurry of activity to contain the bad press and defend its reputation. Anger was directed at the IWGC for failing to maintain the cemeteries, but much of the public anger was pointed at the elites who used their wealth and power to undermine the equal treatment of the war graves.\(^{32}\) The article threatened to undermine the IWGC, but it also showed that large parts of the population supported the policy of equality of treatment.

The other element of equality of treatment was the uniform designs of the cemeteries and memorials. Sir Frederic Kenyon played a pivotal role in clearly outlining how equality of treatment would look as he served as the main artistic and architectural

---

\(^{30}\) Press Clipping, ‘British War Dead Smuggled Home: Bodies Exhumed From Graves in Flanders,’ *Sunday Express*, May 3\(^{rd}\), 1931, CWGC 1/1/7/B/54-Exhumations France & Belgium Sunday Express Article.

\(^{31}\) Notes on statements supplied by the ‘Sunday Express’, May 27\(^{th}\), 1931, CWGC 1/1/7/B/54-Exhumations France & Belgium Sunday Express Article.

\(^{32}\) Laura Tradii, “‘Their dear remains belong to us alone’ soldiers’ bodies, commemoration, and cultural responses to exhumations after the Great War,’ *First World War Studies*, 10, no. 2-3, (2019), p. 255.
advisor. After touring the battlefields of France and Belgium in early 1918 and receiving proposals from leading architects on cemetery design, Kenyon handed in his report, *War Graves: How the Cemeteries abroad Will Be Designed*, in 1918. The report became the basis for the artistic outlook and principles the IWGC would follow in creating the cemeteries and memorials. Kenyon highlighted that he was in contact with, ‘the principal interests involved – the Army, the relatives of the fallen, the religious denominations, and the artists and others whose judgment may be of value in a work demanding imagination and taste and good feeling,’ to show that the report was universal in its approach.³³ In his discussion of the equality of treatment, Kenyon pushed the IWGC argument of ensuring that social and wealth differences were not repeated in death:

‘In a few cases, where money and good taste were not wanting, a satisfactory result would be obtained, in the sense that a fine individual monument would be erected. In the large majority of cases either no monument would be erected, or it would be poor in quality; and the total result would be one of inequality, haphazard and disorder… The monuments of the more well-to-do would overshadow those of their poorer comrades; the whole sense of comradeship and of common service would be lost.’³⁴

He argued for the collective over the individual, stating:

‘The sacrifice of the individual is a great idea and worthy of commemoration; but the community of sacrifice, the service of a common cause, the comradeship of arms which has brought together men of all ranks and grades – these are greater ideas, which should be commemorated in those cemeteries where they lie together … The place for the individual memorial is at home, where it will be constantly before the eyes of relatives and descendants, and will serve as an example and encouragement for the generations to come.’³⁵

---

³⁴ Ibid, pp. 5-6.
Kenyon urged the IWGC to create memorials that advanced collective sacrifice, while individuals should build their own memorials at home to meet their needs. The public display of mourning was meant to contribute to a collective commemoration that was inclusive, allowing all members of society to participate. Commemoration at home was to provide examples for future generations, but not allow for anyone person to be elevated above the collective.

The artistic design of the cemeteries was a concern for the IWGC’s artistic advisors. Kenyon and the heads of other major cultural institutions in Britain had been working on developing a plan for the war graves before the creation of the IWGC. The Prince of Wales’s Committee drafted a memo to guide the design process of the cemeteries, including a list of individuals and institutions to be consulted and a general scheme of the outcome desired by the committee.\(^{36}\) The scheme outlined a basic description of how the cemeteries would look leaving only minor details to the architects. At the end the committee outlined its view of why a uniform and aesthetically pleasing cemetery was important: ‘This scheme, if carefully carried out, might have a reflex effect on our abominable system of individual ugliness in English Cemeteries. Something corresponding to the “Halls” might be adopted at Home as the memorial to the dead from each town, or in the case of villages, a little cloister attached to the parish church.’\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{36}\) The major institutions included the British Museum with Kenyon and Laurence Binyon, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the National Gallery, the National Portrait Gallery, the Wallace Collection, the Slade Professor of Fine Art (Architecture) at Cambridge, the Royal Academy which included the architects Reginald Blomfield and Eward Lutyens, and the Arts and Crafts Society to name several institutions considered.

\(^{37}\) Memo, British War Graves in France, pp. 3-4, part of a letter from Dugald Sutherland MacColl to Fabian Ware, January 20\(^{th}\), 1917, CWGC 1/1/5/1-Adornment of Cemeteries.
Public Relations

In examining the development of IWGC principles and designs, it is difficult to determine how much the Commission consulted the general public. Correspondence in the IWGC archives highlights discussions between heads of cultural institutions, religious leaders, the Dominion high commissioners, military commanders, and members of various government departments, but little with the general public. This lack of communication began to cause problems once the war was over and private citizens began to flood the Commission with questions about the state of the war graves and the government’s plans.38

---

38 One example of questions was the debate in the House of Lords over the IWGC’s plans, ‘Parliament, Memorials to Fallen Officers and Men,’ *The Times*, April 10th, 1919, p. 16; In Canada, individuals and organization asked the government to let repatriate the bodies, ‘Removal of Bides Not so Far Permitted,’ *The Globe*, January 23rd, 1920, p. 12.
In an attempt to reassure the public, the IWGC tried to clarify its work by issuing a press statement for British and Dominion newspapers outlining their policies. Rudyard Kipling, who had been recruited to serve as a literary advisor for the IWGC, contributed to the statement and signed it. Kipling gave the IWGC strength as he was one of the most popular writers in Britain and the Empire, and he represented one of the bereaved as his only son John had been killed in the war.\(^{39}\) He helped push the IWGC to address public concerns in December 1918, arguing that the public needed to be informed about its work.\(^{40}\) Letters from the high commissioners of Australia and South Africa in January 1919 also helped to convince the IWGC to publish a statement, which both commissioners felt was overdue.\(^{41}\)

The statement appeared in the press in February 1919 and generated an active response from the public. One of the final points Kipling included was a suggestion that the public should help provide the IWGC with ideas on its work.\(^{42}\) The IWGC received feedback on its plans as people wrote with suggests for memorial and cemetery designs. Most of the letters were focused on creating memorials, with some suggesting similar ideas to what the IWGC had already come up with. Others were more distinctive in their suggestions. Helen Innes from London suggested the creation of fields of blown glass flowers to mark the graves and places of the fallen as a cheaper and easier alternative to stone. Miss Innes was motivated to suggest glass due to seeing several bottles lined up in...

\(^{39}\) Kipling was unique amongst all the individual’s making decisions about the design and policies of the IWGC in that he was the only one that lost a close member of their family in war. Kipling was the only bereaved individual to contribute to the IWGC’s designs. Gregory, *The Last Great War*, pp. 254-255.

\(^{40}\) Rudyard Kipling to Fabian Ware, December 23rd, 1918, CWGC 1/1/5/9-Mr Kipling’s Advertisement.

\(^{41}\) Letter from High Commission Office, Commonwealth of Australia, to Fabian Ware, January 31st, 1919; Letter from William Schreiner, High Commission of South Africa to J.E. Talbot, secretary of the IWGC, January 31st, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/9-Mr Kipling’s Advertisement.

\(^{42}\) ‘War Graves: Work of Imperial Commission,’ *The Times*, February 17th, 1919, p. 4.
a shop window like tombstones shortly after the death of her brother. Others were interested in providing suggestions for the monuments to the missing. W.H. Chase from Dover suggested the IWGC provide stones or crosses for each unknown soldier in their hometown cemeteries. Chase was concerned about the memorials to the missing as his son Second Lieutenant H.C. Chase’s body could not be found. Chase was not alone in wishing to see a memorial to a missing child as Lina Hunter wrote that each missing soldier should have a stone, ‘of a soldier lying dead, with a half circle of Angels standing around him with bent heads and the text beneath “He shall give His angels charge over thee”-Ps XCI.II.’ Lina was the mother of Captain Nigel Duncan Ratcliffe Hunter, whose memorial in the moors of Devon will be discussed in chapter four. Her idea for the memorial came from a vision she had of her son, ‘climbing a hill with determined face, with a half circle of five angels behind him; and he met his death, when climbing an embankment to locate the enemy’s machine gun.’ Veterans also provided suggestions, with John S. Vickers, a former private in the Royal Fusiliers, suggesting the cemeteries be built next to roads to act as ‘sacred ways’ and to use terracotta instead of carving headstones.

To further clarify for the public the decisions already made by the IWGC, the text of Kipling’s statement was published in a booklet The Graves of the Fallen. Available for purchase or to be given away, the booklet included drawings by Douglas Macpherson of

---

43 It is not known if her brother died in the war, but the implication in the letter is that he did. Letter from Miss Helen Innes to IWGC, February 20th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertisment by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.
44 Letter from Mr. W.H. Chase to the IWGC, February 24th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertisment by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.
45 Letter from Lina Hunter to the IWGC, February 18th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertisment by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.
46 Letter from John S. Vickers to the IWGC, February 18th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertisment by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.
the proposed cemetery designs drafted by the IWGC. These illustrations allowed the bereaved and the public to see how the IWGC planned to commemorate the war dead. The illustrations and descriptions in the booklet reveal the nature of the IWGC’s decision-making, for they were extremely close to the completed headstones and cemeteries. The inclusion of the illustrations showed that the IWGC had made its artistic choices for the design of the headstones and cemeteries without public input.

After the publication of the booklet, the letters to the IWGC shifted to focus on opinions about the designs. Many people continued to provide suggestions about how to commemorate the missing, for the booklet had contained no draft illustrations for the memorials to the missing. Amelia Sowell suggested altering the stone of sacrifice to include a carved image featured barbed wire, a shell hole with several bodies, and a town under artillery fire while an angel stood upon the stone writing into a book titled, ‘The book of life. Rev XX12.’ Sowell believed the imagery would better reflect the probable final resting place of the missing while acknowledging that they are remembered with the angel. Sowell’s suggestion displayed the concern the public had with the missing. Her son Herbert Sowell had been killed in action but was not amongst the missing. Sowell was one of the few from outside of Britain to make suggestions as she lived in Guilford, New South Wales, Australia. Amelia Sowell was not alone in viewing the stone of sacrifice as being too plain. Norah Grundtvig wrote, ‘I do think a grand statue of our

---

47 The booklet was published in March 1919.
48 See pages 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10 for illustrations, Imperial War Graves Commission, The Graves of the Fallen, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/7/1-The Graves of the Fallen.
49 Copy of letter from Amelia Sowell to the IWGC, January 24th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertisment by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.
50 Her son is buried in Queant Road Cemetery, in Buissy France. Lieutenant Herbert Keith Sowell Casualty Details, Commonwealth War Graves Commission Find War Dead, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/casualty-details/314009/herbert-keith-sowell/.
Saviour as the light of the world would be so much more impressive than either stone or cross.’ She also suggested that an angel could be used in place of Jesus and included a drawing with her letter to help showcase her point.\(^{51}\) The IWGC replied to most of the letters if a question was asked, but responded to nearly all suggestions on sculptures, inscriptions, and designs by thanking them for the letter and stating that their suggestions would be taken into consideration.\(^{52}\)

The majority of the letters to the IWGC did not object to the work of the commission. They simply wanted to aid that work and where possible. The sentiment of supporting can be summed up by a Mrs. Kennedy who finished her letter by stating, ‘but I am very grateful for anything they may do.’\(^ {53}\) The letters of support for the IWGC helped to show that many members of the public agreed with its work. These letters demonstrate that rather than simply wanting to be told how the war dead were to be commemorated, the general public wanted to contribute to the commemoration process. The letters demonstrate the broad public desire to have a say in building of memorials. Even when the individuals agreed with the principles of collective remembrance, they wanted to have a say on the final product. Unable to follow all the recommendations of the public, the IWGC had to make choices that could never satisfy everyone. These choices motivated some to build their own memorials.

The IWGC did receive letters of concern over the design choices. The main issue was the decision to use headstones over crosses to mark the graves. Several letters

\(^{51}\) Letter from Norah Grundtvig to the IWGC, February 19\(^{\text{th}}\), 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertisement by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.

\(^{52}\) Variations on this premise can be seen in copies of replies to the letters. Copy of letter from IWGC to Nora Grundtvig, March 21\(^{\text{st}}\), 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertisement by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.

\(^{53}\) Extract of letter from Mrs. Kennedy to the IWGC, December 16\(^{\text{th}}\), 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertisement by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.
showed a dissatisfaction with that choice. Colonel Brownlow wrote to voice his
displeasure with the headstone design, believing the cross as a religious emblem was
being mistreated. Brownlow believed that the cross with the regimental badge on it
‘would be incongruous, and savour of irreverence, and I have heard the term sacrilege
applied.’ He feared that having the badge on the cross would cause offence to French and
Belgian Catholics; if it was done in England, he implied, it would be shamed by the
public. He suggested that the IWGC use the back of the headstone instead of leaving it
empty, which would allow for a good sized cross, an inscription, and the regimental
badge to all have proper representation. He thought back of the headstone should be used
because, otherwise, ‘the reverse side of the tombstones will appear a dreary row of
milestones.’

Cecil Edwards also raised concerns with the headstone and the use of the
cross. He pointed to the design of German headstones in France that have a large stone
with a cross on the top as proof that it does not need to be just a headstone. Edwards’
letter caused some concern in the IWGC due to his wartime experience as an army
chaplain in France for three years and because his suggestion was based on discussions
with soldiers and the families of the dead. Edwards’ status as a veteran, as well as his
close contacts with bereaved, threatened to undermine the IWGC’s authority that it spoke
for the soldiers and families in its decisions.

---

54 Copy of letter from Colonel C.B. Brownlow to the IWGC, November 6th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertismeent by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.
55 Letter from Cecil H. Edwards to the IWGC, May 26th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/10-Advertismeent by Mr R Kipling suggestions by the public re headstones.
The Resistance of Lady Florence Cecil

The concern over the design of the headstone and the use of the cross became a major problem for the IWGC as opposition developed. The letters from Brownlow and Edwards highlight how religion served as the main focal point of that opposition. The strongest opposition the IWGC encountered came from Lady Florence Cecil who began a campaign to change the designs of the headstones. Lady Cecil was the wife of the Bishop of Exeter and was herself a grieving mother as three of her sons had been killed in the war. In February 1919, shortly after the statement by Kipling and the IWGC on the design of the cemeteries, she began a petition to change the headstone and make the cross feature more prominently. She took out a personal advertisement in The Times on February 8th, 1919 stating she, ‘would be glad to hear from those bereaved wives and mothers who feel strongly against the proposed uniform and almost secular memorials to be erected on the graves of our soldiers.’ The petition gathered steam and was submitted to the Prince of Wales as the president of the IWGC; it contained over 8,000 signatures. Lady Cecil presented the petition as being from ‘thousands of heartbroken parents, wives, brothers and sisters of those who have fallen in the war,’ whose main grievance was towards using the headstone instead of the cross. Lady Cecil and the petitioners argue for the cross by stating, ‘It was through the strength of the cross that many of them [the war dead] were enabled to do so [to fight]. It is only through the hope of the Cross that most of us are able to carry on the life from which all the sunshine seems to have gone, and to

---

58 The entire petition can be seen on the CWGC archives website and is so large they had to split it into three pdf files. CWGC 1/1/5/14-Petition to the Prince of Wales from Lady Florence Cecil, wife of the Bishop of Exeter presented in 1919.
deny us the emblem of that strength and hope adds heavily to the burden of our sorrow.’

She did not wish to force everyone to have a cross. Rather, those who wanted crosses
would allowed to have them: ‘we beg most earnestly that within these limits we may be
granted the right of choice both in the form of the memorial and in the inscription we
would have upon it.’

Lady Cecil was able to gather signatures thanks to letters to the editor, primarily
to The Times, got her message out to the general public. The text of the petition was
carefully worded to be diplomatic, but in her letters to the editor Lady Cecil reveals her
anger towards the IWGC. In one letter, entitled ‘Official Sacrilege of Graves’, Lady Cecil
wrote about the removal of wartime crosses and memorials by the IWGC as it prepared
the cemeteries for construction. Lady Cecil railed against the lack of public engagement
and consultation by the IWGC by resurrecting talking points from the war: ‘English men
and women still have a craving for liberty; they do not appreciate having everything
settled for them in German fashion.’ To support her argument, Lady Cecil used
quotations from those who wrote to her, and encouraged them to write letters to the editor
so their voices would join hers. These letters show a similar anger toward the IWGC. A
letter from Robert V.G. Shaw, whose son was killed in the war, expressed his dismay and
sorrow that the memorial erected by his son’s comrades was being removed. Major E.
Faunce-De Laune echoed Lady Cecil, stating, ‘A grave belongs to the next-of-kin, and
their feelings in each case should be the deciding factor.’ Other correspondents also

59 CWGC 1/1/5/14-Petition to the Prince of Wales from Lady Florence Cecil, wife of the Bishop of Exeter
presented in 1919.
63 ‘War Graves’ Times, April 16th, 1919, p. 8.
objected to the design of the headstones. As K.M.B. wrote, ‘But when apparently all that English art can do is a design which one would expect from some small and utterly conventional undertaker in a side street, my heart burns within me and I wish to speak with my tongue.’\textsuperscript{64} W. Lattey also took exception to the design of the headstone, stating, ‘looks like what is ordinarily placed over the grave of a favourite dog, and still more appalling to think that crosses will be taken down and superseded by the dog’s grave tombstone.’\textsuperscript{65} Lady Cecil quoted one mother who spoke of the opposition to uniformity: ‘we protest against making the cemeteries merely regiments of stone as perpetuating the military ideal which our sons sacrificed themselves to crush.’\textsuperscript{66} Lady Cecil or the editor handpicked these letters to be included due to their very provocative and controversial statements, which highlighted the discontent felt by a section of the public towards the IWGC.

Lady Cecil was able to call on other powerful individuals to aid her campaign against the IWGC. Her husband William Cecil, the Bishop of Exeter, was the son of former Conservative Prime Minister Lord Robert Cecil, the Marquess of Salisbury. Two of Lady Cecil’s brothers-in-law, Lords Robert and Hugh Cecil, were members of the House of Commons, and they became active in Lady Cecil’s campaign. In December 1919, both Lord Robert and Lord Hugh delivered speeches in the House of Commons questioning the policies of the IWGC. Lord Robert targeted the IWGC’s decision-making process as being bureaucratic, focused on the official view, and lacking compassion for the bereaved and the fallen. Lord Robert called it ‘bureaucratic tyranny and nothing else.’

\textsuperscript{64} ‘War Graves’ \textit{Times}, April 16\textsuperscript{th}, 1919, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{65} ‘Official Sacrilege of Graves’ \textit{Times}, May 27\textsuperscript{th}, 1919, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{66} ‘War Graves’ \textit{Times}, April 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 1919, p. 7.
McClure 74

Other members of parliament spoke up after Lord Robert on their discontent towards the IWGC. Sir Henry Craik supported Lord Robert’s view and highlighted public anger over the fact that the Commission was appointed and not elected. Colonel Lambert Ward referred to the failure of the IWGC to properly speak to the bereaved, specifically regarding information about personal inscriptions, which was released as ‘a tactless letter.’ Viscount Wolmer went further to challenge the IWGC’s artistic right to dictate the final designs, asking, ‘Who was to be the judge of the proper expression of sentiment over a soldier’s grave. Was it to be the bureaucracy or the relatives of the soldier? What right had any one of them to dictate to other people how their nearest and dearest should be commemorated?’ Lord Hugh Cecil supported his brother by questioning the rights of the IWGC to use the war dead as part of a collective memorial. He called it, ‘a disregard of the tenderest feelings of humanity merely to pursue a bureaucratic ideal.’ Winston Churchill as the Secretary of State for War attempted to reply to the charges, although he was not able to dissuade the Cecils from pursuing the matter further.

Following the letters and petition by Lady Florence, Colonel Sir James Remnant raised a motion in the House of Commons in March 1920 seeking to address opposition to the IWGC: ‘That, in the opinion of this House, relatives of those who fell in the war should be allowed to erect monuments of their own choosing over the graves of their fallen relatives, subject to such regulations as to size as may be prescribed by the Imperial

---

War Graves Commission.”\textsuperscript{68} Forced to address the issue, the government allowed the motion to be discussed in Parliament, followed by a free vote.\textsuperscript{69}

The House of Commons Debate, 1920

The IWGC realized that the Parliamentary debate on its policies needed to be vigorously joined. Should the British Parliament show its opposition to the IWGC, the whole organization could potentially be replaced with something else. The IWGC began marshalling its resources to confront the opposition’s arguments. Ware led the defence of the IWGC, working with members of the Commission and other politicians to refute the criticisms of the IWGC. They outlined several arguments to be spoken to during the debate: the principle of equality of treatment, the imperial dimensions of the IWGC, and the need for someone to deal with the war dead.

The Commission viewed the first point, on the principle of the equality of treatment, to be the most important. The IWGC noted the principle was unanimously supported at the founding of the commission and by leading figures in the British and Dominion governments.\textsuperscript{70} The IWGC sought to show support came, not just from the elites, but from the working classes of Britain. The IWGC produced a letter from the Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee from 1919, when Lady Cecil was starting her campaign, to the Prince of Wales as the President of the IWGC. The committee voiced its support for the principle of equality of treatment, so that the poor


\textsuperscript{70} Memo: War Graves Statement of Reasons in support of the Proposal of the Imperial War Graves Commission, CWGC 1/1/5/19-Headstones Documents.
and working classes could see that the shared struggle of the nation was maintained in death.\textsuperscript{71} For the IWGC debate before Parliament, Ware turned to Harry Gosling, a member of the Labour Party and a commissioner of the IWGC, to write to his party to secure their support. Gosling was very concerned about the principle of equality of treatment. His memo to his party included a quote from the National Federation of Discharged and Demobilised Sailors and Soldiers that supported the principle. He concluded that all members should oppose the motion and anything that might ‘infringe the principle of equality of treatment.’\textsuperscript{72} The support of the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress was a huge boost to the IWGC. As Labour was the official opposition during this session of parliament, that support would show that the Cecils’ opposition was not in the national interest.

The IWGC sought to use the second point, on the imperial dimension of the Commission and its work, to negate any debate in the House of Commons. The IWGC wanted to remind the House that the decision to create the IWGC and approve its policies had been made by the governments of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland, and India. The principle of equality of treatment was presented in the Imperial Conference of 1918 by Canadian Prime Minister Sir Robert Borden and seconded by Australian Prime Minister William Hughes.\textsuperscript{73} The IWGC worked to garner support from the Dominions prior to the debate. Ware had served as escort to the New Zealand and Canadian High Commissioners Sir Thomas Mackenzie and Sir George

\textsuperscript{71} Copy of letter from G.H. Stuart Bunning and C.W. Bowerman of the Trades Union Congress Parliamentary Committee to the Prince of Wales, May 28\textsuperscript{th}, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/18-Mr. Burdett-Coutts.
\textsuperscript{72} Copy of Mr. Harry Gosling’s Letter to Labour Members, April 21\textsuperscript{st}, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/19-Headstones Documents.
\textsuperscript{73} Memo, ‘War Graves. Statement of Reasons in support of the Proposal of the Imperial War Graves Commission,’ pp. 2-3, CWGC 1/1/5/20-Equality of Treatment-Debate In House of Commons; 1920.
Perley as they toured battlefields of France and Belgium in April 1920. Mackenzie reported on the trip to the press and praised on the work of the IWGC in building the cemeteries. He took a shot at the Cecils and their criticism of the symbols in the cemeteries with the press: ‘It was difficult to understand, said the High Commissioner, why such emblems should be characterized as “un-Christian”; yet he understood the view had been expressed in some quarters.’

Included in the report were extracts of a letter that Perley had sent to Winston Churchill that specifically targeted the upcoming debate in the House of Commons. Perley believed that the motion was an attack on the central principle of the IWGC, something he and his government had always supported, and took offence at the insinuation that those working in the IWGC had been not taken their jobs seriously. Many of the Commission’s employees were from across the Empire, and the work of the IWGC was not just isolated to France and Belgium. The IWGC reminded MPs that the IWGC was meant ‘to represent, in a foreign land and to future generations, the whole British Empire joining as one great unit to defend by arms, and if necessary to die for, the freedom of nations and the freedom of man.’ Along with the sentimental argument about the Empire, the IWGC highlighted the legal argument that any changes to the IWGC Royal Charter and constitution would require the support of the Dominion governments.

The third point was the need to have some organization to bury and commemorate the war dead. The IWGC pointed to the scale of its work and highlighted the costs to

---

74 ‘War Graves Visited. High Commissioners’ Impression,’ *Times*, April 21st, 1920, p. 11.
75 Copy of letter from Sir George Perley to Winston Churchill, April 19th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/18-Mr Burdett Coutts.
show why they needed to be permitted to proceed unhindered. In his letter to Churchill, Perley believed that those criticizing the IWGC need only travel to the newly constructed cemeteries to see the good work they were doing around the world.\textsuperscript{78} The IWGC reinforced these points by providing numbers for MPs to consider. The IWGC estimated they were going to create somewhere between two thousand and three thousand cemeteries in France and Belgium alone. To make the process quick and efficient, a degree of standardization was needed in the designs.\textsuperscript{79} The IWGC tried to make this point clear in a memorandum to MPs in February 1920, which demonstrated that it had taken criticism seriously in considering demands for crosses over headstones. The IWGC allowed Lord Balfour of Burleigh to submit a design for a cruciform headstone as an alternative to the solid headstone in September 1919. The artistic advisors to the IWGC all rejected the design. Kenyon believed it was, ‘thoroughly ugly’, and judged it ‘unintelligible that anyone should feel that the Christian emblem is more worthily respected by this design.’\textsuperscript{80} The chief architects all rejected the cruciform design, with Reginald Bloomfield believing it was, ‘quite unsuitable and their effect in the cemeteries would be disastrous.’ Sir Herbert Baker believed they were, ‘a humpty dumpty design which will not be very pleasant.’ And Sir Edwin Lutyens replied, ‘If you really ask my opinion, all I can say is that I think it is extraordinarily ugly and very difficult to transport without fracture.’\textsuperscript{81} The cruciform and IWGC designs were placed in the House of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{78} Copy of letter from Sir George Perley to Winston Churchill, April 19\textsuperscript{th}, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/18-Mr Burdett Coutts.


\textsuperscript{80} Letter from Sir Frederic Kenyon to the IWGC, September 26\textsuperscript{th}, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/13-Proposal for Cruciform Headstone.

\textsuperscript{81} Letter from Reginal Bloomfield to the IWGC, September 25\textsuperscript{th}, 1919; Letter from Sir Herbert Baker to the IWGC, September 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1919; Letter from Sir Edwin Lutyens to the IWGC, September 24\textsuperscript{th}, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/13- Proposal for Cruciform Headstone.
\end{flushleft}
Commons tearoom for MPs to view in February 1920. The IWGC stated that the cruciform headstone would not satisfy all the needs of the IWGC in commemorating individuals and would cost more per headstone due to transportation and masonry work required to carve the cross.\footnote{The IWGC headstone was estimated to cost £4 18s 6d, while the cruciform was estimated to cost £5 14s. ‘Imperial War Graves Commission: Memorandum on Headstones Exhibited in the House of Commons Tea Room, February, 1920,’ CWGC 1/1/5/20- Equality of Treatment-Debate In House of Commons; 1920.}

To get its arguments across in the debate, the IWGC turned to backbench government MP William Burdett-Coutts. Burdett-Coutts was a quiet MP from Westminster who was unaffiliated with the IWGC before the campaign by the Cecils. His defence of the IWGC was a shock to political correspondents due to his lack of involvement in debates. As one journalist observed, ‘Mr. Burdett-Coutts astonished the House of Commons last week in the debate on war-graves by a speech of lofty and moving eloquence. The member of Westminster very seldom takes part in debate, and this sudden revelation of his oratorical gifts came as a great surprise.’\footnote{Truth, May 12th, 1920, p. 6.} Burdett-Coutts came to the attention of the IWGC when he had a letter to the editor of The Times published in February 1920. He supported the principle of equality of treatment and described a hypothetical cemetery where individuals were able to raise their own style of memorial. He argued that a distinction would be created by those with the means to raise their own memorial and those who could not. Families would see their loved one’s grave ‘marked only by a “Government” stone side by side with one more ornamental and significant.’ Burdett-Clutts believed in the equality of sacrifice between classes, that all were equal when they gave their lives for the war effort. It was in his opinion wrong to
reassert class and wealth distinctions after they had all died in equality. The IWGC contacted Burdett-Coutts requesting his help to speak on its behalf in the House of Commons. Burdett-Coutts agreed, stating that the attack on the commission was ‘by private influence, by a particular set of people whose names give superficial weight to their views, and by methods of persistent personal persuasion, including not a little misrepresentation.’

Burdett-Coutts was in regular contact with the IWGC to finalize the points for the debate. Winston Churchill was the sitting Secretary of the War Office and the official representative of the IWGC in the House of Commons, but Burdett-Coutts was selected to lead the defence of the Commission, with Churchill taking a supporting role. The decision to use Burdett-Coutts over Churchill was due to the power his statement would have as he was a private member with no prior affiliation to the IWGC. Correspondence between Burdett-Coutts and the IWGC shows how closely he worked with Ware, Kenyon, and other members of the IWGC to draft a memorandum for the House of Commons to support the IWGC. The memo passed between Burdett-Coutts and the IWGC for confirmation of the information before being printed by Burdett-Coutts’ office and distributed to members of the House, as well as to the High Commissioners of the Dominions.

---

84 ‘War Graves. To the Editor of The Times,’ *Times*, February 23rd, 1920, p. 10.
85 Letter from the IWGC to William Burdett-Coutts, April 15th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/18-Mr Burdett-Coutts.
86 Letter from William Burdett-Coutts to Lord Arthur Browne Principal Assistant Secretary of the IWGC, April 16th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/18-Mr Burdett Coutts.
87 Letter from Lord Arthur Browne Principal Assistant Secretary to Fabian Ware, April 19th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/18-Mr Burdett Coutts.
88 Letter and draft memo from William Burdett-Coutts to Fabian Ware, April 21st, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/18-Mr Burdett Coutts.
89 Letter from William Burdett-Coutts to Lord Arthur Browne, April 30th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/18-Mr Burdett Coutts.
Both sides in the debate focused on sentimental and emotional arguments over more technical ones about practicality or costs. Burdett-Coutts spoke first and outlined his position first as an outsider, someone who had no contact or interaction with the IWGC. He made his arguments as the common citizen on the street with no connection to the work of the Commission whose decision to support the IWGC had been taken on his own. Burdett-Coutts (like most of the commissioners) had not experienced a direct loss in the war in the form of a close family member, but he quoted letters sent to him by war veterans to support his position. His strongest letter was from Rudyard Kipling, whom Burdett-Coutts never named, identifying him only as ‘the great poet of the Empire.’ He quoted Kipling’s anger at the Cecils: ‘You see we shall never have any grave to go to. Our boy was missing at Loos… I wish some of the people who are making this trouble realise how more than fortunate they are to have a name on a headstone in a known place.’

Churchill closed the debate by outlining the practical side of the Commission’s policies and speaking to the huge effort needed to complete the planned cemeteries and memorials. Churchill used his famed rhetoric to speak on the objectives of the IWGC to create a memorial that would last for hundreds and even thousands of years. He pointed out that the IWGC was creating unique cemeteries, unlike those that simply marked the common passage of time and death through natural life. Churchill instead argued that the cemeteries ‘will be supported and sustained by the wealth of this great nation and Empire, as long as we remain a nation and an Empire, and there is no reason at all why, in periods as remote from our own as we ourselves are from the Tudors, the graveyards in France of this Great War, shall not remain an abiding and supreme memorial to the efforts and the

---

glory of the British Army, and the sacrifices made in that great cause.’ Churchill elaborated on the legacy of the IWGC by speaking about the stone of remembrance: ‘there will be 1,500 or 2,000 of them on the plains of France alone, and these stones will certainly be in existence 2,000 or 3,000 years hence. We know the mutability of human arrangements, but even if our language, our institutions, and our Empire all have faded from the memory of man, these great stones will still preserve the memory of a common purpose pursued by a great nation in the remote past, and will undoubtedly excite the wonder and the reverence of a future age.’

The leading figures arguing against the IWGC were Lord Robert Cecil and Viscount Volmer. Both sought to counter the IWGC’s claim that they were wealthy elites speaking for a minority by arguing that some regulations on design and cost of memorials needed to be imposed. Lord Robert dismissed all practical arguments of delay and cost, pointing to his own experience with other government schemes that were said to be impractical but turned out to be easily done. Lord Robert’s speech tried to get at what he saw as the heart of the debate, whether individual graves should represent a national (or imperial) memorial, or a personal one. Lord Robert argued, ‘Right through the Graves Commission is the conception of a national monument; that has been their governing conception. May I just remind the Committee that that is an entirely novel idea? It has never been done before in the world’s history, by any Government, at any time, in any nation, in any place, in any age, in any civilization. It has never been said that the State has a right to turn the individual memory to individual persons into a national memorial against the will and against the desire of their relatives. It is an entirely new idea.’ It was

---

the lack of choice and the IWGC’s refusal to consult the bereaved that made the debate important. Viscount Volmer in his speech also took aim at the IWGC’s controlling attitude to the war graves, quoting a number of letters he had received from bereaved individuals highlighting their disapproval of the IWGC. A secondary theme of the letters was the poor treatment of the bereaved by the IWGC. The Commission had replied with cold bureaucratic language, a lack of sympathy, and refusal to consider the bereaved desires. One letter quoted by Volmer highlighted the anger many people felt: ‘Should they adhere to their policy on uniformity as indicated, I do not propose to accept their invitation to add anything to what they choose to put upon the stone, as I do not wish to desecrate my son’s memory by countenancing in any way the hideous and unchristian memorials which they propose.’ Volmer and others agreed with the policy of equality of treatment, but that uniformity and equality were not the same thing. Seeking to counter the sentimental rhetoric, Volmer replied, ‘What freedom is it if you will not even allow the dead bodies of the people’s relatives to be cared for and looked after in the way they like? It is a memorial, not to freedom, but to rigid militarism; not to intention, but in effect.’ Volmer objected to the IWGC’s control of the bodies: ‘But you have no right to employ, in making those memorials, the bodies of other people’s relatives. It is not decent, it is not reasonable, it is not right. A memorial is something to be seen. There will be two classes of people who will visit these graveyards: there will be the idle tourists in the first place, and secondly there will be the bereaved relatives. Are you going to

---

consider the feelings of the bereaved relatives or the artistic susceptibilities of the casual

tourist?  

As these speeches highlight, both sides attempted to use sentimentality to justify
their positions, arguing with the rhetoric from the war and speaking in terms of sacrifice,
freedom, and rights. A report on the debate highlighted the fiery and emotional responses
aroused by the speeches from other MPs. The correspondent for *The Guardian* reported
that Churchill, Burdett-Coutts, and others who spoke on their side were more convincing
than Cecil or Volmer, and that MPs appreciated and understood the IWGC’s arguments.  

Other speakers during the debate showed the mood of the House, none more clearly than
former Prime Minister Herbert Asquith who, having lost his only son in the war, threw
his voice behind the IWGC. Support for the IWGC from the majority of MPs
highlighted the desire for politicians to find a purpose in the conflict. The Commission’s
position allowed politicians to see a symbolic value in the war dead far more easily than
the desire for private considerations.

The IWGC survived the debate, but Lord Cecil warned in his final remarks that
the debate was not over as others outside the House of Commons would continue the
fight. Resistance against the IWGC did continue in the following decades, but there
would not be as significant a challenge as the debate in May 1920. In the official histories
of the IWGC, resistance and challenges to the Commission are either ignored or swept
aside as little importance to the history of the organization.

93 Viscount Volmer Speech to the House of Commons, May 4th, 1920, *Parliamentary Debates*, Commons,
95 Herbert Asquith to the House of Commons, May 4th, 1920, *Parliamentary Debates*, Commons, 5th ser.,
The Problem of Princess Beatrice and Lady Maud Selborne

One of the criticisms brought up by Volmer and Cecil in the debate was the failure of the IWGC to include any women among its leadership. Burdett-Coutts had made a rhetorical flourish about the stoicism of women stating, ‘The women: the mothers, the wives, the daughters and sisters of England and of Great Britain! We used to read of the Roman women in this connection. But classic story contains no examples of mingled resignation and pride comparable to that shown by British women in the 20th century of the Christian era.’ Volmer targeted such high language to highlight the failure of the IWGC to include any women in the organization: ‘I listened with admiration to the eloquent passage in the speech of the hon. Member for Westminster when he spoke about the women of England. Why are they not represented upon the Commission? Of the hundreds of letters that I have received the greater part of them come from women. Women feel more acutely upon this question than men. That is only natural. Why are the women not represented on the War Graves Commission?’ Lord Cecil echoed Volmer in letter from a Scottish clergyman who stated, ‘in talking it over with various bereaved mothers and widows I find that the prevailing feeling is in favour of their right to put up their own monuments.’ The role of women in the debate was ignored by defenders of the IWGC and the participation of women as commissioners has remained very limited.

---

No women served as commissioners before the outbreak of the Second World War.\textsuperscript{100} It was not until 1954 that Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, the High Commissioner for India to the United Kingdom, became the first first female commissioner.\textsuperscript{101} Pandit was a commissioner due to her position and it was not until 1966 that a woman was selected to serve as a commissioner by the IWGC when Joan Woodgate, the former Matron-in-Chief of Queen Alexandra’s Royal Naval Nursing Service, was chosen to serve as an unofficial member.\textsuperscript{102}

Examining cases of resistance to the IWGC, women are disproportionately represented as opposed to IWGC policy. In addition to Lady Florence Cecil, two more well-known examples of resistance came from Lady Maud Selborne and Princess Beatrice, the last surviving daughter of Queen Victoria. All three of these women were grouped together by the IWGC as exceptions to most women. They were seen as the elites of society using their social connections to get what they wanted. The three women shared the same motivation to resist, as all three were mothers who had lost sons in the war.\textsuperscript{103}

The IWGC took particular interest in Princess Beatrice due to her position as a member of the Royal Family. Her son Prince Maurice of Battenberg was the only member of the Royal Family to be killed in the war; he died on October 27\textsuperscript{th}, 1914, during

\textsuperscript{100} In the appendices of Ware’s book on the 20\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the founding of the IWGC, he lists all members of the Commission from 1917-1937, none of whom are women. The only woman mentioned in the appendices is Dame Adelaide Livingstone who is included with military personal for aiding in the work of the DGRE between 1918-1921 in identifying the missing. Fabian Ware, \textit{The Immortal Heritage}, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1937), Appendix C, p. 78.

\textsuperscript{101} Membership of the Commission: Minutes of Proceedings at the 374\textsuperscript{th} Meeting of the Imperial War Graves Commission, CWGC 2/2/1/374-Commission Meeting No. 374-October 1954.

\textsuperscript{102} Membership of the Commission: Minutes of Proceedings at the 483\textsuperscript{rd} Meeting of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, CWGC 2/2/1/483-Commission Meeting No. 483-June 1966.

\textsuperscript{103} As mentioned earlier, Lady Florence lost three sons in the war and as will be discussed, Princess Beatrice lost her only son in the war, while Lady Maud lost one son.
the First Battle of Ypres. Princess Beatrice did not have his body returned home when she had the opportunity before the repatriation ban. Shortly after the war ended, she began trying to have a personal monument erected over his grave. Ware saw the case as an important marker for the principle of equality of treatment, for having a member of the Royal Family with a war casualty openly agree to the IWGC’s principle would solidify the work of the Commission. But Princess Beatrice remained determined to have her own memorial erected. Her demand threatened the IWGC’s policies, as the Commission could not be seen to give preferential treatment to anyone, even a member of the Royal Family. Mark Connolly and Stefan Goebel highlight the delicate public relations dance Ware and the IWGC were in as they worked to keep the dispute quiet, but also to guard against any deviation from their policy. It was not until 1932 that Princess Beatrice relented and allowed an IWGC headstone to be erected over her son’s grave. She did so only after being asked by her son’s regiment, who wanted to have ensure all their soldiers were remembered properly.104

For Ware and the IWGC the support of King George V for the principle was the greatest success to come out of the fight with Princess Beatrice. The King outlined his stance in a 1925 News of the World article in which his personal views were described as ‘judicious, utterly impartial in his interpretation of regulations, and convinced of the righteousness of equality of treatment for the war dead. The royal officer body was the same as the body of the private soldier of humble background.’105 The importance of the King supporting the IWGC had been seen in 1922, when he toured the old battlefields of

---

104 The article goes into greater depth on the dispute between Princess Beatrice and the IWGC, Mark Connelly and Stefan Goebel, ‘The Imperial War Graves Commission, The War Dead and the Burial of a Royal Body, 1914-32,’ Historical Research, 93, no. 262 (November 2020), pp. 734-753.
Belgium and France with Ware and Field Marshal Earl Haig. Called the King’s Pilgrimage, the tour was full of religious and national symbols. Although it was considered a private and personal tour, it was done in front of the British and international press. The image of the King in visiting the cemeteries helped to give Ware and the IWGC the affirmation that the cemeteries were sanctified by the man for whom the soldiers died. The tour was publicized by the IWGC with a book containing pictures of the King visiting the cemeteries. The carefully selected images and text, including a poem by Rudyard Kipling, showed the King as approving and supporting the IWGC in its work. The support given to the IWGC by the King ensured that Princess Beatrice could not mount a serious objection to the treatment of her son’s grave.

Lady Maud Selborne’s objection to the IWGC focused the point of uniformity. Lady Maud had several children fight in the war, and she lost her second son Robert Stafford Arthur Palmer in the Mesopotamia Campaign of 1916. Lady Selborne took the position that equality did not mean uniformity to the extreme. In the National Review in July 1920, she called the policies of the IWGC ‘national socialism’ as she titled her article “National Socialism in War Cemeteries”. Selborne had grievances with the policy of repatriation rather than headstone design. She objected to the treaty signed by the IWGC with France and Belgium that regulated the handling of war dead arguing that the treaty fostered the ‘socialist spirit’ in the IWGC. Using the rise of Communism in Russia, as well as the contentious issue of conscription, Selborne directs her anger at the IWGC

---


107 This is not Nazism as we today would know it, rather she means a state sanctioned policy that is socialist in nature.
stating, ‘This conscription of bodies is worthy of Lenin.’ She concludes by stating, ‘This contempt of liberty, this exaltation of the State, this aspiration for similarity and equality is the very quintessence of Socialism.’ Selborne’s language sought to stir up public anger and protest towards the non-repatriation policy that she wanted reversed.

The Commission’s concern with Selborne’s article was its potential to increase public demands for repatriation. Selborne’s article was published at a point when the French and Americans governments passed laws to repatriate their war dead. The IWGC had watched with concern as the American government pledged in March 1920 to follow through with wartime promises of repatriation if requested. In 1919, the Belgian and French governments had passed laws banning the repatriation and exhumation of war dead, but when the Americans started asking for assistance in repatriating their war dead, the pressure on both governments mounted. In May 1920, the IWGC learned that the French government was reversing the ban on exhumations and began a debate over how to proceed. The IWGC kept close tabs on those debates. The French government agreed to move the graves for those families who wanted to do so, and to inter the rest in national cemeteries, but they could not decide on the cost. Ware suggested in a letter to the Secretary of State that the financial problems the French were having would be replicated in Britain if the government suddenly reversed course and had to pay both for

---

108 Copy of Maud Selborne, ‘National Socialism in War Cemeteries,’ National Review, July 1920, in CWGC 1/1/7/B/43-Exhumation-France and Belgium-General File.
109 Letter from Major Ingpen, Land and Legal Advisor to IWGC, July 3rd, 1920, CWGC 1/1/7/B/43-Exhumation-France and Belgium-General File.
110 Letter from Major Ingpen to Fabian War, March 30th, 1920. CWGC 1/1/7/B/43-Exhumation-France and Belgium-General File.
111 Letter from Major Tomlin to IWGC, May 20th, 1920, containing a copy of the report from the Chambre des Deputes no. 831. CWGC 1/1/7/B/43-Exhumation-France and Belgium-General File.
cemeteries, and for repatriating the bodies.\textsuperscript{112} The difficulty of the French government to pay for and commemorate their own war dead became a major issue as the construction of their memorials to the missing had to be paid for by private donations when the government failed to provide the funds in a timely manner.\textsuperscript{113} Fearing increased demands for repatriation, the IWGC were able to keep discussions of the situation in France out of the House of Commons, which limited the scope of the conversation on them in Britain.

**Sarah Ann Smith and the Campaigns of the British War Graves Association**

Ware and the IWGC believed that the elites of British society were pushing the hardest for changes to their policy. The most vocal resistors had noble titles, wealth, or influence in government. The IWGC summed up its response to detractors with the line, ‘One could never explain to a person why Lord or Lady this was able to have a body [brought] home while plain Mrs. Smith, a labourer’s wife or widow could not, though anyone aware of the conditions would know quite well.’\textsuperscript{114} The accuracy of this argument would be challenged by Sarah Ann Smith, who helped to organize campaigns against the IWGC ban on repatriation. Smith was the wife of a tailor in Leeds whose son Frederick Ernest Smith was killed in September 1918.\textsuperscript{115} She wrote to the DGRE in May 1919 to demand that she and others be allowed to bring home the bodies of their dead; this was in the context of the public repatriation of Nurse Edith Cavell. Smith warned that she spoke for others in her neighbourhood in highlighting a fear in working-class families: ‘so many

\textsuperscript{112} Letter from Fabian Ware to Secretary of State, July 19th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/7/B/43-Exhumation-France and Belgium-General File.
\textsuperscript{114} Longworth, *The Unending Vigil*, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{115} Private Frederick Ernest Smith Service Number 55715 Casualty Details, CWGC Find War Dead, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/casualty-details/291083/frederick-ernest-smith/
poor people are afraid of speaking out as they could not get the money to pay the expenses of bringing them [the bodies] over.’ Smith reveals that the silence of the working classes over repatriation was not consent, but a fear that the bodies would be neglected if the IWGC was dismantled as they could not afford to pay for repatriation. In response, the DGRE informed her that no bodies were being repatriated, and that the case of Edith Cavell was not under the jurisdiction of the IWGC as she was not in a military cemetery. The return of her body was undertaken by the government due to ‘the special circumstances attending her death.’

Smith was unhappy with the response and organized a petition. In under a month, she was able to gather hundreds of signatures in support of her demand for the repatriation of the war dead. The exact number is not clear, Smith claimed she had over 2,250 signatures, but the IWGC concluded that there were no more than 1,400 and that many of the signatures were either repeated or may have been added without consent.

The petition was only circulated around Leeds and Smith (perhaps inspired by the petition that Lady Cecil had organized) warned that if she expanded the distribution, even more people would support her. As with Cecil’s petition, Smith addressed hers to the Prince of Wales, although she sent the actual petition to Winston Churchill with the request to forward. The petition shows the community canvassing Smith undertook as the pages with signatures vary in size, colour, and design, showing that she used any available
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117 The letter responding to her had two versions created, in the first they spoke of Cavell as a ‘martyr’ and that her return was to be a memorial to the cruel government of the German Emperor. This was replaced in the final letter that was mailed and instead used the quoted line. Letter from the DGRE to Mrs. Smith, May 28th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
118 Note on Petition to Mr. Talbot; Letter from Mrs. Smith to the DGRE, June 17th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
paper. The language that Smith used in the opening of the petition was similar to Lady Cecil’s as Smith argues, ‘It has always been the view of every English family that their beloved dead belonged to them alone.’ The IWGC denied the petition’s request to allow repatriation.

Smith built on her experience in creating the petition to establish a community organization to oppose the IWGC. In April 1920, Smith informed the *Yorkshire Evening News* of the founding of the British War Graves Association (BWGA), with her as the Honourable General Secretary and Treasurer. The BWGA grew primarily in northern England with centres in Leeds, Sheffield, and Wakefield, and had over 2,000 members in Leeds several months after forming. The activities of the BWGA were focused on commemorating the war through meetings and participation in remembrance activities. It routinely passed resolutions demanding the repatriation of bodies, as well as free or discounted travel passes to the battlefields, became involved in the erection of war memorials in their local area, and worked to help veterans in their communities. The BWGA joined the Poppy Appeal, and advertised its work selling poppies. As the Honourable Secretary, Smith was the primary correspondent for the BWGA and her dislike of the IWGC came through in the organization’s letters. Writing to the IWGC in July 1921 after sending in another resolution about the repatriation of bodies, Smith wrote, ‘On my writing a second time I was told the resolution had been lost and would I

---

120 Estimating the number of signatures is difficult as there are 76 pages of signatures. Some pages are lined, some are not, some are large foolscap papers, while the smallest has only three lines of signatures. The full petition is at the front of CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
121 Petition to H.R.H. The Prince of Wales, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
124 Press Clipping from *Yorkshire Evening News*, November 8th, 1921, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
send it again. I did so at once but still no reply this is several weeks ago and our members are becoming very indignant at the treatment we receive and will certainly not be pacified very long." Smith and the BWGA expressed anger at the actions of the IWGC, which they felt were undemocratic. Smith lambasted the treaty the IWGC signed with France stating, ‘It is within your power to alter the “Treaty” made between France and Britain in November 1918 & which was done in secret & not known to the public until March 1919.’ Writing to the Secretary of State of War in December 1921, her exasperation with the IWGC came through: ‘I do not want this passing over to the IWG Commission it is to you as “Minister for War” that I have to appeal & I have to request a reply from you direct.’ Smith was particularly incensed about the poor communication skills of the IWGC: ‘What we object to is that we never hear about things from you until after we hear from the press…I consider we have a right to know things and it is up to you to acquaint the public instead of doing things in secret as you do.’

The IWGC responses to Smith and the BWGA remained negative and frustrated her. She warned that if some sort of action was not taken soon, members of the BWGA would act as ‘they are very resentful about it and some of them are speaking of taking the law into their own hands in bringing their dead home. I cannot see how this can be prevented, seeing that the French themselves removed theirs before permission was granted.’ After years of trying to shift the IWGC, Smith expressed her frustrations in a letter to Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald: ‘We are being treated with great harshness

125 Letter from Mrs. Smith of the BWGA to the IWGC, July 15th, 1921, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
126 Copy of Letter from Mrs. Smith of the BWGA to Sir Worthington-Evans Secretary of State for War, December 13th, 1921, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
127 Letter from Mrs. Smith to the IWGC, October 10th, 1925, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
128 Copy of letter from Mrs. Smith of the BWGA to Sir Worthington-Evans, January 10th, 1922, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
and with far more cruelty than the bereaved of other countries. We are only asking for our just rights and it is high time we should be helped and not put off again and again.'

Smith wrote her letters from the perspective of bereaved families, which reflected her own condition and experiences as a grieving mother. Writing about the difficulties of visiting the cemeteries, Smith demanded the IWGC do something ‘to prevent relatives who visit graves being insulted by frontier officials in Belgium and also having to pay duty on wreaths they take in?’ She demanded, ‘Do not ignore this or make the usual excuses please. We feel we are deeply wronged.’ Later, Smith expressed her frustration with the IWGC’s response: ‘You are of course powerful and we are only an insignificant association started nearly 6 years ago (by myself)...You always reply to my letters with courteously, but at the same time with a lenient sort of way that one uses to a child and I do not like it, as I say our desires have a right to be respected.’ Smith believed that the IWGC and Ware were misogynists, arguing that ‘Our Sheffield manager Mr Smith (no relative of mine) would have been treated with more honour.’

The IWGC disapproved of Smith and the BWGA, fearing that they were misrepresenting the Commission to the public. In a memo to staff of the enquiries section, the Principal Assistant Secretary of the IWGC wrote, ‘Lord Arthur Browne also thinks that though Mrs. Smith’s letters should be replied to, letters should also be addressed to the next-of-kin in question giving the information asked for. This will ensure that the next-of-kin gets unadulterated information.’

The constant barrage of letters and the

129 Letter from Mrs. Smith to Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald, April 8th, 1924, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
130 Letter from Mrs. Smith to the IWGC, October 3rd, 1925, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
131 Letter from Mrs. Smith to the IWGC, October 10th, 1925, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
132 Letter from Principal Assistant Secretary to Enquiries in the IWGC, August 8th, 1921, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
continued reluctance of Smith and the BWGA to accept the decisions of the IWGC ground on the bureaucrats working in the British government and in the Commission. In January 1922 the secretary to the Secretary of State of War revealed that frustration, telling the IWGC, ‘The Secretary of State is not interested in this Association or in the writer. I should therefore be glad if you would send her an official reply,’ ending the War Office’s communication with the BWGA. The IWGC tried to end further debate by writing in an official response, ‘The Commission regret to have to inform you that they see no good purpose in further discussion of principles that, in the House of Commons and elsewhere, have long met with general acceptance.’ Smith ignored the declaration and continued writing to the IWGC to demand repatriation. The IWGC simply gave up trying to convince Smith that repatriation was not going to happen. It informed the War Office that all future communications with her were to ignore any questions or comments about repatriation.

The IWGC’s frustration with Smith and the BWGA led the community organization to be treated poorly and misunderstood. The contempt of the IWGC for Smith and the BWGA reflects the bureaucratic nature of the organization that saw the next-of-kin and the war dead primarily as names on lists. Smith and the BWGA highlight the emotional and traumatic experience of dealing with the IWGC to assert their rights as mourners and as individuals. Ware put little stock in the BWGA as representing working-class resentment to the IWGC: ‘This little Association sprang out of the Cecil

---

133 Letter from the War Office to the IWGC, January 12th, 1922, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
135 Letter from the IWGC to the War Office, July 8th, 1922, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
and Selborne opposition to our policy and is still supported by them.' 137 Ware’s belief
that this was simply the reincarnation of elitist attacks was based on the role played both
Lady Cecil and Lady Selborne in the BWGA. Lady Cecil served as one of two vice-
presidents, while Lady Selborne was one of two honorary patrons. 138 The inclusion of
both these women allowed Ware and the IWGC to see the BWGA as brainwashed by
elites. Ware’s snubbing of Smith as a citizen with legitimate concerns speaks to the
classist way the IWGC and British bureaucracy functioned, only taking social and
political elites seriously.

Smith corresponded with Lady Selborne through their work in the BWGA. One of
the letters highlights the work Smith conducted for the BWGA and the heavy lifting she
was doing. She reported to Selborne that the work was overwhelming her, but as no one
would take her place she felt forced to carry on. She also questioned the work of the
president who was ignoring all their requests for information. Smith told Selborne that her
wish would be to live in France to act as an agent in helping visitors and advocating for
the return of the bodies to England. 139 The letter, rather than showing Smith as serving
Selborne, reveals that her work for the BWGA was a labour she felt needed to be done.
Selborne was not imposing her ideas on Smith; instead, the letter reveals that the two
women shared the same goal and were working together to push for the shared end result.
Even so, the names of Selborne and Cecil continued to serve as red flags that caused the
IWGC to resist working with the BWGA. When the BWGA contacted the head of the

137 Copy of letter from Fabian War to Sir Robert Hudson, December 13th, 1922, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
138 Their names are listed on a copy of a membership application, British War Graves Association, Central Branch, Application for Membership, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
139 Copy of Letter from Mrs. Smith to Lady Selborne, June 21st, 1924, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
IWGC in France, Colonel Harold Goodland, for assistance, he was cautious as he saw the names Selborne and Cecil. He concluded, ‘on looking at the names at the head of the note-paper it occurs to me that some of these people are not our friends.’

Smith was determined to repatriate bodies and began trying to circumvent the IWGC. In November 1919 she wrote to the Belgian King Albert requesting that he allow the bodies of the British war dead be returned. Smith claimed that she was speaking for many and reiterated her belief that English families owned the bodies and deserved to tend the graves. She attempted to contact the French government by writing to the British Consul General of France at the same time. Despite being rejected by the Belgian government, Smith continued to write directly to powerful people as the representative of the BWGA. In November 1920 she wrote to Queen Mary asking for her aid in supporting them. The Queen turned the letter over to the IWGC and simply acknowledged that the IWGC was considering the proposal.

Smith’s use of the BWGA in her attempts to go around the IWGC caused significant confusion for foreign governments. In December 1922, she wrote to the Ministère de la Dèfense Nationale in Brussels requesting that the body of Private Arnold Dyson, the son of BWGA members, be returned to them. The Office des Sépultures Militaires in the Ministère wrote to the IWGC asking them to handle the request.

---

140 Letter from Colonel H.T. Goodland to Fabian Ware, April 27th, 1927, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
141 Letter from Mrs. Smith to King Albert, November 18th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
142 While the letter was not put in her file, the IWGC response was where they mention she sent it on November 15th, 1919, Copy of letter from IWGC to Mrs. Smith, December 8th, 1919, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
143 Letter from Mrs. Smith of the BWGA to Queen Mary, November 15th, 1920 and response, November 24th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
144 Letter from Mrs. Smith of the BWGA to Ministère de la Dèfense Nationale, November 13th, 1922, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
Afraid that the Belgians could undermine the authority of the IWGC unless they clearly understood the situation, the IWGC wrote back stating,

La Commission Impériale des Sépultures Militaires constituée par la Charte Royale du 10 mai 1917, et reconnue par le Gouvernement Belge comme le seul organisme officiel britannique charger de veiller en Belgique à la conservation des sépultures militaires britanniques attache la plus grande importance à ce que toute situation delicate, qui pourrait résulter des activités de particulier sou d’association volontaires, telle que la dite “BRITISH WAR GRAVES ASSOCIATION” qui n’a aucun pouvoir official soit évitée.146

Warnings were put out to the local authorities to be aware of any attempt by Smith, the Dyson family, or others to take Arnold’s body. The BWGA was able to have the remains of one local soldier returned; Tom Backhouse had immigrated to the USA in 1913 and was killed serving the American Army. His family, still living in Leeds and part of the BWGA, was able to have his body returned to them.147

The final and greatest hope Smith and the BWGA had for repatriation was to appeal to the British government directly. They put together a second petition in 1923 and tried sending it to the Prime Minister. Their first attempt in April was to Bonar Law, but when he retired, they sent a second copy to the new Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin.148 When local MPs were informed of the petition, the IWGC found itself repeatedly replying to letters from the War Office, Downing Street, and MPs about the BWGA. The election victory of the Labour Party in 1924 provided hope for the BWGA that things would change. In a letter to the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, the chairman of the BWGA J.W. Chapman expressed his congratulations on his appointment. Chapman pointed to his

147 Press Clipping from Yorkshire Post, May 13th, 1924, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
148 Letter from the BWGA to Lord Derby, April 14th, 1923; Letter from the BWGA to Sir Stanley Baldwin, July 6th, 1923, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
labour credentials in his involvement in the West Hunslet I.L.P. & the South Leeds Socialist Union, before asking the Chancellor to consider reversing previous governments’ failures to act on the IWGC. Smith went further by writing to the new Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald. When she was again turned down, Smith wrote back: ‘Our Association had great hopes that you would give us (we who desire) this very natural request. Do please forgive my persistence but it seems our last hope of comfort is slipping away.’ After being informed by the IWGC of its policies, the Labour Party again turned down Smith. Her response highlights the working-class nature of the BWGA: ‘It appears we cannot get our just rights and I dread having to tell our members of our last appeal being rejected – they had hoped so much from you.’

The rejection by the Labour Party appears to have been a turning point for Smith and her activism. Motivated by both the discouraging response from the Labour government and the completion of many IWGC cemeteries in France and Belgium, she and the BWGA turned away from demanding repatriation. Instead, they began to advocate for the maintenance of the cemeteries. Members of the BWGA began travelling to the cemeteries in large numbers, returning with stories of incorrect headstones, unfinished gardening, damaged cemeteries, and other issues. Smith began including these issues in her letters to the IWGC, demanding that it fulfil the promises of creating beautiful resting places. Smith warned, ‘The reporters generally attend our monthly meeting & so it is quite impossible to keep things out of the press & of course it is only

150 Letter from Mrs. Smith to PM Ramsay MacDonald, March 7th, 1924, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
151 Letter from Mrs. Smith to Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald, April 8th, 1924, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
right that these things should be attended to.’ Always worried about public opinion and the threat of poor publicity, the IWGC responded to Smith’s letters on maintenance. The Commission’s response can be seen when a group of BWGA members from Sheffield visited Bulls Road Military Cemetery and reported their disapproval of the designs. Writing in the visitor book, they called the cemetery’s wall ‘repulsive,’ ‘hideous,’ and in a ‘disappointing state.’ The head of the IWGC in Albert, France, reported that one of the visitors, J.W. Smith, a member of the BWGA (but no relation to Sarah Smith) had encouraged the comments and that he ‘called at this office and made frivolous complaints about constructional and other Commission matters, which have had no beneficial effect.’ Frances Tingey, another member of the tour, wrote to Ware directly upon her return home to complain about the cemetery and demand that the design be changed.

Ware had the cemetery architect Herbert Baker visit it and assess the situation. Baker concluded that while the complaints about design were not entirely wrong, he stated, ‘The grievance really touches two principles which conflict in some cases. That is whether the cemeteries should be considered from the point of view of the passers by on the public road or as enclosed and protected sanctuaries. The latter is the one which I have generally followed in my designs.’ Smith and the BWGA motivated the IWGC to ensure that it maintained the cemeteries so as to elicit as few complaints from them in the future. When

---

152 Letter from Mrs. Smith of the BWGA to the IWGC, July 26th, 1924, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
154 Letter from G.L. Phillips, Branch Office No.5 Area IWGC Albert, to Head Office IWGC Saint-Omer, August 18th, 1925, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
155 Letter from Frances Tingey to Fabian War, September 6th, 1925, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
156 Letter from Herbert Baker to Fabian Ware, October 12th, 1925, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
Smith discovered that the temporary wooden cross over her son’s grave had broken, she wrote the IWGC asking them to replace it with a new one and save the old one. In delivering instructions to the team in the field, the Commission asked the workers, ‘if you could kindly give special instructions about this as we have had so much trouble with Mrs. Smith in the past that it is most important to comply with her wishes.’

Relations between the IWGC and the BWGA were not always frosty and hostile. While Smith was based in Leeds, other branches of the BWGA did make efforts to show support of the IWGC’s actions. The chairman of the Sheffield branch of the BWGA, C.P. Styring, wrote to Ware to thank him for the work that he and Lord Curzon were doing in building the cemeteries in Gallipoli in a timely fashion. He was most interested as three friends of his from Australia had been killed in the battle and were buried there. Even Sarah Smith commended the IWGC for doing a good job after she found several of the cemeteries to be very beautiful.

Smith was not afraid to ask the IWGC for help when organizing tours, as she wrote for advice on which were the best sites to visit. Relations between Smith and the IWGC slowly improved as the BWGA shifted from advocating for repatriation to helping families commemorate and visit cemeteries. They established an annual pilgrimage to the Western Front where they continued to keep tabs on the cemeteries and memorials. The IWGC remembered Smith for her resistance, referring to her as ‘one of our most regular and troublesome correspondents,’ when she wrote

157 Letter from Principal Assistant Secretary to Deputy Controller Head Office IWGC France, August 20th, 1926, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
158 Letter from C.P. Styring to Fabian Ware, January 29th, 1923, CWGC 1/1/5/21-War Graves Association.
159 Letter from Mrs. Smith to the IWGC, August 7th, 1926, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
160 Letter from Mrs. Smith to the Vicar of the IWGC at Saint-Omer, April 13th, 1927, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
161 A press clipping from 1932 reported the trip was a huge success even though numbers declined due to the Depression, Press Clipping from Yorkshire Post, July 1st, 1932, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
about the condition of the memorial in Harponville Communal Cemetery and Loos Memorial.\textsuperscript{162}

Smith passed away in 1936 and the IWGC decided to remember her for the work she did helping families visit the cemeteries.\textsuperscript{163} In a letter expressing their condolences, the IWGC described the relationship with Smith as ‘always … exceedingly cordial and friendly.’\textsuperscript{164} Perhaps the IWGC had forgotten the earlier anger with which Smith targeted them, as by 1936 her correspondence with them had declined significantly. Most likely the Commission was simply being polite. The position of Honourable Secretary in the BWGA was carried on by Ethel Smith, the daughter of Sarah Smith. Ethel’s letters are far more courteous than her mother’s. Wishing to report on some issues they encountered during their annual trip in 1937, Ethel prefaces the letter with, ‘Our people do not wish any trouble to fall on the exsoldier’s (gardeners) in charge of the cemeteries. Whenever they have visited if the gardener was in the cemetery he always treated them all with courtesy & kindness. I would please like you to understand this.’\textsuperscript{165}

The case of Smith and the BWGA highlights that in Britain, there was resistance to the IWGC’s policies surrounding commemoration and the use of the war dead for political messaging. Smith’s advocacy highlights how one individual resisted through a community organization and held the IWGC accountable once it became clear that her personal desires would never be fulfilled. Smith’s work can be seen as an expression of

\textsuperscript{162} Letter from the IWGC to Chief Administrative Officer IWGC Arras, July 6\textsuperscript{th}, 1932, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
\textsuperscript{163} Minutes of Proceedings at the 195th Meeting of the Imperial War Graves Commission, p. 5, CWGC 2/2/1/195-Commission Meeting No. 483.
\textsuperscript{164} Letter from the IWGC to the Chairman of the BWGA, June 18\textsuperscript{th}, 1936, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
\textsuperscript{165} Letter from Ethel Smith of the BWGA to the IWGC, July 19\textsuperscript{th}, 1937, CWGC 1/1/5/22-War Graves Association.
mourning, for she strove to ensure that she had some role in the burial of her son. Smith’s drive shows the failure of the IWGC to provide sufficient closure for the bereaved, for the Commission’s control of the bodies did not give individuals the means to process their grief. Smith was more active and vocal in displaying her dissatisfaction with how the IWGC controlled her mourning, but she was not alone in feeling upset with the politicization of the war dead. Her identity as a working-class mother presents a challenge to the arguments of the IWGC that it represented those who could not afford to memorialize the dead. The policy of equality of treatment was resented not just by elites, but also by those whom the policy was meant to aid. Individuals wanted the ability to mourn and grieve as they wanted, not simply as part of a collective.

The IWGC and the Dominions

The nature of the relationship between the IWGC and the bereaved was much different in the Dominions. While the IWGC portrayed itself as an imperial organization serving all members of the Empire equally, the reality was that the Commission was primarily funded by the British government. In the eyes of the British Treasury Department, the funding arrangement made the IWGC answerable to the British government. The Treasury attempted to cut funding to the IWGC as the construction of the cemeteries was coming to an end, arguing in 1924, that the Commission was spending too much money on the salary of staff gardeners and administrators. Ware responded

---

166 In the 1918 Imperial Conference, the funding for the IWGC was decided to be based on the number of known graves for each nation with each nation paying a set rate for the number of their soldiers graves under IWGC care. In 1930, Britain had the greatest number of graves, consisting of 81.53% of total known graves, Canada was second with 7.78%, followed by Australia at 6.35% and New Zealand at 1.81%. Ware, The Immortal Heritage, p. 47.

