4

‘Formal qualifications for full masculine status’? Challenging the fragmentation of the male life cycle through the First World War pension archives

Jessica Meyer

On 25 April 1959, C. H. Mardon, registrar in the district of Kent (subdistrict Maidstone), registered the death of LA1, age sixty-six, licensed victualler.[1] LA1 had died at home of carcinoma of the lung, certified by his doctor; the registrar had been informed of his death by LA1’s son. This information, a matter of public record, can be found not only in the official records of death, but also in LA1’s personal pension file relating to his disability from the First World War, one of 22,829 such files held in the PIN 26 section of the National Archives (London). LA1’s death certificate, with its wealth of personal information, including residential address, profession, the fact that he had a son, and that his son lived at the same address, was required, along with a raft of other paperwork, for the official closure of the file because, since 29 August 1919, LA1 had been in receipt of a weekly pension, awarded for life. A gunshot wound to his right arm, which he had received at Arras in 1917, was deemed by ministry medical officials on 29 August 1923 to permanently incapacitate him at a rate of 25 per cent,[2] entitling him to a pension of 10s 10d a week for life.[3]

The process by which this final level of disablement was arrived at can be traced through medical cards and treatment records dating from the point of LA1’s first wounding, as well as through the regular reports of medical inspections conducted by the Ministry of Pensions between his discharge from the military and the date of his final award. These contain extensive details of his physical condition over nearly seven years. The file also contains records of LA1’s mobility, most notably from a non-commercial address in Maidstone to the pub he appears to have run until his retirement, and his military discharge records, which include his enlistment records, detailing his place of birth and pre-war occupation.

LA1’s pension records, therefore, give insight into his life from birth to death. Nor is he unusual. Not all PIN 26 files contain a death certificate, as many men received a pension for illnesses and wounds deemed to have

ultimately incapacitated them at a rate less than 20 per cent, meaning that they were eventually awarded a final, fixed-period terminal pension or terminal gratuity, or a combination of the two. Nonetheless, all the personal pension files held in the PIN 26 section of the archives contain material providing medical and demographic information, as well as details of military service. Many also contain additional information about marriages and marriage failures, children born and raised, work opportunities taken and missed, and, in a significant number of cases, the voices of the men themselves and their families, arguing and advocating with the ministry through personal correspondence. They thus form a rich resource for historians of masculinity interested in the quotidian lives of men in twentieth-century Britain.

The scale of the material held in the archive, however, combined with structural issues around the cataloguing of this material, which has tended to focus on the interests of family historians, has often made use of this resource problematic for historians examining broader socio-cultural questions. This chapter draws on material from a database of the demographic information contained in these files, created by the Men, Women and Care project, to consider how such data might be used by historians of twentieth-century British masculinities.[4] In particular, it examines how the longer term trajectory of the life records of individual men recorded in the files directs us to think about masculinity in terms of life cycles rather than periodisations, usually defined in the twentieth century by wars and global conflicts. It considers how applying approaches used by women's historians, early modernists, and historians of disability in relation to gender, temporality, and the life cycle may help to address recent challenges raised to rethinking our approach to the study of modern British masculinities.

The clearest articulation of such a challenge has come from John Tosh in 'The History of Masculinity: An Outdated Concept?'. Arguing that in the history of masculinity, 'questions of behaviour and agency have … been sidetracked by a historical practice dominated by questions of meaning and representation',[5] Tosh calls instead for a renewed focus on individual agency and experience as a way of developing a 'culturally inflected social history which keeps its moorings in social experience'.[6] Such criticisms have a clear relevance for histories of First World War impairment in Britain, the field in which the PIN 26 files have had the most to contribute to date. Such histories have often focused on the interpretation of texts and images representing war-disabled masculinities in ways which run the risk of writing the historical actors themselves out of the record. The works of Ana Carden-Coyne and Gabriel Koureas on the disabled body in the memorial cultures of war demonstrates some of the ways in which post-war British society enabled the social and political marginalisation of

disabled men without necessarily giving voice to men's experiences of this exclusion.[7] Deborah Cohen, Fiona Reid, Julie Anderson, and Seth Koven have all explored how such marginalisation functioned at an institutional rather than a personal, level, exposing some of the power dynamics which shaped the lives of war-disabled men.[8] Yet the comparative richness of these institutional archival records risks obscuring the subjectivities of these men. We enlarge our understanding into how society positioned and treated them without necessarily gaining insight into how they themselves experienced such treatment.

