Transnational War Memories in Australia's Heritage Field

Academic interest in Australia's heritage field has developed primarily around the ways its subject has been used to support dominant – national – interests. Understandings of heritage, however, are increasingly shaped by developments occurring in other nation-states, as well as those occurring at the international level. This paper considers the changing nature of Australian notions of heritage within the context of the 'transnational turn'. It does so in two ways. First, the paper traces talk of transnationalism at a general level, considering especially theorizations around a materialist understanding of memory. Second, it considers what new representations of the past such a theorization might call forth in the Australian context. As a point of illustration, the paper focuses on the specific case of Australian war memories and their articulation within the heritage field.

In 1994, the Keating government launched *Creative Nation*. In its opening line, heritage was positioned as a core component of cultural policy, affecting, informing and transforming Australia and its attendant identities. Almost twenty years later, heritage continued to operate as a key – though somewhat less explicit – concept within cultural policy, as evidenced by aspirations set out in *Creative Australia*, produced in 2013, to reformulate the national agenda for the cultural sector. In addition to positioning heritage as a driving force behind the formulation and promotion of a distinctive national identity, both documents point to an increasingly transnational influence on the forces of cultural production and consumption. As Khan et al. (2013: 30) point out, this necessitates a 'hybrid vision of nationhood'; one that is located *beyond* the nation state. Yet during the same decades bookended by *Creative Nation* and *Creative Australia*, a cultural nostalgia was also hard at work, gathering momentum and public support for a renaissance of the Anzac legend. Re-emerging in the 1980s around the figure of the 'tragic hero' (Donaldson

& Lake, 2010: 90–91), this narrative was to become an integral part of Australia's identity, holding purchase with both Liberal and Labor governments.

The question we ask here in this article concerns the way transnational forces have registered within Australia's heritage field. In taking up the term 'field', we adhere to the Bourdieusian theme of this special issue and take the heritage field to be an area of social life with its own logic or rules, structured in terms of particular issues of 'stake' and power that determine how an 'event' such as Anzac memory is observed, defined and represented. Rather than confine ourselves to that of the nation, we are interested in struggles over scale with regard to representations of Anzac occurring in both social spaces *and* their concretization in physical space, recognizing as Hanquinet et al (2012: 514) do 'that claims to cultural distinction involve claims to location'. As a point of focus, we review the practices of heritage linked to national remembering, especially those operating around Australia's military heritage and the 'spirit of the Anzacs' – which have for some time cemented the memory of Australia's experiences of war as *the* national heritage concern. Our interest emerges not only from the profound position of the Anzac legend within Australia's sense of nationhood, but also from the significant consequences transnationalism could have on its dynamics, given that, by its very name (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps), it already conjures something of a transnational imaginary. Before considering that prospect, however, we first want to piece together a brief review of the academic literature that surrounds heritage and memory. We then intervene in this literature by proposing an articulation of the heritage/memory dyad as one that can be understood as a transnational 'memory-assemblage', before speculating on the prospects of rescaling Anzac remembrance within a transnational agenda.

The Memory Complex

Within studies of heritage, work on memory has largely drawn from cultural psychological traditions such as the work of Wertsch (2002) and sociological perspectives such as that of Connerton (1989) and Nora (1989). In either case, memory is foundational, conceived as an integral social and discursive process that enacts heritage, which in turn is seen to revolve around places and experiences that draw heavily on acts of remembering. To use Macdonald's terms, places of heritage become 'the products of collective memory work' (2013: 1). It follows that sites of heritage are often explicitly designed as spaces that people visit to make sense of, and reconnect with, various aspects of their identities – be they personal, national or transnational. Industrial sites offer a concrete example of this melding of heritage and memory in physical space, illustrating the ways in which redundant sites of production can be repackaged and come to stand in for a way of life that has since become subject to erasure (Waterton, 2011). There are numerous other sites of memory we could pointed to, such as burial sites, battlefields and more spontaneous memorials such as those created at the perimeter of Ground Zero, Manhattan. There is also a performative dimension to this list, which allows for the inclusion of re-enactments and other rituals for remembering the past, as well as practices such as street-naming. All of these fit comfortably within the cartography of heritage, as they are places and experiences that support political and popular connections with the past.

