Introduction

Melbourne’s 1888 Centennial International Exhibition, the bold metropolis’s most momentous social event yet, inspired thousands of columns of press description. *The Australasian Sketcher*, full of Exhibition news, made a momentary circumspect departure:

One cannot but be conscious of an atmosphere of age... imparted by the... presence of the many old people who wander about in quiet wonder and delight... full of memories, and free of the slightest jealousy that this great celebration is not theirs... And some of the younger folks look at them, and think, let us hope, with a dutiful tenderness, that there is something of the *morituri te salutant* about the greeting.¹

The 1888 Centennial Exhibition was a ‘a red letter day in Victorian history’,² presenting a material and symbolic metropolitan culmination of the first half-century of permanent white settlement from 1834 in Victoria and 1835 in Port Phillip (later Melbourne). *The Sketcher* expressed on a general basis the hope the surviving members of Melbourne’s first generation of civic leaders and their successors held for the colony’s broader constituency: a respect for the past which would legitimise the present and order the future.³

Over the previous five tumultuous decades, men concerned with the colony’s civic development had established a culturally-specific order with considerable energy and faith. These men were the city’s first civic ‘boosters’, a contemporaneous although imperfect term. The boosters were a changing and ever-expanding web of men within and closely associated with government and governance—consisting in the first instance of local and colonial politicians, a few government officers, professionals such as doctors, lawyers, scientists, journalists, statisticians and librarians, vice-regal officials,

---

² *The Age*, 1 August 1888, p.9.
³ David Lowenthal has extensively documented the uses of the past along such lines in Europe and America in *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995, see especially pp.35-104; these ideas also inform the publications of Graeme Davison and Tom Griffiths, cited elsewhere in the thesis.
businessmen and cultural and historical connoisseurs—who were concerned with and influenced the development of the colony’s civic life and image, practically and rhetorically. They were an exclusive but not impenetrable group, identifiable in the colony’s early decades especially in membership of the Philosophical Institute of Victoria,⁴ and to a lesser extent, the Melbourne Club,⁵ amongst other clubs. The use of the term ‘boosters’ in this thesis seemed more appropriate than those used by other historians to describe the metropolitan men who initiated and developed the colony’s civic capacity, such as Paul Fox’s ‘men of Melbourne’,⁶ which for the purposes of this thesis is not prescriptive enough, or David Dunstan’s ‘plutocrats’,⁷ Richard White’s ‘colonial bourgeoisie’⁸ or the term ‘statesmen’, which are too prescribed. In The Rise and Fall of Marvellous Melbourne Graeme Davison uses the term ‘boosters’ to mean men who developed inflated, singular and benign civic images for the city.⁹ The use of boosters in this thesis takes it to mean men who both developed images of the city and

---

⁴ In 1854, the Philosophical Society of Victoria, the Philosophical Institute of Victoria and the Institute for the Advancement of Science merged to become the Philosophical Institute of Victoria. It, in turn, became the Royal Society in 1860. The inaugural membership of the Philosophical Institute included Melbourne’s elite scientists and cultural connoisseurs, including Redmond Barry, who was its Vice-President during the 1850s and 1860s (Smith, F.B., ‘Sir Redmond Barry’ in Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society: Australian Bicentenary Number, Vol. XCIII, No.252, January-December 1988. p.16); Dr Ferdinand von Mueller, who was a founding member and Chairman in 1859 (Pike, Douglass (gen. ed.), Australian Dictionary of Biography, Vol.5, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1974, pp.307-08); Frederick McCoy, who was on the Royal Society Council and held occasional executive positions throughout the 1860s (Pike, Douglass (gen. ed.), Australian Dictionary of Biography, Vol.5, p.135); and William Stawell, who was Chairman in 1858 (Nairn, Bede (gen. ed.), Australian Dictionary of Biography, Vol.6, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1976, p.177.) Institute members hatched many of Melbourne’s major nineteenth-century cultural initiatives. See also Hooper-Greenhill, Eileen, Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge, Routledge, London, 1992, pp.145-63. She explores the crucial role the English Royal Society played in moving knowledge and cultural practices from the private to the public sphere.

⁵ de Serville, Paul, Port Phillip Gentlemen and Good Society in Melbourne Before the Gold Rushes, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1980, pp.63,209. He writes that the Melbourne Club was Port Phillip’s ‘most important social institution...[and] the arbiter in the world of male society’. In the first decades of its existence, Redmond Barry and William Stawell were office-bearers.


developed Melbourne’s civic life in substantial pragmatic ways. The use of any single
term to describe this group risks betraying the complexity, particularity, internal
differences and temporal change within it, but has been deployed in this thesis for
purposes of brevity, clarity and consistency. Throughout the thesis the changing
‘membership’ of the booster group is defined through description of positions and
individuals, which in turn continues to underline the problematic notion of its clear-cut
exclusivity and singularity.

In developing the cultural and civic capacities and images of Melbourne and the wider
colony, the boosters drew upon the precedents of enlightened liberalism in the ‘old
world’—reassuring themselves and their imperial masters of their loyalties—but also
negotiated their independent marks upon this ‘new’ society. Their imposition of a new
order was magnified in complexity by Australia’s inhabitation by Aboriginal people.
Aborigines had been in Australia for tens of thousands of years, but colonists needed to
silence Aboriginal ancientness in order to justify land acquisition through warfare and
other attempts at racial containment. Especially from the 1860s, they adopted the
pseudo-scientific frameworks of ethnography and anthropology to view Aborigines as
an undifferentiated and temporally-static anachronism, a ‘pre-historic race’. In this

---

10 For a discussion of colonial Australia and notions of newness and age and their relationships
with race and imperialism see White, Richard, *Inventing Australia*, chapter four.
11 Tom Griffiths has made an elaborate study of the approaches and practices of colonial
bureaucrats, scientists, educationalists and other public men in simultaneously ‘collecting’ a
race that was seen in scientific terms as a human anachronism (indeed, this warranted their
‘collection’) and establishing their own indigeneity and longevity through the use of historical
metaphors such as ‘natives’ and ‘pioneers’, in *Hunters and Collectors: The Antiquarian
Imagination in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1996, passim; see also
Macintyre, Stuart, ‘The Writing of Australian History’ in D.H. Borcherdt (ed.), *Australians: A
Guide to Sources*, Fairfax, Syme and Weldon Associates, Broadway, 1987, p.5; Garton,
University Press, Melbourne, 1989, pp.190-1; Healy, Chris, ‘Histories and Collecting:
Museums, Objects and Memories’ in Darian-Smith, Kate and Paula Hamilton (eds.), *Memory
Fox, Paul, ‘Memory, the Museum and the Post-Colonial World’ in *Meanjin*, Number 2, 1992,
pp.310-11; White, Richard, *Imagining Australia*, chapter two; Bennett, Tony, *The Birth of the
Foucault, Michel, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, Vintage
way, Aborigines could be distinguished from the evolution of ‘man’ in history, the discipline of which was also bolstered by its claim to scientific objectivity.  

Complementing the ethnological ‘writing-out’ of Aborigines from history, colonists also began to write local, patriarchal histories,¹³ establishing post-enlightenment virtues of white indiginity and longevity.¹⁴ Their status as ‘original eye-witnesses’ of colonial progress¹⁵ brought them legitimacy and authenticity, but by the 1880s they were ageing and dying. Simultaneously, Victoria experienced a major influx of immigrants, producing a population whose age structure was skewed towards youth.¹⁶ Literal patrimonial or localised arrangements declined, as colonial government became more complex,¹⁷ and significant cracks began to appear in Melbourne’s economic and social superstructures.¹⁸ The early colonists and their boosting inheritors feared challenge and disrespect from the new, mass immigrant generation,¹⁹ and their demand for hereditary recognition of their work took on a new urgency and complexity.

¹⁵ This was the original and strictly defined meaning of the term ‘pioneers’ in Australia. Hirst, John, ‘The Pioneer Legend’ in *Historical Studies*, Vol. 18, No.71, October 1978, p.318. Tom Griffiths pays particular attention to the strength of legitimation that Australian colonials placed on living memory of ‘the beginnings’, as part of establishing their claim to Australian ‘nativity’, in * Hunters and Collectors*, esp. pp.197-200. See also Davison, Graeme, ‘The Parochial Past’, pp.7-9.
Melbourne’s boosters responded by developing ‘public histories’. The histories were public in two ways: they were about and on behalf of broader constituencies or publics, and they were presented in public forums, of which the 1888 Centennial Exhibition was a major one. Older men who had helped build the colony, such as Frederick McCoy, Ferdinand von Mueller and Hugh Childers joined with their younger boosting descendants to direct the 1888 Exhibition. In heralding Melbourne’s arrival in ‘evolutionary time’ amongst the city’s European counterparts, they were seeking endorsement from the present generation for the colonial order they had established.

