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ABSTRACT

The First World War and the Australian Imperial Force have generated thousands of books and articles. Many studies adhere to the emphasis of C.E.W. Bean, and recount the history of the infantry or a particular infantry battalion. Others examine both the short term and long-lasting effects of the war on the Australian psyche. Some historians have acknowledged that a particular group of non-fighting combatants has been neglected, but generally, this group has been employed in dangerous and difficult pursuits. Very few historians have studied the roles of non-fighting combatants whose contribution is considered as lacklustre, such as the Australian Field Bakeries.

When I began my research, I could not understand why the Australian Field Bakeries did not play any part in the historiography of World War One. An examination of the Anzac legend revealed an emphasis on the characteristics of the Anzac, especially masculinity and heroism. I argue that the bakers’ employment might be considered as being situated within the woman’s sphere and therefore unmasculine, whilst that same employment did not offer the chance for acts of heroism. Because of an emphasis on the exciting exploits of the infantry within Anzac historiography, the Australian Field Bakeries and their role as support troops have been ignored and omitted.

Comparing demographic statistics and the war experiences, values and attitudes of the Australian Imperial Force and the bakers, I conclude that the bakers of the Australian Field Bakeries were extraordinarily similar to the men of the Australian Imperial Force. Only those experiences and statistics directly related to the two groups’ specific fields of employment are significantly different. I argue that specialised skills and a perceived lack of masculinity and heroism have seen the men of the Australian Field Bakeries excluded from all existing Anzac historiography.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAG</td>
<td>Assistant Adjutant-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASC</td>
<td>Australian Army Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>Aide-de-Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADFA</td>
<td>Australian Defence Force Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMS</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Medical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB</td>
<td>Australian Field Bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIF</td>
<td>Australian Imperial Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amb.</td>
<td>Ambulance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZAC</td>
<td>Australia and New Zealand Army Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARS</td>
<td>Australian Reinforcements Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>Army Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>Australian War Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWOL</td>
<td>Absent Without Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2455</td>
<td>WWI Service Dossier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEF</td>
<td>British Expeditionary Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSD</td>
<td>Bulk Supply Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Btn</td>
<td>Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>Casualty Clearing Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Commanding Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA&amp;QMG</td>
<td>Deputy Adjutant and Quartermaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAAG</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Adjutant-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAG</td>
<td>Deputy Adjutant-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAQMG</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Quartermaster General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDMS</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Medical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRL</td>
<td>Donated Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DST</td>
<td>Director of Supplies and Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>Field Bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCGM</td>
<td>Field General Court Martial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHQ</td>
<td>General Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOC</td>
<td>General Officer Commanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRO</td>
<td>General Routine Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMAS</td>
<td>His/Her Majesty's Australian Ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/C</td>
<td>In Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA</td>
<td>National Archives of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO</td>
<td>Non-Commissioned Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBE</td>
<td>Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Officer Commanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIC</td>
<td>Officer In Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Private Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pun. Comp.</td>
<td>Punishment Compound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUO</td>
<td>Pyrexia of Unknown Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q'I'd</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>Quartermaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QMG</td>
<td>Quartermaster-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMC</td>
<td>Royal Army Medical Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RASC</td>
<td>Royal Army Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQM</td>
<td>Regimental Quartermaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSL</td>
<td>Returned and Services League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.Sgt.</td>
<td>Staff Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>Seine Majestäts Schiffe (His Majesty's Ship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQMS</td>
<td>Staff Quartermaster Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAD</td>
<td>Voluntary Aid Detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Victoria Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAB</td>
<td>Western Australian Battalions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE OF IMPERIAL AND METRIC MEASUREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperial</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 inch (in)</td>
<td>2.54 centimetres (cm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 foot (ft)</td>
<td>.3048 metres (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 yard (yd)</td>
<td>.9144 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mile</td>
<td>1.6093 kilometres (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 yards</td>
<td>91.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 yards</td>
<td>731.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ft</td>
<td>152.4 cm or 1.524 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ft 3 ins</td>
<td>160.02 cm or 1.6002 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ft 6 ins</td>
<td>167.64 cm or 1.6764 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ft 9 ins</td>
<td>175.26 cm or 1.7526 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ft</td>
<td>182.88 cm or 1.8288 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 ins</td>
<td>86.36 cm or .8636 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 kilometre (km)</td>
<td>.6214 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 km</td>
<td>14.9136 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 km</td>
<td>24.856 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 km</td>
<td>27.963 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 km</td>
<td>28.5844 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 km</td>
<td>37.284 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 km</td>
<td>43.498 mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The First World War, and particularly the Gallipoli campaign, was a catastrophic and yet remarkable event that still has a special place in the Australian culture and plays a significant role in ideas of ‘national character and identity’.¹ Thousands of books and articles have been written covering many facets of Australia’s involvement while other components have never been researched nor histories written. This is because, as historian Michael McKernan states, some subjects or issues are simply ‘left off the agenda’.² The focus of researchers together with the questions raised frequently change, however, and the appeal of the war ensures that historians and others are still examining and analysing its various features and components, remarkably often returning unique opinions and viewpoints. Investigations are now including specific regiments, units, and even individuals, which is relatively new in the historiography of World War One (WWI). This study is the product of one such investigation into a subject that has previously been ‘left off the agenda’.

The First and Second World Wars were always so prominent within my family they were almost tangible objects. My mother and father met when, as a serviceman, he was hospitalised during World War Two (WWII) and she was his nurse. My two sisters and I were always hearing stories of the lucky bout of laryngitis that landed our father into the care of his ministering angel. My father did not really speak a great deal about his experiences in New Britain, but relayed anecdotes in the manner covered by Alistair Thomson with his WWI veterans in ANZAC Memories: Living with the Legend

My grandfather, who lived with us, although a participant in WWI, never spoke of his experiences, although I realised there was a French connection because he often said ‘mercy buckoo’. I was aware that before he enlisted he had been a baker, that he had served overseas, and that he had returned to Australia physically unimpaired, to be nursed back to mental health by his sister over a period of around six months. My mother, his daughter, knew only the tiny snippets of information that could be prised from her aunt. It was said that my grandfather was buried alive in a trench at Gallipoli, and had to be dug out. This played such havoc with his psyche that he consequently experienced severe claustrophobia. Upon his return to Australia, he obtained a job with the Railways Department in New South Wales so he could work outside. It was also said that he was shot while in service on the Western Front, and, after the bullet was removed, had it fashioned into an iron cross by an enterprising French street vendor. This cross is now a sacred object worn on a chain by another relative. The story went that he was so disillusioned by the war he threw his medals into a river somewhere. Again, a relative claims she has these medals in her possession. Stories embedded within a family structure are hard to challenge and unravel, but it was always on my mind that I would try to determine why he was such a malevolent old man.

A few years ago I became, as many do as they age, very interested in my family tree. Part of my unearthing of the family treasure chest of information was the requirement to discover what my grandfather’s involvement in WWI had entailed. I purchased his WWI service dossier from the National Archives of Australia, and armed with a copy of official war historian C.E.W. Bean’s Anzac to Amiens: A Shorter History of the Australian Fighting Services in the First World War (1952), I determined to

---

3 Alistair Thomson, ANZAC Memories: Living with the Legend, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1996.
unravel the myths from ‘the truth’. Three important pieces of information came from that service dossier: the first was that he enlisted on 24 August 1915 and did not leave Australia until 30 November of that year. The second was that he was attached to the 2nd Australian Field Bakery (2AFB), a section of the 19th Company Australian Army Service Corps. The third was that of the four years between enlistment and discharge, he was hospitalised once, and that was for influenza. The ramifications of these finds were mind-boggling: if he did not leave Australia until the end of November 1915, the seven-week journey ensured he did not arrive at Alexandria, Egypt, until after the evacuation of Gallipoli by 20 December 1915. This means he was never involved in the Gallipoli campaign, and therefore was never buried alive in any kind of trench collapse there. The second absorbing piece of information was that he was not a combatant soldier but was a baker in a bakery unit. This made the possibility of him being shot less likely than if he was an infantry soldier doing his time in the frontlines. The third piece of information, that he was hospitalised once, indicates not only that his health was near exceptional, but also that he was never treated for a gun shot wound, shell shock, or a psychological complaint of any nature. This information obviously required a further depth of research. Bean’s Anzac to Amiens, however, did not make any mention of the Australian Field Bakeries.

I combed the indices of all of Bean’s Official History volumes for mention of the Australian Field Bakeries, and then read the information supplied. In most volumes the bakeries are not mentioned. In the few volumes in which the word ‘bakery’ appears, it is only in general terms, apart from one reference to the number of rations supplied to the Gallipoli campaign and problems with water and wood supplies experienced by the

4 C.E.W. Bean, Anzac to Amiens: A Shorter History of the Australian Fighting Services in the First World War, Australian War Memorial, Canberra, 1952.
1st Australian Field Bakery (1AFB) on Imbros Island during the campaign, and that was buried in two footnotes. The range of my research by raking through every history I could find on WWI; nothing on the Field Bakeries. I searched the Internet and posted requests for information of the bakeries on various WWI websites. Again, I found nothing, and the two replies received concerning my request for information said the topic was ‘too obscure’. At the Australian War Memorial website I was able to find and order a copy, of the 2AFB Unit Diary.

The 2AFB diary was received and read with much fascination. Included in the diary are copies of correspondence between the Officer in Charge of the Bakery, Captain John Miles, and various other people within the First Australian Imperial Force (AIF). Of great interest is an exchange of letters between Captain Miles and Captain John Treloar of the Australian War Records Section in London. In 1917, Captain Treloar and C.E.W. Bean decided there was a need for each unit of the AIF to compile an informative diary, and in July 1917, sent each unit on the Western Front comprehensive instructions on how this was to be achieved. The instructions included the admonition ‘Remember A well-kept diary is the surest pledge to future recognition’. Three months later, on 20 October 1917, after 2AFB had been in France for nineteen months, Captain Miles replied to another request from Captain Treloar for a detailed diary:

8 AWM 4, Control Symbol 25/39, ‘Diary’, in 2nd Australian Field Bakery.
9 John Miles was appointed Quartermaster and Honorary Lieutenant on 30 September 1915. Exactly one year later he was appointed Quartermaster and Honorary Captain. On 8 January 1918 he was appointed Quartermaster and Honorary Major, in NAA, B2455, J. Miles, Canberra, 2001. Because this study is not chronological in approach, I hereafter refer to John Miles as Captain Miles.
10 Again, John Linton Treloar was promoted throughout his service with the AIF. I hereafter refer to him as Captain Treloar.
12 Australian Imperial Force memorandum to Commanding Officers, quoted in ibid, 13 July 1917.
As soon as [the Unit under my command] arrived here [it] settled down to hard work in its branch of the service (baking) and has been working hard ever since, but nothing has eventuated of historical interest, nor have any important orders been received to warrant an entry in my War Diary.\(^{13}\)

On 29 October 1917, Captain Treloar replied to Captain Miles:

> It is recognised of course that units in the firing line have greater opportunities of making history, but in order that they may be maintained there, it is necessary to have a number of units such as yours at the Base. These units are doing good and useful work, and I can conceive of no greater injustice than that there should be no reference to them in the history of the A.I.F. merely because their duty does not place them more in the limelight. One of the chief objects of this Section is to ensure that all units of the A.I.F. receive recognition in proportion to their achievements.\(^{14}\)

I believe that neither Bean nor subsequent WWI historians have considered the achievements of the Field Bakeries worthy of warranting any of their attention, recognition, and limelight.

In June 1918, Captain Treloar wrote to Captain Miles requesting some ideas wherein the bakery could be 'well represented in the Museums'.\(^{15}\) In reply Captain Miles sent the Australian War Records Section in London a large amount of baking equipment, including an Aldershot oven, troughs, thermometers, strainers, bowls, knives, scales, scoops and scrapers, and sieves.\(^{16}\) Captain Treloar replied with a letter of thanks for the 'most interesting collections of exhibits', and added that 'Thanks to your efforts, the Australian Bakeries will be represented in the War Museums by quite an interesting collection'.\(^{17}\) In the latter part of 2001 I spent several months interstate, mainly Canberra. While at the War Memorial, I spent a number of days examining the exhibits and noticed that the only piece of WWI cooking equipment on display was a German field kitchen. I inquired of the tour guides if there was any equipment from the Australian Field Bakeries on display, and none was aware of any such pieces. Upon

\(^{13}\) Letter from Captain J. Miles to OIC Australian War Records Section, in AWM 4, Control Symbol 25/39, 2\(^{nd}\) Australian Field Bakery, 20 October 1917.
\(^{14}\) Letter from Australian War Records Section to Captain J. Miles, in ibid, 29 October 1917.
\(^{15}\) Letter from OIC Australian War Records Section to Major J. Miles, in ibid, 5 June 1918.
\(^{16}\) Letter from Captain J. Miles to Captain Treloar, in ibid, 5 July 1918.
\(^{17}\) Letter from Captain Treloar to Major J. Miles, in ibid, 15 July 1918.
my return home, I wrote to the Australian War Memorial, quoting Captain Treloar’s claim that ‘the Australian Bakeries will be represented in the War Museums’, and inquiring of them ‘why the only piece of [cooking or baking] equipment you deem to be of interest to tourists and researchers is a German field kitchen?’.