When viewed in conjunction with heritage, memory becomes both 'collective' and 'cultural', the combination of which has generated much academic interest in the last quarter century (see Olick et al., 2011). Looked at thus, memory is stretched beyond a psychological interest in individual cognition to that of the public or collective. Or rather, individual and collective memory can be seen as caught up with one another, constantly

becoming as new bodies and other material elements are woven into the collective. We adopt a conceptualization of memory that is both material and distributed; memory is the emergent effect of an assemblage of bodies, things and discourses. This memory-assemblage is constantly becoming otherwise as new elements enter into relation with old. This is true at both the scale of the individual and the collective. Consider the vacation phenomenon of the *souvenir*, a French word meaning 'I remember'. These objects (photographs, tchotchkes, etc.) are used as a way of enabling future recall; the memory is not solely produced in the brain, but in the relation between the remembering subject and the souvenir-object. Among collectives, the equivalents of a souvenir are the heritage sites, monuments and collective rituals described above. These are distributed, material elements of memory that are used to predispose the remembering subject to certain collective memories. Bodies entering into a collective who lack the experience of prior members can potentially destabilize a collective memory, fragmenting it or causing it to mean otherwise. Thus, at all times memory is changing but so is the collective doing the remembering; the remembering subject is as unstable as the memory itself. Rather than thinking in terms of individual memory, then, the memorial context calls for a different sort of conceptualisation – one that is cultural and social, not exclusively *within* people but existing *between* people and things (Welzer, 2010: 5).

Imagining memory as distributed through a range of bodies, objects and sites enables us to think of memory as not autochthonous to the person or collective whose memory it 'is', but (potentially) produced through a range of spaces and sites that are not normally associated with the identity that 'owns' the memory. Collective memory at the scale of the state therefore often relies on a range of bodies, objects and sites that are beyond the borders of the state. To link together these together to produce a 'memory' requires practices of

ordering and representing that are transnational in nature. Of course many of the events that are central to national collective memory involve other polities' collective memories (although often not as centrally). Because the same bodies, objects and sites are often implicated in these competing memories, the politics of these practices can be complicated, not only with regard to the meanings attached to them, but also the central question of which should be allowed to contribute to a memory. The inclusion of new elements into a memory-assemblage can alter the coherence of the memory (making it more diffuse or crystalizing it further) or it can change the discursive content of that memory.

As an example, we turn to the contest over the Elgin Marbles (the sculptures from the Parthenon Frieze). Taken from Athens by Lord Elgin in 1801 when today's Greece was part of the Ottoman Empire, the Marbles feature centrally in the British Museum, where they serve as part of a larger collective memory: that of Western civilization – in which ancient Greece serves as a foundation stone. Having the objects composing this narrative of Western civilization in London serves to buttress British national narratives of centrality to Western civilization. The Greek museum devoted to the Acropolis – opened in 2009 – is architecturally designed to drench the Parthenon Frieze in sunlight, and indeed a few pieces are in place, surrounded by replicas of the pieces held in London. There, the Parthenon Frieze serves as part of a narrative of Greek – rather than Western – civilization, but equally the missing originals construct a narrative of loss and victimhood through their absence (a range of media inform visitors about the British 'theft' and subsequent intransigence with regard to return).

It is clear from this example that the physical presence (and/or absence) of memory-objects in specific heritage sites helps to produce a range of collective memories, and that the

transnational network of elements buttressing each of those memories complicates the politics of those memories. In this example this is because the contestation of ownership and the governance of circulating representations is lifted out of a national context in which legal remedies might be available, and put into an international context in which diplomacy is foregrounded. This is but one example of the transnational politics of ordering and representation through which specific constellations of memory form; other examples will point to different issues. With that in mind, we now turn to the case of Anzac memory.