One way of addressing these concerns is to use gender as a lens through which to explore disability and war-attributable impairment. Nicoletta Gullace's analysis of the white feather campaign, for example, integrates analysis of historically contextualised symbols of cowardice with the lived experiences of men to discuss the gendered wartime relationships of power which policed both the bodies of men and the sexualities of women. Yet in exposing the retrospective nature of men's memories of the white feather campaign, Gullace's work, which itself relies, as she points out, on retrospective memories of gender shaming through white feathers, returns us to the problem of how historians can access historical subjectivities unmediated by representation, whether through language, visual imagery, or other forms of expression.[9] Even in the case of immediately contemporaneous source material, such as the letters of J. B. Middlebrook examined by Wendy Gagen,[10] the language analysed is inevitably shaped by Middlebrook's socio-cultural location as an articulate, educated member of the middle classes. The understanding of his lived experience is, at one level, only available to us through our reading and interpretation of the texts which he has left behind, texts which only cover the (albeit long) period of his hospitalisation. There does not appear to be an equivalent record of his life as an amputee after his discharge from both hospital and the military, with most of his public biography focusing on his career in the Methodist Church. As a result, Middlebrook, like the men discussed by Gullace, is defined in the historical record almost entirely as a disabled *soldier* of the First World War rather than as a disabled *man*.

Personal records of the sort created by Middlebrook are vital to our understanding of male subjectivities. Such material can be interpreted both in terms of the construction of subjective gender identities as relational through the construction of relationships in writing practices,[11] and as representations of an individual's personal negotiation of socio-cultural gender norms through the employment of generic conventions.[12] Yet the official records of the state and its institutions also have a significant part to play in our analysis if we are to arrive at the sort of social history Tosh argues for. This can be seen in Bruce Scates's work on the repatriation files

of the Australian Imperial Force which have been digitised by the National Archives of Australia as part of the Project Albany initiative. These records contain three file types, those relating to military service, those relating to clinical or hospital treatment, and those relating to pension provision.[13] The range of information they contain allows the historian, according to Scates, to 'bridge what has long been a historical hiatus between wartime service and postwar experience'. He uses several case studies to demonstrate how such analysis can enable a reinterpretation of the lived experience of twentieth-century veteran identity and physical disability, including that of Bertram Byrnes. Byrnes suffered serious disfigurement by a gunshot wound which left him 'Permanently and Totally Incapacitated', with difficult swallowing, which caused digestive problems, as well as severe headaches and partial blindness. He survived until 1965, most of that time with no income other than his pension. While these records make, as Scates writes, 'for confronting reading', they also challenge historical understandings of facial disfigurements as stigmatising in interwar anglophone society. Not only did Byrnes marry, thereby fulfilling one of the central requirements of mature normative masculinity, he also 'never expressed shame at [his] injury. To the contrary, he saw himself as a returned man who had "done his bit" – a strong sense of moral economy informed his tireless petitioning. His status, then, was that of a veteran rather than a victim. He would march and wear his medals on Anzac Day.'[14]

Scates's analysis demonstrates how official records help to bridge Byrnes's wartime and post-war experiences, although in ways which continue to locate his identity almost entirely within his wartime service, as 'a man marred by war'.[15] This is unsurprising in an analysis located in war and archival studies rather than the history of masculinity. Yet the contents of the repatriation files, like the pension files, are suggestive of contributions to other histories and historical approaches. Byrnes mobilised his disabled body in his petitioning in ways which provide insight into his experience of the social and political economies of post-war Australia. Similarly, LA1's records reflect the (re)construction of disabled masculinity across the changing social landscape of twentieth-century England, not simply in but through time. There is thus great potential in approaching these records from the perspective of cultural history and the history of masculinity in particular.

PIN 26

It is the potential richness of the material held in PIN 26 files for providing insight into the lives of ordinary men and their families that prompted the creation of a database of information by the Men, Women and Care project.