167 Letter from the Treasury Department to the IWGC, November 29th, 1924, NA T 161/242/15-Imperial War Graves Commission Scheme for Permanent Maintenance.
by going to the British cabinet and wrote on behalf of the Secretary of War a memo outlining his opposition to the Treasury’s interference. He argued that he was forced to do so as,

the Treasury view was that any higher standard of maintenance than had been applied to soldiers’ graves before the Great War (e.g. the Crimean graves) was unnecessary and that the Treasury policy would be to take advantage of any diminution of public interest in the graves as the years progressed until they might ultimately be allowed to disappear…I consulted Dominion representatives on the Commission as to the course they would wish to adopt. They immediately pointed out that any change of policy was a “Cabinet question” for all the Governments concerned.\footnote{168}

Ware warned that if the British government neglected the war graves, the Dominions feared a significant backlash from families who had never given up the demands for repatriation of the bodies. Ware concluded with his own view on how the British government should proceed: ‘I cannot help feeling that the Mother Country should lead rather than be urged by the Dominions in commemorating these dead fittingly and permanently.’\footnote{169} The Treasury responded that it had ‘gone very far to meet Dominion susceptibilities by confining Treasury control to the amount of the annual grant in aid’ and objected to Ware’s manipulation of the Dominions: ‘At present General Ware finds them very convenient bogeys when he objects to Treasury views.’\footnote{170} In response to these issues the British cabinet overruled the Treasury, choosing not to upset the Dominions over the IWGC.\footnote{171}

\footnote{168} The Cabinet: The Maintenance of War Cemeteries, December 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1924, NA T 161/242/15-Imperial War Graves Commission Scheme for Permanent Maintenance.
\footnote{169} The Cabinet: The Maintenance of War Cemeteries, December 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1924, NA T 161/242/15-Imperial War Graves Commission Scheme for Permanent Maintenance.
\footnote{170} Draft letter from the Chancellor of the Exchequer to Sir George Barstow, January 12\textsuperscript{th}, 1925, NA T 161/242/15-Imperial War Graves Commission Scheme for Permanent Maintenance.
\footnote{171} In 1933, a Treasury employee named Mr. Ryan took exception to the IWGC’s financial actions, particularly around the salary and pension of Ware, arguing that more was needed, but his bosses in the Treasury refused to act due to their concerns being overruled in 1927 by the Cabinet when earlier issues.
The relationship between the Dominion governments and the IWGC was built on mutual necessity. Ware needed the Dominions to support his plans to ensure he had the ability to operate without British interference and to create an imperial institution. The Dominions needed the IWGC to help maintain the image for their citizens that they cared for the war dead and took seriously the messages they trumpeted during the war. Of particular concern to the Dominion governments was money; each of them had contributed significant funds to the war effort, and they were nervous about contributing more for the commemoration and burial of the war dead. Histories of the construction of national war memorials for Canada and Australia in France reveal the lack of government incentive to build them in a timely fashion and concerns over costs. The Dominion participation in the IWGC shows the Dominion governments were happy to follow the lead of the IWGC, and to approve its messages, sentiment, and work. The IWGC and the Dominion governments worked together to control the image of the IWGC that was presented to Dominion citizens, fearing that negative press or poor relations could damage both sides of the partnership. Information provided to citizens was therefore primarily positive, with negative reports either suppressed or avoided to help keep the majority of the people supporting the IWGC.

with salary were raised. Memo by Mr Ryan and response, December 4th, 1933, NA T 161/1272-Miscellaneous Correspondence of Treasury Office.

172 The construction of both the national war memorials at home and those in France are somewhat mirrored between the two countries as both experienced long delays, funding issues, and were not unveiled until the cusp of the Second World War. Jacqueline Hucker, “‘After the Agony in Stony Places’: The Meaning and Significance of the Vimy Monument,” in *Vimy Ridge: A Canadian Reassessment*, eds Geoffrey Hayes, Andrew Iarocci, and Mike Bechthold, (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2007), pp. 279-290; Romain Fathi, *Our Corner of the Somme: Australia at Villers-Bretonneux*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), pp. 73-98.
Canada and the IWGC

For Canada, involvement in the IWGC runs counter to the narratives of nation-building that have been constructed in the collective memory of the war. Karine Landry argues that Canadian officials were unable, but also unwilling to influence IWGC policy ensuring that the Canadians were seen first as British war dead.\footnote{Karine Landry, ‘Fall in Line: Canada’s Role in the Imperial War Graves Commission after the First World War,’ (MA diss. University of Ottawa, 2018), pp. 4-15.} Landry’s work focused on Sir George Perley as Canada’s High Commissioner to the United Kingdom and Canada’s representative to the IWGC. Canadian government attitudes started to shift after 1931, when the Statute of Westminster allowed for greater control of foreign affairs. The IWGC encountered some difficulties dealing with the under-secretary for external affairs, Dr. O.D. Skelton. A Canadian nationalist and opponent of greater imperial control, Skelton challenged the actions of the IWGC to represent Canada in signing new war graves treaties in the 1930s.\footnote{Norman Hillmer, \textit{O.D. Skelton: A Portrait of Canadian Ambition}, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015), pp. 3-13.} In 1937 when the IWGC signed a new treaty with Egypt and IWGC required the signatures of all Dominion governments on the treaty. Skelton was reluctant to endorse Canada’s signature on a treaty that had scarcely involved Ottawa, believing the IWGC was misrepresenting Canada on the world stage.\footnote{The correspondence between the IWGC and Skelton raise some interesting questions about Dominion sovereignty and imperial relations. CWGC 1/1/6/16-2\textsuperscript{nd} Anglo-Egyptian Agreement.} Skelton in the end did agree to have the British sign for Canada, but not before making it clear to Ware that the IWGC needed to consult his government before signing any future treaties.

The Canadian governments greater concern was the policy of repatriation. Opposition to repatriation was far more organized in Britain, but Canadians were certainly vocal. They voiced their displeasure due to the actions of the American...
government, which had enacted a policy of repatriation. IWGC officials in Belgium and France expressed fears that the American policy could cause an increase in demands by imperial citizens to have bodies returned home.\textsuperscript{176} Ware hoped that if his staff could keep a lid on demands for the return of bodies for at least two years, they could ensure that no repatriations took place.\textsuperscript{177}

Canadian knowledge of American repatriation was well known even before the Americans had received permission to return the bodies home. A French undertaker named E. Teysseyre began an advertising blitz across the United States, getting in touch with undertakers and municipal officials to get a jump on the business of repatriation. Advertisements and articles about Teysseyre appeared in New York, Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, and North Carolina, all speaking to his connections to the American Purple Cross Society and the French government, stating that he could return bodies home for as little as $600. He was connected to a local undertaker or mayor who would co-ordinate the return of the body to America.\textsuperscript{178} Teysseyre also advertised in Canada, working with the Toronto undertaker Robert U. Stone in an advertisement placed in \textit{The Globe} and \textit{The Weekly British Whig} of Kingston.\textsuperscript{179} Teysseyre’s offer was quickly denounced as a scam as he came under investigation by the Department of Justice. The American War

\textsuperscript{176} Letter from Major Ingpen to Fabian Ware, March 30\textsuperscript{th}, 1920, CWGC 1/1/7/B/43-Exhumation-France and Belgium-General File.
\textsuperscript{177} Letter from Fabian Ware to Sir George Perley, July 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1920, LAC RG25-B-1-b, volume 325, file W-18-26, folder 13: War Office (United Kingdom)-Imperial War Graves Commission-Significance of religious symbols.
Department also issued warnings not to trust Teyssyere or others who stated they could return the bodies, such as the ‘Bring Back Your Dead Leagues’ that were started by undertakers trying make money.\(^{180}\)

Once American repatriation began, the Canadian government requested more information from the IWGC on its policy. Sir Joseph Pope as under-secretary of external affairs made the first request in April 1920 shortly after the Americans had made their policy public. The reply simply provided a quote from the IWGC meeting where the equality of treatment policy was decided.\(^ {181}\) A year later, Colonel Henry Osborne as head of the Canadian branch of the IWGC requested more information to better prepare the Canadian government for potential questions. The IWGC ensured that Sir George Perley was involved in drafting the letter. Beyond providing more details about the policy and the reasons for it, the letter addressed the issue of Canadians raising the American policy of repatriation. The IWGC begged Canadians to consider that ‘the privilege [of repatriation] could not be given to Canadians without being given to all other parts of the Empire, and the numbers concerned make this impossible; in the case of the Americans the comparatively small number of their dead make it a more practical proposition.’\(^ {182}\)

Concern over war graves was felt across Canada as the Ministry for Militia and Defence received thousands of letters from Canadians in the first several years after the war on the topic. The letters requested information on and photographs of the graves,

\(^{180}\) ‘Unscrupulous Undertakers On Job,’ *Plumas Independent*, (California), February 19\(^{th}\), 1920, p. 3; Carolyn Vance Bell, ‘Dead Veterans Scrambled Over,’ *The Times and Democrat*, (South Carolina), February 22\(^{nd}\), 1920, p. 5.

\(^{181}\) Letter from W.L. Griffith to Sir Joseph Pope, April 19\(^{th}\), 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/24-Exhumation France and Belgium Correspondence with the Canadian Government.

\(^{182}\) Letter from the IWGC to Col. Osborne, March 4\(^{th}\), 1921, CWGC 1/1/5/24-Exhumation France and Belgium Correspondence with the Canadian Government.
demonstrating significant concern with the work of the IWGC. Such concern can be seen in the letters of Clara Edward, the widow of Private John Leach. She received several photos of her husband’s grave but found that his name was spelt wrong and the wrong service number was included. Her letters to the Ministry of Militia and the IWGC articulate the desire to ensure that such details are correct, even over the temporary wooden cross. The records of such correspondence show IWGC and Canadian government employees worked hard to ensure accurate, timely, and good service for those wishing to learn more about a loved one’s grave.

Not everyone in Canada accepted the repatriation policy and several of the most high-profile attempts to reclaim bodies involved Canadians. During the IWGC investigation into the claims of the *Sunday Express* in 1931 that a Belgian smuggling ring had been bringing bodies back to Britain, a list of known attempts of repatriations, both successful and unsuccessful, was made. The IWGC only knew of six attempts, of which three were conducted by Canadians, two of them successful. The cases of Private Grenville Hopkins and Captain William Durie have extensive files that include correspondence with the families showing their reasoning for the repatriation attempts. The other cases, while occasionally referenced, are not catalogued as having any significant investigation or interaction between the IWGC and the families.

---

183 There are ten files over four boxes that contain letters asking for information and responses in Library and Archives Canada. LAC RG25-B-1-b-1 volumes 341-344, War Graves Special, folders 59-60, 62-69.
184 Letter from Mrs. Clara Edward to the IWGC, March 11th, 1922, LAC RG25-B-1-b, volume 343, War Graves Special, folder 67-War Office (United Kingdom)-Imperial War Graves Commission-Incorrect inscriptions on crosses.
185 Notes for Colonel Oswald, list of unauthorized repatriations, May 12th, 1931, CWGC 1/1/7/B/54-CWGC 1/1/7/B/54-Exhumations France & Belgium Sunday Express Article.
186 This is not to say that these files do not exist. At the moment, the IWGC archives do not show if any files on these cases were made, or if they might exist in other files. Only Hopkins and Durie received any significant attention. The details in the list of unauthorized reparations shows that the IWGC did investigate how each attempt was made and the outcome.
In both the Hopkins and Durie cases, members of the family went public with their grievances and anger towards the IWGC. Both families used their contacts in Canadian politics and society to advocate for repatriation. William Hopkins, the father of Grenville Hopkins, was a prominent citizen of the Saskatoon where he had served as mayor from 1909-1910 and was connected to the Conservative Party. Hopkins used his contacts in the Party to secure an interview with Prime Minister Arthur Meighen in October 1921 to solicit his support. The IWGC was informed that as Hopkins was a prominent supporter of Meighen in the province of Saskatchewan, the Prime Minister was finding it difficult to reject his claims outright, as the IWGC wished. When Hopkins later took the matter up with his local MP in 1924, the Commission was called upon to help the Canadian government outline its opposition to his demands. When the question of repatriation reached the House of Commons, the Canadian government’s response highlighted the strength of appealing to imperial service. George Perry Graham, the Minister of Railways and Canals, borrowed heavily from the rhetoric on imperial unity used by Burdett-Coutts and Churchill in 1920: ‘Their graves mark the sacrifice of men from all parts of the Empire, and are a record of what the men of Canada accomplished side by side with men from other parts of the Empire and their allies, and will witness to future generations just what kind of a race Canadians belong to. The

188 Letter from Colonel Osborne to Fabian Ware, October 19th, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/54-Private G.C. Hopkins-Schoonsehof Cemetery-Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (Eastern Ontario Regiment).
189 Letter from Colonel Osborne to Lord Arthur Browne, April 1st, 1924, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/54-Private G.C. Hopkins-Schoonsehof Cemetery-Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (Eastern Ontario Regiment).
history of Canada and of the Empire cannot be fully recorded unless the bodies of our boys are left where they fell to form part of that history.'

William Hopkins was motivated to retrieve his son’s body for similar reasons as Sarah Smith and Lady Florence Cecil, the rights of the next-of-kin. Hopkins wrote to Sir George Perley for help getting his son’s body back to Canada, but Perley handed the letter over to the IWGC. Responding to the refusal, Hopkins argued, ‘it is not at all satisfactory to us. We are the parties who have authority in this matter. The body is ours, it does not belong to the Imperial War Graves Commission. In fact, we have more authority in this matter than even our Empire.’ Hopkins went further, arguing that the repatriation of American war dead was unfair to Canadians and pointed to the high financial cost to travel to Belgium to find and visit the grave. The emotional toll on William can be seen when his wife Alice wrote her own letter to the IWGC, stating, ‘he would not wish me to tell you just how badly he is feeling.’ Alice stated that her husband, ‘has become very nervous since the loss of our dear son…I don’t think he has slept over two hours altogether grieving over the thought that he might not be able to take the body home. I have tried to reason with him but of no avail.’ Alice also was grieving; Perley reported after meeting them that Alice’s ‘health has suffered very much through the loss of the boy.’ The Hopkins family as a whole was suffering, as Canadian IWGC officer Colonel Osborne reported: ‘I am inclined to think that the father [William] would be able

191 Letter from William Hopkins to Fabian Ware, February 14th, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/54-Private G.C. Hopkins-Schoonselhof Cemetery-Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (Eastern Ontario Regiment).
192 Letter from Alice Hopkins to the IWGC, February 21st, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/54-Private G.C. Hopkins-Schoonselhof Cemetery-Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (Eastern Ontario Regiment).
193 Letter from Sir George Perley to Fabian Ware, January 17th, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/54-Private G.C. Hopkins-Schoonselhof Cemetery-Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (Eastern Ontario Regiment).
to see the whole affair in a more reasonable light were it not for his wife [Alice] and daughter [Hortense] who are much worked up about it.¹⁹⁴

In William Durie’s case it was his mother, Anna Durie, who advocated for his return to Canada. Durie used every means at her disposal to retrieve her son’s body, including writing to government officials, seeking the support of public opinion, and appealing to the British Imperial government. Durie was active in the Conservative Party in Toronto and her daughter Helen wrote to Arthur Meighen asking for his help in retrieving her brother’s body.¹⁹⁵ Meighen asked Sir George Perley for advice, revealing that he knew the family and that they were close to Sir Edward Kemp, the former Minister of Militia and of Overseas Military Forces.¹⁹⁶ Perley and the IWGC advised Meighen to reject the Duries’ request. Durie was active in writing letters to the press about the condition of war graves and the war itself. She began voicing her opinions after she received word that her son’s body was to be concentrated into a larger cemetery, something that she opposed.¹⁹⁷

Durie was an imperialist who justified her demands by appealing to loyalty to the Empire. Writing to the British War Office, she highlighted the family history of her husband Lieutenant-Colonel William Durie: ‘My husband and his father were both English officers and we have always been outstanding Imperialists. I have in my

¹⁹⁴ Letter from Colonel H.C. Osborne to Fabian Ware, October 19ᵗʰ, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/54-Private G.C. Hopkins-Schoonshof Cemetery-Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (Eastern Ontario Regiment).
¹⁹⁵ She wrote while in France visiting her brother’s grave with her mother. Letter from Helen Durie to Arthur Meighen, July 15ᵗʰ, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
possession Durie Commissions signed by the Sovereigns of Great Britain from George III to Queen Victoria.\footnote{Letter from Anna Durie to the War Office, March 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.} An article on the memorial cross Durie raised to her husband and son celebrated their military service. The senior William was the first colonel of the Queen’s Own Rifles of Toronto, and the junior William was a captain in the 58\textsuperscript{th} Battalion. The Durie family history was included in the article, highlighting its extensive service in the British army.\footnote{Letter from Anna Durie to Fabian Ware, March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.} Durie fully believed in the Empire and wrote to Rudyard Kipling to ask him to support her claim.\footnote{Letter from Anna Durie to Fabian Ware, March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.} In her complaints about her treatment by the IWGC, she found Ware’s conduct to be odd: ‘It is not usual to find an Englishman so wanting in a sense of honour.’\footnote{Letter from Anna Durie to the War Office, March 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.} However, she found it easy to see how those from outside the Empire were ignorant and disrespectful. Discussing her interactions with Colonel Herbert Goodland, the head of the IWGC in France, she claimed, ‘I understand Colonel Goodland is an American by birth. He is not likely, it appears to me to understand Canadian standards.’\footnote{Letter from Anna Durie to Fabian Ware, March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.} She also found it insulting to be referred to as an American by another employee, Major Brown, who thought she was from California and that California was in Canada.\footnote{Letter from Anna Durie to the War Office, March 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.} Durie’s love of the Empire helped foster in her a hatred for the enemies of the Empire and those responsible for her son’s death. In a letter to the editor, Durie showed a lingering and lasting hatred of Germany when she waded into a discussion on teaching foreign languages in Ontario high schools: ‘For 4 percent of the

\footnote{‘Cross of Sacrifice Will Be Unveiled On Sunday Next,’ \textit{The Globe}, May 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1928, p. 15.}
\footnote{The letter was written by Harry Bray, the president of The Great War Veterans’ Association: Toronto District and York County Command, letter from Harry Bray to Rudyard Kipling, January 27\textsuperscript{th}, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.}
\footnote{Letter from Anna Durie to the War Office, March 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.}
pupils in the higher grades of our schools to be studying German should appear to be altogether too high a percentage to any one except those who earn a living by teaching that language.\textsuperscript{204}

The failure of the Hopkins and Durie families to get what they wanted resulted in them taking more drastic actions. In 1921 the Hopkins family tried to retrieve the body of their son. During the night of May 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th}, the body of Grenville Hopkins was exhumed from Tyne Cot Cemetery in Belgium. The Hopkins hired a British officer, Colonel Causton, to retrieve the body for them. Using a hired car from J.M. Dunn of Antwerp, Causton drove to the cemetery, produced a document the Hopkins had given him from the IWGC to the gardeners, and dug up the body. He placed the body in a suitcase and had the car drive him to Antwerp.\textsuperscript{205} Once in Antwerp, Causton attempted to have the body shipped to Canada using the Canadian Pacific Ocean Services. However, once the Belgian authorities were alerted to the exhumation, they alerted all transport companies to be on the lookout for the body. The Canadian Pacific Ocean Services searched the suitcase, sent the remains to the morgue in Antwerp, and alerted the Belgian police of their discovery.\textsuperscript{206} Both Causton and Dunn were arrested by the Belgian police and were interviewed about what happened. Dunn appeared unaware of what was happening and told the police all he knew. He claimed to have no idea he was breaking the law. Causton on the other hand, tried to defend himself by saying he thought the Hopkins had the proper paperwork to retrieve the body, before switching his story and his

\textsuperscript{204} Anna Durie, ‘The Teaching of German,’ The Globe, May 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1925, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{205} Copy of Report by Major Arthur Ingpen to Sir George Perley and High Commission of Canada, July 4\textsuperscript{th}, 1921, LAC RG25-B-1-b-, volume 328, W-18-26, file 21-War Office (United Kingdom)-Imperial War Graves Commission-Meetings and reports.

\textsuperscript{206} Copy of letter from Ministere de la Justice to M. Gaston de Level lawyer before the Belgian court of appeals, sent to Major Ingpen of IWGC, June 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1921, LAC RG25-B-1-b-, volume 328, W-18-26, file 21-War Office (United Kingdom)-Imperial War Graves Commission-Meetings and reports.
belief that they had the moral right to have their son’s body. While the Hopkins had hired Causton, they were not charged or investigated by the Belgian police. William Hopkins hired a lawyer in London to sue the IWGC and the Belgian government for his son’s body but was firmly rebuked and warned that further action would see him breaking an international treaty. The Hopkins family made further efforts to convince Canadian politicians to aid them, but these requests came to nothing.

Anna Durie made several attempts to retrieve her son’s body. She visited her son’s grave in Corkscrew Cemetery in Bully-Grenay, France, with her daughter Helen in the summer of 1921 and found it to be in an unsatisfactory state. Fearing that the cemetery was going to be destroyed by the renewal of French mining activity in the area, Durie began openly speaking about her plans to move her son’s body. Colonel Goodland sent one of his officers, Major Brown, to speak with the Duries at their hotel. Goodland reported back to the IWGC in London that Durie ‘talked a lot of irrelevant talk concerning the doings of the Commission and the War Office and all the Powers that be…Major Brown’s idea of the lady is that she is quite unreasonable and has practically lost her senses on this one subject.’ Brown feared after the conversation that a real attempt would be made to retrieve the body and warned the IWGC gardeners as well as the local gendarmerie. Brown later reported that Durie promised ‘that in the event of the body being moved by the commission, if I would inform the man who did it that she

207 Memorandum of interview by Mr. Richards of Colonel Causton with Major Phillips. CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/54-Private G.C. Hopkins-Schoonselhof Cemetery-Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry (Eastern Ontario Regiment).
208 Letter from Major C.K. Phillips to Mr. E.H. Riches, July 12th, 1921, , LAC RG25-B-1-b-, volume 328, W-18-26, file 21-War Office (United Kingdom)-Imperial War Graves Commission-Meetings and reports.
209 Letter from Colonel Goodland to IWGC Head Office, July 18th, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
would shoot him.’ Brown’s fears turned out to come true as on the night of July 30th and 31st, Anna and Helen, along with two French labourers, dug up William Durie’s body, placed it in a coffin, and tried to flee. Unfortunately for the Duries, as the coffin was loaded onto a wagon the horse pulling it became spooked and ran off, breaking its leg. Fearing that they would be caught, the French labourers disobeyed commands to carry the coffin and instead reburied it. Durie left a note on the wooden cross informing the IWGC that the body was still in the grave. The IWGC investigated, but the Duries had already left for Canada.

After the failed attempt, Durie remained content or at least quiet on the subject of repatriation until 1924. That summer, word reached her that Corkscrew Cemetery was to be closed and the bodies moved to the larger Loos Military Cemetery. Durie was concerned that the movement of the body would be bungled and that her son would be misidentified when he arrived in Loos. She claimed the IWGC had lost his body when the move took place in February 1925, but presented no evidence to back her statement up. Durie’s concern with making sure her son’s body was properly identified dated back to her first interactions with the IWGC in 1919 when she demanded proof that the body in the grave was her son’s. When the IWGC confirmed that her son’s body had been moved, Durie wrote a scathing letter to Ware and the IWGC attacking them for their

---

210 Letter from Major W.S. Browne to IWGC Head Office St. Omer, August 18th, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
211 The IWGC saved the note and filed it in their archives, Letter from Major W.S. Browne to IWGC Head Office St. Omer, August 18th, 1921, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
212 Letter to G.S. Elliot, IWGC Asst. Land & Legal Advisor St. Omer France from IWGC, February 24th, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
213 Letter from Anna Durie to Lt-Colonel G. Hamilton (Director of Graves Registration), October 3rd, 1919, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
dishonourable conduct. She told Ware that ‘I made the statement that the IWGC is the most tyrannical and autocratic body of men that has existed since England lost the North American Colonies. To this I should like to add, “And the most dishonourable.” If you will appoint a committee to investigate my case from the beginning, a committee of gentlemen, I shall make a great effort to go to England to give evidence before it.’ Durie charged Ware with telling her ‘a cold, calculated lie’ when he and other IWGC officers told her that Corkscrew Cemetery would be permanent. She concluded by stating, ‘I beg you will not take refuge, in order to save yourself, behind the fact that I am a deceased soldier’s bereaved mother whom you wish to spare. That did not prevent you from misleading me when I could have done something to have saved the identity of my son’s remains.’

Communications between Durie and the IWGC went silent for several months after her scathing letters in February and March had been replied to. In August the IWGC received word from its Canadian branch that the Duries were claiming to have retrieved the body of William from France and were hosting a funeral for him in Toronto. The IWGC began investigating and discovered that someone had dug up William’s body, hastily opened the coffin and took the remains out, leaving behind only several small bones and some pieces of clothing. The IWGC concluded that the body had been taken on the night of July 27th as local police reported increased dog barking and the cemetery gardeners found the grave disturbed the next morning, but chose to do nothing about it.

---

214 Letter from Anna Durie to Fabian Ware, March 2nd, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
215 ‘Brought To Canada For Final Funeral,’ The Globe, August 24th, 1925, p. 10.
216 Report by J.R. Pitman, Registration Officer, September 4th, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. James’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
217 Letter from Colonel Goodland to Fabian Ware, September 5th, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. James’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
The French police carried out their own investigation, finding little evidence or clues to point them towards how the body was taken. The French government was disturbed by Durie’s success as it was around the same time that another Canadian soldier, Charles Sutcliffe, was repatriated to Canada without IWGC authority. The French and the IWGC sent out warnings that the success of these two Canadian repatriations could spur on others from Canada. The concern resulted in the French government requesting that they be allowed to send several investigators to Toronto to interview both Anna and Helen Durie to learn how they took the body.

Ware and the IWGC were torn on what to do. Ware spoke of the dilemma in a letter to Colonel Osborne stating, ‘We cannot allow our cemeteries to be violated in this disgraceful way with impunity-goodness knows the dreadful things that might happen if once it became known that this could be done…On the other hand, from the point of view of our general policy, in our own interests and those of all decent sentiment, we ought now to leave Mrs. Durie alone.’ Colonel Osborne in Canada helped guide the direction of the IWGC away from prosecuting and helping the French:

Since your letter on the subject, dated 21st April last, considerable time has elapsed and there have apparently been no fresh developments in the way of violation of our cemeteries. The Durie case is absolutely dead here. If it is now revived through this Commission it will mean that Mrs. Durie who as you know is fanatical on the subject will communicate with the press and one newspaper in particular in Toronto which has a very large circulation and opens its columns with great readiness to anything likely to cause trouble. The Imperial War Graves Commission would be pictured as a heartless tyrannical body still pursuing an unfortunate mother. The particular newspaper, to which I know Mrs. Durie has

---

218 Letter from G.S. Elliot to Fabian Ware, September 29th, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. James’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
219 Letter from A.L. Ingpen to Fabian Ware, November 10th, 1925, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. James’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
220 Letter from A.L. Ingpen to Fabian Ware, March 22nd, 1926, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. James’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
221 Extract of letter from Fabian Ware to Colonel Osborne, April 21st, 1926, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. James’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
access, will be only too ready to say that this is what comes of Canada not dealing with her own graves instead of leaving them to an imperial body.\textsuperscript{222}

The IWGC agreed with Osborne and, with the aid of the Department of External Affairs in Dr O.D. Skelton, they were able to stop the French investigation by refusing access to the country.\textsuperscript{223}

The cases of Hopkins and Durie highlight several important issues about the IWGC and its relationship to the bereaved. First, they show the insecurity of the IWGC regarding its position in controlling the war dead. The chief concern in each case was to not only maintain that position, but to ensure against negative publicity. The decisions not to prosecute either the Hopkins or Durie families shows that the public image of the IWGC was of greatest concern. The IWGC believed that these incidents were isolated and worked to ensure they did not develop into larger public scandals that might cause people to question their work. Second, the cases, along with the British examples of resistance, show how the IWGC used its powers to deliver the cemeteries as a fait accompli to stop repatriation debates. Rather than allowing discussion, the IWGC hoped that by delivering to the public the plans already set in stone, they would accept them or not mount a serious challenge to the work. Delivering beautiful, organized, and respectful cemeteries and memorials ensured that the public could make little fuss about improper treatment of the war dead.

The extreme cases of Hopkins and Durie speak to the sentiment felt by the bereaved about lacking control over commemoration and mourning. Hopkins and Durie

\textsuperscript{222} Letter from Colonel Osborne to Fabian Ware, September 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1926, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.

\textsuperscript{223} Letter from Dr. O.D. Skelton to Sir Edward Harding The Dominions Office, January 19\textsuperscript{th}, 1928; The French officially dropped the investigation on March 31\textsuperscript{st}, 1928, Letter from A.L. Ingpen to IWGC, April 25\textsuperscript{th}, 1928, CWGC 8/1/4/1/2/61-Captain William Arthur Peel Durie-Toronto (St. Jams’) Cemetery-Canadian Infantry.
went as far as to break the law to dictate how their sons would be buried, but many other Canadians either lacked the resources or the belief that such actions were necessary to meet their personal needs for mourning. Neither Hopkins nor Durie opposed the political messages of the IWGC. They simply wanted to mourn in their own way with the bodies of their sons. Others who did not have the ability or will to go as far as they did, could still mourn as they desired through the creation of personal memorials that function as secondary gravesites.

**Australia, New Zealand, and the IWGC**

For the bereaved in Australia and New Zealand, repatriation was not at the centre of their relationship with the IWGC. Ensuring that the IWGC was capable of fulfilling its promises became of paramount importance for Australians and New Zealanders. One of the key factors behind the concern of grave maintenance was the distance from the Antipodes to the battlefields of Turkey, Egypt, and Europe. Bart Ziino argues that Australians accepted that the return of bodies to Australia was impractical, which played a role pulling mourners towards shared forms of remembrance as distance, as much as absence, played a role in Australian forms of commemoration.²²⁴ Compared to Britain and Canada, Australians were mostly silent as people either agreed or accepted that they could not change the policy.²²⁵

The lack of resistance in Australia should not be taken as a sign that all agreed with IWGC policies or that there was a lack of concern about war graves. Australians and New Zealanders throughout the war had expressed interest in the maintenance of the war

---

²²⁵ Ibid, pp. 82-83.
graves, particularly on the Gallipoli battlefields. During the Imperial Conference that saw the creation of the IWGC, New Zealand representatives were anxious that other battlefields, specifically Gallipoli, would not be ignored by the IWGC. The Australian and New Zealand governments were anxious to begin work on the Gallipoli cemeteries, resulting in tense feelings as the IWGC and British government negotiated with Greek, Ottoman, and later Turkish authorities over the fate of the peninsula. When the Turkish government demanded a renegotiation of the Treaty of Lausanne in 1936, it was Australian High Commissioner Stanley Bruce who led the negotiations for Britain and he made the issue of Gallipoli cemeteries one of his priorities in the new Treaty of Montreux. The importance of Gallipoli in Australian commemoration has been explored by historians, who highlight how the battle came to serve as the nation’s ‘baptism by fire’ and the beginning of Australian national identity.

The concern with ensuring proper burials saw the Australian government create the Australian War Graves Detachment in 1919 to work alongside the IWGC and the DGRE in locating and burying Australian war dead in Europe. The creation of the detachment was undertaken not to just provide extra manpower, but to show citizens that Australians were taking care of the Australian dead. When issues surrounding discipline

---

226 The fate of Gallipoli was fraught as the entrance to the Dardanelles, a key shipping lane, the region had first been promised to Greece, but the success of the new Turkish nation forced a renegotiation with them over the region. Australian and New Zealand concerns though appear throughout British files on the region. Letter from William Massey, New Zealand High Commission to Arthur Balfour Foreign Office, March 24th, 1919, NA WO 32/4843-Preservation of British Soldiers Graves in Italy, Greece and Turkey; Letter from M.L. Sheppherd, Secretary of Australian High Commission in London, to Fabian Ware on IWGC representative for Gallipoli, June 20th, 1922, CWGC 1/1/6/10-Anglo Greek Agreement.

227 The work of Bruce for defending the IWGC during the negotiations in Montreux can be seen in CWGC 1/1/6/26-Montreux Conference and Agreement.

and morale in the unit came to the attention of the Australian authorities, they worked to keep it out of the press and away from the public. The government needed to ensure that the public believed that their war dead were being well cared for, and incidents of ill-discipline and poor work could damage that image.\footnote{229} Concern over the state of war graves remained with successive Australian governments after the cemeteries were constructed. Under Stanley Bruce as Australia’s High Commissioner to Britain, the IWGC began delivering annual reports to him highlighting work or activities that included Australia or Australian war dead. A regular concern for the High Commission and Australian government was the discovery of Australian bodies in the old battlefields of France and Belgium. The Australians were worried about how the IWGC knew they were Australian, and if any contact had been made with the next-of-kin.\footnote{230} During his tour of Australia in 1934, Ware emphasized the beauty, construction, and designs of the cemeteries, providing a first-hand account of how Australia’s war dead were being treated by the IWGC. His public lectures and visits to memorials gave Australians the satisfaction of knowing that their war dead were being taken care of with care and dignity.\footnote{231}

One of the major differences between Australian and New Zealand reactions to the war graves was in the level of participation of bereaved families. To ensure families could personalize and contribute to the headstones, the IWGC allowed for personal

\footnote{230} Letter from T. Robinson, Australian Imperial Force Base Records to Australian High Commission, December 6th, 1935, response from IWGC to Australian High Commission, February 21st, 1936, CWGC 1/1/2/24-High Commission for Australia-Annual Reports.  
\footnote{231} Ziino, \textit{A Distant Grief}, pp. 130-133.
epitaphs to be included at the base of the headstones. However, in a move that went against the policy of equality of treatment, the IWGC demanded that families pay for the inscription.\textsuperscript{232} Resistance to the policy came from the Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand governments who all opposed making people pay. The Canadian government paid for all the inscriptions their citizens wanted to ensure equality was maintained.\textsuperscript{233} While the IWGC relented and made any inscriptions payment voluntary, the New Zealand government took a stronger stand by refusing any personal inscriptions. The decision to do so was undertaken by Sir James Allen, the former war-time minister for defence and the newly appointed New Zealand High Commissioner, who made his stance based on the idea of equality.\textsuperscript{234} The stance by Allen could not have been made without serious personal conflict as his own son John Hugh Allen had been killed in the war and had a known grave his father could have visited.\textsuperscript{235} The policy was not uniformly accepted, with many people writing in New Zealand papers to speak out about it years after most of the cemeteries had been completed.\textsuperscript{236} Knowledge that New Zealand was the only Dominion or colony not to allow personal inscriptions made many upset with the government, but Allen and other officials reiterated the need for equality of treatment. Newspapers reported favourably for the government, limiting conversation except when it became public in other ways.

\textsuperscript{232} Commission Meeting October 21\textsuperscript{st}, 1919, pp. 3-4. CWGC 2/2/1/16 Commission Meeting No. 16-Oct 1919.
\textsuperscript{233} Letter from Deputy Minister Militia & Defence to High Commissioner for Canada, May 31\textsuperscript{st}, 1920, LAC RG25-B-1-b, volume 325 W-18-26, folder 13-War Office (United Kingdom)-Imperial War Graves Commission-Terms and conditions of service.
\textsuperscript{235} He was living in England when the war started and served with the 13\textsuperscript{th} Worcestershire Regiment and was killed in Gallipoli on June 6\textsuperscript{th}, 1915. Lieutenant John Hugh Allen, CWGC Casualty Details, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/casualty-details/602606/john-hugh-allen/.
The broad acceptance of this policy in New Zealand reflected how the government and society continued to employ ideas from the war. Steven Loveridge argued that the culture of sacrifice was imbued throughout New Zealand and that all needed to sacrifice equally for the war. Loveridge points to conscription debates in New Zealand in comparison to Britain, Canada, and Australia where conscription caused very contentious and at times violent resistance. In contrast, New Zealand experienced significantly fewer issues from either labour movements or minority groups opposed to fighting. The homogeneity of society and dominance of British culture ensured that the majority of New Zealanders supported the arguments put forward by the government. Loveridge’s points about the culture of sacrifice are reflected in Allen’s discussions about headstone inscriptions.

The idea of a culture of sacrifice was not exclusive to New Zealand and can be seen across the British Empire. Adrian Gregory referred to it as the economy of sacrifice and highlighted how the language of sacrifice was used by the IWGC and others to silence those who objected to their modes of commemoration after the war. The concern for the equality of sacrifice was extended to veterans who had not participated in the major battles or theatres of the war. Soldiers who fought in Greece, Egypt, and Mesopotamia demonstrated a desire to show that their sacrifice was equally meaningful to those who fought in Europe. Justin Fantauzzo revealed in the personal scrapbooks of veterans that the message of sacrifice and equality of service was an outward expression

of memory to fit into the collective. Privately most soldiers remembered the war
differently as their scrapbooks were built around camaraderie, tourism, and the lighter
side of the war.\textsuperscript{240} For families and the bereaved, the national rhetoric of the war was the
primary means by which they interpreted the conflict. Having lived through the war, the
need to have the deaths of their loved ones mean something drove them to accept, rather
than reject wartime language and sentiments when they constructed their personal
memorials. The construction of these memorials as secondary graves meant that most
were designed and built just after the war’s end, ensuring that the messages of the
memorials perpetuated wartime rhetoric.

**Conclusion**

The degradation of imperial bonds in the decades after the World Wars meant that
Ware’s dream of the IWGC helping to facilitate greater imperial unity went up in smoke.
Renamed the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC) in 1960 to better reflect
the relationship between members, the defence of the IWGC through ideas of imperial
unity used by politicians during the 1920s was no longer relevant. The end of living
memory of the war also removed another purpose of the IWGC, to help the bereaved
commemorate their loved ones killed in the conflict. As these cemeteries can no longer
serve as memorials to the glory of the British Empire, they have now become what
Viscount Wolmer warned they would be: objects for tourists and sightseers. Rather than
decline, battlefield tours have increased thanks to the ease of travel, allowing individuals
from around the world to visit the cemeteries. The aesthetics of the cemeteries, clean,

\textsuperscript{240} Ibid, p. 207.
orderly, and immaculately maintained, provide picturesque and beautiful settings for visitors. These aesthetics, while no longer serving the bereaved or the imperial cause, do continue to reinforce the policy of equality of treatment and sacrifice.

The IWGC did not develop the messages surrounding the economy of sacrifice, nor did it first express the idea of equality of treatment. It came to claim them as its own and enforce them upon the British war dead as part of its central messaging in commemorating the war. The creation of the IWGC was a novel and unique moment in British Imperial history; its work to ensure that every individual was named and remembered was monumental, but leaves observers overwhelmed. The cemeteries and the memorials to the missing highlight the massive cost in lives but do so in a way that makes the numbers incomprehensible, resulting in the individuality of the soldiers to be lost. The uniformity of the cemeteries leaves visitors wandering through the rows of headstones, unable to focus on the people behind the names. Historians who have worked on the personal inscriptions show the only way to see past the standard headstone layout and get at who the person is being remembered is to examine the epitaphs.241 The number of inscriptions does not amount to the majority of the headstones and ignores all the missing who are only named on one of the memorials to the missing around the world. Attempts to understand the soldiers named on the headstones or on the memorials has seen greater interest in biographical studies. These biographies are limited by several factors. One is the available sources to learn about the individual, and second is interest by the wider

---

While these biographies help illuminate some of the names, they can obscure the larger experience of the war. They provide only a small glimpse into the individuals commemorated by the IWGC and reveal the ways in which the Commission worked to enforce a collective memory of the war that fit into its principles.

---

242 For the troubles involved in doing biographical studies see, Graham Broad, *One in a Thousand: The Life and Death of Captain Eddei McKay, Royal Flying Corps*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017).
Chapter 2: ‘A Good Name Endureth Forever’: Cataloguing Memorials

The nature of personal memory being for the individual and therefore private, compared to collective memory that is meant to be public, means finding expressions of personal memory to be more difficult. An individual participating in a community memorial or ceremony can be a form of personal and collective memory. The creation of memory is personal, but it is always informed by a set of norms that are open to all.¹ The dynamics between personal and collective memory formation means that personal memory is difficult to pin down while collective memory can be easier to identify.

Personal memorials fulfilled the needs of the mourners over the collective need for commemoration. Constructed by next-of-kin, friends, or fellow soldiers, the memorials are expressions of private memory. It is more difficult to extract the meaning of a personal memorial than a collective and official memorial. Regardless, the place to start is to locate personal memorials. I have created a database of 4,966 personal memorials, with 2,323 having demographic research undertaken, and it is the basis for the analysis in the rest of this dissertation. Building a database of personal memorials allows for several avenues of analysis. First, the volume of qualitative data reveals trends, patterns, and differences in memorial construction and memory-making after the war. How else can a memorial be understood as being unique if there are no other memorials to compare it to? Second, the database reveals how individuals attempted to grieve and accept the deaths of loved ones. Stephane Audoin-Rouzeau and Annette Becker argue

that collective memory of the war constructed by communities allowed people to grieve but not to mourn, meaning they were able to come to terms with the death. The belief that adequate mourning was achieved through collective memorials was informed by the logic of one not in grief that wants reassurances that all is better.² The large number of individual memorials suggests that many people needed other forms of memorialization to process the death of family and friends. The database demonstrates that large numbers of people across the British Commonwealth needed or wanted to find other ways to mourn and remember the war dead.

In this chapter, the patterns and trends in personal memorials will be discussed. Understanding what was built, who was being commemorated, and who was remembering demonstrates how individuals understood and reacted to the war dead. The database reveals local and regional elites were the most active in creating personal memorials. These individuals built personal memorials every nation showing the influence of wealth and status on building memorials. Committees building collective memorials were dominated by these same elites, giving their personal memory significant weight in collective remembrance.³ Viewing the ways collective memory is expressed in sites of personal memory can reveal the extent to which individuals accepted the collective commemorative rituals and symbols they were exposed to.

These memorials are not the sole physical expressions of personal memory from the First World War. Personal memories were impressed on objects such as trench art,

souvenirs, letters, and military medals to name a few. The personal memory of these objects is not obvious and scholars can only infer on the basis of what was saved. Ann-Marie Foster in an examination of the Durham Light Infantry Regimental Museum highlighted the role of museums in the preservation of personal memory in the provenance of donated objects. Many individuals donated objects to the museum to protect the item and the personal memories attached to them. Donations were framed as memorials for their family or friends who either died in the war or had been veterans.\(^4\) The majority of these objects were not donated to the museum until the latter half of the twentieth century. Their use during the period of this study was entirely private. The personal memorials being examined are therefore just one, if not the most obvious example of personal memory being expressed during and after the war.

**Locating the Memorials**

Personal memorials were built to be viewed by the larger community rather than hidden solely for private consumption. Yet only some places were seen as appropriate for memorials. The locations of the memorials – where large swaths of society could view them – signifies the social power of the creators.

The database consists of 4,966 individuals being memorialized across the Commonwealth. The largest number are in the United Kingdom with 4,184 individuals, and in England specifically with 3,453, with 410 in Australia, 256 in Canada, and 116 in New Zealand. It might seem like mourners in the Dominions had less need of personal memorials, but in fact the number is proportional to the number of soldiers who fought in

The overwhelming majority of memorials were located in religious buildings. The majority of these buildings were parish churches, but others such as cathedrals, synagogues, and cemeteries were also used. Within the database, 4,516 (88%) of the memorials are located in churches or synagogues. A further 82 (2%) of memorials are located in cemeteries or churchyards, showing that 90% of the memorials were placed in traditional locations of mourning. These numbers demonstrate the role personal memorials had as secondary graves. Churches represented the place where mourning most commonly took place and the erection of personal memorials at these locations provided individuals with a familiar and socially acceptable setting in which to grieve.

In each nation in this study, churches were the most common location for personal memorials to be erected. Yet, the percentage of memorials in churches are lower in the Dominions compared to Britain. In the British Isles as a whole, 91% (3,950 of 4184) of

---

5 According to the statistics put out by the British Army after the war, roughly 4.97 million enlisted in Britain, while Canada had only 458,000, Australia had 331,000, and New Zealand had 112,000. In Britain, England dominated the number of individuals who enlisted with 4 million compared to 557,000 from Scotland, 272,000 from Wales, and 134,000 from Ireland. The War Office, *Statistics of the Military Effort of the British Empire During the Great War 1914-1920*, (London: Naval and Military Press Ltd, 1922, reprinted 2006), p. 363.
the memorials are in churches. England has the highest ratio of memorials in churches with 92% (3,287 of 3,573) and Scotland the lowest ratio with 79% (245 of 312). Australia and New Zealand have 79% each (311 of 396 in Australia and ninety-three of 118 in New Zealand) and Canada having only 61% (162 of 265) of their memorials in churches. Scotland, Australia, and Canada have the highest relative concentrations of memorials in schools and universities with 6% (nineteen of 312), 7% (twenty-seven of 396), and 8% (twenty of 265) respectively. England has the most absolute number of memorials located in schools with sixty-eight, but that only represents 2% (sixty-eight of 3,573) of all memorials. New Zealand has a larger number of memorials in parks, gardens, and other public spaces 8% (ten of 118). Scotland (5% six of 312), Australia (4% sixteen of 396), and Canada (5% fourteen of 265) also have more memorials in parks. Other nations have 2% or less of their memorials in either schools or public locations.

Across the board, England, Scotland, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand display the widest variety of locations where their memorials can be found. These range from social clubs, hospitals, halls or community centres, libraries, museums, businesses, government buildings, military bases, and natural landmarks. Ireland and Wales have the least amount of diversity, with most of their memorials in churches. England has the widest variety of locations for personal memorials due to the vast number of memorials in the country.
The heavy presence of memorials in churches confirms the importance of
religious institutions to mourning. The decision to build a memorial in churches was done
to place the individual being remembered in a place familiar to them, where they could be
seen by people who knew them, and it matched the religious and cultural beliefs of those
building the memorials. Memorials in churches were useful in helping to mourn and grief
to be expressed.

**Memorial Designs: Plaques, Windows, and Crosses**

More than place, the designs of the memorials highlight the dominance of elites in
the database. Unlike memorials built by committees, individuals were free to choose the
artistic designs and the scale of the memorial. While limits did exist based on the location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Church</th>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Community/Halls</th>
<th>Museums/Libraries</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>3287 (92%)</td>
<td>36 (1%)</td>
<td>33 (1%)</td>
<td>13 (&gt;1%)</td>
<td>64 (2%)</td>
<td>68 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>172 (91%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (&gt;1%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>63 (86%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>245 (79%)</td>
<td>12 (4%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>19 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>183 (90%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3950 (91%)</td>
<td>58 (1%)</td>
<td>47 (1%)</td>
<td>24 (&gt;1%)</td>
<td>74 (1%)</td>
<td>93 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>311 (79%)</td>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
<td>16 (4%)</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>27 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>162 (61%)</td>
<td>12 (5%)</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
<td>20 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>93 (79%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Most Common Locations for Private Memorials.*
they were placed, the greater freedom in the design process gave those with wealth the ability to create elaborate and highly decorative memorials that were also expensive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorial</th>
<th>Plaques</th>
<th>Windows</th>
<th>Cross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2303 (64%)</td>
<td>435 (12%)</td>
<td>348 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>129 (67%)</td>
<td>31 (16%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>55 (76%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>191 (63%)</td>
<td>27 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>149 (73%)</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2827 (63%)</td>
<td>516 (12%)</td>
<td>385 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>128 (30%)</td>
<td>131 (31%)</td>
<td>10 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>144 (52%)</td>
<td>41 (15%)</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>52 (42%)</td>
<td>26 (21%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3151 (60%)</td>
<td>714 (14%)</td>
<td>407 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Three Most Common Memorial Designs. Percentage of total number of memorials.

Personal memorials come in a variety of different forms. Within the database, there are a total of 116 different types of memorials created to commemorate individuals. The most common are plaques. Plaques represent 60% (3,151 of 5,144) of all the private memorials in the database. The huge number of plaques is due to the variety of styles and prices, showing that amongst all the memorial designs plaques allowed for greater participation in the memorialization process. The plaque for Thomas J.E.B. Myles, in Sandford Church of Ireland Dublin, is an example of the simplicity of plaque design. The brass plaque measures only 24 cm by 42 cm with a red border and the text, ‘In ever proud and loving memory of Thomas J.E.B. Myles. 14th Canadians. Killed in Flanders. 25th June 1916.’ This plaque bears the minimum amount of information, and the artistic design is simple. (Image 1) Other metal plaques have additional designs such as the one to John Stephen Grantham in All Saints Church of England in Cherry Burton England. The brass plaque has more text stating, ‘To the glory of God and in loving memory of John Stephen

---

Grantham. Driver R.F.A. Aged 28 years, who was killed in action on Sept. 2nd, 1918. Near Bapaume in France and interred in the British Cemetery, Thilloy Road. He sleeps with England’s heroes in the watchful care of God. This tablet was erected by his foster parents. The added text provides a more personal touch by including the location of his body, who erected the memorial, and an epitaph to him. Along with the text, a decorative border is on the plaque with crosses in each corner and oak leaves forming a border around the text. (Image 5)

More elaborate plaques used other materials like stone or marble. The memorial to Frank Hill Gaskell in St Illtyd’s Church in Llantwit Major Wales is made from green marble with a white stone slab on top. On the stone, the text reads, ‘The cross in the churchyard was restored and this tablet erected to the glory of God and in loving memory of Lieut. Colonel Frank Hill Gaskell, (sometime of this parish) In the Great War he commanded the 16th (Cardiff City) Battalion of the Welch Regiment, was twice severely wounded, and died of wounds at Merville, France, May 17th 1916, aged 37. “Who had it not in him to fear.”’ Above the text, the badge of the Welch Regiment is included featuring the three goose feathers and the words ‘Ich Dien’ for the Prince of Wales and the regimental motto, ‘Gwell Angau Na Chywilydd’ below. Also included on the plaque is the Gaskell coat of arms in the bottom left corner. (Image 6) The memorial to Sidney Henry Snelgrove is similar to Gaskell’s with a marble backing with white stone front. Located in St James’ Church in Royal Tunbridge Wells England, the white stone is an

---

9 ‘Ich Dien’ is German and translates to, ‘I serve’ while ‘Gwell Angau Na Chywilydd’ is Welsh for, ‘Death before dishonour.’
oval with the text, ‘In loving and proud memory of Sidney Henry Snelgrove Lieut. King’s Royal Rifle Corps killed in action when leading his platoon under heavy shell fire in the counter attack at the Chateau Hooge July 31st 1915 younger son of Sidney and Gertrude Snelgrove of Kingswood in this parish.’ The second line of text was carved on the marble below the white stone and reads, ‘Think only this of me that there’s some corner of a foreign field that is for ever England.’ (Image 7) The line is from the war poet Rupert Brooke and his famous poem *The Soldier.* The plaque features the badge of the King’s Royal Rifle Corps at the top and surrounding the oval stone of the text is a carved laurel wreath.

These four plaques to Myles, Grantham, Gaskell, and Snelgrove give an idea of the custom features of memorial plaques. Plaques allowed for simple and plain designs like Myles’, or more elaborate creations like Snelgrove’s. The variety of plaque designs gave those with little wealth the ability to participate, but they also allowed those with money to create unique memorials that stand out. In the end, all the plaques achieve the same desire for those who created them by placing the memory of their loved one in a permanent memorial.

After plaques, the next most common type of memorial was stained glass windows. Stained glass windows account for roughly 14% (714 of 5,144) of all personal memorials in the database. The smaller number of windows can be explained by the cost, discussed later in this chapter. Another limiting factor was the need to have the approval of the building’s authorities, where the window would be installed. The memorial

---
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window in St Ann’s Church of Ireland in Dublin to Ray Lancaster Bell tells us about the negotiations between families and church building authorities. Bell had been killed in action on May 17th, 1915, and his mother began the process of erecting a memorial to him in St Ann’s starting in January 1916. The finished window features a kneeling soldier before Christ with other saints in the background. The Church Vestry altered the design of the memorial, changing the uniform of the soldier from wool to khaki to emphasize the memorial related to the First World War and not to earlier conflicts.12 (Image 8) When windows were placed in churches, that determined the nature of the design as the window had to fit the aesthetic and mission of the church. The aesthetics of stained-glass windows in churches will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The third most common personal memorial was a cross. Crosses varied from altar crosses or other decorative crosses that were made of bronze, brass, or even gold to create ornamental memorials for religious use. The majority of the crosses in the database are former battlefield crosses made from wood. During the war and in the immediate aftermath, the graves of soldiers were either marked by their comrades or the Directorate of Graves Registration Unit (DGRU) with wooden crosses. As the cemeteries were being constructed and smaller burial sites merged with larger cemeteries, the graves were given standard crosses.13 When the IWGC erected permanent headstones, the Commission sent the temporary wooden crosses to the next-of-kin if they so desired. Battlefield crosses are located in every nation being examined in this study.14

---

14 Ibid, pp. 45-46.
The battlefield crosses held special significance for the next of kin as they represented a physical link to their loved ones as it had stood on their first graves. An example can be seen with the battlefield cross of John Ross Robertson. John was a pilot in the Royal Flying Corps who was shot down over German lines and was killed on May 12th, 1917. Originally buried by the German Army, his battlefield cross was written in German and reads, ‘Er starb den Heldentod. Ein Engl Flieger offz. 12.5.17.’ The original cross was Anglicized by the DGRU with metal bands that read, ‘Lt. J. Ross. Robertson Fife & Forfar Yeomanry Attd. R.A.F. 12-5-17.’ The cross was returned to his parents in Scotland where a replica of the cross was created and placed in Dunfermline Cemetery in front of the family tombstone. (Image 9) The family kept the original cross until they donated it to the Montrose Air Station Heritage Centre in 2014. The cross was placed in a hangar renamed the Lt. John Ross Robertson Building which serves as the exhibit for the centre’s First World war artefacts including a replica of a B.E.2a biplane. (Image 10)

Other crosses found their way into churches. An example is Lionel Hyman Eliot’s cross, in St Paul’s Cathedral in London, Ontario. Lionel was born in London, but his family was living in the town of Goderich at the time of his death on April 9th, 1917. A window to commemorate Lionel was installed in the local Anglican church in Goderich shortly after the war. The family moved back to London and brought the battlefield cross

---

15 This translates to, ‘He died a hero’s death. An English flying officer. 12.5.17.’ Lieutenant J R Robertson-Battlefield Cross, IWM War Memorial Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/85171.
17 Heritage Centre Layout, Montrose Air Station Heritage Centre, Ian McIntosh Memorial Trust. https://rafmontrose.org.uk/exhibits-2/#example.
with them, where it was permanently placed in St Paul’s.\(^{19}\) (Image 11) Similarly the battlefield cross of Henry James Faull from Kaponga, Taranaki, New Zealand was placed in St John’s and St Mark’s Methodist Church by his family. Henry’s cross also lists his older brother William Thomas Faull. William’s body was never found, and he was listed by the IWGC on the Tyne Cot Memorial for the missing.\(^{20}\) (Image 12) The erection of crosses in churches created a sentimental memorial and placed the memory of the individual in their community. The placement of battlefield crosses in churches also served as a secondary burial site, a location where mourning could occur. The battlefield crosses that had once served as the grave marker created a physical and spiritual connection to the actual grave of the soldier, providing families the ability to ‘mourn’ at the grave even though they were thousands of kilometres away.

Many crosses were kept private. The battlefield cross to Joshua Strong who fought in the 29\(^{th}\) Battalion of the Canadian Expeditionary Force currently resides in the Imperial War Museum in London. The cross was donated to the museum by his sister Ada Strong, who had immigrated to Scotland and donated her brother’s cross along with other personal effects and letters from the war in 1983.\(^{21}\) The cross was selected by curators of the museum to be part of the First World War exhibit to showcase one example of how soldiers were remembered.\(^{22}\) The use of Joshua’s cross in the exhibit for public

\(^{20}\) St John’s and St Mark’s rolls of honour, Kaponga, New Zealand History, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/st-john%E2%80%99s-and-st-mark%E2%80%99s-rolls-honour-kaponga;
consumption both elevates him to ensure he is remembered, but also hides the personal nature of how the cross was used for decades by his family. Now it stands as the representative for all battlefield crosses and represents a collective rather than a personal memorial. (Image 13)

The majority of crosses in the database are former battlefield memorials, crosses were also made after the war in stone or brass. The stone cross erected to the brothers William and Alister Elliot demonstrates their use as a gravesite. The brothers grew up in a croft in Scotland by Loch Glencoul where their father was a shepherd and a ghillie for the Duke of Westminster.23 Erected with the aid of the Duke, the stone cross sits above the house the brothers grew up in and their family lived in until the 1950s.24 The placement of the cross above their home, and upon a hill giving it added prominence, speaks to the role it plays as being a substitute grave for the Elliot brothers. (Image 14)

Image 5: Memorial Plaque to John Stephen Grantham in All Saints Church, Cherry Barton, East Yorkshire, England.

Image 6: Memorial Plaque to Frank Hill Haskell in St Illtyd’s Church, Llantwit Major, Vale of Glamorgan, Wales.


Image 7: Memorial Plaque to Sidney Henry Snelgrove in St James’ Church, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent, England.

Image 8: Stained-Glass Window to Ray Lancaster Bell in St Ann’s Church of Ireland, Dublin, Ireland.

Image 9: Replica Battlefield Cross to John Ross Robertson in Dunfermline Cemetery, Dunfermline, Fife, Scotland.

Image 10: Battlefield Cross to John Ross Robertson in the Montrose Air Station Heritage Centre, Montrose, Angus, Scotland.


Image 12: Battlefield Cross to Henry James Faull and William Thomas Faull in St John’s and St Mark’s Methodist Church, Kaponga, Taranaki, New Zealand.


Image 14: Memorial Cross to William and Alister Eliot next to Glencoul Bothy, Loch Glencoul, Highland, Scotland.
Memorial Designs: Utilitarian and Monumental Memorials

As with community memorials, the construction of personal memorials featured memorials that functioned as either ornamental or utilitarian memorials. The majority of personal memorials were monumental in design, providing ornamentation and contributing to the aesthetic of the location it was erected. Monumental memorials were also sites for mourning, making them useful as well. In the description of memorials as either monumental or utilitarian, those described as utilitarian were used on a regular basis, and not just by the creators of the memorial for mourning or commemoration.

The vast majority of personal memorials were designed to be either used, displayed, or become part of the fabric of religious buildings. These memorials often used religious language and symbols in the windows, plaques, and crosses. A discussion of religious language on memorials is in the next chapter. Besides the three most common designs for personal memorials, memorials in churches also took the form of screens (altar, rood, or other varieties), stations of the cross, and reredos as monumental memorials. Furniture in churches such as pews, organs, and choir seats, along with architectural features such as priest stalls, shrines and sanctuaries, and altars, and candlesticks, collection plates, and lectures were used by churches regularly; they represent utilitarian memorials. The other memorials were intended to beautify the spaces of worship. The reredos helped decorate naves of churches, while the crosses showed the devotion of the congregants to their faith, and stained-glass windows illuminated religious lessons and important figures in the artwork.

Several types of memorials are unique to specific religious denominations. The stations of the cross depicting the Passion of Christ is primarily found in Roman Catholic
and Anglican churches. Made up of fourteen scenes, the stations were placed in the church for devotees to worship at particularly during Lent. When used as a personal memorial, these stations were often part of a larger memorial dedicated to several people. For example, in St Joseph’s Catholic Church in Gunnedah, New South Wales, Australia, twelve of the fourteen stations were war memorials and in St Augustine of Hippo Anglican Church in Grimsby, England, eight of the fourteen are war memorials. (Image 15)

In the database only two religious texts are featured as war memorials. A Bible was given to Christ Church in the village of Croft, Cheshire, England, by Mr & Mrs Peter Ingham in honour of their relative Drummer Edgar Clough. Accompanying the Bible was a bronze lectern that was given by Edgar’s family, and it served as a stand for the Bible. In the East London Synagogue, the local Jewish community created the Leonard Stern Memorial Fund to provide prayer books for youths after their bar mitzvah’s. The book included an inscription reading, ‘Leonard Stern Memorial gift, founded by members of the East London Synagogue, in memory of Leonard Herman Stern BA (Cantab) Second Lieutenant 13th Battalion (Princess Louise’s Kensington) London Regiment. Born at Synagogue House, Stepney, September 12th, 1891. Killed in action in Flanders May 9th, 1915. A worthy son of the sanctuary, true to faith and country. “Wherewith shall a

26 St Joseph’s Church First World War Memorial Stations of the Cross, Gunnedah, New South Wales War Memorials Register, https://www.warmemorialsregister.nsw.gov.au/content/stations-cross-st-josephs-church-gunnedah; Search terms for St Augustine Church in Grimsby, IWM War Memorial Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/search?query=augustine&pageSize=15&filters%5Bwar%5D%5BFirst+World+War%281914-1918%29%5D=on&filters%5Bsettlement%5D%5BGrimsby%5D=on.
young man keep his way pure. By taking heed thereto according to Thy word.” -Psalm cxix. 9. The memorial was designed to match Leonard’s pre-war connection to Jewish youth groups; he had been a leader of the Stepney Jewish Lads’ Club, the Oxford and St George’s Lads’ Club, and the scoutmaster of the 7th Stepney Troop B.P. Scouts. Both Leonard’s and Edgar’s memorials function as utilitarian memorials for their religious communities.

The construction of buildings and additions to existing structures were more obvious and larger utilitarian memorials. Examples of additions include gates, bells, and wood panelling on walls. Several of the personal memorials were donations given to help support the construction of new buildings or community memorials. In New Zealand, the Otahuhu Methodist Church built a Memorial Sunday School to commemorate congregants who died in the war. As part of the building process, four women, Mary Irvine, Agnes Mary Muir, Anna J Whiteley, and Sarah Forthergill laid memorial stones as part of the foundation to commemorate their sons. (Image 16) Similarly, the University of Toronto allowed individuals to assist in the building of the Soldier’s Tower, the university memorial, by donating funds for the carillon bells. There were twenty-three different donations for the bells. Some donations came from organizations associated with the University, such as alumni groups in Montreal, Toronto, and New York. Others were from veteran groups, including members of the 147th Battalion of the CEF, the No 4 Canadian General Hospital, and members of the Canadian Army Women’s Auxiliary. Six

of the twenty-three bells were dedicated to individuals who were killed in the conflict and represent personal memorials.\(^{32}\) (Image 17)

The construction of new buildings as memorials saw a variety of structures built as utilitarian memorials. The types of buildings in the database include chapel or vestry buildings, churches, sports stadiums or stands, and halls. The construction of chapel or vestry buildings were more often extensions to existing churches rather than brand new buildings. The majority of chapels were built in Great Britain. It was not common to build churches as memorials, but this did happen in New Zealand more frequently. The Eskdale Memorial Church built in 1920 in New Zealand was dedicated to Percival Moore Beattie who was killed in France in 1918. The building was built by his widow Annie Clark Beattie and her father Thomas Clark who was a local farmer and landowner. Other men from the rural community of Eskdale are named in the church, but Percival takes pride of place as his battlefield cross, official memorial medallion, and medals are on display in the foyer.\(^{33}\)

Every memorial structure was utilitarian as can be seen in the memorial to Frederick Hugh Geoffrey Trumble. His memorial was a lifeboat house. Trumble was a naval officer and was killed in 1918 during the raid on Ostend, Belgium to stop German U-boat attacks.\(^{34}\) After the war, the Royal National Lifeboat Institute (RNLI) made appeals to the public to provide funds to upgrade their fleet to motorboats. The cost was advertised to be around £500,000 for the country, and roughly £7,000 to £8,000 for a

---


\(^{33}\) Eskdale War Memorial Church, NZ History Memorials Register, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/eskdale-church-war-memorial.

\(^{34}\) Lt F H G Trumble RN, IWM War Memorial Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/60089.
motorboat. In response to the campaign, Mrs Ada Trumble donated money to the RNLI and on June 28th, 1920, they opened a new lifeboat house in Whitby with her donation. Inside the new house was a plaque naming Frederick and acknowledging the contribution of Ada. The lifeboat house remained in use by the RNLI until 2005 when it was torn down and rebuilt as a new modern facility. The plaque was not re-installed and instead was moved to the Whitby RNLI Lifeboat Museum, the original lifeboat station from 1895-1957.

The wide variety of different structures built as memorials reveals that there was no template for what type of buildings could be a memorial. Buildings were sometimes selected to represent the personal connection the individual had to the type of building built. In 1921, James Armstrong Richardson, the Chancellor at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, named the new stadium after his brother, George Taylor Richardson, a former student and athlete at the school. Even after the original stadium was torn down in 1971, the new stadium kept the name, most likely because the Richardson family was still closely associated with the university. (Image 18) Similarly, the Charles Inglis Clark Memorial Hut was constructed on Ben Nevis (the tallest mountain in Britain) because of the Clark family’s involvement in mountaineering and climbing. Charles had

---

35 ‘The Eleventh Hour (AD),’ The Times, November 11th, 1919, p. 18; ‘Armistice Day. A Noble Memorial (AD),’ The Times, November 11th, 1920, p. 17.
39 The Richardson Family remained connected to the University as James’ daughter Agnes McCausland Benidickson also served as chancellor from 1980-1996 with other members serving on the board of trustees. ‘Richardson Family,’ Queen’s Encyclopedia, Queen’s University, https://www.queensu.ca/encyclopedia/r/richardson-family.
been active in mountaineering as his father, Dr William Inglis Clark, had served as the
Scottish Mountaineering Club president from 1913 to 1919. His mother, Jane Inglis
Clark, and his two sisters, Mabel and Lucy, had founded the Ladies Scottish Climbing
Club in 1908. The family built the hut for the Scottish Mountaineering Club who continue
to maintain it after it was opened over Easter in 1929.\textsuperscript{40} (Image 19) These memorials were
meant to represent the individuals being commemorated by supporting activities they
supported in life. Less personal memorials, like halls or churches, anchored the individual
being remembered in their hometowns. The heavy cost of constructing buildings meant
that they were reserved for the wealthiest families.

People also used the memorials to support the community by funding the
construction of operating rooms and wards in local hospitals. In Edenbridge Hospital in
Kent, the Bluett-Winch family provided the funds to erect and equip an x-ray room to
commemorate the cousins Gordon and Ronald.\textsuperscript{41} Ronald’s parents also helped to build
another hospital room, a sterilisation room in Ramsgate Hospital.\textsuperscript{42} These memorials were
donations that provided significant technological improvements to local healthcare. Less
costly, people also donated funds for memorial beds named after individuals.

Although not common, there were other technology-improving memorials
including lights, streetlamps, watches, clocks, and a sound system. These memorials
provided a service to the communities they were placed in. Some memorials updated or

\textsuperscript{40} ‘Charles Inglis Clark Hut Opening Ceremony,’ Film by George Sang and Harry MacRobert, 1929,
https://movingimage.nls.uk/film/7702; Charles Inglis Clark (C.I.C.) Memorial Hut, The Scottish
\textsuperscript{41} Major G. Bluett-Winch and Second Lieutenant R. Bluett-Winch, IWM War Memorial Register,
https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/73715.
\textsuperscript{42} R. Bluett-Winch, IWM War Memorial Register,
renovated older memorials. The memorial to Sir John Edward Fowler and his brother Alan Arthur Fowler were additions to the memorial clock to their father, Sir John Arthur Fowler which had been erected in 1899.43 (Image 20) The memorial clock originally honoured Sir John Arthur’s connection to the parish of Loch Broom and the village of Ullapool. After the deaths of his sons Sir John Edward and Alan Arthur, two new plaques were added to the clock to commemorate their deaths. Similarly, Edward Thomas Stafford-King-Harmon was added to the clock tower of his maternal great-grandfather, Lawrence Harmon King-Harmon. The clock tower was originally raised by residents of Boyle and Rockingham Estate in county Roscommon, Ireland, to their landlord in 1880.44 A plaque was added to the tower after the war to Edward by his father, Sir Thomas Stafford. In 1920, the clock was upgraded with new mechanical parts.45 While it is not clear if the clock’s upgrade was part of Edward’s memorial, it would make sense for the upgrade to be made with the inclusion of his plaque. (Image 21)

Lamps used in churches and chapels were also turned into memorials. The memorials to Joseph Chisnall and John Perry are hanging sanctuary lamps and were designed for candles not lightbulbs. Chisnall’s lamp was installed in Our Lady Immaculate Roman Catholic Church in Bryn, Manchester, England, And Perry’s was installed in Saint John the Evangelist Anglican Church in Shirley, Croydon, England.46

One of the few electric light memorials was installed in All Saints Church in Ilkley, West Yorkshire, England, to commemorate Kenneth Mallorie Priestman by his family. His family owned and ran a worsted spinning and manufacturing firm. A family had to be wealthy to create such a technological memorial. A plaque was erected in the church to explain the memorial to parishioners. It is not clear if the lights are still being used or if they have since been replaced.