The Anzac Legend as Shared Memory

The transnational component evident in the name 'Anzac' makes it an instructive case, not least because this transnationalism has for some time been so neatly eclipsed by a vehement form of national self-representation. Australia's Anzac memory hinges upon the unsuccessful landing of Australian, British, New Zealand, French and other troops along the Dardanelles peninsula in 1915, yet it is really only the Australian troops that are remembered. As our concern is with the social and political influences that have shaped Anzac memory over the past two decades, it is important that we acknowledge a number of significant moments within this time period. First and foremost, there are the efforts to commemorate the centenary of World War I, from 2014 to 2018, and the Anzac centenary in 2015, the latter of which was one of the biggest heritage events in Australia. To understand those commemorations, we need to place Anzac memory in a slightly longer historical context; one that roughly draws back to the publication of *Creative Nation* in 1994, when support for republicanism, reconciliation and multiculturalism was at its peak under Keating's Labor government (Bennett, 2006: 62; Bongiorno, 2014). Shortly thereafter, Labor was defeated by Howard's conservative Liberal-National Coalition, itself

intent on defeating the politics supporting *Creative Nation*, which were rebutted via a 'politics of reassurance' to which a specific form of Anzac memory was instrumental (Wellings, 2014: 53). This narrative, as we (Dittmer and Waterton, forthcoming) have argued elsewhere, can be summarised as revolving around:

> … a fledgling nation defined by youth, humour, mateship and a sense of adventure that was tested by an ill-conceived and doomed campaign resulting in both loss of life and loss of *innocence* in battle. Through spirit, comradery, endurance and love for country – all now considered central to the Australian psyche – Australia *as a nation* triumphed over adversity, if not in a specific battle (emphasis in original).

Since 1996, this conceptualization has been manoeuvred into the centre of Australian nationalism in a way that was more than coincidental given the concurrent deployment of troops to East Timor, Afghanistan and Iraq. This was also an era characterized by a rapid growth in 'battlefield heritage', particularly at Gallipoli, Kokoda and the Somme, with attendance at Anzac Day services *in situ* at Anzac Cove, along with attendance at parallel events in Australia, on the rise (Sumartojo, 2015). The increasingly powerful role of Anzac memory during this timeframe can be firmly tied to nationalist sentiments (McDonald, 2010). Research conducted by Tranter and Donoghue in 2015, which reflects upon the 2003 and 2011 Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA), likewise foregrounds the prominence of Anzacs and their memory to Australian national identity across this period. Crucially, its apparent popularity has been buoyed by a 'chauvinistic, bellicose and intolerant' section of the population (Cochrane, 2015: n.p.; Bongiorno, 2014), which has given rise to an implicitly 'white' Anzac memory. It is thus not easy to find instances in

which national self-representations actuated by Anzac memory are eased, though we will reflect on two possibilities here: Indigenous entries; and the relationship between Turkish and Australian (trans)nationalism.

Indigenous Entries into Anzac Memory

As Beaumont (2015) recently remarked, for a long time Anzac memory was a 'party' to which Indigenous Australians were not invited. This was the case not only for memories of war but for World War I itself, with Aboriginal people ineligible to enlist from the outset of war until 1917, during which time they were prohibited due to their Aboriginal descent. Enlistment criteria were relaxed in March 1917 at which point 'half-castes' were permitted to enlist, 'provided that the examining medical authorities were satisfied that one of the parents [was] of European descent' (Pratt, 1990: 17, cited in Winegard, 2009: 196). While there is a pervasive literature detailing the equity that existed between 'Black-' and 'White-' Diggers ('Diggers' being the affectionate term for soldiers from Australia and New Zealand) during their time of enlistment, this did not extend into post-war life, which saw Indigenous soldiers (or 'Black Diggers') return to the full complement of pre-war acts of discrimination and disenfranchisements (Curthoys, 1998). Indeed, this lack of parity extended to early attempts to commemorate military service and the war dead, eventuating in a lack of memorials dedicated to Indigenous servicemen and women, a denial of the right for returned Indigenous servicemen and women to participate in Anzac Day marches, no access to veterans benefits and the refusal of their entry into Returned and Services Leagues of Australia (RSLs).