While the surviving 22,829 files that form the project's corpus represent only approximately 2 per cent of all such files created in relation to this conflict,[16] they have, to date, proved complex to access for social and cultural historians due to the way in which they have been regarded and consequently catalogued. Deemed at one point of no historical value, and nearly destroyed entirely,[17] the only searchable metadata attached to them in the Discovery catalogue of the National Archives is the name, rank, regiment, and disability of the individual, the last of these relying on the language of the original diagnosis. The terms used are often highly subjective, reliant on an individual doctor's perspective at a given place and time, and regularly fail to reflect changes in condition or diagnosis that occurred over time. The case of EC2 is instructive here. Having initially been pensioned for a gunshot wound and disorder action of the heart (DAH) in 1919, his final pension of £2 a week for life was for the chronic nephritis that resulted from his original injury and which was listed as his cause of death in 1925.[18] The structural limits of the catalogue have meant that systematic analysis around analytic categories pertinent to social and cultural history has been extremely laborious. While the records have been used by historians through close readings of individual files, analysis of the sample as a whole has been impossible, while the selection of files for analysis has rarely been subject to robust sampling methodology. The Men, Women and Care project began the process of creating a searchable database of demographic information and a wider range of metadata related to these files to enable more systematic sampling, for instance, by region, date of birth, or need for hospital treatment. Information about file contents can also be used to identify files potentially useful to future researchers as sources for close reading, providing added value to the current catalogue.

The database is thus intended to make it easier for historians to interrogate this material more effectively, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Yet each file in and of itself contains, as Alexia Moncrieff has noted, only a snapshot of the lives lived by these men.[19] In LA1's case, the period between 1923 and 1959 is almost entirely blank. His marriage in 1919 is noted as is the death of his wife in 1952, but not the birth of his children, although at least one survived him. His listing at death as a retired licensed victualler would seem to indicate that he remained a pub landlord, although not whether of the same pub throughout nor when he retired. In comparison to the information provided on his life as a soldier during the four and a half years of his service, that relating to his life as a disabled ex-serviceman, husband, father, worker, taxpayer, and head of household in Britain in the first half of the twentieth century is limited.

The archive, for all its richness, is therefore not unproblematic. It does present the opportunity for exploring the lived experiences of men from a

range of backgrounds who served in the First World War, but these experiences are episodic and uneven across both the sample and individual lives. However, this very unevenness provides an important opportunity to bridge the divide between men's wartime and post-war lives in ways which challenge the historiographic tendency to categorise experience by period. By hiving off experiences into discrete, periodised categories, historians of masculinity risk failing to fully access male agency across time and to appreciate both the importance of the life cycle to modern masculinities and the potentialities of alternative temporalities in reading male life experience. The history of war disability, through its bridging of periods in individual lives, provides an opportunity, yet to be fully exploited, to rethink twentieth-century British masculinities in these terms in ways which complicate our understanding not only of the gendered legacy of wars across the century but also of changing normative constructions of masculinity. Drawing on approaches already employed by historians of women, as well as early modernists and historians of disability, we may start to develop a practice that acknowledges the agency of men as problematic historical actors in their own right and across time, rather than as representations of the generically male subject at a given moment in time.

Challenging periodisation

The discrete definition of male roles within limited periods is, perhaps, a particular problem for twentieth-century European histories of masculinity. The tendency to periodise the history of the century through its wars, both hot and cold, has led to historical practices which focus on men's experiences either during or between conflicts, without necessarily acknowledging the extent to which periods could overlap or how individual lives encompassed multiple periods. The literature on generational transfer, such as Joel Morley's work on the relationships between veterans of the First World War and combatants of the Second, suggests one way to approach continuities and discontinuities in understandings of masculinity across the period.[20] Scope remains, however, for examining how men's lives and their sense of self as gendered social actors was shaped by shifting social meanings across periods in relation to peace as well as war.

Here I would suggest that the field has much to learn from the approaches taken by women's history and early modernists. In the former field, the work of social historians such as Selina Todd and Pamela Cox shows how women's identities and status as economic and gendered actors changed across time in response not only to socio-political contexts but also their position in the life cycle.[21] This life cycle approach has, in turn, been used

by a new generation of historians such as Claire Martin, who has applied it to women's knowledge of sex and sexuality in early twentieth-century Britain. The focus on women's lived experience of sexual health and knowledge across the life cycle, from learning about sex through menstruation, pregnancy, and childbirth to the menopause, illuminates the shifting social and political contexts in which women lived their lives, rather than being defined by these contexts.[22]

To a certain extent, Tosh has himself pioneered this approach in his work on young men's coming of age in the middle-class home of the nineteenth century,[23] as well as his argument, in 'Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender', that cultural history 'prioritises the current "moment" over a longer term perspective'.[24] However, Tosh's own foregrounding of a particular moment in the male life cycle – namely fatherhood – across his period of analysis risks obscuring the social, cultural, and political changes across time that individual men would encounter as they moved from boyhood to young manhood to masculine maturity, with each stage nuanced by its own set of complex and contingent power relations. This is not to suggest that the shifting social significance of fathers across time is not vital to our understanding of the history of gender and gender relations.[25] This approach does, however, point more clearly to continuity and change across time in relation to our understanding of masculinities, rather than exposing the depths of complexity of those masculinities at any given point in time.