In the 1880s, public history-making became the colony’s ideological backbone: it was the essential rhetoric of the colony’s progress. All public history-makers were ‘colonial boosters’, (and conversely, a large proportion of the colony’s boosters were history-makers, either in sustained or impromptu, temporary capacities). Many public history-makers were employed professionally in various aspects of the colony’s administration, including journalism, librarianship, science, education, statistics, government bureaucracy and large-scale commercial business, and history was an

---

20 As opposed to more literal genealogical or localised pastoral narratives. See Davison, Graeme, ‘The Parochial Past’, pp.333ff.


22 Bennett, Tony, Birth of the Museum, pp.2-6,40-42,46. This is a grammatical adaptation of Bennett’s concept of ‘evolutionary time’.

23 See, for example, Executive Commissioners of the Centennial International Exhibition, Official Record, p.60. See also Davison, Graeme, Marvellous Melbourne, esp. pp.11,229-30

24 Throughout the thesis I have used the term ‘history-makers’ to denote that the act of reconstructing aspects of the past is an action in and metonym for the present. See Dening, Greg, Performances, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1996, pp.XIV,37. My use of the term is not, however, meant to imply that people pulled history from nowhere, and all the past is relative. It is, however, meant to imply that history is used in the present, and that reconstructing history is an act of selecting both what to remember and what to silence from the past. See Thomas, Julian, ‘Heroic History and Public Spectacle: Sydney 1938’, Ph.D., ANU, October 1998, pp.12-3. He prefers to use the idea of history’s ‘disposability’ in the present rather than history being ‘made’, in order to remove himself from the implication of history’s relativism.

25 See also Davison, Graeme, Marvellous Melbourne, pp.239-241.

26 Hutchinson, Mark, ‘A Note on Nineteenth Century Historians and Their Histories: 1819-1896’ in Australian Cultural History, No.8, 1989, p.117.
amateur, extracurricular part of their training. In turn, they boosted the colony by imparting history’s lessons to constituents. They selected particular historical narratives as exemplary models to inspire and instruct individuals and especially young people, in citizenship. Those histories acted as the statement of the public’s civic lineage, and they worked to differentiate the worth and desirable behaviour of individuals as citizens according to their age, race, class and gender.

This thesis takes the 1880s as its starting point for examining public history-making in central Melbourne over the following fifty years. It investigates three major public forms of history, consisting of four main case studies, that were articulated in Melbourne’s prime civic space between 1887 and 1934. Chapter One examines the presence and use of history and time in the 1888 Melbourne Centennial International Exhibition. International exhibitions were a predominant nineteenth-century form of displaying history within a rigorously defined monumental space, through extensive and microscopic use of portable objects. Chapter Two investigates the development and launch of two monuments: a statue of Sir Redmond Barry, unveiled in Swanston Street, Melbourne in 1887 and the Eight Hours’ Day monument, unveiled near Parliament House in 1903. The Chapter is a study in the relatively common late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century use of open-air monumental space to articulate history, through

27 Macintyre, Stuart, ‘Writing Australian History’, p.14. Most nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century historians were ‘amateurs’ insofar as they were not trained in historical method: the first handful of professional historians in Australia began to be employed in the universities in the 1900s and 1910s. From the turn of the century, the other growing area for ‘professional history-makers’ was as curriculum developers in the Education Department. See footnotes 84, 184 and 568.


29 From colonisation, civic boosters and history-makers asserted history in public in many forms. A more obvious first generation assertion of history was naming things: streets, towns, natural features and buildings, for example, drawing from the past for inspiration. Other early forms of historical assertion included the nomination and annual celebration of particular days in the name of historical events, including Discovery Day, Foundation Day and Wattle Day, and various art forms, including painting and portraiture, which drew upon particular historical events and persons. These forms and others are documented in the landmark publication, Inglis, K.S., The Australian Colonists: An Exploration of Social History 1788-1870, Melbourne
the use of singular, symbolic objects. Chapter Three turns to an overview of Victoria’s 1934-35 Centenary Celebrations, including the dedication of the Shrine of Remembrance, and then investigates the establishment of Cooks’ Cottage, opened in the Fitzroy Gardens in 1934, as a hybrid example in the transition to a modern language of public history. The Cottage resurrected a monumental historical theme, but its form as an historic house only began to emerge significantly in Australia after World War Two.

The thesis seeks to identify the public historical sphere between the 1880s and the 1930s, pinpointing the relationship between public history’s language of forms and themes. It asks who made these histories and why, and to what extent the history-making endeavours contributed, both as discrete entities and as a spatial and temporal conglomeration, to developments and shifts in public historical memory. It proposes that between 1887 and 1934, the language of themes and forms of history in the public sphere transformed from settler to modern, with World War One having a special impact on this change.

Settler narratives corresponded most closely to ‘monumental’ history-making. They were made by a group of metropolitan boosters, and often told of monumental and unquestioningly benign and romantic acts of creation by single, visionary actors. Modern narratives, on the other hand, corresponded more closely to ‘critical’ and ‘antiquarian’ history-making, and reflected a more critical, fragmented relationship between civic boosters and the public. Modern histories tended to be made by more diverse and localised groups, and started to tell of mass contribution and ugly, contemporary sacrifice in the name of civic progress.

University Press, Carlton, 1993, passim. Other forms which began to gain precedence in the twentieth century were enabled by newer technologies, including film and photography. I have used the current rather than the original form of punctuation for the Cottage. See page 125 and footnote 656. Davison, Graeme, ‘The Use and Abuse of Australian History’ in Janson, Susan and Stuart Macintyre (eds.), Making the Bicentenary. A special issue of *Australian Historical Studies*, Vol.23, No.91, October 1988, p.56. As above.
Forming a Public Historical Sphere

As a preamble, we will turn back briefly to look at first generation boosters’ efforts to produce a civic sphere, which by the 1880s, history-makers could deploy to teach history in a language that the public could understand. In 1851, the simultaneous separation of Victoria from NSW and the discovery of gold encouraged Melbourne’s first boosters to establish institutions to develop and govern the populace. Throughout the decade, they established a contained ‘monumental’ arena for negotiating the city’s civic life. Several major civic buildings, including the Town Hall (1850), the Post Office (1852), the Melbourne Hospital (1854), the Exhibition Building (1854), Parliament House (1855), Customs House (1856), Treasury (1858), the Gaol (1859), the Mint (1869) and the Courts of Law (1874) were built within and around the perimeters of the city’s grid. Workers, or at least those who were male, skilled and unionised, also asserted themselves as integral to the colony’s civic life, and in 1854 built the first Trades Hall on land at the northern edge of the grid.

Several of Melbourne’s educated boosters, especially those from the ‘old’ professions of medicine and law and the newer scientific professions, who were close associates of the politicians and bureaucrats who enacted the initiatives outlined above, established associated cultural and scientific institutions and clubs to assist in the civic development of the populace. Governor Charles La Trobe founded the Melbourne Botanic Gardens in 1847, and in 1857, appointed Ferdinand von Mueller as inaugural colonial botanist. The National Museum [of Natural History] was established in 1853, and Frederick McCoy, its inaugural Honorary Director, moved the Collection from the Assay Office to the University of Melbourne in 1856, after his appointment as the University’s first

---

33 This was the first exhibition building, erected in Williams Street. Several grander exhibition buildings were subsequently erected, the last of which is discussed further in Chapter One.
Professor of Natural History. In 1854 Redmond Barry, a ‘Port Phillip gentleman’ who played a major role in the cultural development of colonial Melbourne, and Hugh Childers saw the foundations laid for the University of Melbourne, and Barry became the first Chancellor of the University. In the same year Barry worked to establish the Public Library, and was appointed President of its Trustees, which, under his direction, also established a colonial Art Gallery in 1861 and an Industrial and Technological Museum in 1869. The University of Melbourne and the Public Library (and later, Museum) were built in stages from 1856.