Since the 1990s, there have been concerted attempts to include Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander servicemen and women in Australia's military histories, and on these

occasions we might point to something of an unsettling or loosening of Anzac memory. Memorials dedicated to Indigenous Australians' military service have appeared across Australia, with one of the earliest dedications inscribed on a large rock in Burleigh Head National Park, Queensland, in 1991. The suite of memorials to which we refer also includes a plaque on public lands *just behind* the Australian War Memorial, erected by a private citizen in 1993 to commemorate the International Year of the World's Indigenous People in 1995. An informal ceremony commemorating Aboriginal servicemen has been held there, behind the Australian War Memorial, since 1998. The Australian War Memorial itself was moved to commemorate Indigenous service in 1995, and developed the travelling photographic exhibition, *Too Dark for the Light Horse*, which toured Australia in 1999 and 2000/1. Since then, Indigenous organisations have commenced numerous formal commemorations of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander military service that coincide with Anzac day marches, an example of which is that organised by the Coloured Digger Project in Redfern, commencing in 2007. An annual event held on Anzac Day and supported by the City of Sydney, the Redfern march and associated service seek to recognise all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander servicemen and servicewomen, but is spatially distinct from the white-focused Anzac marches (Riseman 2012). A particularly visible attempt at acknowledgement occurred at The Shrine of Remembrance, Melbourne's focal metropolitan war memorial, which produced an exhibition on Koori military service that toured regional Victoria in 2011/12 (Riseman 2012). Although very visible, this tour was time-limited and therefore ultimately ephemeral with regard to collective memory. This is in contrast to more recent attempts to relocate Indigenous service within traditional Anzac narratives via the completion of two memorials. These are the Torrens Parade Ground memorial in Adelaide, a project commenced in 2007 and completed in 2013 which is commonly referred to as Australia's first memorial to all

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander servicemen and servicewomen, and the 2015 installation of the sculpture *Yininmadyemi – Thou didst let fall*, in Hyde Park – home to the Anzac Memorial –, commissioned by the City of Sydney and created by Indigenous artist Tony Albert. The latter was supported by the New South Wales branch of the RSL and the NSW Centenary of Anzac Advisory Council. It is also possible to glimpse narratives seeking to broaden the Anzac legend in popular culture, such as in the play *Black Diggers*, which premiered at the Sydney Film Festival in 2014, and was produced by the Queensland Theatre Company and the Sydney Festival Production, written by Tom Wright and directed by Wesley Enoch.

This brief glimpse at the way Indigenous presence is grappled with in the parameters of Anzac memory points to a growing motivation to render it a little more elastic and a little less 'white', rather than *challenge* it in any profound way. With a few exceptions, these memorialisations are either temporary or located at the margins of heritage sites – either spatially or temporally. The limits of this elasticity become immediately and effortlessly apparent in the Australian War Memorial's refusal to erect a memorial to Indigenous Australians that fought in the imperial forces. This would be too permanent, too visible in the materialized landscape. Likewise, the limits to an obsession with militarising Australia's heritage – and remembering the nation as something *made* in battle – become apparent in the Memorial's failure to acknowledge and narrate the ways in which Indigenous Australians served their 'country' during the Frontier Wars, or the wars of colonial conquest. The Frontier Wars, carefully excised from the Memorial's accounts of Australian experiences of war, is a fascinating point: its inclusion, it seems, would rattle the Anzac legend upon which the Memorial is based in ways too profound to weather. Indeed, intimations of a national narrative that pre-exists Gallipoli, but crucially one that

was still made through war, bloodshed and battle, would shatter the fantasy of 'innocence' epitomized by the Anzac legend. We can consider this collective policing as a racialized re-territorialization of the Anzac memory-assemblage, in which everything from the bodies of the fallen Indigenous soldiers to the blocks of stone that commemorate those bodies' patriotic acts are included within, but are kept marginal enough, so that Anzac memory remains coded as a white, heroic innocence. To make these bodies and materials spatially or temporally central to the memory-assemblage might not only alter the popular understandings of Anzac heritage but also undercut the interventionist foreign policies that are underpinned by that muscular Anzac heritage.