The reply received from Michael Cecil, the Curator of Military Technology, states that ‘there are many aspects of Australia’s military history that we are unable to give prominence to within the galleries’. He adds that ‘exhibitions are usually centred on a theme, event or period, with articles appropriate to that theme chosen ... to illustrate and enhance visitor understanding’, but that I can make an appointment to view bakery ‘items that are of particular interest’ that are not on display.

In 2000 an exhibition arranged by the Australian War Memorial entitled 1918: Australians in France travelled Australia and was on display at the Western Australian museum in Perth. It was a very moving exhibition with photos highlighting the horrendous conditions of trench warfare on the Western Front: planks of wood traversing muddy landscapes, dead bodies, lone helmets, guns, cannons and explosions, tanks, and gas wafting and settling into the trenches. Many pieces of combat equipment were on display, and there was a piece of ‘the red baron’s’ plane, accompanied by an explanation that it was an Australian who brought him down. The foremost objective of the display, however, was to emphasise that the Australians’ involvement in 1918 was highly significant to the allied victory, suggesting that without the Australian involvement, the war may have reached a different conclusion.

---

18 Letter from Treloar to Miles, in *ibid*, 15 July 1918; Letter from P. Ettell to Australian War Memorial, 18 November 2002.
thankful praise of French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau was on prominent display:

When the Australians came to France, the French people expected a great deal of you ... We knew you would fight a real fight, but we did not know that from the beginning you would astonish the whole continent ... I shall go back tomorrow and say to my countrymen; 'I have seen the Australians. I have looked in their faces. I know that these men ... will fight alongside of us again until the cause for which we are all fighting is safe for us and for our children.22

Alongside were photos of heroic Australians whose actions were influential in the victories of 1918. Many of these heroes were recipients of the Victoria Cross or the Military Medal. Missing from the display was anything pertaining to non-fighting Australian soldiers.

My grandfather forgotten, I became fascinated with the bakers and their exclusion from WWI historiography. Most of the literature focused on the fighting combatant, and those that did not, such as Roy MacLeod’s ‘Phantom soldiers: Australian tunnellers on the western front, 1916-18’, which charged that the tunnellers had been ‘neglected’, still gave attention to groups of men employed in dangerous and difficult pursuits.23 Nearly every text I read emphasised that the Anzacs were the epitome of ‘manliness ... physical action, bravery, self control, [and] courage’.24 I read historian John Robertson’s assertion that there is an ‘Australian predilection for focus on heroism and manly qualities’.25 During a discussion between historians Dale Blair and Jonathan King on the Australian Broadcasting Commission’s programme Lateline in 2001, Blair asserted that the digger was ‘inherently masculine’, and cast into the

---

22 Australian War Memorial, 1918, Australians In France.
25 John Robertson, Anzac And Empire: The Tragedy & Glory of Gallipoli, Hamlyn Australia, Port Melbourne, Victoria, 1990, p.268.
‘heroic mould’. I began to reason that the bakers were not mentioned in WWI histories or in the displays at the Australian War Memorial because they were not employed as fighting combatants, or as those employed in dangerous and difficult pursuits - those accompanied by an emphasis on heroism and masculinity. I delved into the Anzac legend, that pervasive belief that embodies several distinct aspects of the Australian experience in WWI, to determine if my reasoning had any basis. I read, more carefully, various historians’ accounts of the war, noting especially the language used and whether the authors followed the well-worn path of the Anzac legend. I also noted the criticisms historians have made of others’ works. Philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche said that only the strong endure history with the weak being extinguished by it. My line of reasoning is now an argument: bread may be the first necessity of life, but those who baked it for the 1st AIF and maintained a continuous supply, first to the Australian troops on Gallipoli and then the Western Front during WWI, have been ignored or forgotten by historians. This has occurred because the role of the Australian Army Service Corps, and particularly that of the bakers, was and is considered ‘weak’, as lacking in heroism and masculinity.

While researching the bakeries, one of the most pressing tasks was to identify the names of the men who spent time in any of the five Australian Field Bakeries. Names were gathered from the examination of Nominal Rolls and Reinforcement Lists, Unit Diaries, Routine Orders, and any other document that disclosed such information. At the National Archives of Australia in Canberra, I perused the service dossiers of 307, or 42.46 per cent, of the 723 bakers I identified. Together with other sources, I was

27 Friedrich Nietzsche quoted in, Wolverhampton Grammar School, Activehistory.co.uk, [http://www.activehistory.co.uk/quotes.htm], date accessed 22 July 2003.
28 At the National Archives of Australia, I quite literally, requested the service dossiers in alphabetical order of the bakers’ names. I had perused 307 when time put aside for such research ran out. Most of the personal information, therefore, derives from those
able to extract full or useful partial information, other than name and
Service/Regimental number, of 467, or 64.59 per cent, of the 723 bakers.²⁹ Lloyd
Robson employed this same micro historical approach in his study ‘The Origin and
Character of the First A.I.F., 1914-1918: Some Statistical Evidence’ (1973), as did
Suzanne Welborn in her study Lords Of Death: a people a place a legend (1982).³⁰

James Surowiecki from the School of Journalism at Columbia University and
journalist with the New Yorker, warns that micro history enables ‘huge generalizations’
to be drawn from the ‘flimsiest evidence’.³¹ Professor of History at the University of
California Carlo Ginzburg, however, says that the benefit of deciding on micro history is
that it looks at ‘apparently inconsequential images which ... [are] full of meaning’,
which can expose and explain much larger issues.³² In the case of this study, the risk
as identified by Surowiecki is acknowledged and hopefully avoided, but is outweighed
by benefits such as identifying the personal characteristics of the bakers, and a close
examination of the conditions in which they lived and worked, for example, discerning
that meted punishments were sometimes extraordinarily harsh. I have selected
evidence to draw attention to comparative features, and although, as historian E.M.
Andrews states, ‘men’s experiences in wartime vary widely’, this historiographical

²⁹ It should be noted that, after Armistice, many soldiers were taken on strength into
one of the bakeries for ration purposes while they were waiting to be returned to
Australia. Within a few days, these men were struck off strength and boarded their
transport. These soldiers are not included in my register of 723 bakers.
Death: a people a place a legend, Fremantle Arts Centre Press, Fremantle, Western
Australia, 1982.
³¹ James Surowiecki, A Consumer’s Republic, 17 February 2003,
³² Carlo Ginzburg cited in Duane J. Osheim, ”Micro-History”, or the Case-Study Method,
[http://www.ukans.edu/~medieval/melcher/matthias/old/log.started950329/mail-
method allows for direct comparison between the bakers and the AIF, and for careful conclusions to be determined.33

In Chapter 2 I explore and give an overview of the Anzac legend. This legend embodies several distinct aspects of the Australian experience in World War One. An examination of Anzac Day is a crucial accompaniment to a review of the Anzac legend because of the soldiers’ attributes eulogised on that day. I also consider the legend’s malleability to include other issues. I examine how different historians have approached the Anzac legend and WWI. English journalist Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett wrote the first eye-witness account of the Gallipoli landing, which was carried in the Argus on 8th May, 1915, under the headline of ‘Australians at Dardanelles: Thrilling Deeds of Heroism’.34 Ashmead-Bartlett confirmed those aspects of the legend already in place, such as masculinity, physique, and bravery, and until the 1970s, historians took their attitude and perspective on the 1st AIF in part from him, but more notably, from official war historian C.E.W. Bean. Bean was an assiduous and painstaking reporter who spent much of his time close to the frontline.35 He was unwavering in his determination to observe as much of the action as possible. Bean’s Australian soldier was a hero, but more importantly, it was the Australian’s character and fighting qualities that earned him that justification. If the soldier was not a combatant, that is, did not take his turn in the frontline trenches, he was not ‘heroic’, and he was, at best, relegated to the periphery. At worst, he was disregarded and forgotten.

In 1965 after Ken Inglis castigated historians for their neglect of Bean, his challenge was promptly accepted by Geoffrey Serle, who credits Inglis with ‘open[ing]
up the first serious modern discussion of Anzac and the digger legend’. Since that time, many historians have taken up Inglis’s challenge and examined Bean’s works, the Anzac legend, and the perspective of each new history as it arises. Some of these histories have followed the lead of Bean, while others have opened up new areas of research and offered new interpretations of the experiences of the 1st AIF and the Anzac legend. I argue, however, that these new areas of research and new interpretations are nearly always constructed according to the template created by Bean, which implicitly regards that in war, a man or group of men must have been employed in heroic and therefore masculine pursuits, if their exploits are to be historically recorded.

The Australian Field Bakeries were a very small sub-section of the Australian Army Service Corps, whose duty it was to supply and transport the army. To date two histories of the Corps have been published, both entitled Equal to the Task, which is the translation of the Corps’s motto Par Oneri. Hugh Fairclough wrote the first, published in 1962, which covers the Corps’s formation on 1 July 1903 to the end of World War II. Neville Lindsay wrote the second text, published exactly 30 years later, again covering the Corps’s formation through World Wars I and II, but also its involvement in Malaya from 1955 to 1960, and Vietnam from 1963 to 1972. Fairclough contends that, when the call went out for volunteers, the members of the Corps:

... dropped their normal work, joined the A.A.S.C., did the job, and at war's end, returned to their homes, literally 'unwept, unhonoured and unsung'.

---

40 Fairclough, Equal to the Task, p.xii.
Lindsay argues that the Australian Army Service Corps has a ‘major, essential, distinguished, but unfortunately unrecognised and unsung record’. These arguments underline my own, and the history of the Australian Field Bakeries I subsequently record. Of Fairclough’s 301-page history, twenty pages are allocated to WWI. A précis of 1AFB’s actions during the Gallipoli campaign constitutes less than one of these pages, and the bakeries are mentioned another three times. Of Lindsay’s 511-page history, plus several pages of maps, approximately 40 pages are allocated to WWI, and I found twenty allusions to one or more of the Field Bakeries of WWI, and two photos. These two histories barely have more coverage than that provided by Bean’s histories. Fairclough admits that he relied on Bean’s details of Gallipoli for his own history, and I argue that much of Lindsay’s information is the same as that provided by Bean. This is not necessarily a criticism of these histories, for as Fairclough and Lindsay acknowledge, each unit needs its own separate history if there is to be a satisfactory documentation of its actions. In Chapter 3, I provide this documentation, and assert the importance of the Australian Field Bakeries to the war effort.

In Chapters 4 and 5, I provide demographic and experiential comparisons of the bakers and the AIF. I argue that the men of the Australian Field Bakeries, although slightly different in some demographics, were essentially the same as the combatants of the AIF. The two groups initially wore an assortment of uniforms due to shortages, and they were equally at risk from enemy shipping while en route to England and Egypt. They shared the same ethos, the same tendency towards larrikinism, had a disrespect for authority and some leadership, they were good at improvisation, and had an antagonism towards the British.

---

41 Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.411.
42 Fairclough, Equal to the Task, p.11.
43 Fairclough, Equal to the Task, p.xi; Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.223.
I explore the relations the AIF had with other nationalities, particularly the Germans and the British, and compare the nature of these to those experienced by the Australian Field Bakeries. I argue that the bakers’ relationships, especially with the British, were of similar nature to those of the infantry. The Australians believed they were vastly superior in every way, and resented any intrusion of the British, both men and ideas. This belief in their own superiority runs counter to the stereotype that Australians were lackadaisical, undisciplined and untrained. Coupled with these feelings of superiority, was a general disillusionment with the ‘myth of the homeland’ and the inadequacies of the British soldiers and decision makers. This disenchantment was shared by much of the AIF. The infantry and the bakers also shared a great yearning for letters from their loved ones back in Australia.