This impressive range of civic buildings was the first generation of colonial monuments. They highlight the symbiosis between civic intent and the visual and built environment in nineteenth-century Melbourne. Redmond Barry was an early advocate for the role of the ‘polite sciences’—art, architecture and monuments—as ‘instruments of civilization...[and] handmaidens of refinement’. He argued that both refined people and those of ‘lowly birth’ such as the ‘humble artificer’, would gain from admiring the ‘Ideal Beauty’ embodied in the buildings, sculptures and paintings that reflected early secular lineage. Collectively, the buildings and spaces outlined a ‘monumental’ arena, their structures and materiality pointed to a preferred public aesthetic of grandiosity and wealth, and the historical allusions of their architecture were

---

36 Public Library, Museums, and National Gallery, Guide to the Collections, Trustees of the Public Library, Museums, and National Gallery, Melbourne, 1934, p.3.
37 The Natural History Collection was moved back to the Library, Art Gallery and Museum building in 1899, immediately after McCoy’s death, but the University maintained its involvement through the directorship of Baldwin Spencer, McCoy’s immediate successor.
38 de Serville, Paul, Port Phillip Gentlemen, p.173.
40 Smith, F.B., ‘Sir Redmond Barry’, p.16.
42 Public Library, Museums, and National Gallery, Guide to the Collections, p.3.
43 Davison, Graeme, ‘Use and Abuse’, p.65.
45 Barry, Redmond, An Introductory Lecture on Architecture, Sculpture and Paintings delivered at the Melbourne Mechanics’ Institute, Gazette Office, Melbourne, 1847, p.5. Barry also addressed similar themes in his address to the builders of the Great Hall at the State Library of Victoria in 1866.
46 As above, p.15.
47 As above, p.11.
visual communications of the preferred civic lineage. By the 1880s, when Melbourne's major colonial civic buildings were well-established, they were often pointed to, along with the churches, as the most overt and immediate evidence of civilised progress. In the words of the Centennial Cantata, the ceremonial centrepiece of the 1888 Centennial Exhibition:

Where the spotted snake crawled by the stream,
See the spires of a great city gleam.\(^4\)

The buildings were an abstraction of the important nineteenth-century pedagogical tenet of 'learning by looking' or 'object lessons'. At a more literal level, 'learning by looking' arose out of methods of industrial training for largely illiterate communities; it underlay the formation of the British mechanics' institutes.\(^5\) The practical value of object lessons especially informed the development of the collecting and exhibiting institutions, such as the museums and galleries. As Frederick McCoy articulated soon after the creation of the National Museum, 'eye knowledge' was for 'a class of persons who have neither time nor the opportunity for lengthened study of books'.\(^6\) Object lessons also best accommodated a mid-nineteenth-century population where approximately one in five adult males was illiterate.\(^7\)

The spatial, visual and materialist symbolism of the civic sphere was central to the establishment of a disciplined population, and is a key to understanding nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century public discourse, a point largely ignored by major cultural histories.\(^8\) Andrew Brown-May's recent study on Melbourne's public life, however, recalls the use of the colonial city's central civic space as an emotional, theatrical and rhetorical forum for delineating socio-political power, order and


\(^{49}\) Davison, Graeme, 'Exhibitions' in *Australian Cultural History*, No. 2, 1982-3, p.6.


\(^{51}\) Government of Victoria, *Census*, 1854, (Education Section). By 1901, illiteracy rates were negligible. Government of Victoria, *Census*, 1901. See Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities*, p.80. He writes, 'The new middle-class intelligentsia of nationalism had to invite the masses into history, and the invitation-card had to be written in a language they understood'.
processes, according to 'particular conceptions of reason, race, acceptability, gender, convenience, class, propriety, efficiency, indeed, of history itself'. His study offers clues to some of the theatre of colonial public discourse, and provides an important context in which this thesis investigates the establishment of permanent object lessons in history in the central civic sphere.

By the 1880s, Melbourne’s boosters—including the surviving members of the first generation and also incorporating a wide number of government bureaucrats, businessmen, and contemporary colonial and local politicians—needed to communicate histories of the public’s exemplary historical lineage to the public. While fiction and non-fiction writing, including newspapers, books and pamphlets became and remained a predominant colonial mode of public communication about history, it remained limited to encounters with a voluntary, imagined community; writers were not guaranteed a broad audience. Already professionally practicing in the public sphere, by the 1880s Melbourne’s boosters found a ready-made rhetorical space to establish a second generation of historical monuments for Melburnians to literally encounter. The central civic sphere had the most potential to reach the greatest numbers of people; the unveilings of monuments, for example, were mass public spectacles, and members of the public would continue to encounter them by chance over the mid- to long-term. Further, and almost uniquely, the central civic sphere lent itself to permanent fixtures, and thus was a crucial forum for the inculcation of history in social memory through repeated encounters. The boosters’ use of public space had the added advantage of

52 See, for example, Australian Cultural History edited by S.L. Goldberg and F.B. Smith, Australia: A Cultural History by John Rickard, and Australian Popular Culture edited by Peter Spearritt and David Walker.


54 Macintyre, Stuart, 'Writing Australian History', p.4.

55 Anderson, Benedict, Imagined Communities, esp. chapter three, which discusses the invention of print-capitalism as enabling the first imagined communities.

56 Macintyre, Stuart, A History for a Nation: Ernest Scott and the Making of Australian History, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1994, see especially chapter nine. Ernest Scott epitomised this dual-fold practice: after his shift from journalist to Professor of History at the
confirming *ipso facto* their right to order the civic realm. They began to map central Melbourne with historical seals, a practice they continued well into the twentieth century.  

**Contained Historical Spaces**

Chapter One studies object lessons in history within enclosed exhibiting arenas. This section introduces a theoretical framework for and outlines the contents of Chapter One. International exhibitions or ‘world’s fairs’, originating in Europe and America in the middle of the nineteenth century, became the cornerstone of western peacetime international relations through to the 1930s. The exhibitions were massive promotions for the respective trading and military positions of empires and their outposts. For Australian colonies, hosting exhibitions announced their arrival ‘among the society of nations, gave a brief epitome of their trade and prospects, and opened the door to closer international relations’.  

International exhibitions also worked to establish disciplinary frameworks for the local population through object lessons. Tony Bennett has characterised them, along with the major permanent collecting and exhibiting institutions of the nineteenth century, as an ‘exhibitionary complex’. International exhibitions were held in purpose-built, cathedral-like buildings, invoking principles of omniscient spectacle and surveillance for the purposes of governance and self-governance. Through material display, they symbolically established an universal hierarchy, with western imperial-colonial space,  

---

University of Melbourne in 1913 and as he continued to add considerably to his publication record, he remained very active in making history in the public sphere.

57 It could thus be argued that history-making in Australia was ‘born’ public, and that the term ‘public history’ would have been tautologous in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. See Davison, Graeme, ‘Paradigms of Public History’ in Rickard, John and Peter Spearritt (eds.), Packaging the Past: Public Histories, special edition of *Australian Historical Studies*, Vol.24, No.96, April 1991, p.4; Thomas, Julian, ‘Heroic History’, p.24.

58 As they were more popularly known.


60 Bennett, Tony, *Birth of the Museum*, esp. chapters one and two; see also Hooper-Greenhill, Eileen, *Museums and the Shaping Of Knowledge*, especially chapter seven.

time and peoples at the top.\textsuperscript{62} Melbourne’s nineteenth-century international and colonial exhibitions reinforce Bennett’s contention about their universality quite literally: there was a labyrinthine and ongoing web of connections between institutions, people and geography involved in their organisation and exhibits. Exhibition organisers, including many of Melbourne’s founding boosters, such as Redmond Barry, Ferdinand von Mueller and Frederick McCoy, simultaneously held executive positions across the collecting and exhibiting institutions, many for significant parts of the latter half of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{63} Various museum and library collections either formed major displays in international exhibitions,\textsuperscript{64} or conversely, material gathered as part of international exhibitions became the foundation collections of the newly-formed major museums and art galleries.\textsuperscript{65} Further, each institution extended its arm over the region.\textsuperscript{66} Bennett argues that the exhibition complex is designed to create self-governing citizens


\textsuperscript{64} See, for example, Executive Commissioners of the Centennial International Exhibition, \textit{Official Record}, pp.596-9; for other links see also Griffiths, Tom, \textit{Hunters and Collectors}, pp.18,49-50.

\textsuperscript{65} See, for example, Trustees of the Public Library, Museums, and Art Gallery, \textit{Annual Report}, 1888, pp.3,5,32-4; Trumble, Angus, entry on Exhibitions in Davison, Graeme, John Hirst and Stuart Macintyre (eds.), \textit{The Oxford Companion to Australian History}, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1998, p.231.

\textsuperscript{66} The museum and library had multiple local outposts across Victoria. For the library, see, for example, McCallum, Colin A., \textit{The Public Library of Victoria 1856-1956}, p.23. For the museum, Bennett, Tony, ‘Beyond the Museum?’, talk presented at ‘Re-inventing the Object?’ Conference, Museum Studies Unit, University of Sydney, 7 February 1997. International exhibitions also incorporated exhibits from local shows. See, for example, VPRS 3992/P, Unit 330, Chief Secretary’s Office, Inwards Correspondence, Executive Commissioners of the 1888 Melbourne Centennial International Exhibition, \textit{Fourth Report}, circa November 1887.
who aspire to bourgeois standards of behaviour, endeavour and taste: an ambition that is further examined in Chapter One.\textsuperscript{67}

However, Bennett and others have distinguished the public museum in particular as the most explicit break, apparently at least, from pre-modern government. Several recent studies show how nineteenth-century Australian museums established standards of normality by constructing pseudo-scientific frameworks in which to classify others, including Aborigines and the natural world.\textsuperscript{68} This was part of the exhibitors' process of possession and subordination of threats. Bennett has also productively looked at how exhibitors used technology as an inter-related rhetoric in the equation—at how the latest technology and its manufactured outputs established the 'new' and the material as normal desires.\textsuperscript{69} Conversely, Chris Healy has demonstrated that major colonial museums contained little historical lineage of the 'same',\textsuperscript{70} although arguably, the Royal Society,\textsuperscript{71} major libraries, art galleries and later, historical societies were performing more important roles here.\textsuperscript{72} These complementary studies provide important contexts for this thesis, which searches for 'histories of the same'.