Turkish and Australian (Trans)Nationalism

A more pointed indication of the changing relations between the national and transnational capacities of the Anzac legend – and one that involves the circulation of bodies and objects across international borders – might be found in remembrances of the Turkish 'foe' at Gallipoli and the subsequent emergence of a nationally celebrated relationship between Australia and Turkey since 1915. Simpson (2010) illustrated this process of transformation by probing at the possibilities for an articulation of the Gallipoli campaign that extends beyond pervasive ideas about nationhood. Simpson commences her piece by constructing a rough chronology of the changing face of 'the Turk' in popular culture, from 'ruthless foe', to 'noble enemy' to 'national friend' (p. 58), before considering the significance of the 'noble Turk' since the Howard era. Here we recount some of Simpson's key findings, emphasising the varying spaces and times in which various material representations of the Turks were able to circulate.

In World War I, accounts of Turkish soldiers were censored via the *War Precautions Act,* a physical intervention into the circulation of war narratives throughout Australia. The resulting newspapers were cleansed of elements that did not advance the patriotic narrative that would become known as the Anzac legend: 'Harvey Broadbent argues that this was the *tangible* moment at which the Anzac legend was born' (Simpson 2010, 59, emphasis added). In other words, the transnational ordering of objects and images was at work to screen out any sympathetic account of the Turks lest it undermine the collective understanding of the event. This was in parallel to the propaganda films being produced at the time, such as *The Hero of the Dardanelles* (1915), which likewise screened out the actual Turkish experience of war. Both the newspaper censorship and propaganda films circulated within Australian territory, with the intention of convincing white Australian male bodies to enlist and ship out to reinforce Gallipoli.

By World War II, Turks were being remembered as 'noble enemies', with the cruelty and war crimes previously attributed to the enemy at Gallipoli narratively displaced onto their German allies. Through this manoeuvre, the Turks themselves become – though hardly friends – a noble and chivalrous enemy. Once wartime censorship was over, Australian accounts of the 'formidable' Turk were allowed to circulate in films such as *Forty Thousand Horsemen* (1940). Bringing 'home' the martial effectiveness of the Turks was a way of bolstering the Anzac legend, given the outcome of the battle. However, this shift to a noble enemy was not just about opening up the circulation of diaries and other representations from Gallipoli to public view, but equally about restricting another transnational circulation: accounts of the Armenian genocide contemporary with (or perhaps even sparked by) the Gallipoli campaign. This cultural amnesia continues to this day.

Simpson further notes that by 2005 the shift from 'noble enemy' to 'noble Turk' was complete, with Turkish battlefield experiences juxtaposed with those of Australians (and other Empire forces) as equivalents in documentary films and other venues. Both countries are victims of war. This view has become mainstream, and is materialized in a range of times and spaces that – unlike the Aboriginal memorializations described above – are *central* to Australian heritage. The main form of this materialization is a quote by Kemal Atatürk, made in 1934 in the context of narrating his new state. Shorthanded as 'To the Mothers of the Fallen Soldiers', this ode was lifted from its original context in Turkey and circulates within Australia as a statement of peaceful friendship between Turkey and Australia, rooted in the mutual experience of Gallipoli and etched in the Atatürk Memorial in Canberra (Figure 1).

FIGURE 1

Figure 1: The Atatürk Memorial, Anzac Parade, across from the Australian War Memorial

The quote is recited in Anzac Day parades, to which Turkish veterans were officially invited to march by the Victoria RSL in 2006 (Webb 2006). It is not just Turkish bodies that have been incorporated into Australian collective memory, but Australian bodies that are increasingly circulating to Anzac Cove itself, generating new individual memories of Gallipoli that can be brought 'home' and circulated with friends and family or in more public venues.