Chapter 6 expounds the dangers and deprivations experienced by the bakers of the Australian Field Bakeries. Although vastly different in lines of work, the bakers and infantry shared many of the same feelings and experiences. I argue that, contrary to the appearance of the bakers’ relative safety, those at the Calais and Rouen Bakeries experienced constant air raids. An Australian infantry soldier passing through the same camp as that in which the bakers at Calais were housed, after experiencing an air raid while there, wrote:

> It was without doubt one of the most dreadful nights of suspense I have ever experienced ... the majority of us soldiers would rather be in the front line and put up with huge shells from the guns, than experience an air raid.\(^{44}\)

The psychological impact of ‘frequent and severe’ air raid warnings and aerial attacks, sometimes exceedingly close to the camp, brought an uncertainty of life expectancy that was lasting and more acute than has been recognised in non-combatant troops.\(^{45}\)


I argue that although the bakers did not suffer the horrendous conditions of trench life on the Western Front, they still worked in unsafe surroundings, suffered freezing conditions, leaking tents, poor food, and hard labour. In other words, some lives behind the lines were not as easy as many combatants believed. They experienced similar rates of hospitalisations, venereal disease infections, and influenza, as did the infantry.

In Chapter 7 I argue that the Bakeries took a great deal of pride in their work habits, their superior knowledge of baking and flour, their finished product, and their ability to overcome shortages of supplies. Bread was identified as a vital to the soldiers’ health, although feelings towards it varied greatly. The amount issued in the ration changed several times throughout the course of the war. The bakers exhibited a need for validation, and visits and favourable comments by famous or prominent people were always recorded in the unit diary. I explore the relations between fighting and non-fighting combatants. There is no doubt that many fighting combatants believed that those who did not take their turn in the lines led ‘a more secure and easier existence than’ themselves. The non-fighting combatant was seen as ‘privileged … [and] therefore at once despised and envied by his fellows’.46 Although those who were seen to be having it easy were despised, many fighting combatants were quick to volunteer for such positions in order to leave dangerous situations when those openings became available.

Although my thesis does not take a feminist stance as such, it focuses on the Anzac legend as a masculinist myth that excludes, amongst others, those whose tasks are perceived as feminine or women’s work. Baking bread is possibly thought of in this way, and is another reason for the bakers’ invisibility within WWI histories. After it was decided to employ women at the Calais Bakery, the bakers were very patriarchal and

46 MS 9839, Tristan Buesst, War Diary of Tristan Buesst France and Flanders September 1916 – March 1918, 23 September 1916.
territorial when it came to their expertise and space being invaded by women. While this decision to employ women was successful in England and Rouen, it never eventuated at Calais. I also argue that the responsibilities of the bakers extended beyond baking bread. This raises questions about the roles of non-combat support troops.

There were few awards bestowed on bakery members regardless of their accomplishments. Those excluded from Bean’s histories naturally include non-enlistees, those who attempted to volunteer but were rejected, women, including nurses, Aboriginal Australians, and the self-inflicted wounnder and suicide. Although the eight-month Gallipoli campaign was ‘a minor sideshow’, wherein less than 17 per cent of the total numbers of Australians killed during the four years of the War occurred, Gallipoli has captured the Australian imagination, to the detriment of those who served on the Western Front.47 The 1st Australian Field Bakery (1AFB) was based at Lemnos for the first month of the campaign, and then Imbros for the rest of the campaign. It supplied bread to the Australians and New Zealanders fighting the Gallipoli campaign on alternate days. The men of 1AFB never came closer to the shores of Gallipoli than the 24-kilometre distance from Imbros.48 Alec Campbell, who arrived on the shores of Gallipoli in late November 1915, was almost immediately hospitalised with influenza, and was discharged from hospital on 19 December 1915, the day before the Australians were evacuated, has achieved great recognition because of his longevity.49 Upon his death, Campbell was afforded a state funeral, and Prime Minister John Howard bowed to his coffin.50 While my intention is not to belittle Campbell’s contribution or the man himself, I argue that Gallipoli holds such a sacred place in the Australian imagination, that one man who was there for less than one month, is

48 Lindsay, *Equal to the Task*, pp.210-211.
considered a hero and afforded a greater recognition than many who saw out the entire campaign albeit from a distance of 24 km. I argue that Bean’s leaving the non-fighting man from the historical agenda was significant in ensuring the future obscurity of the Australian Field Bakeries.

After almost one hundred years, the First World War still looms large in the Australian historical consciousness. Historian Alistair Thomson has acknowledged that ‘representations of Anzac in ceremony, history or film support the recollection of certain memories while silencing others’. 51 Whether the bakers’ recollections of their participation were heard or acknowledged is for families to recall, and perhaps the odd published article will stay buried and forgotten. Historian Dale Blair asserts that ‘a concentration on aspects of the soldiers’ experiences other than the ‘heroic’ ought to be encouraged’. 52 My study aims to give voice and credence to the experiences of a large group of men, some of who served with the 1st AIF for almost five years, but whose efforts have been ignored, to date, by historians.

51 Thomson, ANZAC Memories, p.204.
52 Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.4.
Chapter 2
The Anzac Legend

Writer and historian Ian Jones says a legend is ‘something transcending fact’, and journalist Henry Louis Mencken states that a legend is only ‘a lie that has attained the dignity of age’.1 Author and academic Bruce Clunies Ross, however, states that the Anzac legend has been scrutinised, analysed, reworked and moderated by many historians but has never been denied.2 Certainly, the boundaries between legend and reality are often blurred. In this chapter I outline the separate aspects of the Anzac legend, how these are reflected in the word ‘Anzac’ and Anzac Day celebrations and discourse, and the legend’s malleability to include any issue deemed necessary. I note that two of the central features of the Anzac legend, masculinity and heroism, are also two of those usually emphasised in Anzac Day celebrations. These attributes are central to my argument because it maintains that they are perceived as lacking in the men of the bakeries. The bakers are, therefore, deemed as too uninteresting and unimportant for historians to write about. This explains their absence from the agenda of Anzac and the historiography of WWI. I also examine the way the Anzac legend has been approached by different historians. It is not my intention to dispute these approaches or to offer rebuttal. Nor is it my intention to belittle the ‘valour of those who have’ experienced ‘the terrifying savagery of battle’.3 A close examination of the Anzac legend is crucial to my study because I argue that, legitimacy or fabrication, it implicitly and explicitly excludes the men of the Australian Field Bakeries.

the Anzac legend

The word ‘Anzac’ has a sacred and seemingly untouchable place in the Australian psyche. ‘Anzac’ is an acronym for the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps, and was formulated and used in WWI by Headquarters staff initially as a telegraphic code name to refer to soldiers from both of those countries. ⁴ Although the acronym includes Australians and New Zealanders, Australia has appropriated it wherein it has become ‘a special Australian way of defining Australianness’. ⁵ Historian Richard Nile states that the word ‘conjures up Australia and what it means to be Australian in a way that no other ritual can’. ⁶ I disagree with the inclusiveness of Nile’s interpretation; I believe that the word does not define an Australian, but a very specific, distinctive, and unmistakable Australian male. Initially referring to members of the First Australian Imperial Force, Anzac now refers to those who have left the country to fight in a time of war. The legend also initially referred to members of the 1st AIF but has since been appropriated for other campaigns and for a variety of purposes.

The Anzac legend embodies several distinct aspects of the Australian experience in WWI and can be summarised as follows. When England declared war, Australian men rushed to enlist to defend the King and Empire. Those who could not fight because of age or gender actively encouraged eligible men to do so. At Gallipoli especially, but also later on the Western Front, the Australian men exhibited and demonstrated a battle prowess that proved ‘the character of Australian manhood’ to the rest of the world. ⁷ Their triumphs and sacrifices evinced glowing reports of magnificence and heroism from the official correspondents, and the spirit of the

---

⁶ ibid.
Australian nation was born. These superior abilities are attributable to uniquely Australian characteristics such as a tall and muscular physique, and the large open spaces that encouraged independence, hardiness, an adventuresome spirit, and boldness. The freedom from caste or class resulted in an egalitarian AIF wherein relations between officers and other ranks were friendly and respectful and where any man could be promoted. The Anzac had a wry sense of humour, was a good-natured larrikin, and featured an unswerving loyalty to his mates. He was aware he was from the best country in the world, and grew more and more contemptuous of the lack of due recognition given to the Australians, and the British Army with its military etiquette, its class system, its officers and their demands and decisions, and its general fighting abilities.8

Historians such as Joan Beaumont, Richard White and John Robertson have concluded that the hypotheses about the Australian national character that are of primary importance to the Anzac legend were in place well before the outbreak of World War One.9 In 1883, the Melbourne Age stated that ‘our men are splendid material for an army ... above average ... in physique and intelligence’.10 Although 16,000 Australian troops had taken part in the Boer War of 1899-1902, their contribution received a mixed assessment: they were ‘occasionally embarrassing’, but also ‘courageous’, therefore winning a ‘good reputation’.11 A Royal Commission set up

---

10 Quoted in White, Inventing Australia, p.125.
to examine the British Army’s mediocre performance in the War proclaimed the exceptional quality of Dominion troops.\textsuperscript{12} Although British Field Marshall Lord Frederick Roberts acceded that ‘all the colonials did extremely well’, the Boer War did not answer the question of whether Australian men would be able to meet the levels of confidence, and disciplinary and fighting ability standards necessary if they were to have any chance against overseas soldiers.\textsuperscript{13}

Although most Australians were of British origin and accepted they were a part of the superior race, those born in Australia believed they were unspoiled and physically greater than the 400,000 ‘new chums’ who had arrived in Australia from the United Kingdom in the ten years before the war.\textsuperscript{14} There was an underlying fear, however, that life in Australia may have degenerated the superior Anglo-Saxon race, a concept insinuated and underlined by British General Sir Ian Hamilton, who, on 24\textsuperscript{th} April 1914, was less than impressed by Australian troops.\textsuperscript{15} In August 1914, however, after the AIF marched through the streets of Sydney, the Sydney Morning Herald observed their ‘fine physique … and soldierly bearing [which] won the warmest commendations from critical observers … All were young, active, and alert, born soldiers’. It was indeed ‘a triumphant procession’.\textsuperscript{16} The West Australian told its readers that ‘Perth was thrilled to the core … when the thousand lusty specimens of Western Australian manhood marched through the crowded streets of … the city’.\textsuperscript{17}
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politician Joseph Cook told the parliament that the members of the AIF were ‘boys of the bull-dog breed’ who exhibited ‘no indication of decadence’ for their having been ‘transplanted’.18

Despite the 1901 Federation of Australian states, in 1914 Australia was very much tied to Britain, with its place in the great Empire and loyalty to the King, George V, uppermost.19 School curricula and private schools were modelled on British ideals, parades honoured King and flag, and attitudes reiterated on Empire Day were an obligation to the ‘home country’ and ‘pride of race’.20 Although most Australians supported Britain’s declaration of war on 4th August, many were ambivalent. The most noticeable mood however, was one of patriotism, manifested by crowds in the streets singing the National Anthem and waving British and Australian flags.21 Students at the University of Melbourne sang the National Anthem after each lecture on 5th August.22

When Britain declared war in 1914, it did so on behalf of the whole Empire, and Australia had no choice but to respond.23 This it did with the fervour that it would defend Britain ‘to our last man and our last shilling’.24 Author David Malouf has suggested that the request issued to Australia to play with ‘the big boys in the playground’ engendered pride in the country’s acceptance of worth by ancestral Britain.25 Australia could now have a role in a ‘tangible partnership’.26 It was also, of

21 Robson, Great War, p.3.
course, a chance to test the mettle of the young and vigorous male population against those of other countries.

Australian men in their thousands, the 'cream of Australia’s masculinity', flooded recruiting stations to enlist to help, as Bean suggests, 'an old friend in danger'. Historian John Laffin asserts that Australians of the period believed that the great cause they were defending was obvious: 'nothing less than ... all that was good and right'. At close of business on 11th August 1914, Sydney's first day of enlistment, 3,600 men had signed up, by 20th August 20,000, and by year's end, 53,000. Of the 416,809 men who volunteered, over 331,000 served outside of Australia. There have been many reasons given for enlistment, however the Anzac legend gives dominance to patriotism and loyalty to the British Empire, the call of self-sacrifice, and duty to peers already enlisted, which, in turn, translates into an extraordinary bond of mateship. Recruitment propaganda also appealed to the Australian humour and sense of adventure by advertising enlistment as a 'Free Tour to Great Britain and Europe – The Chance of a Lifetime'. Indeed, as historians E.M. Andrews, Alison

26 Gammage, Broken Years, p.2.
28 Laffin, AIF Epitaphs, p.36.
29 ibid, p.15.
30 Forrest, "Milling Around Outside The Town-Hall", p.97; Beaumont, Australia's War, p.1. This figure of 416,809 is supported by Nile, 'Peace, Unreliable Memory', p.80, and Clark, Australia, p.197, although Andrews, Anzac Illusion, p.5, quotes a figure of 412,953.
Forrest, Richard White, and James Curran argue, many Australian men joined up, in part, for adventure and ‘the chance of seeing the world’. That the AIF remained an entirely volunteer force in the face of its allies’ introduction of conscription at various times during the war, engendered a great sense of pride and uniqueness both within the force itself, and throughout the whole nation.