\textsuperscript{67} See also Hooper-Greenhill, Eileen, \textit{Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge}, passim
\textsuperscript{69} Bennett, Tony, \textit{Birth of the Museum}, pp.77-82.
\textsuperscript{70} Healy, Chris, 'Histories and Collecting', pp.40-42.
\textsuperscript{71} From its inception, the Royal Society developed a museum. Royal Society of Victoria, \textit{Transactions}, Vol.5, 1860, Mason & Firth, Melbourne, 1861, p.12.
\textsuperscript{72} For the library, see, for example, McCallum, Colin A., \textit{The Public Library of Victoria}, pp.12,19-22. For the library and art gallery, see, for example, Galbally, Ann and Alison Inglis with Christine Downer and Terence Lane, \textit{The First Collections: The Public Library and National Gallery of Victoria in the 1850s and 1860}, The University of Melbourne Museum of Art, Melbourne, 1992, pp.60,70,75,77-8,83; Trustees of the Public Library, Museums, and Art Gallery, \textit{Annual Report}, 1888, pp.10,36-7 (and other \textit{Annual Reports}, 1888-1900); LaTouche Armstrong, Edmund and Robert Douglass Boys, \textit{The Book of the Public Library, Museums and National Gallery of Victoria, 1906-1931}, Trustees of the Public Library, Museums and National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, 1932, pp.6,9,20,23,26-7,36,38,43. The Public Library was collecting explorers' journals and statesmen's documents, as well as sketches and photographs of early Melbourne and other historical events such as the opening of Victoria's first parliament, and portraits and busts of statesmen. When the Art Gallery gradually began to collect contemporary Australian artwork around the turn of the century, its selection included
The ambition of international exhibitions was broader than museums, with regard to displaying ‘histories of the same’. Colonies and nations positioned themselves in evolutionary time in order to promote themselves contemporaneously. Along with displaying the other and the new, they also showed their own exemplary lineages. Perhaps this was because there was an international audience and a relatively diverse and remarkably large local audience (especially when compared to museums), and exhibition commissioners felt the need to define their temporal lineage explicitly rather than implicitly. Perhaps, also, international exhibitions allowed a wider and potentially more creative use of display frameworks that especially lent themselves to stories of historical lineage.

Between August 1888 and March 1889, Melbourne held its second international exhibition in the Royal Exhibition Building in Carlton, on the northern perimeter of the grid. It was prompted by the centenary founding of Australia’s first colony, New South Wales, in 1788. One element of Chapter One focuses on how Victoria and NSW respectively used history to manage and develop the sensitive relationship between the two colonies, including suppressing parts of their histories. It also pinpoints inter-

paintings by Emmanuel Phillips Fox and John Longstaff of explorers’ landings and portraits of statesmen, Australian impressionists works by Arthur Streeton and Frederick McCubbin on pioneers and frontier settlement, and later, a painting of the Gallipoli landing. The Gallery also acquired busts and medallions of statesmen. The fact that the Public Library played such an important role here reinforces Chris Healy’s point that ‘histories of the same’ were imagined primarily in the thematic terms of explorers and statesmen, and mostly in the form of documents, but a study of the Library’s and Art Gallery’s collections reveals that librarians, curators and public benefactors were also significantly imagining ‘histories of the same’ in wider thematic terms including pioneers and frontier settlement, and in forms such as paintings, portraits, sketches, photographs, busts and medallions.

73 Notwithstanding their claims to be open to all members of the public, the major Museums had predominantly male, adult audiences throughout the nineteenth century. See Trustees of the Public Library, Museums, and Art Gallery, Annual Reports, 1888-1900. These reports contain comments about the Museums’ visitors which suggest that they consisted largely of natural science and technology students, who would be entirely male. School children did not begin to visit museums in large numbers until well after the turn of the century. International Exhibitions, on the other hand, made special efforts to encourage school children to visit, although they were not entirely successful. See Executive Commissioners of the Centennial International Exhibition, Official Record, p.300. Two million people visited the 1888 Melbourne Centennial International Exhibition, making it the most popular of all Australian International Exhibitions. Trumble, Angus, entry on Exhibitions in Davison, Graeme, John Hirst and Stuart Macintyre (eds.), Companion to Australian History, p.231.
colonial historical moments that might be considered embryonic symbolic gestures towards the possibility of constructing a federated nation and national history.

Chapter One then turns to some of the other dominant historical themes on exhibit. It uses as a frame of analysis Davison’s claim that monumental history was the main history-making genre in which Australian histories were established from the middle of the nineteenth century to WWI. Monumental history—‘the natural mode of consciousness in new lands’—is traditionally linked to patriotic fervour and the establishment and reinforcement of collective nationhood, serving calls to action and struggle. The genre tended to attach specific personalities to the abstract lineage of the nation-state as the strategy most likely to inspire. Epic heroes were ‘total individuals who magnificently concentrate in themselves what is otherwise dispersed in the national character’.

The pre-eminent thematic narrative in the Exhibition was British explorers, marking the Exhibition’s contribution to the cementing of imperial explorer narratives as a major theme in much officially-made or endorsed Australian history by the 1880s. Ken Inglis argues that war is the essential nation-making epic, and that in the absence of an acceptable (celebratory) warfare frame in Australia, explorers filled the gap, insofar as they were at war with nature and indigenous populations. War, in particular, went hand-in-hand with the notion of physical sacrifice ‘for a greater good’—indeed, it defined the possibility of nation-making as an exclusively male endeavour, so too,

---

74 Davison, Graeme, ‘Use and Abuse’, p.62.
75 As above, p.56. Davison draws upon Nietzsche’s three over-lapping genres of monumental, antiquarian and critical history-making.
77 Georg Hegel quoted in Cochrane, Peter, Simpson and his Donkey, p.3.
80 Such a construction of the idea of sacrifice made any direct nation-building endeavour exclusively male. See Condren, Mary, ‘Sacrifice and Political Legitimation: The Production of a Gendered Social Order’ in Journal of Women’s Studies, Vol. 6, No.4 and Vol.7, No.1,
stories of explorers often ended in death, giving them the requisite emotional pathos. Explorer narratives can be seen as the most proto-national of colonial themes. History-makers developed the navigations of imperial explorers into narratives of providence, providing an historical bridge between Australia’s off-shore imperial foundations and on-shore, or ‘native’ foundations.

**Open Air Exhibitions**

Chapter Two turns to history-making in open air civic space, and this section introduces its chronological and theoretical contexts, and describes the Chapter’s content. Chapter Two looks at the erection of two monuments, where the monumental history-making genre most literally equated with its form. The ideological purpose of monumental history was best served by concrete forms of heroic, gigantic physical depiction, such as obelisks and statues. They exuded obviousness, solidity and permanence, enhancing their chances of being repeatedly incorporated into public memory and therefore remembered. And apparently, they lent themselves to awe-struck, emotional responses. Monuments also commandeered public space of more or less civic value, signifying a spatial hierarchy of worth in terms of race, class and gender. Here, history-makers focussed exclusively on defining the ‘heroic patronage’ of themselves and their imagined audience.

The singularity of each monument intensified its symbolic role, and yet each monument’s placement within a monumental conglomeration also reinforced and augmented the generalised rhetoric of exemplary lineage. Boosters consolidated their colonisation of the public landscape, and thus public memory, with historical markers or

Winter/Spring 1995, pp.160-182. Drawing upon psychoanalytical and anthropological frameworks, she writes of the use and interpretation of ritual sacrifice—from which women are specifically excluded—in times of ‘festival’, including war, as establishing and reinforcing patrilineal descent in the social order.

81 Macintyre, Stuart, ‘Ernest Scott: “My History is a Romance” ’ in Macintyre, Stuart and Julian Thomas (eds.), *Discovery of Australian History*, pp.75-6; Macintyre, Stuart, *A History for a Nation*, p.41; Fletcher, Brian, ‘History as a Moral Force: George Arnold Wood at Sydney University, 1891-1928’ in Macintyre, Stuart and Julian Thomas (eds.), *The Discovery of Australian History*, p.19. Australia’s first university history professors were devoting considerable energy to discounting the exploration activities of the Portuguese and the French and promoting those of the British.
‘flags’. Chapters Two and Three show that each monument-making endeavour also became part of a wider discursive space and chronology. Bennett’s exhibitionary complex then, might be conceptually expanded to encompass open air civic space.