The most technologically advanced memorial in the database was a sound system in St Clement’s Church in Mosman, Sydney, Australia, dedicated to Roderick Francis Macdonald. The memorial is marked with a metal plaque in the church. The memorial was not made immediately after the war, though when it was installed is not clear. Roderick himself seems to have had no connection to the church as he was born in Perth, Western Australia, and when he enlisted, he was living in Keswick, a suburb of Adelaide, South Australia. It was his brother, Alexander Henry Macdonald who had a connection to Mosman. He was living there when he applied for his brother’s Gallipoli Medallion in 1968. Whenever the sound system was installed the construction of the memorial was still sentimental to Alexander as it allowed him to mourn his brother even if the memorial was utilitarian.

Chairs and tables were a cheaper and more common utilitarian memorial. The communion table that commemorated the brothers Henry Greener and John William

---

50 MacDonald Roderick Frances, Australian Imperial Force Personnel Files, NAA: B2455, Macdonald R F, 1845380.
Greener was given by their family to Fawcett Hill Methodist Church in Craghead, Durham, England. It exemplifies the most common type of tables used as memorials. Chairs were also given to churches for use in services or other purposes, such as the memorial to John Evans, given to St Madryn’s Church (Eglwys Sant Madryn) in Trawsfynydd, Wales. Each of the memorial furniture was designed to show a personal connection to the individual being remembered while also being useful. In John Evans’ case, the chair was dedicated in Welsh by his father to show his connection to the community.

In addition to tables and chairs, candlesticks, beds, desks, as well as the complete furnishings for a house and a billiard table were also turned into memorials. The furnishings for the house were a memorial to Thomas Harry Basil Webb and his mother, Dame Ellen Webb. Their local church, Tredegarville Baptist Church in Cardiff, Wales, purchased the adjacent house to the church to serve as a war memorial. The main memorial in the church lists the names of congregants who died in the war, but a second plaque reads, ‘A donation was made from the estate of Dame Ellen Webb wife of Sir Henry Webb Bart, Llwynarthen, towards the furnishings of this house in proud and loving memory of Thomas Harry Basil Webb 2nd/Lt of the Welsh Guards who was killed in action at Gouzencourt 1st December 1917.’ The house was sold by the church and is

---

51 The church closed and the table was relocated to the Pit Hill Chapel in Beamish Open Air Museum. 2nd Lieutenant H Greener and Corporal J W Greener, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/60679.
53 It reads, ‘Er coffa am fy unig fab John Evans, a syrthiodd yn Ffarinc, Mawrth 21 ain, 1918. Offrwm ei dad Thomas Evans I Eglwys Trawnfyndd, O Maengwyn.’ Translates to, ‘In memory of my only son John Evans, who fell in France, March 21st, 1918. His father Thomas Evans’ offering to Trawnfyndd Church, Maengwyn.’) Ibid.
54 Tredegarville Baptists, IWM War Memorial Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/6659.
now owned by the University of Wales. The memorial plaque has been moved inside the Tredegarville Baptist Church. The billiard table is still in use. The table was dedicated to James Neville Marshall by a group of friends and is still in its original location, the Harlow War Memorial Institute.

Many personal memorials mixed utilitarian function and monumental beauty through nature. The use of nature either in natural formations or the creation of new parks and planting of trees, mixed monumental and utilitarian forms. The use of natural memorials is far more prevalent in the Dominions than in the United Kingdom. It is in Canada and Australia where the use of nature is most common, with mountains in Canada and trees in Australia.

The use of mountains as memorials in Canada was influenced by the ongoing survey of the Rocky Mountains that formed the border between the provinces of British Columbia and Alberta. The survey was conducted between 1913-1917 and moved along the Great Continental Divide. The surveyors named a number of the major peaks during the war after military leaders such as Mt Joffre, Mt Beatty, and Mt Sir Douglas (after Douglas Haig) to name a few. In the 1920s, other peaks were named by the Canadian government after other commanders like Currie, French, Jellicoe, Smuts, Foch, and Byng. A number of peaks were named after regular soldiers with connections to the Dominion.

---

56 Google Maps, Wales International Academy of Voice at 42 The Parade, Cardiff Wales, https://www.google.com/maps/place/Wales+International+Academy+of+Voice/@51.485306,-3.167022,17.74z/data=!3m1!4b1!5m2!3m4!1m1!4m5!1s0x486e1cc7aad73eb7:0x3dd1bb8af4f1125a!4m12!1m6!3m5!7s0x0:0xaf2960e81b896916!2sTredegarville+Baptist+Church!7m2!3d51.485369!4d-3.1667816.
57 Lt Col J N Marshall VC, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/22422; The Harlow War Memorial Institute identifies the location of the table on a map of the building with all its extensions, https://www.hwmi.co.uk/hwmi-history.
Land Survey. Mount Bolton was named after Lambert Ernest Stanley Bolton who had been a Dominion Land Surveyor out of Calgary, Alberta, before he enlisted.\textsuperscript{59}

In Australia, trees were planted as part of larger memorials and for individual remembrance. Trees were common collective memorials in Australia as many communities constructed avenues of honour using trees.\textsuperscript{60} Several of the tree memorials in the database are from larger tree planting memorials. The Laura Primary School in the town of Laura, South Australia has a memorial of six trees with brass plaques at the base of the trees to commemorate individuals.\textsuperscript{61} Other trees were planted by families in their hometowns such as the trees to Arthur Smith in Wilby and Elizabeth Rothery in Myrtleford, both in the state of Victoria.\textsuperscript{62} (Image 24)

A common nature memorial was a memorial park. Parks took one of two forms; they were either named by the community after an individual or the family of the individual donated land to become a park. In Britain, land was given to the National Trust in memory of an individual. Castle Crag for example was given to the National Trust in memory of John Hamer. The memorial sits upon a hill in Cumbria, England, between the towns of Grange and Borrowdale in the Lake District National Park and also serves as a community memorial for Borrowdale.\textsuperscript{63} Castle Crag includes walking paths that take


\textsuperscript{60} John Stephens, ‘Remembrance and Commemoration through Honour Avenues and Groves in Western Australia,’ \textit{Landscape Research}, vol 34, no 1 (February 2009), pp. 125-141.

\textsuperscript{61} Laura Primary School Memorial Plaques, Virtual War Memorial Australia, https://vwma.org.au/explore/memorials/458.


hikers past the memorial.\textsuperscript{64} (Image 25) The National Trust was also able to purchase and support nine different sites around London thanks to the donation of William Alexander Robertson upon his death in 1937 to commemorate his two younger brothers, Norman Cairns and Laurence Grant Robertson.\textsuperscript{65} In New Zealand, the Kaitarakihi Park, part of the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park, was donated to Auckland by Wesley Spragg to remember his son Wesley Neal Spragg.\textsuperscript{66} (Image 26) Like the donations to the National Trust, Kaitarakihi Park and the Spragg Memorial were designed to protect the natural history of the area and protects local vegetation. Today, the park is one of the best locations in Auckland of native forests.\textsuperscript{67}

A difficulty with natural memorials lies in maintaining them for the long term. While the memorials in the care of the National Trust and Auckland Council have succeeded in protecting and maintaining the natural setting, others have not been so successful. Natural memorials become lost if they are plants such as trees or gardens. The Laura Primary School trees mentioned earlier have all been cut down and the brass plaques have been placed in the school.\textsuperscript{68} The memorial to Frank Colin Ross in Mount Waverley, Melbourne Australia, was lost for years, probable because the tree was either

\textsuperscript{66} Kaitarakihi First World War Memorial, NZ History Memorial Database, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/kaitarakihi-first-world-war-memorial.
\textsuperscript{68} Laura Primary School Memorial Plaques, Virtual War Memorial Australia, https://vwma.org.au/explore/memorials/458.
cut down or died. In 1974, when the city of Melbourne was creating the Monash Freeway, construction crews dug up the plaque. A new tree was planted near the site the plaque was found in memory of Frank.69 (Image 27)

Natural memorials were not the only personal memorials erected in public and outdoor spaces. These memorials had less restrictions to viewing them as they did not require people to enter any buildings, making them public personal memorials. These memorials, vary from artistic works to plain stones with several being utilitarian in function, but most were monumental. Being in the open, these memorials contribute to the formation of collective memories of the war by being open for social consumption.

The most common styles of public memorials include stone plinths, steles, and obelisks, often placed in cemeteries to act as headstones for lost loved ones. The memorial to George Janes and William J. Janes is a headstone for the brothers. They both fought with the Newfoundland Regiment and died in France. In the Old United Church Cemetery in Britannia, Newfoundland, their parents erected a marble stele to act as a substitute grave for their sons.70 (Image 28) A similar memorial is the memorial cairn to Allan George Cameron and Archibald Cameron, the sons of the chief of clan Cameron in Scotland. Erected in the Locheil Burial Ground of clan Cameron, the memorial cairn commemorates the two brothers in the cemetery they most likely would have been buried in had they been allowed to be repatriated after the war.71 (Image 29) Animals also received similar memorials as these stone memorials. Bess the horse has a memorial in

71 Captain A G Cameron and Captain A Cameron, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/82558.
New Zealand in what is now the AgResearch Flock House, the site of a former agricultural college near Bulls, Manawatu-Wanganui. Bess had served in the war after being donated to the New Zealand army in 1914 and was ridden by Captain Charles Guy Powles in Egypt and Palestine. Powles brought Bess home after the war and continued riding her at the agricultural college where he worked. Bess died of natural causes in 1934 and Powles built the memorial to her over the spot where she collapsed and is buried.\textsuperscript{72} Locals continue to visit the memorial to Bess and advocate for a national memorial to all horses from New Zealand used in the war.\textsuperscript{73}

Personal memorials in a communal space mix private and collective memory but elevate the individual over the collective. Several community memorials are also personal memorials due to families contributing money, land, or services to the community memorial project. The Te Karaka War Memorial in New Zealand is an example of a personal memorial in a community monument. The memorial paid for by Edward Massey and Eleanor Hutchinson for their son Brian Massey Hutchinson and the town of Te Karaka in 1920. The memorial features a marble statue of the New Zealand Rifle Brigade badge, the unit Edward was a member of, atop a plinth listing the names of forty members of the community who died in the war.\textsuperscript{74} The memorial remains the main memorial for the town and had a gate added to include the Second World War dead. (Image 30) A similar but smaller example is the St Nicholas’ Parish Church memorial that was erected to Geoffrey Thomas Lovick Ellwood. The stone cross, reminiscent of the Imperial War...
Graves Cross of Sacrifice was erected in the churchyard of the Anglican St Nicholas’ Church in Cottesmore, Leicestershire, England, by Geoffrey’s father the church rector. Ten names of parishioners killed were listed on the memorial for the First World War, and a second list of five names was included for the Second World War. These community memorials reject the idea of equality of treatment in official memory as one individual was elevated above the others on the memorial. Communities tried to prevent one individual or family having a disproportionate amount of influence over community memorials. Creating organizing committees or limiting the amount of money that could be donated helped to limit any one person’s control over the memorial and ensure it represented all members. In the few community memorials that were funded by one family, their dead relative was elevated above the rest.

Park benches, flags, and fountains were other kinds of utilitarian memorials found in public parks. The bench to Alfred Lewis Arnold and his son Bertram Lewis Arnold in the Garden of Remembrance in Stratford-upon-Avon, England exemplifies the simple utilitarian public memorials. The bench was erected in 1954 after the opening of the Garden of Remembrance and the bench remembers Alfred who died in the First World War and his son Bertram who was killed in the Second. A unique memorial belongs to Hector McIntyre whose wife Margaret erected a horse trough in the town of Port Campbell, Victoria Australia. The memorial commemorates Hector who died in

---

Belgium but also commemorates ‘his noble horses.’ Hector was a major in the Australian Light Horse and a grazier, meaning he most likely provided horses for the Australian Army. The reference to his horses was to the thousands of horses that were requisitioned by the Australian army for the war effort and never returned. (Image 33)

Utilitarian memorials stand out because of how few were constructed. The same is true for memorials that were designed as pieces of art such as photos, paintings, statues, and busts. They stand out due to the decorative, ornamental, and the interest amongst art critics. There are thirty-nine photos and thirty-eight statues in the database. The small number of photographs reflected the view that photos were unsuitable for long-term remembrance. During the war, governments and propagandists used photos to provide short-term and immediate sites of memory for the general public. Nonetheless, physical memorials and paintings were seen as more permanent and longer-lasting forms of remembrance. Photos were also deeply personal for the families, and it might be that photos were kept in homes or photo albums for posterity. Photos were too private to be exposed for public consumption.

The private nature of photographs can be seen in the memorial to Frederick William Charles Drover of the 1st Hampshire Regiment. The memorial consists of a photograph of Drover with the King’s Memorial Medallion, also known as a Dead Man’s

79 McIntyre Hector, First Australian Imperial Force Personnel Dossiers, 1914-1920, NAA B2455, 1946984.
80 The Anzac Mounted Division that fought in Egypt and the Middle East displays the post-war treatment of horses from Australia. Unwilling to pay the transportation or quarantine costs, the Australian government sold roughly 6,000 horses to British and Imperial authorities in Egypt, while also killing roughly 3,000 that were too poor to sell. Jean Bou, Light Horse: A History of Australia’s Mounted Arm, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 200-201.
Penny, in a frame with text. The memorial is located in Lt. Col. David Currie V.C. Armoury in Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan Canada, the home of the Saskatchewan Dragoons. The memorial was erected on Remembrance Day, 1983 when Drover’s sister Annie Broomfield gave it to the Saskatchewan Dragoons to maintain and protect. At that point, the photo would have been over 67 years old. Annie kept the photo and the medallion for all those years, bringing it to Canada at some point. Eventually she found a place where the photo and he could be remembered permanently. (Image 34)

In photographs, the image of the deceased connected the memorial to the person being commemorated. Previously restricted to portraits, statues, or busts, the use of photographs allowed for a more accessible and easier means to personalize the individual being remembered. Families could also personalize the way they wanted to remember their family member in photographic memorials. Edwin George Pipe’s memorial in Beccles Bell Tower in the town of Beccles, Suffolk, England, is a piece of paper with his photo in a frame; Pipe had been one of the bell ringers. Pipe himself was not wealthy as he was employed in the 1911 England census as a monotype caster attendant at the age of 15, working with his father in a print shop. (Image 35)

Pipe’s memorial is more the exception than the norm when it comes to memorials featuring an image of the individual. The majority of such memorials, including portraits, statues, and busts, were restricted to wealthy or well-known individuals. Predictable when

---

83 Private F W Drover, CWGC Find War Dead, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/casualty-details/311803/F%20DROVER/.
85 Edwin George Pipe, Census Returns of England and Wales, 1911, NA RG 14, 1911, 217 Beccles 9 Queens Road, Beccles Suffolk.
it came to more expensive styles of memorials, this also included photographs. Examples in the photographic memorials to Basil Maclear and Henric Clarence Nicholas reveal the wealth gap in photo memorials. Basil Maclear was an international rugby player who played for the Irish national team before the war and was a member of the Bedford Rugby Club in Bedford, England. The memorial to Basil in Beford Rugby Club features two photographs of him, one in his military uniform, and the second in his Irish Rugby jersey.86 Basil was a well-known player ensuring he was commemorated in his local club due to his fame. (Image 36) The photographic memorial to Henric Clarence Nicholas is located in the council office of Hamilton, Tasmania, Australia, where he had been a councillor and a Justice of the Peace.87 In the photo, Henric is sitting on his horse with a rifle resting on his hip. All the other photos mention so far are portraits, the individual sitting or standing in a studio whereas Henric’s shows him as a man of action. (Image37) The memorial is not the only one dedicated to Henric. His father created a park in the neighbouring town of Ellendale, as well as a carved wooden cover to a baptismal font for St John the Baptist Church in Ouse as additional memorials.88 The multiple memorials to Henric reveal the wealth and influence he and his family held in the community.

The creation of portraits, busts, and statues also provided a physical representation of the individual being memorialized through figurative mediums. Each of these mediums was used by those who had wealth and to commemorate someone famous. An example of

87 While the web page does not name the location as the council offices, going onto Google Maps for where they have pinned the location reveals it is the council offices. Henric Clarence Nicholas, Hamilton, Tas, Places of Pride National Register of War Memorials, Australian War Museum, https://placesofpride.awm.gov.au/memorials/214806.
wealth and status is the statue to Edward William Horner in St Andrews Church in Mells, Somerset, England. Edward was the son of Sir John and Lady Frances Horner who were friends with Prime Minister Herbert Asquith. After Edward’s death, the Horners commissioned a statue of Edward sitting on a horse in uniform on a stone base. The memorial was designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens, one of the chief architects of the Imperial War Graves Commission and designer of the Cenotaph in London, along with bronze sculpturer Sir Alfred Munnings. The statue is accurately detailed with Edward on his horse in full khaki uniform and the distinctive helmet of the British army at his side. The base was intricately designed. The front features the coat of arms of the Horner family while his wooden battlefield cross attached to the back. The memorial stands out from other memorials in the database due to the size and design that no other statue replicates. (Image 2)

Statues were erected to commemorate other famous individuals such as Edgar Mobbs. Mobbs was a well-known rugby player from Northampton where he was their captain and he played international rugby for England before the war. On the outbreak of the war Mobbs helped raise a company in the 7th Northamptonshire Regiment, nicknamed ‘Mobbs Company.’ He joined the unit as a private and rose through the ranks to command the battalion as a Lieutenant Colonel when he was killed. The memorial to Mobbs was raised by public subscription and erected in Northampton. The statue is not

---

89 The Horner and Asquith families were very close, so much so that Edward was friends with Asquith’s son Raymond who was married to Edward’s sister, Katherine. W.J. Reader, At Duty’s Call: A Study in Obsolete Patriotism, (Manchester: Manchester University press, 1988), pp. 126-132.
92 Originally it was placed in The Market Place square but was moved to a new Memorial Garden, Edgar R. Mobbs, DSO, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/14949.
of Mobbs, but of victory holding a torch and laurel wreath upon an obelisk. Near the base, a bronze bust of Mobbs was included with two reliefs featuring a rugby match on one side, and soldiers marching into battle on the other, while on the rear a plaque provides details of the memorial’s construction and details of Mobbs’ life.\(^93\) (Image 38) Generic statues of commonly carved figures were cheaper than custom statues like those of Horner or Mobbs. The memorial to Peter Joseph Kennedy in St Mary’s Catholic Church in Cleator, Cumbria, England, is a statue of St. Peter and was given to the church by his parents Thomas and Elizabeth Kennedy.\(^94\) The Kennedy family were not wealthy or famous. In 1911 they are recorded in the census as operating a pub and inn in the town.\(^95\) Statues like the one to Peter were cheaper, but still would have cost a significant amount of money. (Image 39)

Paintings and busts were also made for famous or wealthy individuals. The memorial bust to Thomas Michael Kettle in St Stephen’s Green, Dublin, Ireland, is an example of bust memorials. Kettle was a prominent and radical Irish nationalist before the war who enlisted with other nationalists in the hope that the war would deliver Irish independence.\(^96\) An outlier amongst radical nationalists for serving in the war, Tom was killed in action on September 9th, 1916. After the war, a group of his friends pooled their resources and had a bust of Kettle made by leading Irish artist Albert Power in 1921 and planned to erect it in St Stephen’s Green. Its installation was delayed due to the War of

\(^93\) No images of the statue are on the IWM War Memorials Register and so to see the statue visit, Edgar Mobbs DSO, War Memorials Online, https://www.warmemorials.org.uk/memorial/136424/.
\(^95\) Thomas Kennedy, Census Returns of England and Wales, 1911, NA RG 14, 1911, District 577 Egremont, 48 Jacktrees Rd Cleator Moor Cumberland.
Independence and the Civil War, and afterward by the new Irish government’s resistance to the memorial. Of concern was the use of the phrase, ‘Killed in France’ as it implied that nationalists could exist outside of the republican branch that formed the government. The memorial was later modified to say ‘Killed in Guinchy’ which is not well known and does not explain what he was doing there. The wording obscures that it is a First World War memorial, yet it remains one of the few public memorials in Dublin to the First World War.\footnote{Keith Jeffery, Ireland and the Great War, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 128.} \footnote{Kettle Memorial, Irish War Memorials, http://www.irishwarmemorials.ie/Memorials-Detail?memoid=169.} \footnote{Captain Joseph Holt, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/43956.} \footnote{In the virtual tour of the school the bust is at the front entrance between the main doors. Gerard Illtyd Turnbull MC, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/6656; Virtual Tour, St Illtyd’s Catholic High School, http://www.stilltyds.org.uk/virtual-tour/.}

The wealthy also commissioned portraits as memorials, seen in the memorial to Joseph Holt. He was the son of Sir Edward Holt and the grandson of Joseph Holt, the founder of Joseph Holt Brewery in Manchester, England. A portrait of Joseph was erected in one of the Joseph Holt Brewery pubs in Manchester, The Ape and Apple Pub along with his military medals, sword, Dead Man’s Penny, and other portraits of Holt family members.\footnote{Image 40} \footnote{Image 41}

Some busts and paintings were also not of the individuals they commemorated. The memorial bust to Gerard Illtyd Turnbull in St Illtyd’s Catholic High School in Cardiff, Wales, is of St Illtyd. It was donated to the school in honour of Gerard and remains in the school on display in the main hall.\footnote{Image 42} The bust, however, was damaged when the school was hit by a bomb in the Second World War. The inscription on the memorial was destroyed. It currently sits on a new pedestal in the school with no indication it was
dedicated to Gerard.\footnote{Gerard Iltyd Turnbull MC, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/6656; History, St Illtyd’s Catholic High School, http://www.stilltyds.org.uk/history/} A similar memorial to Joseph Octavius Carter was erected in Horwich Town Hall, north-west of Manchester. A painting of local historian Thomas Hampson was given to Horwich town council by Joseph’s father and his brother in memory of his death as Joseph and Thomas died in 1918.\footnote{JO Carter, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/43776.}

One way paintings varied from photos was their depiction of war and the individuals in combat. Most photos were taken in studios and were static compared to painting that recreated combat in their scenes. For example, the memorial to William Charles Williams in St Mary’s Church in Chepstow, Monmouthshire, Wales, shows the landing of British forces at Gallipoli. Williams held the landing craft together by hand whilst troops disembarked under heavy fire. Williams was killed during the landing, and he was posthumously awarded the Victoria Cross.\footnote{An account of the action can be read here where Williams was one of six Royal Navy personnel to win the Victoria Cross in that action. Wonderful Stories. Winning the V.C. in the Great War, (New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, 1918) pp. 148-158.} The painting recreates for views the landing that saw Williams decorated with the Victoria Cross.\footnote{Able Seaman Williams VC Painting, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/38216.}

A number of memorials were created from personal mementos from the war such as medals, swords, flags or banners, and trophies. Several memorials already mentioned included these mementos in the memorial. These memorials are souvenirs of service in the war and personal mementos of the war dead. The clearest example of a war souvenir can be seen in the memorial to Richard Walker in All Saints Church in Bingley, Yorkshire, England. The memorial is the casing of an 18-pound artillery shell that has
been engraved and turned into a vase in the church.\footnote{Sgt R Walker, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/29006.} Richard probably sent the shell home as a souvenir when he was a Sergeant in the Royal Field Artillery.

Finally, some memorials are very odd in design and use, marking them as one-offs. One such one-off memorial is to John Theobald Milne. It is a snuff box in the shape of a ram’s head. Gifted to the Caledonian Club in Belgravia, London, by his father John Alexander Milne, the memorial stands out in the database for both the distinct look, and the use of the memorial.\footnote{In a video advertising the Caledonian Club, the memorial is featured as the narrators says, ‘…some wonderful quirks and antiques…’ A Short History, Club Tour Video, The Caledonian Club, https://www.caledonianclub.com/club-information/a-short-history/; Captain J Milne, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/53242.} (Image 44)
Image 19: Charles Inglis Clark Memorial Hut on Ben Nevis, Highland, Scotland.

Image 20: Memorial Clock to the Fowler Family, Ullapool, Highland, Scotland.

Image 21: King-Harmon Memorial Clock, Boyle, Roscommon, Ireland.


Image 23: Memorial Plaque for the Amplifying System in St Clement’s Church, Sydney, Australia.

Image 24: Memorial Tree to Elizabeth Rothery, Myrtleford, Victoria, Australia.

Image 26: Obelisk to Wesley Neal Spragg in Kaitarakihi Park, Waitakere Ranges Regional Park, Auckland, New Zealand.

Image 27: Memorial Tree to Frank Colin Ross, Melbourne, Australia.

Image 28: Memorial Plinth to George Janes and William J. Janes in the Old United Church Cemetery, Britannia, Newfoundland, Canada.

Image 29: Memorial Cairn to Allan George Cameron and Archibald Cameron in Locheil Burial Ground Clan Cameron Museum, Achnacarry, Highland, Scotland.

Image 30: Te Karaka War Memorial to Brian Massey Hutchinson, Te Karaka, Gisborne, New Zealand.

Image 31: Memorial Cross to Geoffrey Lovick Ellwood and St Nicholas’ Parish Church Parishioners, Cottesmore, Rutland, England.

Image 33: Memorial Horse Trough to Hector McIntyre, Port Campbell, Victoria, Australia.

Image 34: Memorial Medallion and Photograph of Frederick William Charles Drover in Lt. Col. David Currie V.C. Armoury, Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, Canada.


Image 37: Memorial Photograph of Henric Clarence Nicholas in the Council Office, Hamilton, Tasmania, Australia.


Image 39: Memorial Statue of St Peter to Peter Joseph Kennedy in St Mary’s Catholic Church, Cleator, Cumbria, England.

Image 40: Bust of Thomas Michael Kettle in St Stephen’s Green, Dublin, Ireland.
Analysing the Database: Economics and Labour

Using the database, we can examine the military ranks and pre-war employment of the deceased and their families; this confirms that people who were wealthy and part of the social elite were the ones most likely to build personal memorials. Many of those being commemorated were officers who belonged to the upper and middle classes. Officers were more likely to receive a personal memorial over enlisted personnel. A total of 1,330 officers are in the database compared to 958 enlisted men. The ratio of officers to enlisted in the database does not match the ratio of officers and enlisted who served in the British military or were killed in the war. A total of 46,703 officers were reported
killed, and 861,668 enlisted men were killed, a ratio of one officer for every eighteen enlisted.\(^{107}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Enlisted</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>524 (65%)</td>
<td>269 (33%)</td>
<td>18 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>153 (85%)</td>
<td>20 (11%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>47 (67%)</td>
<td>22 (31%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>222 (78%)</td>
<td>57 (20%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>109 (55%)</td>
<td>90 (45%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,055 (68%)</td>
<td>458 (30%)</td>
<td>30 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>111 (27%)</td>
<td>293 (71%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>130 (50%)</td>
<td>127 (49%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>34 (29%)</td>
<td>80 (68%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,330 (57%)</td>
<td>958 (41%)</td>
<td>38 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (&gt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Officers, Enlisted, and Civilians in the Database.*

Amongst the nations in the database, there are more officers to enlisted men, except in Australia and New Zealand. In the United Kingdom, officers were more prevalent in commemoration over enlisted. Only Wales was close to parity. In the Dominions the numbers were reversed. Canada had almost an even number of memorials to officers and enlisted. Australia and New Zealand were both mostly enlisted over officers. Even so, the number of officers being commemorated in New Zealand and Australia is disproportionate to the number of officers who were killed in the war. The high number of officers suggests that elites within each nation were the ones who were predominately constructing personal memorials.

An examination of pre-war occupations provides additional evidence of the high social status the majority of individuals in the database held. Soldiers fighting in Dominion units on their attestation papers were required to state what their previous employment was, and in some cases who their previous employer was. For individuals

who served in British units, I determined their pre-war occupations by using census records, and *De Ruvigny's Roll of Honour 1914-1919*. To categorize occupations, I used the definitions created by Mark McGowan who examined Irish Canadians in the First World War, and Carman Miller who examined Canadian forces in the Boer Wars. Individuals were placed into different sectors of the economy that reflect the type of work they were doing, and the level of education required to perform such an occupation. Each occupation was categorized as; white-collar, and included students, lawyers, engineers, medical practitioners, clerks, and people connected to business; blue-collar, including skilled artisans, carpenters, blacksmiths, factory workers, and labourers; service industry, including soldiers, firemen, transportation workers, gardeners, and people in communications; and primary industry, including farmers, fishermen, sailors, and miners. Some occupations were harder to place, and they will be discussed shortly. Scotland (13%) and Ireland (12%) had the largest number of unknown pre-war occupations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Blue Collar</th>
<th>Service Industry</th>
<th>Primary Industry</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>364 (45%)</td>
<td>83 (10%)</td>
<td>214 (26%)</td>
<td>84 (10%)</td>
<td>65 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>146 (52%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
<td>79 (28%)</td>
<td>17 (6%)</td>
<td>35 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>101 (51%)</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td>35 (18%)</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>41 (59%)</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
<td>10 (14%)</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>101 (56%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>42 (23%)</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
<td>22 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>753 (49%)</td>
<td>125 (8%)</td>
<td>380 (25%)</td>
<td>141 (9%)</td>
<td>142 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>133 (32%)</td>
<td>105 (26%)</td>
<td>32 (8%)</td>
<td>126 (31%)</td>
<td>14 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>147 (57%)</td>
<td>34 (13%)</td>
<td>26 (10%)</td>
<td>36 (14%)</td>
<td>13 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>35 (30%)</td>
<td>20 (17%)</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>46 (40%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,068 (46%)</td>
<td>284 (12%)</td>
<td>446 (19%)</td>
<td>349 (15%)</td>
<td>176 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Pre-War Occupations by Industry.*

---

There are more white-collar occupations than the other categories. In every nation except New Zealand, white-collar workers are the largest group, and they make up 46% of all occupations in the database. Canada is the only Dominion where white-collar workers are over half with 147 of 256. Canadian numbers reflect British trends where where-collar workers are over half of every nation but England. In New Zealand, white-collar workers account for only thirty-six of 116 individuals and their largest group of workers are from the primary sector, accounting for forty-six of 116. Australia’s largest group is also white-collar workers with 133 of 410 individuals, but it only outnumbers the primary sector by seven people (126 of 410 in the primary sector).

Students are usually the most common type of worker in the white-collar category; only Australia and New Zealand are the exceptions. The number of students is due primarily to their age at the time they enlisted. The importance of schools in the development of British imperial identity, and masculinity through the use of education as well as sports helped to create a youth that equated sports with the battlefield that encouraged service in the armed forces.\textsuperscript{109} Dissemination of these ideals was limited by resources, location, and individual headmasters or teachers pushing students towards such ideas. State schools did not promote imperial and military ideals to the same extent as the elite public schools and universities.\textsuperscript{110} The lack of attestation or service files from Britain makes it harder to identify any other occupation for the students. Many of the individuals recorded their occupation in the 1911 census as students. Without data from other sources

\textsuperscript{110} The headmasters of Eton, Rugby, and Harrow in England, and Loretto in Scotland show the elite importance to empire, education and masculinity. Ibid, pp. 21-43; As compared to other schools, Brad Beaven, \textit{Visions of Empire: Patriotism, Popular Culture and the City, 1870-1939}, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), pp. 125-146.
to show they had graduated, the assumption is that they were still in school in 1914. For example, Trevor William James from Cardiff, Wales, was born in 1898 and was last recorded in the census records in 1911 with no occupation. His father, William, was the only member of the household to have an occupation recorded as ‘dairyman’. His service file and attestation papers did not survive but on his death, he was recorded as being 19. Trevor was only 16 at the start of the war, old enough to still be in school, but judging from his father’s occupation as a dairyman suggests that he may have left school to find work. As no clear evidence has presented itself, Trevor was recorded as being a student in the database.

The commemoration of students as the largest group speaks to the sense of sorrow and loss that the war helped generate. This supports one of the early myths and memories of the war centred around the ‘Lost Generation’. The ‘Lost Generation’ emphasized the sense of a life and potential future unfulfilled. The promised future that would never come. Members of this generation would later be seen as scarred by their experiences and by the loss of so many of their family and friends. The story of Vera Brittain, an Oxford student whose brother, fiancée, and friend died in war were students just like her. Their deaths, along with how it changed her planned future, would epitomize the sense of loss for her generation.

After students, the largest group of white-collar workers were clerks. A number of these workers worked for banks and other companies, but the generic word ‘clerk’ was

---

111 Trevor William James, Census Returns of England and Wales, 1911, 1 Amesbury Road Cardiff, NA RG 14/32080 Schedule Number 180, 1911.
used regularly. Teachers, headmasters, and university professors are present across the
database in large numbers. So too are lawyers, law students, solicitors, barristers, judges,
justices of the peace, members of parliament, and engineers, ranging from civil to mining.
Frank Reginald Beck was the land agent to the Royal Estate of Sandringham in Norfolk,
England, had a less common white-collar job. He had inherited his job from his father and
Frank served as the agent from 1891 to his death in 1915.\textsuperscript{114} Members of the nobility,
when other occupations were not stated, were included as white-collar workers. Some
were active such as Lord Ninian Crighton-Stuart who was the member of parliament for
Cardiff at the time of his death, while others have no information on their occupation such
as George Francis Augustus Venables-Vernon, 8\textsuperscript{th} Baron Vernon.\textsuperscript{115}

The smallest group of workers in the database are blue-collar workers, making up
12\% of the total. The database shows that in the British Isles, blue-collar workers were
the least represented with Scotland having only five of 282 and Ireland with five of 179.
Both have more unknown and unclassifiable occupations than blue-collar workers. The
Dominions have the largest number of blue-collar workers with Australia having 105 of
410, New Zealand twenty of 116, and Canada thirty-four of 256. Besides Ireland and
Scotland, the most common type of blue-collar job was the generic labourer. In Scotland,
labourers included cheesemaker, grocer, oil refiner, and rural labourers. In Ireland, no
individual identified as a labourer, but there were two maltsters, a builder, a dock worker,
and a painter. Several individuals did identify themselves as farm labourers, so they were

\textsuperscript{115} Baron Vernon does not appear in the 1911 census and in the 1901 census he is a student. George F A the
Baron Vernon, Census Returns of England and Wales, 1901, Ramsgate Kent, NA RG 13/828 Folio 169 p.
28, 1901.
classified as part of the primary sector, and they were not included in the blue-collar occupations.

The smaller number of blue-collar workers was due to several reasons. First was the protected status of many skilled workers for war industries. Even before the institution of conscription in Britain, Canada and New Zealand, some recruits were rejected because their occupation supported the larger war effort. This can be seen in voluntary enlistment between August 1914-February 1916 that shows a higher percentage of white-collar workers joining the military over blue-collar workers.\textsuperscript{116} With conscription, some workers were explicitly protected to maintain the home front and valuable resources. The British government outlined exemptions from national service for railway and transport workers, coal miners, agriculturalists, munition, shipbuilding and ship-repairing workers, government department employees, students, Red Cross workers, and those involved in special war work.\textsuperscript{117} However, while the percentage of white-collar workers joining the military was higher, the absolute number of blue-collar workers in the military was higher. In Britain, the number of volunteers from industries, including mining, that volunteered between August 1914-February 1916 numbered 1.7 million, compared to the next highest group, workers from finance and commerce numbering only 500,000.\textsuperscript{118} If personal memorials reflected the class breakdown of soldiers, then there should be more memorials to blue-collar workers. That is not the case because commemoration was influenced by class.

\textsuperscript{116} Winter, \textit{The Great War and the British People}, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{118} Winter, \textit{The Great War and the British People}, p. 34.
Cost, connected to class, also determined who and how people were commemorated with a personal memorial. One of the explanations for why citizens volunteered for the army was the need for money.\footnote{119} Considering the need for work that motivated many working-class volunteers for the war, they would not necessarily have the family income to build memorials after the war. In Canada, the stained-glass studio of Robert McCausland Ltd in Toronto produced large numbers of stained-glass windows for churches and others. The cost of erecting a window in St Peter’s Catholic Basilica in London in 1926 for $174 a window.\footnote{120} Bronze and brass plaques could vary in because the buyer had more freedom to choose the design, the size, and the level of details. The jewellery and metal-working company of Birks in Canada advertised in \textit{Maclean’s Magazine} in 1919 that bronze and brass memorial tablets were available for between $50.00 and $500.00.\footnote{121} Based on census data from 1921, Canadian men in cities were earning yearly between $1,438.61 and $970.77; while Canadian women were earning yearly between $824.86 and $403.74.\footnote{122} Even at their lowest price, memorials represented a significant investment and would have been beyond the reach of most people.

The second-largest industry in the database is the service industry. The numbers in the database show a division between the nations of the British Isles and the Dominions. In Britain, the service industry represented nearly 25% of all those memorialized, with the

\footnote{121} ‘Memorial Tablets and Honor Rolls,’ \textit{Maclean’s Magazine}, Vol. 32 issue 7, (July 1919), p. 47.
\footnote{122} These numbers represent the cities with the highest and lowest average yearly earnings in 1921. They are Regina and Saint John for men, and Windsor and Quebec City for women. Dominion Bureau of Statistics: General Statistics Branch, \textit{The Canada Year Book 1927-28}, (Ottawa: F.A. Acland Printer to the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, 1928), table 5-Total Number of Wage Earners and Average Yearly Earnings in the Census Years 1911 and 1921, in Cities of 30,000 Population and Over, p. 777.
largest in Scotland with seventy-nine of 282 and England with 214 of 810. Compared to
the Dominions, the service industry is the smallest with only eight of 116 for New
Zealand, thirty-two of 410 for Australia, and twenty-six of 256 for Canada. The
differences in the service industry between Britain and the Dominions are the number of
professional soldiers. After students, the largest occupation in England are soldiers. In
every nation in Britain, except Wales, professional soldiers feature as the second-largest
pre-war occupation. In the Dominions, the number of professional soldiers is far lower,
with New Zealand having no professional soldiers being commemorated while Canada
has ten of 256 and Australia has six of 410.

Several factors explain the high number of professional soldiers being
commemorated. One is the high level of military recruitment amongst middle and upper-
class individuals who undertook military training in their youth. Many were trained and
part of the Territorials or militia units. Members of these units were part-time soldiers
rather than full-time members. These officers often came from backgrounds where their
families gave them the financial support to be part-time officers and many also
participated in family businesses on the side. Participation in the military was expected
and emphasized in Edwardian Britain. As such, service in the military was something to
be remembered and celebrated.

The commemoration of soldiers was also an established tradition by the time the
First World War started, particularly in Britain. During the expansion of the British
Empire around the globe in the 18th and 19th century, many soldiers and sailors who died

---

123 Ian Beckett, Timothy Bowman and Mark Connelly, *The British Army and the First World War*,
overseas were often not transported back to Britain.\textsuperscript{124} As will be seen in the next chapter, the construction of memorials to military expeditions for imperial expansion and defence was well established within churches. These imperial memorials to campaigning soldiers created a template and model for personal memorials for those killed in the First World War.

Beyond soldiers, individuals involved in the service industry were diverse in their pre-war occupations. The variety of workers makes it harder to pin down how the service industry fits in the social ladder. Railway workers, as well as couriers, mailmen, and waggoneers, suggest they were blue-collar workers. Policemen and newspaper reporters were more middle-class or white-collar workers. Telegraph and wireless operators display the ambiguity of the sector, as they required specific skills to be good operators, and yet were in a lower socio-economic position.\textsuperscript{125} The ambiguity of service industry occupations to social class comes across in the case of Colin Blythe. A professional cricketer, Colin came from a working-class background. His father worked in the munitions factories in Woolwich, which Colin also worked in before his career in cricket.\textsuperscript{126} Colin became a renowned cricketer and played internationally for England.

\textsuperscript{124} Drew Gilpin Faust examines the industry of returning bodies during the American Civil War and highlights that while the technology was available, the cost, and unreliability of caretakers, meant not everyone could take advantage of it. For Americans, it was easier to transport the bodies as the trip was far shorter than it would be for British families transported bodies from the far side of the globe. Drew Gilpin Faust, \textit{This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War}, (New York: Vintage Books, 2008), pp. 61-101.

\textsuperscript{125} Michael Feagan, ‘Precarious Professionals: The Liminal Identity of Canadian Telegraph Operators, 1880-1914,’ \textit{Bruce J. McCaffery Graduate Student Seminar Series}, (London Ont: Western University, September 12\textsuperscript{th}, 2019).

before the war. On his death, Colin left to his widow £2,838 13s 8d, a tidy sum of money that revealed his elevated status thanks to cricket.\textsuperscript{127}

Finally, there were memorials to individuals from the primary sector. More individuals in this sector were from the Dominions than from Britain. New Zealand’s industry were primary sector workers with forty-six of 116, making them the only nation in the database that did not have white-collar workers as the largest sector. In Australia, primary sector workers accounted for 126 of 410, just behind the white-collar workers. Canada had thirty-six of 256 primary workers, Wales had the highest in Britain with twenty-six of 200, while Ireland with nine of 179, Scotland with 17 of 282, and Northern Ireland with four of seventy had primary workers represent less than 10%. In England, the number of primary workers was eighty-four of 810, matching their number of blue-collar workers.

In every nation except Ireland, farmers were the most common occupation in the primary sector. In Ireland, the largest occupation in the primary sector were sailors. Due to the ambiguous and varied work that sailors could have ranging from fishing to the mercantile navy, they have been included in the primary sector to reflect the similar role they held in the war to other primary industries. In Australia and New Zealand, farmers represent the single largest pre-war occupation. The number is even larger in these two nations when graziers are added along with farmhands, farm labourers, shepherds, and others involved in farming. In Canada, farmers make up the second-largest occupation after students. In Britain, farmers are the largest group in the primary sector even though they are the fourth most common pre-war occupation. In England and Wales, farmers are

fewer than students, soldiers, and clerks. The heavy presence of farmers from the
Dominions can be explained by their national economy’s reliance on agriculture during
the pre-war years.\textsuperscript{128} The agricultural sector was not the largest employer in Britain before
the war.\textsuperscript{129}

Other occupations in the primary sector were few. Sailors, miners, and fishermen
were some of the other occupations in the primary sector, but they were represented in
small numbers. The lack of workers from the primary sector can be explained similarly to
those from factories and industrial labour in blue-collar occupations mentioned earlier.
The need to have farmers work to feed the nations and the armies meant recruiting them
was dangerous for national morale and military effectiveness. The importance of farmers
can be seen in their exemption from the Military Service Act of 1917 in Canada.\textsuperscript{130} As
mentioned in the list of exemptions from conscription in Britain, miners and other
extractors of resources were considered equal to munitions workers and so were exempt
from conscription.

The close association between primary sector and blue-collar workers as members
of the working-class can help explain why they have fewer memorials but farming in
Britain and the Dominions meant two different things. A large number of those who listed
their pre-war occupation as farmers or graziers were extremely wealthy. An example is
Henric Clarence Nicholas from Ouse, Tasmania Australia. The eldest son of George

\textsuperscript{128} The New Zealand economy between 1890 and 1930 ‘hinged upon expanding pastoral production of
Oxford History of New Zealand, edited by Giselle Byrnes, (South Melbourne: Oxford University Press
\textsuperscript{129} Winter, The Great War and the British People, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{130} Patrick Dennis, Reluctant Warriors: Canadian Conscripts and the Great War, (Vancouver: UBC Press,
2017), Appendix 1: Excerpts from the Military Service Act, 1917, p. 236.
Clarence and Minnie Nicholas, he was a pastoralist in his attestation files. He enlisted as a regular soldier in 1914 and was killed in 1916 as a Lance Corporal. His family though was wealthy as his father bought the land Henric farmed in 1886 for £1789 and it consisted of 1,752 acres of land in Tasmania. Henric was also a leading figure in the community serving as councillor of Hamilton from 1908 to his death. The wealth of the Nicholas family is further displayed by the three memorials erected to Henric in a photograph in Hamilton town hall, a memorial plaque in St John the Baptist Church in Ouse, and the Ellendale Recreation Ground. Another example is Lord Edward Beauchamp Seymour, the son of the 6th Marquess of Hertford. Lord Edward had moved to Calgary, Alberta Canada, and he had served with the Lord Strathcona’s Horse during the war in South Africa. He re-enlisted with the Lord Strathcona’s Horse in 1916 after serving several months with the Royal Warwickshire Regiment in France. On his attestation papers for both conflicts he listed his occupation as a rancher. He appears to have spent time away from his farms in Canada as he is not in the 1911 Canadian census but is on the 1911 England census living with his parents.

---

131 Henric Clarence Nicholas Service Record, NAA: B2455, Nicholas Henric Clarence.
135 Edward Beauchamp Seymour Service Files South African War, LAC RG 38, Item 12217.
136 He had been discharged for being drunk on duty and most likely used his connections to get himself enlisted with the Strathcona’s so quickly. David Tattersfield, Western Front Association, ‘Drunk as a Lord? The dismissal and redemption of Lord Edward Seymour,’ https://www.westernfrontassociation.com/ww1-articles/drunk-as-a-lord-the-dismissal-and-redemption-of-lord-edward-seymour/; Edward Beauchamp Seymour Service Files First World War, LAC RG 150, Box 8788-47, Item 222324.
137 Edward Beauchamp Seymour, Census Returns of England and Wales, 1911, Ragley Halle Alcester Warwickshire, NA RG14, 1911.
Lord Edward showcase the way that farmers could be extremely wealthy and from socially powerful families.

The final category is for individuals with no known occupation which represents 7% of the database. The lack of service files for British soldiers has meant that they have the highest number of unknown occupations. Scotland has thirty-six of 282 (13%) unknowns, the most for any nation. This is primarily because the Scottish census of 1911 is behind a paywall. Ireland has twenty-two of 179 unknowns. More individuals in Ireland have little to no other records on their lives during or before the war. Most of those in the database in Ireland without an occupation also have no know residence before the war and in some cases no known place of birth. The number of unknown soldiers in England and Wales is comparable to the overall average as England has sixty-five of 810 unknowns and Wales has sixteen of 200 unknowns, and the total for the database is 176 of 2323. Australia with fourteen of 410 and Canada with thirteen of 256 have the lowest number of unknown occupations. The low number of unknown occupations in the Dominions is because of the surviving service records.

Some of the people with unknown occupations were women who recorded their occupation as housewife or spinster. These women were volunteers, but the place of a housewife and spinster in the economic output of a nation is unclear. Several women in the database did have occupations before the war as either nurses, doctors, or domestic cleaners. These women are included in the sectors their occupation fits into such as white-collar, blue-collar, or service industry. There seems to be a correlation between the fact housewives and spinsters who were memorialized and class. In general, these women were predominately members of the upper and middle-classes who were able not members of the wage-earning economy.
Analysing the Database: Demographics

The study of the occupations reveals that class influenced who was commemorated, but the youthful nature of the dead was also a strong motivation. Students represented the single largest pre-war occupation highlights the youthful nature of the war dead. Jay Winter outlines the largest age group killed in the war were those 20-24, making up 37.15% of all deaths and 71.22% of all British casualties were under the age of 30. In my database, individuals aged 20-24 were represented at 33.08% of the total and 65.17% of the database were under the age of 30. The difference between Winter’s calculations and the database are fewer casualties under the age of 20, and more casualties over the age of 40. The database has 7.97% of all casualties being between the ages of 15-19, while Winter concludes 11.76% of all casualties were 16-19. Winter calculates that those over 40 account for 4.43% of all casualties, while the database has 9.07% of the individuals being over 40.

In comparison to Winter’s numbers, older casualties are overrepresented in personal memorials, but most memorials commemorated young people. Unlike when examining ranks or occupations, the age of casualties more accurately reflects the trends of national data. The high level of youths being commemorated demonstrates the sorrow of their loss by older generations who built the memorials. Their deaths elicit greater focus in the memory of the war as seen in the Lost Generation mentioned earlier in the dissertation as the focus on youth demonstrates the reality of that memory in personal memorials.

---

139 My age range is 15-19 due to the fact that the youngest individuals in the database are 15.
The database also allows us to determine when people died. While it is obvious that the majority died during the war, ninety of the 2323 individuals in the database died after the fighting stopped on November 11th, 1918. Most died of wounds sustained during fighting or succumbed to the Spanish Flu. For example, Stearne Tighe Edwards, a Canadian pilot in the RAF who was wounded on November 11th, 1918, and died of his

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40-44</th>
<th>45-49</th>
<th>50+</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>64 (7.91%)</td>
<td>235 (29.04%)</td>
<td>187 (23.11%)</td>
<td>135 (16.68%)</td>
<td>94 (11.61%)</td>
<td>43 (5.31%)</td>
<td>27 (3.3%)</td>
<td>23 (2.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td>75 (37.5%)</td>
<td>44 (22%)</td>
<td>30 (15%)</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>27 (9.57%)</td>
<td>84 (29.78%)</td>
<td>69 (24.46%)</td>
<td>40 (14.18%)</td>
<td>33 (11.7%)</td>
<td>12 (4.25%)</td>
<td>9 (3.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
<td>3 (1.06%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>16 (8.93%)</td>
<td>58 (32.4%)</td>
<td>37 (20.67%)</td>
<td>31 (17.31%)</td>
<td>17 (9.49%)</td>
<td>11 (6.14%)</td>
<td>3 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
<td>4 (2.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>6 (8.57%)</td>
<td>23 (32.85%)</td>
<td>20 (28.57%)</td>
<td>13 (18.57%)</td>
<td>6 (8.57%)</td>
<td>1 (1.42%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>135 (8.76%)</td>
<td>475 (30.84%)</td>
<td>357 (23.18%)</td>
<td>249 (16.16%)</td>
<td>165 (10.71%)</td>
<td>72 (4.67%)</td>
<td>43 (2.7%)</td>
<td>34 (2.2%)</td>
<td>10 (0.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>29 (7.07%)</td>
<td>151 (36.82%)</td>
<td>121 (29.51%)</td>
<td>51 (12.43%)</td>
<td>27 (6.58%)</td>
<td>14 (3.41%)</td>
<td>3 (0.7%)</td>
<td>9 (2.1%)</td>
<td>5 (1.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>19 (7.45%)</td>
<td>100 (39.21%)</td>
<td>55 (21.56%)</td>
<td>31 (12.15%)</td>
<td>27 (10.58%)</td>
<td>11 (4.31%)</td>
<td>4 (1.5%)</td>
<td>6 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2 (0.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2 (1.72%)</td>
<td>42 (36.2%)</td>
<td>27 (23.27%)</td>
<td>18 (15.51%)</td>
<td>11 (9.48%)</td>
<td>6 (5.17%)</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>8 (6.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185 (7.97%)</td>
<td>768 (33.08%)</td>
<td>560 (24.12%)</td>
<td>349 (15.03%)</td>
<td>230 (9.9%)</td>
<td>103 (4.43%)</td>
<td>51 (2.1%)</td>
<td>57 (2.4%)</td>
<td>18 (0.77%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5: Age of Individuals Commemorated.*
wounds on November 22\textsuperscript{nd}.\textsuperscript{140} George Whitmore Beadle died of influenza on March 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1919, whilst serving with the occupation force in Germany.\textsuperscript{141} In the database, fifty individuals died between November 12\textsuperscript{th}, 1918, and December 31\textsuperscript{st}, 1919. The remaining forty individuals passed away in the decades after with the majority passing away in the 1920s due to war wounds and illness they received serving. Henry Edward Gurney passed away on June 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1922, due to the effects of being a prisoner,\textsuperscript{142} while Australian Charles Henry Tindal passed away on May 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 1926, in Yokohama Japan from shell shock.\textsuperscript{143} These memorials were included because their memorials referred to their military service and their deaths were attributed to their service in the war. A small number of memorials were included where the individuals did not die due to their service, but the memorials referenced their service in the war. One of these was a stained-glass window erected by Alice Margaret Rowe and May Eleanor Hall, two nurses from the Australian Army Medical Corps who served together and became friends after the war.\textsuperscript{144}

The years of death demonstrate a fairly even distribution of casualties from 1915-1918. The year 1914 has the fewest commemorations as the war began over halfway through the year and the Dominion expeditionary forces had not arrived on the battlefields. The times when soldiers died reflected the different wartime experiences each nation had. Their soldiers were engaged in different campaigns at different points of

\textsuperscript{141} Soldier’s Effects Records, 1901-60, National Army Museum Accession Number 1991-02-333, Record Number 50003 Beadle Lieut G.W.
\textsuperscript{142} Maj H Gurney, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/35639.
the war. The high number of casualties for three Dominions in 1917 reflects each of these nations at the height of their military contribution and engagements. Northern Ireland’s heavy casualties in 1916 speaks to the deployment of the Ulster Division that saw its first major combat in 1916, at the Battle of the Somme that became cemented in Unionist memory.\(^{145}\) The higher number of casualties in Britain during the first years of the war (1914-1916) reflects a trend in personal memorials to commemorate volunteers over conscripts. The message of willing service was important in commemoration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Death</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1917</th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>During War</th>
<th>Post War</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>54 (7%)</td>
<td>192 (24%)</td>
<td>183 (23%)</td>
<td>182 (22%)</td>
<td>161 (20%)</td>
<td>772 (95%)</td>
<td>37 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (&gt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>24 (9%)</td>
<td>85 (30%)</td>
<td>54 (19%)</td>
<td>64 (23%)</td>
<td>49 (17%)</td>
<td>276 (98%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td>43 (22%)</td>
<td>40 (20%)</td>
<td>50 (25%)</td>
<td>52 (26%)</td>
<td>195 (98%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>20 (11%)</td>
<td>38 (21%)</td>
<td>46 (26%)</td>
<td>42 (23%)</td>
<td>28 (16%)</td>
<td>174 (97%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>28 (40%)</td>
<td>18 (26%)</td>
<td>13 (19%)</td>
<td>68 (97%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>110 (7%)</td>
<td>365 (24%)</td>
<td>351 (23%)</td>
<td>356 (23%)</td>
<td>303 (20%)</td>
<td>1485 (96%)</td>
<td>55 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (&gt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1 (&gt;1%)</td>
<td>83 (20%)</td>
<td>79 (19%)</td>
<td>154 (38%)</td>
<td>75 (18%)</td>
<td>392 (96%)</td>
<td>16 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (&gt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>25 (10%)</td>
<td>66 (26%)</td>
<td>83 (33%)</td>
<td>67 (26%)</td>
<td>245 (96%)</td>
<td>8 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (&gt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>21 (18%)</td>
<td>24 (21%)</td>
<td>31 (27%)</td>
<td>28 (24%)</td>
<td>105 (91%)</td>
<td>11 (9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116 (5%)</td>
<td>494 (21%)</td>
<td>520 (22%)</td>
<td>624 (27%)</td>
<td>473 (20%)</td>
<td>2227 (96%)</td>
<td>90 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (&gt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Year of Deaths of Individuals Commemorated.

Analysing the Database: Volunteers and Conscription

A better data point to explore the commemoration of volunteers over conscripts is the date of enlistment. The date of enlistment is an important marker in gauging the enthusiasm of the individual. Besides Australia and Ireland, all nations in the database enacted conscription. The number of conscript soldiers who fought varies between the nations, but the vast majority of soldiers in the war were volunteers. When they enlisted reveals the value of military service in the commemoration process as it demonstrates if those who volunteered were more worthy of remembrance over those who waited or were conscripted.

It was not always possible to find an accurate date of enlistment. The lost service files of British soldiers make it almost impossible to know when they enlisted. The service files of Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand soldiers state the day they signed the attestation papers. Enlistment dates for British soldiers who joined before the war are more reliable as they are recorded in army lists, or Hart’s Army List that published data on officers serving in the forces.\textsuperscript{146} Naval service records survived the bombings of the Second World War and members of the Royal Navy have accurate records for enlistment. To estimate when British soldiers enlisted, their military medal index cards were used. These cards listed the name, rank, date of death, and what medals the soldier was awarded during their service. Most of the cards recorded the location they saw combat, and the date they entered into combat for their service medals. It is impossible to know for sure when they enlisted because training during the war was limited and haphazard with little uniformity or oversight.\textsuperscript{147} In any case, using the date they entered combat helps to

determine if they volunteered or were conscripted and at what stage in the war they enlisted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pre-War</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1917</th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>During War</th>
<th>Post War</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>150 (19%)</td>
<td>147 (18%)</td>
<td>201 (25%)</td>
<td>74 (9%)</td>
<td>15 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (1%)</td>
<td>444 (55%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>215 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>37 (21%)</td>
<td>30 (17%)</td>
<td>43 (24%)</td>
<td>16 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (1%)</td>
<td>90 (51%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>7 (10%)</td>
<td>11 (16%)</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>42 (60%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>57 (20%)</td>
<td>53 (19%)</td>
<td>71 (25%)</td>
<td>19 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>153 (54%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>25 (13%)</td>
<td>61 (31%)</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>106 (55%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>277 (18%)</td>
<td>266 (17%)</td>
<td>397 (26%)</td>
<td>124 (8%)</td>
<td>36 (2%)</td>
<td>12 (1%)</td>
<td>835 (54%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>428 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>111 (27%)</td>
<td>158 (39%)</td>
<td>110 (27%)</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>392 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (&gt;1%)</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
<td>47 (18%)</td>
<td>107 (42%)</td>
<td>65 (25%)</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (1%)</td>
<td>231 (91%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>31 (28%)</td>
<td>35 (30%)</td>
<td>32 (28%)</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (1%)</td>
<td>106 (91%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>293 (13%)</td>
<td>455 (20%)</td>
<td>697 (30%)</td>
<td>331 (14%)</td>
<td>68 (3%)</td>
<td>13 (&gt;1%)</td>
<td>1564 (68%)</td>
<td>1 (&gt;1%)</td>
<td>463 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The database contains an accurate date of enlistment or date of entering combat for 80% of all individuals. The year with the most recruitments was 1915 with 697 of 2323 enlisting or entering combat in that year. This is followed by 1914 with 455 of 2323, 1916 with 331 of 2323, 1917 with sixty-eight of 2323, and 1918 with thirteen of 2323.

There were 293 of 2323 individuals who enlisted before the war. These numbers display the commemoration of individuals who volunteered, over those who were conscripted. The memorials reveal the importance of volunteers in the commemoration process and the neglect of conscripts. Within the database, only six individuals were definitely
conscripts: Douglas Wiseman, a Canadian farmer conscripted on January 8th, 1918; Meredith Richard Williams, a Welsh florist conscripted on July 25th, 1916; Ellis Humphrey Evans, a Welsh farmer more famously known as Hedd Wyn as he was a Welsh bard who was conscripted 1916; Niven Boyd Stewart, an Irishman who was conscripted into the US Army on May 2nd, 1918.; Henry Lionel Coate, a New Zealand farmer who was conscripted on December 4th, 1917; and Robert John Orsbourn, a New Zealand farmer who was conscripted on September 12th, 1917.

The memorialization of volunteers is confirmed when examining those individuals who enlisted or entered combat in 1918. This year was when the nations that had conscription had conscript soldiers fighting on the front lines. A total of thirteen individuals are recorded as having enlisted or entered combat in 1918. Two of the conscripts mentioned above, Douglas Wiseman and Niven Stewart were conscripted in 1918, but the remaining eleven individuals were not conscripts. Nine of the individuals were officers who were commissioned in 1918 and the remaining two were telephonists for the Women’s Royal Naval Service. Many of the officers were quite young. William Glew was eighteen when he was commissioned in the Royal Air Force, while Lionel Winnington Forde was nineteen when he entered combat in 1918. Others were in their 30s when they entered combat, such as James Graham Mylne who was thirty in 1918 or William George Gresham Leveson Gower who was a clerk of the House of Lords before the war and thirty-five in 1918. The emphasis on volunteers and the lack of conscripts in the database does need to be considered with the fact that the majority of those individuals with no known enlistment or date of entering combat come from the British Isles, where conscription was instituted first. The lack of individuals from New Zealand and Canada, where conscription was instituted in 1916 and 1917 respectively, should not
be surprising considering how many conscripts served in each of their armies overseas by wars end.148

The predominance of volunteers over conscripts in personal memorials might have contributed to the elimination of conscripts from the memory of the war in both Britain and Canada. The war was seen to have been won by volunteers, with conscripts playing little to no role and the whole process being seen as a failure. Patrick Dennis has argued that many conscripts served enthusiastically in the Canadian forces and played a significant role in 1918 to ensure Canadian troops were still capable of fighting until the war’s end.149 The lack of memorials to conscripts speaks to ways the private memory was impacted by social pressures as conscripts were viewed as shirkers, and unequal in their sacrifice to those who volunteered. Politics might also have contributed to the lack of personal memorials to conscripts. Conscription debates were very contentious and not supported by everyone in society as the failure to enact conscription in Australia attests to. Individuals conscripted, along with their families, may not have agreed with the war or way they were forced to serve. As a result, creating a personal memorial that extolled the war would not appeal to them. The lack of anti-war personal memorials suggests that those opposed to the war did not use the medium of monuments to deliver political messages.

148 Roughly 24,000 Canadian conscripts were sent overseas by the end of the war where a total of 1,435 would be killed in action. Dennis, Reluctant Warriors, p. 12, 241. In New Zealand, a total of 19,548 conscripts were sent overseas to fight in the war. Tim Shoebridge ‘First World War by the numbers,’ NZ History, 2015, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/war/first-world-war-by-numbers/#q2.
Analysing the Database: Civilians and Women in War

The First World War as a total war meant soldiers were not the only casualties of the fighting. Within the database, forty individuals are identified were civilian casualties, just under 2% of all individuals. The small number is no surprise considering few British civilian populations were targeted during the war. England, which had the largest number of direct attacks to it during the war has the highest number of civilian deaths, while Ireland, which had the Easter Uprising has the second most, followed by Australia and Scotland. Canada, Wales, New Zealand, and Northern Ireland all have one or two civilian memorials.

The most common civilians to be memorialized were those working in organizations to assist the war effort. These groups included the Red Cross, YMCA, Voluntary Aid Detachment, and Scottish Women’s Hospital. A number of these individuals died while at home as they worked in hospitals in Britain, but several died overseas, mostly in France. Olive Smith a masseuse with the Scottish Women’s Hospital, was an exception as she died in Salonika, Greece, in 1916.150 For the majority of these civilians, their deaths were caused by illness rather than combat and only a handful were killed due to direct enemy action. Bertha (Betty) Gavin Stevenson was killed on May 30th, 1918, by enemy action. Betty was a driver for the YMCA at the Etaples Military Hospital in France. She had been serving in France since February 1916, first in a YMCA canteen, and then as a driver. She was killed during a German air raid that accompanied their Spring Offensives in 1918.151 The memorials to civilians display the wide range of

150 The Times, ‘Miss Olive Smith.’ (Saturday October 14th, 1916), p. 4.
service they provided to the war effort. Dr Elsie Maude Inglis from Edinburgh was the founder of the Scottish Women’s Hospital and served in France, Serbia, and Russia before dying of cancer in 1917. Maud Alice Clerk was living in Italy before the war and volunteered with the Italian army nursing services. She died on August 17th, 1918, in the military hospital in Rapallo.

Twelve of the forty civilians were killed at sea due to submarine warfare. While most of the civilians killed at sea were working for the mercantile marine, transporting war goods and other supplies, five were passengers. Colin and Katherine Harragin were returning to Britain from Lagos, Nigeria where Colin worked in the Colonial Civil Service. Their ship, the SS Apapa, was sunk by U-96 off the north Wales coast on November 18th, 1917. Edith Catherine Wilks and Letitia Harriet Hill were traveling with family members who were in the army; Edith with her husband Second Lieutenant Percy Walter Wilks, and Letitia with her brother Lieutenant Sydney George Crawford. They were both killed on October 10th, 1918, when the RMS Leinster was sunk as it sailed from Dublin to Holyhead, Wales.

Most of the merchant sailors memorialized were experienced sailors. Two were teenagers who were too young to enlist in the armed forces but sought to aid the war effort. William Esson Martin was only 15 when his ship, SS Otaki, was sunk on March
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10th, 1917. William had been a student at Robert Gordon’s College in Aberdeen, Scotland, when the war broke out. He used his school network as a gateway onto the Otaki as the master of the ship, Archibald Bissett-Smith, was an alumnus of the school. The Otaki has been remembered by Robert Gordon’s College and the government of New Zealand as the ship was owned by the New Zealand Shipping Company. The Otaki Shield, created by the college sees the top student awarded a plaque and a paid trip to New Zealand which still occurs to this day.158

Several of the civilians commemorated were killed working on the home front. Philip Doyne MacDonnell was killed on November 30th, 1917, while working in the Trenton Munitions Plant in Trenton, Ontario, Canada. He was too young to enlist and worked in the munitions factory where he was killed in an explosion.159 William Ellis Chadwick was working at the Faversham Munitions Factory in Faversham, Kent, England, when he was killed by an explosion on April 2nd, 1916. His body was recovered and buried in a mass grave with seventy-three victims of the explosion, a total of 108 people lost their lives in the explosion.160 David Hume Pinsent was a test pilot at the Royal Aircraft Establishment in Farnborough, England. David was killed when his plane crashed during a test flight on May 8th, 1918.161 Two civilians are remembered for their work in charities on the home front. Gertrude VanKoughnet worked for the Canadian organization Soldiers Comforts. She remained active in helping veterans after the war and

159 Registrations of Deaths, 1869-1948, Haldimand, Hastings, Archives of Ontario, MS 935, Reel 231.
in 1925 was named the chair of the Soldiers Aid Commission.\textsuperscript{162} She was involved in remembrance of the war and was the chair of the Scarborough War Memorial Commission, now a suburb of the city of Toronto. She passed away on September 18\textsuperscript{th}, 1939, at the age of 72 and on May 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1940, a plaque was added to the Scarborough War Memorial by veterans in gratitude for her work.\textsuperscript{163} The other civilian was a teenage girl, Hera Takuira, also known as Sarah, from Maketu New Zealand. Hera had participated in the Queen Carnival contest in Te Puke as the Māori representative that was raising funds for the Red Cross in the spring of 1918. She and the Māori from the area raised £748 9s, finishing fourth in the contest.\textsuperscript{164} Hera passed away of illness shortly after on July 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1918, and a memorial arch to her was raised in the town of Te Puke.\textsuperscript{165} The memorial notes, in English and Māori, that ‘she loyally assisted the Empire in the Great War 1914-1918’ as justification for her memorial.\textsuperscript{166}

There were German attacks on civilian populations and civilians were also caught up in the violence of Irish revolutionary activities against British forces. The first attack on British civilians by German forces took place in December 1914 when the Germans launched a naval raid on several coastal towns including Hartlepool, Durham England. Etta Grace Harris was working as a schoolteacher in Hartlepool when the raid took place, and she was killed by German shelling on December 16\textsuperscript{th}, 1914. She was commemorated

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{164} Queen Carnival Contest, \textit{Te Puke Times}, May 24, 1918, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{165} The Te Puke Times and Paengaroa Notes, \textit{Te Puke Times}, July 9, 1918, p. 2 and p. 3.
\end{flushright}
by her father Rev. Alfred Benjamin Harris a minister in St Andrew’s Church in Kirton-in-Lindsey. The German military launched air raids on south-east England over several years using first zeppelins, and later airplanes. Bertram Francis Browning was killed on July 7th, 1917, when German bombs hit his office and warehouse in London killing him and three of his employees, William Bennet Wigzell, Leonard Wheatley, and Edward Thomas Scuse. His brother Edgar Charles Browning, and fifty other employees made it to the cellars before the bombs hit and survived. The Easter Uprising in Dublin in April 1916 saw widespread destruction of the city as Irish Republicans attempted to use the First World War to remove British rule over Ireland. Three civilians who were killed during the fighting were commemorated. Charles Hachette Hyland was a dentist and became a first responder providing aid to those wounded in the fighting. He returned home after three days of work and was shot while standing on his back porch on April 27th, 1916. The final two civilians were William John Rice and Cecil Eustace Dockeray, both of whom were killed in the same incident on April 29th, 1916. Both men were employees of the Guinness Brewery and on the night of their deaths were watching over the brewery. William was with British Lieutenant Algernon Lucas when they ran into British Sergeant Robert Flood who was guarding the Brewery. Believing them to be rebels, Flood killed both William and Lucas. Later that night, investigating what happened to his partner, Cecil and another British officer, Lieutenant Basil Henry Worsley-Worswick, ran into Flood, again fearing they were rebels, killed them.
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170 Dublin Rising: Murder Charge Against a Sergeant, The Times, June 13, 1916, p. 3.
William and Cecil were both commemorated in Christ Church in Ranelagh with a plaque. Flood was acquitted of the murders and returned to service with the Royal Berkshire Regiment where he would be killed in action on May 9th, 1917 in the Salonika Campaign.