Here the intricate constructions of masculine hierarchies based on age and position within the life cycle in the early modern period, as discussed by Alexandra Shepard, are instructive.[26] While never as clearly articulated in the twentieth century, the schemas of male aging that she outlines have relevance for a range of social and political changes in the period, from welfare provision to military conscription, from educational policy to periodic moral panics over youth gangs and drug use. Understanding how men experienced multiple stages of manhood *across* periods of pre-war, wartime, interwar, and post-war, rather than simply in relation to either a single period or a fixed stage in their life cycle, has the potential to shift analytic focus towards the more culturally inflected social histories called for by Tosh.

In addition, the work of historians of disability such as Joshua St. Pierre offers ways of thinking about how men experience time itself as both disabled and gendered actors. Drawing on feminist and queer theory, St. Pierre uses the experience of stuttering as a case study to argue that consideration of 'bodily temporalities', as exposed through queer/crip readings of time, enables a questioning, even a subversion, of 'straight-male' future-directed linearity in our interpretations of lives and life cycles. Such distinctions

provide scope for questioning how disabled ex-servicemen's expectations of the male life cycle were disrupted and changed in the face of their new experiences of bodily time, now out of sync with those they might have held prior to illness or injury. In particular, the challenges of such disabled bodies to reproductive and familial time, 'where futures are in question, cut short, unable to be projected into domestic (heteronormative) bliss',[27] resonate throughout the pension files. How men negotiated these challenges across their lives can provide insight into both how normative expectations of appropriate masculinity altered across time and life stage, and how such social expectations interacted with subjective individual experience.

Rethinking temporalities

How, then, can we use the material in the PIN 26 archives to shift our analytic focus away from periodisation and other hegemonic temporalities? In the first instance, the longevity of many of the files provides insight into individual lives across a protracted period of time. While many of the files were subject to four-year closure assessments under the 1921 War Pensions Act,[28] and thus end in 1922 or 1923, a significant number span much of the twentieth century, with the last file closing in 1987. These long-opened files reflect one of two scenarios. Either, like LA1, the pensioner had been awarded a pension for life, or else the pensioner objected to some aspect of how his pension was assessed, whether the diagnosis of his disability, the amount awarded, or the treatment offered, and remained in contact with the ministry through appeals and letters of complaint.[29] In the first case, the files can have large gaps, where contact between the ministry and the pension was minimal, although they continue to reflect changes in political management and the national economy through modifications to the amount of the weekly award and the way it was paid out. Additionally, as in LA1's case, social details of a particular moment – that of the pensioner's death – are also captured, allowing for the, albeit fragmentary and partial, reconstruction of a life.

In the second case, more detail of the shape of individual lives across the entire period can be gleaned from the personal correspondence, statements of case, and letters of support written by advocates that form part of the appeals process. The work of Moncrieff on the pensions of men who emigrated overseas illustrates this. In her exploration of the impact of distance on state care provision, Moncrieff traces patterns of emigration among pensioners seeking work outside the difficult labour market which they faced in Britain through correspondence located in their pension files.[30] 'These letters', she notes,

> let slip the intimate details of people's lives, as individuals shared their circumstances with bureaucrats, and provide insight into the ways families interacted with state and imperial administrations. At the same time as the individual's voice can be heard in this archive – as they petition the Ministry and shape their stories to engender sympathy from officials – this archive also divulges how these narratives were received, understood and judged. The cases discussed in … highlight the politics of respectability as they reveal both its performance and how that performance was interpreted.[31]

Tracing lives in this way thus enables understanding of the intersections between masculinity, domesticity, and imperialism as all three categories of analysis were subjected to stresses and change.