Nonetheless, Melbourne’s boosters used the city’s monumental space sparingly. Contemporaries such as Charles Long, the ardent imperial patriot and editor of the Victorian School Paper (later Reader) from 1896 to 1928, bemoaned the paucity of monuments in Melbourne and Victoria, while Ken Inglis has recently agreed that ‘Australia was still nearly bare of monuments by 1914’. Perhaps the ‘relative emptiness signified a new society whose makers discerned few attainments worthy of commemoration’. Notwithstanding, the period from 1887 to WWI remains the empirical high point of monument-making—especially to individuals—in central Melbourne.

Monument-making in Melbourne began in 1865, when the tragedy of Burke and Wills’ exploratory expedition inspired the Victorian Government to proffer £4000 for a statue. This was an unusually early use of the Australian civic sphere to commemorate

---

87 As above.
88 From 1887 to 1914 approximately fourteen major monuments were erected in central Melbourne. The rate slowed after WWI, which saw the erection of a further nine monuments in the city between 1915 and 1949. Ridley, Ronald T., A Walking Guide to Melbourne’s Monuments, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1996, pp.20-1. I have made these calculations from Ridley’s chronological summary of monuments. I have included most conventional statuary in this calculation, but excluded rotundas, buildings, the Shrine of Remembrance and gardens, as for the purposes of the calculation, they offer departures from the conventional monumental form, which are discussed further below.
specific individuals, showing both how early the imperial explorer narrative gained momentum in Australia’s historical imagination, and indicating Victoria’s determination to assert its unique place in the story of imperial possession of Australia. (Illustration 1)

Twenty-two years later, Melbourne’s boosters erected their next monument, a statue of Sir Redmond Barry. The first section of Chapter Two investigates its development and unveiling in 1887 in front of the Public Library of Victoria in Swanston Street. With the statue, the story of one of Melbourne’s most prominent founding statesman consolidated the thematic rendering of statesmen. Alongside explorers, the statesmen theme was gaining prominence across various fields of public history-making, including in the 1888 Centennial Exhibition. Barry was the first of five statesmen to be immortalised in central Melbourne statuary up to WWI, a numerical reading that places statesmanship at the forefront of commemorative colonial themes for monuments.

Through such monumental object lessons, the statesman worked conceptually as the explorer’s successor. If explorers were the lone providential witnesses, statesmen were their generational inheritors. They were public men who grasped the explorers’ social visions and implemented them. Statesmen also made sacrifices for the public good. The statesmen theme was an urban and spatial narrative, because the central metropolis

---

91 Cash, Damien, entry on Robert O’Hara Burke in Davison, Graeme, John Hirst and Stuart Macintyre (eds.), Companion to Australian History, p.97.
92 Ridley, Ronald T., Melbourne’s Monuments, p.20.
93 Here and elsewhere in the thesis, the terms ‘statesman’ and ‘statesmen’ are used in their lateral, abstract senses, as persons who worked to develop their major concrete geo-political constituency, which was the ‘state’, again deployed in an abstract sense. At this point in time, the colony was the concrete geo-political translation of the state.
95 Ridley, Ronald T., Melbourne’s Monuments, pp.20-21. The other statesmen were Francis Ormond (erected 1897), Sir William Clarke (erected 1902), Edmund Fitzgibbon (erected 1908), and the Earl of Hopetoun and Marquis of Linlithgow (erected 1911).
96 Inglis, K.S., Sacred Places, p.29. He describes monuments to “…‘colonial worthies’, who were deemed to have enriched society by philanthropy or public service beyond the call of the vocation'.
Illustration 1
Monument of Burke and Wills, c.1870
Courtesy La Trobe Picture Collection, State Library of Victoria
was the symbolic and material epicentre of the colony.\textsuperscript{97} Indeed, it was in the ‘great statesman’ theme that the history-makers most literally rendered their own images\textsuperscript{98} in public forms. Commemorations of specific statesmen complemented buildings as the second generation of monuments to the colony, while they also worked to cement specific, local indigeneities. (Illustration 2) Further, historical narratives of the colony were personalised at the point at which it needed metaphorical ‘father-figures’ to foster filial allegiance. To these extents, the statue of Redmond Barry offers a conventional case study in central city monument-making by Melbourne’s boosters about Melbourne’s boosters.

In 1899, planning began for the erection of the Eight Hours’ Day monument, and in the same year, a statue was erected to General Charles Gordon, colonial Melbourne’s only monument to a ‘fallen’ hero.\textsuperscript{99} In 1891, Daniel O’Connell, an Irish Catholic emancipist and statesman, was monumentalised on sectional turf in front of St. Patrick’s cathedral.\textsuperscript{100} Statues were then unveiled to statesmen Francis Ormond and William Clarke.\textsuperscript{101} Melbourne’s next central city monument to be unveiled was the Eight Hours’ Day monument, in Carpentaria Place in 1903, fourteen years after its original conception. The second section of Chapter Two investigates the efforts to commission, erect and unveil this monument.

Barry’s statue and the Eight Hours’ Day monument were very different central city monuments. The Eight Hours’ Day monument can be seen as an overtly ‘sectional’ one: it was commissioned and otherwise pursued by an essentially private group of elderly ex-tradesmen who lobbied to integrate their concern as a part of Melbourne’s public historical terrain. Unlike most other monuments of the period, it was an explicit gesture to an abstract and universal ideal. However, its driving narrative was ‘pioneering’—the same narrative that implicitly underwrote the Barry statue and many

\textsuperscript{97} See footnote 93.
\textsuperscript{98} This echoes Manning Clark’s well-known statement that ‘[E]very generation writes its own history in its own image’, cited in Ridley, Ronald T., Melbourne’s Monuments, pp.14-5.
\textsuperscript{99} Inglis, K.S., Sacred Places, p.30. Ridley, Ronald T., Melbourne’s Monuments, pp.66-9. General Gordon’s statue was unveiled in 1889, making it Melbourne’s third monument. The piece of land was later named Gordon Reserve.
\textsuperscript{100} Ridley, Ronald T., Melbourne’s Monuments, pp.57-9.
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Public Library, Museum and National Gallery
Valentine and Sons Publishing Co., c.1909
Courtesy La Trobe Picture Collection, State Library of Victoria
other monuments to the colony. To this extent, these monuments offered a fragmented but cohesive historical discourse.

Between the 1880s and the 1930s, the pioneer theme was explicitly or implicitly stated in the histories of localities and of broader constituencies. Its initial orientation, from the 1880s, was ‘grounded in personal territory’ and celebrated ‘firsts’ based in the ‘eye-witness’ memories of ‘pioneers’.

Towards the turn of the century, pioneers came to mean immigrants who settled the land, stepping beyond local boundaries and assuming a more general and timeless applicability. By the early twentieth century, the pioneer was a general and perhaps the strongest nationalist metaphor that served local, national and less frequently, imperial patriotism, and which ‘showed the way to the generations or the nation which came after them, and benefited from their labours’. After WWI, Diggers quickly assumed the mantle of the first genuinely national pioneers.

Pioneer history has often been seen as a counterpoint to the themes of ‘state’ embodied in the statues of Barry and other statesmen. While it too demands filial piety, it contrasts with explorer and statesmen themes in several ways. Pioneer history has a strong rural bent, with an emphasis on land acquisition and settlement, and deed rather than word. In political terms, the ‘pioneer legend’ has been characterised as more popular, populist and democratic history, produced either by people at very localised and informal levels, or by urban-based men who were specifically anti-plutocratic and distrustful of metropolitan statesmanship. John Hirst argues that the pioneer myth is about ‘rugged individualism’ rather than specific individuals; about

101 See footnote 95.
104 As above, p.318.
105 Thomas, Julian, ‘Heroic History’, pp.120-6.
109 Thomas, Julian, ‘Heroic History’, p.117.
apparently ordinary rather than exceptional people, and is thus, ostensibly, 'classless'. 112 Certainly, its application to an Eight Hours' Day monument seems to support this assertion, although we will see class tensions within the theme. 113 Historians have also debated the inclusiveness of the pioneer myth with regard to women, 114 and this thesis will show the theme's vexed relationship with women, eventually allowing them an attenuated historical appearance in the 1934 Centenary Celebrations.