The examination of civilian casualties reveals the presence of women being commemorated with war memorials. Women could not serve on the front lines for the most part. Women who wanted to participate in the war had to serve in medical units, factories, or find other ways to support the war. The issues of conscription were received differently by women who were not going to be called up but could see family or friends forced to fight. The nature of gender in the war and after has seen increased scholarship as historians work to understand the way the war was experienced and understood by all genders.

Highlighting these civilian casualties is important as they reveal alternative ideas about the war. They speak to how war is remembered in society beyond those who chose to risk their lives. The design of civilian memorials mirrored the military ones, demonstrating that the death of a civilian in the war was treated the same way as a soldier’s death. As many of the civilians were involved in the war effort, such as nurses,
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merchant sailors, or working in munitions factories, their deaths were seen as similar to the deaths of soldiers killed in combat. They were all working to serve in their own ways.

**Conclusion**

The myth of the Lost Generation was one of the first narratives to emerge from the First World War. In Britain, the term came to be applied to the war dead as the best of the generation who died in the war. Jay Winter in his demographic study of the British population during the war argued that the Lost Generation was not a myth in Britain, but a reality for social elites of the country as they suffered a proportionally higher casualty rate compared to the worker classes.\(^{174}\) Survivors interpreted the war as a moment where they not only lost their friends and family, but the best of their generation.\(^{175}\) Such ideas extended to the survivors thanks to the literary works of many post-war authors such as Ernest Hemmingway who coined the phrase ‘Lost Generation’ in his book *The Sun Also Rises* in 1926.\(^{176}\) Vera Brittain’s memoir *Testament of Youth* that has come to represent the experience of British women during the war, and the sense of loss Vera’s generation felt due to the deaths of friends and family.\(^{177}\) Vera, a member of the middle-class in Britain, reinforces the idea that the Lost Generation was an experience of the social elite. Others who helped shape the post-war memory of the conflict, such as the war poet Siegfried Sassoon who also came from a middle-class background, used his memories of

\(^{176}\) Hemmingway states that he got the term from a story told to him by Gertrude Stein. ‘Lost Generation,’ Encyclopedia Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lost-Generation.
the Lost Generation for anti-war purposes.\textsuperscript{178} The intellectual, political, and economic elites of society pushed the idea of the Lost Generation because, to them, it was reality.

This chapter has revealed that it was the elites of society who were the loudest and most frequent contributors to the memory-making process. These memorials demonstrate in part how the myth of the Lost Generation came to the fore of the memory of the war in the inter-war period through the expression of private memory. The value of the myth has declined in recent decades as historical studies have moved away from studying elites. Social history, focusing on class and the structures within society, has democratized the memory of the war and the experience of suffering and loss. The cultural turn moved away from examining who was involved to focus on the ideas behind the commemoration of the war, centering discussions on the relationship between the nation and its citizens. The database shows that class plays a significant role in the formation of collective memory through expressions of private memory. The power of personal memory is directly correlated to the social power that an individual has in society. The ability to shape collective memory is concentrated in the hands of certain classes.

Because First World War no longer in living memory, we have to rely on the work of historians and sites of memory left behind by those who experienced the conflict. As we continue to grapple with the enduring myths of the conflict, this database reveals that focusing on collective memorials and myths is not enough. Private memorials communicate the messages of the former elites of society and show that they influence how the war continues to be remembered. Understanding who is setting the memory of an

\textsuperscript{178} Sassoon would become friends with Katherine Horner Asquith, the sister of Edward Horner and the wife of Raymond Asquith, both mentioned earlier in the chapter and both youthful members of the generation expected to gain power and influence from their aristocratic and political fathers.
event, and who is dictating the language and imagery provides historians with the ability to analyze, and if needed, challenge the messages that are still regurgitated in collective remembrance. Having now established who created these memorials, the messages they sought to express can be examined to understand how they understood the war and the dead.
Chapter 3: ‘Greater Love Hath No Man Than This’: Religion and Memory

The memorial plaques to Gomer Davies and Rowland Edward Thomas sit on the walls of Tabor United Reformed Church (formerly Welsh Congregational Chapel) in the town of Maesycwmmer Wales, as they have since they were erected.¹ Unlike other memorials during the recent centenary of the First World War, neither plaque was cleaned, repaired, or used for commemorations. That is because the Tabor URC has been abandoned and the church is sitting derelict. A designated historic building, the Tabor URC and the war memorials inside display the decline of religious life as the building has been left to decay over the years (Image 45).² The fate of the two memorials, the only ones in the church, show a growing issue with personal memorials and their placement in
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² The current state of the building can be seen on Google Maps Street View (from June 2021) where plywood struggles to stop anything from getting into the windows and the churchyard is overgrown. Urban explorers have made their way into the building (from June 2019), confirming that the memorials are still there, while also showing the decay of the building. Google Street View, https://www.google.com/maps/@51.6450062,-3.2216951,3a,34.9y,69.66h,100.12t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1s83zeYkDlwaEn6HduG_xg!2e0!7i16384!8i192; Tabor Welsh Congregational Chapel, Maesycwmmer June 2019, Derelict Places, https://www.derelictplaces.co.uk/threads/tabor-welsh-congregational-chapel-maesycwmmer-june-2019.37126/; Full Report for Listed Buildings Tabor United Reformed Church, Cadw Llywodraeth Cymru Welsh Government, https://cadwpublic-api.azurewebsites.net/reports/listedbuilding/fullreport?lang=en&id=18961.
churches: they are at risk of being lost. The memorials were erected by their families in the church to fulfill their need to mourn their deaths by putting them in a centre of spirituality. When Tabor URC was in use, these memorials would have allowed their family to commemorate, and the community to remember them in the years after their deaths.

The placement of personal memorials in churches or religious institutions highlights the primary function of personal memorials; they were to create sites of mourning and become alternative gravesites. The creation of the memorials as alternative graves centred around the reality for many families: the lack of an actual grave (due to the body being missing) or a grave located in a distant land. Even if families had the funds to travel to the IWGC cemetery or the memorials to the missing, such trips could not be completed regularly and represented special occasions. Private memorials located in churches or other locations allowed individuals to mourn on a more regular basis that accorded with pre-war mourning customs.

Memorials in churches seek to replicate, ‘the good death.’\(^3\) The ‘good death’, or *ars morendi*, was one of the central social desires in Victorian and Edwardian mourning culture that sought to place death as a moment of reflection and spiritual salvation. The idea of the ‘good death’ was propagated by the middle and upper classes of British society, but the core ideology of creating a ‘good death’ filtered through all levels of society.\(^4\) Passages from the Bible and the images of saints reveal that individuals needed to know that their loved ones died well and were safe in the next life. Personal memorials
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gave comfort to the bereaved as their placement in sites of worship helped give them the space to grieve in locations of sentimental and spiritual importance. The act of mourning is both a private and public act that is unique to each person but must be displayed to allow others either to join or to see that social conventions were being followed. By placing personal memorials in churches, individuals were able to fulfill the private and public functions of mourning.

How different religious groups and denominations viewed death and the afterlife impacted the way individuals constructed personal memorials. As the memorials had to be erected in religious buildings, the doctrinal and internal politics of the denomination influenced the language and symbols on display. At the same time, the war and politics had impacted the way religious leaders viewed the role of their church in society. Examining religious denominations shows the tensions between faith, nation, and commemoration as churches had to reconcile pre-war issues with concerns over the post-war world. The debates in churches in the years before and after the war highlight how different denominations struggled with their role not only in their nation but in the British Empire. Notions of national identity, imperial identity, and faith were all tied up in debates over the place of the church in the national conversation. These debates over national identity, faith, and commemoration played out in personal memorials as individuals erected memorials as part of the religious debates of the time.

The differences in denominational views of death and politics were across the British Empire. Churches in the Dominions did not have the same experience or politics as the same denominations had in Britain. To understand how personal memorials were influenced by religious doctrine, national denominational histories are explored to understand why members of certain churches were more and less active in the
construction of personal memorials. Before exploring the differences between denominations, it is important to highlight why many individuals felt the need to have religious memorials constructed. The Imperial War Graves Commission was central to the adoption of religious language on personal memorials. The IWGC’s desire to advance a political message of imperial unity could only allow generic and uncontroversial religious imagery in its cemeteries and memorials. Families that wanted memorials speaking to the spiritual aspect of the ‘good death’ had little choice but to act on their own.

IWGC and Religious Symbols

Displaying religious symbols was important to the IWGC. Yet in keeping with its policy of equality of treatment, the Commission worked to ensure that religious symbols were not the dominant feature of their cemeteries and memorials. The diversity of religious groups that fought for the British Empire meant the IWGC had to ensure that sectarianism did not damage the memory of the war they were striving to create. The cemeteries, therefore, had to ensure that the secular power of the British Empire was expressed first, and that religion was in the background.

Sir Frederic Kenyon, along with the architects Sir Edwin Lutyens and Herbert Baker, agreed that the cemeteries needed to be marked as British. Lutyens wanted to have a stone that was a kind of altar, while Baker wanted it to be more clearly English and pushed for ‘the English village churchyard “cross”’. 5 Both were included in IWGC designs. Kenyon noted that Lutyens’ stone ‘would have the character of permanence, as
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5 Minutes of a Meeting held at D.G.R.&E., G.H.Q. July 14th, 1917, CWGC 1/1/5/1-Adornment of Cemeteries.
much as any work of man can hope for it,’ and, ‘As an altar it would represent one side of
the idea of sacrifice, the sacrifice which the Empire has made of its youth, in the great
cause for which it sent them forth. And wherever this stone was found, it would be the
mark, for all ages, of a British cemetery of the Great War.’ Baker’s cross would be
included as it would serve as a better symbol of ‘self-sacrifice’: ‘great distress would be
felt if our cemeteries lacked this recognition of the fact that we are a Christian Empire,
and this symbol of the self-sacrifice made by those who lie in them.’ To ensure the cross
marked a cemetery as British, its design was to be unlike French (more specifically
Roman Catholic) crucifixes, resembling instead ‘many English country churchyards, or
the Celtic crosses characteristic of northern Britain.’ The cross was understood to
represent the religious imagery being used to describe the war. In a summary of the
minutes of the meeting between Lutyens, Baker, and the DGRE in July 1917, the cross is
described ‘as a mark of the symbolism of the present crusade.’

The IWGC understood the importance of religious sentiment in its work. It
continually strove to consult and receive the support of religious leaders during the
planning and construction process. During the Imperial War Conference of 1917, the
IWGC was presented with the reality that religion could pose an issue for its work. A
letter from the delegates representing India, the Maharaja of Bikanir Ganga Singh,
Satyendra Prasanna Sinha, and James Meston, the Lieutenant Governor of the United
Provinces of Agra and Oudh, voicing concerns about the treatment of Indian graves. The
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6 Sir Frederic Kenyon, ‘War Graves. How The Cemeteries Abroad Will Be Designed,’ Report to the
Imperial War Graves Commission, p. 10, CWGC 1/1/5/7/2-War Graves. How The Cemeteries Abroad Will
Be Designed.
7 Ibid, 10-11.
8 Letter from Herbert Baker, Edwin Lutyens, and Charles Aitken to DGRE, GHQ, 2nd Echelon, July 18th,
1917, CWGC 1/1/5/1-Adornment of Cemeteries.
letter was focused on Hindu graves, as cremations were used more regularly than burials in that faith. The delegates wanted to ensure that funeral pyres would receive the same attention as burials, as ‘the site of the funeral-pyre has a sanctity of its own in Hindu sentiment.’

Concern for Hindu and Muslim soldiers was taken into consideration by the leading architects for the IWGC. Baker and Lutyens had experience working in India before the war as both men were involved in the construction of New Delhi. Baker raised the possibility that non-Christians might take exception to their designs. He suggested that instead of a rectangular stone of remembrance, a hexagonal one based on the five major dominions of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and India be used. In Indian cemeteries, he suggested the cross of sacrifice be replaced with an Asoka column. These columns would end with ‘the wheel of law and authority,’ in which the IWGC could insert a swastika or the Star of India to ensure that Hindus and Muslims were accommodated. Baker’s suggestions were considered, but ultimately not taken up due to the desire to keep costs down and maintain uniformity across all cemeteries. However, the IWGC made other efforts to ensure that Hindu and Muslim graves were treated properly by contacting the India Office for advice. Sir Prahashankar Dalpatram Pattani, the prime minister of Bhavnagar state, and Sahibzada Aftab Ahmad Khan, a professor of law at the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College, wrote instructions for IWGC staff on how to treat Hindu and Muslim graves. Both men agreed that a memorial to the missing
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9 Letter from James Meston, Ganga Singh, and S.P. Sinha from the India Office to Fabian Ware, April 13, 1917, CWGC 1/1/2/2.

10 Letter from Herbert Baker to Fabian Ware, July 27th, 1917, CWGC 1/1/5/1-Adornment of Cemeteries.
would be appropriate but emphasized that the memorials were not to be sanctified as either a temple or a mosque.\textsuperscript{11}

In his final report on the design of the cemeteries, Kenyon highlighted that while the cemeteries were to reflect ‘the fact that we are a Christian Empire,’ he also stressed that ‘where our Mohammedan, Hindu, and other non-Christian fellow subjects lie (and care has always been taken to bury them apart) their graves will be treated in accordance with their own religious beliefs and practices, and their own religious symbol will be placed over them.’\textsuperscript{12} In the public pamphlet by Rudyard Kipling, a section on Indian graves was included, as was a drawing showing a headstone for a Jewish soldier with the Star of David.\textsuperscript{13} The IWGC worked to ensure to the best of its ability that proper funeral rites were given to the war dead when their bodies were being exhumed and re-interred in the new cemeteries. In 1920, the IWGC worked with Michael Adler, a rabbi and senior chaplain in the British Army, to ensure that he could visit the graves of Jewish soldiers and give them their final rites. Rabbi Adler was impressed with the IWGC’s dedication to religious observance, describing the Commission as acting, ‘in a spirit of true reverence.’\textsuperscript{14}

The IWGC was confronted in its correspondence with the public with requests for alterations to the religious symbols on headstones. In 1920, Catherine Higgins of the Salvation Army contacted the IWGC for information about members of that

\textsuperscript{11} Minutes of a Meeting of the Indian Graves Committee held at The India Office, March 20\textsuperscript{th}, 1918, CWGC 1/1/5/29-Indian Graves Committee.
\textsuperscript{13} Rudyard Kipling, *The Graves of the Fallen*, pp. 12, 14. CWGC 1/1/7/1-The Graves of the Fallen.
\textsuperscript{14} Report from the Rev. Michael Adler, D.S.O., upon his recent visit to the Cemeteries in the War Area, September 21\textsuperscript{st}, 1921, CWGC 1/1/5/31-Jewish Graves.
denomination having the cross on the headstone replaced with either the motto or the crest of the Salvation Army. Sir Fabian Ware agreed to have the cross on the headstone replaced with the Salvation Army badge, but he was reminded by his staff that such an action would contravene the Commission’s ruling that only religious symbols could be allowed and the request was denied. Salvation Army followers were not the only ones to request their emblem on headstones. Mrs. Davies from Brackenhoe in Yorkshire requested that her husband have the Freemason logo engraved. Even alternative religious symbols, such as the cross of St Andrew for Presbyterians, were not allowed as the IWGC feared it would appear that it was giving undue favour to individuals of different denominations.

One of the primary criticisms of the IWGC was the design of the headstones. Lady Florence Cecil often referred to the lack of religious symbols and the way the cemeteries were being created as secular memorials. The IWGC did look at alternative suggestions for the headstones, but rejected cruciform designs submitted by Lord Balfour of Burleigh as being too ugly, too expensive, and not fit for the desires of the commission. The debate in the House of Commons in May 1920 included discussion of the headstone design, but shifted away from religious symbols and became much more about the imperial ideology of the IWGC.
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15 Letter from Catherine Higgins to IWGC, June 1st, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/33-Religious Emblems on Memorials.
16 Letter from Fabian Ware to Catherine Higgins, July 16th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/33-Religious Emblems on Memorials.
17 Letter from IWGC to Mrs. Davies, July 6th, 1924, CWGC 1/1/5/33-Religious Emblems on Memorials.
18 Letter from the IWGC to O.S. Cleverly War Office, July 20th, 1921, CWGC 1/1/5/33-Religious Emblems on Memorials.
The Commission’s concern with religious symbols and text reflected the importance of faith in mourning and remembrance. The IWGC tried to maintain a secular and non-denominational position, with its design choices seeking to accommodate all religious sentiments of the next-of-kin. The design choices never satisfied everyone and the dissatisfaction with the IWGC’s artistic choices are evident when looking at the use of religious language in personal memorials. The features of IWGC cemeteries had to accommodate every religious and belief system that was present in soldiers of the British Empire. For individuals, personal memorials allowed them to align their mourning more closely to their specific religious doctrine and beliefs by using specific quotes or Biblical imagery, and by following denominational traditions in their memorials.

The religious denomination to present the greatest challenge to the IWGC was the Anglican church. Motivated by the work of the Cecil family, who were active in the leadership and administration of the church, Anglicans repeatedly posed questions about the design choices of the IWGC.\textsuperscript{21} The office of the Archbishop of Canterbury was consulted on at least two occasions to discuss critiques of a lack of distinct Christian elements in the cemeteries. One case dealt with the cross of sacrifice, which Lord Hugh Cecil argued needed to have some Biblical text on it to show clearly its Christian character.\textsuperscript{22} A second issue arose when the House of Laymen passed a resolution pushing for the freedom to choose memorial designs, a distinct character (implied to be Christian for the cemeteries), and assurances that Hindu and Muslim memorials not be made into

\textsuperscript{21} Lady Florence was married to Lord William Cecil, the Bishop of Exeter, and both Lord Robert and his younger brother Lord Hugh Cecil were members of the House of Laity in the Church Assembly for the Anglican church.

\textsuperscript{22} The issue came to nothing in the end as Lord Hugh failed to provide an adequate text supported by either the IWGC or the Anglican church. CWGC 1/1/5/17-Proposed Inscription on Cross of Sacrifice.
sites of worship. The third point was due to a fear of Lord Hugh Cecil that the sites would become either temples or mosques, but more importantly, that they would be funded by the British government and therefore paid by the taxes of Christians who might oppose such memorials. These issues were part of the campaign by the Cecils to alter the IWGC’s policies, and they demonstrate the power and central role the Anglican church had in presentations of Britishness and Imperial power.

The Anglican Church

The Anglican Church owed its significant cultural and political power to its status as the official state church. The Anglican church as the dominant denomination in commemoration demonstrates the interconnectedness of religion, politics, and remembrance. The religious denominations of those being commemorated in the database reflect the power of English culture and it was reflected in the memorials. The largest religious group in the database are Anglicans or members of the Episcopal church. The only nation where Anglicans were not the largest group was Scotland. Anglicans were the second largest in Scotland with 101 of 282 individuals, compared to 134 Presbyterians. Even in nations where Anglicanism was not the dominant denomination, they were still the largest. In Wales, famous for its non-conformist attitude, the number of Anglicans is 162 of 200 compared to 20 non-conformists. In Ireland, Anglicans accounted for 132 of 179 individuals while the largest denomination, Roman Catholicism, only counted for 36. In the Dominions, Anglicans were the largest group by far with Australia having 251 of
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24 Letter from G.M. Young, War Office, to Arthur Browne, IWGC, March 5th, 1920, CWGC 1/1/5/16- Correspondence Lord Hugh Cecil and Lt Col Sir F Kenyon.
410, followed by 45 Catholics and Methodists each. Canada was similar with 138 of 256 Anglicans followed by 41 Presbyterians, while New Zealand had 78 of 116 Anglicans followed by 18 Presbyterians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Anglican</th>
<th>Methodist</th>
<th>Presbyterian</th>
<th>Other Protestants</th>
<th>Roman Catholic</th>
<th>Judaism</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(86%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(74%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(81%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9 (&gt;1%)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(74%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(61%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(67%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8: Most Common Religious Beliefs in the Database.*

Anglicans are the largest denomination with personal memorials for several reasons. The first relates to Anglicanism as the state-sponsored church, both formally and informally. Emphasis within governments, social elites, and military establishments of the British Empire on the Anglican church made it acceptable to commemorate the war dead in their churches. In Canada, 46.8% of recruits for the Canadian Expeditionary Force identified themselves as Anglican by June 1st, 1917. Anglicans, however, constituted only 14.5% of the Canadian population, displaying the strong military connection to the
The commemoration of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey, one of the most important Anglican Cathedrals in Britain, was used by the state to place the sacrifice of all the war dead as being in service to and central to the national story. The burying of the Unknown Warrior with a crusader sword ensured that the war dead were inheritors of medieval honour and bravery, and were equal to the rulers of England, the great poets, the scientists, and the politicians who had made the nation great. Westminster Abbey dominated the commemoration of national figures until the nineteenth century as the importance of Empire and memorialization became prioritized.

St Paul’s Cathedral in London followed the Abbey in making military memorialization normal but showed the shift to memorializing the empire. At the end of the eighteenth century, St Paul’s began to turn itself into the centre of state memorialization through the construction of memorials to great soldiers, sailors, and administrators of national and imperial importance. Memorials to heroes of the Napoleonic Wars such as Nelson and Wellington were to be joined by soldiers and politicians for their actions around the British Empire. St Paul’s played an important role in commemoration of the First World War with a memorial to Lord Kitchener (who died in 1916), and by hosting the memorial service for Nurse Edith Cavell in 1915. The memorials to soldiers and heroes of eighteenth and nineteenth century wars and imperial conquests were echoed in other cathedrals across the British Isles. In Ireland, St Patrick’s

---

(Anglican) Cathedral in Dublin became a site of national remembrance before the First World War. The north transept became the home of military remembrance with the construction of two memorials to the Royal Irish Regiment for its participation in wars in Burma in 1832 and in China in 1840-42. Alongside them, memorials to the Boer War and the Crimean War in the form of stained glass windows display imperial participation by Irish soldiers.29 St Giles Cathedral in Edinburgh (the mother kirk of Presbyterianism) followed suit as its restoration in the 19th century was to transform St Giles into ‘Scotland’s Westminster Abbey.’30 As St Giles only began erecting memorial plaques and stained glass windows in the nineteenth century after centuries of Presbyterian resistance to such memorialization, St Giles was used to commemorate Scottish participation in imperial and military actions.

The pattern of commemoration from the cathedrals was replicated in smaller churches. The erection of memorials in Anglican churches was part of a larger trend in the nineteenth century towards the restoration of churches in a Victorian Gothic revival. The desire to restore old churches was extremely strong amongst the Victorians. Even amidst a growing population, more churches were restored than new churches built. Over 7,000 medieval parish churches between 1840 and 1875 were restored, primarily using private donations, to preserve the medieval Gothic buildings.31 The architectural interest in the Gothic arose out of the shifts in the Church of England as theologians pushed for a return to older Christian doctrine from the early days of the Anglican Reformation and to

medieval practices. The rise of Anglo-Catholicism in the church saw architecture follow suit as church designs looked to Gothic architecture from the medieval period.\textsuperscript{32}  Anglicans asserted that medieval Gothic architecture was the most Christian of architectures. Restoring or building new churches to reflect the period of medieval Gothic art and architecture was the best means to reflect their faith.\textsuperscript{33} Churches needed to be decorated as the iconography of many medieval churches had been removed before the Victorian era. Individuals were able to contribute to the fabric of their churches throughout the nineteenth century by erecting memorials and, following the tradition set in the major cathedrals, they built memorials to family and friends who had died on imperial service.

An example of individuals participating in the restoration of medieval churches is St Leonard’s Church in the Kentish town of Hythe. Built around 1080, the church features twenty-seven war memorials dating from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{34} The oldest memorial commemorates Captain Robert Finnis who served in the War of 1812 and was killed during the Battle of Lake Erie on September 10\textsuperscript{th}, 1813 (Image 46).\textsuperscript{35} The majority of the war memorials before the First World War commemorate individuals who died whilst serving in India. Three family memorials to the Finnis family, the Mackeson family, and the Hart family display family members who died in India (Image 47, 48, 49, 50).

\textsuperscript{34} The church states it was built c. 1080. ‘The Parish of St Leonard, Hythe.’ https://www.slhk.org/stleonardschurch.htm.
Other imperial conflicts feature on different memorials like the one to the Hamilton family, who saw three of their four sons killed in South Africa (Image 51). These memorials display a strong tradition in St Leonard’s Church of commemorating war and deaths overseas with plaques and memorials. The inclusion of individuals who were killed in family memorials was meant to replace the family headstones and graves they would have had if they had died in England. These plaques served as substitute graves for the families who could not easily visit the other side of the world.

The tradition of memorializing fallen soldiers who died overseas was continued during the First World War in St Leonard’s. The church features a memorial to the town of Hythe that named 152 individuals who died in the war, but it also has several memorials to individuals. Members of the Finnis family continued to erect memorials, with one to John Fortescue Finnis who died in 1916 during the Battle of Kut in the Mesopotamian Campaign (Image 52). Other memorials commemorate Thomas George Hakewill who died in 1916 as a member of the Royal Flying Corps in Egypt (Image 53); Lyall Brandreth who died in 1915 during the Battle of Gallipoli (Image 54 and 55);

Victoria Cross recipient John Franks Vallentin, who was killed in 1914 (Image 56);\(^{41}\) William Hope Amos who died in 1916 (Image 57);\(^{42}\) Robert Aubrey Hildyard, who died in 1916 at the Somme, two memorials in the form of a stained glass window and a battlefield cross (Image 58 and 59);\(^{43}\) John Frederick Winder Reid who died in 1921 whilst still a member of the armed forces (Image 60);\(^{44}\) and Frank Turner, the only enlisted soldier to have a personal memorial, who died in 1914 (Image 61).\(^{45}\) The Boy Scout troop of Hythe also had a memorial erected to members who died in the war; it was later updated to include those killed in the Second World War.\(^{46}\) St Leonard’s Church also features a memorial to Alfred and Mary Winnifrith, who helped support Belgian refugees and prisoners of war. These civilians were also awarded the Medaille du Roi Albert from the Belgian government.\(^{47}\)

In the Dominions, Anglican churches followed the same traditions of Anglican churches in Britain. Wars fought on their soil in the nineteenth century resulted in memorials for the European settlers, and racial attitudes meant that commemorating fallen Māori, Aborigines, or First Nations warriors was not important. In Australia, the conflict between British settlers and Aborigines prompted little commemoration due to the lack of

\(^{41}\) Capt J F Vallentin, IWM War Memorial Register. https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/16134.
\(^{42}\) 2LT W H Amos, IWM War Memorial Register. https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/16137.
\(^{44}\) Lieut J F W Reid, IWM War Memorial Register. https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/16131.
\(^{46}\) 1st Hythe Troop Boy Scouts-WW1, IWM War Memorial Register. https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/62509.
heroism involved and the irregular nature of combat without regular troops or pitched battles. In Canada, the first conflict to be commemorated was the War of 1812 where the enemy was the United States, not First Nations. The conflicts of the Red River and North-West Rebellions in 1869 and 1885 attracted more attention but the low casualty rates meant the memorials were less about remembering the dead and more about building a white Canadian nationalism. New Zealand saw more commemoration around their conflict with the Māori. The memorials were not built immediately after the conflict ended in the 1870s, but rather in the first decades of the twentieth century as New Zealanders were spurred by their participation in the South African Wars to commemorate their own imperial conquests.

The Gate Pā Memorial Church in the city of Tauranga in the Bay of Plenty region displays the complex history of military commemoration in Dominion Anglican churches. The church was built in 1900 on the former Māori Pā (fort) where, in 1864, a British-Māori clash ended in defeat for the British. Later, after the Māori evacuated the Pā, the church was built to commemorate British forces killed in the battle. The church features several memorials to the fighting in the region during the New Zealand wars including a plaque naming nine members of the local militia killed in fighting at Opepe in 1869 (Image 62). After the First World War, two memorials were erected in the church to

---

52 ‘Gate Pa Memorial Church’ Bay of Plenty Times, February 12, 1900, p. 2.
commemorate residents of the community of Gate Pā who died in the war. A community memorial plaque, naming nine men, was remarked at its unveiling as being equal to the memorial from 1869 and the two were placed opposite each other in the nave of the church.54 Below the community memorial, a plaque was raised to Herbert ‘Bert’ Pengelly Mansel who died in 1918 in Palestine of malaria. (Image 63)

Increased interest in the New Zealand Wars on the centenary of the conflict saw increased memorialization. Concerns about Māori sentiments were ignored in the commemorations. The site had suffered significant damage by a road and farmers, but the centenary of the battle saw the remains of the Pā receive increased attention and several new memorials.55 These memorials, however, displayed a skewed racial view of the conflict; Māori were seen as having ‘chivalry and knightly virtues’, and it was implied that unity between the two peoples had been achieved.56 The growth of Māori independence and resistance movements in subsequent decades resulted in shifts in commemoration at the church. Most recently, the Anglican Church in New Zealand and the leaders of the Gate Pā memorial church issued an apology to Tauranga Moana iwi in 2018 for their role and participation in the seizure of their lands during and after the New Zealand Wars.57 In an attempt to further reconciliation, the memorials to the soldiers killed in 1869 and the First World War were moved out of the nave of the church and to a hallway linking the church to its adjacent hall.58

54 ‘War Memorials Unveiled’ Bay of Plenty Times, November 15, 1920, p. 3.
In Canada, St Paul’s Cathedral in London, Ontario, exemplifies the memorials to military engagements in Anglican churches of the Dominions before the First World War. The church, constructed in 1846, has strong ties to British and Canadian military units; it had private pews reserved for British officers until the departure of British units for the Crimean War, and is home to the standards of nine Canadian militia and reserve regiments. The only pre-First World War memorial to commemorate a death in battle is to Lieutenant-Colonel Chester and the men of the 23rd Regiment or Royal Welch Fusiliers who died in the Battle of Alma in 1853 during the Crimean War. Several plaques were also erected to commemorate soldiers garrisoned in the city who attended the church.

The church saw a burst of commemoration after the First World War. A plaque was erected to the 33rd Battalion of the CEF that was raised in London early in the war, but the rest were individual memorials. These include plaques to Victor John Kent, killed in 1918 (Image 65); Frederick Courtney Raymond, who died in 1916 (Image 66); Lionel Hyman Eliot, who was killed in 1917 (Image 11); and the Becher brothers, Henry Campbell who was killed in 1915 and Archibald Valancey who died of illness in 1915.

---

60 Miller, *Gargoyles & Gentlemen*, p. 163.
Even though St Paul’s lacks the historic memorials to Canadian military engagements of the nineteenth century, it drew on the example of Anglican churches in Britain that have memorials to military service. As the church to the military garrison in the city, St Paul’s demonstrates the tradition of memorial-building before the outbreak of the First World War. Other churches in the city house far fewer symbols of military commemoration from before the war, as they were not the home church of local military units.

The three churches of St Leonard’s, Gate Pā, and St Paul’s demonstrate that throughout the Empire, Anglican churches had developed a tradition in the nineteenth century to commemorate military service. These memorials from imperial conflicts of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries served as templates for First World War personal memorials, having set the precedent for the erection of memorials in churches. Individuals who erected personal memorials in Anglican churches were not breaking with tradition, but rather were following the established church custom of building personal memorials that had been encouraged by both state and church.


Image 51: Hamilton Family Memorial in St Leonard’s Church, Hythe, Kent, England.

Image 52: Memorial Plaque to John Fortescue Finnis in St Leonard’s Church, Hythe, Kent, England.

Image 53: Memorial Plaque to Thomas George Hakewill in St Leonard’s Church, Hythe, Kent, England.

Image 55: Memorial Plaque to Lyall Brandreth in St Leonard’s Church, Hythe, Kent, England.

Image 56: Memorial Plaque to John Franks Vallentin V.C. in St Leonard’s Church, Hythe, Kent, England.

Image 57: Memorial Plaque to William Hope Amos in St Leonard’s Church, Hythe, Kent, England.


Image 60: Memorial Plaque to John Frederick Winder Reid in St Leonard’s Church, Hythe, Kent, England.
Image 61: Memorial Plaque to Frank Turner in St Leonard’s Church, Hythe, Kent, England.

Image 62: Memorial to Soldiers Killed at Opepe in Gate Pā Memorial Church, Gate Pā, Bay of Plenty, New Zealand.

Image 63: Memorial Plaque to Herbert Pengelly Mansel in Gate Pā Memorial Church, Gate Pā, Bay of Plenty, New Zealand.

Image 64: Tomokanga to Gate Pā Memorial Reserve next to Gate Pā Memorial Church, Gate Pā, Bay of Plenty, New Zealand.


Image 66: Memorial Plaque to Frederick Courtney Raymond in St Paul’s Cathedral, London, Ontario, Canada.

The Catholic Church

Very few non-Protestant denominations of Christianity can be found in the database. Roman Catholics are the largest non-Protestant faith group in the database, with one memorial in every nation except for Northern Ireland. Catholics constitute a minority of individuals in the database with Ireland having the most Catholics, 36 of 179 (20%). The lack of Catholic memorials in Northern Ireland, and the fact Catholics are not the largest in the Republic, is due to the politicization of commemoration in Ireland. The conflict over commemoration in Ireland resulted in the memorials and rituals of remembering becoming more insular and private to avoid contests between the commemoration of the First World War, the Irish War of Independence, and the Irish Civil War.

In the immediate aftermath of the First World War, large numbers of Irish citizens expressed joy at the war’s end. In Dublin, participation in the Peace Day parade on July 19th, 1919, numbered around 20,000 people and the parade was well received by the general public. The push for commemoration was made rapidly in Ireland as a national committee was established in 1919 for the creation of an ex-servicemen’s home and club that was eventually reformed to build a national memorial. War memorials were raised in local communities across the island, even in towns and cities that often displayed nationalist sentiments. Cork City erected a war memorial in 1925 that was draped with a Union Jack even though the city was part of the ‘rebel county’ and had experienced large-

---


scale violence in the Irish War of Independence and Civil War. Jason Myers argues that Ireland was not ‘slow’ to the commemoration process, as the construction of community and personal memorials displays a high level of participation in remembrance by Irish citizens.

The difficulty in Ireland for commemoration was the lack of official support for any kind of commemoration, particularly moral, that was seen in other nations. The Irish government under Lord John French initiated the plan for the National War Memorial in 1918, but the committee found itself run by private citizens as the state was busy with the War of Independence after January 1919. The conclusion of the war with the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1922 set off the next conflict, the Irish Civil War, which saw more violence and did not end until 1924. The new Free State government was not interested in supporting or advancing commemoration of a conflict that was seen as British. The delay in the construction of the Irish National War Memorial was lengthened by interference from members of the Free State government before the memorial’s completion in 1939. With the ruling parties and politicians displaying no interest in, or outright contempt towards, commemoration of the First World War, it became harder for Irish citizens in the Catholic church to find social or political support for commemoration and memorial building.

A major problem emerging in Ireland was the politicization of commemoration that often led to violence. The conflicts in Ireland from 1919 to 1924 were far more personal and divisive for Irish citizens than the fighting in the First World War. The Civil War ripped families apart as different members supported opposite sides, while

comrades-in-arms from earlier struggles cruelly turned on each other. After the Civil War, Ireland needed to be rebuilt and re-united, and what better way to do so than by targeting the old enemy, Britain? Remembrance Day ceremonies became targets for Irish Republicans of all stripes. In Dublin, Remembrance Day events were often hosted in large public parks in the city centre, making them easy targets for intimidation and confrontation. The Peace Day parade in 1919 attracted violence and scuffles, as did most Remembrance Day ceremonies after. The processions to the parks where ceremonies were being held saw repeated fistfights, yelling, destruction of flags, and poppy-snatching which prompted people to put razor blades in their poppies to discourage snatching. The link between Remembrance Day and the tyranny of British Imperial rule in Ireland was clearly made in 1928 when several bombs were set off on statues of British monarchs on November 11th. The public ceremonies declined after 1932 when the new Fianna Fail government began placing restrictions on parades, and finally ceased in the Second World War, as they were interpreted as acts of support to the British government that violated Irish neutrality.

The result of the violence was that Irish commemoration became more insular and private even before the outbreak of the Second World War. The Church of Ireland, the Anglican church in Ireland, found itself isolated in the new Irish state due to its historic and political ties to Unionism and Britain. The Anglo-Irish identity that was tied up with the Church of Ireland was devastated by the division of Ireland; those remaining in the

---

73 After the two minutes silence a group of nationalist students began singing rebel songs and caused a disturbance amongst the crowd. Jeffery, *Ireland and the Great War*, p. 115
74 Myers, *The Great War and Memory in Irish Culture*, pp. 105-106.
Free State, later the Republic, found themselves undergoing a cultural shift as they attempted to find a new way of living in a changed Ireland.\textsuperscript{77} In an attempt to secure their identity in the new Irish state, Anglicans and members of the Anglo-Irish community turned to the commemoration of the First World War as a means to differentiate themselves from the new state that prized republicanism over Britishness. They retreated into their churches, which were places safe from the strong Catholic influence over the new state.\textsuperscript{78} St Ann’s Church in Dublin reveals that retreat, with the construction of a community memorial that was originally planned to be on the exterior of the church but was instead placed inside due to ‘the present unsettled state of the country’ in 1920.\textsuperscript{79}

For Catholic churches, the commemoration of the First World War was seen as an antithesis to their place in the new Irish state. In Dublin, the only Catholic church to have a roll of honour was St Mary’s Church on Haddington Road. The church was led by a conservative parish priest, Bishop Nicholas Donnelly, who was known to be a unionist and was supported by the British government.\textsuperscript{80} In St Andrew’s Church on Westland Row, memorials naming individuals who died in the First World War and in colonial conflicts are hidden from public view behind the parish office. The memorials cannot be accessed without permission from church staff.\textsuperscript{81} The turn away from commemorating the First World War was not sudden. Catholic participation in remembrance events during the

\textsuperscript{78} Ibid, 77-78.
\textsuperscript{79} RCB P.0344.25-1 \textit{St Ann’s Parish Magazine}, June 1920.
\textsuperscript{81} I was fortunate enough to access them during my master’s research in 2016. I had first explored the interior of the church before speaking to the parish office where I was led through the office itself to the room behind it where the memorials were all on the walls.
inter-war years was common. In Cork, the memorial constructed in 1925 was unveiled after Protestant and Catholic ex-servicemen and their families had attended church services, and they co-ordinated a meeting time to march together to the memorial. Many Catholics remained active in remembering, but with the government and high-ranking church officials pushing back against markers of Britishness, Catholic participation in commemoration declined.

Northern Ireland saw the same divisions, with the state supporting the First World War instead of rejecting it. The erection of memorials in Northern Ireland was primarily funded by the general public with independent committees that operated with little or no government influence, just like in the Free State. In her analysis of Northern Irish memorials, Catherine Switzer argues that commemoration during the inter-war years was not unique in Northern Ireland compared to Britain, and the Dominions of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The memorials lacked a distinct Irish flair in Celtic crosses, or round towers, and instead focus on cenotaphs, obelisks, and statues of soldiers. The lack of political messaging in the memorials, however, did not stop them from being used to create a Northern Irish identity. By the outbreak of the Troubles in the 1960s, it had become clear to both Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland that the First World War was for unionists and Protestants.

Catholics outside of Ireland also experienced political challenges when it came to commemoration. In Canada, the majority of Catholics were Francophones in Quebec,

---

82 Myers, *The Great War and Memory in Irish Culture*, p. 132.
84 Ibid, pp. 58, 74-75.
where there was significant political distress during the First World War. The Conscription Crisis of 1917 led to charges from the Canadian public and politicians that Francophones were not loyal and were shirking their duty to volunteer for the war effort. Francophones claimed Anglophones were militarists, just like the Germans they were fighting. The divisiveness of the election and Conscription Crisis became a central focus in Quebecois memory of the war. Francophone politicians emphasised the memory of the four individuals killed during the 1918 Easter Anti-Conscription Riot in Quebec City over the thousands of Francophones who fought and died in France and Belgium. Historians were more obsessed with the political fallout of conscription than Quebecois military service. The evolution of Quebecois nationalism, with a memory that contrasted with that of English-Canada helped to cement those nationalist views, just as the war helped to create an English national identity. Due to the antagonism generated by the First World War in Quebec, Catholics stayed away from commemorating the conflict.

The underlying discontent in Quebec and amongst Francophones in Canada can be seen in the low number of Catholic churches with memorials, the lack of memorials in French, and the lack of memorials in the province of Quebec. In the database, only thirteen individuals in Canada identify themselves as Catholic, compared to 134 Anglicans, and only two of the Catholics are Francophone. One is Jean Brillant from Bic, who won the Victoria Cross and is the only individual with memorials in French. Brillant

---

has several memorials dedicated to him; the oldest (from his family) was erected in Saint-Cécile-du-Bic Church and is a bronze plaque with French text (Image 68). Two others were included by his regiment, the Royal 22e Régiment in its headquarters in the Citadel in Quebec City. A plaque was erected in the memorial chamber where famous members of the regiment are remembered, including fellow Victoria Cross winners Joseph Kaeble and Paul Triquet, and former general and Canadian Governor-General Georges Vanier who is buried in the Citadel with his wife. The most recent memorial is a park in Montreal named for Brillant; a stone plinth has an excerpt from his Victoria Cross commendation and a letter he sent to his parents before his death (Image 69). The only other Francophone in the database is Conrad Baril, born in Arthabaska-ville, south of the city of Trois-Rivieres, who worked as a surveyor for the Canadian government before the war. His memorial, a mountain peak in Alberta, was named by his former employer rather than his family in Quebec.

In Australia, the role of the Catholic church in the contentious conscription debates left it open to attacks from the rest of Australian society. The face of Australian Catholics during the war, the Archbishop of Melbourne Dr Daniel Mannix, was a polarizing figure in Australian society and politics. Mannix, like the majority of Catholics

---

in Australia, was from Ireland and brought with him an interest in and attachment to Irish politics. The support of Mannix and most of the Catholic hierarchy in Australia for Irish nationalism made them targets for their presumed disloyalty to Britain. Animosity increased when Mannix became one of the public faces of the anti-conscription campaign that succeeded in preventing conscription. Mannix and Catholics in Australia were portrayed by the Protestants and the government of Billy Hughes as enemies of the war effort.\textsuperscript{93} The conscription debates in Australia saw not only rifts between Catholics and Protestants, but also divisions within the Catholic community. Many wealthy and powerful Catholics in Australia supported conscription, particularly those who had family in the armed forces. Mannix found significant support from working-class Catholics who also held trade unionist and Labour party ideals that also opposed conscription. Mannix tapped into the roots of Protestant/Catholic tensions in Australia, exposing working-class agitation towards the elites and anti-English sentiment towards the state.\textsuperscript{94}

The memorials to Catholics in Australia highlight the tensions in the work of Mannix and the social divisions in Australia. Catholics make up 45 of 410 (11\%) of Australians in the database, rivalling the number of Methodists and Presbyterians. Looking at the Catholic individuals, the majority of were born in Australia, with only four born outside the country. Of these four, only one, Thomas Markey was born in Ireland; the others were born in England or South Africa. The large number of Australian-born Catholics represented in the database demonstrates how Catholics established in Australia were more inclined to support the war effort. Even if their parents building the memorials


\textsuperscript{94} Ibid, pp. 328-332.
were born outside of Australia, they had strong connections to Australia, having settled in the country long ago. These families, unlike Mannix who only arrived in Australia in 1911, would be more concerned with Australian politics than Irish nationalist politics.

Unlike in Quebec where the war helped solidify a separate Catholic and Francophone identity, in Australia the Catholic community found itself lacking a base on which to build its identity. The outbreak of the Irish Civil War left many Catholics in Australia disillusioned with Irish politics and they turned to dealing with Australian issues instead of Ireland. The sectarian divisions remained, but their role in Australian politics and social interactions declined as Australian identity integrated Catholics of Anglo-Celtic origin. The role of religion in Australian memory of the war, particularly the divisions between Protestants and Catholics due to Mannix, has not featured prominently in Australian historiography. Differences in Christianity became less of an influence on the development of Australian national identity and later generations saw the wartime religious squabbles as of little concern for their memories of the conflict.

The lack of personal memorials in Catholic churches was a result of the tensions, violence, and identity crises that the different national Catholic churches experienced. The lack of support within Catholic communities due to ethnic or language identities meant that individuals felt social and political pressure to restrict the commemoration of loved ones killed in the war. Placing memorials in churches could have created tensions

---

95 Ibid, pp. 350-353.
and potential opposition from fellow parishioners could have ostracized families from their religious community.

Presbyterians, Methodists, and Other Protestant Churches

Protestant denominations did not suffer from the same tensions as Catholic churches. The lack of non-conformist memorials is due to church doctrine and the role of the churches in society. A major issue for memorial construction in non-conformist churches was the stance on iconography in places of worship. During the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century, many churches in Britain suffered large-scale iconoclasm as Protestants destroyed symbols and images in churches. Iconoclasm was more prominent in denominations that followed Calvinism, as his theology encouraged followers to target religious art as inconsistent with the new way of seeing God.97 The Reformation in Scotland, which was led by John Knox, a student of Calvin, undertook the largest episode of iconoclasm in Britain. In 1559, Knox and his followers began tearing

---

down images, smashing stained-glass windows, and burning many churches. In the wake of the iconoclasm, Scotland was declared to be a Protestant nation under Knox’s version of Calvinism called Presbyterianism.\(^9\) Episodes of iconoclasm took place under other Protestant denominations, including Anglicans in England who were supporters of the Puritans. The construction of new churches, both in Britain and in the Dominions by non-conformist settlers, reflected Calvinist views on imagery in churches as the buildings were austere and plain. The erection of memorials in churches was therefore controversial in Calvinist and Presbyterian teachings. The construction of personal memorials in non-conformist churches was banned in some denominations and potentially controversial in others, depending on how the church felt about iconography.

The stance of non-conformist churches towards the display of memorials was often informed by their understanding of how they fit into national and imperial identities. Scotland demonstrates the conversation that non-conformist churches were having about national and imperial status within their faith, and how that conversation reflected the erection of memorials. The Church of Scotland was established in 1690 as the national and state-sanctioned Church of Scotland and was Presbyterian in doctrine. Throughout the next 200 years, Scottish Presbyterians debated, fought, and quarrelled about the place of the Church of Scotland in the practice of their faith and their relationship to the British state. Breakaway churches formed throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the largest occurring in 1843 in the Disruption that created the Free Church. All the various Presbyterian churches squabbled over doctrine and political relations as the

Church of Scotland was seen to be in bed with landed elites and the British rulers of Scotland.\textsuperscript{99}

Towards the latter half of the nineteenth century, the increase of government control over social institutions like education, health care, and poor relief helped to refocus the debates in Presbyterianism as people were becoming increasingly disillusioned with the churches. Alongside social shifts, new interpretations of the Bible began to push back against strict readings of Calvin and Knox, allowing for more diversity of expression and ideas.\textsuperscript{100} In the years leading up to the First World War, Presbyterian churches realized they needed to unify as their separation was causing more harm than good. The war drove the Presbyterian churches together as they worked to help soldiers and families at home deal with the various crises caused by the war. In 1918, the second-largest Presbyterian church, the Free United Church, began talks to reunite with the Church of Scotland and advocated for greater spiritual independence from the state. The removal of political influence on church doctrine was granted in 1921 with Church of Scotland Act. In 1929, the two churches united, with only a small faction remaining outside.\textsuperscript{101}

A major ideology with which Presbyterians had to wrestle during the war was the theological issue of what happened to the war dead. Under Presbyterian teaching only the elect were chosen to go to heaven, but this was unsatisfactory to the bereaved who did not find the lesson comforting. Many Presbyterian churches began altering their views and

\textsuperscript{99} The Free Church sought to duplicate the Church of Scotland, though free of political outsiders and influences that the established church suffered from. Ibid, pp. 141-149.
\textsuperscript{100} An example was the reestablishment of Christmas traditions that had been suppressed by the Presbyterian church. Ibid, pp. 134-140.
\textsuperscript{101} Ibid, pp. 204-206.
preaching on the subject, taking on a crusading ideal that death in battle was righteous.\textsuperscript{102}

This sentiment was incorporated into the construction of the Scottish National War Memorial in Edinburgh after the war. Built to honour Scottish service in the war, the memorial was designed to be free of sectarian tensions, hence its placement in Edinburgh Castle. The design of the memorial borrows primarily from Presbyterian ideas. The building was designed to be a cultural expression of Scottishness within a British identity, using Scottish building materials and iconography. The religious images in the carvings and the stained-glass windows elevate Presbyterianism above the other denominations in Scotland and reflect the sentiment that service in the war was righteous.\textsuperscript{103}

The construction of the Scottish National War Memorial using Presbyterianism as the basis for religious imagery reveals the extent to which commemoration of the war was accepted by the largest church in Scotland. Followers of the Church of Scotland were free to erect memorials to their war dead. The Church of Scotland’s historic ties to the state meant that building memorials honouring the war dead were now both religiously and secularly sanctioned in the churches as they did not jeopardize their faith or their national identity. Examining the number of memorials in Scotland, Presbyterians make up the largest number of individuals in the database. They do not, however, represent the majority of individuals at only 134 of 282 (48%). The lower than expected number of Presbyterians from Scotland can be explained by the divisions between Presbyterians. Separate Presbyterian churches from the Church of Scotland continued to reject iconography in their churches and to refute the argument that soldiers were righteous for

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid, pp. 204.
their deaths in battle. As such, individuals may have either been denied the opportunity to build a memorial, or they supported their faith and did not want to build a memorial in their church. The high number of Anglicans (Scottish Episcopalians) with 101 of 282 memorials in Scotland reinforces the close identification the Anglican churches had with both memorialization and the British state.

In Wales, religious debate was centred on Welsh nationalism of the nineteenth century that became focused on the disestablishment of the Anglican church as the national church of Wales. During the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, non-conformist churches proliferated in Wales and quickly came to challenge the Anglican church. One of the main engines of growth the Welsh language as non-conformist chapels came to be seen as bastions and protectors of Welsh culture from English domination. After decades of debates, protests, and campaigning, the bill on disestablishment entered into the House of Commons just after the Irish Home Rule Bill in 1912. Both bills were passed at the same time in September 1914, and both were put on hold until the end of the war. Unlike the Irish Home Rule Bill, the Welsh disestablishment bill come into effect after the war in 1919. In June 1920, the Anglican church was disestablished in Wales and officially became the Church of Wales.

Examining the number of Welsh non-conformists with personal memorials, the database shows the continued importance of Anglicanism to commemoration. Anglicans represent the majority of personal memorials in Wales with 162 of 200 memorials compared to twenty for non-conformists. The reasons for the high number of Anglican

---

memorials can be explained by the connection of Anglicanism to the state and military service even after disestablishment. The long history of the Anglican church as the state church of Wales, and the connection the church had to England would remain strong in the Anglican community. In terms of the location of Anglican memorials in Wales, more are located on the border and in the south of the country, where there were large communities of English migrants who had moved to Wales for work. The importance of commemoration in Anglicanism is evident when looking at the north and west of Wales, where Welsh and non-conformist churches were the dominant communities. Even there, Anglican churches have the majority of personal memorials.

The lack of personal memorials in non-conformist churches can be down to several reasons. Like Presbyterianism, many non-conformist churches were Calvinist in doctrine which rejected iconography. As well, the long fight to disestablish the Anglican church in Wales contributed to the lack of memorials as the act of memorializing soldiers was part of the tradition of the Anglican churches. Building memorials had not been customary in Welsh non-conformist churches, limiting the number of personal memorials non-conformists would have erected. Another factor was the decline in attendance in the post war years. Welsh citizens in the 1920s no longer cared about the political status of churches as new economic crises arose with the slow recovery of industry and coal after the war.106 The non-conformist churches in Wales saw the beginning of their decline in the years after the disestablishment bill in what should have been their period of greatest success. A declining attendance combined with economic uncertainty would contribute to a lack of personal memorials to be constructed.

Jewish and Non-Christian Memorials

Outside of the dominant Christian denominations, few religious groups are represented in the database. The largest faith with memorials is Judaism with nine, seven memorials in England and two in Wales. The Jewish soldiers commemorated are predominantly members of the officer corps and have backgrounds in elite institutions. Leonard Herman Stern, for example was a student at Magdalene College, Cambridge University, where he studied classics. A member of the Jewish Lads Brigade, Stern was active in the East London Synagogue, where his father was Rabbi, and in the Jewish community of East London. The Jewish Lads Brigade was an organization that sought to replicate the Boys’ Brigade and used the public school model of muscular Christianity to produce active and British Jewish youths. The leaders of the Jewish Lads Brigade were members of the Anglo-Jewish elite that sought to help integrate Jews into British society through assimilation and integration. Stern’s memorial in the form of prayer books perpetuated the goal of integration as it was given to Jewish boys, reminding them of his service and sacrifice in the war for Britain. Nathan Leonard Harris, from Newport, Wales, displayed a similar status as his memorial was a hall for the Newport Synagogue. Harris was the son of a Jewish-Polish immigrant who found success in Newport as a tailor with his own business. The construction of a hall for the Newport

111 Lionel Harris Duplicate Certificate of Naturalization, Declaration of British Nationality and Declaration of Alienage, NA HO 334 Piece 57.
Synagogue displayed the family’s status and helped to reinforce the importance of class to the commemoration process (Image 70). An exception amongst the Jewish memorials was the only enlisted member, Raphael Lazarus. Lazarus’ parents were Polish Jews who immigrated to England and worked as tailors in Grimsby, Lincolnshire.\textsuperscript{112} Lazarus was living in North London, and working as a palmist and phrenologist according to 1911 census.\textsuperscript{113} His memorial in the form of a plaque was placed in Sir Moses Montiefore Memorial Synagogue in Grimsby by his mother (Image 71).\textsuperscript{114}

Asides from Jewish memorials, the only other non-Christian religions in the database are those of fringe spiritual groups. There is one spiritualist from New Zealand, one atheist from Northern Ireland, and one Freemason from England. The spiritualist was Henry James Nicholas from the town of Lincoln in Canterbury. Nicholas self-identified as a spiritualist on his attestation form.\textsuperscript{115} Nicholas’ memorial is in the form of a statue in the Park of Remembrance and a plaque on the Bridge of Remembrance in Christchurch. The memorial was erected by the Returned and Services’ Association and the city of Christchurch in 2007.\textsuperscript{116} He was given such an honour due to the fact he was awarded the Victoria Cross during the war. His religious beliefs did not have any significant role in his commemoration as he was worthy of remembrance due to his heroism in the conflict. The atheist, Thomas Greenwood Haughton, has more questions about his actual beliefs. Born

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{112} Lesser Lazarus, Census Returns of England and Wales, 1911, 43 Earl Street Great Grimsby, NA RG14/19950, 1911.
\textsuperscript{113} Raphael Lazarus, Census Returns of England and Wales, 1911, 101 Canonbury Avenue Canonbury London N, NA RG14/921, 1911.
\textsuperscript{115} Nicholas, Henry James, VC, MM-WWI 24216-Army, ANZ Military Personnel Files (Gallantry medal recipients), R23523710.
\end{flushleft}
and living in Belfast, he was remembered in Craigs Parish Church of the Church of Ireland. Haughton’s faith was recorded in the 1911 Ireland census as an atheist, as were his father and siblings. His mother, however, was recorded as being an Anglican in the census.\textsuperscript{117} In the 1901 Irish census he, along with his father and siblings, stated they were Anglicans.\textsuperscript{118} The memorial was not erected by his family but by the employees of the linen bleaching company where he was the manager. The text of the memorial states, ‘This tablet is erected by the employees in Hillmount, Bleach Green.’\textsuperscript{119} The Freemason, William Buckle Solly from Margate in Kent, was commemorated in a Freemason Hall by his fellow brothers.\textsuperscript{120} Solly’s faith is questionable as other Freemason Brothers have been memorialized in a Freemason Hall, but were members of churches.\textsuperscript{121} Solly’s identification as a Freemason is an assumption, as no other evidence of a religious affiliation could be found either through baptismal records or marriage certificates that would point to a definitive religious group he was a member of. A total of 148 of 2323 individuals in the database have no clear religious identity either due to a lack of records, or their records having no indication of faith.

\textsuperscript{117} Thomas Greenwood Haughton, NAI Census 1911, Residents of a house 186 in Dunminning (Dunminning, Antrim), Household Return (Form A).
\textsuperscript{118} Thomas Greenwood Haughton, NAI Census 1901, Residents of a house 149 in Craigs (Dunminning, Antrim), Household Return (Form A).
\textsuperscript{119} Lt T G Haughton, IWM War Memorials Register.
\textsuperscript{120} Bro Capt W B Solly, IWM War Memorials Register.
\textsuperscript{121} In Dublin a memorial was erected to four members of the lodge who were killed in the war and all four identified as Anglican in census records. Freemasons Hall Memorial Window, Irish War Memorials.
http://www.irishwarmemorials.ie/Memorials-Detail?memoid=326; James Archdall, NAI Census 1911, Residents of a house 1 in Urney Glebe (Urney, East, Tyrone), Household Return (Form A); Charles Fredck Ball, NAI Census 1911, Residents of a house 18 in Marguerite Road (Glasnevin, Dublin), Household Return (Form A); Edward VI Crofton, NAI Census 1911, Residents of a house 1 in Ballynerrin, Lower, part of, rural (Wicklow rural, Wicklow), Household Return (Form A); Edward John McCormick, NAI Census 1901, Residents of a house 25 in Morehampton Road (Pembroke West, Dublin), Household Returns (Form A).
As this analysis has demonstrated, faith played a very important role to the commemoration and private memory of the war dead. The role of a person or their family’s faith played a key role in if they would erect a private memorial. The dominance of Anglicans in the database across all the nations demonstrates the relationship that faith and politics had to building personal memorials. The importance of religion with other cultural markers of identity impacted the tendency of individuals to erect personal memorials. Churches that opposed either the war or imperial politics would create tensions that might get in the way of placing personal memorials in that church.

Links Between the Memorials and the Graves

The placement of memorials in any religious site reinforces the importance placed on mourning the dead by the bereaved according to their religious customs. The placement of memorials in churches creates substitute graves in traditional places where they would have been mourned and remembered. To create a grave, the mourners needed a body over which to mourn, and the ritual of burial in a funeral. The funeral was a public display of mourning that allowed the family and society to come together in grief and mourning. The act of burying and mourning in the funeral was a public display of
meeting the requirements of the good death that Victorian society emphasized.\textsuperscript{122} With the absence of bodies from the war, due to the IWGC policy or the destruction of bodies in the fighting, the erection of personal memorials helped to fulfill the void of graves. The IWGC had identified and buried the majority of the war dead in its cemeteries, and those who were missing were named on the large memorials to the missing like the Thiepval Memorial or the Menin Gate. Personal memorials, therefore, played the role of a secondary grave site, a location that was closer to home and filled the sentimental needs of the family, which the official burial given by the IWGC sometimes did not.

For families with dead whose bodies were missing or could not be identified, the IWGC’s memorials attempted to ensure they were not forgotten. The memorials to the missing list tens of thousands of individuals with no known grave. The largest memorial is the Thiepval Memorial in France which has the names of 72,175 individuals, followed by the Menin Gate in Belgium with 54,358 names. The largest cemetery is Tyne Cot Cemetery with 11,968 burials, but only 3,606 are identified.\textsuperscript{123} The majority of the war dead have known burials but are scattered over a large number of cemeteries and burial grounds around the world. In his report on the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the IWGC, Sir Fabian Ware reported that the Commission maintained 767,978 graves, of which 180,681 were unidentified. On the memorials to the missing, a total of 517,773 individuals were commemorated.\textsuperscript{124} In the past century, more of the war dead have been

\textsuperscript{122} Jalland, \textit{Death and the Victorian Family}, pp. 210-229.
\textsuperscript{123} Find Cemeteries and Memorials, CWGC, https://www.cwgc.org/visit-us/find-cemeteries-memorials/search-results/?Country=null&Lat=0&Lon=0&Locality=null&Name=&CasualtiesRange=4000&WarSelect=1&Sort=totalcasualties&Size=100&Page=1.
\textsuperscript{124} These numbers have shifted over time as the IWGC continually reviewed their files and individual bodies were identified as new technology was developed. See the work of Dr Sarah Lockyer who works for the Canadian Branch of the CWGC in identifying Canadian servicemen. Sir Fabian Ware, \textit{The Immortal Heritage}, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1937), p. 26; Sarah Lockyer and Renee Davis, ‘We Will
identified but hundreds of thousands remain on the memorials to the missing. The
memorials at home represent a key element of the mourning process for the families of
the missing: a space to record the information typically on headstones that the IWGC had
prevented them from having.

The number of personal memorials dedicated to the war dead with known graves
in the database is higher than those to casualties named on memorials to the missing. A
total of 3283 of 4966 individuals with known graves in the database have personal
memorials compared to 1653 without known graves. Across all the nations, the ratio of
individuals with known graves with personal memorials is comparable, revealing that
most personal memorials were built for war dead who also have an IWGC headstone.

The high number of memorials to dead with known graves is not to suggest that
their actual graves were neglected by their families. Next-of-kin were unable to design
their own headstones for the graves, but the IWGC allowed them to write a personal
epitaph at the base of the headstone. The IWGC did regulate the length and content of the
epitaphs, allowing next-of-kin some leeway in what they could write. In the database,
2033 individuals have an epitaph on their IWGC headstone, 1208 have no epitaph,
twenty-four have an IWGC epitaph, and 1653 are listed on memorials to the missing. The
IWGC gave the epitaph, ‘Their glory shall not be blotted out’ to headstones of individuals
who were known to be buried in the cemetery but could not be identified. Examples of

Remember Them: The Canadian Armed Forces’s Casualty Identification Program, ’Forensic Science
International,’ vol. 316 (2020).
125 The length was regulated to ensure the text would fit on the space left on the headstone, and content was
scanned for potentially inappropriate language. An example was when one family wanted to write, ‘With
every breath we draw We curse the German more; May the French and British paw Keep the devils in their
place For evermore’ which was seen as being too vulgar and not in line with the IWGC’s vision. They also
censored those who spoke out against the war as they refused another family for wanting, ‘Set out to help
save England, Result: England permanently damned.’ CWGC 2/2/1/41-Commission Meeting No.41-Jan
1922 p. 13; CWGC 2/2/1/42-Commission Meeting No. 42-Feb 1922 p. 16.
this include cemeteries that were damaged during the fighting or where a mass burial took place.\textsuperscript{126} These numbers highlight the value that families placed on the actual graves of their loved ones as they tried to contribute to their memory through the writing of epitaphs.

Epitaphs on headstones need to be contextualized as many next-of-kin were not able or shied away from placing an epitaph. The decision by the IWGC to allow personal epitaphs was made to calm dissatisfaction with its policies. The IWGC chose to charge next-of-kin for the epitaph to help recoup the costs of engraving. The decision for payment was met with resistance from some governments which felt that demanding money was too much. The Canadian government disapproved of the decision and chose to take on the cost of the inscriptions for Canadians.\textsuperscript{127} New Zealand, on the other hand, decided that allowing for voluntary inscriptions was damaging to the IWGC’s ideals of equality of treatment and refused to permit epitaphs on their soldier’s headstones.\textsuperscript{128} The IWGC relented and allowed the epitaphs to be carved free of charge. The cost of the engraving was sent to next-of-kin asking if they would pay it as a voluntary donation to help with grave maintenance.

These political decisions reflect a lower number of epitaphs than could have been in the database. New Zealand stands out amongst the trends within each nation as only five of 116 individuals have an epitaph while sixty-seven have no epitaph. The individuals who have epitaphs served in units outside of the New Zealand Expeditionary

\textsuperscript{127} Longworth, *The Unending Vigil*, p. 43.
Force, allowing their families the opportunity to have a personal inscription. The shift in IWGC policy from demanding payment to making it voluntary also played a role in a lack of epitaphs. Families may have chosen to save their money for the personal memorials instead of the epitaphs on their headstones. The confusion of the policy can be best seen in Canada where only 104 of 256 individuals have epitaphs, while eighty-two individuals with known graves have no epitaph. Considering that Canadians did not have to worry about payment or even making a voluntary contribution to the engraving, the fact more did not take up the governments suggests that confusion on the policy played a role in the lack of epitaphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Known Grav.</th>
<th>With Epitaph</th>
<th>No Epitaph</th>
<th>IWGC Epitaph</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2255 (65%)</td>
<td>1429 (63%)</td>
<td>805 (35%)</td>
<td>19 (1%)</td>
<td>1177 (34%)</td>
<td>21 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>121 (68%)</td>
<td>91 (75%)</td>
<td>30 (25%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>47 (67%)</td>
<td>32 (68%)</td>
<td>15 (32%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 (33%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>177 (63%)</td>
<td>104 (58%)</td>
<td>72 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>103 (37%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>132 (66%)</td>
<td>78 (59%)</td>
<td>53 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>68 (34%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2732 (65%)</td>
<td>1734 (63%)</td>
<td>975 (35%)</td>
<td>27 (1%)</td>
<td>1427 (34%)</td>
<td>25 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>281 (69%)</td>
<td>190 (67%)</td>
<td>82 (29%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>192 (75%)</td>
<td>104 (54%)</td>
<td>84 (44%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>63 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>78 (67%)</td>
<td>5 (6%)</td>
<td>67 (84%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>36 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3283 (66%)</td>
<td>2033 (61%)</td>
<td>1208 (36%)</td>
<td>24 (1%)</td>
<td>1653 (33%)</td>
<td>30 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Individuals in the Database with Known Gravest, with Epitaphs, No Epitaphs, IWGC Epitaphs, and Named on Memorials to the Missing.

Nevertheless, the high number of individuals commemorated with personal memorials and who also have personalized epitaphs on their IWGC graves demonstrates the importance individuals placed on commemorating the dead. The personal memorials were not designed to replace the graves of the war dead, but rather to provide a local sentimental link between the mourners and the dead. Families and mourners placed
importance on both sites through the language used, ensuring that their grief could be felt through both the personal memorials and the epitaphs.

The connection between the epitaphs and the memorials can be seen in the language used in both to commemorate the individual. A number of memorials repeat the same phrase on the headstone, emphasizing the role of the memorial as a secondary grave. An example of this is in the memorial and epitaph of Rodney Vernon Franklin. A pilot from Australia who died in Egypt on June 24th, 1917, his parents had his headstone epitaph quote the Bible, ‘Be ye also ready’; this was repeated on his memorial plaque in St George Anglican Church in Gawler, South Australia (Image 72).129 Another example is in the memorial to Joseph Edwin Bellis whose parents had the opening line from a hymn, ‘We shall meet beyond the river,’ included on both his headstone and the plaque created to commemorate him.130 (Image 73)

130 The quote is from the hymn *We Shall Meet, By And By*, by Rev. John Atkinson in 1867. ‘We Shall Meet, By And By’ The Hymn Society, https://hymnary.org/text/we_shall_meet_beyond_the_river_bye_and_by; Rifleman E Bellis, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/28004; Rifleman E Bellis, CWGC Casualty Details, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/casualty-details/310659/E%20BELLIS/.
Biblical Quotes and Religious Language

The language chosen for the memorials reveals the function they had as secondary graves. The IWGC created a standard formula for headstones with the regimental badge, regimental number and rank, name (or initials) with honours, the regiment, date of death, age, religious emblem, and an epitaph if provided. The memorials often followed the same formula when including information about the individual being commemorated. The memorials often went further providing the date of birth, longer inscriptions, and more artistic designs. The inscriptions that function as epitaphs on the memorials demonstrate the role of the memorial as secondary graves in that the majority of them are religious, either quotes from the Bible or hymns.