Institutions such as churches, families, and politicians, actively encouraged all eligible men to enlist. All churches supported the war and sermons were formulated accordingly. Those who did not enlist were not just seen as unpatriotic, some preachers even claimed that those who did not enlist were pro-German. Women were encouraged to persuade not just their own men to enlist, but also all eligible men. If their persuasive techniques failed, they were berated as if it was a personal failure, and it was deemed a blight on both themselves and their femininity. Children were also used to encourage eligible men to enlist. They learned at school about the achievements of Australian troops, of which they were encouraged to take immense pride. It can be imagined that constant hero-worship would be a great inducement to enlist. Prime Minister W.M. Hughes solicited recruitment by writing a personal ‘Call to Arms’ letter to over one million Australian eligible men:

38 Gerhard Fischer, “Negative Integration’ and an Australian Road to Modernity: Interpreting the Australian Homefront Experience in World War I’, in Australian
If you love your country, if you love freedom, then take your place alongside your fellow-Australians at the front and help them to achieve a speedy and glorious victory.  

Local recruitment committees also sent leaflets to all eligible men in the area asking reasons for their failure to enlist, with their replies read out at the committee's next meeting and printed in the local papers as minutes of the meeting. Peer pressure also effected a considerable number of enlistments. Many joined because their mates were doing so. Those men who did not volunteer were branded as ' slackers' and 'shirkers', and it was the duty of those unable to enlist to encourage or pressure them, either overtly or latently, to patriotism and duty.

The legend represents most of the Australian involvement in World War One as positioned on the shores and cliffs of Gallipoli. The invasion of Gallipoli was a failure, and has been described as 'an ill conceived and poorly planned' 'complete and utter administrative disaster'. Historian Gerhard Fischer describes Gallipoli as 'no more than a footnote in the larger history of World War I' because of its isolation from other theatres of war. It therefore provided a 'detached and uncrowded stage' on which Australians could make 'their first public appearance in a major role'. Gallipoli has, however, assumed 'larger-than-life proportions of heroic grandeur' in the Australian imagination. Richard White suggests that with the landing, the 'ready made myth was

---
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given a name, a time and a place'.

Despite its vileness and misery, the Western Front has a minor role and possesses paltry prestige in the Anzac legend where nearly all of the attention is focussed on Gallipoli. Although veterans of Gallipoli were shocked at the intensity and scale of the fighting they experienced once on the Western Front, where as many died in six weeks as died in the whole Gallipoli campaign, the word ‘Anzac’ has become synonymous with ‘Gallipoli’, wherein the former is often used exclusively to refer to the Gallipoli campaign.

The first ‘eye witness’ account of the landing to be printed in an Australian newspaper was that of English journalist Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, which was carried in the Argus on 8 May 1915. Under the headline of ‘Australians at Dardanelles: Thrilling Deeds of Heroism’, he used phrases such as ‘the Australians rose to the occasion’, ‘this race of athletes’, and ‘the Australians proved themselves adepts at this kind of warfare’ to describe the Australians’ superb battle prowess.

Indeed, there was ‘no finer feat’ and ‘these raw colonial troops in these desperate hours proved worthy to fight side by side with the heroes of Mons, the Aisne, Ypres, and Neuve Chapelle’. Before this account appeared however, the Argus was already proclaiming, on 30 April 1915, that the Australians had ‘won honour by their brilliant work’. ‘His Majesty’s Government’ was crediting them with ‘splendid gallantry and magnificent achievement’. The King

---
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himself sent a message that stated the Australian troops had ‘indeed proved
themselves worthy sons of the Empire’. The Argus hastened to explain that it was
indeed ‘high praise ... coming from such an official quarter’ that was not ‘wont to
indulge in the language of exaggeration’.53

The legend was well and truly on its way to entrenchment when, on 3 May
1915, again before Ashmead-Bartlett’s account was carried, the Argus described the
pride that Australians at home were feeling:

The war is beginning to take its toll of our bravest ... bring[ing] grief to the
sorrowing hearts of many ... a grief tempered with that noble pride which old
Spartan fathers and mothers felt when their loved ones fell in obedience to their
country’s call upon the field of battle. Australians have all the high patriotism and
self-control of a ruling race, and they will not let their private sufferings dim their
eyes to the glory of wounds and death incurred in their country’s cause by its
gallant sons ... Already our troops have established a superiority.54

Although official historian C.E.W. Bean’s first news bulletin, delayed by
bureaucracy so that it appeared a week after Ashmead-Bartlett’s, did not specifically
emphasise the Australian combative characteristics, was more objective, and appeared
‘almost insipid’ in comparison, he still praised the Australians and allowed himself the
‘occasional stylistic flourish’. He described the third brigade going:

... over the hills with such dash ... Each ridge was higher than the last, and each
party that reached the top went over it with wild cheers.55

Bean informed readers in Australia that those:

... who saw the Third Brigade go up those heights and over successive summits
like a whirlwind with wild cheers and bayonets flashing, [spoke] of it with tears of
enthusiasm.56

Bean wrote in his diary that ‘War correspon dents have so habitually exaggerated the
heroism of battles that people don’t realise that the real actions are heroic’.57 After

53 Quoted in Robson, Great War, pp.59, 44.
54 Quoted in ibid, p.45.
56 Bean, ‘First Report’, p.4; see also Fewster, ‘Ashmead-Bartlett’, p.20; Robin Gerster,
Big-Noting: The Heroic Theme in Australian War Writing, Melbourne University Press,
Carlton, Victoria, 1987, p.25.
deciding to write ‘responsibly’, he spent a great deal of time in the frontline focusing on the soldiers who he decided were ‘heroic fighters’. \(^{58}\) He claimed that some men ‘died fighting like tigers’. \(^{59}\)

Historian M.R.D. Long has described the Anzacs as:

... probably, man for man, the most impressive combatants this century has seen ... Everyone ... who saw them in action was struck by their air of mastery over themselves and their surroundings. \(^{60}\)

They ‘revealed a distinct quality as warriors’ and the Reverend W. Borland told his congregation at Scots Church that ‘nothing in the history of human bravery’ had surpassed the landing. \(^{61}\) The Reverend W.H. Fitchett, who was the author of best sellers *Deeds that Won the Empire* (1898), and *How England Saved Europe* (1902), stated that ‘Wellington’s lads would not have had the initiative and daring to climb that cliff. That was the “Australian touch”’. \(^{62}\) British Commander Hamilton wrote to the King’s private secretary that the Australians were ‘indubitably splendid fighting stuff’, and Gallipoli Commander Sir John Monash counted himself ‘fortunate’ that he had been placed at the head of ‘the finest fighting machine the world has ever seen’, and described the Australians as ‘the backbone of the Allied Armies’. \(^{63}\)

The British authorities, needing to deliver the heroic picture expected from warfare that was lacking on the Western Front, loudly proclaimed the ‘heroism’ of the ‘colonial sons of Britain’. \(^{64}\) In 1918, British General Hubert Essame regarded the
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\(^{58}\) McKernan, ‘Writing About War’, p.8.

\(^{59}\) Bean, ‘First Report’, p.3.

\(^{60}\) Quoted in Ross, *Myth of the Digger*, p.28.


Australian soldier as ‘the best infantryman of the war and perhaps of all time’. In 1919, Smith’s Weekly described the Australians as an ‘army of warriors’ with ‘the greatest physical perfection that the world has seen ... patient endurance, Herculean labour, unflinching optimism, and, heroism unequalled’. Even advertising for the recent Australian War Memorial travelling exhibition 1918: Australians In France found it necessary to hark back to the first campaign when it announced that ‘the qualities of [the AIF], demonstrated at Gallipoli ... culminated in the victorious actions of 1918’. To the Australians at home, Gallipoli was presented as a ‘tale of heroism that thrilled the world’, and the 1st AIF as practical and resourceful, aggressive, brave, manly, magnificent, and heroic.

The Anzac legend celebrates the Gallipoli campaign as a triumphant defeat. That the Australians had been ‘tested’ for the first time, and were not ‘found wanting’ was reason to celebrate, both on Gallipoli, where the cheers of the wounded ‘resounded throughout the night’, and back in Australia, where, with little tradition of war, its troops had been something of an unknown quantity. The Australian troops, disoriented by the terrain on landing and facing a ‘furious onslaught’, had established themselves by the end of the first day in a strange and desperate campaign that lasted for eight months. They distinguished themselves by the close and ‘bitter’ fighting, the ‘terrible trials of the occupation’, and phenomenal acts of heroism. Earlier parts of the campaign were also considered triumphs however. That the grandson of Eureka’s Peter Lalor was killed on the first day of fighting was considered almost proud destiny by the

66 Quoted in Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.172.
70 Quoted in Robson, Great War, p.59; Robson, p.8.
Bulletin, which had been arguing that Australia’s history began not in 1788, but at Eureka in 1854:

That there should be a Lalor in Australia’s second big fight – a grandson of Peter who was its leader in the first. Old Peter gave an arm; the grandson, his life.71

The evacuation and the whole Dardanelles tragedy met with ‘world-wide applause’, was a ‘meritorious achievement’, and indeed, it has been considered something of a triumph that the evacuation of Gallipoli on the 19th and 20th December 1915 was carried out without loss of life.72 The Australians, however, unwilling to accept defeat and withdrawal, were furious and astonished when rumours of evacuation began to circulate. A wounded Australian who had been repatriated to England wrote the ‘suffering [had been] for nothing’ when hearing about the evacuation. There was some trepidation that the Australians would refuse to fight elsewhere.73 This fear, of course, proved groundless.

Within the Anzac legend there is a grand but contradictory sense of sacrifice: the first of these is that the magnificent deaths were necessary for the nation, whereupon those who died were ‘nobly discharging [their] duty’, and the second is that World War One was a ‘pointless and bloody episode’ fought for a colonial power on foreign soil.74 Almost one quarter of Australia’s total male population enlisted with almost forty per cent of those between the ages of 18 and 45.75 Of almost 60,000

73 2 DRL/0020, Diary, Lt. J.E. Adlard. 1st Divisional Artillery, 20 December 1915; see also Beaumont, Australia’s War, p.12.
75 Nile, ‘Peace, Unreliable Memory’, p.80; K.S. Inglis & Jan Brazier, ‘The Silent Sentinel: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape’, War: Australia’s Creative Response, in Anna Rutherford & James Wieland (eds.), Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, New South Wales, 1997, p.155, gives an enlistment figure of 50 per cent of men between 18 and 45; McKernan, The Australian People, p.82 gives an enlistment figure of 38.7 per cent of all Australian males between the ages of 18 and 44; Thomson, ANZAC Memories, p.25, gives a figure of just under 40 per cent.
Australian men who died in WWI, 8,141 deaths occurred in the Gallipoli campaign.\textsuperscript{76} Over 150,000 were wounded and a further estimated 30,000 died within ten years of the war ending.\textsuperscript{77} Australian casualties were the highest of any of the Allied forces relative to the proportion that saw action.\textsuperscript{78} In any case, households that escaped the loss or maiming of a son or husband were rare.\textsuperscript{79} Prime Minister Billy Hughes, speaking in London on the first anniversary of the landing at Gallipoli, claimed that ‘Through self-sacrifice alone can men or nations be saved’.\textsuperscript{80} Poet Wilfred Owen however, claimed the saying ‘How sweet it is to die for your country’ was ‘the old lie’.\textsuperscript{81} Which ever of these was pertinent to the thoughts of the Australians, many of the Australian troops on the Western Front believed they had next to no possibility of survival.