Intersections with a fourth key category of analysis can also be discerned here, that of work. Required to work even within a pensions system which was designed to compensate for '"loss of amenity", not "loss of earning capacity"', the men studied by Moncrieff found it particularly hard to secure work in an economy where 'disabled soldiers are not over popular as candidates for jobs'.[32] The pensions records reveal the dominance of Canada and the Unites States as destinations for men seeking manual work, although Australia, New Zealand, and India all feature as significant alternatives, pointing to the practical as well as imaginative importance of empire to metropolitan British masculine identity in this period. These files thus provide source material for the exploration of the 'sense of personal attachment between metropole and colonies [which formed a] … basis for pro-empire sentiment in Britain', which Tosh identifies as a significant area for further discussion by historians of twentieth-century British masculinities.[33]

As Tosh notes, however, such sources are 'no more transparent or authentic than any other personal sources. One has to be alert all the time to the distortions of self-making.'[34] Indeed, the nature of the appeal to or challenging of authority implicit in the type of material contained in correspondence with a government department lends itself to particular types of self-construction designed to elicit a favourable response.[35] However, through their very act of self-fashioning, such material exposes both the gendered values which shaped lived experience and the cultural imaginaries that influenced the ways in which such values and experience was articulated. EB1, for example, emigrated to Canada in an attempt to 'start in an outdoor way of business' with the support of his father-in-law. His struggles to do so were consistently articulated to the ministry in terms of economic independence and domestic support of his sons.[36] By contrast, the report on his condition in 1930, after he had returned to England where he worked as a pub landlord, emphasises the labour of his wife in caring for her husband and assisting in his work.[37] The geographic context in which

EB1 found himself had changed, but so too had his point in the life cycle. The sons who he struggled to provide for in Canada had left home, with his relationship to his wife becoming central to his struggles to live with his disability. The ways in which men negotiated their sense of impaired masculinity arising from disability over time can thus be seen to provide a space where men could articulate experiences of emigration in terms that draw on the cultural texts of both empire and gender.

Alongside, and deeply implicated in, the imperial narratives mobilised by the pensioner emigrants run stories of domestic strain and breakdown.[38] These illustrate Tosh's point that 'the largest category of emigrant men were husbands with children: men who had achieved the formal qualifications for full masculine status, but whose circumstances usually made a bitter mockery of it; one might call them casualties of the patriarchal order.'[39] Emigrants were, of course, by no means the only such casualties, particularly in interwar Britain. War disability, with its paradoxical power to rob men of their claims to or hopes for full masculine status through the performance of the ultimate hegemonically masculine role of good husband and father, created a section of the male population, within as well as beyond Britain, who might be classified as acknowledged casualties of patriarchy. What a more comprehensive examination of the pensions archive demonstrates is not just the extent to which war disability contributed to this category of masculinity in this period. Approaching the archive in this way also highlights the ways in which the hegemonically dominant identity of the soldier was not merely a temporary one for many men, but a contingent one during the years of war as well as after.[40] The discharge papers included in almost all files allow for a more robust and representative analysis of the number of men who enlisted with a less than A1 health classification, enlisted over or under age, or served a significant part of their service in non-combatant units behind the lines than has been undertaken to date. Such information illustrates how, even within the familiar periodisation of the war years, men's individual location within the life cycle shaped their subjective relationship to cultural constructions of the male ideal. Regular inclusion of military enquiry records, meanwhile, indicates the extent to which men were wounded accidentally rather than in the gender-appropriate context of the front line, challenging the hegemonic dominance of the identity of 'soldier'. Qualitative analysis of the sample thus helps to complicate our understanding of what it meant to be a British man during the First World War.

Yet by forcing us to look beyond the temporal limits of the war years, these files have an even more important role to play in nuancing our understanding of how masculinity was coded in terms of male hegemonies across the twentieth century. This data also allows us to identify not only the men within the sample who received allowances for spouses and dependents, but