The use of religious quotes seeks to showcase the individual experiencing the ‘good death’. The most common Biblical quote is from John 15:13, ‘Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.’ The quotation, while originating in the Bible, uses language that is universal in extolling the virtues of sacrifice and camaraderie but does not speak to the higher meaning of the war. The quote was never always precisely replicated on memorials as individuals altered it to shift the meaning for their own purposes. The plaque to Herbert Ernest Malcolm Owen in St Mark’s Church, Brithdir, Wales, uses the quotation from John 15:13. His family replaced ‘friends’ with ‘country’ so it reads, ‘Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his country.’ (Image 74)¹³¹

Quotations that speak to the faithfulness of the individual reflect both their religiosity and their service as soldiers. The quotation, ‘Faithful unto death’ from

---

Revelation 2:10 reflects this dual meaning in the language. Others like 2 Timothy 4:7, ‘I have fought a good fight’, and Matthew 25:23, ‘Well done thou good and faithful servant,’ also reflect the two ideals of faith and service. These Biblical quotations highlight the individual’s devotion to duty alongside their faith as a soldier. Attaching the individual to Biblical passages associated with combat helped to bridge their death with their actions in life, a key component of the ‘good death’. The use of 2 Timothy 2:3, ‘A good soldier of Jesus Christ’, and 1 Peter 2:17, ‘Fear God honour the king,’ demonstrated the links made between the individual, their death, and service in the war. Many were influenced by the IWGC and its artistic advisor Rudyard Kipling in using Ecclesiasticus 44:14, ‘Their name liveth for evermore.’ The quote was selected by Kipling to be inscribed on the Stone of Remembrance in Commission cemeteries.132 A total of thirty-four personal memorials use Ecclesiasticus 44:14 in Britain and the Dominions, showing the spread of the quotation across the Empire.

There is a wide variety of Biblical quotes used amongst the memorials.133 The selection of the specific quotation can be difficult to determine the relevance for commemoration. Many Biblical passages may have had personal meaning for the creators or the individuals being commemorated. Others have clear meanings such as the use of 2 Samuel 1:23, ‘In death they were not divided’, which was used for several pairs of brothers killed in the war (Image 75).134 Other memorials followed convention in funerary readings such as using Psalm 23:4, ‘Yea though I walk through the valley of the

133 Using the demographic database, there are 683 religious quotes on the memorials. A total of 167 different quotes were used, revealing a wide variety of choices.
shadow of death.’ Many Biblical quotations display the sorrow of loss in the death of the soldier. A popular passage from Philippians 1:3, ‘I thank my God upon every remembrance of you,’ was the most common quotation to speak to the sorrow felt. Many memorials used lines that showed a reconnection with their loved ones and the salvation they had received after death. The most common was from the Song of Solomon 2:17, ‘Until the day break and the shadows flee away’, and Malachi 3:17, ‘And they shall be mine saith the Lord on the day I make up my jewels.’

The Bible was the most quoted religious text but other texts were used such as hymns and prayers. The Lord’s Prayer, a fixture of Protestant religious services, was used regularly on the memorials, specifically the line, ‘Thy will be done.’ The Book of Common Prayer was used regularly as well, as memorials used the prayer, ‘Make him to be numbered with thy saints.’ On Catholic memorials, common prayers to the dead were used regularly. The prayer, ‘Grant him o Lord eternal rest and light perpetual shine upon him,’ was amongst the prayers used most frequently. Alongside the prayers, hymns were often quoted on memorials. The most common hymn was Peace Perfect Peace by Bishop Edward Henry Bickersteth. Written in 1875, the hymn reflected the security of life with Jesus after death.135

The passages from hymns and prayers reflect the same messages as the Biblical quotations. The use of the Lord’s Prayer and the Book of Common Prayer helped to give a sense of purpose and security in death. Other hymns and prayers were chosen to reflect the service of the individual as a soldier. The memorial to George William Noel Frankish, a sailor who was killed in the Battle of Jutland, used a line from the Naval Prayer from

---

the Book of Common Prayer. The memorial to Charles Edward Stewart, a bell for Crieff Parish Church in Scotland, used the line of prayer, ‘Animabus mortuorum auribus viventium’ (Listen living souls of the dead) which was from a phrase commonly inscribed on church bells dating to the Protestant Reformation (Image 75).

The large number of Biblical quotations, hymns, and prayers used on memorials highlights the shared cultural identity within the database. The use of these quotations reveals the way individuals desired to have specific religious text on the memorials, something that the IWGC and community memorials could rarely provide. The repetition of certain passages, on private memorials and in IWGC headstone epitaphs, demonstrates how many people accepted collective patterns of commemoration. It is difficult to extrapolate whether these individuals were simply following the trends or if they chose them independently. Either way, their selections reveal how Biblical passages and religious traditions remained central to mourning and demonstrate the continuing effort of memorials to display the ‘good death.’

Image 74: Memorial Plaque to Herbert Ernest Malcolm Owen in St Mark’s Church, Brithdir, Gwynedd, Wales.

Image 75: Memorial Plaque to Fergus Robert Forbes and Noel Edmund Forbes in Holy Trinity Church, Pitlochry, Perth and Kinross, Scotland.


137 The common phrase is, ‘non sono animabus mortuorum sed auribus viventium’ (I sound not for the souls of the dead but to the ears of the living), Margaret Aston, Broken Idols of the English Reformation, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), p. 472; Brigadier General C E Stuart-Commemorative Bell, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/81839.
Religious Imagery

The religious language on the memorials reflects a population that sought to use religion as a means of justifying the deaths of their loved ones. Historians have discussed the importance of religion during the war in interpreting the conflict as a crusade and the soldiers as Christ-like figures. Such imagery caused some doctrinal issues for clergy but was still readily used by politicians and church leaders. The description of the war as a crusade became more common towards the end of the war thanks to Prime Minister David Lloyd George’s speeches and the campaign in Palestine. The language used helped to explain the conflict as worthy as the crusade of the First World War was about the defence of humanity, civilization, and the militarist apocalypse of Germany. The romantic image of the crusades dominated as knights and chivalry, rather than the bloodthirsty and religious wars that they were, harkened back to the language of adventure stories that celebrated honour and duty.

The imagery of crusades and soldiers as holy warriors was reflected in official commemorations of the war. The Cross of Sacrifice in IWGC cemeteries was made to provide a Christian religious element, but the placement of a bronze sword on the cross showcased the crusader image of the war. IWGC architects Herbert Baker and Edwin Lutyens, along with artistic advisor Charles Aitken, visited the battlefields of the Western Front for inspiration on future cemetery design that emphasized the image of the war as a crusade. In the minutes from a meeting on July 14th, 1917, they argued for a cross in the cemeteries to be ‘the dominating feature as a mark of the symbolism of the present crusade.’

In a letter discussing the design principles of the new cemeteries, Baker described the Cross of Sacrifice as ‘the accepted sign of self-sacrifice throughout Christendom since the days of Constantine…the symbol of self-sacrifice which the wooden crosses on the graves of their fallen have sanctified.’ He turned to more medieval imagery in his suggestions for the headstones, proposing ‘bars and chevrons have been granted to soldiers to denote wounds and long service, these primitive heraldic charges together with other representing medals should be blazoned in accordance with the laws of heraldry on shields.’ Baker’s heraldry idea was not taken up, but the use of medieval chivalric and crusader imagery for remembrance was embraced by the IWGC.

The soldier as a crusader was reinforced by the British government in the rituals used to bury the Unknown Warrior in 1920 in Westminster Abbey. The Unknown Warrior was linked to the medieval past through a coffin built to replicate a sixteenth-

---

140 Minutes of Meeting held at DGR&E, GHQ, July 14, 1917, CWGC 1/1/5/1-Adornment of Cemeteries
141 Letter from Herbert Baker to Sir Fabian Ware, November 9th, 1917, page 3, CWGC 1/1/5/1-Adornment of Cemeteries.
142 Letter from Herbert Baker to Sir Fabian Ware, November 9th, 1917, page 7, CWGC 1/1/5/1-Adornment of Cemeteries.
century chest, the placement of a crusader sword on the coffin, and the decision to use text from the tomb of a bishop who died in 1395 on the gravestone. Stefan Goebel argues that placing the Unknown Warrior in the Abbey over St Paul’s Cathedral was done to create stronger links to the glorious medieval past, because many medieval kings who had fought in France were buried in the Abbey.\textsuperscript{143}

In personal memorials, the links between medieval Christianity and the war were best expressed through the designs of stained-glass windows. Inspired by Gothic revivalism and the language of the war as a crusade, window designs in churches used martial figures from Christianity to reflect their purpose as war memorials. Many windows featured the patron saint of England and a key figure in the crusades, St George the dragon-slayer. The use of St George combined religion and patriotism as representing the soldier of God slaying the dragon, and the nation with the flag of England (St George’s cross) appearing on the windows. The window to John Boyd Wilson in Dunblane Cathedral, Scotland, features a standard representation of St George as a medieval knight wielding a sword and shield, with the shield bearing the red cross and, the dragon lying defeated at his feet (Image 77).\textsuperscript{144} The other common representation of St George showed him carrying his lance with a banner of the red cross hanging from it. The window to Robert Jackson Correll in St John’s Anglican Church in Whitby, Ontario, features St George being met by Jesus after slaying the dragon (Image 78).\textsuperscript{145} The design of Correll’s window was used a second time for Aubrey MacKinnon’s window, located in

\textsuperscript{143} Goebel, \textit{The Great War and Medieval}, p. 44-45
\textsuperscript{144} Lieutenant Colonel J B Wilson, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/69237/.
\textsuperscript{145} Window A9 in St John’s Anglican Church, Whitby, Ontario, Registry of Stained Glass Windows in Canada. http://www.yorku.ca/rsgc/StJohnsWhitby/A9.html
the United Baptist Church in Sydney Nova Scotia.\textsuperscript{146} The dragon being slain was not only used in windows featuring St George. Another common figure from Christianity to have a defeated dragon was the Archangel Michael. The window to Thomas Charles Richmond Baker in St John’s Church, Adelaide, Australia, features a dramatic Michael with a flaming sword and shield with bright red angel wings standing over the fallen dragon (Image 79).\textsuperscript{147} The symbolism of the two saints as warriors links them to the soldiers, the evil of the dragon representing the language of the Germans.

While St George and Michael are used regularly, they are very rarely featured alone. Windows often included other saints or medieval figures to create more complex symbolism. In the window to Ambrose Hutchinson and his nephew John Harvey in the Church of St Oswald in Backford, England, Michael is shown slaying the dragon in the left panel with the angel of peace on the right (Image 80). The inclusion of the angel of peace next to Michael highlights the sense of victory and the establishment of peace. The two panes stand in juxtaposition to the nature of their deaths: violent, but with the ultimate objective of peace. It is poignant as Ambrose was killed in the First World War, and his nephew John was killed in the Second World War.\textsuperscript{148}

Alongside St George and the Archangel Michael, windows commonly feature other soldier saints who were associated with war either due to their histories or the reason for their sainthood. The saints selected reflect a connection to the individual and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[148] The description of the window on the IWM website states that it is St George, not Michael in the window, but due the lack of St George’s cross and the wings on the knight, I conclude that they were mistaken. Lieutenant A. Hutchinson and Wing Commander J.H. Hutchinson, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/9974.
\end{footnotes}
their service overseas. Two French saints, St Martin of Tours and St Joan of Arc, are extensively used on stained glass windows for soldiers who served on the Western Front. The selection of St Martin was due to several reasons. The first was his position as a knight which played a role in his conversion to Christianity before he became a Bishop and Saint. The vignette of St Martin used in windows was set outside of Amiens, France, when he cut his cloak with his sword to give to a beggar, who was Jesus in disguise.\(^{149}\) The location of this event was significant for British families as Amiens was one of the cities in northern France here the British Army spent much of the war. Alongside his association with northern France, St Martin’s feast day was November 11\(^{th}\). The war ending on his feast day was seen as significant for those using faith to help understand the war.\(^{150}\) As such, St Martin appeared on stained-glass windows in the British Empire in larger numbers than other saints.

Windows featuring just St Martin are rare, as he was often part of a collection of religious figures. The window to Charles Rushton Turner in Christ & St Mary’s Church in Armathwaite, England, is one of the few that only features St Martin alone. The window is much more dramatic than other such windows because the design was based on a drawing by Dutch painter Anthony van Dyck (Image 81).\(^{151}\) St Martin features more often as one of several figures in a window. The memorial window to the brothers Gordon and Eustace Crocker in St Peter’s Church in Ballarat, Victoria, Australia, has St


\(^{150}\) Goebel, The Great War and Medieval Memory, p. 251.

\(^{151}\) The IWM website says it was based of a painting by Dutch painter Peter Paul Rubens, but a print of the drawing held by the British Museum attributes the drawing to Antony van Dyck. Lieutenant C R Turner, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/66907; St Martin dividing his Cloak, The British Museum, Registration Number 1870,0625.597, https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1870-0625-597.
Martin and St George flanking St Peter (Image 82). The selection of St Martin and St George was to reflect the soldier’s deaths the brothers experienced, while St Peter was chosen to represent the church in which the window is situated.\textsuperscript{152} The window to Edward Stamford, in St Peter and St Paul’s Church in Burton Pidsea, Yorkshire, England, features St Martin and St Alban between St George (Image 83).\textsuperscript{153}

St Joan of Arc was a common saint to feature on windows after St Martin. St Joan is distinctly French as she is one of the most famous figures in French history, and her use by British, specifically English, is peculiar considering it was the English who engineered her execution in 1341. During the First World War St Joan came to be a unifying symbol of France, inspiring both right-wing and left-wing factions in the nation to repeat her success of driving out the invader – now the Germans instead of the English. Her power and importance to French national memory and identity saw her canonized as saint in 1920.\textsuperscript{154} Her presence in memorial windows, particularly in Anglican churches where she is not a saint, displays the attempted links between her as a marker of France and the soldiers as equal to St Joan. The window to Gavin Ince Langmuir in the Church of the Holy Trinity in Toronto, Canada, displays the link between Gavin and St Joan. The window features the Archangel Michael presenting a laurel wreath to the armoured Joan (Image 84).\textsuperscript{155} While the window was made in 1922 after St Joan was canonized, she does

\textsuperscript{152} See the Memorial Window Description & History on the page for more information. Stained Glass Window at Ballarat St. Peter’s Anglican Church, Victoria War Heritage Inventory, Heritage Council Victoria, https://vhd.heritagecouncil.vic.gov.au/places/196995.
\textsuperscript{153} Edward Stamford (Window), IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/36201.
not have the typical golden halo behind her head, signifying her sainthood. Meanwhile, the window to the brothers Charles Stockley French, Claude Alexander French, and Bernard Digby Johns in St Patrick’s Cathedral in Dublin, Ireland, features St Joan, in armour and halo, being given a laurel wreath by two angels (Image 85).\textsuperscript{156} The window was erected in 1917, three years before her canonization. In both windows Joan represents the fallen soldiers in victory, being presented with the laurel wreath. The French and Johns window was used in another memorial to Charles Seaver in St John’s Malone Church of Ireland in Belfast, installed a year later (Image 86).\textsuperscript{157}

Other saints reflected geographic associations the soldier had in their life. The earlier example of Edward Stamford’s window features St Alban, a Roman soldier stationed in Britain who was martyred due to his faith and is recorded as the first Christian martyr saint in Britain.\textsuperscript{158} (Image 44) As a British soldier saint, St Alban was a suitable choice for the window. The window to Godfrey Valentine Brooke Hine in St Mary’s Church in Leigh, Kent, features three saints, St Joan, St George, and St Patrick (Image 87). The use of St Patrick was due to Godfrey’s enlistment in the Irish Guards. The identification of the saints with text in the window signals that the saints were chosen for their geographic relationships to Godfrey as it reads, ‘Saint Joan of Arc. Saint Patrick of Ireland. Saint George for England.’ The national symbols of each nation, the French fleur-de-lis, the Irish harp, and England’s three lions, all decorate the window as well.\textsuperscript{159}

The window to Locke Francis William Angerstein Kendall in All Saints Church,
Lessingham, Norfolk England, displays St Andrew and St George along with King Richard I Coeur de Lion, the crusader king of England who fought in Palestine. The selection of King Richard connected his crusade with Kendall who fought and died in the Palestinian campaign of 1917. A painted image of Jerusalem was included on the window and the text records Kendall, ‘died of wounds near Jerusalem 22nd Nov. 1917.’ Just as St Martin and St Joan were selected for soldiers who died in France, King Richard was selected for Kendall as both had fought in Palestine.

Several windows feature more than one or two figures to create tapestry windows where multiple stories are shown or blended together. Two windows by Wilhelmina Geddes in St Bartholomew’s Church in Ottawa, Canada, and St Ann’s Church in Dublin, Ireland, share the same style and religious images. The window in St Bartholomew’s Church was commissioned by the Governor General of Canada during the war, the Duke of Connaught, to commemorate members of his staff who fell. Unveiled by his nephew the Prince of Wales on his tour of Canada in 1919, the window features a soldier being welcomed into heaven by the Angels of Peace and Death; the Archangels Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael; the Saints Longinus, Sebastian, Martin, George, Edmund, Joan of Arc, and Louis; and the knights of King Arthur with non-descript angels in the background (Image 89). The window bears strong resemblances to the window Geddes created for St Ann’s Church that commemorated Ernest Lawrence Julian and Robert Hornidge Culinan, two lawyers killed in the war. The window in St Bartholomew’s tells a story of a soldier’s rise into heaven. The smaller window in St Ann’s features no single

story; rather, the Archangel Michael in the centre is surrounded by six scenes from the lives of the warrior saints of David and Jonathan, Gideon, Joshua and Jacob, Martin of Tours, Sebastian, and Longinus and George (Image 90).

Other tapestry windows sought to tell the story of the dead through the windows using religious imagery. The window to John Hugh Allen in All Saints Church in Dunedin, New Zealand, features two sides of his life, war and peace, represented by St George and the Angel of Peace. Below them, scenes of John’s life in war and peace are depicted with him in the trenches at Gallipoli and at Cambridge University in England (Image 91). The window to Bartlett McLennan in St Andrews and St Paul’s United Church in Montreal, Canada, was dedicated to an individual who stands in as a representative of a larger group. Erected in the home church of the Black Watch of Canada, the window functions as a memorial to all the members of the 42nd Battalion (perpetuated by the Black Watch) who fell in the war. Bartlett was the commanding officer and highest-ranking member of the battalion to fall in the war, and as such is named on the memorial. The window speaks to the crusading spirit of the war as it features a medieval knight with the cross of St George on his shield and a soldier of the Black Watch in battle dress from the war described as ‘a modern crusader, a private of the 42nd Battalion in full battle array.’

---

162 W 06 in Dublin St Ann, Gloine: Stained Glass in the Church of Ireland, https://www.gloine.ie/search/window/13969/w06/?i=1.
165 ‘Unveiled Window to Fallen Heroes,’ The Gazette, Montreal, November 14th, 1921, p. 4.
viewers with St Andrew, the patron saint of Scotland on the left (the Black Watch is a Scottish regiment), and David holding the head of Goliath on the right (Image 92). The window contains a unique memorial to Lieutenant Myer Tutzel Cohen in the form of a Star of David over the right shoulder of David on the window. Myer, a Jewish-Canadian from Toronto, joined the 42nd during the war. He gained special attention due to his popularity within the battalion and his bravery, which was recognized with the Military Cross. His comrades felt that a special symbol had to be included for their Jewish comrade.¹⁶⁶

Many stained-glass windows feature specific religious figures, but others use more generic knights or legendary figures such as characters from the stories of King Arthur. The memorial to Arthur Edmund Trouton in Kilternan Church of Ireland in Dublin features the risen Christ and King Arthur in a traditional medieval style of stained glass (Image 93).¹⁶⁷ The window to James Chester Manifold in St Paul’s Church in Camperdown, Victoria, Australia, features a kneeling Sir Galahad holding his sword before him (Image 94).¹⁶⁸ The knights in both these windows are identified, but others are left as generic knights such as in the window to brothers James Russel, Alexander Samuel, and George Hilton Middleton in Strathmiglo Parish Church in Scotland. Two windows are dedicated to them, with the first having a knight with angels on his shoulders and the

¹⁶⁶ The information about Cohen is known due to a visit to the church by the Queen Mother in 1962 where it was pointed out to her my her hosts. ‘Of Many Things… St. Andrew and St Paul’ by Edgar Andrew Collard, The Gazette, Montreal, September 8th, 1973, p. 8; ‘Lieutenant MacCohen’s Memorial’ by John Kalbfleisch, The Gazette, Montreal, November 2nd, 2013, p. 33.
second a fallen knight looking up to a descending Christ (Image 95). The visitation of the knight by Christ was a common motif in stained glass windows, representing the blessing of Christ on the knight who represents the soldiers being commemorated. The window to Frederick Ronan Campbell in St Joseph’s College Chapel in Dumfries, Scotland, and Robert Vere Clerk in St Aldhelms Church in Doulting, Somerset, England, display the variety of crusading knights before Christ shown in windows. In Campbell’s window, the knights are preparing to go to war while in Clerk’s the knight is kneeling before Christ to receive his blessing (Image 96 and 97). Clerk has a second window dedicated to him in St Peter’s Church in Fingal, Tasmania, Australia, which features a knight standing next to his horse looking into the distance (Image 98).

Memorial windows took the link between the crusades and the First World War further by replicating the designs of crusading knights with soldiers in uniforms. As already seen in the Bartlett McLennan window, other windows featured the modern soldier as both a crusader and being welcomed into heaven. The window to Charles Willington Lane in St Patrick’s Church, Slane, co. Meath, Ireland, features Charles in khaki uniform, wearing the distinctive helmet of the British Army but with his sabre drawn by his side. Charles was a Major in the 7th Dragoons, and the window shows him standing before his horse with his troopers in the background – a modern knight entering battle (Image 99). The memorial window to Kenneth Koeppen Wendt in All Saints...

---

169 Photos of the two windows can be found at: Strathmiglo Parish Church, Places of Worship in Scotland, http://www.scottishchurches.org.uk/sites/site/id/4661/name/Strathmiglo+Parish+Church+Strathmiglo+Fife  
170 For a photo of Correll’s window see: Window A9, St John’s Anglican Church Whitby Ontario, Registry of Stained Glass Windows in Canada, http://www.yorku.ca/rsgc/StJohnsWhitby/A9.html; Capt R V Clark [webpage is spelt wrong], IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/24584.  
Anglican Church in Adelaide, Australia, features three panels with the left showing a group of knights going to war, and the right with a group of knights tending to a wounded comrade. In the centre, Wendt is shown in his khaki uniform with the stereotypical Australian slouch hat at his feet being held by Christ as angels descend to take him to heaven (Image 100). The central image of the soldier being taken by Christ was a common motif and was seen on the window to Ray Lancaster Bell in St Ann’s Church in Dublin. Here the khaki-clad Bell is kneeling before Christ as angels behind them have the eucharist ready for his last rites (Image 8). The window to Henare Mokeua Kohere and Pekama Kaa in St Mary’s Church in Tikitiki, New Zealand, displays the two Māori soldiers kneeling before the crucified Christ. The window is part of the larger church design in Māori art and culture but reflects the purpose of the church and the memorials to help link the soldiers to Christ and their redemption (Image 101).

The majority of personal memorials are located in Anglican churches and the designs of the stained-glass windows reflect Anglican traditions. Other denominations and faiths did have windows that reflected their own beliefs. Presbyterian windows were less common due to different Presbyterian churches having different ideas about iconography. Two examples of Presbyterian windows can be seen in the memorial to Matthew Andrew MacFeat in Colintraive Church in Colintraive, Scotland, and Gordon William McCulloch in St Andrew’s Church Centre in Auckland, New Zealand. Matthew’s window features the patron saint of Scotland and the Presbyterian Church St

---

Andrew carrying his distinctive ‘X’ cross (Image 102).\textsuperscript{176} Gordon’s window also features St Andrew’s cross in the saltire, the flag of Scotland, and the burning bush, the symbol of the Presbyterian church (Image 103).\textsuperscript{177}

The memorial window to Henry Bloom, formerly in the Middlesbrough Synagogue, reflects Jewish traditions through symbols on the window. Two Stars of David are on the window along with Hebrew text translating to, ‘A loving son and brother.’ His date of death was written in the Julian calendar as February 14\textsuperscript{th}, 1917, and also in the Hebrew calendar as Shebat 22 5677 (Image 104).\textsuperscript{178} Windows outside Anglican churches are not as common, but when they do appear, they demonstrate the ways different denominations and faiths used their own symbols and iconography to make the windows appropriate to the space in which the memorial was erected.

\textsuperscript{176} The page featuring the memorial misidentifies Matthew as perishing in the HMHS Rohilla when he fell in action in 1918. M A MacFeat (Hospital Ship Rohilla Tragedy at Whitby), IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/58231.

\textsuperscript{177} St Andrew’s Church memorials, Howick, New Zealand History, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/st-andrews-church-memorials-howick.

\textsuperscript{178} Henry Bloom’s window is currently in the hands of private individual and photographs of the window were given to me by Dr Anne-Marie Foster, formerly of Queen’s University Belfast. In a slideshow of the final service at the Middlesbrough Synagogue in 1998, the window, along with the congregation’s war memorial where Bloom is listed, can be seen. Middlesbrough Synagogue Closure Ceremony, November 1998. Kehilat Middlesbrough Newsletter and Archives, Photo Gallery, http://kmbro.weebly.com/photo-gallery-001.html.
Image 79: Stained-Glass Window to Thomas Charles Richmond Baker in St John’s Church, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.

Image 80: Stained-Glass Window to Ambrose Hutchinson and John Harvey in the Church of St Oswald, Backford, Cheshire, England.

Image 81: Stained-Glass Window to Charles Rushton Turner in Christ & St Mary’s Church, Armthwaite, Cumbria, England.

Image 82: Stained-Glass Window to Gordon Crocker and Eustace Crocker in St Peter’s Church, Ballarat, Victoria, Australia.

Image 83: Stained-Glass Window to Edward Stamford in St Peter and St Paul’s Church, Burton Pidsea, East Yorkshire, England.
Image 84: Stained-Glass Window to Gavin Ince Langmuir, top two panes, in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.


Image 86: Stained-Glass Window to Charles Seaver in St John’s Malone Church of Ireland, Belfast, Northern Ireland.

Image 87: Stained-Glass Window to Godfrey Valentine Brooke Hine in St Mary’s Church, Leigh, Kent, England.

Image 88: Stained-Glass Window to Locke Francis William Angerstein Kendall in All Saints Church, Lessingham, Norfolk, England.

Image 89: The Governor General’s Window or the Ottawa Window in St Bartholomew’s church, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
Image 90: Stained-Glass Window to Ernest Lawrence Julian and Robert Hornidge Culinan in St Ann’s Church of Ireland, Dublin, Ireland.

Image 91: Stained-Glass Window to John Hugh Allen in All Saints Church, Dunedin, Otago, New Zealand.

Image 92: Stained-Glass Window to Bartlett McLennan and the men of the 42nd Battalion CEF in St Andrew’s and St Paul’s United Church, Montreal, Canada.

Image 93: Stained-Glass Window to Arthur Edmund Trouton in Kilternan Church of Ireland, Dublin, Ireland.

Image 94: Stained-Glass Window to James Chester Manifold in St Paul’s Church, Camperdown, Victoria, Australia.
Image 95: Stained-Glass Window to James Russel Middleton, Alexander Samuel Middleton (left), and George Hilton Middleton (right) in Strathmiglo Parish Church, Strathmiglo, Fife, Scotland.

Image 96: Stained-Glass Window to Frederick Ronan Campbell in St Joseph’s College Chapel, Dumfries, Dumfries and Galloway, Scotland.

Image 97: Stained-Glass Window to Robert Vere Clerk in St Aldhelms Church, Doulting, Somerset, England.

Image 98: Stained-Glass Window to Robert Vere Clerk in St Peter’s Church, Fingal, Tasmania, Australia.

Image 99: Stained-Glass Window to Charles Willington Lane in St Patrick’s Church, Slane, Meath, Ireland.
Conclusion

The current location of Henry Bloom’s window symbolizes a growing danger to private memorials. The window was taken out of Middlesbrough Synagogue when it closed in 1998 and currently is in private hands. No longer located in a synagogue, Henry’s memorial is in danger of being lost or damaged, but also misinterpreted. In the Royal Canadian Regiment Museum in London, Ontario, a stained-glass window to James
Everet Fitzgerald which was originally located in Bethesda East United Church can be seen. The window was donated to the Museum in 1974 after the church closed and the congregation had moved out of the building (Image 105). The demolition of the church in 1975 meant the window was saved from destruction and is still on display, unlike the window to Henry Bloom. Both windows find themselves removed from their original setting and placed in locations where the meaning of the memorial has now shifted. Compared to the memorials mentioned at the opening of the chapter in Tabor URC in Maesycymmer Wales, these windows have at least been saved, whereas the memorials to Gomer Davies and Rowland Thomas continue to live in a derelict church.

These memorials show a growing issue with commemoration and local memory as the use of these church buildings declines. As congregations shrink and move out of their historic buildings, the war memorials in them are being lost or forced to move locations. The significance of the memorials, such as the window to James Fitzgerald, has now shifted to be memorials to all the fallen, rather than to a specific individual. The role of the memorial as a personal memorial has become altered due to the memorials being moved from their original location.

The loss of memorials, or their recontextualization in new settings means, that the key emotions driving commemoration of the First World War are being diluted: the emotional responses of sorrow and grief. The quest to create memorials that reflected the ‘good death’ each of the soldiers experienced reflects the importance of grief in the memory process, and the ability to express this grief by performing mourning rituals in

---

private and in traditional spaces such as churches. The loss of the memorials damages our understanding of how the war was remembered. Relying on collective commemoration and memorials fails to provide a clear picture of how individuals understood the war, resulting in generalizations of the past. The nuances in the language, design, and imagery of these private memorials reveal how these members of society followed collective remembrance practices, and how they deviated to fit their own requirements. The continued loss of these sites of remembrance will damage attempts to create a balanced and meaningful picture of commemoration and society’s understanding of the war. These secondary graves that display the ideals of a religious ‘good death’ highlight the importance of the sites in which memorials were erected, showing the need for grief and sorrow to be expressed.

The loss or reuse of religious buildings is a natural part of social change. Yet, their loss and the lack of serious historical analysis of their role in shaping memory for individuals and the communities they represent reveals the need for greater participation of public history and local history enthusiasts in academic history. The history of these spaces is predominantly reserved for those who occupy them. By opening them up for greater historical analysis and placing them into the larger fields of memory, a better picture of how society remembers events can be explored. These spaces, both public and private, allowed for individuals to escape collective remembrance but also reinforce public memory in ways that worked for them. It was here that private memory was solidified and adapted as the individual re-engaged with the larger world. It was in the
churches, with their Biblical verses and images of knightly saints, that individuals were able to process their grief with their interpretations of the war.

Chapter 4: ‘Pro Patria Mori’\textsuperscript{1}: Literature on Memorials

In St Peter’s Church, in the town of St Alban’s in Hertfordshire, England, a large stained-glass window was erected by Mary Ellen Mead to her husband and sons. Her husband, Frederick Mead died in August 1915, while their two sons, Joseph Frederick and Robert John, who both enlisted in the British army, were killed in the war. The window featured three panes, the first, a knight visiting an altar, the second, a knight being visited by an angel, and the third an angel in prayer. (Image 106) On an accompanying plaque, the details of the sons are laid out and concludes with the quote, ‘E’en as they trod that day to God so walked they from their birth, in simpleness and gentleness and honour and clean mirth.’\textsuperscript{2} (Image 107) The quote was from the British poet, Rudyard Kipling, from one of his early collection of poems, \textit{Barrack-Room Ballads}.

The presence of literary quotations on memorials was made from of a similar desire as when Biblical quotes were used. Literary quotes provided the bereaved with closure by displaying the qualities of the ‘good death’, the belief that the individual

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{1} Translates to ‘to die for one’s country.’
\textsuperscript{2} 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lieutenant JF Mead and 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lieutenant RJ Mead, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/14691.
commemorated died honourably and for a just cause. While the use of religious texts and language showed that the individuals had spiritual closure in their ‘good death’, literary quotes reveal the importance and meaning of a secular good death. Although there were several layers to a secular ‘good death’, Victorian and Edwardian concepts of honour, duty, and personal achievement dominate the language with service to the nation being central for a secular ‘good death’. Understandings of what honour and duty meant came from a distinctly English view of service as English literature and the English education system shaped which authors and quotations were selected for use on memorials.

The literary quotations selected for memorials present a romantic vision of war, emphasizing patriotism through high diction and rhetoric. Such language not only elevated the pain of loss, but also raised the nature of death above the reality of the war. Seeking a traditional way of expressing the war as ennobling, memorials used language, symbols, and ideas that were later interpreted as romanticizing war. The lens by which the modern world was interpreted, particularly in the wake of the First World War, by equating it to traditional values was not unique to mourners in the 1920s. Modris Ekstein highlights the way Europeans viewed aviation in the flight of Charles Lindbergh through the same language of honour, chivalry, and bravery.\(^3\) The language used on memorials to describe the war dead reflected how individuals attempted to make the modern world understandable to them. The heavy use of historic authors, famous literary figures, and romantic imagery reflected how individuals creating memorials revealed the way society at large was processing the war.

In the database, sixty-three different authors were featured, ranging from works written during Ancient Rome to contemporary work written during the war. To analyze the use of literary quotes, the authors have been grouped first, by the time period they wrote in and second, by nationality of authors. As these sections will show, the importance of English cultural production extended beyond England and into all the nations of the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth demonstrating how across the Empire, English culture was the centre of their shared identity.

**Classical and Historic Literary Quotations**

Victorian and Edwardian society was interlaced with tales of classical literature as it occupied important positions in the cultural milieu. Classical literature was rooted first in the education system of Britain which heavily emphasized the classics. Regular study of classical literature was a key feature of elite schooling in Britain, from the public schools to university studies. It was not until 1920 that Oxford finally removed the mandatory Greek examinations for undergraduates.\(^4\) Alongside the upper classes who experienced the focused teaching of classics in elite schools, middle and working-class readers were introduced to the works through translations published in popular magazines and mass published books. The rising tide of education standards and mass printing markets made it viable for publishers to market to the masses. While the works had once only been available for those who knew Latin or Greek, they were now growing in popularity as they became widely available in English.\(^5\) The rise of adventure stories and

---


children’s literature saw classical myths and stories become entry points for many people into the classics.\textsuperscript{6}

Horace, the Roman poet from the period of the first Emperor Augustus, was the author most quoted on memorials in the database, with his most quoted line, ‘dulce et decorum est pro patria mori’ appearing on forty-six memorials.\textsuperscript{7} The line is drawn from Horace’s third book of Odes, from the second poem titled \textit{Angustam amice} (Narrow friend) where he seeks to motivate Roman citizens to take up arms and maintain a martial spirit against their foes.\textsuperscript{8} The only quotations used more frequently are the Biblical passages ‘greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends,’ and ‘faithful unto death.’ According to Rudyard Kipling (in an interview with \textit{The Times} in 1918), ‘dulce et decorum est,’ was ‘the best-known line of war poetry in all the world.’\textsuperscript{9}

Horace’s words appeared on a range of memorials. In Canada, a large plinth and bust of Edward Cuthbert Norsworthy was erected in Ingersoll Rural Cemetery by his father in 1918. The text of the memorial describes his service as, ‘not for fame or reward-not for place or rank/ not lured by ambition-or goaded by necessity/ but in simple obedience to duty/ as he understood it/ Major Norsworthy sacrificed all-suffered all/ dared all-and died/ “Dulce et decorum est pro patria more”.’\textsuperscript{10} (Image 108) The quotation


\textsuperscript{7} Translates to, ‘sweet and seemly (fitting) is it to die for your country (homeland).’


\textsuperscript{9} ‘The Poet-Prophet of the Empire: Twenty Poems From Kipling,’ \textit{The Times}, May 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1918, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{10} Norsworthy Monument, Canadian Military Memorials Database, \url{https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/memorials/national-inventory-canadian-memorials/details/7033}. 
emphasized the message of Norsworthy having lived a virtuous life and experienced a secular ‘good death’ in duty to his nation. The same sentiment can be seen in the plaque to John Alexander Tower Robertson in Holy Trinity and St Mary’s Church in Berwick Upon Tweed. The brass plaque opens with ‘dulce et decorum’ before describing Robertson’s war experiences as an officer in the Indian Army fighting in France. The nature of Robertson’s death, his ship was sunk by a submarine while returning to his unit in India after leave, seeks to demonstrate that he experienced a ‘good death’.\(^\text{11}\) The use of Horace on Robertson’s memorial speaks to the idea that the nation and the empire were one in the same as Robertson had been living in India as a lawyer since 1907, and was serving in the Indian Army.\(^\text{12}\) In Australia, the quotation can be found on the memorial to C.W. Reginald Benson in St Anne’s Anglican Church in the community of Strathfield in Sydney. Erected by his parents, the plaque features the quotation on the bottom of the plaque. The centre of the plaque features an Australian soldier in a slouch hat and the rising sun, a symbol of the Australian Imperial Force to distinctly mark the memorial as Australian.\(^\text{13}\) Here, like the others, “dulce et decorum est” serves as an epitaph for the memorial.

The popularity of the line led it to be a target for anti-war sentiment in literature expressing disillusionment with the conflict. A version of the line is used in the 1930 film-\textit{All Quiet on the Western Front} when the main character Paul returns to his old classroom where his schoolmaster Kantorek has him speak to a new crop of students.

Paul expresses his thoughts about the old man sending him to war, ‘I heard you in here reciting that same old stuff, making more Iron Men, more young heroes. You still think it’s beautiful and sweet to die for your country don’t you.’ In Britain, the strongest critique of the line came from the war poet Wilfred Owen with one of his most famous poems, ‘Dulce et Decorum est.’ The poem, tells the story of wounded soldiers experiencing a gas attack and ends with Owen warning against the high rhetoric of Horace: ‘My friend, you would not tell with such high zest/ To children ardent for some desperate glory,/ The old Lie: Dulce et decorum est/ Pro patria mori.’ The critique by Owens has come to represent one of the key interpretations of the war by the British public as they saw a truthfulness in the futility and horror he described. His critique of Horace as ‘the old lie’ was picked up by those who opposed war during the 1960s and saw the language of such patriotism as dangerous.

Literary scholars Robin Nisbet and Niall Rudd caution against taking the line out of context of the larger poem and ideas of Roman society. They highlight that the individualism of society today does not reflect the attitude of other societies in the past, including those quoting it after the war. For memorial creators, the line speaks directly to the desire of personal memorials to express a secular ‘good death’ as the quotation praises deaths for the nation. Death in the name of the country meets the requirements of the secular ‘good death’ as the individual is represented as serving something higher than themselves.

14 All Quiet on the Western Front, directed by Lewis Milestone, (Los Angeles: Universal Studios, 1930).
The larger message of the poem from which ‘dulce et decorum est’ was taken insists that death is not a danger or something to fear, but rather an event that can be celebrated and part of what makes an individual a virtuous person. Taken as whole, the entire work functions as a guide and demonstration for how to achieve a secular good death that involves not only living virtuously, but also dying in service for the nation. Individuals with a classical education from many of Britain’s schools would have knowledge of Horace’s odes, however, it is not always clear they understood the larger context and were instead likely selecting the line due to its popularity and the sentiment it expresses. As Wilfred Owen would also have known the context of the line when he used it in his poem, his criticism of the war and society becomes far more biting as he attempts to show the reality of death in the war.

Even though Horace is now viewed as expressing an overly romantic view of war, in the years immediately after the war his words resonated with memorial creators. While Horace was the most popular, other ancient writers were similarly used to express the ideas of a secular ‘good death’. Greek writers and orators such as Homer, Demosthenes, and Simonides of Ceos all were quoted, while Roman writers Pliny the Younger, Ovid, and Juvenal were also used. Pliny the Younger is used the most in the database after Horace with his line, ‘Non sibi sed patriae’ (translates to ‘not for self, but for country’) which is part of the epitaph for the Roman general Lucius Verginius Rufus. The use of Pliny’s epitaph to Verginius on memorials such as the one to George Averil Read in St

---

Cronan’s Church of Ireland in Roscrea, Ireland, speaks to a similar message Horace was stating in his poem about virtue. Verginius was a political sponsor and supporter of Pliny in his youth who praised him as being ‘a model of a bygone age’ and for being a virtuous and honourable man. The memorial, a marble pulpit featuring a crusading knight and angels has a plaque identifying the memorial to Read with Pliny’s quote as the concluding line. (Image 111)

Even though Horace and other ancient writers are often interpreted as presenting an overly romantic vision of war, only a few of their quotations expressing glory or fame from fighting was used on memorials. The memorial to Thomas Markey in Yeronga Australia features a quote from Homer’s *The Iliad* ‘A glorious death is his who for his country falls’ before identifying the memorial to Markey. (Image 112) A similar quotation was used on the memorial to Gordon Daubeney Gresley Elton in St Mary the Virgin Church in Fryerning England. The quotation comes from Simonedes of Ceos’ poem to the dead of the Battle of Platea in the Greco-Persian Wars: ‘Yet being dead they die not: in the grave tho’ they be lying, these be the souls to whom high valour gave glory undying.’ The use of glory in these contexts speaks to having fought and earned glory through combat rather than through service. Through newspapers, first-hand accounts,

---

visual aids in photographs, films, and war trophies, society knew how the war was fought and how the battles were anything but episodes of heroic glory. The industrial war made it difficult to use the ancient world’s descriptions of combat as glorious.

While classical literature was widely available and popular, working-class schools placed greater emphasis on English literature. By focusing on English works, students not only had an easier time understanding them, but also were taught ideas of patriotism and national identity. These lessons carried into the choice for text on personal memorials, with key English writers like William Shakespeare, Geoffrey Chaucer, John Milton, and John Bunyan appearing frequently. One of the most popular lines was from Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*, ‘he loved honour more than he feared death.’ (Image 113) The quotation is a play on the original line spoken by the character Brutus ‘For let the gods so speed me as I love the name of honour more than I fear death.’ The play chronicles the assassination of Roman dictator Julius Caesar by Brutus, his friend Cassius, and other conspirators. The play was used by Shakespeare to speak to social questions of power and civic duty, which was exemplified in the character of Brutus who represented the ideals of Roman virtue in the play. Brutus is portrayed by Shakespeare as a character motivated by principle, driven by ideas of duty, honour, and the greater

---

The selection of the line by Brutus to feature on a war memorial works not only because by itself it has a strong connection to a good death, but also the context of the play speaks to propaganda surrounding the First World War. Such a sentiment towards Brutus draws comparison to the view of Germany, the Kaiser, and “kulture” from the war as propaganda presented a German victory as the spread of tyranny over Europe.

Alternatively, the use of Geoffrey Chaucer was meant to show the individual’s characteristics through ideas of chivalry and knighthood. Memorials used The Canterbury Tales line, ‘he was a verray parfit gentil knyght’ to describe the individual being memorialized. The line comes from the general prologue where one of the pilgrims on the way to the shrine of St Thomas of Becket is a crusading knight. (Image 114) The selection of Chaucer’s knight highlighted the chivalric qualities of the war dead and their crusading spirit. The line from the general prologue comes at the end of Chaucer’s introduction of the knight where his prowess as a knight and crusader was outlined. In the description of him, the knight is said to have fought in Egypt, Prussia, Lithuania, Russia, Spain, Morocco, Algeria, and Turkey. The knight in this introduction is cast as a chivalrous individual and in literary analysis of him, has been seen to represent the ideals of what a good knight should represent. In the story the knight tells to the narrator and the other pilgrims later in the book, known as “The Knight’s Tale”, Chaucer focuses on ideas

---


30 An example of a memorial with Chaucer’s line can be found at, Lieut Richard E.L. Treweeks, R.N., War Memorials Online, https://www.warmemorialsonline.org.uk/memorial/143667/.

of honour, chivalry, and proper rule in the figure of Duke Theseus, reinforcing the description of the figure in the prologue as a virtuous individual. As a crusader, Chaucer drew on contemporary episodes of crusades in Spain as part of the Reconquista, the crusade of King Peter of Cyprus in the capture of Alexandria, and in the Balkans where the Germanic Teutonic Order recruited knights to fight. The knight is shown to not only be a good soldier, but also a good Christian as his exploits never saw him fight other Christians, only fighting against the enemies of Christendom. The use of the crusader helps to justify the war and the individual being commemorated death. The quote equates the First World War to these knightly warriors, but it also helps individuals understand the conflict where their loved ones died away from home. The knight who crusades in far-flung places against the foes of Christendom can be reflected in the nature of the First World War soldier who left their homes to fight in other places around the world to defend the Empire.

Recent scholarly analysis of the texts highlights the way society has moved away from reading them as honourable examples of how to live. The war influenced the readings of Horace as the war poets rejected such patriotism and this cultural shift questions the patriotism seen Chaucer’s knight. In 1980, literary scholar Terry Jones argued that the knight represented not a valorous crusader, but rather a bloodthirsty mercenary who should be looked at with ridicule and disdain by readers. Stephen Rigby counters Jones by warning against de-historicizing the text. Rigby argues that even if the text promotes ideas that appear morally or ethically corrupt today, such sentiments should

not colour the way individuals in the past interpreted the text.  

Rigby’s point is vital for the interpretation of literary quotations in personal memorials. Each of these texts was selected to assist in how individuals wanted to ensure their loved ones were to be remembered, but also to provide them with an understanding for why and how they died.

---

Victorian and Edwardian Literature

Quotations from famous English authors on memorials were primarily drawn from Victorian and Edwardian writers across the nineteenth century. Romantic writers such as Lord Byron, Percy Shelley, William Wordsworth, and Lord Thomas Macaulay featured on many memorials. Lord Macaulay’s line ‘And how can man die better than facing fearful odds’, from Lays of Ancient Rome was often repeated.35 (Image 115) The line was taken from the first lay of Horatius which tells the story of the defence of the city of Rome by the lone warrior Horatius Cocles. The line is spoken by Horatius when he first appears in the story and declares his intention to defend the city from an invading army.36 The quote uses similar ideas as Horace’s more common ‘dulce et decorum est’ but has the distinction of being known in English rather than Latin. Macaulay was an education

35 An example of a memorial with Macauley’s line can be found at, Lieutenant F C E Clarke, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/52070.
reformer and historian who was well-known and read in Britain, introducing audiences to Roman and classical history through his works. Even after his death, Macaulay remained very popular as his works were repeatedly reprinted for new generations before the war.

The most popular quote from a nineteenth century work to appear on the memorials was ‘Though lost to sight to memory dear’, which was the title of a song by lyricist George Linley. In the song, the singer recalls time spent with a loved one and explains all that was good would be remembered. Linley’s authorship of the song is contested as the song’s origins are uncertain. In John Bartlett’s book that collected popular and common phrases and cited their sources, he explains the song was written by Linley for the singer Augustus Braham in London around 1830. Another song, however, published in 1880, under the same title claimed to be a reprint of the original song by someone named Ruthven Jenkyns who published the song in 1703 for the “Magazine for Mariners.” Bartlett states this alternative should be questioned as no magazine ever existed and Bartlett claims that the real Ruthven Jenkyns was living in California under a different name in 1882. This uncertainty can be explained because Linley often wrote poetry and lyrics in newspapers using a pseudonym. The song is not remembered as one of Linley’s best, and it was not featured in the biography of him by William Sparks in 1888.

The American version of the song appears to have been quite popular as it was featured in the Boston Globe in a running section titled “Poems You Ought To Know” but

---

37 Bartlett gave a more detailed explanation for the quote, ‘as so much inquiry has been made for the source of “Though lost to Sight, to Memory dear.”’ John Bartlett, Familiar Quotations: A Collection of Passages, Phrases, and Proverbs Traced to their Sources in Ancient and Modern Literature, Ninth Edition, (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1903), p. 587.

they also failed to attribute the song’s authorship to Linley.\textsuperscript{39} While the origins of the phrase is unclear, the popularity of it becomes clear when examining the use of the phrase in newspapers from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The many uses of the phrase, almost always in quotations, reveals that it had become well-known and used in a variety of publications. The use of the line on memorials demonstrates how individuals building memorials drew from literary sources that they knew and understood rather than for the artistic or literary power the author of the line had. Compared to other Romantic writers, Linley was not as well-known, and this specific line may or may not have actually been written by him. Yet it is the sentiment that mattered more than any other quality of the quote.

The most quoted nineteenth century writer was the Romantic poet William Wordsworth whose poems ‘Character of the Happy Warrior’, ‘London 1802’, and ‘Anticipation. October, 1803’ were used on many memorials. The final lines from the poem ‘Character of the Happy Warrior’ were Wordsworth’s most popular quotations: ‘This is the happy Warrior; this is He that every Man in arms should wish to be.’\textsuperscript{40} (Image 116) The poem was written at some point between 1805 and 1807 about Admiral Horatio Nelson who Wordsworth wrote about after learning of his death in the Battle of Trafalgar.\textsuperscript{41} The poem extolls the virtues of Nelson and the importance of national service. The use of the final line of the poem on the memorials elevates Nelson as dying a
‘good death’ as his example of service and sacrifice demonstrates for Wordsworth the ideal death for a soldier. In using the line, the memorials sought to equate the person being commemorated with one of Britain’s great military heroes whose death inspired national mourning and pride in his military career. The quotation is meant to showcase the place of the First World War death to that of earlier British military glory.

The use of poems about famous soldiers in British history was repeated with the use of Lord Alfred Tennyson. Tennyson, who died twenty-two years before the start of the war, was well known to both the soldiers who fought and their families’ creating memorials. As the poet laureate of Britain, Tennyson was very well read by the British people and his works feature regularly on memorials. His most quoted poem was his first major work as poet laureate ‘Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington’ written in 1852 after the death of former general and Prime Minister Arthur Wesley, the Duke of Wellington.\(^{42}\) The popularity of the line from the poem, ‘the path of duty is the way to glory,’ provides another link to the good death that mirrors much of the religious quotes in achieving a glorious afterlife.\(^{43}\) (Image 117) Here though, the glory is secular as it is duty to the country, in a manner similar to the Duke of Wellington, that is being celebrated and seen as the way to a glorious afterlife. Just like Wordsworth, the use of Tennyson’s poem to the Duke of Wellington helps to equate the death of the soldiers to one of Britain’s great military heroes.


Several other Tennyson poems do feature on memorials, though not with the same frequency as ‘Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington.’ However, his most famous and popular poem ‘Charge of the Light Brigade’ does not appear on any memorial in the database. The poem, a highly charged description of British cavalry in the Crimean War, was very popular, but was criticized during Tennyson’s life for being too bloodthirsty. The poem’s subject, the elite cavalry of the British army, and the celebration of what was military incompetence made the poem unworthy to be used in the wake of the First World War. Tennyson’s poem marked a shift in English poetry towards war as the growth of education and participation in war by the end of the nineteenth century saw regular soldiers as the subject of war poetry, and by the First World War the poets themselves.

While several of Tennyson’s Victorian contemporaries were used on memorials, they were never used in the same frequency. Writers such as Robert Louis Stevenson, St John Henry Newman, and Robert Browning, all saw their works quoted to replicate the idea of the good death. The most popular writers to be quoted on memorials were those who were popular in the years leading up to the war, and those still writing during the conflict. Some were war poets as they had enlisted and wrote during the war, others were on the home front writing about the conflict as established names in the literary world. Of those writing from the home front, the most popular were Sir Henry John Newbolt, William Arthur Dunkerley writing under the alias John Oxenham, Laurence Binyon, Arthur Campbell Ainger, and Rudyard Kipling.

Kipling was the most popular of these authors due to his informal position as the poet of the Empire. Kipling’s standing has been viewed with a critical eye in the

---

aftermath of the war as his work and language have been portrayed as jingoist and out of touch with the new movement of modernism of the inter-war period. Yet his status as the leading literary figure of not just Britain, but the Empire during the war led him to be called upon to work with the Imperial War Graves Commission in 1917 as a literary advisor and represent bereaved families. He provided advice on the inscriptions of memorials and provided the text for the stones of remembrance in the cemeteries, ‘Their name liveth for evermore,’ which came from Ecclesiasticus 44:14 and now has been closely associated with remembrance.

While Kipling wrote poetry through the war, the majority of memorials quoting him use the poem, ‘the dedication,’ the opening poem in his book, Barrack Room Ballads, which describes a soldier in heaven. The book was first published in 1892 and first put Kipling on the literary map as it contained his more famous poems of ‘Gunga Din’ and ‘Mandalay.’ The line most frequently used, ‘E’en as he trod that day to God so walked he from his birth, In simpleness and gentleness and honour and clean mirth’ describes the deceased as they entered heaven. The use of ‘the dedication’ over other poems by Kipling highlights the way the poem serves to present the ideal good death of the soldier, that he was worthy of entering heaven. The line itself borrows from ideas of predetermination as the soldier was destined to enter heaven, providing comfort that in

---

49 It was Barrack Room Ballads that saw his fame spread beyond just Britain, Harry Ricketts, ‘“Nine and sixty ways”: Kipling, ventriloquist poet’ in The Cambridge Companion to Rudyard Kipling, ed. Booth, p. 116.
hindsight their loved one was going to enter heaven. The quotation also serves to elevate the war dead above the nature of the conflict as they were literally clean of the horror of the war and remained pure.

‘The dedication’ was the most popular of Kipling’s works to be quoted on memorials, but it was not the only one used. A popular poem was one of his wartime poems ‘For All We Have and Are’ written in 1914 shortly after the start of the war. A call to arms, it extolls the reader to join the fight. The end of the poem is quoted on memorials, with Kipling asking the reader, ‘What stands if Freedom fall? Who dies if England live?’

Far more jingoistic in its language, the poem was written before Kipling’s son was killed in the war. The use of the poem, in particular the final line, ‘who dies if England live?’ was used on memorials to show the answer to the question in the individual being commemorated. The quote highlights what it is that the individual died for.

Although Kipling was more famous, John Oxenham and Sir Henry John Newbolt were quoted more frequently on memorials than Kipling, but not by a large margin. Newbolt’s work was popular in a similar vein as Kipling’s and has been treated by scholars as being militaristic and jingoist, causing him to fall under similar criticisms as Kipling. Newbolt’s language and sentiments coming out of the English public school system were lampooned by historians of the war, particularly his use of sporting metaphors to describe war. One of his most well-known poems ‘Vitaï Lampada’

encourages the view of war as a sport as the poem describes how playing cricket can prepare citizens for life as a soldier. The metaphors were used during the First World War as sports became a popular tool for recruitment and describing the conflict.

The most popular Newbolt poem, ‘Clifton Chapel,’ was a tribute to his alma mater and to imperial service. The poem describes a father returning to Clifton College and entering the school chapel with his son as they look at memorials to past students who fought and died in foreign countries. Examining a plaque, the narrator reads the Latin inscription, ‘Qui ante diem periiit sed miles sed pro patria,’ which was used on war memorials. (Image 119) Newbolt’s language is a variation on Horace’s more popular ‘dulce et decorum est’. The use of Newbolt over Horace displays a stronger attachment to British imperialism as Newbolt’s poem displays commemoration of imperial conflicts that was replicated by the memorials to the First World War. In both the poem and the memorials using the poem, the death of the soldier is celebrated as being done for their country, displaying a noble, worthy life, and the nobility of dying for their country. Newbolt’s language from before the war, like Kipling’s, was used as the sentiment it expressed was understood to provide meaning to the conflict, rather than criticism.

The analysis of both Newbolt and Kipling by literary scholars and historians to understand the First World War reveals similarities to the interpretations of Horace and Chaucer on honour, duty, and service to the nation. Both Newbolt and Kipling wrote in a

---

53 Ibid, pp. 80-81.
55 The Latin translates to, ‘Died before his time but he was a soldier and it was for his country.’ Henry Newbolt, ‘Clifton Chapel’, in Selected Poems of Henry Newbolt, edited by Patric Dickinson, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1981), pp. 63-64; An example of this Newbolt poem on a memorial can be seen at, King Memorial, Irish War Memorials, http://www.irishwarmemorials.ie/Memorials-Detail?memoId=410.
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style on subjects that spoke to a specific audience and ideal that has been seen in the decades after the war as being both outdated and dangerous. The dismissal of Newbolt as a poorer and lesser copy of Kipling ignores the way he was able to speak to a large segment of the population. Newbolt believed the best qualities of English society came from the public school and praised it for developing him and society. The public school was questioned and damaged by the war, but Newbolt, writing from his experiences before the war, was able to capture a sense of purpose, identity, and unity that attracted others to his work.56 Newbolt spoke to an older generation, the parents, and grandparents of those killed who experienced the life he writes about in his poems of public schools. The older generations use Newbolt as part of their creation of the lost generation, emphasizing the losses of public school students and alumni in the war. These losses represent the elites of society as public schools were restricted to those with economic and social power in British society.

Kipling on the other hand stood as the representative not of the elites, but rather of the regular soldier. The use of *Barrack-Room Ballads*, which speaks to the regular soldier’s experiences in their language, highlights the way Kipling sought to discuss war and the Empire.57 Kipling’s views of the Empire came under attack during his life and in the decades after his death. Scholars have often treated his writing as pieces of propaganda that helped push a racist and colonial view of inhabitants of the Empire, particularly in India, which Kipling was fascinated by. Scholars have argued that Kipling needs to be reassessed, and not simply taken at face value to understand the importance of the writings. Edward Said argued that Kipling, specifically his novel *Kim*, should not be

57 Bradshaw, ‘Kipling and war’ p. 81.
viewed as imperial propaganda, but rather as a contemporary reflection on how the English saw their Empire.\textsuperscript{58} With the end of the Empire in India, literary critics have reassessed Kipling as they were able to move past his political support of Empire to examine how his work reflected larger issues in Indian society, revealing that his politics were more complex than first understood.\textsuperscript{59} While elements of Kipling cannot be overlooked for their racism and imperialist attitudes, placing his works within the historical context reveals that the use of his poems reflects British society’s acceptance of these ideas.

The poetry of John Oxenham proved to be as popular as Newbolt and Kipling, but memorials quoted his war-time book \textit{All’s Well} instead of his pre-war work like memorials using Kipling and Newbolt. Oxenham was the pseudonym used by the journalist and novelist William Arthur Dunkerley.\textsuperscript{60} Oxenham was very popular as by 1918 with his works, often focusing on religious topics, having sold over seven and a half million copies.\textsuperscript{61} He published a collection of poetry, \textit{All’s Well}, in 1915 and contains several poems he wrote about the war. The subtitle of the book displays the purpose of writing the poems: ‘some helpful verse for these dark days of war.’\textsuperscript{62} The collection was

\begin{itemize}
\item John Oxenham, \textit{All’s Well!}, (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1915), frontispiece.
\end{itemize}
personal to him as the book was dedicated to his son Hugo was serving in the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders.63

While several of the poems in the book were used on memorials, the most popular was, ‘To You Who Have Lost.’ The poem seeks to console bereaved families by explaining that their sons were called to heaven and died for a higher cause. The line most used on memorials, ‘He died the noblest death a man may die, Fighting for God, and Right, and Liberty;-And such a death is Immortality’ blends religious and secular understandings of a good death.64 (Image 120) Unlike Kipling or Newbolt, Oxenham’s work lacks the same jingoistic language and sentiment. The lack of jingoism in ‘To You Who Have Lost’ was repeated in another of Oxenham’s poems ‘Lord, Save Their Souls Alive!’ stating ‘They sprang to Duty’s call, They stood the test’ that emphasizes the worthiness of the individual being commemorated.65

The language of Oxenham proved to be very popular during the war as Oxenham was quoted on more memorials in the database than Kipling, Wordsworth, or Chaucer. Yet, Oxenham has not been viewed as one of the key poets of the war. His works are not included in studies of literature from before the war, nor are they included in anthologies of First World War poetry as he has been ignored and forgotten by scholars of the conflict.66 Oxenham’s writings displayed sentiments that large sections of bereaved sought to express on memorials.

---

63 Ibid, p. 4.
64 John Oxenham, ‘To You Who Have Lost’ in All’s Well, p. 22; An example of a memorial with this line can be seen at, 2Lt C A B Elliot, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/4502.
One poet who has seen their work increase in popularity due to commemoration of the war is the poet Laurence Binyon. His poem, ‘For the Fallen’ written shortly after the start of the war first appeared in *The Times* on September 21st, 1914. While written so early in the war, unlike the work of Kipling, Newbolt or Oxenham, Binyon’s poem gained more popularity after the war’s end, becoming a regular fixture in commemoration ceremonies a century later.\(^6^7\) The most famous lines of the poem that are read during moments of remembrance, and were quoted on war memorials comes from the middle of the poem: ‘They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old: Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn. At the going down of the sun and in the morning We will remember them.’\(^6^8\) (Image 121) The popularity of Binyon’s poem was due to it straddling the older Edwardian and Victorian poetry like Oxenham, Kipling, and Newbolt, and the new modernist movement as Binyon was friends with many leading modernists such as William Butler Yeats and Ezra Pound.\(^6^9\) The poem met the needs of the older generation of mourners in its use of traditional language, but the style met the new literary needs of modernists. The poem elevated the actions of the mourners and demonstrated that they were fulfilling their own duty to remember and commemorate the war dead, giving their actions value and importance.

---


\(^6^8\) Ibid, p. 194; An example of a war memorial with this line see, Midshipman J R H Faed, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/44430.

\(^6^9\) Ibid, p. 188.
Binyon, along with all the poets mentioned so far, did not enlist, or fight in the war. While they had connections to the war, Kipling’s only son was killed, Oxenham’s
sons fought, and Binyon volunteered with the Red Cross, they did not have experiences of combat. Their appearance on memorials was balanced with a number of poets who had enlisted and fought during the war. The soldier poets in this section, however, were used less frequently than others previously mentioned. Perhaps surprisingly, famous poets like Wilfred Owen or Siegfried Sassoon were not quoted on any memorials in the database.

One soldier poet who featured on memorials was Rupert Brooke, a member of the Royal Naval Division. Brooke was involved in the defence of Belgian channel ports and saw action in the retreat from Antwerp in 1914. It was this experience in Belgium that inspired Brooke to write his series of war poems entitled, 1914. The series was made up of five poems reflecting his views on the war with the most famous being his poem, ‘The Soldier.’ The opening lines of the poem were the most frequently quoted: ‘If I should die, think only this of me: That there’s some corner of a foreign field That is for ever England.’ (Image 122) His work first became popular as war poetry when the Dean of St Paul’s Cathedral in London quoted them during his Easter Sermon in 1915. His fame became cemented when he died on the way to the Gallipoli Campaign in April of blood poisoning and his obituary was written by Winston Churchill.

Whereas Oxenham is now mostly forgotten, Brooke has become one of the renowned poets of the war and is included as one of the ‘war poets’ taught in British schools. He is included as representing the pre-war ideals of patriotism and, along with two other war poets, Siegfried Sassoon, and Wilfred Owen, is used to display the

---

disillusionment and disaster that the war turned out to be. In 2002, the Imperial War Museum created an exhibit on the major war poets, arguing that the twelve selected ‘were true to their different forms of experience’ over the more ‘bad, vapid poets’ of the war. Yet of the twelve poets selected by the museum, Brooke is the only one to be quoted on memorials in the database. The language of Brooke, particularly the jingoist nature, appealed to those dedicating memorials as it explained the death of their loved one and reflected their desire for a good death. It was particularly appealing considering the inability of families to have the bodies returned to them, as the poem gave them the satisfaction of knowing that their bodies had turned the soil English. Brooke seized on the sentiment of the good death and mourning customs in his language as he presented mourners with a satisfying view of the dead overseas. Other poets, particularly the twelve in the Imperial War Museums exhibit, failed to deliver mourners with the same appealing language that showed the good death. Owen and Sassoon displayed the anger and criticism of the war that mourners found hard to reconcile with their desires to portray their loved ones as having had a good death. Owen’s most famous poem, ‘Dulce et Decorum Est’, features a description of dying due to a gas attack as ‘guttering, choking, drowning.’ Such a description of death was the antithesis of the good death.

One of the biggest criticisms of Brooke was that he never saw the development of the mechanized and industrial war that the conflict turned into. The horrors of trench warfare were yet to be fully realized when he died. As such, Brooke has been viewed in a

---

similar vein as Oxenham and Kipling, poets of a previous generation with romantic patriotic rhetoric and as part of the lost generation of the elite and educated of British society. Yet Brooke also changed how the poetry of the First World War was interpreted and read. The popularity of his work, which exploded due to his death, made him part of the cannon of how the war was explained and ensured that the voices from the front had significant power over how the war was interpreted.

The lack of memorials in the database that contain similar language or sentiments as Sassoon and Owen demonstrates a significant limitation of the database. Many individuals expressed sentiments of resistance and anger over the deaths of their loved ones in the war, viewing the conflict as a waste. Resistance to the high diction used to commemorate the war dead and remember the war was expressed in different ways throughout the inter-war years. Alongside the poetry of Sassoon and Owen, the work of other artists like Marie Erich Remarque with his novel *All Quiet on the Western Front*, and Canadian painter Frederick Varley whose painting *For What?* revealed questions about the war and the result of the fighting. It is clear in the database that individuals who rejected the rhetoric around the war did not use personal memorials to express their thoughts.

The examination of two memorials to soldier-poets who developed disillusionment with the war effort reveal that when it came to building memorials, such

---

78 For some examples see, Ian McKay and Jamie Swift, *The Vimy Trap: Or, How We Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Great War*, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2016), pp. 83-104.
sentiments were not seen as appropriate on memorials. The rejection of disillusionment can be seen in the memorials to Thomas Michael Kettle and Hedd Wyn. Kettle’s memorial faced excessive scrutiny and has been well researched as an example of the difficulty of First World War commemoration in Ireland. Created by a group of Kettle’s friends, the memorial was set to be erected in the central Dublin park of St Stephen’s Green. The memorial was set to be erected in 1927 until objections over the use of the phrase, ‘killed in France’ on the memorial halted government support for the memorial in a public park. It was not until 1937 when the memorial was changed to ‘killed in Givenchy’ (the battle and town in France) that it was allowed to be unveiled. The memorial was not officially unveiled due to fears of backlash, which were not unfounded considering the destruction of several statues to former British Kings in central Dublin on Remembrance Day in 1928. The memorial does not identify Kettle as a soldier, simply giving his birth and death dates, and identifies him as ‘Poet. Essayist. Patriot.’ (Image 40)

The base of the memorial contains several lines from a poem he wrote to his daughter before his death. The poem, ‘The Gift of Love’ was Kettle’s attempt to explain to his daughter, and by extension Ireland, why an Irish nationalist fought for the British army in the war. The poem was written in 1916 after the Easter Rising in Dublin where Kettle and other nationalists who enlisted had watched fellow nationalists stage a revolt in the name of Irish independence. Nationalists like Kettle in the British army were

---

questioned for their loyalty to Ireland.\textsuperscript{83} The lines from the poem that are quoted on his memorial are Kettle’s justification for fighting and dying: ‘Died not for flag, nor King nor Emperor But for a dream born in a herdsman’s shed And for the secret Scripture of the poor.’\textsuperscript{84} Using Kettle’s poetry and words on his memorial helped to not only explain why he fought but to also give his memorial a political defence against Irish nationalists who attacked service in the British army. The quoted section seeks to refute criticism from the Irish Citizen Army who unveiled a banner over their headquarters of Liberty Hall during the war that read, ‘We serve neither King nor Kaiser but Ireland.’\textsuperscript{85} The poem by Kettle was a defence for his actions in serving in the war which was motivated by a genuine concern for the fate of small nations in European conflicts.\textsuperscript{86} Expressing disillusionment was not seen as an appropriate way to honour his memory and defend his actions in fighting for a cause Kettle did believe was right.