Sergeant-Major Pat Kinchington of the 3rd Australian Infantry Battalion wrote from France on 26\textsuperscript{th} November 1917:

\begin{quote}
You have no idea of the troops’ sufferings, summer and winter, rain and mud and cold. It really is a mercy for God to take us. I assure you at times I have asked God to take me from this life.\textsuperscript{82}
\end{quote}

Another Australian said:

\begin{quote}
We just go into the line again and again until we get knocked. We’ll never get out of this. Just in and out, in and out, and somebody stonkered every time. Australia has forgotten us, and so has God.\textsuperscript{83}
\end{quote}

Although not disclosed in newspapers at the time, accounts such as English commander of the AIF, General Birdwood’s, that ‘Turks and Australians [were] piled four and five deep on one another’ at Lone Pine in August 1915, eventually found their way into the legend as futility, sorrow, and sacrifice.\textsuperscript{84} At Pozières, the AIF suffered

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{76} Quoted in Beaumont, Australia’s War, p.13.
\textsuperscript{77} Nile, ‘Peace, Unreliable Memory’, p.80.
\textsuperscript{79} ibid.
\textsuperscript{80} Quoted in Ross, Myth of the Digger, pp.14-15.
\textsuperscript{81} Quoted in Laffin, AIF Epitaphs, p.99.
\textsuperscript{82} ibid, pp.74, 130.
\textsuperscript{83} Adlard, Diary, p.34.
\textsuperscript{84} Quoted in Inglis, ‘The Australians at Gallipoli – II’, p.368.
23,000 casualties in six weeks.\textsuperscript{85} John Laffin, who has spent an enormous amount of time touring and documenting the graves and cemeteries containing memorials to fallen members of the AIF, states that the rising sun emblem can be seen in cemeteries all over both Belgium and France. He believes that ‘There is no more vivid and dramatic example of service, courage, endurance, suffering and sacrifice than the graves’.\textsuperscript{86} The rows and rows of white crosses observed on peaceful green lawns, add to the sense of terrible sacrifice made by the AIF in the ‘Great Struggle for the Freedom of the World’. Sister Nellie Pike of the Australian Army Nursing Service called the war a ‘wicked waste of good men’.\textsuperscript{87} Author Eleanor Dark suggested in 1933 that the ‘countless thousands of parents and wives [could not have] preserved their own sanity’ if they had thought this way and not thought of their dead as anything but heroes, sacrificed for the greater good.\textsuperscript{88} Hughie, in Alan Seymour’s play on Anzac Day and conflict between generations, \textit{The One Day of the Year} (1961), states:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

His father Alf replies with the oppositional argument:

\begin{quote}
I’m proud to be a bloody Australian. If it wasn’t for men like my old man this country’d never bin heard of. They put Australia on the map they did, the Anzacs did. An’ bloody died doin’ it.\textsuperscript{89}
\end{quote}

One of the most oft-repeated components of the legend is heroism. An example of the accentuation on heroism as a major characteristic of the AIF can be seen in a documentary representation of a mutiny in 1918. The D Company of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion staged the mutiny at Ruby Wood on the Western Front on 21 September 1918. The three hundred survivors of a once-strong 1,000-man Battalion were very tired and

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{ibid}, p.9.
\textsuperscript{87} Welborn, \textit{Lords of Death}, pp.127-128; Laffin, \textit{Australian Battlefields}, p.7.
\textsuperscript{88} Quoted in Nile, ‘Peace, Unreliable Memory’, p.86.
\textsuperscript{89} Alan Seymour, \textit{The One Day of the Year}, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1973, pp.20, 55.
believed they were going to be granted leave. Instead, they were ordered back into the frontlines. Believing they had been overused in the worst of the fighting and that they had suffered extremely heavy losses, they refused to move. Many of the mutineers were gaolled for ten years, but pardoned once the war was over.90 Journalist John Tognolini states that the event was erased from the history of the war, like so many others that would have ‘tarnished the romantic myth of ANZAC’.91 In 1979, however, a documentary retelling the events was made entitled *Mutiny on the Western Front*. Dale Blair describes the mutineers as having been represented in this documentary as ‘displaying the individual, democratic and egalitarian qualities of the stereotype’. One viewer wrote that the mutineers could not be regarded by anyone as ‘cowards or criminals’ but instead were ‘quiet heroes’.92

John Laffin asserts that Australian epitaphs in cemeteries throughout France and Belgium convey the ‘sunshine and the smell of the bush’, that the Australians who served were ‘independent-minded, brimful of enterprise and initiative, energetic and self-reliant ... not subservient and they disliked authority and discipline’ and that ‘every frontline soldier was a hero’.93 This, in itself, is a summary of the character of the Anzac legend, and it reiterates my assertion that the legend is underlined by prowess and bravery.

The 25 April 1915, the day of the storming of Anzac Cove, is incorporated into the Anzac legend as the defining national event - the nation’s ‘baptism of fire’, the

---

91 Tognolini, ‘The story not told’.
93 Laffin, *AIF Epitaphs*, pp.11, 13, 77.
sacred day when the nation’s soul was proved.94 Interestingly, the Sydney Morning Herald announced on 6th August 1914, only two days after England declared war on Germany, that the war would be Australia’s ‘baptism of fire’, and Bean was one of the first to state that on the 25th April 1915, ‘the consciousness of Australian nationhood was born’.95 One year after the landing, the Sydney Freeman’s Journal greeted the anniversary with the headline ‘Anzac Day: the Birth of a Nation’, and said that before 25 April 1915, the national sentiment had been ‘of a flabby and sprawling character’.96 In 1919 when advertising for letters, diaries, and memoirs of ex-servicemen, the state library of New South Wales, the Mitchell Library, promoted its campaign with the slogan, ‘The war gave Australia the biggest advertisement in its history’.97 Indeed, because of the insistence and recurrent reiteration of these types of statements, historians, one of whom is Geoffrey Serle, argue that most Australians believe them to be true.98

In 1914 Australia was small with an ambiguous nationhood and was ‘a young community without traditions’.99 By 1918, however, it had formed a ‘loyal partnership’ with Great Britain and her allies, suffered the highest percentage of casualties proportionate to the size of its troops, and, by 1919, was left with a debt of £364
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94 Williams, ‘Seven Battles’, p.25; Welborn, Lords of Death, p.3. For ‘baptism of fire’ see the Toowoomba Chronicle, 30 April 1915; Argus, 8 May 1915; Ely, ‘Invented or Discovered?’, p.41; Ross, Myth of the Digger, p.125; White, Inventing Australia, pp.127-128; Beaumont, Australia’s War, p.4; Thomson, ANZAC Memories, pp.53, 134.
million. Although Australia had federated as a nation in January 1901, the populations of each state still thought of themselves as Victorians or South Australians and so on. There is no doubt that the war brought men from each state of the country under the mantle and status of ‘Australian’ for the first time and was a major force in unifying the population as ‘Australians’. They were, the war proclaimed, at last a people. Events at Gallipoli on 25 April 1915, the first, terrible instance when many Australian lives were lost in battle, resulted in a unified allegiance to the nation, a loss of innocence, and pride in its achievements. The ‘national character’ had been tested and validated.

In the legend, the Anzac’s superior qualities are attributable to uniquely Australian characteristics, and his natural ability therefore makes him a natural soldier who is masculine and virile. Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett’s account of the landing emphasised not only the Australians’ magnificence in battle, but also their ‘remarkable physique’. Because of the closeness of Gallipoli to the geographical theatre of classical Greece, the ‘legendary Trojan battlefield’, comparisons between Greek athletes and heroes of old, and the Australians, began at the landing, particularly by the British correspondents. This may be accounted for by detailing that in August 1914 the standards for enlistees were quite stringent, with at least 5 foot 6 inches in height and
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a 34 inch chest, and that the Australians were more likely to strip down to their shorts or to nakedness than the troops of its Allies.\textsuperscript{105} English poet John Masefield wrote that the Australians ‘walked and looked like Kings in old poems’, and writer Compton Mackenzie praised them for their ‘absolute beauty’, their ‘tallness and majestic simplicity’, and their ‘litheness and powerful grace’ of which any one could have been ‘Ajax … Hector or Achilles’. He said their bodies were as ‘near to absolute beauty’ as he should ever hope to see.\textsuperscript{106} The tall, blond, athletic hero, Archy Hamilton (Mark Lee) of the film \textit{Gallipoli} (1981) is the epitome of all that is revered in the Anzac, as is George Johnston’s Jack in \textit{My Brother Jack} (1964):

\begin{quote}
He was so darkly sunburnt that his hair seemed almost white, and he looked tough, hard, and very fit ... strong, graceful boxer’s legs, a deep brown now and dusted with a thick gold down of hair ... here was a man totally sure of the rightness of what he was doing.\textsuperscript{107}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
In a 1919 ‘proud Roll and Record’ detailing Australian recipients of the Victoria Cross (VC), Sir Walter Davidson, the Governor of New South Wales, stated that the honour of the VC typified the Australian race because, while retaining the best qualities of their British ancestors, Australians had added:

\begin{quote}
... fearlessness in the face of danger, and a resourcefulness amid unknown difficulties which are special attributes to their upbringing in this fair land of Australia – some day to become the greater Britain of the Southern Seas. The People which produce the heroes of today and have attained to a Nation’s manhood, are a race of born and trained athletes, because they are free and well nurtured and are reared under ideal conditions.\textsuperscript{108}
\end{quote}

That the Australians were so masculine, vigorous, resourceful, and independent was attributable to generations having had to fight, survive, and carve out a livelihood in

\textsuperscript{105} Ross, \textit{Myth of the Digger}, p.32; Flaherty, ‘Anzac Symbolism’, p.58. The physical standards of recruits lowered as the war progressed. By June 1915 the age limit had been increased from 35 to 45 years, and height lowered to 5 ft 2 ins. By 1917, height requirements had been reduced to 5 ft.

\textsuperscript{106} Quoted in Nile, ‘Origins of Anzac’, p.35.


the inhospitable Australian bush. Almost ten years after the war, Bean was still insisting that:

... the country-bred man is, other things being equal, the better soldier ... [and that] the proportion of those who think and act for themselves is considerably higher than in the towns.

The legend has it that the 1st AIF was a superior fighting force because of its egalitarian composition. Because Australia was not a class-based but was a classless society, all men were of equal value, and anyone could be promoted. Bean suggests that the Australian ‘knew only one social horizon, that of race’. Historian David Huggonson points out that the 400 Aboriginal Australians who served were afforded ‘honorary white status, and enjoyed the same pay and conditions as their comrades’. They were even allowed to vote in the conscription referendum, something they would have been prohibited from doing had they still been in Australia. Because the members of the AIF were extremely aware of their voluntary status, that they were citizen soldiers, they believed that the rules and disciplines that applied to other armies did not apply to them. The inflexible, semi-feudal distinctions and separations of the British Army were seen as explanations why the British were not as efficacious as had been expected. In contrast, the talent of the AIF:

... was not in spite of the Australian Jack's being as good as his master, but because of it – or, more accurately, because in the AIF Jack and his master were the same.

The Anzac of the legend has a wry sense of humour and is a good-natured larrikin who is somewhat undisciplined. These attributes intermingle but there is
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114 Bean quoted in Gerster, Big-Noting, pp.70-71.
nothing offensive or damaging about his larrikinism because he is very likeable. The number of anecdotes and yarns that could be offered as examples of the Australian humour are endless, however, a glance through some of the troopship and trench newspapers and *The Anzac Book* (1916) reveals the wry sense of humour and the resigned acceptance of conditions and life in general.\textsuperscript{115} The Australians of the legend are hardened gamblers, often gambling on the likelihood of another making it through a burst of shellfire, and they swore profusely.\textsuperscript{116} Just like the stories, jokes and cartoons in *The Anzac Book*, edited by Bean, their humour admits the discomforts of the troops’ lives and highlights the wry humour that was one of the Anzacs’ main ways of coping, which they did with a grin.\textsuperscript{117}

The legend devotes great significance and value to the creed of mateship. Mateship is a code of honour and a unifying force that is held up and revered as an ideal. In the 1984 television mini-series *Bodyline*, which tells the story of the 1932-33 cricket series between Australia and England, the actor representing Vic Richardson stirs up, challenges, and inspires his fellow cricketers to get out onto the cricket field regardless of the amount of damaging bouncers they may have to face:

That’s what built this country. Going out against all the odds and giving it your best ... That’s what comes from the shores of Gallipoli; somewhere out there they taught us about courage, about loyalty to your mates, and about being Australian.\textsuperscript{118}

Circumstances and surroundings at Gallipoli were not conducive to conforming to or observing strict separations of rank, and therefore proved extremely hospitable to the


notion of ‘mateship’. This ‘relationship between men’ was regarded as one of the highest of qualities, and a man stood by his mate regardless of the consequences.\textsuperscript{119} The legend has it that of all troops of all countries, mateship is a monopoly of, and quite unique to, the AIF, and it accounts for their staying power at Gallipoli and in the hellhole of the Western Front.\textsuperscript{120} Unlike the British, Australians of a particular region were kept together throughout the War. This meant that regardless of the date of enlistment, or how long a soldier spent in hospital, he would always be living with, and fighting beside, men from his own area of Australia.\textsuperscript{121} This unquestionably encouraged a sense of cohesion between the men, where they thought of themselves as a distinct geographical unit. The immense distance between Australia, the Dardanelles and the Western Front meant that the Australian troops could not return to their homeland for regular leave. The battalion became home, and fellow soldiers, a man’s family. The common identity of country, region, and usually trade or employment, together with the Australian kit, the slouch hat, the sense of humour, the vernacular, the common disrespect to authority and discipline, and the knowledge that he was a citizen-soldier, moulded the Australians into a cohesive force, where mateship was the code.\textsuperscript{122}

The Anzac legend brings with it an interesting phenomenon. As previously mentioned, the word ‘Anzac’ holds a special place in the Australian psyche. Whenever ‘Anzac’ is used, regardless of the context, there is a subconscious attachment of those aspects of the legend that are appropriate to, and correspond with, the context of its usage. For example, a recent newspaper article informed of a group of 500 Harley-Davidson motorbike riders shipping their bikes to the United States of America for the brand’s centenary celebrations. Because there is also a group from New Zealand attending the festivities, organisers are going to arrange ‘a special Anzac party’ for
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them. In this context, those aspects of the legend that subconsciously attach themselves to the article are that they are good Australians, they exude their masculinity, they are independent and hardy, have adventuresome spirits, a touch of larrikinism, they are classless, and they stand by their mates. There is also the side-by-side partnership with New Zealanders – mostly forgotten with Australia’s appropriation of the legend. The word ‘Anzac’ legitimises the bikers by negating any lawless images, and reduces any bad behaviour to loveable larrikinism.