also those who did not, and thus did not achieve the 'formal qualifications for full masculine status' of marriage and, more particularly, children.[41] The dominance of fatherhood in the historiography of nineteenth- and twentieth-century British masculinities has tended to sideline men who did not have children, a reflection of the power of the sort of heteronormative male timeframes which St. Pierre identifies as controlling constructions of disabled masculinities. The challenge that disabled male bodies pose to these normative cultural constructions of time and life cycle suggests that childless men potentially form a highly significant category within the sample of the war disabled. Locating their experience in the historical record allows us additional insight into the lived experience of such marginalised forms of masculinity, as well as the opportunity to explore men's engagement with hegemonic ideals in their articulations of masculinity. In bringing the experiences of men as sons, brothers, and in-laws to the fore, it allows for the exploration of the functioning of complex family structures of care across time, encompassing the emotional, the physical, and the financial. Thus the support provided to AF1's wife by her siblings and in-laws, as discussed by Eilis Boyle, can be seen to divide along gender lines, with men providing financial support and advocacy, the women domestic aid and nursing care.[42] CE1's complaint that 'I am now living on my wife's people', due to the paucity of his pension, speaks not to his sense of failure as a masculine provider but also the ways in which the dependence of disability shaped generational relationships between parents and children.[43] In combination with Michael Roper's exploration of the experiences of children growing up with war-disabled fathers and Marina Larsson's work on the Anzac experience of war disability,[44] such analysis will enable further insight into the legacy of war on both families and British society more broadly in gendered terms. It also allows us to map the changing nature of gendered understandings of family structures, and men's place within it, across the twentieth century.

Conclusion

As episodic as the PIN 26 files are, therefore, they have an important role to play in shaping our understanding of masculinities in twentieth-century Britain and the significance of both war and peace to gender as a socio-cultural force in the period. Both as individual files to be explored qualitatively and as a sample to be explored quantitatively, these files offer insight into changing perceptions, individual and collective, of masculinity over time. The genesis of their creation may have been a particular war, and the exceptional and unexpected physical and mental damage caused by the length and

violence of that war. The stories they allow us glimpses into, however, are those of men – and their families and associates – whose lives encompassed significant periods of peace and even other wars, with their own effects on the socio-cultural significance of gender and gender relations. As disabled men, and men whose disabilities were obtained at the point of or beyond the achievement of full masculine status through the life cycle markers of employment, marriage, and fatherhood, their stories, told across time, have the potential to challenge normative framings of masculinity in relation to both period and life cycle.

Approaching the men whose stories are at least partially told in these files thus helps us to see these men more clearly, in spite of archival fragmentation, as individuals whose gendered identities were shaped by all the stages in their life cycle, not just their four years of war service, however profound the impact of that war service may have been on their bodies and minds. By seeing them holistically as men rather than as facets of masculinity – as soldiers, fathers, workers – we can more fully appreciate the multiplicity of masculine constructions which combine to shape lived experiences of individuals as well as the society in which they live.

Notes

1 Death certificate, PIN 26/235, 25 April 1959, The National Archives, London (hereafter TNA). Throughout this chapter, pensioners and their family members named in the PIN 26 archives will be anonymised via unique alphanumeric codes. This is in line with the practice agreed in the Men, Women and Care project's ethical review, PVAR 14–065.
2 For details of the schedule of impairment used by the Ministry of Pensions to evaluate war disability, see Joanna Bourke, *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War* (London: Reaktion Books, 1996), 65–68.
3 PIN 26/235, *passim*.
4 'Men, Women and Care: The Gendering of Formal and Informal Care-Giving in Interwar Britain', European Research Council Starting Grant Project Number 638694, ran at the University of Leeds from 2015 to 2020.
5 John Tosh, 'The History of Masculinity: An Outdated Concept?', in John H. Arnold and Sean Brady (eds), *What Is Masculinity: Historical Dynamics form Antiquity to the Contemporary World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 18.
6 Tosh, 'The History of Masculinity', 31.
7 Ana Carden-Coyne, *Reconstructing the Body: Classicism, Modernism and the First World War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Gabriel Koureas, *Memory, Masculinity and National Identity in British Visual Culture, 1914–1930: A Study of 'Unconquerable Manhood'* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