The statue of Hedd Wyn, located in the village of Trawsfynydd in Wales, speaks to an alternative interpretation of the war that clashes with recent interpretations of the war. Hedd Wyn, the bardic name of Ellis Humphrey Evans, was an established Welsh bard before the war but gained national fame after he won the National Eisteddfod in 1917, several months after his death in the Battle of Passchendaele in July. The bardic chair was draped in black to mourn his passing and efforts were made to commemorate

\textsuperscript{84} Kettle Memorial, Irish War Memorials, http://www.irishwarmemorials.ie/Memorials-Detail?memoid=169.
\textsuperscript{85} The Irish Citizen Army was a socialist armed force created by the leaders of the Irish Transport and General Workers Union that was based out of Liberty Hall in Dublin. They went on to form part of the rebellious Irish in the Easter Rising in 1916. Keogh Brothers Ltd. \textit{Irish Citizen Army lined up under banner “We serve neither King nor Kaiser”, outside Liberty Hall, crowds look on}, National Library of Ireland Keogh Photographic Collection, (1914-1923), KE 198.
him in his hometown. A national committee in Wales was established to commemorate him by having his bardic name engraved on his Imperial War Graves Commission headstone, and have a statue erected to him. As Hedd Wyn was a native Welsh speaker and all his poetry was written in Welsh, the desire to commemorate him as an example of Welsh service in the war was strong. The statue, erected in 1923, features an artistic depiction of Hedd Wyn as a shepherd, his career before the war, with the main plaque in Welsh and two plaques in the base in Welsh and English. On the Welsh plaque at the base was included Hedd Wyn’s poem ‘Nid a’n Ango’ (Ever Remembered) which was written earlier in the war to commemorate a friend who died fighting. The text translated to English is ‘His sacrifice will not be forgotten, His countenance so dear will ever be remembered Tho’ Germany’s Iron Fist by his blood is stained.’ (Image 123) The poem was written before Hedd Wyn had joined the army, which he did in 1917 as a conscript. Direct references to Germany on memorials was not unheard of, but was not the norm for memorials, revealing who was believed to be blamed for his death.

The selection of ‘Nid a’n Ango’ can be seen as an odd choice as Hedd Wyn was more famous for two other poems he wrote during the war. The first titled ‘Rhyfel’ (War) has been highlighted by scholars as an important poem describing the war in the Welsh language. His other poem, ‘Yr Arwr’ (The Hero) was the epic poem he won the

88 The translation is provided by Angela Gaffney in the footnote on, Ibid, p. 148; An alternative translation and information on the memorial can be found at, Hedd Wyn-Private E H Evans, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/7028.
90 On the centenary of Hedd Wyn’s death, he was selected by the National Library of Wales to be featured in an exhibit on Welsh poets who died in the war. The poem ‘Rhyfel’ was selected to be recorded by actors, highlighting its importance above all others. Fallen Poets: Edward Thomas & Hedd Wyn, The National
National Eisteddfod with in 1917. Both ‘Rhyfel’ and ‘Yr Arwr’ describe the war in critical terms. In ‘Rhyfel’, the poem describes the loss, bloodshed, and the horrors of the war in a manner that shows the narrators incapability of stopping it. While ‘Yr Arwr’ describes the sacrifice of the character ‘Arwr’, representing goodness and justice, for the character ‘Merch y Drycinoedd’, representing love and beauty who creates a better world. While these poems have been focused on in recent years during commemorations of Hedd Wyn, it is clear that in the poem ‘Nid a’n Ango’ was far more popular for commemoration in the immediate years after the war. Not only was it included on the memorial to Hedd Wyn, but it was also used on a number of Welsh community memorials in the towns of Llanddaniel, Llysfaen, and in Engelaim Chapel. The use of ‘Nid a’n Ango’ on memorials runs counter to modern interpretations of Hedd Wyn, particularly the film based on his life from 1992 that presented him as one of the anti-war poets, a Welsh contemporary of Owen and Sassoon.

Both Kettle and Hedd Wyn were established writers before the war, and they have been remembered because of their positions politically and culturally. Nigel Duncan

---


Ratcliffe Hunter was the opposite of these men, showcasing how soldiers who wrote romantic poetry could be quoted on their memorials. Nigel was an officer in the Royal Engineers, a recent graduate of the Royal Military College Woolwich, who grew up in Devon, near Dartmoor, and became fond of regularly walking through the moors. During his last visit home, Nigel wrote a poem comparing life to the River Lydd in Dartmoor. The poem was replicated by his family as a memorial to Nigel that was erected on Black Rock on the banks of the River Lydd. (Image 124)

The memorial and the poem were designed to make less of a political statement and instead focus on honouring and remembering Nigel. The location of the memorial was chosen due to the personal connection Nigel had to the site. This is not to say that St Stephen’s Green or Trawsfynydd were not important to Kettle or Hedd Wyn, rather the location in Dartmoor where access to the memorial is not easily achieved, reveals the memorial was designed less to make a public statement and more to personally honour Nigel. Along with the location, the text of the poem makes no references to the war or any political figures. The poem is rather an exploration of life and a rejection of the perceived futility of life seen in the moor stream. The final line of the poem sees Nigel

---

95 He was born in London as his father was a retired police officer from India. The family lived in Sidmouth Devon before moving to Oakhampton on the north end of Dartmoor. Nigel Hunter, Census Return of England and Wales, 1911, Setonica, Peasland Road Sidmouth Devon, NA RG14/12570, 1911; Nigel Duncan Ratcliffe Hunter Principal Probate Registry of 1918, Calendar of the Grants of Probate and Letters of Administration made in the Probate Registries of the High Court of Justice in England, p. 269.


97 Finding the memorial is not easy as it is not on a major hiking path or trail. While close to the town of Lydford, access is only by hiking and is not part of the National Park trails. A walking guide was created by The Guardian in 2009 to find the memorial and historic sites on the river, ‘Memories of the first world war, High Down, Devon,’ The Guardian, June 8th, 2009, https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2009/jun/08/devon-walking-guide.
reject a nihilistic view of life as he gazes across the moor at Widgery Cross, a local landmark erected in 1887 to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of Queen Victoria. The cross, rising above the moor and breaking the lull of the stream suggests a higher purpose to life seen in religion, but also in service to the nation as the cross was erected to commemorate the Queen. The memorial to Nigel was featured in the Devon edition of ‘The King’s England’ by Arthur Mee, a guide on the different counties of England for travellers. The inclusion of the memorial in the guide ensured that the memorial was to be visited and remembered by visitors to the town of Lydford and Dartmoor. Nigel’s poem was by no means ground-breaking and could be seen in the category of ‘vapid poets’ in the eyes of the Imperial War Museum. The placement of the memorial and the use of the poem demonstrate the value of all writers about the war as it became an important tool for Nigel’s family to remember him.
Australian Literature

Of the poets explored in this chapter so far, the majority have been British, and except for Tom Kettle and Hedd Wyn, English. The popularity of English writers over others can be explained by the spread of British educational practices, the continued migration of British citizens in settler colonialism, and the reinforcement of British culture across the Empire. Historically significant writers such as Shakespeare or Tennyson were taught in schools throughout the Empire, ensuring their familiarity to people across the globe. The power of the metropole is most obvious when examining the use of authors who wrote in the years before the war as they dominate the works quoted for memorials outside of England. The importance of poetry, used predominantly on the memorials, was significant during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in England as poets displayed the ideals of ‘England’ in their work. Drawing influence from the literature of England, the other nations drew from English writers to create their memorials. When examining the number English writers are quoted in, Binyon is the most popular, with his poetry quoted on memorials in Australia, Canada, England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.\(^{100}\)

Amongst the three Dominions, the use of homegrown poets is more common in Canada than in New Zealand and Australia. New Zealand has the smallest number of literary quotes on its memorials, and all of them are from non-New Zealanders. In Australia, the only writer quoted on memorials with ties to their nation is Adam Lindsay Gordon. Gordon was a well-known Australian poet who wrote several books of poetry.

\(^{100}\) The only writer to appear in all the nations of this study is Horace.
whilst working as a horse-breaker and steeplechaser in Australia in the mid-nineteenth century. His popularity grew after his suicide in 1870 and he reached his height of popularity in the decades before the First World War. He became so well-known across the Empire that he had a bust unveiled to him in Westminster Abbey in the Poet’s Corner thanks to lobbying by several British poets, including Kipling.101 His poetry is seen as an important contribution to Australian literature as his work helped bridge Victorian Romanticism with the frontier bush lifestyle that was seen as Australia in the nineteenth century, turning him into an icon of Australia.102

Two of Gordon’s poems are quoted on several memorials. The first poem, entitled ‘Gone’ features a statue of a dead man who speaks of death and the ways that one can die. The line used from the poem speaks of battle: ‘But few who have heard their death-knell roll, From the cannon’s lips where they faced the foe, Have fallen as stout and steady of soul As that dead man gone where we all must go.’103 The poem was quoted on the memorial to Percy Walter Foster in the village of Lucindale, South Australia. The use of the poem by Gordon augments another section of the memorial that identifies Percy as an ‘ANZAC’ highlighting the strong Australian national sentiment in the memorial.104

(Image 125) A second poem used was ‘Fytte II-By Flood and Field’ from the collection *Ye Wearie Wayfarer. Hys Ballad. In Eight Fyttes*, using the line ‘One of many who

102 The commemoration of Gordon reached it’s peak in the 1930s but continues today as one of the most important Australian poets in their history. Brigid Magner, Locating Australian Literary Memory, (London: Anthem Press, 2020), pp. 17.
perished, not in vain, As a type of our chivalry.’ In the poem, Gordon recalls a fox hunt from his youth in England where he rode with a man who would be killed during the charge of the Light Brigade during the Crimean War. The quote from the poem recalls how the man died in the battle.\(^{105}\)

A memorial that uses the line from ‘Fytte II’ can be found in England for an Australian, Hussey Burge George MacCartney. Hussey was born in Melbourne in 1875 and was educated in Britain, graduating from Trinity College, Cambridge in 1896. He served in the South African War as a Lieutenant from 1899-1902 and in 1912 he retired a Captain, settling on Vancouver Island in Canada. On the outbreak of the war he re-enlisted with his old regiment, the Royal Fusiliers and was killed in action on June 25\(^{th}\), 1915.\(^{106}\) His sister, Jane Elizabeth Catherine Hays, was living in Radipole, Dorsetshire England and as his next-of-kin, had his battlefield cross erected in St Annes Church with a plaque underneath which included Gordon’s poem.\(^{107}\) (Image 126) The inclusion of Gordon’s poem on the memorial helps place MacCartney back with the country of his birth, even though he never lived in Australia again after leaving for school. The inclusion of the poem by the Australian poet was designed to ensure his roots were not lost. Today though, the lack of knowledge about Gordon, particularly outside of Australia, means that the connection between the lines and MacCartney to Australia are lost to viewers who come across the memorial.

Canadian Literature

While Gordon is the only Australian poet to feature on memorials, three Canadian poets have their works included on memorials: John McCrae, Robert Service, and Robert Stead. The most famous of the three with regards to the First World War was Lieutenant Colonel John McCrae and his famous poem *In Flanders Fields*. McCrae was a doctor born in Guelph, Ontario who served with the Canadian forces in South Africa before becoming a professor at McGill University in Montreal. In his spare time, he took up writing and poetry becoming involved with the Pen and Pencil Club in Montreal, which included leading Canadian authors Stephen Leacock and Andrew Macphail. He re-enlisted in 1914 following the outbreak of war, serving in France as a doctor in the Royal

---

Canadian Army Medical Corps. His famous poem was written during the war, marking him as a war poet like Rupert Brooke, Tom Kettle, Hedd Wyn, and Nigel Hunter.

McCrae’s poem, *In Flanders Fields*, garnered attention during the war and became a useful tool for both remembrance and recruitment. During the war, the poem came to be used for both patriotic and commercial benefits, but it was McCrae’s death in 1918 that saw him and his poem elevated to new heights. The use of the poppy in the poem helped solidify the flower as a symbol of the war, inspiring the post-war use of the poppy as a marker of remembrance.109 *In Flanders Fields* has become established as one of the most important poems from the First World War, resting alongside *For The Fallen* by Binyon, and *The Soldier* by Brooke.

McCrae entered into the collective memory of the First World War, particularly in Canada but also across the Empire with the wearing of the poppy on Remembrance Day. Yet, in the private memory of the war and the use of literature on individual memorials, McCrae did not have the same impact as other writers. McCrae is only quoted on memorials in Canada, unlike Binyon who appeared on memorials across Great Britain and in Canada and Australia. When examining the memorials that quote McCrae, only those with close associations to McCrae and individuals remembered in public settings use his poetry. A memorial to Alexis Hennum Helmer, whose death in 1915 helped inspire McCrae to write *In Flanders Fields*, features the use of McCrae’s poem. Remembered in Ottawa, Helmer has two memorials erected to him in the city. The first is in Dominion-Chalmers United Church, where the Helmer family were congregants, and

---

109 The myriad of uses of the poem and its imagery across Canada, the United States and the British Empire can be found here, Jonathan F. Vance, ‘A Moment’s Perfection,’ in *In Flanders Fields 100 Years*, pp. 189-200.
the second is in Lisgar Collegiate Institute, the high school Helmer attended.\textsuperscript{110} (Image 127 and 128) The older of the two plaques in Dominion-Chalmers United Church does not refer to McCrae’s poem or that Helmer was the inspiration for it. The second memorial was erected in 2001 by the Lisgar Alumni Association and while remembering Helmer as a Lisgar alumnus, the plaque places significant emphasis on the poem as the largest text on the plaque is ‘In Flanders Fields’.

The memorial to George Harold Baker, located in the Centre Block of the Canadian House of Commons, features McCrae’s poem prominently. Baker was elected as an MP in 1911 for the County of Brome in Quebec. He had served in the militia before the war and was given command of the 5\textsuperscript{th} Mounted Rifles in January 1915.\textsuperscript{111} Baker was the only Canadian MP to be killed in action, dying during the Battle of Mount Sorrel on June 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1916.\textsuperscript{112} In 1919, the Canadian Senate proposed erecting a memorial to Baker in Parliament. During this time, the Canadian government was in the process of rebuilding the Centre Block of the Houses of Parliament after a fire in 1916 had destroyed the original structure. The newly reconstructed building that housed the House of Commons and the Senate Chamber was to serve as a memorial to Canadians in the First World War.\textsuperscript{113}


\bibitem{112} Another Canadian MP, Samuel Simpson Sharpe, committed suicide after serving on the front. More on him will be discussed in Chapter 4.

\bibitem{113} See the text of the Confederation Column that marked the 50\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of confederation to see the link between the building and the First World War. ‘Column,’ History, Arts and Architecture, Parliament of Canada,
Baker’s statue was unveiled in 1924 by his former commander, Governor-General Lord Byng, and Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King. Sculpted by Robert Tait McKenzie, the statue features Baker in full uniform standing with his greatcoat over his arm as he looks out over the House of Commons foyer. Carved into the walls and on brass plaques are quotes commemorating Baker. Carved in stone to the left is a Biblical quote from 2 Maccabees 6:31, ‘And thus this man died leaving his death for an example of a noble courage and a memorial of virtue not only unto young men but unto all his nation’ and on the right is a quote from *In Flanders Fields*, ‘To you from failing hands we throw the torch. Be yours to hold it high. If ye break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep though poppies blow in Flanders Fields.’ The inclusion of these two speaks to the way the statue was portrayed by government officials. A memorial to Baker, it was also designed to serve as a memorial to all Canadians killed in the war, and act as a reminder to future generations of service to the country. The plaques contain the inscription on the base of the memorial and the two wall carvings in both English and French.

---

116 This sentiment was displayed in Prime Minister King’s speech during the unveiling. ‘Nation Pays Tribute To Memory of Late Lieut. Col. Baker, M.P. When Statue Was Unveiled in House,’ *The Ottawa Citizen*, February 29th, 1924, pp. 1 and 3.
117 The French plaque has the quote from *In Flanders Fields* not directly but in the interpretation that was done by Jean Parizeau. Lieutenant-Colonel George Harold Baker Statue, Canadian Military Memorials Database, https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/memorials/national-inventory-canadian-memorials/details/8992; << In Flanders’ Fields>> (Au champ d’honneur), Musée Canadien de la Guerre, https://www.museedelaguerre.ca/apprendre/au-champ-dhonneur/.
The use of *In Flanders Fields* on Baker’s memorial is interesting as it is not clear if it was originally inscribed alongside the statue. In an article from *The Ottawa Citizen* written about the unveiling, the author explains the inscription carved in stone to the right of the statue was ‘He gave his earthly life to such matter as he set great store by, the honour of his country and his home.’ The origin of that quote is not known, but it also appeared on the memorial to English officer Edward Wyndham Tennant in Salisbury Cathedral in 1920. The alternative inscription was quoted again as being on the wall in a newspaper article about Baker published in Sherbrooke, Quebec in 1984. In the official Parliamentary Memoir on Baker, a photograph of the memorial shows the quote from *In Flanders Fields* and in the speech by Prime Minster King, all of which was not quoted by newspapers, he makes reference to the quote from *In Flanders Fields*. The Parliamentary Memoir includes the article from *The Ottawa Citizen* quoting the other inscription. The confusion over the inscription is not clear, but the fact that *In Flanders Fields* was up against another poem for the memorial highlights the difficulty the poem had with Canadians to represent an individual on a memorial.

The final memorial in the database to feature McCrae’s poem is a memorial to him. McCrae is one of the most commemorated Canadian soldiers. In Canada, he features on the names of four schools, his birthplace is a national historic site, and he has two identical statues located in Ottawa and his hometown of Guelph, Ontario to note just a

---

118 ‘Nation Pays Tribute To Memory of Late Lieut. Col. Baker, M.P. When Statue Was Unveiled in House,’ *The Ottawa Citizen*, February 29th, 1924, p. 3.
120 Bernard Epps, ‘George Harold Baker: In the honor of his country,’ *The Record*, February 22nd, 1984, p. 11.
few. Of all the memorials to McCrae though, only three were constructed before the Second World War, with the remainder dedicated more recently. He was included in the stained glass window memorial in McGill University alongside two other doctors from the university who died in the war, Roland Playfair Campbell and Henry Brydges Yates. In the memorial, *In Flanders Fields* is quoted and the poppy motif is used across all the windows. (Image 130)

The final two memorials are in his hometown of Guelph. The first is a plaque under the family window in St Andrews Presbyterian Church. The plaque commemorates his parents first and was erected upon their deaths. The plaque does make specific reference to his fame as the author of *In Flanders Fields* but does not quote any lines from the poem. (Image 131) The family memorial is the only one to have any references to *In Flanders Fields*. The second memorial in Guelph, was erected in his old high school, the Guelph Collegiate Vocational Institute, and features poetry by McCrae, but not his most famous work. The brass plaque, unveiled in 1919, features a brief biography of McCrae, including the years he attended the school. The base of the plaque features several lines of poetry by McCrae, ‘Remain the well-wrought deed in honour done, The dole for Christ’s dear sake, the words that fall In kindliness upon some

---

123 A search for John McCrae in the Canadian Military Memorials Database reveals 36 memorials across Canada are either to him or use his poetry on the memorials. Search Results for John McCrae, Canadian Military Memorials Database.

124 McCrae House, the birthplace of John McCrae was only turned into a memorial in 1946 and was not named a national historic site until 1966. McCrae House Memorial, City of Guelph, https://guelph.ca/living/arts-and-culture/public-art/public-art-collection/mccrae-house-memorial-2/.


127 ‘Memorial To War Poet Is Unveiled’, *The Windsor Star*, November 14th, 1919, p. 21.
outcast one, - They seemed so little: now they are my all.\textsuperscript{128} (Image 132) The lines are from a poem he wrote in 1904 titled, \textit{Upon Watts’ Picture}, "\textit{Sic Transit}".\textsuperscript{129} The poem was McCrae’s interpretation of the painting \textit{Sic Transit} by British artist George Frederic Watts. The painting and the poem both reflect the futility of earthly gains as they do not accompany you after death.\textsuperscript{130} McCrae goes one step further than Watts in rather than presenting a bleak end to human activity, he displays the redemption of not glory but honour in helping others that becomes the ‘all’ at the end of the poem. The selection of this poem over his more famous work even by 1919, displays a lack of power that \textit{In Flanders Fields} had for personal commemoration. Unlike \textit{Upon Watts’ Picture} which ends with a redemptive quality, \textit{In Flanders Fields} does not show if the dead died a good death. It fails to provide closure as it functions more as a call to arms, which is why it is popular for collective commemoration as it pushes for a never-ending remembrance of the dead but never gives them closure.

The popularity of \textit{In Flanders Fields} also helped to dissuade individuals from quoting it on personal memorials. The poem had reached a famous status during the war and remained popular after the conflict with it featuring regularly during commemorative ceremonies and other rituals of remembrance. Personal memorials may have moved away from using the poem due to the power it held in collective remembrance, as it held less

\textsuperscript{129} A copy of the poem was included in the edited collection of his work published after his death by his friend, Joh McCrae, \textit{In Flanders Fields and Other Poems by Lieut-Col John McCrae, M.D. with An Essay in Character by Sir Andrew Macphail}, ed. Sir Andrew Macphail, (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1919), pp. 36-37.
\textsuperscript{130} The painting is held by the Tate Museum in Britain, the poem most likely was written upon the death of Watts who passed away in 1904, George Frederic Watts, \textit{Sic Transit}, 1891-2, Tate Museum, https://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/watts-sic-transit-n01638.
power to mean something significant to the individual and rather was a symbol of collective sacrifice and loss. Such symbolism speaks to its use on the Baker memorial in the Canadian House of Commons where Baker was meant to represent the nation. For families and friends wishing to mourn a loved one with a personal memorial, using *In Flanders Fields* would not have spoken to their private memory of the war, but the collective.

The second Canadian poet used on memorials was Westerner Robert J.C. Stead. Based out of Calgary, Alberta he made a name for himself for his popular novels and poetry about life on the Canadian prairies. The war played a major role in Stead’s work as he published a collection of poetry inspired by the war in 1918 and used the war as a backdrop for several novels after the war. The memorials that quote Stead are drawn from his poems on the war, in particular *He Sleeps in Flanders*. The poem tells of the war dead in Flanders, the condition of their bodies, and how they died. The third stanza of the poem was quoted on memorials: ‘He saw a nation in her need; He heard the cause of Honour plead; He heard the call, he gave it heed, And now he sleeps in Flanders.’

Despite being the poet of the Canadian prairies, no memorial in Western Canada uses Stead on a memorial. Stead appears on two memorials, one in Newfoundland (which did not become part of Canada until 1949) and the other in Scotland. In Newfoundland, the memorial to Abel Halliday, a member of the Newfoundland Regiment who was killed on April 14th, 1917, can be found in the cemetery of the Old United Church in the village

---

of Britannia.\textsuperscript{133} (Image 133) In Scotland, Stead is quoted on the memorial to Edward Maxwell Salvesen in St Giles Cathedral in Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{134} (Image 134) The Salvesen memorial does not use the full quote of Stead’s poem like Halliday’s does and instead cuts out the final line of ‘And now he sleeps in Flanders’ as Salvesen was killed in the Gallipoli Campaign. The use of Stead on both these memorials reveals the spread of his work beyond his traditional Western Canadian experience as it speaks to the larger and shared experience of the war across the Atlantic Ocean.

The third Canadian poet quoted on memorials is Robert William Service. Service had made his name writing poetry about the Klondike Goldrush in the Yukon and by the start of the war was well known across Canada and the Empire, earning the nickname ‘the Canadian Kipling.’\textsuperscript{135} He worked as an ambulance driver during the early years of the war, during which time he wrote a collection of war poems titled, \textit{Rhymes of a Red Cross Man}. The collection was dedicated in memory of his younger brother Albert Nivian Parker Service who had been killed in action in August 1916 whilst serving with the Canadian Expeditionary Force.\textsuperscript{136} A memorial to Albert was presented to the Thunder Bay Military Museum by Service’s granddaughter, Anne Longepe, who held onto her grandfather’s archives in Paris, France. The memorial included photographs of Albert

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{133} On records the name is spelt ‘Haliday’, but the memorial spells it ‘Halliday’, Halliday Memorial, Canadian Military Memorials Database, https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/memorials/national-inventory-canadian-memorials/details/2097.
  \item \textsuperscript{134} Second Lieutenant E M Salvesen, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/44609; An image of the memorial can be found here, Edward Maxwell Salvesen, War Memorials Online, https://www.warmemorialsonline.org.uk/memorial/132681/.
\end{itemize}
along with original covers of the book *Rhymes of a Red Cross Man*.137 (Image 135) Service is only quoted on one memorial in Sydney Nova Scotia to Aubrey MacKinnon. The stained-glass window to MacKinnon quotes the poem ‘Son’ from *Rhymes of a Red Cross Man*: ‘how worthier could he die?’ 138 (Image 136) The poem tells the story of an English parent recalling the loss of their son in the war and finding closure in the cause for which they died. While not as popular as other Canadian poets, Service displays the need for quotations that help provide not just a sense of purpose, but a sense of closure for mourners, demonstrating that their deaths were worthy.

Scottish Literature

The lack of non-English writers from the British Isles reveals the heavy reliance and dominance of English culture on commemoration. Other than Thomas Kettle and Hedd Wyn, no other poets from Ireland or Wales were quoted for war memorials. In
Ireland, the political crisis saw many writers become part of either the unionist or nationalist camps, even if they had written works mourning the losses of the First World War. William Butler Yeats for example, wrote in 1918 a poem in memory of Robert Gregory, the son of his friend and patron Lady Gregory who was a pilot in the RAF. The poem, *An Irish Airman Foresees His Death*, was published in 1919 alongside a poem directed to Robert, *In Memory of Major Robert Gregory*, in the same collection as his 1916 poem *On Being Asked For A War Poem* where he rejects writing about the war. In Wales, war memorials in English used the same authors as English memorials. Welsh-language memorials often used the same phrases as their English counterparts and when quoting, they used Hedd Wyn or the Welsh national anthem.

More Scottish authors are quoted but not in the same numbers as English poets. Famous Scottish poets who are often described as national symbols were rarely used on personal memorials. Robert Burns is not quoted on any memorial and Sir Walter Scott only appears on one. The memorial Scott is quoted on is not in Scotland, but in Queanbeyan, New South Wales, Australia, to William Andrew Morton. (Image 137) The most quoted Scottish poet was Scott’s contemporary, Thomas Campbell. Born in

---

139 The National Library of Ireland posted the original version of the poem, written as an elegy to Lady Gregory by Yeats on news of her son’s death. He later reworked it to the published version. The author was able to view the letter during an exhibition to Yeats in 2015 at the NLI. The exhibit can be viewed online at, Yeats: The Life and Works of William Butler Yeats, NLI, https://www.nli.ie/en/udlist/current-exhibitions.aspx?article=827fddf7-0013-4202-b9f1-f2eedf3b3af8.


141 Where Welsh was used it was not always clear if it was a quote from a Welsh writer or not due to the fact the author does not speak Welsh. A fluent Welsh speaker may refute these claims upon looking at the data collected but these claims are based on the work of, Angela Gaffney, *Aftermath: Remembering the Great War in Wales*, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1998), pp. 147-148.

Glasgow, Campbell left Scotland to work in London where he made a name for himself as a journalist and poet.\textsuperscript{143} His status as a Scottish poet can be questioned as he spent most of his adult life in England.\textsuperscript{144} Campbell’s poem, \textit{Hallowed Ground}, published in 1825, was the only work quoted on memorials using: ‘to live in hearts we leave behind is not to die.’\textsuperscript{145} Like Scott, Campbell is not quoted on any memorial in Scotland but appears on memorials in England, Ireland, and Canada.\textsuperscript{146} (Image 138 and 139) The use of Campbell does not speak to Scottishness. The line highlights the importance of remembrance for next-of-kin as the act of remembrance ensures that the dead are still alive and playing an important role in the world.

After Campbell, the most quoted Scottish writer was Robert Louis Stevenson. A well-known author of novels and adventure stories, Stevenson did write poetry and published several collections. While his most well-known poems were for children, he published two books of more serious poetry titled \textit{Underwoods Books 1 and 2}. It was the twenty-eighth poem of \textit{Underwoods Book 1} that was quoted on memorials. The poem, titled \textit{In Memoriam F.A.S}. was written in Davos, Switzerland, in 1881 and recalls the happy life of a boy who recently died.\textsuperscript{147} Several lines were used on memorials, ‘Yours

\textsuperscript{143} Thomas Campbell, Britannica Academic, https://academic.eb.com/levels/collegiate/article/Thomas-Campbell/19856.
the pang, but his, O his, the undiminished undecaying gladness, undeparted dream’ (Image 140) and, ‘took his fill of music, joy of thought and seeing, came and stayed and went, nor ever ceased to smile.¹⁴⁸ (Image 141) Both lines celebrate the life of the individual being commemorated with the first placing the individual as moving to a better place away from the pain of loss being felt by erecting the memorial.

The final Scottish writer quoted on memorials uses imagery that is distinctly Scottish. William Gillespie was a minister in the Church of Scotland who also wrote poetry as he was active in Scottish literary circles in the late 18th and early 19th centuries as a friend of Robert Burns. His poem, *The Highlander*, was used on a memorial as an epitaph. The poem reflected his activities in preserving Scottish culture and the line speaks to a symbol of Scotland: ‘his battles are fought, and his march it is ended, the sound of the bagpipe shall wake him no more.’¹⁴⁹ Only one memorial features Gillespie and that is the memorial to John Murray. The memorial was erected by his family shortly after the war and is located on the side of Loch Ken, in what is now part of Galloway Forest Park. The memorial is a large stone cross, designed to be viewed by the family that lived on the other side of the Loch as John’s father was Rev. George Murray of Balmaclellan.¹⁵⁰ (Image 142) The base of the memorial has the quote by Gillespie,

---

¹⁴⁸ The first quote can be found on a memorial at, Lieutenant A R MacLeod, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/26489; The second quote can be found on a memorial at, Captain J E Crombie, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/5849.
marking the rest that Murray was now at, though buried in Belgium instead of Scotland.\footnote{John Murray has no known grave and was listed on the Tyne Cot Memorial. Second Lieutenant J Murray, Commonwealth War Graves Commission Casualty Details, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/casualty-details/831856/J%20MURRAY/}  

The lack of memorials in Scotland that speak to the Scottish nationalist character or draw from authors who use distinctly Scottish language reveals the way Scots did not see the conflict as a space to express nationalist thought. Instead, major literary quotes used by Scots on their memorials were more ambiguous in their references to country and service, with Horace being the most popular but others quoting Binyon, Newbolt, and Shakespeare. Yet in each of these cases when English writers are used, they do not use quotes with ‘England’ and instead use the more generic ‘country’. Both Scottish and Welsh quotations have a lack of national qualities to them, highlighting the way the war was perceived as British.
Foreign Literature

Other than the works of ancient Greeks and Romans, only a few non-British pieces of literature were featured on memorials. One of the only two female writers quoted on memorials was American Julia Louise Woodruff. She was an active member of the Episcopalian church in the United States, writing under the pseudonym of W.M.L. Jay. She came to the attention of the British public when her poem *Harvest Home* was published a year after her death in 1909 in *The Sunday at Home* by the Religious Tract Society of London. Published in May 1910, her poem was quoted on memorials using the line, ‘Out of the strain of the Doing, Into the race of the Done.’ A fellow American, Theodore O’Hara, was quoted with his poem *Bivouac of the Dead*. The poem, written before the American Civil War gained prominence due to its widespread use on memorials to the Civil War, particularly by the 1880s when it was officially sanctioned

---


by the US government and military to be used in national cemeteries. The line most quoted, ‘In fame’s eternal camping ground their silent tents are spread,’ universally spoke to soldiers and to the idea of a good death. (Image 143)

A few non-English language works, besides the ancient poets and Hedd Wyn, appear on memorials. Two foreign languages sources reveal the fascination of British society with Eastern cultures, in these cases Persia and India. The first source was the Persian philosopher, mathematician, and poet Omar ibn Ibrahim al-Khayyam, colloquially known as Omar Khayyam who lived between 1048-1131. Known for his contributions to mathematics, Omar Khayyam became popular due to a series of poems in Arabic called rubaiyat’s. The popularity of Omar Khayyam in British and American society came in the 1870s when a translated collection of his rubaiyat’s by Edward FitzGerald became popular. There were seventy-five rubaiyat’s in Omar Khayyam’s collection and they covered a wide variety of topics. The thirty-second rubaiyat is quoted on a memorial, ‘There was a Door to which I found no Key: There was a Veil past which I could not see: Some little Talk awhile of Me and Thee There seemed – and then no more of Thee and Me.’ The memorial is to Charles Willington Lane in St Patrick’s Church of Ireland in Slane co. Meath. Lane’s memorial features a large stained-glass window of him in uniform in front of his troops and a plaque next to the window that

156 So many are attributed to him, and many after his death it is not clear if Omar Khayyam wrote some or any of ‘his’ rubaiyat’s, Edward FitzGerald, *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*, ed. Daniel Karlin, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. xii-xxiii.
157 The reason for its popularity is debated considering FitzGerald failed to gain any traction when it was first published, Ibid, pp. xxiv-xxv.
158 Ibid, p. 32.
features the Omar Khayyam rubaiyat. Omar Khayyam may have been quoted due to text being sentimental to the family. The use of a Persian poet was an interesting choice considering Lane’s career as he was born in India and was a career military officer. He joined the British army in 1908 and he served in several colonial posts including in Egypt, West Africa, and India. The inclusion of Rudyard Kipling’s line, ‘There is but one task for all – One life for each to give. What stands if Freedom fall? Who dies if England live?’ on the stained-glass window highlights the cause Lane died for, while Omar Khayyam signals the grief Lane’s family felt on his death.

Another foreign language source for a memorial comes from Sir Edwin Arnold’s interpretation of the Hindu holy text Bhagavad Gita in *The Song Celestial*. Arnold became famous for his work on religion, particularly Buddhism and Hinduism as his translations and poetry introduced several of these faiths important texts to Britain and the West in general. His most famous work, *The Light of Asia*, which sought to tell the history and story of Buddhism, garnered him great fame, wealth, and controversy. His translation of the Bhagavad Gita in 1885 helped bring Hinduism to the fore in the same way that Buddhism was the focus of *The Light of Asia*. However, Arnold’s ‘translation’ of these texts was full of re-interpretations to make them more appealing to a popular reading audience. Arnold often did this by using rhetoric Western audiences were used to by drawing on Christian and Greek stories to make them understood. Using Arnold’s

translation, the memorial to Launcelot Russell Gubbins in St Luke’s Church in Formby England uses the line ‘To die in performing duty is no ill.’¹⁶⁴ The line displayed the desire to speak of the good death and emphasizes the worthiness of soldiering. The selection of Arnold for the memorial had little to do with Gubbins’ life or any connection to India. Gubbins was an officer with the New Zealand Expeditionary Force, though he enlisted under a fake name, James Lance, and had been working on a plantation in the Cook Islands before the war.¹⁶⁵ His parents likely chose the text because of its popularity in England before the war.

Several memorials quoting foreign poets kept the quotations in the original language. The memorial to John Somerled Thorpe kept the original French, ‘sans peur et sans reproche’ translating to ‘without fear and above reproach.’ The quote comes from the epitaph for a French medieval knight, Pierre du Terrail the Chevalier de Bayard who became known as the knight ‘sans peur et sans reproche.’¹⁶⁶ Stories of Bayard had been circulating during the nineteenth century, and just before the war he was the subject of an adventure story by British Lieutenant-Colonel Andrew Charles Parker Haggard.¹⁶⁷ The use of Bayard on memorials speaks to the desire to see the war a chivalrous, and the memorials using the line elevated the individual to a higher place of honour. The memorial has the line above a body wrapped in cloth with swords, drums, and a laurel

¹⁶⁵ Gubbins will be explored further in the next chapter on representations of the Empire in the memorials, Lance, James – [a.k.a. Gubbins, Launcelot Russell] – WW1 2/746- Army, Archives New Zealand, Military Personnel Files R118058614.
¹⁶⁷ When introduced in the book he is given the title of ‘sans peur et sans reproche’ and the book ends with his death and his title being repeated, Andrew Charles Parker Haggard, The Romance of Bayard, (Toronto: McClelland & Goodchild, between 1908 and 1915), p. 14 and 312.
wreath laying below.\textsuperscript{168} (Image 146) The use of the line in the memorial elevates Thorpe both in his life and now in death as being a good honourable soldier. Similar to how images of medieval knights and saints were used on stained-glass windows, the use of the epitaph of Bayard displays the idealization of the war and the individuals as being above the reality of the conflict. The pre-war conception of the chivalry of knights helped to elevate individuals and the world around them. Haggard’s novel, like more popular works such as Sir Walter Scott’s \textit{Ivanhoe}, helped imbue these ideas into society and are reflected in the war memorials.\textsuperscript{169}

\begin{itemize}
\item Image 143: Memorial Plaque to Thomas James Bowers in Zion Church, Dublin, Ireland.
\item Image 144: Memorial Plaque to Charles Willington Lane in St Patrick’s Church, Slane, Meath, Ireland.
\end{itemize}


Family and Military Slogans

Many memorials chose to include more personal quotations that had direct connections to the individual being commemorated. These quotations included the use of family mottos, regimental mottos, and in one case a popular sports chant. The use of mottos was almost always accompanied with the family coat of arms or the regimental badge. These mottos predominately in Latin, and they were used due to their language that spoke to a good death. On James Ernest Robertson’s memorial bell in the University of Toronto’s Soldiers’ Tower, the inscription includes the Robertson family motto of ‘Virtutis Gloria Merces’ which translates to ‘glory is the reward of valour.’

James Robert Boothby has his family motto on his memorial twice, first in Latin, ‘Mors Christi Mors Mortis Mihi’ and again in English, ‘The death of Christ is to me the death of death.’ (Image 147) Several family mottos in Irish and Scots Gaelic also appear, the

---

only instances of these languages being used on memorials. In Scotland, the memorial to father and son Stewart and Iain MacDougall of Lunga erected to in Craignish Parish Church features the MacDougall coat of arms the Scots Gaelic family motto, ‘Buaidh Na Bas,’ which translates to ‘victory or death.’\(^{172}\) (Image 148) In Ireland, a church pew was dedicated to Frederick O’Neill in Saint Teresa’s Church, also known as Clarendon Street Church in Dublin. The pew references the O’Neill family slogan, ‘Lamh deargh aboo’ (also written as ‘lamh dearg abu’) which translates to ‘red hand to victory.’\(^{173}\) (Image 149) The red hand came to represent the O’Neill family beginning in the Middle Ages and their territory in Ulster and is still used to this day.\(^{174}\)

Regimental mottos displayed the connection the individuals had to their war service. The memorial to Rupert Colerick Laybourne Pilliner in All Saints Church in Llanfrechfa Wales has the badge of the Royal Engineers with their motto, ‘Ubique’ and ‘Quo fas et gloria ducunt’ which translates to, ‘everywhere’ and ‘where right and glory lead.’\(^{175}\) (Image 150) Pilliner’s memorial highlights the use of regimental mottos as a way to connect the individual to the military history of their unit and their service.

One unique motto used on a memorial comes from a sports chant for the Leicester Tigers Rugby Club. The chant, ‘Come on the Tigers!’ was used on the memorial to Philip Eric Bent, who was the commanding officer of the 9\(^{th}\) Battalion Leicestershire Regiment.


when he was killed in action that saw him awarded the Victoria Cross. According to his
citation, it was reported that when he was killed he was yelling, ‘Come on the Tigers!’ as
encouragement to his troops.\textsuperscript{176} Born in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, his sword was
hung in All Saints Anglican Cathedral with a plaque that included the chant.\textsuperscript{177} (Image
151) Bent would have known about the chant as he had attended school in Ashby-De-La-
Zouch in Leicestershire, and as a member of the Leicestershire Regiment, others in the
unit would have been familiar with the rugby team.\textsuperscript{178} The inclusion of the chant on the
memorial was in reference to his citation as it was his final words and a display of
heroism, symbolizing he had a good death.

The use of family, military, and sports teams’ slogans reveals important
sentiments the families wanted expressed on the memorials. The use of family mottos
demonstrates the desire to connect the war dead to their families back home, highlighting
shared symbols that unified them. When the family mottos, like the military ones, spoke
about their lives as soldiers or helped display elements of the good death, they were put in
to help foster these sentiments. Yet the use of military and sports mottos reflected the
lives of those being commemorated as the memorial creators wanted specific and
communal slogans that would speak to those who shared the same values. The selection
of these very distinct slogans demonstrates the desire of personal memorials to speak to
the private memory of the individuals constructing them. Selecting uncommon or unique

\textsuperscript{176} Supplement to the London Gazette, January 11\textsuperscript{th}, 1918, pp. 722-723.
\textsuperscript{177} The sword in Halifax is not to be confused with a sword that appears to have once been in the village of
Ashby-De-La Zouch in Leicestershire that was reportedly stolen in the 1970s, Lieut Colonel Philip E. Ben
Memorial Sword, Canadian Military Memorials Database,
https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/memorials/national-inventory-canadian-
memorials/details/6207; Bent, Philip Eric-VC DSO, The Royal Leicestershire Regiment,
\textsuperscript{178} Bent, Philip Eric-VC DSO, The Royal Leicestershire Regiment,
quotes for the memorials demonstrates their wish to personalize and make the memorial not about the collective losses of the war, but their own. These institutions played important roles in how they died and how they lived, they needed to be celebrated to showcase the individual behind the memorial that was being raised.

**Conclusion**

A number of memorials contain inscriptions with quotations that cannot be identified. These lines might come from literary sources that were either not popular or
were obscure. Finding the original source might be impossible after one hundred years. Other quotations might have been written by the next-of-kin specifically for the memorial. Others may have been written by the individual being commemorated considering the large numbers of poetry and writing that came out of the conflict. Whether the line can be identified or not, they all reveal similar sentiments about how the war was understood and how they wanted to remember the individual. Examining those that can be identified highlights the importance of Britishness, particularly the standing of English culture over others. The lack of poets and other authors who were critical of the war, or war in general, reveals how the medium of memorials was considered inappropriate for such language. Memorials were designed to provide comfort for the mourners, allowing them to view the person being commemorated as a good, honest, and dutiful individual. Highlighting the reality of war, the violent nature of death in the conflict, or presenting their death as anything but clean and pure would sully the image of the good death individuals strove to present through personal memorials. The use of patriotic and romantic language highlights the way individuals sought to ignore the realities of the conflict and elevate the deaths of loved ones to a higher plane. The different depictions of war on the memorials compared to the reality of war helped grow divisions in the memory of the war between pessimism and optimism. The use of other mediums to express the pessimism of modernism fueled the disillusionment many felt in the inter-war years. The attempts by the memorials to express optimism failed to stick as they were placed on shrines to death. The mass number of memorials, collective and personal, meant that such optimistic language was undermined by the volume of death.

---

The acceptance of high rhetoric by memorial creators did not mean that all memorials were carbon-copies of each other or that they followed recommendations by authoritative voices. While no government publications were made on what inscriptions should or could be placed on memorials, efforts were made to provide examples of memorial texts. An example of these suggestions was made by the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A) in 1919, drawing from Biblical and literary texts to encourage memorial language.\footnote{Victoria and Albert Museum, \textit{Inscriptions Suggested for War Memorials}, (London: His Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1919).} Comparing the suggested quotations from the V&A to quotations used in the database highlights not only the ways individuals did listen to professional guidance when building memorials, but also how they went their own way and selected language that worked for them. In the book of quotes by the V&A, seventy-one different authors were included as suggestions for inscriptions. The majority were well-known writers from the period and the past including Laurence Binyon, Rudyard Kipling, Alfred Tennyson, Virgil, Homer, and William Shakespeare. Others were less known or had provided work in newspapers like Mildred Huxley whose work was quoted in \textit{The Spectator} on September 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1916.\footnote{Ibid, p. 14.} The range of authors provided also branched out to include authors not from Britain such as Americans Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Theodore O’Hara, and President Abraham Lincoln. Russian authors such as Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky along with Italians Alighieri Dante and Giuseppe Mazzini were also included to provide more quotes that might be popular with those commissioning memorials. The entire book was put together by Cecil Harcourt Smith for the V&A out of an article in \textit{The Times} that argued for special attention placed be placed on the
inscriptions of war memorials. Smith sought to use the list to highlight not all the possible options, but a number of the best and most worthy based on his work, dialogue with other writers, and public responses to the discussion.\textsuperscript{182} The book was published as part of a larger effort to influence memorial construction as the Royal Academy War Memorials Committee had hosted an exhibition at the V&A in July 1919 to guide the public in memorial construction. The Royal Academy hosted further exhibits in October and November as memorial construction was well underway.\textsuperscript{183}

The response to the Royal Academy and the V&A trying to influence individuals in their memorial construction can be gauged by the use of the quotes suggested on the memorials themselves. Of the seventy-one authors listed by the V&A, only twenty-one were quoted on memorials in the database, less than 30%. The public’s lack of response to these suggestions can be seen in the fact that Horace, the most popular author quoted on war memorials, was not included in the suggestions by the V&A. Even when authors suggested in the book were quoted, the lines used on the memorials did not always line up with the suggestions. Tennyson’s most popular poem for memorials was ‘Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington’, but this poem was not one of the suggestions in the book. Many of the suggestions in the book were used. Binyon, Brooke, and Newbolt’s poems that were popular on memorials were included in the book. Kipling was quoted extensively in the book, but the limited use of his work on the memorials reveals that when it came to constructing the language of memorials, the focus was much narrower than the experts were suggesting. With most of the personal memorials ignoring the advice of the Royal Academy and the V&A in selecting quotes for their memorials,

\textsuperscript{182} Ibid, Prefatory Note.
\textsuperscript{183} Wellington, \textit{Exhibiting War}, p. 289.
individuals took the design of their memorials into their own hands. The inscriptions they chose, whether Biblical or literary, was their choice, highlighting their rejection of cultural institutions and experts to dictate how commemoration and mourning was to be undertaken. While some may have taken the advice of the book and selected the inscriptions based on experts, the majority of individuals building personal memorials acted on their own to fulfil their needs on their own terms. The memorials were their work, their memory, their means of mourning. Taking the advice of experts and artists, no matter how skilled or famous they might be, was not something that everyone could do as the memorials needed to fulfil their mourning needs. Regulatory bodies, from the IWGC to the V&A were attempting to tell individuals how to act, and personal memorials gave individuals the ability to do things in their own manner.

The rejection by the war memorials to use foreign or less-well-known authors reveals the way families building the memorials were seeking a common language that was universal and easily understood by contemporary observers. The use of British, or more precisely English, authors demonstrated a nationalist understanding of the war as they strove to ensure their loved ones were clearly remembered for their service and time as soldiers. Expressions of nationalist language was not limited to poets and quotes used on war memorials, but they demonstrate the ways the reading public gravitated toward those who represented and stood for British imperialism and English nationalism.
Chapter 5: ‘Who Dies If England Live?’: Expressions of Nationality

The expressions of identity, citizenship, and loyalty that are synonymous with national and community memorials could also be found on personal memorials. The primary function and drive for personal memorials was the development of private memory surrounding grief, mourning, and loss, but in their attempts to express these emotions, the memorials exemplify political messages seen on collective memorials. The creation of the ‘good death’ in war necessitated the engagement of personal memorials with the political messaging and ideas of the period; the use of rhetoric surrounding the ‘good death’ helped to reinforce official messages supporting the war. In the attempts to build the image of the good death, the personal memorials reveal a lack of criticism, anger, or rejection of the war, for they sought to affirm that the individuals being commemorated had done their duty and served with pride, a secular version of the religious good death.

The political messages on personal memorials emerged from the lived experiences of those involved in the memorial. The life of the war dead, as well as their family history, helped shape the language and symbols used on the personal memorials. The different experiences of the British Empire – from being born in Britain, the Dominions, or the colonies, as well as living in different parts of the Empire – impacted political expressions on the memorials. Their experiences during the war, whether fighting in Flanders or in other theatres, helped shape the way the memorial portrayed service and death. The development of different nationalisms from the United Kingdom to the Dominions complicated the messages as personal memorials revealed the way citizens viewed their nationality and the British Empire. The presence of memorials for
Indigenous soldiers from Australia, Canada, and New Zealand further highlights the contested understanding of nation and Empire among the colonized peoples of the Empire. Examining personal memorials reveals the messy and complicated nature of imperial citizenship as viewed by individuals. Personal memorials provide a significant view of how different communities within Britain and the settler colonies saw themselves in the Empire. Where governments and collective narratives strove to create simple messages about imperial unity and national growth, personal memorials reveal that individuals had divergent thoughts about who they were and how they were represented in the Empire.

### Lived Experiences of Empire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation of Birth</th>
<th>Number in Database</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>852 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>219 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>207 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>151 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>388 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>188 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>116 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>64 (3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>9 (0.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>6 (0.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>41 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>82 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10: Birth Locations for Individuals in Database.*

Before examining the political messages about nation, citizenship, and Empire on personal memorials, it is important to examine the imperial experiences the individuals and families that build those memorials. By doing so, we are able to gauge the degree to which memorial-makers were familiar with the Empire through the lived experiences of the individual being commemorated. The memorials demonstrate that large numbers of individuals had varied experiences of the British Empire as they were born in colonies; and moved to different parts of the empire, travelling around the globe whilst remaining
in British imperial territories. By examining the places they were born, where they lived before the war, and their experiences in the war, the database demonstrates that individuals building personal memorials had diverse experiences of imperial citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military</th>
<th>British (70%)</th>
<th>Australia (8%)</th>
<th>Canada (8%)</th>
<th>New Zealand (2%)</th>
<th>Indian/Imperial Forces (12%)</th>
<th>South Africa (1%)</th>
<th>Foreign (1%)</th>
<th>Civilian (2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>656 (70%)</td>
<td>33 (4%)</td>
<td>66 (8%)</td>
<td>19 (2%)</td>
<td>96 (12%)</td>
<td>6 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>20 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>157 (88%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>62 (89%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>249 (88%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>16 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>189 (94%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1222 (79%)</td>
<td>43 (3%)</td>
<td>86 (6%)</td>
<td>21 (1%)</td>
<td>121 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (0.6%)</td>
<td>6 (0.4%)</td>
<td>32 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>24 (6%)</td>
<td>375 (91%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>36 (14%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217 (85%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>12 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 (86%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1294 (56%)</td>
<td>421 (18%)</td>
<td>304 (13%)</td>
<td>126 (5%)</td>
<td>121 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (0.4%)</td>
<td>7 (0.3%)</td>
<td>40 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: National Armed Services Individuals Served With.

Outside of the nations being examined in this dissertation, India accounts for the most births occurred, with sixty-four of 2323 individuals. The number of individuals born in India displays the strong connections between the country and military service. The connection is further corroborated when examining the number of individuals who were living in India before the war, forty-five of 2323, and who enlisted with Indian or Imperial troops at 121 of 2323. As many individuals in the database served in the Indian

---

1 Most individuals who enlisted in imperial forces were enlisting in the Indian Army with other branches including the Egyptian Army, the King’s Royal African Rifles, and other African based units.
and Imperial armies as served with the New Zealand Expeditionary Force. Examining individuals who had military experience and had served in India at some point reveals that eighty-three of the 2323 individuals in the study had been posted to India at one time, just less than the number of individuals who served in the South African Wars, ninety-four.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Pro/Veteran</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>41 (5%)</td>
<td>60 (7%)</td>
<td>173 (21%)</td>
<td>304 (38%)</td>
<td>82 (10%)</td>
<td>506 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
<td>38 (21%)</td>
<td>65 (36%)</td>
<td>27 (15%)</td>
<td>114 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
<td>16 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>54 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
<td>11 (4%)</td>
<td>71 (25%)</td>
<td>106 (38%)</td>
<td>30 (11%)</td>
<td>176 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>23 (12%)</td>
<td>47 (24%)</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
<td>153 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>75 (5%)</td>
<td>81 (5%)</td>
<td>314 (20%)</td>
<td>538 (35%)</td>
<td>152 (10%)</td>
<td>1003 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
<td>8 (2%)</td>
<td>203 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>207 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
<td>158 (62%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>98 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66 (57%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>50 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94 (4%)</td>
<td>83 (4%)</td>
<td>336 (14%)</td>
<td>965 (42%)</td>
<td>163 (7%)</td>
<td>1358 (58%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Military History and Connections to Service in the Database.

The numbers for India, however, are heavily skewed towards the United Kingdom over the Dominions. Between Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, only two individuals on memorials in these nations were known to have served in India. This compares to those who served in the South African Wars where four of 256 Canadians, nine of 410 Australians, and three of 116 New Zealanders fought in that imperial war. Memorials in the Dominions do not commemorate a single individual who served in Indian or Imperial forces, revealing that imperial service was restricted to the United Kingdom. The Dominions’ lack of interaction with other parts of the Empire is further highlighted when examining where individuals lived before the war. On Australian memorials, there are
only six other nations of pre-war domicile recorded.\(^2\) Canada has only five nations (with the only non-British country being the United States of America),\(^3\) while New Zealand has only four.\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lived before the war</th>
<th>Number of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>762 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>154 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>171 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>127 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>438 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>318 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>134 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>45 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>17 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>87 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Unclear</td>
<td>70 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13: Nation Individual Lived Before the War.*

Interaction with the Empire and the wider world is much more obvious when examining the United Kingdom as each of the nations has a number of individuals who had experiences with Empire. In England, twenty-nine different nations or colonies are listed where individuals were living before the war. Most were parts of the British Empire, not only the three Dominions and India but also British East and West Africa, Sri Lanka, Egypt, Malay, Hong Kong, Cook Islands, Singapore, and Burma. Other nations closely associated with Britain, such as Argentina, China, and Iran, along with foreign nations like France, USA, Belgium, Chile, and Morocco also appear in the results. In Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, many of the same British colonies were found, as well as locations such as Brazil, Italy, and Mexico, revealing the wide diversity of places where individuals lived. Roughly 7% (149 of 2323) of all individuals in the study lived outside of the eight nations being examined.

The numbers and figures reveal that a minority of the individuals being commemorated had direct experience with the Empire either through their birth, place of

\(^2\) The six nations from most to least are Australia, England, New Zealand, Canada, India, and Ireland.
\(^3\) The five are Canada, England, Newfoundland, USA, and Ireland.
\(^4\) They are New Zealand, England, Australia, and Ireland.
residence, or nature of enlistment. Yet these numbers do not display the breadth of personal experiences these individuals had with the Empire. Delving into the lives of these individuals can reveal the ways that they had knowledge of the Empire through other means.

In England, the memorial to Launcelot Russell Gubbins does little to explain the vast life experiences he had. Launcelot was born in Lima, Peru, and he spent his childhood there before travelling to England to attend Rugby School. He left school in 1900 and travelled to Canada where he worked on a farm in Manitoba.\(^5\) After working in Canada for several years he travelled to the Pacific in 1908 where he lived in New Zealand before working as a planter on the island of Rarotonga in the Cook Islands starting in 1912.\(^6\) He enlisted in the New Zealand Expeditionary Force, using the pseudonym James Lance, but giving his place of birth still as Peru.\(^7\) Launcelot’s travels around the world enabled him to see different aspects of the Empire, a level of movement not seen in many others. His memorial in England was erected by his family who remained in England rather than follow him around.\(^8\) (Image 145)

One of the main means by which individuals in the database experienced the Empire was through soldiering. The old stereotypical recruitment slogan – “join the military and see the world” – was in the pre-war period quite accurate. John Sharpey

---


\(^6\) Higginbotham, *Rugby School Register Volume IV*, p. 83.

\(^7\) Lance, James-[a.k.a. Gubbins, Launcelot Russell]-WW1 2/746-Army, Military Personnel Files Archives New Zealand, R118058614.

\(^8\) I suspect that he had a falling out with his family in some way as his brother Thomas Russell became an engineer while he did farm labour and he enlisted under the alias stating he had no living relatives, Higginbotham, *Rugby School Register Volume IV*, p. 175; Lance, James, Military Personnel Files Archives New Zealand; St Luke’s Formby-2\(^{nd}\) Lieutenant L R Gubbins, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/15411.
Schafer joined the Royal Navy in 1890 as a Midshipman and saw action in China during the Boxer Rebellion, before serving in the Indian Ocean, patrolling the Horn of Africa and the Persian Gulf. He retired in 1912, settling in Malacca in Malay as a rubber planter. On the outbreak of the war, he re-joined the navy and served in Singapore before being redeployed to Britain for the blockade of Germany. He fought in the Battle of Jutland and was killed in 1918 when his ship hit a sea mine between Scotland and Norway.9 John’s service in the Royal Navy allowed him to travel to different parts of the Empire before his death in the war. His memorial in Scotland also commemorates his brother, Thomas Sydney, who did not have the same life.10 Thomas remained in Scotland, studying at Cambridge University instead of travelling the world. The first evidence of Thomas leaving Britain was when he was deployed with the Northumberland Fusiliers to France where he was killed in 1915.11 The lives of the Schafer brothers highlight how much experiences might vary, even within the same family.

In New Zealand, an individual who had experience of the Empire which cannot be seen in the data above was Harold Renwick. He had been born in Curragh, Ireland, the son of Joseph Renwick a career soldier in the British army. During his years of service, Joseph had fought in Africa with Lord Kitchener in the campaigns in Sudan and in Egypt.12 An obituary to Harold highlighted that he came from ‘a good fighting family, his father being, an old Imperial soldier who served in Egypt with Kitchener, and who having

---

12 Joseph reenlisted during the First World War in New Zealand, revealing his previous military service, Renwick, Joseph Arron-WWI 53979-Army, Military Personnel Files, Archives New Zealand; He was awarded medals from Sudan, Mounted Infantry, Signallers, Corps and Departments, Malta Artillery, Campaign Medals and Awards Rolls Soudan, NA WO 100/67, p. 308.
heard the call of Empire recently volunteered for service.\textsuperscript{13} The text of Harold’s memorial in New Zealand is unknown, but the experience of his family and the close association with his father indicates that Harold had a strong understanding of the Empire growing up.\textsuperscript{14}

Having a parent who was active in overseas service was common in other nations as well. Gordon Smith Mellis Gauld was born in Formosa, modern-day Taiwan, to two missionary parents from Canada in 1896. Gordon spent most of his life living without one or both of his parents, as he was sent to Canada for his education in 1900.\textsuperscript{15} Lawrence Oliphant Graeme followed his father into the military and, just like his father, was deployed to India, serving as an aide-de-camp to King George V when he visited India in 1910.\textsuperscript{16} The importance of family in Empire cannot be understated. It played a critical role in the expansion of ties between different parts of the Empire, and in connecting different imperial holdings to each other.\textsuperscript{17}

Examining the experiences of these individuals with the Empire before the war demonstrates a more expansive view of the British Empire that is not as constrained by notions of the metropole or the periphery. The ability of individuals to move throughout the Empire in the years before the war shaped their understanding of the Empire as they

\textsuperscript{13} ‘Roll of Honour’ \textit{Poverty Bay Herald}, July 28\textsuperscript{th}, 1917, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{14} No photo of Harold’s memorial can be found, and its existence is mentioned here, Holy Trinity Church Memorials Gisborne, NZ History Memorials Register, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/gisborne-first-world-war-memorial.
\textsuperscript{15} In 1901 he was living with his maternal grandparents, and in 1911 his mother had returned home but not his father, Gordon Gauld [Zorden Elma], Huron South Ontario, Census of Canada 1901, RG 31-C-1, District 74, p. 2; Gordon Gauld, Huron South Ontario, Census of Canada 1911, RG31-C-1, District 82, p. 2.\textsuperscript{16} \textit{De Ruvigny’s Roll of Honour}, Vol. 3, pp. 117-118.
\textsuperscript{17} While many of these individuals would create interesting narratives on the importance of family in imperial relations, work on this has already been done by several authors including, Adele Perry, \textit{Colonial Relations: The Douglas-Connolly Family and the Nineteenth-Century Imperial World}, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), and Alexander Charles Baillie, \textit{Call of Empire: From the Highlands to Hindostan}, (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2017).
were able to see how it functioned in various locations under different circumstances. Combined with these travels was correspondence. The improvements of ships and communication technology allowed these travellers and settlers to send letters around the world to families and friends in Britain or other colonies. The ability to move and see the Empire was rooted in their place as imperial citizens with the rights and freedoms of British subjects. This imperial citizenship was built on the racial vision of the Empire as Anglo-Celtic and white in character, and so was not afforded to every imperial subject.\(^\text{18}\) Their freedom to experience the Empire in different ways impacted how individuals would speak about the Empire when it came time to serve in the war and commemorate those who fell in the conflict.

**Imperial Experiences During the War**

During the war, individuals had new experiences of Empire as many found themselves deployed to fight outside of the main battlegrounds of Flanders and France to defend imperial territories around the world. Examining the burial locations and locations of memorials to the missing where individuals in the database were commemorated by the IWGC – which stretches across forty-six different countries – shows the diversity of experience.\(^\text{19}\) This range of nations where individuals fought and died highlights the breadth of the First World War, although much of the focus was on the European front of France and Flanders. The importance and scale of combat on the Western Front is

\(^{18}\) Serious debates were being held within the Imperial Conferences before the war and between political philosophers to determine who had imperial citizenship, should it be expanded to colonial subjects, and what the future of imperial movement and relations would be. For more details see, Daniel Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).

\(^{19}\) These are based on modern nations not those that existed in 1918 at the end of the war.
highlighted by the number of individuals who died on this front as it accounts for 1607 (69%) of the 2323 individuals in the database. The remaining individuals are divided between burials on the other imperial fronts and those buried at home. The home front represents the second highest number of individuals with 278 of 2323 (12%), with burials in the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States. The high number of burials on the home front represents those who died of illness, during training, and the wounded who died in hospitals after being evacuated from the front lines. A small number of individuals (fourteen) were transported from the front lines back home for burial before the repatriation ban and are included in the home front burials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign/Fronts</th>
<th>Number of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Front</td>
<td>1607 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallipoli/Salonika</td>
<td>200 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Campaigns</td>
<td>42 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian/Palestinian</td>
<td>95 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesopotamian</td>
<td>55 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>7 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean (Malta, Gibraltar)</td>
<td>9 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia (Including India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, China)</td>
<td>12 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe Other (Sweden, Italy, Germany)</td>
<td>18 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Front (United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, New Zealand)</td>
<td>278 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Campaigns Individuals in Database Died In. Based off the location of the grave or memorial to the missing.

A total of 438 (19%) of the 2323 individuals in the database were buried outside the Western Front and the home front. The largest number are those who fought in the Gallipoli Campaign with 179 (8%) of individuals buried in Turkey. The Gallipoli Campaign stands out as the largest primarily due to the Australian and New Zealanders who fought in the battle and their lionization by Australian war correspondent, later official historian C.E.W. Bean. The celebration of Gallipoli by Australians can be seen in the

---

20 France has much more than Belgium with 1126/2323 (49%) in France to 481/2323 (21%) in Belgium.
21 England has the highest percentage amongst these nations with 174/2323 (7%) of all burials.
22 Some were legal, others were illegal. The issue of reburial and bodysnatching will be discussed in chapter 6 and the policies of the Imperial War Graves Commission.
database as Australians killed at Gallipoli are over-represented. Roughly 8,000 Australians were killed and buried in Gallipoli out of the roughly 60,000 Australians to die in the war, or 13% of Australia’s war dead.23 Yet when examining the memorials from Australia in the database, seventy of 410 (17%) of them are buried in Turkey. The same can be said for New Zealand. Roughly 2,000 of the 18,000 New Zealanders who died in the war are buried in Turkey, or 13% of New Zealand’s war dead.24 In the database, 17 (15%) of 116 memorials in New Zealand honour an individual buried in Gallipoli.

The participation of Australians and New Zealanders in other imperial theatres is seen in the number who were killed in the Egyptian and Palestinian Campaigns. For Australia, twenty-five of 410 (6%) individuals in the database are buried in either Egypt, Israel, and Palestine; for New Zealand that number is six of 116 (5%). Within the database as a whole, only ninety-five (4%) of 2323 individuals were part of these campaigns, with Wales being the only nation with a higher percentage of individuals killed in the campaigns, with 7% (fourteen of 200).25 Of the three Dominions, Australia and New Zealand soldiers had a larger experience of Empire as they found themselves fighting in more imperial theatres. Canadian burials are dominated by the Western Front as Canada has 220 (86%) of 256 individuals buried on this front.26 Only four memorials in Canada commemorate an individual who did not die on the Western or home fronts.27

---

24 These numbers are drawn from the CWGC Find War Dead by applying the filter of those who served with New Zealand in the First World War and then specifically buried in Turkey. https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/.
25 This though is dominated by Welsh troops being involved in the Palestinian Campaign at 12/200 (6%) of their total.
26 152/256 (59%) are in France and 68/256 (27%) in Belgium.
27 There is one burial in Egypt, one burial in Russia, and two burials in Iraq.
Memorials from the United Kingdom show more imperial service, with 305 of 1541 (20%) of the memorials commemorating an individual killed outside of the Western and home fronts. Gallipoli also represents the largest imperial campaign that was commemorated with ninety-two (6%) of 1541 individuals, followed by the Egyptian and Palestinian Campaigns at sixty (4%), the Mesopotamian Campaign at fifty-one (3%), and the various African Campaigns at forty-two (3%). These smaller campaigns, with smaller numbers of casualties and less of a profile generally, saw them neglected in collective post-war memory. The focus on the Western Front over the others was partially due to the size, but also the perception that the war was won and lost in Europe with imperial fronts as mere side-shows. Soldiers who returned home objected to the characterization of their service in such a way but had difficulty dislodging the public’s mindset.\(^2^8\) As this data shows, a significant minority had to justify the losses and service of loved ones for imperial projects and their service outside the Western Front.

**The Language of Empire**

How were the experiences of Empire reflected on the personal memorials? The language of Empire was present during the war as it was used both to encourage recruitment and to celebrate the strength of British forces. The language of Empire was particularly strong in the Dominions, with calls for volunteers and explanations of the war in terms describing service to the motherland and referring to soldiers as cubs returning

---

home. Some of this language did filter into the memorials, but not on a significant scale. Direct references to the Empire were rare in the language of the memorials. The memorial to Alan Torrance Powell in St Alban’s Anglican Church in Ottawa notes that he ‘gave his life for the Empire.’ (Image 152) This sentiment is reflected in a similar phrase used on the memorial window to Henry Norman Rothery in St Paul’s Anglican Church in Myrtleford, Victoria, Australia that states, ‘fell fighting for the Empire.’ (Image 153)

The use of the word ‘Empire’ on memorials is rare particularly when compared to the use of the word ‘country’. Equating country with Empire and vice versa can be seen through the use of the phrase ‘King and Country/Empire’ on memorials, the meaning of the phrase changing based on the use choice of words. The separation between the two may not have been clear for memorial-builders considering the development of national identities in the years before the war. Examining the development of settler colonial national identity, John Eddy and Deryck Schreuder argue that the creation of the Dominions’ national identities was made based on local conditions, but always in the framework of Empire. James Belich highlights the importance of this overarching identity in his exploration of what he terms ‘settlerism’ that allowed individuals to retain collective imperial identity markers and political structures that were adapted to the local

29 The poster by Arthur Wardle featuring a lion, as Britain, and four cubs, as the Dominions, highlights the imagery and language used to represent the war, Arthur Wardle, The Empire Needs Men!, IWM Art Collection, ART.IWM PST 5110, https://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/37297.
context of settler colonialism.\textsuperscript{33} The high levels of movement out of Britain to the Empire, and the return of settlers and their descendants to Britain, ensured that British Imperial identity was constantly being rejuvenated and re-established through these migrants. Even within Britain, the use of country and Empire shifted to take on different connotations depending on location. The four nations theory of British history highlights the varied responses and experiences England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland had to the Empire, arguing that the United Kingdom needs to be seen as an imperial state rather than nation state. The Empire, and the conflicts that it engendered, served to strengthen rather than weaken the bonds of Britain allowing a British identity to be more clearly defined and accepted.\textsuperscript{34}

How individuals viewed the Empire therefore varied on their own personal history, and where they lived. Within the Dominions, the language of empire on the memorials reveals little difference or distinction between nation and empire. The use of empire on the memorials does not speak to their imperial service in a unique or distinct manner compared to those who use the same phrases but replace ‘empire’ with ‘country’. In comparison to the memorial to Alan Torrance Powell, in Christ Church Cathedral in Ottawa is the plaque to Eric Munro Anderson which reads, ‘who gave his life for his country.’\textsuperscript{35} (Image 154) The language used is identical with the only exchange being ‘Empire’ and ‘country.’