On Anzac Day 2002, a 19 year-old friend of mine, Brett Bermingham, died after a battle with cancer. He was eulogised by his sister Alycia as having been:

... the leader of an army in the biggest war [their] family had ever seen ... he pushed the enemy back for two years and five months ... Brett was not willing to concede defeat ... Brett was ... a true soldier. One who personified what the Anzac spirit was about.

In this instance, ‘Anzac’ refers to Brett’s heroically brave and spirited, but ultimately futile fight against all odds. There is a recruitment poster on the wall of the Outpost Café at the Australian War Memorial. It is a representation of three servicemen: one each from the navy, army, and air force. The cap of the serviceman from the navy is embossed with the word ‘ANZAC’. For recruitment purposes, this serves as a reminder of all of the positive connotations of the Anzac legend, especially masculinity, and encourages a young man to enlist and earn the respect and reverence of a grateful nation. The word ‘Anzac’ even ensures that there is something vaguely patriotic about Anzac biscuits, particularly if they are the brand endorsed by the Returned and Services League of Australia.

**Anzac Day**

To argue that the Australian Field Bakeries have been overlooked in histories of the First World War because they do not correspond to the characteristics of the Anzac
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legend, particularly masculinity and heroism, requires stress on the importance of Anzac Day on the Australian calendar and an outline of the soldierly qualities revered on this special day. Historian Lloyd Robson calls Anzac Day the ‘nation’s annual funeral’, and journalist Luke Slattery believes it has ‘become a quasi-religious ceremony or form of ancestor worship’. Over the past forty years, many historians, such as Jeffrey Grey, Geoffrey Serle, Richard Nile, David Kent, Suzanne Welborn, and Maurie Scott have suggested that Anzac Day is more important to Australians than Australia Day, and is the ‘de-facto’ national day.

On 25 April 1915 the Australian troops stormed ashore at Anzac Cove at Gallipoli in the Dardanelles. Less than eight months later, they had evacuated the area, their efforts ending in defeat, and leaving behind over 8,000 dead. The first anniversary of the attack, which was labelled ‘Anzac Day’, almost passed in Australia without any formal remembrance. Only ten days earlier, 15 April 1916, Australian Defence Minister and Acting Prime Minister George Pearce suggested to ex-Prime Minister and Australia’s High Commissioner in London Andrew Fisher, that they delay their decision on a date for commemoration until the war was over so they could then
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decide which event was ‘more worthy of remembering’. Victorian premier Sir Alexander Peacock also believed that ‘other deeds as glorious as ANZAC may yet be achieved’ and they should wait until the war finished before deciding on an event for homage and tribute. On 25 April, however, church services and public meetings were held where ‘returned servicemen and soldiers’ relatives’ were honoured and those who had died were venerated as heroes. This was followed by a formal silence of one minute. Victorian state schools conducted observance ceremonies. In London there was ‘a great celebration ... at the anniversary of the landing at Anzac’ and a meticulously crafted march through the streets of London by 2,000 Anzacs. Australian Prime Minister Billy Hughes lauded the Australians and his speech included that the men exhibited ‘glorious valour’, gave their lives ‘gladly’, and that ‘Through self-sacrifice alone can men or nations be saved’. Journalist and historian Peter Charleton describes the day as ‘an astute and cynical propaganda exercise’, and E.M. Andrews states it was an ‘impressive cover-up’ that ‘conveniently blurred ... that Gallipoli was a disaster while [it] promot[ed] Hughes’ image as the leader of fighting men’.

In 1923, an act of parliament added Anzac day to ‘the Australian calendar of commemorative occasions’, and by 1927 all states had declared 25 April a public holiday. Alistair Thomson claims that Anzac Day commemorations almost vanished in the early 1920s, although the event was still observed in schools. From the mid-1920s, however, it made a resurgence and was ‘institutionalised as a popular patriotic
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In 1926, General John Monash said the event had become a day when the Australian populace stopped to ‘mourn their dead and honour their memory’. Despite society’s interest in commemorating the day waxing and waning over the course of the twentieth century, the services and marches are now drawing record crowds.

Such is the magnitude of Anzac Day in the Australian consciousness that there is a dispute over the location of the first Dawn Service. At 4 in the morning of 25 April 1919 at Toowoomba, Queensland, a Captain George Harrington of the 9th Battalion, and his friends placed flowers on memorials to those killed in action in WWI and then toasted their memories with rum. The next two years followed the same pattern, with the toast being made at the first light of dawn. A bugler played the Last Post and Reveille. At dawn on 25 April 1923 at Mount Clarence overlooking King George Sound in Albany, Western Australia, Reverend Ernest White and a group he assembled watched a wreath float out to sea. White then recited: ‘As the sun rises and goeth down we will remember them’. Reports of the poignant ceremony spread quickly.

Reverend White said:

Albany was the last sight of land these ANZAC troops saw after leaving Australian shores and some of them never returned. We should hold a service [here] at the first light of dawn each ANZAC Day to commemorate them.

On 25 April 1927 the first official Dawn Service was held at the Sydney cenotaph. Regardless of which of these places can claim to have conducted the first ceremony, it can be discerned that these services were held to remember those who did not return.
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It can also be noticed that the rituals of the Harrington and White ceremonies were quickly established as the rites and rituals of subsequent Anzac Day services held in all parts of Australia.

Anzac Day services have become very elaborate over the course of the twentieth century. The rites and rituals are similar throughout Australia and places throughout the world where Australians have been involved in conflict with other nations: The Last Post sounds, followed by a formal silence, which is then followed by Reveille and a verse of Laurence Binyon’s poem *To The Fallen*:

They shall grow not old as we that are left grow old;  
Age shall not weary them nor the years condemn.  
At the going down of the sun and in the morning;  
We will remember them.141

The words ‘Lest we forget’ follow the ode, which are then optionally repeated by those present. Over the years, the services have expanded to become much more involved, with ‘hymns, readings, pipers and rifle volleys’, the national anthem, and speeches, usually from politicians or highly ranked Returned and Services League office bearers.142

Historian Deborah Tyler writes that Anzac Day has ‘change[d] shape to maintain its validity’.143 It now accepts and supports people from other nations. In 1986, Vietnamese migrants were allowed to march for the first time.144 In the early 1990s, migrants who had served with the Allied forces were invited to march in their
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etnic groups. In 2001, one hundred people attended the first Anzac Day service ever held at Doomadgee, North Queensland, in honour of the town’s Aboriginal men who had enlisted even though they were not recognised as Australian citizens. In 2002, the Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs, Gary Hardgrave, called for all ethnic groups in Australia to join in Anzac Day ceremonies. His press release invited:

... all Australians, including newly arrived migrants and refugees, to observe ANZAC Day as one of the most important symbols that unifies us as a nation ... The common bond of citizenship we share is at the heart of a unified and inclusive Australia ... Together, we have worked to create a nation the ANZAC troops would be proud of today.

Anzac Day has certainly changed shape by acknowledging and admitting all service personnel, whether or not they were a part of the Australian forces and regardless of their origin. As can be recognised by Minister Hardwick’s press release, however, rhetoric surrounding Anzac Day has remained unaltered since Prime Minister Hughes’s ‘astute and cynical propaganda exercise’ of 1916. It is a forum for appealing to conservative values, and opportunistic politicking. In 1987 Victorian state governor Dr Davis McCaughey urged his listeners to unselfishness, moderation and generosity, and to do everything within their power to help others. Alastair Thomson documented the then Victorian State President of the Returned and Services League, Bruce Ruxton, as using the occasion to call for ‘racial purity, the importance of the monarchy and Australian defence preparedness’. In 2003 Australian Defence Minister Robert Hill used the occasion to secure support for the decision to send Australian troops to Iraq when he said:
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You have to draw the line in the sand on the issue of weapons of mass destruction ... Others of the like of Saddam Hussein, who hold weapons of mass destruction as a tool to strategic advantage, will know civilised communities will no longer tolerate such threats. 151

In 2003 at Canberra’s Anzac Day service, Prime Minister John Howard expressed his gratitude that the Australian troops in Iraq were safe, and then offered the government’s sanitised and alternative reason for the deployment, that ‘They went in our name in a just cause to do good things to liberate a people’. 152 Journalist Christopher Bantick states that he is uncomfortable with Defence Force Chief General Peter Cosgrove’s invocation of:

... the Anzac spirit, [by] suggesting that the soldiers on operations in Iraq are “... following in the proud traditions of our forefathers who first stepped on the shores of Gallipoli”. 153

Historian Joan Beaumont says that, ‘Most people who write about memory say the past is used in politics to legitimise the values of the present’. 154

The Anzac Day discourse encompasses a romanticised and triumphantly overt emphasis on, amongst other things such as mateship and the birth of the nation, bravery and heroism, and masculinity. In a 1980 Anzac Day lead up edition, The Australian Women’s Weekly stated that on Anzac Day, old Gallipoli veterans ‘will straighten their shoulders and find from somewhere the gait that once they knew’. 155

Journalist Peter Flaherty states that:

Nearly 9000 Australians were killed and more than 19,000 were injured but their heroism and feats of bravery earned them the respect of the nation and the admiration of the world. 156

In 2003, the Australian Prime Minister was reported as saying that Anzac Day is a celebration of the courage, valour, mateship, decency and ‘a willingness as a nation to
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do the right thing, whatever the cost'. At the 2003 Dawn Service at the memorial at
Gallipoli, federal treasurer Peter Costello ‘paid homage to the original Anzacs and to
the nation and ideals they helped create’. He was also reported as saying that:

... Anzac gave the nation a consciousness of itself, the knowledge that Australians
were distinct and different and now proud, with their feats of courage and their
own history on the international stage.

In 2003, the *West Australian* newspaper reported that Anzac Day:

... is a day for reunions and old songs and battalions walking by and hymns and
prayers and thoughts for the 100,000 Australians who died in war, and for two-up.
It is a day when those who went to war smile and shake hands with strangers who
stand applauding and sometimes call out to them: ‘You’re still my heroes’.

Returned and Services League president William Gaynor expressed his satisfaction that
those veterans and casualties from the:

... ‘forgotten wars’ ... Korea, Borneo, Indonesia and Vietnam would be
commemorated alongside the heroes of the world wars in ... [the 2004]
compulsory government school Anzac Day services.