The increasing incorporation of Turkish experiences (in contrast to propaganda images) into Australia's collective memory has been enabled by the wider circulation of Turkish bodies, materials and accounts of the war and their emplacement in spaces and times central to Australian heritage. However, the loosening of these restrictions has been paralleled by continued restriction of the circulation of bodies, objects and images related to the Armenian genocide. Therefore, we should understand the spaces and times of transnational collective memories (Australian, Turkish, Armenian) as constantly co-producing each other through their interaction: the transnational circulation of bodies, objects, and images leads to the interweaving of memories, thus affecting the political subjectivities of those identifying with those memories.

Beyond the Nation?

In terms of theoretical space, we trace a trajectory quite similar to that of Mike Savage (2011) and his attempt to bring together field theory with the work of Deleuze and Guattari, which we do here through the lens of assemblage. Above, we have considered the 'possibility spaces' opened up by both Indigenous entries into Anzac memory and Turkish-Australian (trans)nationalism; we'd like to close the paper with a few further speculations on the limits of the Anzac legend as a transnational 'memory-assemblage'. Thus far we have pointed to an exclusive and troubling Anzac legend that has nevertheless been a difficult one to resist. By making Anzacs extraordinary, the legend has frozen their memory and put it beyond interrogation, and in recent years we have seen, as Cochrane (2015: n.p.) points out, a 'declining tolerance of any critique of Australian military endeavour'. At the same time, we have seen a rising interest in 'German Anzacs', 'Irish Anzacs', 'Russian Anzacs', 'Chinese Anzacs' and so forth, and questions could be asked as to how this emergence sits against the transnational memory-assemblage as we have

collated it here. Our response would be to point to the more general mechanisms at work within the Anzac legend, which consistently downplay recognition of almost the entire international story of Australia's military history. Indeed, with regard to Gallipoli, as Bennett (2014: 646) points out, '…one could be forgiven for thinking that nobody else on the Allied side was present except perhaps for some hapless British generals'.

But these intimations of a German or Chinese Anzac draw us towards not only objects and sites that could be considered as beyond the borders of the Australian state (yet implicated in its collective memories), but bodies, too. Indeed, the intensity of concern over fallen Australian bodies buried in 'heathen, alien soil' became a live issue as soon as the Anzacs withdrew from Turkish territory (Ziino, 2006), hinting at the transnational materials upon which Anzac heritage is built. Similarly, the circulation of Australian (living) bodies that visit the dead at Ypres on the Western Front – itself an embodied performance of pilgrimage – began shortly after the war ended (Lloyd, 1998). For those who could not afford that trip, 'Will Longstaff's painting *Menin Gate at Midnight* […] enabled Australians to contemplate in expressive reproduction a monument, honouring thousands of their Missing men, which few could ever hope to see for themselves' (Inglis and Brazer, 2008: 260). These pilgrimages continue today (Scates, 2002).

To think this through with a more contemporary focus, we focus upon recent Anzac parades and the tensions surrounding the possibilities for opening up a transnationalising force when considered in relations to marching bodies. What has piqued our interest are the ways in which bodily experiences of Anzac memories are used to close down transnational memories. In 2014, for example, Indian veterans in South Australia agitated to participate in the annual Anzac Day parade; a request that was declined by the South

Australian Anzac Day Committee (Kemp, 2014). Indian ex-servicemen were instead offered the option of marching in the 'descendants' category rather than that of the veterans, whose eligibility is limited to those who have served in the Australian Defence Force. This is by no means an event isolated to South Australia. Descendants of WWI servicemen and women from other Commonwealth or Allied countries are regularly encouraged to take part in what have become national parades, but their 'bodies' are strictly located to those parts of the march dedicated to a particular descendent group, such as the 'WWI New Zealand Descendants' group or that of the 'WWI Turkish Descendants' – if at all. Here, Bongiorno's (2014: 93) reflection on the exclusionary nature of Anzac memory rings particularly true: 'If Gallipoli is where the nation was born, and if the Anzacs were responsible, then national inclusion implies a place in Australian military tradition. The easiest way for any ethnic group is to find your own in the First Australian Imperial Force (AIF), preferably at Gallipoli'.