The pioneer was a fundamental racial narrative, intent on establishing white historical nativity. To that extent it shares a key characteristic with themes more obviously pitched at the nation-state. It may represent a complex continuum with rather than a departure from other 'proto-national' histories. 115 Explorer histories in particular shared many characteristics with pioneer history, particularly with their emphases on firsts, on the social and public-spirited visions of the first-comers, and their human characteristics of suffering, hardship, risk-taking, action, inventiveness, sacrifice and gallantry. Occasionally the two types of histories were conflated. 116 Similarly, statesmen were sometimes referred to explicitly as 'pioneers'. While pioneer history manifested itself most explicitly at local and rural levels and through local councils, explorer and statesmen histories also worked to imply specific local indigeneity, and to this extent may be considered local as much as broader histories. The thesis explores some of the interrelationships and convergences between these historical themes, especially in Chapters Two and Three.

111 Macintyre, Stuart, 'Writing Australian History', p.11.
112 Hirst, John, 'The Pioneer Legend', p.316. Hirst suggests, however, that the category of pioneer obscures rather than nullifies private interests, at whatever level they may lie. See p.336 in the same article.
113 See also Thomas, Julian, 'Heroic History', chapter four. Here he investigates the 'politics of pioneering'.
114 John Hirst suggests that the pioneer trope incorporates women equally, in 'The Pioneer Legend', p.331; Chilla Bulbeck notes conversely that pioneer memorials rarely incorporate women, in 'Remembering Ourselves', p.408; Graeme Davison argues that the inclusion of women depends on the particular chronological period in question in his entry on Pioneers in Davison, Graeme, John Hirst and Stuart Macintyre (eds.), Companion to Australian History, p.507, and Julian Thomas's thesis supports Davison's point that women were incorporated in the pioneer trope by the 1920s and 1930s, in 'Heroic History', pp.117-20,147-51; while Kay Schaffer argues that women's inclusion was in masculinist terms in Women and the Bush: Forces of Desire in the Australian Cultural Tradition, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1988, passim.
115 Bulbeck, Chilla, 'Remembering Ourselves', pp.407-08.
**Nation-making and History**

Temporally, Chapter Two ends around the turn of the century, and there is a significant thirty-year interlude between it and the temporal focus of Chapter Three. This section maps out some major geo-political events of the first two decades of the twentieth century, and particularly sketches the shift in the public history-making landscape as a result of WWI. Between 1899 and 1901 Australian colonies sent over 10 000 soldiers to fight for the British empire in the Boer War,\(^{117}\) and on 1 January 1901, Australia became a nation. Even though Australian remembrance of the Boer War was based in unambiguous colonial-imperial terms, Inglis suggests that it had at last delivered to monument-makers in Australia a local hero, the citizen as soldier. Within a few years the civic landscape displayed more statues of [the citizen soldier] than of explorers or governors or other worthies.\(^{118}\)

Melbourne erected a major Boer War monument in St Kilda Road in 1903.\(^{119}\) The Boer War monument movement was driven by communities rather than the state, and Inglis identifies its emotional terrain as one of grief, meditation and tranquillity, coming closer to critical history, with its connotations of suffering and desire for deliverance.\(^{120}\) Nevertheless, the Boer War failed to become the nation-making moment, notwithstanding its coincidence with Federation.\(^{121}\)

The simultaneous accomplishment of Federation explicitly introduced the nation as a historical frame for the public imagination. Even so, Federation occurred predominantly in an ongoing plural imperial-colonial context, where history-makers continued to rhetorically emphasise race and Australian nativity.\(^{122}\) The ‘radical nationalists’, who offered a subterranean critique of the inter-connected arrangements of

\(^{117}\) Inglis, K.S., *Sacred Places*, p.40.
\(^{118}\) As above, p.52.
\(^{119}\) As above, chapter two.
\(^{120}\) Davison, Graeme, ‘Use and Abuse’, p.56.
\(^{121}\) Ken Inglis suggests this was because Australian communities did not broadly feel its effects, and its nature, including Australia’s involvement in it, was ‘too complicated, obscure, equivocal and ambiguous’, in *Sacred Places*, p.68.
class, empire and state, were also avowedly race-conscious, masculinist and backward-looking, and their ‘conservative’ strains gave them a good deal in common with the imperial nation-builders; enough perhaps to temper the differences. Their common ground was perhaps represented most strongly in the metaphor of the pioneer, which had captured the Australian historical imagination across the cultural spectrum, including in the arts and literature. Thus while a new frame was opened up that seemed to offer the possibility of departure, Federation was ‘not yet a sentimental entity’. Extant historical thematics served the new frame as well as older ones.

Federation did, nevertheless, weaken the argument of colonial possession of respective parts of Australia’s history, so evident in the 1888 International Exhibition. In particular, it loosened NSW’s hold on the ‘primal’ moments of national history, including Captain Cook’s ‘possession’ of Australia in 1770, and the founding of NSW as the first Australian colony in 1788. Federation made national history less a place-specific concern than an abstract concept, and place-based arguments of possession became increasingly difficult to sustain. After Federation, Captain Cook’s story could transcend place-based boundaries to work as an opportune metaphor for any imperial-national patriotic cause, as discussed in Chapter Three.

WWI represented the most significant transition between colonial and national history, creating the conditions for the transformation of the language of history-making from settler to modern. Australia’s participation in WWI was quantitatively far greater than in the Boer War—330 770 men, or 13% of Australia’s total male population participated, and one in five enlistments died, with 7 600 deaths at Anzac Cove alone. Death affected every second Australian family. From soon after the occurrence of Anzac, prominent Australian historian Ernest Scott hailed it as the ‘new

124 Davison, Graeme, entry on Pioneers in Davison, Graeme, John Hirst and Stuart Macintyre (eds.), Companion to Australian History, p.507; Thomas, Julian, ‘Heroic History’, chapter four
125 Inglis, K.S., Sacred Places, p.62.
126 As above, pp.91-2.
127 As above, p 90.
128 As above, p.97.
name’ for Australian history, and by the late 1920s, Australia’s involvement in WWI and the ‘Anzac story’ assumed a prime position in school history curricula. Nevertheless, it was in realms other than writing that warfare and Anzac histories were embraced most rapidly and widely.

Australia’s participation in WWI inspired Australians to embrace public commemoration in a quantitatively-increased and qualitatively different way, which transformed the nation’s monumental and memorial landscape. Most localities, rural and suburban, established one or more war memorials, in order to commemorate, very specifically, the local meeting point of ‘the national, the sacred and the military’, often ignoring the advice a board of Melbourne-based experts. The movement’s localism continued a major tradition of pioneer history: indeed, dignitaries officiating at memorial openings often invoked local pioneers as the direct predecessors of Anzacs. The characteristic localism of Anzac and War history-making perhaps distinguished it most from the monumentalism of Australia’s pre-War history-making.

WWI memorials were about grief, pride and thanksgiving, whereas victory and conquest—the stuff of monumental history—were residual themes. The majority of memorials were symbolic, such as obelisks and statues of (generic), relaxed, ‘everyman’ Diggers, while others fulfilled a more modern idea of usefulness which served a range of local practical needs, such as memorial halls or hospital wings. Nearly all

129 Macintyre, Stuart, A History for a Nation, p.73.
131 C.E.W. Bean, Australia’s official war historian, authored and edited an eleven volume history of Australia’s participation in WWI. The 5000 print run for the first volume, The Story of Anzac, sold quickly, but the other volumes did not sell as well as its author and publishers had hoped, until the War Memorial administration introduced an automatic pay-roll deduction scheme in the public service for purchase of the history in the early 1930s. McKernan, Michael, Here is Their Spirit: A History of the Australian War Memorial 1917-1990, University of Queensland Press in Association with the Australian War Memorial, St. Lucia, 1991, pp.134-6.
132 Inglis, K.S., Sacred Places, p.123.
133 As above, p.209.
134 As above, p.150.
135 As above, p.219; Griffiths, Tom, Hunters and Collectors, pp.161-2.
136 Inglis, K.S., Sacred Places, p.124.
137 As above, pp.160-1,164-71.
138 As above, p.144.
memorials acknowledged by name the individuals who had served in the War, rather than only those who died.\textsuperscript{139} Anzac and war remembrance histories diverged from pre-War monumental histories, because they were about the mass efforts of native-born, ordinary men.\textsuperscript{140} Such ordinariness lent them a ‘classless’ transcendence, a major point of attraction at this point in time.\textsuperscript{141} Like explorer and statesmen histories, however, they were exclusively male with regard to the possibility of direct public citizenship,\textsuperscript{142} overtly racist,\textsuperscript{143} and married nation with empire.\textsuperscript{144} Such characteristics quelled their radical appeal, and made them acceptable to Australian public communities, a minority of Catholics and pacifists notwithstanding.\textsuperscript{145} Explicit dissent was seen as sacrilege.\textsuperscript{146}

Immediately following WWI, there were simultaneous, separate moves to create a national war museum and a national war memorial in Victoria. In 1917 Australia’s official war historian C.E.W. Bean and ex-serviceman John Treloar began lobbying for a national war museum,\textsuperscript{147} which gained a temporary start in Melbourne’s Royal Exhibition Building. After decades of delay, including major financial constraints,\textsuperscript{148} the Australian War Memorial finally opened in Canberra in 1941, funded by the Federal Government. As Australia’s first genuine national history museum, it underlined the shared possession of Anzac and WWI as the country’s nation-making historical moment.