Battle prowess and heroism are intrinsically masculine when connected to
Anzac, even when gender is unspecified. These Anzac Day heroes are men, and most
of the marchers are men. The masculinity of the march is palpable. Historian Jeffrey
Grey maintains that of all experiences ‘white’ Australian men shared in the twentieth
century, ‘military service’ accounted for the greatest commonality. There are ever-
increasing ruminations about the now old and stooped men who were once vigorous
and the finest of Australia’s masculinity. There is a plaque hanging in the offices of
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the Queensland state headquarters of the Returned and Services League underlining the gender divide of war. It reads in part:

... I saw the going down of the sun on that first ANZAC Day ... I was an Army private ... a Naval commander ... an Air Force bombardier. No man knows me ... no name marks my tomb, for I am every Australian serviceman ... I am the Unknown Soldier.\textsuperscript{165}

Although women are now included in marches on Anzac Day, it is the service man whose valiant and heroic deeds are revered regardless that 'his individuality and personality [has been] subsumed in the mass of servicemen ' (my emphasis).\textsuperscript{166} The achievements of these men, once boys, are celebrated and acclaimed, for it is these men, or their forebears, whose military manhood gave Australia its foundation and identity, and whose spirit 'became the canon of Australian life'.\textsuperscript{167}

\textbf{Anzac Historiography}

The Australian historiography of World War One has evolved over the course of the twentieth century and is still drawing responses – some unique and others following what I believe is the ‘conventional’ or ‘Bean’ approach. Although I believe that almost every piece of written information on WWI is relevant to my study in some way, I have had to be savage in choosing those to review. My discussion is divided into approaches designated under the headings of Bean Revisionist, the Masculinist Myth, Statistics of Enlistment, Commemorations of Anzac, and Oral Histories. Finally, I explain how I have drawn on each of these approaches in my study of the Australian Field Bakeries.

Bean revisionist approaches

Official war historian, C.E.W. Bean, was very impressed with the character, fighting qualities and heroism shown by the Australians under tough conditions, and identified them as national traits. He believed that 'The worse the conditions of war, the more heroic was the ordinary Australian soldier'. Bean noted in his first volume that 'a standard of complete indifference to shell fire' became the 'standard' at 'Anzac'. They regarded shrapnel as if it was 'a summer shower'. The Australian men carried on with their duties without even the 'flicker of an eyelid', such was their 'careless, easy manner'. This then went on to distinguish and characterise Australians on every battlefield. Bean had always thought of the Australian bushman as a superior being due to the good food, benign climate, and active life. Accompanying the Australian convoy to Egypt, he concluded that the Australian soldiers exhibited the characteristics of the bushmen: natural, bold and brave fighters, tough, resourceful, an inquisitiveness and an eagerness to learn, laconic, independent, able decision-makers, and anti-authoritarian. It can be concluded that Bean was instrumental in propagandising and building up the characteristics of the AIF soldier, and the suggestion that they were common national traits.

Since the 1960s, historians began to question the objectivity of Bean's historical accounts of WWI, as well as examining the effects of the war on members of the AIF and those previously excluded by the historiography. In 1968, Noel McLachlan stated that the members of the AIF were encouraged to consider themselves as 'an elite with the aura of heroes', and he argued that those who did not enlist paid for it for the rest
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of their lives.\textsuperscript{172} McLachlan is just one of a large number of historians such as Lionel Dennis, Eric Andrews, Richard White, Marilyn Lake, Annabel Cooper, Alistair Thomson, and Terry King, who assert that the digger legend has been ‘profoundly divisive’.\textsuperscript{173}

In 1987, Robin Gerster released his inquiry into the Anzac legend and the resultant impact on Australian identity, named \textit{Big-Noting: The Heroic Theme in Australian War Writing}.\textsuperscript{174} Gerster explains the term ‘big-noting’ as ‘the giving of extravagant praise to oneself or the exaggeration of one’s own importance’, and argues that such skiting is apparent in all WWI writing, including letters, memoirs, and diaries.\textsuperscript{175} He contends that Australians were very happy to accept the ‘swagger [that ran] through Australian war prose’ with reports of unique soldierly, fierce and strong heroes, because of their eagerness to hear that the country’s young men were starring on the world stage.\textsuperscript{176}

Gerster calls attention to the emphases on masculinity and heroism in the first reports from Gallipoli by Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett and C.E.W. Bean, and repeated by ‘later memorialists’.\textsuperscript{177} He argues that Bean is of utmost significance ‘in securing for the Digger a supreme place in the pantheon of Australian heroes’.\textsuperscript{178} Gerster also notes that Bean wrote about those at ‘the cutting edge of battle’ so that he could ‘distribute the credit as widely as possible among those who deserve it’.\textsuperscript{179} Gerster’s history questions whether the Anzac legend accurately relates the true experiences of the
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Australian soldiers because, rather than heroics, many of their own accounts instead centred on their ‘suffering’. 180

In 1988 historian John Barrett wrote a spirited defence of Bean’s works entitled ‘No Straw Man: C.E.W. Bean and Some Critics’. He accused Bean’s critics, such as Kevin Fewster, Alistair Thomson, David Kent, Lloyd Robson, and Suzanne Welborn, of selectively using parts of Bean’s works without taking context or reconsiderations into account. 181 In a 1989 article entitled “‘Steadfast Until Death’? C.E.W. Bean and the Representation of Australian Military Manhood’, Alistair Thomson returned fire on Barrett’s defence of Bean. 182 This title is a somewhat sarcastic querying of a claim in a footnote in the *Official History*, wherein Bean asserts the Australians were:

> Steadfast until death, just the men that Australians at home know them to be ... holding fast through anything that man can imagine ... 183

Thomson rebuts the criticism levelled at himself and others by Barrett, stating that Barrett misunderstood the assessments of Bean’s reviewers. In this article Thomson focuses on Bean’s choice of language, the way he constructed the stories, and the belief system behind his version of Australian military manhood. 184 Thomson concludes that Bean fashioned his histories to correspond with his own preconceptions and ideals of ‘national loyalty and patriotism’. 185

Thomson argues that incidents or battles that Bean describes as being ‘SHEER HEROISM’, such as the charge at the Nek, where the “‘flower of the [Western Australian] youth” ... run “as swiftly and as straight”’ as they can towards the Turkish
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trenches, were really horrifying experiences and a tragic waste. Bean’s concept of heroism, explained as being a part of the national character, was difficult for some soldiers to achieve. Thomson argues that repressing their terrors in an attempt to match the Anzac reputation of courage and discipline undoubtedly led to mental breakdown. Bean, however, handled these breakdowns as rare occurrences and often 'defined their behaviour disapprovingly as "malingering"'.

In 1994, E.M. (Eric Montgomery) Andrews’s inquiry into what he describes as the illusions of WWI, The Anzac Illusion: Anglo-Australian relations during World War I, was released. The ‘illusion’ of Andrews’s text refers to two of the main themes of the Anzac legend: the first is the special bond with Britain, and the second is that the Australian soldiers were much better fighters than those of the other British armies. Andrews argues that the Anglo-Australian relationship was not as close as many have contended. He also argues that Australians were not ‘different from, and better than, other soldiers in the British armies of WWI’. Andrews’s book proved highly controversial: following the release of this text, a cartoon appeared wherein Andrews was represented as stabbing a WWI soldier in the back with his pen.

Andrews suggests that new and groundbreaking analyses of military history can be made as new sources become available, and argues, as does Alistair Thomson, that many Australian historians have been lazy because they have used Bean’s works as the basis for their own, instead of researching primary sources and ‘thinking for
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themselves’. Andrews maintains that Bean’s writing style made his prose problematical because of its ‘emotional propagandising’. He asserts that a lot of Bean’s work needs to be re-evaluated because it is insular and ‘preoccupied with heaping praise on Australian soldiers’, without a fair comparison of the soldiers of other countries. He acknowledges that New Zealand was effectively ignored or overlooked.

There are significant advantages and limitations of the Bean revisionist approaches. They lead to a questioning and re-examination of Bean’s claims and conclusions of the characteristics of the Australians of the AIF, and activate a more realistic evaluation of Australia’s role in the war. An acknowledgement that Bean concentrated almost solely on the infantry combatant means these approaches also lead to an examination of the roles of other members of the AIF. This results in a more comprehensive historiography of the war. Conversely, the main limitation of the Bean revisionist approaches is that, with Bean and his works at the heart of the research, historians might be reduced to a narrow, almost tunnel vision, wherein the goal becomes to rebut Bean’s works rather than to construct new histories.

**The Masculinist Myth**

Many authors have acknowledged the emphasis on masculinity and the exclusion of the female within the Anzac legend and much of the historiography. Anzac is a powerfully masculinist mythology. Masculinity is, of course, very much intertwined with emphases on heroism. Some authors examine conceptions of masculinity and heroism and identify that these notions have excluded not only women, but more importantly for my study, some returned WWI servicemen.
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In 1975 Carmel Shute explored gender and war and discussed Australian women’s roles during the war as mothers and suppliers of future soldiers, as urgers of men to do their duty, and nurses, all of whom:

... were cast into the age-old abyss of powerlessness, of resignation to suffering, of waiting [while] ... the men went off to war, to decide the fate of nations and to achieve 'fame, glory and manhood'.

Shute concludes that masculinity and national identity are one, and that WWI ensured that Australian women continued to retain their passive and subordinate status. In 1919, the journal Lone Hand described the Australian serviceman as 'the most virile thing on earth ... [with] Australian manhood [being Australia’s] chief asset'. Shute asserts that 'the Australian male was enshrined on the battlefield as a super-masculine hero'.

Feminist Annabel Cooper concedes that most military histories exclude women, but argues that the Australian Anzac became the ‘quintessential Australian’ to the detriment of women, who were ‘frustrated at every turn’. Cooper determines that the war was never a unifying force in Australia because Anzac instituted masculinity as the core of Australian nationalism, which ‘banish[ed] female worlds back to the margins’.

Joy Damousi and Marilyn Lake explain that warfare has always entailed ‘a series of conceptual oppositions’ between genders, and that in WWI ‘Australian men proved their manhood and their historical agency and reinforced our nationhood all at once’,
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while the divide ensured a woman’s relegation to passivity and subordination. Damousi and Lake conclude that although the legend stresses masculinity and heroism, in actuality, some ‘men were reduced in scale ... in an overpowering technological wasteland of exhaustion, terror and destruction’. They claim that notwithstanding the idiom maintaining war brings out the best in masculinity, it actually creates ‘a crisis in masculinity’. The authors assert that shellshock in WWI is a ‘stark reminder of the fragility of masculinity’. When a hysterical soldier cracked from shell shock, it was at first thought to be cowardice, madness or disorderly behaviour. Damousi and Lake maintain that few men returned from the war psychologically sound.

Alistair Thomson continues the argument that war created a crisis in masculinity. He contends that:

Soldiers struggled to compose masculine identities that bridged the gap between the potentially emasculating effects of much war experience and the macho rhetoric of martial propaganda. The men, although often finding the legend positive and ‘empowering’, also found it sometimes difficult to reconcile the differences between ‘personal experience and the public presentations of Anzac manhood’. Having experiences running counter to the legend caused many to repress their own memories. Thomson states that the Anzac identity is ‘defined in terms of masculine and national ideals’. He maintains ‘The
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Australian national identity ... did not necessarily distinguish between Australians in and out of the line.207

There are advantages and limitations to the masculinist myth approaches to Anzac historiography. They expose those excluded by the Anzac myth with its emphasis on heroism and masculinity, and determine that even those who theoretically correspond to these ideals do not necessarily do so. Acknowledging emotional distress as more than just weakness, endows legitimacy upon those so affected. Similarly, an examination of masculine and feminised roles within the AIF reveals the rationale basic to the prominence of the fighting combatant in current historiography. Advantages also include a revelation and emphasis that there were others, specifically women within Australia, who performed various roles: knitters of socks and other items imagined as specifically required by the soldiers, mothers, wives, dance partners, anti-conscriptionists and anti-war advocates, and prostitutes. On the other hand, most of the historiography on the masculinist myth relates to women and their exclusion from the Anzac legend. This means there is a dearth of examination into male exclusion from the myth.

**Statistics of Enlistment**

Some historians have approached Anzac by gathering statistics from enlistment attestation papers, and then using this information to assess claims by C.E.W. Bean or compare various groups within the AIF. Three of these are Lloyd Robson’s article ‘The Origin and Character of the First A.I.F., 1914-1918: Some Statistical Evidence’ (1973), Suzanne Welborn’s *Lords of Death: a people a place a legend*, and Dale Blair’s *Dinkum Diggers: An Australian Battalion at War* (2001).208
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Robson examined 2,291 enlistment papers, which amounts to .55 per cent of the 1st AIF’s 417,000 service dossiers. Robson utilises the data gathered to reach various conclusions about the 1st AIF in its entirety. The statistics allow an assessment of some of Bean’s claims and conclusions: claims such as the quintessential strong and independent bush-Australian as making up the backbone of the AIF, the relationships between Other Ranks and their officers, and the egalitarian nature of the force where a man could be promoted from the ranks because of his abilities.