While a range of bodies, objects and sites have been drawn into memories of Anzac – including those that are located beyond the borders of the state (such as Commonwealth cemeteries) – we can nonetheless point to a policing of marching bodies that contributes significantly to the material and embodied notion of collective memory with which we started this essay. Certainly there has been a pluralisation of Anzac memories – via Indigenous entries and an acknowledgment of 'Other' Anzacs – but it is quite another thing to render those bodies *visible* as part of the most potent performance of Anzac memory. The threat of this visibility is something that was acutely felt by a number of Australia's ethnic communities, as disclosed by the *A Century of Service* Community Research Reports (Colmar Brunton 2011). A sense of exclusion and lack of acknowledgement by Turkish community groups was reported with regards to Anzac marches and wider acts of

commemoration, as well as a reticence by Sudanese communities to participate in such events due to a fear of 'racism' and of 'being made to feel unwelcome' (Colmar Brunton 2011: 2). Similarly, Afghan communities noted a desire to participate but a simultaneous fear that such participation would be unwelcome; precisely because the inclusion of their bodies would implicate meanings, bodies and sites that are already linked with more recent wars.

These groups' anxiety over becoming visible within the Anzac context indicates the complex nature of collective memory. Indeed, these groups – as a result of very local experiences of discrimination (see Simpson 2010) – are effectively excluded from participation in the construction of new collective memories. The absence of these bodies forecloses possibilities for a different kind of Anzac memory to form. Moreover, their inclusion might – as we have seen with the Turks – only serve to reinforce the dominant narrative. Or, as with Indigenous Anzacs, their presence might threaten the narrative of innocence that makes the Anzac legend so effective. Yet it is only by experimenting in this way that a more just Anzac legend might be founded, and a more transnational infusion into the Australia's war memories might be realized.

References

Beaumont, Joan 2015, 'The Old, the New and the Borrowed: Indigenous War Commemoration', paper presented the *Brothers and Sisters at Arms: Historicizing Indigenous Military Service* conference, Australian Catholic University, 25-26 June.

Bennett, James 2014, '"Breaking out of the Nationalist/ic Paradigm": International Screen Texts on the 1915 Gallipoli Campaign', *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 640-53.

Bennett, Tony 2006, 'Exhibition, Difference and the Logic of Culture', in I. Karp, C.A. Kratz and L. Szwaja (eds) *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bongiorno, Frank 2014, 'Anzac and the Politics of Inclusion', in S. Sumartojo and B. Wellings (eds) *Nation, Memory and Great War Commemoration: Mobilizing the Past in Europe, Australia and New Zealand*, Oxford: Peter Lang.

Cochrane, Peter 2015, 'The Past is Not Sacred', *Griffith Review*, vol. 48, https://griffithreview.com/articles/past-sacred/.

Connerton, Paul 1989, *How Societies Remember.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Colman Brunton 2011, *Department of Veterans' Affairs "A Century of Service" Community Research Report: Phase 2.* Colman Brunton: Sydney.

Curthoys, Ann 1998, 'National Narratives, War Commemoration and Racial Exclusion in a Settler Society: The Australian Case', in R. Nile and M. Peterson (eds) *Becoming Australia: The Woodford Forum*, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Dittmer, Jason and Waterton, Emma *forthcoming*, 'Embodied Memory at the Australian War Memorial', in D. Drozdzewski, S. De Nardi and E. Waterton (eds), *Memory, Place and Identity: Commemoration and Remembrance of War and Conflict,* London: Routledge.