The inability to separate imperial identity from national identity can be seen in the memorial to Bartlett McLennan, commanding officer of the 42nd Canadian Battalion, in the Church of St Andrews and St Paul in Montreal. The window includes the line, ‘They sought the glory of their country. They see the glory of God’ and features on one side the figures of St George carrying the flag of England (St George’s Cross), and on the other side a modern soldier in full gear with the flag of Britain (the Union Jack) behind him.  

(Image 92) Based on the imagery and the language in the window, the ‘country’ is both Canada and Britain at the same time. The patriotic imagery stands out considering the Church of St Andrew and St Paul was Presbyterian (now part of the United Church of Canada) and the inclusion of St George of England over St Andrew of Scotland highlights the patriotic design of the window to the Empire. The same imagery is seen on another Canadian memorial to James Everet Fitzgerald. Originally located in Bethesda United Church, but now housed in the Royal Canadian Regiment Museum in London, Ontario, the window features two soldiers in khaki and above the coat of arms of the United Kingdom.  

(Image 105) The coat of arms could be confused with the Canadian version which is very similar in design, but the lack of any Canadian symbols such as the maple leaf or beavers, and the fact the current Canadian coat of arms was not developed until 1921, two years after the memorial was erected, identifies the symbol as British. While the memorials to McLennan and Fitzgerald do not feature distinct imagery of Canada, the memorial to George Lenard Illingworth displays the link between Dominion nationality.

---

with the Empire. Located in St Cyprian’s Anglican Church in Narrabri, New South Wales, Australia, the memorial makes references to country stating that Illingworth ‘was gassed in France, while fighting for King and country’ and ‘Sleep on dear George, your life for your country you nobly gave.’ In the background of the stone plaque are the flags of Australia (the Southern Cross) and the Union Jack.\(^\text{38}\) (Image 155) These memorials display the strong links that many such memorials made between their national or Dominion identity and the British Empire, seeing themselves as part of the larger Empire rather than distinct separate entities.

When examining memorials that refer to the Empire in Britain, it becomes clear that those who served in colonial units or specifically the Dominion expeditionary forces were considered to have been fighting for the Empire. The language clearly articulates the service of these individuals as being part of the imperial armed forces, and that their service was in response to the call to arms by Britain to the Empire to help fight the war.

The memorial to James Randolph Innes Hopkins, a Captain in the 5\(^{\text{th}}\) Battalion of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, highlights this reading: ‘who gave his life for England and the Empire at Ypres on the 24\(^{\text{th}}\) May 1915. He not untimely dies who dies for England.’\(^\text{39}\) The memorial to Frank Davey Perry, a Lance Corporal in the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) Battalion of the Australian Imperial Force, has a similar message: ‘In memory of Corporal Frank Davey Perry of this parish and a colonist of the British Empire who when heeded by the mother country at once joined the Australian Imperial Forces and on August 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) 1915 in the


Gallipoli Peninsula gave his life for his King and country. Aged 21 years.’⁴⁰ (Image 156)

These memorials equated the service of individuals to the Empire rather than the Dominion with which they enlisted. The memorial to Philip Stanley Edwards in Swansea, Wales, highlights this; his soldiering identity was ‘of the PPCLI [Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry] 1⁴ Canadian Contingent British Imperial Forces who gave his life for King and country at Etaples, France, Sep 18 1916, aged 23 years.’⁴¹ (Image 157)

The memorials mentioned above were erected by family members, but the memorial to Thomas Hunter was erected by locals who sought to commemorate him. Hunter, originally born in Newcastle, England, had immigrated before the war to Australia, war where he worked as a miner before enlisting and serving through the Gallipoli Campaign. He was wounded in July 1916 and transported to hospital in Peterborough, England, where he died of his wounds.⁴² Locals took an interest in Hunter, referring to him as the ‘lonely Anzac’, and paid for his grave marker and using the extra funds to erect a bronze plaque in Peterborough Cathedral. The memorial features both Australian imagery (with the Australian coat of arms) and British (with the Union Jack serving as the background). Hunter is carved in military uniform, carrying a gun, but in the distinct Australian slouch hat. The text of the memorial reveals the importance of identifying him as an imperial soldier: ‘This tablet is dedicated in the faith and fear of God by fellow citizens of the Empire for which he gave his life…’⁴³ (Image 158)

---

⁴² NAA, B2455 First Australian Imperial Force Personnel Dossiers, Hunter Thomas service number 505, Item 11600921.
⁴³ Sergeant T Hunter (The Lonely Anzac), IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/8477; An exact replica of the bronze plaque but made of
Hunter’s memorial displays the understanding of the Empire as being separate from Britain; indeed, Hunter is given a distinct remembrance over other casualties in Peterborough. Buried in Peterborough Old (Broadway) Cemetery; with fifty-nine other casualties, Hunter is the only Australian and while a Canadian soldier is also buried in the cemetery, he was born in the town of Peterborough. Hunter is given distinction as a truly imperial soldier compared to the rest of the casualties, for he was buried as the lone Australian, and lone imperial soldier in the cemetery, even though he was born in England. By marking him out as special, Hunter and his service to the Empire is commemorated by the local population as being unique and separate from their own Britishness.

British soldiers who gave their lives or served the Empire were memorialized as examples of civic duty and examples for the future. On one of the many memorials created to John Travers Cornwell, the sixteen-year-old Victoria Cross recipient, he was so described: ‘his noble heroism at the naval battle of Jutland May 31st, 1916, inspires the highest admiration and sincerest gratitude of all citizens of the Empire but especially of the boys and girls of this parish.’ The memorial erected to George William Noel Frankish by his parents in St Wilfred’s Church in Ottringham on the Humber contains a similar message, by noting his ‘exemplary character in the home and of promising

---

wood is located in the Peterborough Museum as well, Sergeant Thomas Hunter, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/70195.

44 The Canadian is Percy Norman James and his family was still living in Peterborough when he died and was buried in the cemetery. Cemetery or Memorial Peterborough Old (Broadway) Cemetery, CWGC Find War Dead, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/search-results/?CemeteryExact=true&Cemetery=PETERBOROUGH%20OLD%20(BROADWAY)%20CEMETERY&Size=100&Page=1.

45 The memorial plaque was originally placed in All Saints Church which was across the street from where he was born, but was moved to the local museum of Vestry House after the church was renovated. John Travers Cornwell VC, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/39935.
attainments at school.’

The plaque provides a quote from the Naval Prayer from the Anglican Churches Book of Common Prayer categorizing his service as imperial: ‘That the inhabitents [sic] of this Empire may in peace and quietness serve thee our God.’

The choice of the Naval Prayer was fitting as Frankish was a sailor who was killed in the Battle of Jutland. Both the memorials to Cornwell and Frankish highlight their imperial duty to serve while also displaying the hope they would inspire for future generations.

The fact that both were teenagers; (Cornwall was sixteen and Frankish was nineteen when they died) was meant to provide the younger generations with examples of imperial service to follow.

Image 152: Memorial Plaque to Alan Torrance Powell in St Alban’s Anglican Church, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Image 153: Stained-Glass Window to Henry Norman Rothery in St Paul’s Anglican Church, Myrtleford, Victoria, Australia.

Image 154: Memorial Plaque to Eric Munro Anderson in Christ Church Cathedral, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.


Expressions of National Identity: The Dominions

When examining the expression of national identities on the memorials, a clear distinction can be seen between the different nations. Within the Dominions, memorials were split between focusing on imperial identity and national identity. A number of memorials were far more emphatic about their nationalism. In Australia the use of the term ‘Anzac’ on memorials occurs on a regular basis. The development of the Anzac myth that surrounded the Gallipoli Campaign played on the memory of the war in Australia, and the memorials show individuals embracing the myth. Historian Jenny Macleod argues that the campaign survives due to the romantic nature of the fighting for
both Australian and British publics: ‘The Somme was a watershed: it tainted all that came after it. Conversely, the battles that came before – particularly Gallipoli – retain something of a sense of romance and excitement that characterised the earliest days of the First World War.’\(^{48}\) The Anzac myth was cemented in the Australian psyche through the memorialization process, and the word ‘Anzac’ became sanctified by the government through the construction of memorials and the work of journalists and historians such as C.E.W. Bean.\(^{49}\)

The power of the Anzac myth in memorialization can be seen in memorials where individuals are distinctly identified as being an Anzac. In the memorial to the brothers Harold and Roy Smith in St Aiden’s Church in Annandale, New South Wales, the two were described as, ‘Anzacs whose lives were nobly ended.’\(^{50}\) (Image 159) Eric Anderson Whiting was described on his memorial (erected in December 1916) as ‘An Anzac, true to his God and his country.’\(^{51}\) (Image 160) The memorial to Thomas Markey in the form of a weeping fig tree outside the Country Women’s Association Hall in Yeronga, Brisbane, Queensland, has his plaque identify him as ‘Pte T. Markey. Anzac.’\(^{52}\) (Image 112) The identification of being an Anzac did not simply end when soldiers left the Australian army during the war. Rodney Vernon Franklin enlisted in the Australian army in August 1914 but left in December 1915 and joined the Royal Flying Corps; he was


\(^{50}\) St Aiden’s Anglican Church Memorial Plaques Annandale, New South Wales War Memorials Register, https://www.warmemorialsregister.nsw.gov.au/content/st-aidens-anglican-church-memorial-plaques.


killed in action in June 1917. On his memorial in St George’s Church in Gawler, South Australia he was identified as ‘An “Anzac” and “Croix de Guerre”,’ placing his status as an Anzac on par with a decoration for gallantry, the Croix de Guerre. (Image 72) Many more memorials in Australia identify the soldiers as having died at ‘Anzac’, the landing site of the Australians during the Battle of Gallipoli. An example of this is on the stained-glass window to Bertram Atkinson in St Matthew’s Church in Mulgrave, Victoria. Killed in Gallipoli, Atkinson’s window marks his death by stating that he ‘was killed in action at Anzac on September 21st 1915.’

Alongside the identification of soldiers as distinctly Australian through the term Anzac, the design of memorials featuring Australian symbols reflects the burgeoning national identity. It was through stained-glass windows that many of these national identities were expressed. The Frederick James Maslin window in St Thomas’ Church in Carwoola, New South Wales, features Maslin in uniform standing to attention. He is distinct in wearing the slouch hat that came to characterize Australian soldiers in the Digger trope. (Image 162) Maslin fits into the ideal image of the Australian Digger, an infantryman with a stoic facial expression standing to attention as if on the parade ground, in a uniform that was distinctly Australian due to the slouch hat. While not an infantryman, one of the memorials to Henric Clarence Nicholas features a similarly stoic

---

57 The slouch hat is distinct as it appears as a wide brimmed cowboy hat, but the left side is pinned or tied up, and is often not worn flat but on an angle. Examples can be seen in other statues here, Inglis, Sacred Places, p. 164-166.
photograph of him on horseback wearing the slouch hat. Nicholas was a town councillor in Hamilton, Tasmania, before the war, and the framed photograph of him in uniform was placed in the town hall to remember him. Nicholas sits on his horse, with a rifle in one hand resting on his leg, and he is wearing the Australian slouch hat of a Digger.\footnote{Henric Clarence Nicholas, Places of Pride National Register of War Memorials, Australian War Memorial, https://placesofpride.awm.gov.au(memorials/214806.}

The image of the Digger tied into the Anzac myth, helping to distinguish Australians from British soldiers with a design that touched on their frontier status on the edge of the Empire. The slouch hats gave them the rough look of cowboys, ready to contend with the bush.\footnote{For more on the slouch hat and it’s ties to Australian masculinity see, Steve Marti, ‘”The Symbol of Our Nation”: The Slouch Hat, the First World War, and Australian Identity,’ Journal of Australian Studies, vol 42, no 1 (2018), pp. 3-18.}

The use of the slouch hat of Australian Diggers resembled what New Zealanders used to separate themselves from other soldiers of the Empire: the lemon-squeezer hat.\footnote{Called due to the tall peak and ridges the hat created, it also was wide brimmed to give them a cowboy look and the style was also used by American and Canadian militaries before the First World War. ‘The Lemon Squeezer’, National Army Museum Te Mata Toa, https://www.armymuseum.co.nz/the-lemon-squeezer/.}

Statues to Alexander Ormond and Rev. Hēnare Wēpiha Te Wainohu both feature them in uniform wearing lemon-squeezer hats. Ormond’s memorial (which also functions as a community memorial) is not meant to represent Ormond himself as he never served with the New Zealand Expeditionary Force, instead enlisting with the Manchester Regiment in England.\footnote{Māhia Soldiers’ Memorial Kaiuku Marae, New Zealand History Memorials Register, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/mahia-soldiers-memorial-kaiuku-marae.}

(\footnote{Henare Wepiha Te Wainohu Memorial Wairoa, New Zealand History Memorials Register, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/henare-wepiha-te-wainohu-memorial-wairoa.}) Ormond’s memorial has the soldier with a rifle standing at attention, while the memorial to Rev. Hēnare has him carrying a book, presumably a Bible, to showcase his work as a chaplain in the army.\footnote{Henare Wepiha Te Wainohu Memorial Wairoa, New Zealand History Memorials Register,}
statues, New Zealand has few references to their own national identity compared to
Australia. The Ormond and Rev. Hēnare memorials are important markers of New
Zealand identity as they are both Māori soldiers and represent Māori communities who
fought. Amongst the Pakeha community, the depiction of distinctly New Zealand identity
was limited. One of the few examples is the memorial window to John Hugh Allen, the
son of the New Zealand politician Sir James Allen who served as the Defence Minister
and temporary Prime Minister during the war. On the window can be seen a kiwi, the
national bird of New Zealand, next to the text identifying the window as a memorial to
him.\(^\text{63}\) (Image 91) Details of the window can be seen in chapter 3 as it features two panes,
one of war and one of peace. The kiwi is placed on the peace side of the memorial rather
than war.

Like New Zealand, the lack of references to Canada in Canadian memorials
highlights a different national identity being expressed. Both Australia and New Zealand
soldiers had very distinctive hats in the slouch and lemon-squeezer, but Canadian troops
did not have the same unique uniform marker. Canadians were shown in their memorials
to wear the soft cap. (Image 104) They were not unique in this as memorials throughout
the United Kingdom displayed soldiers in the soft cap, which was ubiquitous amongst
British troops. For example, the statue to Lord Ninian Edward Crighton-Stuart in Gorsedd
Gardens in Cardiff features him in uniform, wearing a soft cap.\(^\text{64}\) (Image 165)

The symbol used most frequently on Canadian memorials to mark them as
Canadian was the maple leaf, which featured regularly as part of the military badges of

\(^{63}\) All Saints Anglican Church Memorials, Dunedin, New Zealand History Memorials Register,

\(^{64}\) Lord N C Stuart MP, IWM War Memorials Register,
Canadian units during the war. The use of military badges was common across all nations on memorials as the badge easily showcased the regiment and service of the individual. The memorial plaque erected by the family of Jean Brilliant in L’Église Ste-Cecile du Bic included the badge of the 22e Battalion that featured a beaver in the badge.\(^{65}\) (Image 68) The use of Canadian symbols was replicated for Canadians memorialized in other countries. The plaque to Philip Stanley Edwards in St Peter’s Church in the neighbourhood of Cockett in Swansea has the badge of the Princess Patricia’s Canadian Light Infantry at the top and at the bottom a maple leaf with a crown and ‘Canada’ written over it.\(^{66}\) (Image 157) Other symbols of Canada appear infrequently on memorials. The Canadian flag, of which there was no definitive version during the war, and the coat of arms are rare. The Canadian coat of arms on the stained-glass window to Robert Jackson Correll in St John’s Anglican Church in Whitby, Ontario is one of the few examples of an official symbol being used. At the top of the window is the Canadian coat of arms from 1868, featuring the four original provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia.\(^{67}\) (Image 78) The design on the window is out of date, and other provinces were added to the shield until a new updated version was created in 1921 that has remained with only slight changes until the present day.\(^{68}\)

---


In Newfoundland, now part of Canada but during the war a separate Dominion, the caribou was used on memorials to showcase their identity because it had been selected as the mascot for the Newfoundland Regiment. St George’s Church in Brigus, Newfoundland, has two memorials to members who died in the war serving with the Newfoundland Regiment, William Bartlett, and Frank Jerrett. Both men have the badge of the Newfoundland Regiment, featuring the caribou, at the top of their memorials.\(^69\) (Images 166 and 167) The importance of the caribou to Newfoundland memory can be seen in the Newfoundland Memorial at Beaumont-Hamel, which features a large bronze caribou over the battlefield, one of six on battlefields the Newfoundlanders fought in.

The lack of distinct Canadian symbols or language on the memorials matches research on Canadian memory in collective remembrance. Historian Jonathan Vance has outlined that the collective memory of the war in Canada was dominated by an Anglo-British perspective of nation building that failed to appeal to other groups such as French-Canadians, First Nations, and other immigrant groups because it pushed a British form of Canadian identity.\(^70\) French Canada’s difficulty in finding its place in the Canadian memory can be clearly seen in the memorials as only one memorial was written in French, that to Jean Brillant by his family in Le Bic, Quebec. Brillant’s memorial highlights the complexity of memory in Quebec as attempts to commemorate the war by those who lost loved ones never matched the scale English-Canada. Individuals were able to express a counterpoint to the collective rejection of the British-Canadian identity that

---


did not explicitly endorse the new identity. The complexity of French-Canadian memory of the war and the lack of consensus in Quebec can be seen in the work of Mourad Djebabla-Brun, who argues the memory of the war in Quebec was more complex.\textsuperscript{71} The Canadians were not alone in their emphasis on a British Imperial identity, for both Australia and New Zealand had similar outlooks. The Dominions wanted to separate themselves from the Empire as distinct nations but were wary of going too far. Their understanding of the world was through a British cultural lens that made them comfortable in expressing their politics.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{71} Mourad Djebabla-Brun, \textit{Se Souvenir De La Grande Guerre: La Mémoire Plurielle de 14-18 au Québec}, (Montreal: Vib Éditeur, 2004), pp. 11-18.}
Image 162: Stained-Glass Window to Frederick James Maslin in St Thomas’ Anglican Church, Carwoola, New South Wales, Australia.

Image 163: Memorial Statue to Alexander Ormond as part of the Mahia Soldiers’ Memorial on the grounds of Kauiku Marae, Hawke’s Bay, New Zealand.

Image 164: Memorial Statue to Reverend Henare Wepiha Te Wainohu at the intersection of Crarer St and Carroll St in Wairoa, Hawke’s Bay, New Zealand.

Image 165: Memorial Statue to Lord Ninian Edward Crichton Stuart in Cathays Park, Cardiff, Wales.

Image 166: Memorial Plaque to William Bartlett in St George’s Church, Brigus, Newfoundland, Canada.

Image 167: Memorial Plaque to Frank Jerrett in St George’s Church, Brigus, Newfoundland, Canada.
Expressions of National Identity: Ireland

The emphasis on British Imperial identity does run through the memorials in the United Kingdom. In the four nations of the British Isles, attempts to interpret the war as a British Imperial conflict can be seen most strongly in the nations on the periphery, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. Here, the lack of nationalist language in the memorials in favour of a universal British identity emphasizes the role of the First World War in strengthening the bonds of the union. Historical analysis on the creation of a British identity has always placed England at the centre due to the significant political, economic, military, and cultural power it had over the other nations in Britain. Yet it was through consensus, the agreement by the peoples of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland to the arrangement, that gave them significant benefits of participating as partners in the process of Empire. The balance of the union, tipped to England, forced each of the nations to reconcile their subservient status to the needs of Britain with the benefits of being in the Empire.\(^72\)

Memorials’ expressions of Britishness was an attempt to highlight their participation in the formation of British identity, rather than seek to push an anti-English or exclusionary idea of who was British.

The development of a distinct ‘British’ identity came out of war, specifically the wars Britain fought during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century against France. Linda Colley identifies the wars with France as creating a visible ‘other’ against which the newly formed United Kingdom of Great Britain could forge a national identity.\(^73\)


rise of ethnic nationalism during the nineteenth century challenged the established British identity, but the continued benefits of Empire helped to forestall nationalist revolts in Scotland and Wales. In Ireland, it developed into a growing resistance movement. The identification of Irishness with Catholicism, which was in opposition to the established Protestant identity of Britishness, helped to partially explain why Scottish and Welsh nationalism failed to develop the same level of rebelliousness. The outbreak of the First World War in Scottish eyes came to be seen as a continuation of the previous conflicts that had established Britishness, with Germany instead of France as the enemy. The place of Scotland in Empire and their ability to contribute to the eventual victory ensured the conflict was imperial and not national in understanding.\(^\text{74}\) These sentiments are reflected not just in Scottish memorials, but also in Welsh and Irish memorials, revealing that in these nations, individuals building memorials interpreted the war as securing their place in the Empire and their Britishness.

Displays of Britishness can be seen in the memorials in several ways. The first is through the lack distinct national symbols or language. Just as memorials in the Dominions often made little reference to their own nation, Scottish, Welsh, and Irish memorials also lacked self-reference. It is in Ireland where national identity was portrayed more often due to the political climate of the country. In Northern Ireland, the larger Protestant populations with their own brand of unionism resulted in several memorials seeking to highlight their status as Ulstermen and unionist.\(^\text{75}\) An example of this is the memorial to William Frederick McFadzean in Newtownbreda Presbyterian


Church in Belfast. McFadzean sacrificed himself by throwing himself onto a grenade, saving his comrades’ lives; he was awarded the Victoria Cross. However, before the war McFadzean had joined the Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF), the unionist paramilitary organization that had formed to protect northern unionist desires to stay in the United Kingdom. His memorial plaque in Newtownbreda Church was erected by members of the 1st Battalion East Belfast Regiment of the UVF along with members of the Ballynafeigh and Newtownbreda Unionist Clubs. At the bottom of the plaque the badge of the UVF with the red hand of Ulster and their slogan ‘For God and Ulster’ was included. 76 (Image 168) The political imagery highlights the connection made by Ulster unionists between the First World War and their success in keeping Northern Ireland part of the United Kingdom. The fact that McFadzean was killed during the preparations for the Battle of the Somme, seen as main episode of unionists’ ‘blood sacrifice’ to Britain, further highlights the importance of Northern Ireland’s connection to Britain through the war. 77

Unionists in the Free State also sought to display their connections to Britain. Particularly after the creation of the Free State, it was through First World War commemoration that they were able to maintain their community. As the Free State developed and enforced a specific form of nationalist identity, those outside it such as Protestants and former unionists, found war memorials and the rituals surrounding commemoration as a way to maintain a sense of community in the face of political and cultural challenges. 78 The result of the retreat into the Protestant churches was that the

images and language of war memorials in Ireland display Britishness in these private spaces for members of a select community. As symbols of British rule in Ireland were being removed, Britishness in Ireland survived in churches on the war memorials that celebrated the Irish as part of Britain. The memorial to Edmund Arthur Trouton highlights the Irish in Britain as the stained-glass window features Jesus Christ, carrying a pole with the cross of St George; below him is King Arthur in medieval knight’s armour.\(^79\) (Image 92) The use of King Arthur, the mythical king of the Britons, displays the strong connection the Trouton family felt to Britain as they chose to put a non-Irish king in the window.

The apparently neat separation between Protestant and Catholic support for the war is not as clean as imagined. As new works by Irish historians have revealed, Catholic Irish who fought in the war tried to defend their service in opposition to the radical nationalists who remained in Ireland during the war. Here, fighting in the war was to defend the freedom of small nations that had been used as a recruiting tool and as justification for nationalist support for the war effort.\(^80\) No memorials represented the attempt by nationalists to justify their war effort than those to William Hoey Kearney Redmond. The younger brother of John Redmond, the leader of the nationalist Irish Parliamentary Party at the start of the war and a MP himself, William enlisted to follow his brother’s call to arms to ensure that Irish Home Rule would be honoured. The first memorial erected to William in Kilquade Church in the town of Kilquade co. Wicklow contains elaborate Celtic knot work, highlighting the Irishness of William even though he


died in the First World War.\textsuperscript{81} A more overt memorial defending William’s service, and by extension his brother’s actions in supporting the war, can be found in Redmond Memorial Park in Wexford City, the hometown of the Redmond family and the constituency that William represented in Parliament. Constructed during the late 1920s, the park opened with the unveiling of a memorial bust of William in 1931 by renowned Irish sculptor Oliver Shepherd. The bust features William in uniform with his collar bearing the badges of the Royal Irish Regiment (there is also a badge on the plinth). The symbol of the Royal Irish Regiment, the Harp of Brian Boru, is a traditional symbol of Ireland that is used by the Irish government as the official logo of Ireland.\textsuperscript{82} At the base of the plinth, a quote from his final speech in Parliament defends William’s war-time service: ‘I should like all my friends in Ireland to know that in joining the Irish Brigade and going to France I sincerely believed like all Irish soldiers that I was doing my best for the welfare of Ireland in every way.’\textsuperscript{83} (Image 170) William was not the only Irish soldier to have Irish symbols to display their service as being compatible with Irish identity. The memorial to three brothers, John O’Connell Dodd, Francis Joseph Dodd, and Walter de Courcey Dodd, in St James’ Catholic Church in Killorglin, co. Kerry features another traditional Irish symbol, the clover. A carved stone clover was placed on the top of the plaque; on each of the three leaves are the military badges of the units the three brothers

\textsuperscript{81} Redmond Memorial, Irish War Memorials, http://www.irishwarmemorials.ie/Memorials-Detail?memoId=178.
\textsuperscript{82} It also features on the most Irish of exports, Guinness stout.
\textsuperscript{83} Redmond Memorial, Irish War Memorials, http://www.irishwarmemorials.ie/Memorials-Detail?memoId=961; Bust of Major William Redmond erected in Memorial Park Wexford, 31\textsuperscript{st} May, 1931, NLI Redmond Family Photographic Collection NPA RED1, http://catalogue.nli.ie/Record/vtls000720783.
fought with, the Machine Gun Corps, the Royal Munster Fusiliers, and the Royal Flying Corps. 84 (Image 171)

Expressions of National Identity: Scotland

A distinguishing element for the other nations of Britain is the presence of their own national languages, Irish, Scots Gaelic, and Welsh. Spoken by a minority of the population in each nation, they were promoted as tools to advance nationalism in the

years before and after the war. In Ireland, the Gaelic Revival of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was intrinsically tied into the notions of nationhood, independence, and colonialism. The push in Wales for the disestablishment of the Anglican Church as the national church was linked to the speaking of Welsh and national identity. The use of these other languages on memorials varied. In Ireland, the connection between nationalism and the Irish language left little room for the use of Irish on war memorials. Memorials to the First World War were being designed and erected before memorials to the Easter Rising or the War of Independence, but the use of the Irish language on the former was rare, which helped to cast the memory of the First World War as British over Irish simply by the language used. One of the only memorials to use Irish is the memorial to Frederick O’Neill mentioned in the previous chapter. Here the use of the O’Neill family motto and war cry ‘lamh deangh aboo’ (red hand to victory) highlighted the family’s historic Irishness. (Image 149) The lack of Irish on memorials in the database highlights the value those erecting the memorials had on emphasizing their Britishness by using English over Irish.

Similarly in Scotland, the lack of Scots Gaelic on the memorials speaks to Scottish nationalism’s relationship to Britain. The use of Scots Gaelic on memorials was rare, with only a handful of memorials having Scots Gaelic phrases. One memorial, to the brothers Colin and Angus Macdonald in St John’s Episcopal Church in Dumfries concludes with the phrase ‘dileas gu bas’ which translates to ‘faithful unto death’ from Revelation 2:10.

---

85 Evidence though shows that the speaking of Welsh amongst Anglican ministers by the time of the First World War was equal to the non-conformist chapels in Wales, Kenneth O. Morgan, Modern Wales: Politics, Places and People, (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1995), pp. 142-176.
Another memorial that was also mentioned in the previous chapter is the MacDougall memorial to father Stewart and son Iain in Craignish Parish Church in the town of Ardfern. The MacDougall family coat of arms at the top of the memorial bears the family motto of ‘buidh no bas’ which translates to ‘conquer or die’, while at the bottom of the memorial an epitaph in Gaelic reads, ‘B’thaoin leòm bas, be’n theàsnos an durachd.’  

The lack of Scots Gaelic on memorials highlights the dominance of English in Scottish memorial construction, but also the importance of Britishness in commemoration.

But this was not necessarily at the expense of Scottishness, because families usually emphasized their Scottishness on memorials. The memorial to Stewart and Iain MacDougall was not the only memorial to them, as a second was erected in Croabh Haven at the entrance to the marina. Taking the form of a Celtic cross, the memorial has three bronze plaques attached to the base. The smallest identifies the memorial to Stewart and Iain, while the following two trace their family history back to John MacDougall of Lorne who lived from 1340 to 1400. Following their ancestors, the memorial identifies several who participated in major military engagements such as Thomas and Andrew MacDougall who served King James VI (also known as James I), Allan of Craigenight who fought with the clan at the battle of Sheriffmuir in 1715, the four sons of John of Craigenight who all fought in the Battle of Waterloo in 1815, John MacDougall who was the aide-de-general to Sir Colin Campbell, and Stewarts’ service with the Royal Family.

---

88 The origin of this phrase is unclear as it does not have a clear reference. Attempts were made to find a translator, but no Scots Gaelic speaker could be found. A rough translation is, ‘It was with me to die, be sincere in duty.’ Craignish Parish Church-MacDouglalls of Lunga Plaque, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/82309.
and father and son’s deaths in the First World War.\textsuperscript{89} (Image 173 and 174) Tracing their history, with particular interest in ancestors who had served in the military, reveals their service in the war as part of a long tradition in the family to fight not only for Scottish causes but also for British ones. The MacDougalls were not the only people to construct memorials that emphasized their Scottishness through their family. The memorial cairn to the brothers Allen George and Archibald Cameron, the sons of the clan chief, was placed in the Clan Cameron of Lochiel Burial Ground to commemorate their deaths.\textsuperscript{90} (Image 29) The importance of family and their identity as sons of the clan chief can be seen in another memorial to Allen George that was erected in St Andrew’s Church in Fort William by his oldest brother Donald that specifically identifies him as ‘3\textsuperscript{rd} son of Cameron of Lochiel XXIV chief.’\textsuperscript{91} (Image 175) The MacDougalls and the Camerons all came from noble families, so tracing their family history helped to symbolize their inherit Scottishness alongside their service in Britain in the First World War.

The presence of Scottish symbols on memorials can be seen primarily in the regimental badges that feature either the Scottish saltire or the Scottish thistle to mark the regiment as Scottish. An example of this can be seen on the memorial to Archibald Garden Robertson in St Magnus’ Cathedral in the town of Kirkwall in the Orkney Islands. The large wooden plaque features a carving of the badge of his regiment the Royal Highlanders Black Watch with the regimental motto in Latin. The badge features St

\textsuperscript{89} It is necessary to zoom into the images to read the family tree, Captain I MacDougall and Lieutenant Colonel S MacDougall, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/70777.
\textsuperscript{90} Captain Allen George Cameron and Captain Archibald Cameron, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/69558.
\textsuperscript{91} Fort William is the largest town to the home of Clan Cameron at Achnacarry, where the burial ground is located, Captain A G Cameron, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/44537.
Andrew, the patron saint of Scotland, carrying his cross, known as the saltire that appears on the national flag of Scotland. A crown rests on top and flanking St Andrew are thistles, the flower of Scotland. (Image 176) The use of these symbols of Scotland can occasionally be seen in other memorials outside of the military badges. One example is the memorial to Sir George Reginald Houstoun-Boswall in the town of Edrom. The memorial features a laurel wreath in the centre, flanked on the left by a roaring lion (the royal symbol of Scotland) next to the Scottish flag and a thistle, and on the right a rampant lion (the royal symbol of England) next to the English flag and a red rose. (Image 177) The use of both Scottish and English symbols on the memorial highlights the unity between them and the service Houstoun-Boswall performed for each of them by serving in the British military.

Image 172: Memorial Plaque to Colin MacDonald and Angus MacDonald in St John’s Episcopal Church, Nithsdale, Dumfries and Galloway, Scotland.

Image 173: Memorial Cross to Stewart MacDougall and Iain MacDougall outside the Marina in Coabh Haven, Highland, Scotland.

---

Expressions of National Identity: Wales

In examining Welsh memorials, the higher number of Welsh-language memorials jumps out as a distinguishing feature of Wales compared to other nations. The use of Welsh on memorials was common not only on private memorials but also on community memorials, particularly in regions where a large proportion of the population spoke Welsh. Unlike Scots Gaelic or Irish, Welsh had become the language of religion in the
country as it was spoken regularly in both the non-conformist chapels and in Anglican churches in the lead-up to the First World War.\textsuperscript{94} War memorials in Wales used both English and Welsh, sometimes together. The use of Welsh was a political issue during the war as Welsh nationalists wanted to protect their language and identity through Welsh military units.\textsuperscript{95}

In an analysis of collective memorials in the traditional heartland of the Welsh language, Cardiganshire, Carmarthenshire, and northern Pembrokeshire, Gwenllian Awbery argues that Welsh-language memorials display a stronger sense of local identity. The memorials eschew more abstract concepts of Welsh national identity, Britishness, and the Empire. The lack of abstract concepts like ‘country’, ‘freedom’, ‘duty’, and ‘honour’ on Welsh language memorials compared to English ones highlights the use of Welsh to centre the deaths of the soldiers in the community.\textsuperscript{96} The personal memorials examined for this dissertation reveal similar patterns amongst the Welsh language memorials as Awbery found. The memorial to Rhys Davies in Hawen Congregational Church reveals the plain text many of the memorials have: ‘Er cof annwyl am Rhys Davies penffos. Syrthiodd yn y Rhyfel Mawr yn Ffrainc, Gorffennaf 23, 1918, yn 20 oed.’ (In memory of Rhys Davies head. Who fell in the Great War in France July 23, 1918, aged 20 years.)\textsuperscript{97} (Image 178) The memorial to Victor Roberts in Moriah Chapel in the town of Llangefni on Anglesey shares similar qualities in the simplicity of text: ‘Er serchog gof am Victor Roberts 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lieut: 9\textsuperscript{th} Welsh Reg. Metropolitan Bank.

\textsuperscript{95} Angela Gaffney, \textit{Aftermath: Remembering the Great War in Wales}, (Cardiff: University of Cardiff Press, 1998), pp. 133-151.
\textsuperscript{96} Awbery, ‘The Language of Remembrance’, pp. 112-136.
\textsuperscript{97} R. Davies, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/70437.
Cwympoddyn y frwydr yn Belgium gorphenaf 19, 1917, yn 20 oed.’ (In loving memory Victor Roberts 2nd Lieut: 9th Welsh Regiment Metropolitan Bank. Fell in battle in Belgium July 19th, 1917, 20 years of age.)

Other memorials featured more religious language including the memorial to Alun Mabon Jones that reads, ‘Gofeb eglwys soar. Trwm oedd y groes ysgafn yw y goron. Am Alun Mabon Jones a gwymodd yn y Rhyfel Mawr 1914-1918. Ofnodd Duw yn fwy na’r gledd.’ (Soar church memorial. Heavy was the light cross is the crown. For Alun Mabon Jones who fell in the Great War 1914-1918. Feared God more than the sword.) The memorial to Robert Davies identifies his place of death and burial location through Biblical references: ‘Er gogoniant Duw ac er cof anwyl am Robert Davies, Teiliau Isaf, Ffestiniog, Lance-Corporal yn y R.W.F. Bu farw dros ei wlad ar faes Brwydr Gaze, gwalad Cannan, ebrill 20 fed, 1917, ac a gladdwyd ger Bryn Samson. Rhoffedig gan ei frodyr William ac Owen Davies.’ (To the glory of God and in dear remembrance of Robert Davies, Teiliau Isaf, Ffestiniog, Lance Corporal Royal Welch Fusiliers, who died for his country on the battlefield of Gaza, Canaan, April 20th, 1917, and who lies buried at Samson Hill. Donated by his brothers William and Owen Davies.)

The memorial to Robert Davies is one of the few to refer to him fighting and dying for his country amongst Welsh language memorials. The use of Welsh on memorials was not restricted to any one denomination as Robert Davies was Anglican in St Michaels Church, part of the Church in Wales, while Alun Mabon Jones’ memorial was original located in Soar Chapel before

100 The untranslated section of ‘Teiliau Isaf, Ffestiniog’ is the name of the Davies home as the memorial is located in the town of Blaenau Ffestiniog, Lance Corporal R Davies, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/37124.
being moved to its current location in the Royal Welch Fusiliers Club in Blaenau Ffestiniog.

The use of Welsh was not limited to the memorials, as Welsh could be used on the headstones of soldiers whose bodies had been identified. The epitaph of Alun Mabon Jones was also written in Welsh: ‘Tawel hun hyd adgyfodiad gwell’ (Rest in peace until a better resurrection). Others though swapped languages, using Welsh for the memorial and English for the epitaph or vice versa. Victor Roberts’ memorial is in Welsh and his epitaph was written in English: ‘My purposes are broken off’ from Job 17:11 in the Bible. On the other side, the memorial to Vernon Own located in St Hywyn’s Church in the town of Aberdaron took the form of a vestry screen; the accompanying plaque identifying the memorial was written in English. The epitaph for Vernon’s headstone reads, ‘Coronwyd ti’n arwr yn more dy ddydd’ (You were crowned the hero of your day). The text is a line from the Welsh poem, ‘Y Milwr Na Ddychwel’ (The Soldier Who Will Not Return) by John Ceiriog Hughes. The Owen family and the community they lived in were Welsh speakers; the community memorial for Aberdaron, on which Vernon Owen is listed, was written in Welsh and is located outside of St Hywyn’s

101 Private Alun Mabon Jones, CWGC Find War Dead Casualty Details, https://www.cwgc.org/find-records/find-war-dead/casualty-details/570824/ALUN%20MABON%20JONES/.
103 The memorial was erected by members of the church and the community to remember Vernon who was the son of the vicar of St Hywyn, Lieutenant V. E. Owen, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/60683.
The mixing of English and Welsh between memorials and epitaphs highlights the lack of controversy surrounding the use of language in Wales.

The mixing of English and Welsh on memorials was not uncommon; several memorials were designed with both languages, although they are predominantly English with a final epitaph in Welsh. Two examples of mixed memorials are to Gomer Davies and Glyn Rhys Morgan. Gomer had a plaque erected to him by his parents in Tabor United Reformed Church (Welsh Congregational Chapel) that was in English, with the final line ‘Gwell angau na chywilydd’ (death before dishonour), which is the motto of the Royal Welch Fusiliers. Glyn’s memorial was erected by his father in Pontypridd High School, now Coed y Lan Lower Comprehensive School, in the town of Pontypridd. Written in English like Gomer’s, the final line of the memorial is in Welsh and reads, ‘Ei enw a gofir’ (his name is remembered). (Image 179) Both these memorials display Welshness through the final line of the memorial, but the selection of English over Welsh for the majority reveals a closer alignment to Britain than to Welsh nationalism.

One memorial that stands out is to Ellis Evans, better known as Hedd Wyn, the Welsh bardic poet. His death in 1917 before being named winner of the Birkenhead national eisteddfod saw him come to represent the losses of the Welsh nation, particularly for nationalists advocating for the Welsh language. His memorial seeks to be for the community as it is placed in his hometown of Trawsfynydd, but the language of the memorial stands out due to the selection of his poem ‘Nid a’n Ango’ (Ever Remembered)

---

107 The transcription of the line is incorrect on the IWM database as the line is the motto of the Welch Regiment, G Davies, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/36868.
that he had written before joining the war. The text in Welsh reads, ‘Ei aberth nid a heibio-ei wyneb annwyl nid a’n ango er I’r Almaen ystaenio ei dwrn dur yn ei waedó’ (His sacrifice will not be forgotten-his countenance so dear will be remembered tho’) Germany’s iron fist by his blood is stained) which takes a stronger stance towards the war compared to other memorials.¹⁰⁹ (Image 123)

Besides the use of the Welsh language, Welsh memorials also used national symbols of Wales. Like in Scotland, it was typically in the form of military badges of Welsh regiments. Most Welsh regiments bore the badge of the Prince of Wales: three goose feathers in a crown with the motto ‘Ich dien.’ The motto is German for ‘I serve’ and might have turned some individuals away from having it on a memorial. Yet the memorials to George Rees and Frank Hill Gaskell, both members of the Welch Regiment, have the Prince of Wales badge at the top of their memorials with the words ‘Ich dien’ included.¹¹⁰ Gaskell’s memorial includes under the badge the Welsh motto for the regiment, ‘Gwell angau na chywilydd’ (Death before dishonour) as well. (Image 6) Other distinct Welsh symbols on the memorials were not common on community memorials in Wales. Most war memorials made little reference to Wales through traditional symbols such as the Welsh dragon or St David, the patron saint of Wales. Rather, the use of English symbols on Welsh memorials highlighted the power of war commemoration to unify Wales with Britain.¹¹¹ English symbols can be seen on the memorial to William Henry Seager in the Cardiff Royal Infirmary. Coming from a wealthy and leading family

in Cardiff, he was honoured with an operating theatre in the hospital. The plaque identifying the memorial has a painting of St George carrying his banner, the flag of England, as he slays a dragon. Below the text identifying William, the plaque also quotes English poet William Wordsworth’s poem, ‘Character of the Happy Warrior’ as an epitaph.\textsuperscript{112} (Image 116)

**Expressions of National Identity: England as Britain and Empire**

When approaching expressions of Englishness in England, the role of the nation in the portrayal of Britain and the larger Empire has to be taken into consideration. Britain was constructed with an uneven power structure, with England always in the superior position over the other member nations. Their dominance in Britain led the English to struggle in developing a clear defining national identity within Britain as the other nations were able to. Putting the bulk of their efforts into creating Britain, the national identity of England is equal to and subsumed by Britishness.\textsuperscript{113} The link of Englishness to Britishness can be seen in the commemoration of the First World War, particularly when examining the major memorials constructed by the British government. Jenny Macleod’s

\textsuperscript{112} 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lieutenant W H Seager, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/30105.

article examining the national memorials in Britain and Ireland highlights that England is
the only nation not to construct a national memorial to the war. Instead, they placed their
emphasis on British or Imperial memorials. The construction of the Imperial War
Museum, the Cenotaph, and the Unknown Warrior, all sites of collective remembrance
that emphasizes British or Imperial identity are located in England at the heart of both the
nation and the Empire.\textsuperscript{114} Examining the use of ‘England’ or English symbols on
memorials therefore can be difficult because a memorial that speaks to Englishness or
England might also be representing Britain and the Empire. The invocation of England on
memorials was meant to be a lesson, a tool to help instruct others about how the live, act,
and serve. The equation of England to Britain and the Empire therefore reveals that using
England on memorials helped to demonstrate how good and loyal servants of the Empire
functioned.

The use of England to stand in for Britain is reflected more clearly in memorials
outside of England that reference England or use English symbols. The use of St George
on memorials, particularly stained-glass windows, reflects the equation of England to the
Empire. No patron saint of the Empire exists but if one did, the memorials suggest that it
would be St George. Yet using St George does not always reflect a desire to equate the
memorial to England and the Empire. St George as a soldier saint can be invoked as a
symbol for bravery, honour, and courage. He might have been selected simply because it
would help identify the window or memorial as a war memorial and fit into the setting in
which it was being erected. The desire to use England as Britain can be seen when
memorials use the word ‘England’ in their inscriptions. In Ireland, the memorial to

\textsuperscript{114} Jenny Macleod, ‘National Memorials to the First World War in Britain and Ireland’, \textit{Journal of
Contemporary History}, vol. 48, no. 4, (October 2013), pp. 650-651.
Charles Willington T. Lane quotes the Rudyard Kipling poem *For all We Have and Are*:
‘There is but one task for all, For each one life to give, Who stands if freedom fall, Who
dies if England lived?’115 (Image 144) Similarly, the memorial to William Stewart Collen
in Ireland quotes Rupert Brooke’s *The Soldier*: ‘If I should die think only this of me that
there’s some corner of a foreign field that is for ever England.’116 (Image 180) In
Scotland, the memorial to Anthony Herbert Strutt has the text, ‘None untimely die who
die for England’ with a painted image of St George on the plaque.117 (Image 181) In
Wales, the memorial to Harold James has the inscription, ‘He sleeps not beneath his
native soil but out in a foreign place where he fought and died for England and the honour
of his race.’118 (Image 182) Each of these memorials demonstrate the importance of
England as an instructive tool for the way citizens are meant to act. The use of Kipling’s
and Brooke’s poetry to highlight service demonstrates how influential these individuals
were as public figures.

In comparison to how other nations, or even the Empire, were expressed on
memorials, England was represented as tangible. The language used to describe England,
while still portraying the abstract concept of the nation, references England as a physical
place as much as an imagined concept. This is often achieved through the use of imagery
of the land or environment, as on the memorial to Edgar Hazel Hester in St Margaret’s
Church in Oxford, which uses a different quotation from Rupert Brooke’s *The Soldier*: ‘A

117 Lieutenant A H Strutt, IWM War Memorials Register,
118 Pte H James, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/36945;
An image of the plaque can be seen here, Llanishen, IWM War Memorials Register,
dust whom England bore, shaped, made aware, gave, once, her flowers to love her ways to roam, a body of England’s, breathing English air, washed by the rivers, blest by suns of home.’¹¹⁹ The use of Brooke to make reference to England on memorials was frequent, but typically the line used was, ‘If I should die think only this of me that there’s some corner of a foreign field that is for ever England.’ These lines are more ambiguous about what England represents compared to the section quoted on Hester’s memorial. The reference to the natural features of England, the flowers, air, rivers, and even sun of England, helps conjure images of England’s landscape in the reader’s mind. The memorial to William Thomas Stackhouse makes a similar reference, as he is remembered as dying ‘For his King and the homes of England.’¹²⁰ The use of the phrase ‘homes of England’ gives the memorial a real object that Stackhouse fought and died for. Similarly, the memorial to Noel Loftus Moore Ward in St Mary’s Church in Barnston describes his death and afterlife as ‘The sons of England with lifted swords shall gather at the gates of paradise.’¹²¹ (Image 183) Being seen as a ‘son of England’ shares similarities with Brooke’s description of the landscape of England, as Ward was a child of the country that shaped him.

The concept of England being something tangible is also reflected in the memorials when it is represented as the ideal for which soldiers fought and died. The memorial to Duncan Flower Cunningham Reid highlights the war being for England with the line, ‘True love by life, true love by death is tried live thou for England, he for

England died.122 (Image 184) The quote is from a poem by Arthur Campbell Ainger who first wrote it anonymously for The Times under the title ‘For a Memorial Tablet.’123 Ainger’s poem was used on several memorials. One is to the brothers Christopher Farrer and Thomas Culling Farrer, both of whom were born in New Zealand to parents who later moved to England. Their memorial using Ainger’s poem reinforces the image of England being representative of the larger Imperial service and the service of Dominion troops to Britain.124 (Image 185) Other memorials spoke to Rudyard Kipling’s poem, ‘For All We Have and Are’, which Kipling ends by asking, ‘What stands if Freedom fall? Who dies if England live?’125 Memorials quoting this particular Kipling poem are implying not only that the individual being commemorated ensured England lives, but also that England is real as it ‘lives.’ The memorial to Elliot Blair Crasett, a captain in the Indian Army, quotes the final question of Kipling’s poem, displaying an understanding that England in this case represents the Empire and the sacrifice of Imperial forces in its defence.126 The memorial to Sydney Richard Hickmott answers Kipling’s poem directly by stating, ‘He died that England might live.’127 Other memorials pick up on the theme of Kipling even if they do not quote him directly. The memorial to Richard Manning, was originally in St

122 Lieutenant Duncan Flower Cunningham Reid, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/19435.
123 The author in the first publication of the poem was simply ‘A.C.A.’ and Ainger was not identified clearly as the author until a letter to the editor in 1925 clearly identified ‘Mr A.C. Ainger’ as the author. ‘For a Memorial Tablet’, The Times, February 16, 1918, p. 7; ‘Points form Letters: War Memorial Inscription’, The Times, September 7, 1925, p. 8.
124 Sergeant C Farrer and Sapper T C Farrer, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/29528.

The idea of dying for England appeared frequently on memorials that were utilitarian in design and function. These memorials, created to benefit society, sought to emphasise not just the cause that the person died for, but also to serve as a lesson for future generations. Providence House in Burton-on-Humber was donated to the National Children’s Home, an orphanage, by the Sharpley family to commemorate Henry Sharpley. It later became a public library and adult education centre.¹²⁹ Over the entrance to the building a plaque was installed that includes Ainger’s poem with the line, ‘Live thou for England, He for England died.’¹³⁰ (Image 187) The memorial hall in Ockley Village was constructed in memory of John Henry Gordon Lee Steere. Above the entrance to the hall is inscribed the text, ‘Be proud: For many died for England and there was much glory.’¹³¹ (Image 188) The family of Robert Ivan Doncaster contributed funds to the construction of the south wing of the Sandiacre Memorial Institute and had a plaque erected to commemorate him that reads, “‘I go into this hoping to do as an Englishman should.” These were the words written by Robert Ivan Doncaster in a letter to his parents before going into action at Thiepval on July 1ˢᵗ, 1916. This wing of the Sandiacre Memorial Institute is erected in his memory in the hope that England may

¹²⁸ The memorial is currently in the Hull Maritime Museum, taking some of the power away from the quote, Seaman Richard Manning, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/70697.
¹²⁹ The fate of the building is currently up for debate. The adult education centre closed in 2019 and in 2021 applications were filed to turn the building into a private residence and office building. The local council of North Lincolnshire has yet to make a decision on what will happen to the building. ‘Application PA/2021/803’, North Lincolnshire Council, https://apps.northlincs.gov.uk/application/pa-2021-803.
¹³¹ Lieutenant J H Lee Steere and Village Hall, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/76035
continue to produce sons with the same high sense of patriotism and duty.’

In Edenbridge Hospital, two cousins, Gordon Bluett-Winch and Ronald Bluett-Winch, were commemorated by having an x-ray room dedicated to them. The plaque in the hospital includes the line, ‘Went the fight well? We died and never knew but well or ill England we died for you.’

(Image 189) In each of these memorials England was identified as the cause that these soldiers fought and died for, an entity that needed to be defended and protected.

The use of England as a political identity over an ethnic one depended on where the memorial was located and the origins of the individual erecting the memorial. Unlike Britain which was viewed as a political identity, Englishness was viewed as both a political and ethnic identity on the memorials, giving it more substance and power over just Britain for those erecting memorials in England. As such, memorials in England referencing the nation can be harder to interpret if the creators are referring to England the country, or England as part of Britain.

133 The hospital in Edenbridge in the years since the end of the war moved to a new location and updated their equipment, but the two were still commemorated in the new building even though the x-ray technology purchased to commemorate has since been updated, Major G. Bluett-Winch and Second Lieutenant R. Bluett-Winch, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/73715.
Image 182: Memorial Plaque to Harold James in St Dennis Church, Llanishen, Monmouthshire, Wales.

Image 183: Memorial Plaque to Noel Loftus Moore ward in St Andrew’s Church, Barnston, Essex, England.

Image 184: Memorial Plaque to Duncan Flower Cunningham Reid in Holy Trinity Church, Stratford Upon Avon, Warwickshire, England.


Image 187: Memorial Plaque to Henry Sharpley above the entrance to Providence House formerly a National Children’s Home and Public Library, Barton Upon Humber, Lincolnshire, England.

Image 188: Memorial Plaque to John Henry Lee Steere above the entrance to Ockley Village Hall, Ockley, Surrey, England.

Image 189: Memorial Plaque to Gordon Bluett-Winch and Ronald Bluett-Winch for an X-Ray Room in Edenbridge Hospital, Edenbridge, Kent, England.
The Monarchy in Commemoration

Using the word ‘England’ creates a more tangible understanding than the most common term for the nation across the entire database, the word ‘country’. ‘Country’ was used frequently on personal memorials, but unlike England, is far more abstract a concept and difficult to define. Due to the lack of specificity in the word when used on memorials, it is nearly impossible to determine if the word is referring to the nation or the British Empire. Rather than trying to understand what the memorials mean by country, it is more productive to examine the word that often proceeded country on the memorials, ‘King’. The phrase, ‘King and country’ appear repeatedly on memorials, most often together but sometimes as separate words. While both are abstract concepts, there was only one King being referred to, making it even more tangible than England.

The role of the monarchy, particularly the King, in the First World War has been under studied by historians. Histories of the British monarchy during the First World War have focused less on the role of the monarchy as a cultural force, and more on the political history of the monarchy, particularly examining how it survived the threat of revolution and modernized. The work of Heather Jones’ *For King and Country* attempts to rectify the lack of analysis on the monarchy by examining the role of the monarch in popular perceptions and moving away from the political history of the institution. In examining of the role of the monarchy in commemoration, Jones argues that the central role the monarchy took in commemorating the war dead was a strategy to reinvigorate its popularity in the face of challenges and crises that arose during the war. The King was able to put himself and his family, including later generations, at the centre of

---

commemoration, ‘sacralising it [grief] through the monarch’s association with the spiritual, and with those cultural understandings of honour that had survived the war… grief became the dominant commemorative trope and the monarchy central to channelling this message.’\textsuperscript{135} The use of the phrase ‘For King and Country’, while at first used in the war as a recruiting tool, came to mean more by war’s end. With it being placed on war memorials, it represented a shared Britishness that evoked national honour in a tradition that transcended the circumstances of the war.\textsuperscript{136}

Beyond simply using the phrase ‘for King and country,’ many memorials used the language and symbols the monarchy supported during the war in the memorialization process. One means of incorporating the language of the King was to draw from public announcements about service in the conflict. The primary announcement many memorials referenced was King George’s message to the troops made on August 12\textsuperscript{th}, 1914. The short message was meant to encourage the troops and the line used by memorials reads, ‘Duty is your watchword, and I know your duty will be nobly done.’\textsuperscript{137} Memorials referenced the line often by declaring, ‘duty nobly done,’ ‘nobly he did his duty,’ or ‘his duty nobly done.’\textsuperscript{138} (Images 190, 191, and 192) In these cases the memorials are reaffirming the sentiment of the King’s message to highlight the service these individuals made in fighting in the war and for the King. More commonly, memorials drew upon the commemorative scrolls issued after the war to the next-of-kin in the name of the King.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid, p. 363.
\textsuperscript{136} Ibid, pp. 365-366.
The scroll featured the royal coat of arms on the top with the individual’s rank, name, and unit at the bottom with the text, ‘He whom this scroll commemorates was numbered among those who, at the call of King and Country, left all that was dear to them, endured hardness, faced danger, and finally passed out of the sight of men by the path of duty and self-sacrifice, giving up their own lives that others might live in freedom. Let those who come after see to it that his name be not forgotten.’ Each scroll also was accompanied by a letter from Buckingham Palace in which the King expressed his grief and sorrow for their loss.

The scrolls were incorporated into memorials or quoted directly. The memorial to John Francis Baker in St John the Baptist Church in the village of Londonthorpe, Lincolnshire, England, features a stained-glass window as the main memorial with the scroll mounted on the wall in a frame. Similarly, the memorial to Percival Molson in the Percival Molson Stadium in McGill University in Montreal, Canada, features a display case that has athletic trophies, medals, a picture of Percival, and the scroll sent to his family. In Ireland, the memorial to Henry Geoffrey Hamilton Moore in St Matthew’s Church in Newtownmountkennedy, county Wicklow, features the text of the scroll on a metal plaque.

---

139 An example of the scroll can be found here, Next of Kin Memorial Plaque and Scroll, IWM Souvenirs and Ephemera Collection, https://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/30082124.
Alongside the commemorative scrolls, next-of-kin were also sent memorial plaques, commonly known as the “dead man’s penny”. These pennies were designed at the same time as the commemorative scrolls, but due to the longer production time for metal, the pennies were mailed out after the scrolls were distributed. The penny and scroll function as a pair to showcase government and royal sorrow at the losses of the war through commemoration. The penny featured British symbols as the main figure is Britannia, the personification of Britain in the form of a woman. She wears an ancient Greek helmet, while carrying a trident in one hand and holding a laurel wreath in the other. At her feet stands a lion, the royal symbol of British monarchs. On the edges of the penny reads the phrase, ‘He died for freedom and honour’ while the name of the soldier is included under the laurel wreath.143

These pennies were used as part of the memorials in a similar way to the scrolls. In Australia, the entrance gates to Anzac Park in the town of Balranald in New South Wales were erected in memory of Sydney Leo Greenham. Above the inscription on one of the posts his parents had his penny installed.144 (Image 196) In St Andrew Catholic Church in Judique, Nova Scotia, Canada, four pennies were installed as a memorial to four individuals who were killed in the war.145 (Image 197) In Tullow Church of Ireland in Carrickmines, co. Dublin, the family of Nathaniel Hone had his penny installed on the end of a church pew that served as his memorial.146 (Image 198) The inclusion of the

---

143 An example of the plaque can be seen here, Next of Kin Memorial Plaque and Scroll, IWM Souvenirs and Ephemera Collection, https://www.iwm.org.uk/collections/item/object/30082124.
penny as part of the memorial helped to personalize it, but also showcase the acceptance of the individual’s death as being for the state.

The importance of the memorial scrolls and pennies for individual commemoration cannot be overstated. The survival of these memorials into the present day, often passed down from generation to generation, reveals the importance of these official memorials for families. An example is in the memorial to Frederick William Charles Drover located in the David Currie V.C. Armoury in Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, Canada. The memorial was only erected in 1983 when Frederick’s sister, Annie Broomfield, donated the penny and scroll to the armoury that serves as a military museum for the Saskatchewan Dragoons.¹⁴⁷ (Image 34) Frederick did not fight for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, he had never visited Canada (he had enlisted with the 1ˢᵗ Hampshire Regiment), and in 1911 was living in Bournemouth working as an errand boy for a grocer.¹⁴⁸ Annie held onto the penny after she moved to Canada and kept it with her until the 1980s when she donated to the Currie Armoury.¹⁴⁹

The importance of the penny and the monarchy for family commemoration can be seen in the memorial to Austin Kirk Shenton. Located in All Saints’ Church in the village of Husbands Bosworth, Leicestershire, the memorial contains the penny as part of a large wooden memorial to Austin. The memorial stands out not because it contains the penny,

¹⁴⁸ Fred Drover, Census Returns of England and Wales, 1911, NA RG 14, 1911, District 95, 25 Muscliff Road, Winton, Bournemouth.
¹⁴⁹ Annie’s story is harder to trace based on research from Ancestry. She appears to have immigrated to Canada during the Second World War where she worked as a factory worker. After the war she travelled back to England several times. Her last trip in 1960 is when she first appears to have been married as it is the first time she travels under her married name of Broomfield. He passed away in 1993 and is buried in Rosedale Cemetery in Moose Jaw.
but rather that it reaches back in time to commemorate Austin in conjunction with his
ancestor John Shenton. John had fought as a Captain of cavalry in the English Civil War
for the Royalist Army of King Charles II. The memorial brings the two men together by
naming the major battles they fought in, along with the year they were fought, their final
resting places, and that both of their officers’ swords were buried in the church. The
design features of the memorial also work to unite the two men, nine generations apart,
through their service to their monarchs. Both sides of the memorial contain paintings with
the royal coat of arms. On the left side, the memorial honours John with an older version
of the royal coat of arms when the English monarchy still claimed to be the monarchs of
France as the French fleur de lys is present. Below the coat of arms, the painting shows a
knight in armour with a boy. On the right side honouring Austin is the royal coat of arms
(without the fleur de lys) and the painting below shows a soldier in khaki kneeling with a
woman next to him. (Image 199) The images connect the two by representing them in
their military dress, but also through their loyal service to their king in the placement of
the coat of arms. While John is listed first on the memorial, Austin receives more
attention. His memorial plaque is included, as are representations of his medals and,
several quotes from condolence letters the family received after his death that extoll his
virtues and soldiering abilities. The fact that John had fought for the Royalist Army in the

150 John Shenton was listed as fighting in the battles of Naseby (1645) and Worcester (1651) while Austin
fought at Loos (1915), Somme (1916), Arras (1917), Cambrai (1917) and Montdidier (1918). Captain J
Shenton and Captain A Shenton MC, IWM War Memorials Register,
151 The only photo of the memorial is located on the photo sharing website flikr, and is cited by the
Leicestershire County Council in their War Memorials Project, All Saints Church-Husbands Bosworth,
Leicestershire County Council War Memorials Project,
http://www.leicestershireshermalmemorials.co.uk/war/memorials/view/575; All Saint’s Husbands Bosworth
Leicestershire, Lord Muttley McFester,
https://www.flickr.com/photos/16545729@N03/3923857447/in/photostream/.
English Civil War, a conflict where one had to fight for or against the monarchy, highlights the desire of Austin’s family to show that his service was equal to the earlier conflict. By linking them together, the Shenton family emphasized not just their service to the crown, but the importance of the monarchy to understanding the meaning of the war in memory. The connection between the two soldiers across the centuries gave meaning to Austin’s death by showing the continuity of service and sacrifice to the monarchy.

The use of both the scroll and the plaque in the commemorative process signals the power of the monarchy in remembrance. Individuals and families valued these items sent to them by the government with the personal backing of the monarchy. They represented the sacralisation of the war dead and their importance to the monarchy through the active participation of the monarchy in the commemoration process. These symbols of dying for their King demonstrate the emphasis that many individuals placed on the service of their loved ones in the conflict and the role of the King in helping make their deaths understood.

Invoking the King in commemoration provided individuals with a useful tool to help them comprehend and understand the war. The King was as an individual who stood for all parts of Great Britain and the Empire and could unify the different nationalities being expressed on the memorials. As a person, the King and the royal family were something real that could be seen, understood, and easily identified. Even in the Dominions, the monarchy was understood as being connected to the people practically, constitutionally, and emotionally. Yet the monarch wore many hats and could be interpreted in many different ways. He was the King of the nation, the monarch of the United Kingdom, and the ruler of the Empire. No matter the political disposition, what
extended throughout all was the King, allowing individuals to use the monarchy to help anchor their memories in creating the good death.
Image 195: Memorial Plaque to Henry Geoffrey Hamilton Moore in St Matthew’s Church, Newtownmountkennedy, Wicklow, Ireland.

Image 196: Memorial Gates to Sydney Greenham in Anzac Park, Balranald, New South Wales, Australia.

Image 197: Memorial Plaques to John Alexander McLean, John Alexander McDonald, Angus McDougall, and Dan Alex McDonald in St Andrew Catholic Church, Judique, Nova Scotia, Canada.

Image 198: Memorial Plaque and Pew to Nathaniel Hone in Tullow Church of Ireland, Carrickmines, Dublin, Ireland.

Image 199: Memorial Plaque to Austin Kirk Shenton and John Shenton in All Saints Church, Husbands Bosworth, Leicestershire, England.
Expressions of National Identity: Indigenous Memorials

Until this point the majority of the memorials being examined in this chapter have all been focused on individuals of white, Anglo-Celtic ethnicity. The impact of the war upon other communities has drawn increased attention as the historiography has expanded to ensure that the full breadth of experiences is brought into historical analysis. While the majority of the memorials in the database were built by white Anglo-Celtic individuals from the British Isles or settler communities in the Dominions, a small number of memorials were constructed by indigenous populations to highlight their service in the conflict.

The history of indigenous participation in the war has recently received increased scholarly attention. Part of the gap in the historiography ice stemmed from the lack of interest the armies had in recruiting non-white soldiers during the war. Most governments discouraged the use of indigenous, Black, or other racial groups. When members of these communities were recruited, they were often placed in labour units rather than combat units. The British West Indies Regiment was a labour battalion recruited from the British island colonies of the Caribbean that received many Black Britons who had originally enlisted with combat units. Recruitment of indigenous populations was undertaken in all the Dominions with different recruitment policies in each. In the opening stages of the war, recruitment was limited as there were enough white volunteers to meet the commitments of the Dominions. It was not until manpower shortages emerged later in the war that recruiters began to allow larger numbers of indigenous volunteers join the expeditionary forces. However, indigenous soldiers were usually limited to labour units

instead of combat. In South Africa, Black troops were limited to the labour corps in the campaigns across Africa, France, and the Middle East. The loss of the troopship *Mendi* in 1916 saw heavy casualties for Black South Africans and has since become a focus of collective memory for the country.\(^{153}\)

In examining the policies towards indigenous populations in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, there is a clear difference between New Zealand and the other two. Unlike Australia and Canada, Māori were theoretically equal citizens of the nation according to the law, although they suffered from racial prejudice and violations of their treaty rights. The outbreak of war therefore led Māori leaders to demand their participation in the conflict as a means of winning better bargaining positions with the New Zealand government for greater Māori autonomy. A Māori contingent was recruited, with both New Zealand’s military and the Imperial government guaranteeing that Māori could participate in the war openly and with fewer barriers than indigenous peoples in the other settler colonies. Yet Māori were still relegated to the side lines. The first Māori contingent was organized as a garrison unit, to allow white troops to fight in battle. It was only with the heavy casualties at Gallipoli that it became a combat unit in July 1915. Its own casualties and continued Pakeha distrust in Māori capabilities led the contingent to be disbanded, to be reconstituted shortly after as the New Zealand Pioneer Battalion and designated to serve as a labour force. The unit gave Māori some opportunity to rise through the ranks as Māori became junior officers and commanded over Pakeha troops who served in the battalion.\(^{154}\)

---


In Australia and Canada, First Nations men attempting to enlist were routinely turned down due to racial policies that emphasized white soldiers over others. In Australia, the recruitment of Aborigines was forbidden under the guidelines of the Australian Imperial Force.\footnote{The official order stated that recruits could be denied if they were ‘not of substantial European origin.’ Philippa Scarlett, *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Volunteers for the AIF: The Indigenous Response to World War One*, Fourth Edition, (Macquarie, A.C.T.: Indigenous Histories, 2018), p. 3.} Canadian forces followed a similar policy and argued it was due to the fear that ‘Germans might refuse to extend to them the privileges of civilized warfare,’ but also the government worried that First Nations recruits would not legally be allowed to enlist due to treaty rights.\footnote{Timothy C. Winegard, *Indigenous Peoples of the British Dominions and the First World War*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 88.} For Indigenous volunteers in both Canada and Australia, successful enlistment in the early years of the war relied on the recruiting officer ignoring racial regulations or their ability to pass as ‘European’. Due to the nature of local recruiting, the recruiting officers in both Canada and Australia could attest Indigenous volunteers if they were willing to overlook their race or if they were unable to determine their ethnicity.\footnote{Ibid, 90-91.} The lack of any distinct category on the attestation forms for race saw Indigenous soldiers successfully pass federal government observation. An unintended result is that identifying Indigenous soldiers in Canada and Australia has proven difficult when examining military files.

When looking through the database the policies of recruitment are reflected in the number of memorials that can be identified to Indigenous war dead. In Canada there are three memorials to Indigenous soldiers while in Australia there is only one. In New Zealand there are seven memorials to Māori. It is possible that there are more including Metis individuals who are commemorated with individual memorials but are missing...
from the database or are not clearly identified as being Indigenous. The identification of individuals as being of Indigenous descent relied on several factors. The first was the text of the memorial. In New Zealand, memorials that contained Te Reo (Māori language) text indicated that the individual was of Māori descent. The design of the memorials as well, using Māori imagery and symbols from the arts and crafts movement, highlighted Māori ethnicity. A second indicator was the location of the memorial in the country. The presence of reservations, particularly in Canada, helped to identify the individual as First Nations; a memorial on a reservation usually signalled that the individual was Indigenous. The final marker used to identify indigenous soldiers was if they were named on collective memorials to Indigenous communities. The naming of members on community memorials revealed who was identified as being an Indigenous soldier, even if they had found a life outside their own community.