During the course of its development, the Memorial’s interim administration mounted several exhibitions. In 1921 an exhibition of photographs of sites where Australian

\textsuperscript{139} As above, pp.180-2.
\textsuperscript{140} As above, p.192. Even though the AIF was more ‘British’ than the Australian population: one in five AIF enlistments was born in Britain, compared to one in eight in the Australian population.
\textsuperscript{141} Inglis, K.S., ‘Memorials of the Great War’ in Australian Cultural History, No.6, 1987, p.6.
\textsuperscript{142} Inglis, K.S., Sacred Places, pp.30,172-5; Speck, Catherine, ‘Women’s War Memorials and Citizenship’ in Australian Feminist Studies, Vol.11, No.23, April 1996, pp.129-145. The few depictions of women in war memorials were as allegorical figures, or as maternal citizens, and therefore citizens whose role was to perform ‘natural’ functions of birth and mothering in private settings.
\textsuperscript{143} Inglis, K.S., Sacred Places, pp.187-8, 218-19.
\textsuperscript{144} As above, p.191.
\textsuperscript{145} As above, pp.224-233.
\textsuperscript{146} As above, pp.230-1.
\textsuperscript{147} Dunstan, David, Victorian Icon, p.329. It was named the Australian War Memorial in 1923.
soldiers had fought attracted 80 000 visitors over five weeks.\textsuperscript{149} A second, more elaborate exhibition of models of AIF warfare scenes opened in 1922, and attracted 800 000 people over three years.\textsuperscript{150} In 1927 prominent artist Will Longstaff painted *Menin Gate at Midnight* after envisioning the ‘spirits of the dead’ at the unveiling of the memorial in Ypres to the 350 000 men who had died in battle. The War Memorial travelled it nationally, and it attracted 35 000 paying visitors\textsuperscript{151} during its three-week display at the Melbourne Town Hall.\textsuperscript{152}

Photographs, dioramas and paintings had been introduced as methods of historical display in the 1888 Centennial Exhibition, although historical materialism was now more pronounced: a pattern we will see confirmed in Chapter Three. However, the methodologies in the 1888 Centennial Exhibition had celebrated the apparent pristine innocence of colonial birth. The post-WWI methodologies commemorated rather than celebrated national birth, and pinpointed its contexts of violence, sacrifice and death, adding levels of complexity and solemnity to the nation’s genealogy. Like the local war memorials, the public embrace of the exhibitions spoke to an imaginative convergence between the memory-makers and the public as to the rightness of and need to remember both the loss and drama of war.

In 1918, military personnel led by Major-General Sir John Monash, supported by the conservative Premier and ex-AIF officer, Sir Stanley Argyle, enlisted the Victorian Government and Melbourne City Council to develop a Victorian ‘national’ memorial.\textsuperscript{153} In 1923 ‘The Shrine of Remembrance’ won an architectural competition for the memorial,\textsuperscript{154} but its building was delayed for a decade, and it became an ‘accidental’ Melbourne Centenary project, dedicated by the Duke of Gloucester on 11 November.

\textsuperscript{148} McKernan, Michael, *Here is Their Spirit*, p.130.
\textsuperscript{149} Dunstan, David, *Victorian Icon*, p.332.
\textsuperscript{150} The Australian War Memorial administration remained in the Royal Exhibition Building.
\textsuperscript{151} McKernan, Michael, *Here is Their Spirit*, pp.132-3.
\textsuperscript{152} As above, p.133.
\textsuperscript{153} At first, all state memorials were known as national memorials, reflecting the continuing strength of the notion of the sovereignty of each Australian state, despite Federation. Inglis, K.S., *Sacred Places*, pp.280-1.
\textsuperscript{154} As above, p.318.
1934.\textsuperscript{155} The Shrine overwhelmed Melbourne as a monumental tomb, demanding to a greater extent than any monument before or after it, solemn remembrance of and mourning for Victoria’s sacrifice in the name of imperial progress. Its combination of monumental and modern languages of history-making are investigated further in Chapter Three.

\textbf{Transitions in the Historical Sphere After World War One}

WWI in particular accelerated a number of inter-related political, spatial, methodological and technological shifts in Australia which laid the foundations for a modern language of public history-making. This section maps those changes as a conceptual and chronological lead-in to the temporal focus of Chapter Three, the content of which is introduced at the end of the section. The War ruptured social relationships between people, and between people and metropolitan boosters. The bitterly-fought conscription campaigns had fractured the political and emotional balance in sectarian, political and local community relationships. Apart from the grief of mass death, there was also plenty of living evidence of damage wrought by war: 90 000 returned AIF enlistments were pensioned off for physical and/or mental incapacitation.\textsuperscript{156} Political and emotional friction even lay just below the surface of those most cohering of public rites: the unveiling of community war memorials.\textsuperscript{157} Unveilings were dominated by new strains of conservative politics, including an ‘anti-party politics’. Newly-formed pacifist and Communist movements also made their voices heard at a small minority of ceremonies, or built alternative monuments to peace.\textsuperscript{158}

The 1920s and early 1930s saw the introduction of modern democratic politics characterised by factionalism and critique: features which were amplified by the Depression. The decade was marked by bitter industrial disputes, while radical community elements also began to question the validity of Australia’s role in the

\textsuperscript{156} Inglis, K.S., \textit{Sacred Places}, p.244.
\textsuperscript{157} As above, chapters four and five.
\textsuperscript{158} As above, pp.205-7,224-33.
imperial equation and to question the legitimacy of nationalism itself.\footnote{Alomes, Stephen, 
\textit{A Nation at Last?}, pp.74,85; Thomas, Julian, ‘Heroic History’, pp.59,67-73; Griffiths, Tom, \textit{Hunters and Collectors}, chapter seven; White, Richard, \textit{Inventing Australia}, pp.145-6.} The rupturing of the relationship laid the political and emotional foundations for a transition from settler to modern renditions of history in public. In particular, WWI made the conditions for a monumental language of public history difficult to sustain, because the human cost of civic progress was so evident in contemporary society. The War damaged history’s romantic reputation.\footnote{Turner, Henry Gyles, ‘Romance and Tragedy in Victorian History’ in \textit{Victorian Historical Magazine}, Vol. III, No.2, December 1913, p.50.}

A number of associated developments also laid the foundations for modern renditions of history, in form and theme. The methodology of history-making itself was being transformed, limiting its role as a civic booster. Around the turn of the century, the promotion of ‘scientific’ history coincided with the creation of the first handful of Australian professional ‘historians’, with inaugural professorial appointments in history in Australia’s major universities.\footnote{MacIntyre, Stuart, ‘Writing Australian History’, pp.20-1; MacIntyre, Stuart and Julian Thomas (eds.), \textit{The Discovery of Australian History}, esp. pp.2-3,10-13,28,38,46,75-81; Griffiths, Tom, \textit{Hunters and Collectors}, pp.203,206,211-14; MacIntyre, Stuart, \textit{A History for a Nation}, pp.38-9.} Scientific historians promoted history as the objective search for facts, with documents and statistics as the evidence. Social memory was eschewed as legitimate historical evidence.\footnote{Hamilton, Paula, ‘The Knife Edge: Debates about Memory and History’ in Darian-Smith, Kate and Paula Hamilton (eds.), \textit{Memory and History}, pp.10-15; Healy, Chris, \textit{From the Ruins of Colonialism: History as Social Memory}, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1997, esp. chapter two. These and the other works cited in this paragraph explore the gradual separation between social memory, including oral tradition, local history and amateur historical pursuits on the one hand, and ‘history’ on the other, with its claims to systematisation, scientific rigour and objectivity, and its associated institutionalisation and professionalisation. All works imply or argue, however, that the estrangement cannot be sustained in practice, and that history and memory have always had and continue to maintain an extraordinarily intricate and complex symbiosis.} Scientific history potentially limited history as a rhetorical device, and underlined the epic fiction genre upon which monumental history modelled itself. It encouraged the institutionalisation and professionalisation of history, and made its pursuit and outputs more private affairs,\footnote{Davison, Graeme, ‘Paradigms of Public History’, p.4.} gradually shifting the form of history-making and its methods predominantly to writing.
At the same time, Melbourne’s city councillors and other law-makers had gradually marginalised the popular use of the central civic sphere in a modernist push for cleanliness, order and control, which they had virtually achieved by the 1930s, particularly in regard to processions.\textsuperscript{164} Conversely, Australians embraced new, mass information-conveying technologies, including silent film in 1900, ‘talking’ and Cinesound Newsreel in 1931,\textsuperscript{165} and commercial radio broadcasting in the 1920s.\textsuperscript{166} Australia’s past provided early and continuing inspiration for Australian film-makers as they produced ‘faction’,\textsuperscript{167} or explicitly dramatised history. In 1906 Australia’s first feature film, \textit{The Story of the Ned Kelly Gang} was made,\textsuperscript{168} followed by \textit{A Hero of the Dardanelles} in 1915, and \textit{For the Term of His Natural Life} in 1927. A new group of history-makers, driven by commercial interests, began to present a receptive public with more populist and popular historical themes, such as bushrangers,\textsuperscript{169} convicts,\textsuperscript{170} and Diggers, which characterised ‘ordinary’ men as heroes,\textsuperscript{171} and which had been marginalised or obliterated from monumental history-making frameworks. Film and radio proved popular with the public because they overcame issues of distance, were accessible to more women and working-class people than literal civic spheres, and they acknowledged a level of cultural diversity, including historical diversity, on which moral crusaders initially attempted to trounce.\textsuperscript{172} These communication forums shared some of the characteristics of earlier communications in the public sphere, such as
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aurality and visuality, emotion and theatre, while also offering verisimilitude and non-fiction. By the 1920s and 1930s they became for Australians their regular theatres of engagement in public life. People listened to the radio and watched film in relatively private places, however, and like the press and literature, these mediums spoke to imagined rather than literal communities.