8 Deborah Cohen, *The War Come Home: Disabled Veterans in Britain and Germany, 1914–1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Fiona Reid, *Broken Men: Shell Shock, Treatment and Recovery in Britain, 1914–1930* (London: Continuum, 2010); Julie Anderson, *War, Disability and Rehabilitation: 'Soul of a Nation'* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011); Seth Koven, 'Remembering and Dismemberment: Crippled Children, Wounded Soldiers and the Great War in Britain', *American Historical Review*, 99 (1994), 1167–1202.
9 Michael Roper, 'Slipping Out of View: Subjectivity and Emotion in Gender History', *History Workshop Journal*, 59 (2005), 57–72; Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* (London: Routledge, 1994), 3–5.
10 Wendy J. Gagen, 'Remastering the Body, Renegotiating Gender: Physical Disability and Masculinity during the First World War, the Case of J. B. Middlebrook', *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*, 14 (2007), 525–541.
11 Roper, 'Slipping Out of View', 63–65.
12 Jessica Meyer, *Men of War: Masculinity and the First World War in Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 10–13.
13 Bruce Scates, 'How War Came Home: Reflections on the Digitisation of Australia's Repatriation Files', *History Australia*, 16:1 (2019), 191–192.
14 *Ibid.*, 199–202.
15 *Ibid.*, 201.
16 The remaining files were either badly damaged during the Second World War or culled from the archive in a space-saving exercise in the 1990s.
17 See 'Ministry of Pensions and Successors: Selected First World War Pensions Award Files', Discovery Catalogue, TNA, https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/C11539 (accessed 17 April 2019). Additional information on the sampling process was provided to the author in an email from Professor Jay Winter, 13 November 2001.
18 PIN 26/273.
19 Alexia Moncrieff, 'Imperial Pensioners, Domestic Violence and the British Ministry of Pensions: State Involvement in Family Life', paper delivered at the No End to the War: Cultures of Violence and Care in the Aftermath of the First World War Conference, University of Manchester, 24 January 2019.
20 J. M. Morley, '"Dad Never Said Much but …": Young Men and Great War Veterans in Day-to-Day Life in Inter-war Britain', *Twentieth Century British History*, 29 (2018), 199–224.
21 Selina Todd, *Young Women, Work and Family in England 1918–1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Pamela Cox, Heather Shore, Zoe Alker, and Barry Godfrey, 'Tracking the Gendered Life Courses of Care Leavers in 19th-Century Britain', *Longitudinal and Life Course Studies*, 9:1 (2018), 115–128.
22 Claire Martin, 'Bodies of Knowledge: Science, Popular Culture, and Working-Class Women's Experiences of the Life Cycle in Yorkshire, c.1900–1940' (PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2018).

23 John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999).
24 John Tosh, 'Hegemonic Masculinities and the History of Gender', in Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann, and John Tosh (eds), *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 52.
25 Julie-Marie Strange, *Fatherhood and the British Working Class, 1865–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Laura King, *Family Men: Fatherhood and Masculinity in Britain, 1914–1960* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
26 Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 55.
27 Joshua St. Pierre, 'Distending Straight-Masculine Time: A Phenomenology of the Disabled Speaking Body', *Hypatia*, 3 (2015), 54.
28 Helen Bettinson, '"Lost Souls in the House of Restoration"? British Ex-servicemen and War Disability Pensions, 1914–1930' (PhD diss., University of East Anglia, 2002), 74–78.
29 *Ibid.*, 4.
30 Alexia Moncrieff, 'Gendered Respectability and the Maintenance of Imperial Order: Family Breakdown and the Ministry of Pensions after the First World War' (unpublished paper, 2018). On the employment difficulties faced by disabled ex-servicemen in Britain, see Meyer, *Men of War*, 107.
31 Moncrieff, 'Gendered Respectability', 4–5.
32 JL1, Letter to the Secretary, Ministry of Pensions, 16 July 1924, PIN 26/19942, TNA.
33 Tosh, 'The History of Masculinity', 27.
34 *Ibid.*
35 Bettinson, '"Lost Souls in the House of Restoration"', 9.
36 This association of Canada with the outdoors chimes with the narrative of Canadian muscular masculinity in this period identified by David B. Marshall, '"A Canoe, a Tent and God's Great Out-of-Doors": Muscular Christianity and the Flight from Domesticity, 1880s–1930s', in Heather Ellis and Jessica Meyer (eds), *Masculinity and the Other: Historical Perspectives* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 23–42.
37 PIN 26/21230, TNA, *passim*.
38 Alexia Moncrieff, 'Assessing Respectability: Disabled British Veterans, Family Breakdown and the State after the First World War', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, forthcoming.
39 Tosh, 'The History of Masculinity', 27.
40 Helen McCartney, *Citizen Soldiers: The Liverpool Territorials in the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 2–3.
41 Tosh, 'The History of Masculinity', 27.
42 Eilis Boyle, 'Gender and Care in Interwar Britain: An Examination of the Care Provision and Experiences of Care for Facially-Wounded and War-Neurotic Ex-servicemen' (PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2020).

43 CE1, Letter to the Ministry of Pensions, 9 April 1920, PIN 26/21580, TNA.
44 Michael Roper, *Afterlives of War: A Descendants' History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2023). Marina Larsson, *Shattered Anzacs: Living with the Scars of War* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2009).