The task of identifying all Indigenous soldiers who fought in the war is an ongoing process and the lists identifying these soldiers are still incomplete. The only Aborigine from Australia to have a memorial exemplifies the difficulties of identifying these soldiers. Alexander Russell Rackstraw was from the village of Toora in Victoria near the coast. He found work before the war as a fisherman and was frequently in the town of Port Welshpool, down the coast from Toora. He enlisted in September 1914 and was killed during the Gallipoli campaign on April 30th, 1915. His friends in Port Welshpool erected a memorial to him and another resident of Port Welshpool, William Bruce Smith, in the form of a marble plaque that hung in the local hall until a fire in 1967. The plaque was originally thought to have been destroyed in the fire and a replacement

---

was made in 2002 and erected with the plaque to Smith in the Port Welshpool & District Maritime Museum. The original plaque to Rackstraw was later found and donated to the museum where it currently resides with the replica. (Image 200) Rackstraw was also commemorated in his hometown of Toora where the Returned Soldier’s League Hall erected two rolls of honour. One was to citizens of Toora and the other was by the Australian Natives Association; Rackstraw was listed only on the Natives Association roll of honour. (Image 201) Even though Rackstraw is named on the local Australian Natives Association memorial, he has yet to be added to the Australian War Memorial’s list of Indigenous soldiers who fought for Australia or to Philippa Scarlett’s database of Aboriginal enlistments. Information on Rackstraw and his Indigeneity is sparse in his service files; the only indication that he was Indigenous is a form from the Australian Natives Association providing funds for the upkeep of his grave. Rackstraw may have been left off as an Indigenous soldier due to the lack of accompanying evidence to show that he was of Aboriginal descent. Scarlett points to the issue of supporting evidence as keeping some individuals off the databases of Australian Aboriginal service.


160 The memorial information above shows both the original and the replica. The original was apparently found in the basement of a house a person in Port Welshpool had bought. Private Alexander Rackstraw, Monument Australia, https://monumentaustralia.org.au/themes/people/military/display/33134-private-alexander-rackstraw.


162 The list contains the names of 4,110 individuals as of October 6th, 2021. Australian War Memorial, Indigenous Service, https://www.awm.gov.au/webgroups/indigenous%20service; Philippa Scarlett’s list from 2018 is more selective and contains 1,185 individuals, Scarlett, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Volunteers for the AIF.


164 Scarlett, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Volunteers for the AIF, pp. 5-7.
In Canada, the three First Nations soldiers with memorials all reveal different circumstances of commemoration. The most well-known is Cameron Donald Brant, the descendant of Kanin'keh:ka chief Joseph Brant. Cameron was born in the town of Hagersville, Ontario, on the corner of the Six Nations of the Grand River Reservation. As a descendant of a famous historical figure in Canadian history, his service and death caught the attention of the Canadian press not only when he was killed in April 1915, but after the war as well. Brant was regularly referenced during the unveiling of community memorials that bore his name and those of members of the Six Nations Reservation who were killed in the war. The unveiling of the Brantford community memorial in 1919 saw the most attention as it was performed by the visiting Prince of Wales.\textsuperscript{165} The private memorial to Brant was erected in New Credit Methodist Church (now United Church) by the Mississauga of New Credit. Having attended New Credit Methodist Church as a boy, his parents still attended church after the war, the erection of the Brant memorial in New Credit spoke less to his stature as a descendant of Joseph Brant, and more about the loss felt by the community in which he grew up. The design of Brant’s memorial speaks to mourning as it is a stone plaque with the text, ‘In memory of Lieut. Cameron D. Brant, killed in action in France, April 23\textsuperscript{rd} 1915, aged 27 y’rs. Erected by the Mississaugas, of New Credit, 1919.’\textsuperscript{166} (Image 202) The simple design highlights the function of the memorial as a site of memory for the family and the community to mourn his death as an individual rather than as the descendent of a historical figure.


\textsuperscript{166} Cameron Donald Brant, We Remember: WWI Records Search, Great War Centenary Association Brantford Brant County Six Nations, http://doingourbit.ca/profile/cameron-brant.
The second memorial to a First Nations soldier is located in the Munsee-Delaware Nation, south-west of the city of London, Ontario. The memorial is dedicated to Arnold Logan who grew up and lived on the reserve as well as on the neighbouring reserve, Chippewa of the Thames. Logan worked as a fireman in the nearby town of St Thomas before joining the war and was killed in April 1916. His memorial was erected in the Lower Muncy (St Paul’s) Cemetery in the form of a statue. The statue has a soldier in full gear standing to attention with the inscription on the pedestal reading, ‘In memory of Arnold Logan son of Scobia & Isabelle Logan, born Aug. 6, 1896, killed in France April 26, 1916, in his 20th year. Greater love hath no man than to give his life, for his King and country.’ (Image 203) Scobia Logan was a Munsee Chief and was active in the commemoration of the war. In a ceremony honouring veterans and First Nations service on July 19th, 1919, Scobia was reported to have told the crowd during the raising of the Union Jack, ‘theirs is a flag that knows no colour line.’ The comment by Scobia about the flag matches the text of the memorial that played with the Biblical quote of John 15:13, ‘Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friends.’ Changing the ending to read ‘to give his life for his King and country’ speaks to Scobia’s understanding of what his son died for, and what the service of First Nations soldiers meant. The statue was erected in the family plot by members of both Arnold’s unit and former co-workers who mourned his death with his family and community.

The third memorial to a First Nations soldier in Canada is located on the west coast, on Cormorant Island in the village of Alert Bay home to the ‘Namgis First Nation. The memorial is dedicated to Edwin Victor Cook in Christ Church Anglican Church. It was not erected until after the Second World War as it commemorates two individuals, both of whom are named Edwin Victor Cook. The older Edwin was killed on August 10th, 1918, while the younger Edwin was killed on September 30th, 1944. The Cook family held a high position in Alert Bay as members of the Kwakwaka’wakw. The older Edwin’s parents were leading figures in the community with his father Nage (Stephen Cook) running a fishing shop and later a fleet of fishing vessels, and his mother Ga’axstal’las (Jane Constance Cook née Gilbert) an advocate for First Nations rights and active fighting colonialism on the ‘Namgis. The younger Edwin was the nephew of Nage through his half-brother Tsuxtsa’es (Herbert “Bert” Cook) who grew up with Nage and Ga’axstal’las and named his own son after the older Edwin. The memorial is a brass plaque with the text, ‘To the glory of God and in loving memory of Edwin Victor Cook, D.C.M., killed in action, August 10, 1918. Edwin Victor Cook, killed in action, September 30, 1944. Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends.’ (Image 204)

The erection of these three memorials to First Nations soldiers in Canada reveal several important trends not just for their ethnicity, but for personal memorials in general.

---

170 The complex history of Ga’axstal’las fight for her people’s rights, along with a more in depth history of the family can be found here: Leslie A. Robertson and the Kwagu’l Gixsam Clan, Standing Up with Ga’axstal’las: Jane Constance Cook and the Politics of Memory, Church, and Custom, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012), pp. 53-103.
171 Ibid, p. xxii, 357.
The first is the clear socio-economic power each of the three families had in their respective communities. The Brant, Logan, and Cook families were all either leaders or part of the upper echelons of society, giving them a heightened stance in the community. The ability to memorialize their loved ones highlights their elevated status further as they stand out amongst other First Nations war dead.

The importance of status is further reflected when examining Māori who were commemorated in New Zealand. Seven Māori have personal memorials, four of them are commemorated as a pair due to familial connections and close friendships. The first pair are brother Te Taira and Henare Metekingi who have a plaque in St Paul’s Memorial Church in the town of Putiki, Manawatū-Whanganui. The simple brass plaque reads, ‘In memory of Te Teira Metekingi who was killed in action on Gallipoli 1915. Also, of Henare Metekingi who was killed in action in France 1916. Well done thou good and faithful servant.’\(^\text{173}\) (Image 205) While both Te Teira and Henare were recorded on their attestation forms as labourers, they held important standing in Putiki and the Māori of Whanganui. Their grandfather and father were both Whanganui chiefs, with their grandfather Mete Kingi Paetahi serving as the first western Māori MP and their father Hoani Mete Kingi serving as the government Under-Secretary for Native Affairs during the war.\(^\text{174}\) The Mete Kingi family had a history of service to the British as they had helped defend settlers during the New Zealand Wars in the 1860s.\(^\text{175}\) The erection date of the memorial is not clear, but it most likely was done before St Paul’s Memorial Church.

\(^{173}\) Saint Paul’s Church, Memorial Cross, Putiki, New Zealand History Memorial Register, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/saint-paul%E2%80%99s-church-memorial-cross-putiki.


\(^{175}\) ‘Historic Flag.’ Auckland Star, May 11th, 1945, p. 7.
was rebuilt (for the fifth time in its history) in 1937. The church itself is decorated with Māori art thanks to the work of Sir Apirana Ngata, a leading Māori politician who advanced the Māori arts and crafts movement during the 1920s.\footnote{Ngata was instrumental in the creation of a Maori school of arts at Rotorua which included carving and tukutuku (wood carved panelling): ‘Memorial Church.’ New Zealand Herald, December 6th, 1937, p. 12; M.P.K. Sorrenson, ‘Ngata, Apirana Turupa,’ Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, (1996), https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/3n5/ngata-apirana-turupa.}

Ngata played a key role in another memorial to two Māori soldiers. Henare Mokeua Kohere and Pekama Kaa were commemorated in St Mary’s Church in Tikitiki, Gisborne. Located in the home of the Ngati Porou, the iwi of Sir Apirana Ngata, the church was built between 1924 and 1926 by Ngata as a memorial to the Māori from the East Coast (a common name for the region of Gisborne) who fought and died in the war. The church interior was designed and decorated using traditional Māori arts and crafts, serving as an early example of the revival of Māori art undertaken by Ngata.\footnote{Tikitiki Church War Memorial, New Zealand History Memorial Register, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/tikitiki-church-war-memorial.} The memorial to Kohere and Kaa takes the form of a stained-glass window that features the two soldiers kneeling and looking up at Christ on the cross with the borders painted in traditional Māori designs. (Image 101) The selection of Kohere and Kaa was due to the fact they were both Ngati Porou and were both officers in the Māori battalion. Kohere was a close friend of Ngata from before the war as he was the grandson of the Ngati Porou chief Mokena Kohere.\footnote{Henare Kohere Swann, ‘Kohere, Henare Mokena,’ Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, (1996), https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/3k17/kohere-henare-mokena.} Kohere’s death deeply affected Ngata as he not only had him commemorated on the window, but he named his youngest son Henare Kohere Ngata.\footnote{Monty Soutar, ‘Ngata, Henare Kohere,’ Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, (2021), https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/6n2/ngata-henare-kohere.} Ngata also referenced Kohere’s death in his recruiting song, Te Ope Tuatahi, in
the second verse of the song.\textsuperscript{180} Kohere was a member of the Māori elite who had travelled to England in 1902 as members of the Māori contingent that attended the coronation of King Edward VII. Kaa, while less famous than Kohere, was also part of the Ngati Porou elite as he was Kohere’s cousin.\textsuperscript{181} While Kohere and Kaa were not the only Māori officers to be killed in the war, their status as high-ranking members of the Ngati Porou ensured they would receive a higher standard of commemoration in the memorial church.

The issue of how to commemorate all the Māori who participated in the war surfaces in the remaining three memorials to individual Māori in various ways. The memorial to Reverend Henare Wepiha Te Wainohu reveals the debate within Māori communities. Rev Henare served as a chaplain in the New Zealand Expeditionary Force and was assigned to the New Zealand Māori Contingent and then the New Zealand Pioneer Battalion. He became well-known in New Zealand as he wrote letters to describing Māori actions in the war. During the war he met Dr Peter Buck, a leading Māori politician who served as a surgeon for the Māori Contingent. The two became figureheads for Māori soldiers during the war.\textsuperscript{182} Shortly after his return to New Zealand Rev Henare was diagnosed with stomach cancer, and he passed away on October 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1920. In 1924 his memorial in the form of a statue was unveiled in the town of Wairoa, Hawke’s Bay, where he had served as a vicar for the Māori Anglican community. The


importance of Rev Henare was demonstrated in the attendees to the unveiling that
included Dr Peter Buck, Sir James Carroll (Native Minister), and Ngata who attended
with over 100 members of the Ngati Porou.\textsuperscript{183} The statue, with inscriptions in both
English and Te Reo, commemorates his service as a chaplain and ends with the text ‘Also
to the memory of all members of the Pioneer Battalion especially those who have made
the supreme sacrifice on the fields of battle or at home.’\textsuperscript{184} (Image 164) The desire to
commemorate all Māori who served was added at the end, but helped to show how a
single individual could transcend his own service and come to represent a community.

On the Mahia Peninsula on the north-east corner of Hawke’s Bay, the community
memorial for the area was erected by the Ormond family. The Ormonds were a powerful
settler family that had acquired large tracts of land in the Hawke’s Bay region. The eldest
son of the family, George Canning Ormond settled in Mahia where he married Maraea
Kiwiwharekete of the Ngati Rongomaiwahine and Ngati Kahungunu.\textsuperscript{185} Three of George
and Maraea’s sons fought in the First World War, Alexander, William, and John (Tiaki
Omana). Alexander was the only brother not to survive the war. Alexander left New
Zealand in May 1915 for England where he was commissioned as a Lieutenant with the
1\textsuperscript{st} Manchester Regiment. It is not clear why Alexander sought to enlist with British units
over New Zealand ones. A possible explanation could be that he sought front-line action
as both his brothers who fought with the New Zealand Expeditionary Force were placed

\textsuperscript{183} ‘Maori War Memorial.’ \textit{New Zealand Herald}, January 18\textsuperscript{th}, 1924, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{184} Henare Wepiha Te Wainohu Memorial, Wairoa, New Zealand History Memorial Register,
\textsuperscript{185} Mary Boyd, ‘Ormond, John Davies,’ \textit{Dictionary of New Zealand Biography}, (1990),
https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1o5/ormond-john-davies; Alexander Ormond, New Zealand History
in the Māori contingent of the New Zealand Pioneer Battalion. Alexander was killed in action on September 30th, 1916, during fighting near Pozieres, France.

The wealth of the Ormond family can be seen in the memorials erected to Alexander. The first memorial was dedicated in 1919 by his aunt, Fanny Ormond, who purchased an old one-room school for the Cathedral parish of St John the Evangelist in the city of Napier. Donated to the church, the building was named the Ormond Memorial Chapel and has a plaque inside commemorating Alexander and its donation by Fanny.\textsuperscript{186} (Image 206) The other memorial was built by Alexander’s parents as a community memorial for the soldiers of Mahia who died in the war. The memorial features a statue of a New Zealand soldier, with the lemon-squeezer hat, and a list of those from the community being remembered. The text of the memorial clearly identifies Alexander above the others: ‘This memorial was erected to the honoured memory of Alexander Ormond, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lieut, 1\textsuperscript{st} Manchester Regiment. And the following boys of Mahia who made the supreme sacrifice in the Great War 1914 to 1918.’\textsuperscript{187} The final lines of the memorial highlight the importance of the memorial, not just for the Ormond family but for the entire community of Mahia: ‘All members of one family and of the Rongomai-Wahine tribe.’ (Image 163) It should be considered a Māori memorial as the inscription is in both English and Te Reo, and the memorial was moved from its original location on Whakarewa Point to the grounds of the Kaiuku Marae, part of the Ngati Rongomaiwahine iwi. Constructed by the Ormond family to help commemorate their son, his inclusion with

\textsuperscript{186} Ormond Memorial Chapel, Napier, NZ History Memorial Register, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/ormond-memorial-chapel-napier.
\textsuperscript{187} Mahia Soldiers’ Memorial, Kaiuku Marae, NZ History Memorial Register, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/media/photo/mahia-soldiers-memorial-kaiuku-marae.
the other Māori from the area showcases the power of the Ormond family in the local 
community, but also connects Alexander back to his home.

The final Māori memorial located in the town of Te Puke, Bay of Plenty, features 
a large stone arch dedicated to Hera Takuira, and was also known as Sarah in local 
newspapers. Hera was a teenager, the daughter of Takuira Mita and his wife Pare from 
Maketu. Hera became well-known in the community of Te Puke when in May 1918 the 
Red Cross organized a campaign to raise funds for the war effort which took the form of a 
Queen Carnival. Different towns in the area nominated a Queen to represent them and 
they undertook a variety of fundraising efforts in competition with each other. The Queen 
who raised the most money would be crowned victorious. Hera was nominated as the 
Māori Queen and finished fourth in the contest, raising £748 9.188 Hera, however, was 
apparently ill during the carnival and several weeks later she passed away on June 29th, 
1918.189 The desire to commemorate Hera began shortly after her death when her family 
approached the Te Puke town board to erect a memorial to her. Their desire to 
memorialize her publicly was due to her participation in the Queen Carnival.190 The 
errection of a memorial took time as the town was hesitant to support it, and opposition 
from other Māori arose over fears that the memorial would see Hera’s mana enter the 
town as she was not from Te Puke but Maketu.191 In November 1920 the memorial was 
finally constructed in the form of a marble arch near the eastern entrance to the town. The 
funds for the memorial were raised entirely by Māori of the region; it is not clear if the

188 ‘Queen Carnival Contest’ Te Puke Times, May 28th, 1918, p. 2.  
189 ‘Paengaroa Notes’ Te Puke Times, July 9th, 1918, p. 3.  
town board gave its blessings to the memorial or not. The memorial has moved several times since it was erected and today it stands as the entrance to Jubilee Park from the parking lot. The marble arch was designed with a red cross on the keystone and inscriptions on each pillar. Written in both English and Te Reo, the text speaks about Hera and her ancestry. The memorial is marked as a war memorial with the line, ‘She loyally assisted the Empire in the Great War 1914-1918.’ (Image 207)

The design and language of Indigenous memorials reveals how these communities viewed the war and worked to shape the memory of the conflict. One of the key elements in the design of the memorials was the mix of Indigenous and British culture. The language used on the memorials reflect similar sentiments and phrases used on settler memorials. The Logan memorial uses the popular lines of ‘Greater love hath no man than this..’ and ‘For King and Country’, while the Metekingi memorial has another popular line, ‘Well done thou good and faithful servant.’ The use of religious language and symbols on the memorials reflects the desire to mourn the death of these individuals. The use of Christian, over Indigenous religious practices highlight the way that these memorials reflect the desire of these Indigenous families to work within settler societies to advance Indigenous needs. The actions of Scobie Logan and Sir Apirana Ngata as leaders who were active in the commemoration process reveals that both saw the service of Indigenous soldiers as justifying and securing them rights in settler society. It is clear that commemoration of Indigenous service in the war was to reflect positive messages of loyalty rather than objections to settler colonialism. The mix of Indigenous and British

192 ‘Local and General’ Te Puke Times, November 2nd, 1920, p. 3.
193 The arch can be seen from Google Street View from the parking lot of Jubilee Park in Te Puke.
society was reflected in the memorials, seen in the memorial to the two Cooks in Alert Bay and the stained-glass window in Tikitiki Memorial Church, show a concerted effort to tie the two societies together culturally. The placement of memorials in churches, as well as replicating British styles of commemoration mixed with their own art styles reveals the type of memorials that were being accepted after the war in Indigenous communities. The war, and the service of the individuals being commemorated, was to showcase the valuable contributions Indigenous communities provided not just to the Dominion, but to the Empire. These individuals were commemorated as heroes, symbols of the equal service they gave to the British not just in armed combat but at home, as the memorial to Hera Takuira demonstrates.

The use of Indigenous commemorative practices was challenging given the degree to which assimilation was being advocated for Indigenous peoples before, during, and after the war. Conflict within Indigenous nations over how to respond to the repression and outlawing of their culture made it difficult for many to represent their dead outside of settler colonial norms. The mother of Edwin Cook, Ga’axstal’las, found herself torn between her Indigenous culture and her spirituality in the Anglican Church.\textsuperscript{195} Ngata blended Māori culture into the memorials, as seen in the use of arts and crafts, language, and rituals during the unveilings. Even so, the use of British styles of commemoration spoke to the way these individuals saw commemoration and their people’s participation in the war as a strategy to further their rights and relationships with settler populations. The war, rather than open the rights for Indigenous peoples, saw few changes on how they

\textsuperscript{195} She was most torn about the potlatch, and while she became known as a defender of the ban, her views were not that simple and parts of her opposition to the practice stemmed from her faith. Robertson and the Kwagu’l Gixsam Clan, \textit{Standing Up with Ga’axstal’las}, pp. 232-284
were treated with many war veterans leading new pushes for rights that they thought they had earned and fought for in the war. The language of the memorials failed to achieve the desired goals of their creators as the messages of service and sacrifice proved to have not changed the way settler colonial governments treated them.

---

Other Nationalities in Memorials

Indigenous communities were not the only ones to showcase their loyalty to the British Empire through the commemoration of individuals. Recent immigrants from nations outside of the English-speaking world used their memorials in similar ways to highlight their integration into British society. In St Sophia’s Greek Cathedral of the Holy Wisdom in London, a memorial was erected to the brothers Michael and Cyril Spartali who both were killed during the war. The memorial identifies them as ‘Anglo-Greek brothers’ who ‘died for England and liberty.’ (Image 208) The design of the memorial fit into the aesthetic of the Greek Orthodox church featuring marble and a mosaic on the top of the memorial. The mosaic design has two angels, with a laurel wreath into which

---

197 St Sophias Greek Cathedral-WW1, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/39491.
the Greek text, ‘ΕΙΣ ΜΝΗΜΗΝ ΜΙΧΑΗΛ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΛΛΟΥ ΣΠΑΡΤΑΛΗ’ (In memory of Michael and Cyril Spartali) is written. The memorial highlights their Greek identity, but places their service and deaths as being for England.

In St Luke’s Church in the town of Pamber Heath in Hampshire, two memorial plaques to twin brothers Henry Sigismund and Thomas Armin Oppe are on the wall of the church. The brothers were born in England, but their parents, Siegmund Armin and Pauline Jaffe Oppe, had immigrated to England from Germany. Siegmund had been born in the town of Mulhausen, in the Alsace-Lorraine region, and Pauline was born in Hamburg. Because both Siegmund and Pauline were citizens of Germany, the service of Henry and Thomas was complex. They were born and raised in England, but they had connections to Germany through their mother and the disputed territory of Alsace-Lorraine through their father. Both of their memorials conclude with the epitaph ‘He fought for his country and humanity.’ The vague language does imply allegiance to Britain and the reference to ‘humanity’ in the memorials potentially reveals the war-time justification of the war being between British civilization and German barbarism. The move away from their German heritage may have been motivated partially by the experiences of Henry and Thomas’ younger brother, Ernest Frederick Oppe, who also fought in the war with the Royal Navy and was captured in 1914. He was a prisoner of war until he was able to escape to Holland in spring 1918. Interestingly, the memorials

200 Oppe, Ernest Frederick, Service Number 2/3209, National Archives, Admiralty and War Office: Royal Naval Division: Records of Service, ADM 339/1/28863.
to Henry and Thomas do not spell out their middle names of Sigismund and Armin, instead they simply provide the initial. The hiding of their German middle names suggests the family was either moving beyond their German heritage and instead embracing their British identity they were now living in, or attempting to mask their German identity.

As mentioned in chapter two, the Jewish community in Britain strove to place itself within British society and war memorials showed Jewish service to Britain. Many of the families had immigrated from Eastern Europe to seek new lives in Britain and their descendants were the ones fighting in the war. Nathan Neville Levene was one Jewish descendant from Eastern Europe in uniform. Nathan’s grandparents, Harris and Ann Levene had immigrated to Britain from Poland, settling in Cardiff, Wales, where they had Nathan’s father Lewis (or Louis).  

The memorial to Nathan, erected in Blackpool United Hebrew Synagogue, was erected not just by his family but by the congregation of the synagogue, who point to Nathan as ‘fighting for King, country and freedom.’

(IMAGE 209) The memorial has a line in Hebrew at the base but due to time and weathering with the memorial outside, the text has become too difficult to make out.

The majority of the memorials being studied make no overt mention of race in their text or design. The memorials are operating within a racial understanding of British imperial and colonial power structures. Race and ethnicity, even if not seen as important markers for the construction of memorials, contributed to the how the political identity of the memorials was understood. Implied through the cultural references to Britishness, the memorials elevate a specific cultural practice above others, making it central to the

---

201 Harris Levene, 30 Bute Terrace Cardiff Wales, National Archives, Census Returns of England and Wales 1871, RG 10/5361/15/8.
commemoration process. The centrality of race becomes evident when someone outside of British culture was commemorated within the British Empire. These include not only the Indigenous and recent immigrants mentioned above, but also those who have a closer affinity to British culture such as Americans.

Several Americans and soldiers who fought for the American army are included in the database as memorials dedicated to them were found during the search for personal memorials. Most Americans were recent immigrants to America from one of the nations in this study, such as Niven Boyd Stewart who had immigrated to America from the town of Carrow, co. Down, Ireland, and was serving in the US Army when he was killed in action.²⁰³ (Image 210) Others like Robert Roy McKibben had been born in America before immigrating to a British territory where they enlisted.²⁰⁴ (Image 211) The memorial to Henry Morrell Atkinson Jr., however, is different. Atkinson having spent his life in the United States, had a memorial erected to him in the town of North Hatley, Quebec, Canada. A small park and flagstaff were donated to the town by Atkinson’s parents. The memorial makes no clear indication that Atkinson was American as the text on the flagstaff reads, ‘The park and flagstaff were given by his parents in loving memory of Captain Henry Morrell Atkinson who died in the service of his country at Angers, France November 2⁰⁵ nd 1918.’²⁰⁵ (Image 212) The Atkinsons were a wealthy family from Atlanta, Georgia, where Henry Atkinson Sr. had made his fortune installing the first

²⁰³ Niven and his brother John had both immigrated to North America, Niven to America and John to Canada. Both served in their new home nations armies when they were killed. Corporal N Stewart and Private J Stewart, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/6556.
electric lights in the city and centralizing the railroads in the city as chairman of the Georgia Railway and Power Company.\textsuperscript{206} The family spent their summer holidays away from Atlanta, vacationing in the town of North Hatley. Atkinson’s parents began the memorial process by first purchasing the land for the park in 1923 and donating it to the town.\textsuperscript{207} In 1926 they unveiled the flagpole that was hoisted over the park. In the ceremony dedicating the memorial, Henry Sr., May, and their remaining children attended the unveiling hosted by members of the Sherbrooke Regiment and the mayor of North Hatley. During the ceremony, Henry Sr. stated,

So this flagstaff and flag are a fitting memorial to him [Henry Jr.]. That is true because the Union Jack, equally with the Stars and Stripes, is the emblem of bravery, honor and manhood, the three qualities inherent in the Anglo-Saxon race and which have made it what it is. … May this simple gift and program this afternoon help to bind England, Canada and the Untied States together and may all three in time become one again, at least in spirit, so that those who think alike may act alike, and the two flags blend into one common, glorious future.\textsuperscript{208}

The language used in the speech highlights the war as defending and advancing English-speaking cultural superiority. By highlighting the racial ties between American and British-Canadian soldiers in their service during the war, the memorial dedication demonstrates the assumption that memorials made about racial understandings of the conflict and how memorials supported the cultural and racial views of imperial power.

\textsuperscript{206} ‘H.M. Atkinson Wins Plaudits From Magazine,’ \textit{The Atlanta Constitution}, November 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 1922, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{207} ‘Purchase Site for Park In Memory of War Dead,’ \textit{The Globe}, August 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 1923, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{208} ‘Atlantans Give Flagpole, Memorial to Son Slain In War, to Canadian Town,’ \textit{The Atlanta Constitution}, July 25\textsuperscript{th}, 1926, p. 3.
Conclusion

In the creation of memorials after the First World War, several factors played a key role in the design and language choices that reveal how individuals and families understood the politics of the conflict. The power of British cultural traditions emphasized a commemorative form that showcased less national identity than an acceptance of imperial understandings of the conflict. The use of royal symbols, including
the mementos given by the monarchy reveals that many people took the line ‘for king and country’ literally in their remembrance of the war. The lack of national symbols or designs on memorials emphasized an acceptance of British Imperial identity as they showed that they had fought not for their nation, but the Empire. The image of the Empire was not equal even amongst Britons; England was placed at the centre of power through the use of English symbols and language. The power of British culture to influence war memorial construction was perhaps seen most clearly on indigenous memorials in the Dominions, where Indigenous communities and families commemorated those who showed loyal service to the Empire. The blending of Indigenous and British material cultures reveals the desire of indigenous communities to show their ties to the Empire to achieve a degree of recognition for the services provided.

While few memorials were explicit in holding up British cultural design as the standard, nevertheless the memorials expressed and helped reinforce the ascendency of British power throughout the Empire. Divergences seen in colonial nationalism and other ethnicities do little to undermine the messages that personal memorials advanced regarding the importance of Britishness in commemorating the war. The differences seen in the memorials highlight different perspectives on how to interpret the Empire, and the importance of private memory to the expression of political ideology in these memorials.
Conclusion

During the centenary of the First World War governments around the world participated in a wide range of commemorative projects. Some were transnational, showing shared remembrance across countries that had fought together and against each other. Others were undertaken by international non-governmental agencies to showcase their commitment to remembering the war. In Britain, the government put significant effort into commemorating the war through an arts program called 14-18 Now, which funded over 420 artists from over forty countries to produce content for the centenary. The most well-known projects to receive funding from 14-18 Now was the documentary film They Shall Not Grow Old by Peter Jackson, who colourized and restored film held by the Imperial War Museum, and the installation of poppies in the moat of the Tower of London called Blood Swept Lands and Seas of Red. The dramatic display of poppies flowing over the building and moat has now become a common design feature in Britain and in the Commonwealth.

Many of the projects funded by 14-18 Now focused on collective remembrance; one of the objectives was to be as far-reaching and publicly accessible as possible. In seeking to engage and show the loss of the war, several projects focused on delivering the impact of the war on a personal level by focusing on individuals who died in the conflict. One of the most popular art installations was by British film maker Danny Boyle entitled

---

1 An example can be seen in the European football organization UEFA, producing a commemorative video featuring British, French, and German footballers reading letters from the 1914 Christmas truce discussing the playing of football in no-man’s land. ‘UEFA marks 100th anniversary of World War One Truce’ UEFA YouTube Channel, December 11th, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DUyV6dHy5TJE&ab_channel=UEFA.

Pages of the Sea. Produced on November 11th, 2018, Boyle co-ordinated the installation of thirty-two massive portraits of individuals into sand beaches around Britain. Drawn on the beaches at low tide, they were slowly washed away as the tide rose, symbolizing the death of the individual in the war as the water removed them from this world. Boyle hand selected the portraits, ‘to represent a range of stories-ordinary people who gave their lives to the war effort, from doctors and poets to munition workers, privates and officers.’ The selection of individuals was influenced by who was known to the British public. Several individuals mentioned in this dissertation were included, such as Elias Humphrey Evans aka Hedd Wyn and Dr Elsie Maud Inglis. Others, including Wilfred Owen and Walter Tull, were selected due to their celebrity. They enjoyed an elevated status before the centenary, and represented important elements of society through their life experiences. Boyle selected others to reflect the diversity of experiences to the war and ensure that everyone could see a different part of the war. The decision was to bring the war and loss to the public by placing them on beaches, as Boyle described: ‘The shoreline belongs to everyone, it is a democratic space, where only the sea rules; at once a personal and public landscape.’ These thirty-two individuals were meant to bridge the private practice of mourning with public commemoration in a way that allowed everyone in British society to see themselves in the remembrance actions.

Boyle was not the only artist involved in 14-18 Now to see value in bringing the individual to the collective. Jeremy Deller, working with theatre companies across Britain

---

3 Ibid, p. 280.
4 The full list of the thirty-two individuals selected can be seen here. ‘Beach Portraits’, Pages of the Sea, https://www.pagesofthesea.org.uk/beach-portraits/.
created the living memorial of *We’re Here Because We’re Here*. The project saw 1,400 volunteers dress up in British military uniform; on July 1st, 2016, they went out into public transportation hubs, shopping districts, and street corners. Standing silently or singing the popular trench song the art piece was named after, the volunteers would hand out cards to anyone who came up to them containing information on an individual they represented who had been killed in the first day of the Battle of the Somme. The cards contained few details with only the name, regiment, age, and the hashtag ‘#wearehere’ that was used to spread awareness of the event over social media. It was later reported that the project had a huge impact on the British public as over two million people saw the actors during the day, and over thirty million people had seen or were aware of them through social media. The memorial highlighted the way these individuals shared the experience of death on the first day of the Somme and that behind each name there was a story to be told about how they got to the Somme. The memorial highlighted the individuals, but in a way that revealed the shared experiences of society that so many thousands were lost at the same time. The individual in the living memorial serves not as the focus of attention, but rather a vehicle upon which collective understanding of the past can be made.

The drive to commemorate individuals killed in the First World War has a short-shelf life. The time period is often restricted to the lived memory of the individual and those people who had physical interactions with the person before their death. Once those with a lived memory of the individual have passed away themselves, the memory of the individual becomes far more entwined with collective memory. Those who remember the

---

6 Koo ed. *14-18 Now*, pp. 130-137
7 Ibid, p. 136.
individual without a lived memory must reconcile all the information they know about the person, with what they know of the past. The majority of the war dead become forgotten as time passes, often commemorated only as part of the larger collective or as part of an education program. Whereas individuals were commemorated shortly after the war as an attempt to reconcile their deaths and bring closure to those mourning them, the commemoration of individuals a century later revolves around the need to teach the war and speak to collective experiences in the conflict. Mourning is not the primary goal of these modern commemorations, and the recent memorials erected to individuals highlight the way they are symbols of a collective experience. In the database there are a number of individuals who were commemorated just after the war by family and friends, and again in the century after by generations who never knew them. By examining a select few of these individuals, we can see how their memory has shifted over time from private to public as they become solely part of the collective memory of the war. Each of these individuals stand out from the rest of the war dead due to several factors, including acts of bravery, social standing, and media attention during the war. Such things made it easier for later generations to gravitate to them as information was more readily available about their lives than about others who had been killed in the war.

**John Simpson Kirkpatrick**

The use of individuals by the collective to advance its goals is not new to current commemorative practices and has its origins in the war itself. Some individuals were elevated to represent the causes for which the war was being fought (Edith Cavell), or as
examples to live up to (Sir Herbert Kitchener). Some of the individuals elevated from the war remain noteworthy today and continue to serve as symbols of different war experiences. One such individual is John Simpson Kirkpatrick. His story became well known throughout Australia when news reports filtered in about Kirkpatrick, a stretcher-bearer, using a donkey to move wounded men to safety during the opening weeks of the Gallipoli campaign. His death on May 19th, 1915, while transporting a wounded soldier, drew more attention to him as a heroic figure. Kirkpatrick reached the public’s attention and started to be celebrated thanks to the work of Australian war correspondent and military historian C.E.W. Bean who first published an article on Kirkpatrick in June 1915. Other newspapers picked up on the story and began repeating it with ever more details. The story of Kirkpatrick became so popular that a film was made about him in 1916. Bean became a central figure in Australian commemoration, helping to craft the central memory of Australian soldiers in “mateship” based on his experiences in Gallipoli. Writing as a journalist during the war, Bean became focused on individual actions and personal stories to help create a romantic hero mythology around the Australians and the Gallipoli campaign. Kirkpatrick fit the mould perfectly.

Kirkpatrick received increased attention in the post-war years as he came to symbolize the memory of the war. He soon became the most commemorated soldier of Australia from the First World War, or from any conflict. The first statue to Kirkpatrick was raised in 1936 on the grounds of the Shrine of Remembrance in Melbourne. The

---


statue was the first in Australia to an individual at any major war memorial and was the work of a group of women who raised funds for Lone Pine memorials. Kirkpatrick remains the only individual commemorated on the grounds of the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance.\textsuperscript{11} For decades, this statue of Kirkpatrick remained the only one raised to his memory until the 1970s, when others were erected. The first was in the town of Coffs Harbour in New South Wales, which built a new cenotaph in 1970 and placed atop the cenotaph a statue of Simpson and his donkey.\textsuperscript{12} In 1988, two more statues of Kirkpatrick were erected that showed his growing importance to the memory of the First World War. The first was on the grounds of the Australian War Memorial in the capital city of Canberra where the statue sits near the front entrance to the building.\textsuperscript{13} On the other side of the world, the town of South Shields, Tyneside, England, erected a statue to Kirkpatrick in 1988 to celebrate him in his hometown.\textsuperscript{14} (Image 215) Decades later, as the centenary approached, more statues of Kirkpatrick were erected. In 2007, the Returned Servicemen’s Memorial Club in the town of Inverell, New South Wales, had to cut down its Lone Pine Memorial Tree due to age and weather damage. The stump was saved and put in the club where a small bronze statue of Simpson


\textsuperscript{13} The Australian War Memorial does not include a photo of the statue, only the maquette created that is part of their archive. Inglis, \textit{Sacred Places}, pp. 452-453.

\textsuperscript{14} Pte JS Kirkpatrick the man with the donkey South Shields, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/48301; Information on the erection of the statue can be found here, ‘War Hero Kirkpatrick Remembered In Centenary Year,’ South Tyneside Council, May 20, 2015, https://www.southtyneside.gov.uk/article/42911/War-Hero-Kirkpatrick-Remembered-In-Centenary-Year.
and his donkey were placed on top to serve as a new memorial.\textsuperscript{15} (Image 216) The other capital cities around Australia began building statues to Kirkpatrick with Adelaide, South Australia erecting one in 2012 in the Angas Gardens across from the Adelaide Oval,\textsuperscript{16} (Image 217) followed by Brisbane, Queensland, in 2015, in the Centenary Suburbs War Memorial Garden.\textsuperscript{17} (Image 218)

The elevation of Kirkpatrick in the years immediately after the war was not accepted by all Australians and veterans, who resented that one individual was placed above others whose experiences were similar. On the statue to Kirkpatrick in Melbourne, for example, the text does not name him, simply calling it ‘the man with the donkey’; he was only identified as Kirkpatrick with the inclusion of his date of death.\textsuperscript{18} The proliferation of Kirkpatrick statues decades after the First World War came about due to his place in the ANZAC myth of Gallipoli, that was reinvigorated after the fiftieth anniversary of the war. During the 1960s, the image of Kirkpatrick became cemented as the image of Australian service in the war, and he became more prominent as the lived memory of the war dwindled with the passing of the war generation. With renewed interest in the war by a new generation, Kirkpatrick’s story was reframed to allow for quick and easy consumption of the war. This made him the face of Australian service, mateship, and bravery.\textsuperscript{19}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} North Adelaide “Simpson and his Donkey” Memorial, Virtual War Memorial Australia, https://vwma.org.au/explore/memorials/1791.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Simpson and His Donkey, Virtual War Memorial Australia, https://vwma.org.au/explore/memorials/5330.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Inglis, \textit{Sacred Places}, pp. 325-326.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Cochrane, \textit{Simpson and the Donkey}, pp. 219-238.
\end{itemize}
The legacy of Kirkpatrick impacted those associated with the myth and were involved in helping create it. In 1917, New Zealand painter and Gallipoli veteran Horace Moore-Jones was hired by the British Historical Section to paint Kirkpatrick with his donkey. Using a photograph from Gallipoli, Moore-Jones created the well-known painting “The Man With The Donkey” that later became the basis for many of the statues of Kirkpatrick. The problem was that Moore-Jones did not actually paint Kirkpatrick. Rather, the painting is of another stretcher-bearer who used donkeys, Richard Alexander Henderson of the New Zealand Medical Corps. Moore-Jones would later have his own statue (created in the city of Hamilton, Waikato, in 2015 as part of New Zealand’s centenary celebrations) that depicted him in uniform, with a rifle on his back, sketching at Gallipoli with his famous painting placed on the side in bronze. Moore-Jones died in Hamilton in 1922 when he rushed into a burning hotel to rescue people from the fire. The memorial was created not only to remember Moore-Jones, but also improve relations with the Turkish government, which had donated the rock (taken from the cliffs of Gallipoli) upon which the statue sits. (Image 219) The Moore-Jones statue gives New Zealand a place in commemorating the Anzacs of Gallipoli that are dominated by Australia.
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Image 213: ‘Man with the Donkey,’ Memorial to John Simpson Kirkpatrick on the grounds of the Shrine of Remembrance in Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.


Image 217: Memorial Statue to John Simpson Kirkpatrick in Angas Gardens, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia.

Image 218: Memorial Statue to John Simpson Kirkpatrick in Centenary Suburbs War Memorial Gardens, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

Dr Elsie Maud Inglis

Pioneers and activists have come to stand as symbols for future generations to learn from and be inspired by. Their tragic deaths from the First World War, before they could live to see the success of their work, helps to make them suitable for commemoration. To showcase the important role of women in the First World War, as well as their struggle at the beginning of the twentieth century to obtain political, social, and economic rights, Scottish doctor Elsie Maud Inglis has been commemorated frequently in the century since her death. Her memory has become increasingly important as women’s rights and freedoms in the modern day demand celebration and commemoration.

Dr Inglis was a prominent doctor who had dedicated herself to being a servant to the poor of Edinburgh by establishing hospitals, clinics, and outreach programs to help women and children living in slums. Along with her medical work, she was a very active member of the Scottish suffragist movement, serving as a secretary of the Scottish Federation of Women’s Suffrage Societies. On the outbreak of the war, Dr Inglis combined her roles in medicine and suffrage when she created the Scottish Women’s Hospital (SWH) in 1914. She had originally volunteered to serve with the Royal Army Medical Corps but was rejected by the army and War Office who reportedly responded to her off with, ‘my good lady, go home and sit still.’ Determined to participate, Dr Inglis established the SWH with support from suffrage movements across the United Kingdom and offered its services to the governments of France and Serbia. Dr Inglis travelled to the front lines of Serbia twice, first in 1915 when she accompanied the Serbian army in...

22 Lady Frances Balfour, Dr. Elsie Inglis, (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1919), pp. 96-123.
23 Ibid, pp. 155-156.
retreat into Romania, and second in 1917 when she was again with Serbian units fighting in Russia. Dr Inglis and the SWH left Russia in October 1917 as the political situation deteriorated with the Russian Revolution and they came to be viewed with suspicion by the Bolshevik Party. She was quite sick at this time, and died on November 26th, 1917, only three days after returning to Britain.\(^{24}\)

Dr Inglis’ death saw significant media and government attention. Her body was taken to Edinburgh where it was laid in state in St Giles’ Cathedral, where members of the British and Serbian royal families visited her. The funeral saw thousands in attendance as her body was put on a gun carriage, draped with the flags of the United Kingdom and Serbia, and given a military escort to Dean Cemetery in Edinburgh where she was buried. The press published a large number of stories that praised her as a heroine and compared her death to a battlefield sacrifice.\(^{25}\) Several memorials to Dr Inglis were erected in her honour in Edinburgh. The Serbian government commissioned a bust from Croatian sculptor Ivan Meštrović in 1918 to commemorate her work in Serbia; it was later presented to the Scottish people.\(^{26}\) (Image 220) A memorial plaque in St Giles’ Cathedral was erected in 1922 by the SWH in memory of its founder. The plaque features three angels holding an anchor, cross, and heart with a dedicatory text that summed up her pre-war life in two words, ‘surgeon’ and ‘philanthropist’, and emphasized her wartime service and the fact that she, ‘died on active service 1917.’\(^{27}\) (Image 221) A year later, a fundraising campaign saw the construction of the Dr Elsie Inglis Memorial Hospital for

---

\(^{24}\) Ibid, pp. 245-260.


\(^{27}\) E M Inglis, IWM War Memorials Register, https://www.iwm.org.uk/memorials/item/memorial/44612.
Women and Children in Edinburgh.\(^{28}\) The maternity hospital, in contrast to the plaque in St Giles’, spoke to Dr Inglis’ life and work before the war, particularly her establishment of a hospice for women and children in Edinburgh in 1904.\(^ {29}\) The memorial hospital would remain in operation as a maternity hospital until 1988 when it was shut down.\(^ {30}\)

Dr Inglis was commemorated in the years immediately her death, but she received little attention in the decades after the war. The decline in interest was partially due to several factors. The first was the changing nature of feminism as the women’s movement shifted away from what Dr Inglis represented. She was considered a moderate and conservative feminist even during her own life, as she was opposed to the militant suffragettes such as Emeline Pankhurst. She based her activism for women’s rights and helping the poor of Edinburgh on her Christianity that was influenced by ideas of paternalism and education as a force that uplifted society.\(^ {31}\) Dr Inglis advocated working with-in the system and showing that women could be useful and productive members of society to prove they deserved political and economic rights. The SWH was her way of showing society that women could and did have the ability to serve the nation in similar ways as men. Later generations of feminists and women’s rights campaigners saw such a stance as too conservative, for its refusal to push against the structures of patriarchy to further women’s rights.\(^ {32}\) Another factor that prevented Dr Inglis from gaining greater attention was the fact she was Scottish, and England dominated the narrative of British history.\(^ {33}\) The greater influence of English nurse Vera Brittain as one of the leading

\(^{28}\) ‘Dr Elsie Inglis Memorial Hospital.’ \textit{The Times}, October 20, 1923, p. 13.
\(^{29}\) Knox, \textit{The Lives of Scottish Women}, p. 144.
\(^{30}\) Ibid, p. 157.
female voices of the war highlights how Dr Inglis fell into obscurity due to both her nationality and her conservative brand of feminism.

The growth of interest in Dr Inglis appears to have been caused by several factors beginning in the 1990s and intensifying around the centenary of the war. After having two biographies written shortly after her death, one in 1918 by fellow suffragist Lady Florence Balfour and a second by her sister, Eva Shaw McLaren in 1920, Dr Inglis had little written about her. A new biography was published in 1971, shortly after the fiftieth anniversary of the war, but did not spark a resurgence of interest. In the 1990s, Leah Leneman published two books on Dr Inglis. The first was in 1994 but the second, in 1998, was more widely known as it was published by the National Museums of Scotland. Attention on Dr Inglis increased in the years leading up to the centenary of both the war and her death as further research on her was published. One key factor playing a role in the increased attention to Dr Inglis was the demand for greater diversity and the inclusion of women in public commemoration. Her life as a leading female physician and suffragist, and her service during the war made her an ideal figure to feature in public commemorations for Scotland. In 2009, Dr Inglis was featured on new bank notes issued by Clydesdale Bank for its £50 note. In 2015, she and four other Scottish women who worked in the SWH were featured on commemorative stamps in Serbia, where all five of them served during the war. Most recently, a public campaign was staged in Scotland to erect a statue to Dr Inglis on the Royal Mile in Edinburgh.

---

major cultural, political, and tourist centre in the city, the Royal Mile contains twelve statues of famous Scots, all of them men. Led by locals advocating for more representation of women, the campaigners plan to unveil a statue to Dr Inglis in November 2024. Controversy around the statue broke out after the charity suspended an open call for artists and appointed the King’s Sculptor in Ordinary in Scotland to design the statue. The decision was done after seeing news footage of Queen Elizabeth’s funeral cortege through Edinburgh and feeling that the statue needed to fit into the historical design of the Royal Mile. Scottish artists were opposed to the move, but the action reveals the way commemoration of individuals today focuses on collective needs.

The sentiments between the memorials from the 1920s and the plan for the statue for Dr Inglis reflects the shifting nature of memory of the First World War. While each of the memorials seek to honour the impact and role of Dr Inglis in history, the ones from the 1920s were designed to both mourn and ensure her work continued in a practical manner. The need to have a more public monumental statue to Dr Inglis speaks to the decline of churches and cathedrals as public spaces; St Giles’ Cathedral sits in the middle of the Royal Mile, but campaigners believed that the plaque in the cathedral was not sufficiently public. The decline and resurgence of interest over time shows the selective memory of collective commemoration as she was forgotten due to her conservative feminism but was later remembered because of her pioneering feminism. Aspects of Dr Inglis’ life are ignored or downplayed in favour of other aspects that meet the needs for collective remembrance. Such issues were not factors in the construction of the memorial

---

to Dr Inglis in St Giles’ by her colleagues in the SWH who wanted a permanent and prominent memorial to ensure their co-worker and friend was remembered. The memorial, a site to mourn and remember, reveals the limitations that personal memorials constructed after the war have in current collective remembrance, as it failed to meet the demands of advancing representation of women in public spaces.

Samuel Sharpe MP

The continued use of war in foreign policy since 1918 has been characterized by a tendency to look to the past to help support ongoing issues associated with modern conflicts. Individuals from the First World War have been used to reinforce nationalism or, the military, and to gather support behind other objectives of the state. The commemoration of Samuel Sharpe has been used to aid veterans of recent conflicts, particularly those suffering with mental rather than physical wounds.

Samuel Sharpe was a Canadian Member of Parliament before the war, representing the constituency of Ontario North from 1908 until his death in 1918. He was elected three times to (including during the wartime election of 1917) as a backbench
Conservative and later Unionist member under Prime Minister Sir Robert Borden. On the outbreak of war he attempted to enlist but found himself in a quarrel with the Minister of Militia Sir Sam Hughes which saw him denied a position with the Canadian Expeditionary Force. In the ensuing, a newspaper in his constituency labelled Sharpe a coward who was fleeing from duty. Sharpe was able to repair his relationship with Hughes and was given command of the 116th Battalion which went overseas in 1916. He would lead his battalion throughout 1917, fighting at Vimy Ridge and Passchendaele, where he was awarded the Distinguished Service Order. He was sent to England in March 1918 to receive senior leadership training as he was seen as a potential candidate for higher command. Shortly after arriving in England, he suffered a mental breakdown and was hospitalized with ‘general disability.’ He was sent back to Canada in April and was put into the Royal Victoria Hospital in Montreal. On May 25th, 1918, Sharpe took his own life by jumping out his hospital window, to the shock of his family and the medical staff looking after him, who were under the impression he was recovering.

Sharpe’s body was returned to his wife Mabel and their home in Uxbridge, Ontario, where he was buried. Mabel also had a plaque erected in the Uxbridge Methodist Church (now known as the Trinity United Church) honouring her husband’s life and military service. The memorial does not acknowledge his death by suicide, instead only

---

41 The quarrel was reportedly over if either Hughes or Sharpe were suitable military leaders. ‘Hatchet is Buried: Olive Branch Grasped.’ The Globe, September 30th, 1915, p. 4.
43 Sharpe, Samuel Simpson, Personnel Records from the First World War, LAC RG 150 Box 8807-52.
stating, ‘died May 25th 1918.’\textsuperscript{45} (Image 222) Sharpe, along with George Baker (discussed in chapter 4), were the only Canadian MPs to be killed during the war. The commemoration of the two varied as Sharpe never received the same level of attention as Baker, who had a statue erected to him in the foyer of the rebuilt House of Commons. In examining the nature of military suicides using Sharpe as a case study, Matthew Barrett and Allan English argue that while the individual could be honoured for dying in the service of the war effort, the act of suicide was stigmatized as unbecoming by the general public.\textsuperscript{46} Such stigma ensured that Sharpe could not be commemorated in the same way as Baker, who was killed in combat by enemy fire.

Renewed interest in Sharpe began in 2014 when then Minister of Veteran Affairs Erin O’Toole began using him as a symbol to highlight ongoing mental health issues with Canadian veterans. The high level of suicides by Canadian veterans returning from the War in Afghanistan fell under O’Toole’s purview as minister, and he sought to use Sharpe as an example of how, ‘our struggle to come to terms with mental injuries from military service that are still taking their toll on the Canadian Forces’ needed to be addressed.\textsuperscript{47} Sharpe was always placed in the larger context of the veterans of Afghanistan, to represent the need for greater medical care, increased social awareness, and past failures in dealing with the veterans’ mental health.\textsuperscript{48} O’Toole worked to have a

new memorial put up to Sharpe in the House of Commons and continued to advocate even after his party lost the election of 2015. In 2018, a plaque featuring a bronze portrait of Sharpe was unveiled in the foyer of the House of Commons, next to the statue of Baker.\textsuperscript{49} But as media attention in Canada has declined on the topic of veterans’ mental health, so has the discussion of Sharpe.

The ultimate fate of the memorial is still up in the air as the location in Parliament was not permanent. Due to long-overdue renovations and upgrades, the centre block of Parliament where Baker’s statue and Sharpe’s plaque were located was closed for construction work. Sharpe’s plaque was moved to the Royal Ottawa Mental Health Centre, to the Operational Stress Injury Clinic where it can be seen in the waiting room.\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image223}
\caption{The memorial appears to be in a state of political limbo as it was the work of O’Toole, a member of the Conservative Party, and the ruling Liberal Party has suggested that the plaque not be re-erected in Parliament but permanently remain in the Royal Ottawa Mental Health Centre.\textsuperscript{51} The final home for the memorial will generate discussion over the place of veterans and their health in the priority of Canadian society. Still, its value should be questioned as this may be a case of a memorial allowing the government and society to pay lip-service to remembering veterans with mental wounds from war, while in reality there has been a process of active forgetting.}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{51} This was the statement of Seamus O’Reagan, the former Minister of Veterans Affairs, the current minister has made no known statements on the memorial. Laura Stone, ‘Parliament to vote on commemoration for veteran MP,’ \textit{The Toronto Star}, May 24\textsuperscript{th}, 2018, p. A4.
Victoria Cross recipients typically have more than the usual number of memorials because such memorials use them as representatives of their communities. These individuals have been elevated above others due to the recognition of their actions in the war, creating conflicting memories when comparing their personal memorials to their public memorials. The memorials to Edmund de Wind serve as an example of these conflicting memories. Edmund was born in the town of Comber, co. Down in what is now Northern Ireland and immigrated to Canada, where he joined the Canadian Expeditionary Force on the outbreak of war. He served with the Canadian forces as an enlisted soldier until 1917, when he obtained a commission as an officer of the Royal Irish Rifles. During the German Spring Offensives of 1918, he held his outpost against German attacks and died of wounds on March 21\textsuperscript{st}, 1918. He was awarded the Victoria Cross later for his bravery on the day he died.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{52} De Wind, Edmund, Personnel Records of the First World War, LAC RG 150 Box 2496-3 Number 353014.
\textsuperscript{53} The London Gazette, May 15, 1919, Issue 31340, p. 6084.
In both Northern Ireland and Canada, he was commemorated with memorials. In Canada, a historic plaque was erected in the town of Yorkton by the provincial government of Saskatchewan on the site of where he lived.\textsuperscript{54} (Image 224) Several decades later in 1948, a mountain in Alberta was named Mount de Wind; it is close to the city of Edmonton, where he was living when he enlisted in 1914.\textsuperscript{55} Edmund is also one of the individuals featured by the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (CIBC) on their information page about remembrance; he had worked as an employee of the bank before the war and is named on their branch memorial in Edmonton.\textsuperscript{56} In Northern Ireland, where he lived in Belfast as a student, he has two memorials in the city. The first is in Campbell College, his alma mater, where a bronze plaque was raised to him.\textsuperscript{57} (Image 225) A second memorial is in St Anne’s Cathedral, created by his mother Margaret, consists of his name and date of death carved into the base of a pillar at the west entrance to the cathedral.\textsuperscript{58} (Image 226) In Comber, the town was given a German artillery piece after the war that was placed in the town square next to the community war memorial in memory of Edmund. The large gun did not survive long as it was taken away in 1940 for

\textsuperscript{54} The original building was torn down and today the plaque sits in front of a parking lot for the local Bank of Montreal. Edmund de Wind Memorial Plaque, Canadian Military Memorials Database, https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/remembrance/memorials/national-inventory-canadian-memorials/details/2430.


\textsuperscript{57} ‘Lietuenant Edmond de Wind VC,’ War Memorial Online, https://www.warmemorialsonline.org.uk/memorial/246113/.

scrap metal during the Second World War.\(^5^9\) St Mary’s Church, which sits just off Comber’s town square, contains a personal memorial erected by his family. The stone plaque has the badge of the Royal Irish Regiment above the details of his military service, including his years with the CEF. The personal importance of the memorial for the de Wind family has it placed above a brass plaque to Arthur de Wind, Edmund’s father who passed away in 1917.\(^6^0\) On the centenary of his death, the town of Comber erected a new memorial in the town square in the form of short plinth.\(^6^1\) The plinth features his Victoria Cross on the top while on the sides descriptions of his life, bravery, and the former memorial were carved.\(^6^2\)

The numerous memorials to Edmund, as well as the continued commemoration of him during the centenary, are reliant upon his Victoria Cross. Being associated with a recipient of the highest military honour serves as a source of pride for communities. The erection of memorials in places he lived, such as Belfast and Yorkton, reveal the interest of local towns in showing their connection to someone considered a hero. Comber took greater steps to celebrate Edmund in placing memorials to him in the town square shortly after his death.

---

\(^5^9\) The plaque on the gun was moved to St Mary’s Church when the gun was scrapped. 2/Lt Edmund de Wind VC-Gun (Lost), War Memorials Online, https://www.warmemorialsonline.org.uk/memorial/246127.

\(^6^0\) Images of the plaques can be seen in a 360° photo taken by Planemo 360 Photography of the interior of St Mary’s Church and uploaded to Google Street View in July 2022. Other images can be found on amateur websites dedicated to recording the war dead of north county Down. ‘St Marys Parish Church Street View & 360°,’ Planero 360 Photography, https://www.google.com/maps/uv?pb=!1s0x48610cae23dde367%3A0xcfa68d1b68e65d2e13m117e1154shtps%3A%2F%2Fh5.googleusercontent.com%2Fp%2FAF1QipMuYQXsDAXMuV4eLnG5n5Z8V0K9obd7qohze63B%3Dw300-h200-k-no!5ssst%20mary%27s%20church%20comber%20co.%20down%20war%20memorial%20-\%20Google%20Search!15sCglgARICCAI&imagekey=!1e10!2sAF1QipPACY2dvqGC3fEyClvrLB9MoCBtu36WbVkpHv0m&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwixt-6tpuL5AhWwGDQJHbUI5D6MQoip6BAhHEAM; ‘Comber church of Ireland (St Mary’s), The War Dead of North Down and Ards, https://barryniblock.co.uk/war-memorials/church-memorials/comber-church-of-ireland-st-marys/.


after the war and during the centenary. Focus on him in public memorials is always on his actions that awarded him the Victoria Cross. The Campbell College memorial contains a shortened version of his commendation, while the memorial in Yorkton prominently features the medal and also provides a description of his commendation. On the personal memorial raised by his family in St Mary’s, the only sign that he was awarded the Victoria Cross is the ‘VC’ placed after his name. His death was described on the personal memorial, but the family does not celebrate that it brought him the prestige of the Victoria Cross.

Edmund was not the only Victoria Cross recipient to receive extended attention from their community, for there are other examples in Northern Ireland. Catherine Switzer examined the commemorative history of William McFadzean from Belfast; like de Wind, being a recipient of the Victoria Cross won him fame in his community. McFadzean came to be celebrated in East Belfast where his memory moved from private to public as communities around Northern Ireland in which he had lived and worked moved to claim him. In both McFadzean and de Wind’s commemoration, focus was on the individual in collective memorials served to represent the community, because the communities had a hero to be admired and elevated above other soldiers. Switzer argues that the public memory of McFadzean did not always fit into the private memory of the

---

family, who struggled to mourn the loss of a child and sibling in the midst of the celebration of him as a hero by the community.

The Unknown Soldier

The Unknown Soldiers stands above all individuals in the collective and personal memory of the First World War. The Unknown Soldier, or Unknown Warrior in Britain and New Zealand, has garnered a level of attention, commemoration, and importance in the memory of the conflict that no other individual can match. The issue, of course, is that
the individual is not known – so how can they represent any personal memory? Laura Wittman argues that it is precisely because of the Unknown Soldier’s namelessness that it plays such a powerful role in both collective and individual memory of the conflict. The ambiguity of the Unknown Soldier allows society, individuals, and groups to place upon the figure any identity they need or want. This ensures that the Unknown Soldier functions as both a national and personal site for mourning. The treatment of the Unknown Soldier in the burial and commemoration process displayed the way society deemed it appropriate to mourn the dead. The Unknown Soldier was given Christ-like qualities of sacrifice while also being seen as the ideal soldier, representing the best of the nation and individuals who died. The burial of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey in 1920 highlighted the individual as being chivalric, honourable, and linked to the nation’s past not just in the place of burial, but because of the royal assent to allow the body to be buried with a sword from the Royal Armoury used in the Crusades. Personal memorials used the same language, symbols, and commemorative ideals in their designs, displaying the way the Unknown Soldier matched the necessary components for mourning.

The Unknown Soldier, however, demonstrated the destructive powers of the First World War that obliterated bodies to the point that they could not be identified. War had made the body unknown. Yet the names were known and ensuring the names were not

---

66 Ibid, pp. 95-129.
lost served as a drive for individuals to commemorate. The power of naming individuals on memorials, either personal or collective, served as an important tool to ensure that the dead were being remembered. The fear of having their loved one become lost due to the war or due to their burial overseas, played a role in the creation of personal memorials that functioned as secondary gravesites. The placement of memorials in churches and other traditional sites of mourning ensured that the war dead were being remembered in a similar manner as if they had died at home. Personal memorials ensured that the name of the individual being commemorated was not lost or missed in the massive lists of war dead. The use of the Unknown Soldier as a space to mourn allowed all the dead to have a place where their families could mourn, but in reality was a ceremonial space for the state and the collective over the individual.

The Unknown Soldier as a space to display active participation in commemoration was utilized by states to help advance their own messages. In the Dominions, the need for their own Unknown Soldier demonstrated the growing gulf between the messages they wanted to display about the war and their continued links to Britain. Each of the Dominions in this study undertook to repatriate an Unknown Soldier to serve as a focal point for national memory, not just of the First World War but of military service to the nation in general. Discussions about creating tombs of Unknown Soldiers in each nation were held shortly after the war. But they never went very far, being overwhelmed by arguments for other national memorial projects or by assumptions that Imperial symbols

---

encapsulated their own war as well.\textsuperscript{69} It was not until the 1990s that serious interest in creating Unknown Soldier tombs became politically convenient and useful.

Australia was the first to repatriate an Unknown Soldier in 1993. Repatriation had been rejected for decades by the Australian government, but in 1991 the Australian War Memorial, previously a fierce resistor to installing a tomb, was the main backer to the scheme. It was proposed that the repatriation of an Unknown Soldier would form part of their anniversary celebrations, a plan endorsed by the Australian government. At the time, Australia was led by the Labor Party of Prime Minister Paul Keating, who was a strong supporter of the republican movement in the country. Keating and his government backed the creation of the tomb of an Unknown Australian Soldier as a means, not just to encourage nationalism throughout Australia, but also to further separate Australia from Britain by giving the country a separate shrine from the one in Westminster Abbey. While some people objected to Keating using this to advance his own republican agenda, the deputy director of the museum described the support for the tomb as being ‘very much in touch with Australia’s own history.’\textsuperscript{70} Most Australian commentators found the ceremonies and actions tasteful, giving Australians an important site for further commemoration and to display national pride and sorrow.\textsuperscript{71} The tomb was placed in the Australian War Memorial in the capital of Canberra.\textsuperscript{72} (Image 230)

In Canada, interest in burying their own Unknown Soldier began in 1996 when the government received two independent requests to create a tomb to an Unknown Canadian

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid, p. 40.13.
Soldier. The first came from university professors Robert Bernier and Jean-Yves Bronze who wrote to Prime Minister Jean Chretien about creating the tomb. Bernier and Bronze were politically motivated to have a Canadian Unknown Soldier to create stronger national ties and symbols in the wake of challenges to Canadian federalism and confederation. The near-miss of the 1995 Quebec Referendum that barely saw the province vote to stay in Canada, along with other challenges to Canadian nationalism in the failed Meech Lake and Charlottetown Accords, made Bernier and Bronze see the need for a commemorative project that could symbolically unite Canadians.\textsuperscript{73} In 1997, the Canadian Legion called for a tomb of the Unknown Canadian Soldier when it was looking to commemorate the centenary of the Boer War. Finding enthusiastic responses to the proposal, the Legion moved forward in contacting the federal government, the military, and the Canadian War Museum for support in the project. The three organizations gave their endorsement in 1998 when the project was expanded to be a tomb for all Canadians killed in war. In 2000, the project concluded as the Canadian Unknown Soldier was buried in front of the Canadian National War Memorial in Ottawa.\textsuperscript{74} (Image 231)

New Zealand repatriated its Unknown Warrior in 2004. The New Zealand project was less concerned with issues of national identity than in Australia and Canada, both of which saw their projects receive government support in the midst of national identity debates. Historian Ian McGibbon began pushing for a New Zealand Unknown Warrior in

1999, citing the pomp and ceremony of the Australians as an example of how successful it could be. The government began working on repatriating the Unknown Warrior in 2002 as a way to focus and unite all generations of New Zealanders together in their military service. The project was delayed by resistance to the design choice by the government, which would have seen the removal of the National War Memorial entrance in Wellington. A new design was chosen that incorporated the tomb into the steps leading up to the memorial, adding rather than removing elements of the National War Memorial.75 (Images 232 and 233)

Each of the tombs to Unknown Soldiers demonstrates the degree to which the First World War remained the primary conflict to commemorate the nation’s war dead. In post-war Australia, several commentators called for their own Unknown Soldier because the soldier buried in Westminster Abbey was not from Australia’s main battlefield of Gallipoli.76 When Australia selected the Unknown Soldier for their tomb, they chose not to use anyone from Gallipoli. They instead selected a soldier buried in Villers-Bretonneux, as France was where more Australians had fought and died.77 The Canadian Legion had originally started its project as part of its commemoration of the centenary of the Boer War. It was the Canadian military under General Romeo Dallaire that advocated for the Unknown Soldier to be selected from Vimy Ridge and the First World War.78 New Zealand also chose to select an Unknown Warrior from the battlefields of France, from

77 Inglis, Sacred Places, p. 457.
the Somme battlefield. In each nation, the Unknown Soldier was to represent all the nation’s war dead, missing or not, from every conflict they had fought in. The purposeful decision eighty to ninety years after the conflict to choose soldiers from the First World War demonstrates how the rituals and symbols associated with that war continue to dominate remembrance in each nation. For Canada and Australia, the First World War was the historical moment that saw the start of their nation-building myths, the trial by fire for each nation to become free, independent, and self-sufficient from the British Empire. Selecting soldiers from other conflicts would not fulfil the nation myths that the repatriations were meant to symbolize for the politicians.

---

Individuals in Memory and History

The continued focus on individuals from the First World War demonstrates an ongoing problem in historical studies and their interaction with public discourse: the difficulties in teaching complex events to those with no historical background by simplifying the past into easy, bite-sized stories. Great-man history, once the dominant form of historical analysis, creates easy-to-understand histories as the life and experiences of one person are more digestible than the diverse and unique lives of the masses. Attempts to democratize history, as social and cultural histories try to do, reveals the daunting complexity of the past. The use of individuals to teach about the war gives the public greater access to the past as the lives of soldiers, sailors, pilots, and civilians can be easily generalized in the experiences of a handful of people. The individuals selected are placed on pedestals, often removing the personality and life of the person to fit a socially desirable construct to help teach the past or fulfil political agendas.

The individuals discussed in this conclusion came to represent different aspects of the collective memory of the war. As this dissertation has demonstrated, the variety of experiences in the war was extensive and complex. Each individual involved has their own story to tell, and each memorial dedicated to them seeks to tell it in different ways. Connections between these stories are haphazard; they demonstrate the shared experiences of living and fighting in war but are still unique and different to everyone involved.80

This dissertation has worked to demonstrate the variety of private memories through the stories of personal memorials. In those stories, we see overlap but also the

---

80 Switzer, *Unionists and Great War Commemoration*, p. 150.
uniqueness of individuals coming to terms with the war they lived through and the violent and tragic loss of those close to them. The rhetoric, symbols, and imagery used on the memorials reveal that private and collective memory are not two distinct and separate entities. They are symbiotic in their development. Mourning and grief in the memorials operated hand in hand with pride and honour as individuals worked through their experiences and ideas with the reaction of society to the war. The memorials examined in this dissertation reveal how a select number of people tried to express their emotions and thoughts about their loved ones and the war. Many were seeking to fulfil obligations of mourning, while others were seeking to have their own loss expressed. The creation of personal memorials operating in a space between private and public memory reveals how individuals negotiated their own needs and societal demands for commemoration. Highlighting and discussing these memorials, at time when the living memory of the war has passed, ensures that the diversity of voices, experiences, and perspectives on war is not lost. The permanence of these memorials protects those diverse voices from being completely erased or forgotten.
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