After WWI, the combined effects of these transitions undermined the bases of monumental history-making, and Melbourne’s boosters began to make history in different arenas, with subtle shifts in theme and form. Apart from the ongoing Shrine project, they curtailed their use of Melbourne’s central civic sphere to make history. They completed three monuments, the initiative for each of which had begun before WWI, to King Edward VII in 1920, another Boer War monument in 1924, and a monument to Captain Matthew Flinders in 1925 who, ‘next to the great Cook...stands highest in the estimation of all Australians’.

In 1926, they resurrected the arena for a monument to Edith Cavell, who, as an imperial ‘warrior nurse’, was the single female war figure to be commemorated in prime civic space. In 1932, a monument was erected to Adam Lindsay Gordon, a Scottish emigrant poet. No statesmen were commemorated between WWI and 1934, reflecting the deteriorating relationship between state and people. The use of the central civic sphere, both numerically and thematically, following WWI, spoke to the declining power of the central civic sphere as a monumental history-making arena.

While Melbourne’s public history-makers remained high level ‘public men’, they had become increasingly bureaucratised, professionalised and institutionalised. Their

175 As above, p.108. This follows a well-established colonial tradition of honouring the imperial sovereign following their death. A statue of Queen Victoria was unveiled in 1907, six years after her death. The dearth of statues to dead royalty was only due to the Queen’s longevity.
176 The initiator of the memorial, Henry Gyles Turner, the long-standing banker, Chairman of the Trustees of the Public Library, Museum and Gallery from 1905-1920 and prolific history-maker, quoted in Ridley, Ronald T., *Melbourne’s Monuments*, p.106.
179 As above, pp.63-5.
historical work began to occur in slightly more private, cordoned spheres, and they
looked to new strategies to colonise social memory. Between 1910 and the early 1930s,
the Victorian Historical Memorials’ Committee, a close relative of the newly-formed
Historical Society of Victoria,\(^\text{180}\) erected over one hundred cairns, obelisks and plaques
across exploration routes in regional Victoria.\(^\text{181}\) The members of the Committee were
ardent imperialists and nationalists,\(^\text{182}\) persisting with a more conventional
‘monumental’ ideology of sorts. They determined to articulate the ‘foundation
narrative’ of imperial discovery and possession across Victoria, localising its moments
in attempts to garner local possession of the stories, much like the more modern war
memorial movement, only it was driven in the first instance by Melbourne’s boosters.
(Illustration 3) Graeme Davison also notes of this endeavour that there was a subtle
move from the heroics of explorers themselves to the deed of exploration, indicated in
the ‘austere, non-representational form’\(^\text{183}\) of the monuments. Their work implied a shift
from a settler to a more modern language of public history-making. The modern
language was characterised by the ‘periodisation’ of history rather than the placement of
the state’s foundation in the hands of a few great men, by more humble, universal
monumental forms, and by acknowledgement of the local need to own history.

At the same time, the very same metropolitan history-makers, including Charles Long
and Frank Tate, two high ranking government educators,\(^\text{184}\) were also looking to schools
to capture a young audience for monumental history. Long and Tate ensured history’s
prominence in Victorian school curricula. Initially, it was taught as a form of
homiletics, concentrating on British explorers and statesmen as the exemplars in civic
duty, and later, as a more period-oriented imperial-colonial history based on ‘scientific’

\(^{180}\) The Royal Victorian Historical Society formed in 1909.
\(^{181}\) Griffiths, Tom, *Hunters and Collectors*, p.158; Macintyre, Stuart, *A History for a Nation*,
p.51.
\(^{182}\) Griffiths, Tom, *Hunters and Collectors*, p.158; Macintyre, Stuart, *A History for a Nation*,
p.51.
\(^{183}\) Davison, Graeme, entry on Monuments in Davison, Graeme, John Hirst and Stuart
Macintyre (eds.), *Companion to Australian History*, p.437.
\(^{184}\) See footnotes 27, 84, and 568. Also see Griffiths, Tom, *Hunters and Collectors*,
pp.142,158-9 and Selleck, R.J.W., entry on Frank Tate in Ritchie, John (gen. ed.), *Australian
methods, but still retaining its moral force.\textsuperscript{185} School children also celebrated nationhood through other mnemonic rituals, such as Empire, Wattle, Discovery and Pioneer Days, and soon after, Armistice Day, while Anzac assumed a strong presence in history curriculum. Schools became ideal forums for history-makers in the twentieth century: compulsory education guaranteed a captive audience, and it was on this group that state history-makers began to focus.

However, the centenaries of Victoria and Melbourne in 1934 and 1935 demanded a temporary and significant revival of history-making in the central civic sphere. These events were the biggest, sustained commemoration of history Melbourne had seen since the 1888 Exhibition, even though they were held in the immediate wake of the Depression. The Centenary Celebrations consisted of over 300 events and other projects. The program included many historical events, including the Centenary’s two ‘accidental’ but ultimately most momentous and enduring initiatives, the Shrine of Remembrance and Cooks’ Cottage.

Chapter Three firstly looks broadly at history-making around the 1934 Centenary Celebrations, identifying departures in theme and form from the pre-war public historical terrain. It then turns its attention to the Centenary’s two major projects, the Shrine of Remembrance and Cooks’ Cottage, contrasting their languages in order to pinpoint major shifts to modernity. Finally, it undertakes a detailed study of the development, unveiling and public reception of Cooks’ Cottage, which resurrected an archetypal monumental narrative in the modern form of the historic house, making it, for one of its few historians, Imara Walden, a ‘cultural oddity’.\textsuperscript{186}

\textbf{Conclusion}

1888 to 1914 marks the high point for public history-making in Melbourne’s central civic arena by the city’s boosters, reflecting their monumentalist frame of mind. Using the arena’s language of object lessons, history was being made in artistic and

\textsuperscript{185} As above, pp.158-9; Macintyre, Stuart, \textit{A History for the Nation}, pp.75,182-3; Macintyre, Stuart, ‘Writing Australian History’, p.18; White, Richard, \textit{Imagining Australia}, p.126.

picturesque forms in Melbourne’s exhibitionary complexes, and especially the commemorative 1888 Centennial International Exhibition, and in statues and monuments, which formed generational and spatial complements to the exhibitionary complexes. The extent of public history-making during this period, although not especially resounding in international terms, refutes Chris Healy’s suggestion that an ‘important silence existed at the centre of the public historical sphere’ in colonial Australia.187

WWI offered a nation-making experience, but the public history that it prompted reflected the now damaged relationship between the state and people and a new questioning of the world order upon which it was based. While public history-making quantitatively increased across the state, it was now being made and owned at a local, decentralised level, and its flavour was sombre and self-reflective, coming closer to a critical kind of history. With the major exception of the Shrine, metropolitan history-makers’ use of the central civic sphere declined, representing a fin de siecle in public history-making, only to be truly resurrected, in a very different language, from the 1960s and 1970s.188 However Melbourne’s and Victoria’s Centenaries occurred in 1934-5, momentarily reviving the metropolitan history-makers’ uses of the central civic sphere for object lessons, but in this Depression-era commemoration, some of public history’s language foretold of modern historical emphases, some major shifts of which are illustrated in the Shrine of Remembrance and Cooks’ Cottage project.

188 Davison, Graeme, ‘Paradigms of Public History’, pp.4-14.