Donaldson, Carina and Lake, Marilyn 2010, 'Whatever Happened to the Anti-War Movement?', in M. Lake, H. Reynolds, with M. McKenna and J. Damousi (eds), *What's Wrong with Anzac? The Militarization of Australian History*, Sydney: New South/UNSW Press.

Hanquinet, Laurie, Savage, Mike and Callier, Louise 2012, 'Elaborating Bourdieu's Field Analysis in Urban Studies: Cultural Dynamics in Brussels', *Urban Geography*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 508-529.

Inglis, K.S. and Brazier, Jan 2008, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Kemp, Miles 2014 'South Australia's Indian Community Want to March on Anzac Day to Honour 15,000 of Their Countrymen Who Served Alongside Diggers at Gallipoli', *The Advertiser*, 27 August, http://www.adelaidenow.com.au/news/south-australia/south-australias-indian-community-want-to-march-on-anzac-day-to-honour-15000-of-their-countrymen-who-served-alongside-diggers-at-gallipoli/story-fni6uo1m-1227037987153,

Khan, Rimi, Wyatt, Danielle, Yue, Audrey and Papastergiadis, Nikos 2013, '*Creative Australia* and the Dispersal of Multiculturalism', *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 25–34.

Lloyd, David W. 1998, *Battlefield Tourism: Pilgrimage and the Commemoration of the Great War in Britain, Australia, and Canada, 1919—1939.* London: Bloomsbury.

Macdonald, Sharon 2013, *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. Abingdon: Routledge.

McDonald, Matt 2010, '"Lest We Forget": The Politics of Memory and Australian Military Intervention', *International Political Sociology*, vol. 4, pp. 287–302.

Nora, Pierre 1989, Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Memoire*, *Representations*, vol. 26, pp. 7–24.

Olick, Jeffrey K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, Vered and Levy, Daniel (eds) 2011, *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Riseman, Noah 2012, 'Rectifying "the Great Australian Silence"? Creative Representations of Australian Indigenous Second World War Service', *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, no. 1, pp. 35–48.

Savage, Mike 2011, 'The Lost Urban Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu', in G. Bridge and S. Watson (eds) *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Scates, Bruce 2002, 'In Gallipoli's Shadow: Pilgrimage, Memory, Mourning and the Great War. *Australian Historical Studies* vol. 33, no. 119, pp. 1-21.

Simpson, Catherine 2010, 'From Ruthless Foe to National Friend: Turkey, Gallipoli and Australian Nationalism', *Media International Australia*, no. 137, pp. 58-66.

Sumartojo, Shanti 2015, 'On Atmosphere and Darkness at Australia's Anzac Day Dawn Service', *Visual Communication*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 267-288.

Tranter, Bruce and Donoghue, Jed 2015, 'National Identity and Important Australians', *Journal of Sociology*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 236–251.

Waterton, Emma 2011, 'In the Spirit of Self-Mockery? Labour Heritage and Identity in the Potteries', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 344–363.

Webb, Carolyn 2006, 'Anzac March Open to "Johnny Turk" – But That's It', *The Age*, April 12, http://www.theage.com.au/news/national/anzac-march-open-to-johnny-turk/2006/04/11/1144521340623.html.

Wellings, Ben 2014, 'Lest You Forget: Memory and Australian Nationalism in a Global Era', in S. Sumartojo and B. Wellings (eds) *Nation, Memory and Great War Commemoration: Mobilizing the Past in Europe, Australia and New Zealand*, Oxford: Peter Lang.

Welzer, Harald 2010, 'Re-narrations: How Pasts Change in Conversational Remembering', *Memory Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 5–17.

Wertsch, James 2002, *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winegard, Timothy, C. 2009, 'A Case Study of Indigenous Brothers in Arms during the First World War', *Australian Army Journal*, vol. VI, no. 1, pp. 191–206.

Ziino, Bart 2006, ‘Who owns Gallipoli? Australia’s Gallipoli anxieties, 1915-2005’, *Journal of Australian Studies*, vol. 30, no. 88, pp.1-12.