Welborn’s text charts the histories of 1,500 men from three Western Australian battalions: the 10th Australian Light Horse and the 11th and 28th Battalions, through their inception to their return to Australia. Her argument follows Bean’s bushman-soldier theories and embraces fully the legendary aspects of the Anzac, particularly those of heroism and masculinity. When originally published in 1982, the title of her text was Lords of Death: a people a place a legend. Upon the book’s reprint, the title was altered to Bush Heroes: a people a place a legend. This is a significant change because Welborn’s emphasis throughout the history is that the men from Western Australia, and particularly those from the bush such as miners, shearers, and farmers, had all of the characteristics and skills that made them extremely capable and heroic soldiers. The words ‘Lords of Death’ do not have the same implicit meaning as ‘Bush Heroes’. The latter is much closer to the emphases on masculinity and heroism underlining her history of these battalions. Although Welborn’s study is not primarily statistical, she scrutinises 1,500 enlistment papers, amounting to .36 per cent of the war’s service dossiers. Her statistics are positioned at the back of her text, and although used to reach conclusions, are secondary to the history she recounts.

Dale Blair’s Dinkum Diggers: An Australian Battalion at War, examines the Anzac legend in relation to the 1st Battalion and commemorates those who served in
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the unit’.\textsuperscript{211} He utilises oral histories, unit diaries and operational records, and attestation papers and casualty/record of service forms in his exposé of aspects of the battalion and themes not covered by earlier war histories that he describes as ‘laudatory and humorous with an emphasis on the comradeship and sacrifice involved with the men’s war experience’\textsuperscript{212} He states that ‘narrowing the focus of Australian war experience to a single battalion, [meant that] nuances in behaviour that ha[d] been previously undiscovered [would] be revealed’.\textsuperscript{213} Blair employs statistics to make comparisons between officers and other ranks, and draws out the significance of a man’s prior occupation, religion, and height, on his chance of promotion.\textsuperscript{214}

Statistics are revealing; their analysis can uncover fine distinctions between aspects under discussion, and they can shed light on a specific context. They provide not just another angle to the discussion, but a check on whether the hypothesis under discussion is sound. Other historical documents can be allied with or opposed to the evidence exposed by statistics. One of the main pitfalls of using statistics is that selective interpretations are sometimes used, either intentionally or otherwise, to mislead.

**Commemorations of Anzac**

Ken Inglis makes an interesting observation about memorials and C.E.W. Bean. He states that Bean’s histories were written ‘to be a monument to the men who fought – a literary equivalent to the National War Memorial’.\textsuperscript{215} In this case, the memorial is a number of volumes of written histories, rather than metal, stone, marble, or concrete constructions. Many authors have written about the commemoration of Anzac. Some authors such as Inglis in ‘The Anzac Tradition’ (1965), ‘Memorials of the Great War’
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with Jan Brazier, examine the Australian War Memorial in Canberra and war memorials in various towns.\textsuperscript{216} These approaches are descriptive, but also analyse decisions for particular representations and who are thus excluded. Ann Millar concentrates on the history behind the decision to accumulate records and artefacts, and the ultimate building of the Australian War Memorial.\textsuperscript{217}

Historians, such as John Laffin, study memorials outside Australia.\textsuperscript{218} In \textit{We Will Remember Them: AIF Epitaphs of World War 1} (1995), Laffin examines hundreds of inscriptions on the overseas graves of those killed in WWI, and in \textit{Guide to Australian Battlefields of the Western Front 1916 – 1918} (1999), he visits each cemetery on the Western Front. Both of these are histories, not necessarily all encompassing, of WWI, using the memorials as signposts to guide the narrative.

In 1990, Peter Cochrane wrote an analysis of the fund-raising efforts for the Simpson memorial at the Shrine of Remembrance in Melbourne entitled ‘Legendary Proportions: The Simpson Memorial Appeal of 1933’.\textsuperscript{219} He examines the decision to build the memorial and the problems encountered from plan to fruition. Cochrane speculates it is Simpson’s identification with the feminine qualities of care giving that located the appeal within ‘the woman’s sphere’; this attracted donations from women and children but failed to bring large contributions.\textsuperscript{220}

The main advantage of the commemoration of Anzac approach is that it reveals all aspects of the myth and glory of the Anzac. By doing this, it exposes the relevance
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to past and present Australians of the country’s first major foray into world events. The major limitation of this approach is that, while enhancing an understanding of popular myth, it does not challenge this myth in any significant way, and in most cases, does not add appreciably to new histories of the war or the AIF.

**Oral Histories**

‘Oral histories’ is perhaps a misnomer as a classification of the work of those historians who have utilised interviews, soldiers’ letters and diaries, and unit and regimental diaries and routine orders. Only the interviews, of course, can be strictly categorised as oral history. It is necessary to give a clear definition of what I select ‘oral histories’ to be in the context of this study. It is ‘oral reminiscence’, which are ‘first hand recollections of people interviewed by a historian’, not ‘oral tradition’, which are ‘narratives and descriptions of past peoples and events handed down orally over several generations’. For classification purposes in this study, however, ‘oral histories’ includes primary sources from the period that convey, in the men’s own words, their daily lives, and general thoughts about their world.

In 1974 when Bill Gammage published *The Broken Years: Australian Soldiers in the Great War*, it was the first study of Australians at war to use private letters and diaries as ‘source material’. Since then, other historians such as Alistair Thomson, Suzanne Welborn, and Dale Blair have used interviews, personal letters and diaries, and official unit and regimental diaries and routine orders, to write their own interpretations of the experiences and circumstances of the men upon which they were focused.

Gammage utilised the diaries and letters of one thousand Australian soldiers in his research into the thoughts, feelings, and experiences of WWI soldiers, and details
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the reasons WWI had such an extreme effect on Australia and Australians.\textsuperscript{223} He emphasises the courageous and yet tragic aspects of the AIF experience, stating that 'There was never a greater tragedy than World War I'.\textsuperscript{224} The Age newspaper's reviewer states that:

> His selections from soldiers' letters and diaries left his readers weeping for our boys while not letting us forget that they should never have been there.\textsuperscript{225}

While emphasising the tragedy of the Anzac experience, Gammage always stays true to the ideals of the Anzac legend. He says:

> Their world rested upon King and country, upon duty, honour, patriotism, manhood, and courage, and they would die for their world.\textsuperscript{226}

Gammage states that when wounded, the men 'cracked hardy', 'thus least inconveniencing their comrades, and best showing their manhood to the world'.\textsuperscript{227}

Alistair Thomson describes The Broken Years as 'vintage Bean', because both Bean and Gammage draw on 'national character to explain Australian war experiences and achievements, and in the particular nature of the Anzac characterisation'.\textsuperscript{228} Thomson argues, and I concur, that Gammage reached the same conclusions as Bean: 'that through their endurance of terrible circumstances the Anzacs were truly heroic'.\textsuperscript{229}

In 1996 Alistair Thomson’s exploration of the Anzac legend and its impact on survivors of WWI, \textit{ANZAC Memories: Living with the Legend}, was published.\textsuperscript{230} In this analysis, Thomson focuses on three WWI veterans and examines how 'individual and collective memories of Australian soldiers' have culminated in the Anzac legend. He believes that such 'cultural myths reveal the selective nature of war remembrance'.\textsuperscript{231}
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He outlines many incidences in which the men of the 1st AIF did not behave as represented in the Anzac legend.\textsuperscript{232} He concludes that the accepted and homogeneous version of the Anzac legend has silenced and marginalised many because the memories of their experiences do not conform.\textsuperscript{233}

Thomson explores the concept of heroism during and after the war. He reveals that there ‘was little romance or heroism in the war stories’ of the men to whom he listened, and concludes that many returned soldiers were not treated as heroes upon their return to Australia.\textsuperscript{234} Most of those to whom he spoke contrasted their supposed national hero status with the neglect or abuse they endured after the war.\textsuperscript{235}

Thomson observes that although the 1st AIF did not have as large a ratio of support staff to fighting soldiers as the other armies, there was still a large number of men who ‘did not see service on the line’.\textsuperscript{236} He states that of those he interviewed, about 25 per cent were in this category. He acknowledges that:

> The war experiences of these men, which rarely figure in the public accounts of the Anzacs, were markedly different from those of other soldiers.\textsuperscript{237}

Thomson maintains that these men frequently suffered ‘uneas[e] or guil[t] about the relative safety and comfort of their service’, even though they were aware their work was necessary as support for the fighting combatants.\textsuperscript{238} Thomson recognises that:

> ... new histories can help give voice to the experiences of individuals and groups who have been excluded or marginalised by prior historical narratives.\textsuperscript{239}

Suzanne Welborn read personal diaries and letters, unit and brigade diaries, and examined attestation papers of the 1,500 men of her study. Welborn’s study, like

\textsuperscript{232} ibid, pp.28-34.\textsuperscript{233} ibid, pp.7, 156, 218-219.\textsuperscript{234} ibid, pp.6-7.\textsuperscript{235} ibid, p.7.\textsuperscript{236} ibid, pp.34-35.\textsuperscript{237} ibid.\textsuperscript{238} ibid.\textsuperscript{239} ibid, p.35.
Gammage’s *The Broken Years*, can also be described as ‘vintage Bean’. By using the men’s own accounts, she reveals how the hardships and struggles of the Australian bush characterised the men of the three Western Australian battalions, who were courageous and heroic, strong and masculine, and honest and decent, on the battlefields of Gallipoli and France. Her Western Australian men, even after surviving a battle, and with dead bodies all around them, ‘could have cried’ but they desisted because they were stoic, manly heroes. Even in the face of such horrors, ‘Australian heroes never cry. A curse, a shrug, an “ah well” or “such is life”, but never a tear.’

In *Dinkum Diggers*, Dale Blair examines personal letters and diaries, official unit diaries, operational records, attestation papers, and casualty/record of service forms, statistical analyses, and conducts interviews with family members, to record the experiences of the 1st Battalion of the AIF, and to determine if the Anzac myth corresponds to the reality. He chose one particular battalion to investigate because:

> … the infantry battalion is arguably the most distinct unit pertinent to the majority of Australian soldiers’ war service.

Blair asserts that such an investigation is suitable ‘as a means of broadening our understanding of Australians in war’. He concludes that the experiences, ‘attitudes, insights and criticisms’ of the 1st Battalion ‘qualify and even contradict the Anzac legend’.

The information uncovered by oral histories, as defined above, ‘examining the minutiae of a soldier’s experiences’, can lead to questions, insights and understandings unlikely to be revealed in a ‘wider-ranging general stud[y]’. The approach is particularly suited to an ‘examination of the attitudes and behaviour within the smaller unit

---

240 See *ibid*, pp.194-195.
243 *ibid*.
244 *ibid*, back cover.
formations’, which can expose the ‘myths and falsehoods’ of the Anzac legend.\textsuperscript{245} Richard White and Dale Blair have noted that often, ‘The microcosm might well prove to be far more revealing than the macrocosm’.\textsuperscript{246} It is always wise, however, to be careful with written and oral testimonies. The small number available means they are not ‘necessarily an accurate representation of the men who served in a battalion’ or unit.\textsuperscript{247}

With oral histories, there is also the problem of honesty and subjectivity. Bean believed care was required with the diaries and letters of soldiers. He thought them unreliable for his purposes.\textsuperscript{248} They can conceal and misrepresent experiences, and indeed, many of the soldiers’ letters home to their loved ones withheld the more unpleasant aspects of army life, and tried to dispel anxieties held for their welfare.\textsuperscript{249} An example is a letter home from Lieutenant Arthur Thynne of the 2nd Pioneer Battalion, in January 1916:

I wish you dear girls could come and join us. It’s jolly fine to be a soldier ... Don’t worry your head any more about Turks. We have fixed them up alright (sic).\textsuperscript{250}

Another example is the letters home from Les Chandler. He was an avid ornithologist, and filled his letters with descriptions of the birds and natural surroundings he had observed.\textsuperscript{251} In July 1915, Private Thomas Sibson of the 5th Battalion wrote home to his parents:

I am having the time of my life since I have been over here ... P.S. Who would not be a soldier its a great life (sic).\textsuperscript{252}

\textsuperscript{245} ibid, pp.4, 6, 8.
\textsuperscript{246} White quoted in ibid, p.6.
\textsuperscript{247} ibid, pp.5, 9.
\textsuperscript{248} ibid, p.9.
\textsuperscript{249} ibid, pp.183-184, 117.
\textsuperscript{252} Letter, 7 July 1915, Quoted in Kerr, Private Wars, p.21.
Homesickness, illness, fear, and fatigue, undoubtedly also influenced that written in letters and diaries. Lloyd Robson’s review of *The Broken Years* queried the objectivity and honesty in the letters and diaries examined by Bill Gammage. Robson said he gained:

... the impression that [the] men [were] indulging in rhetoric and playing a role, explaining their motives and conduct in ideological terms because they [felt] that [was] required of them.\(^{253}\)

The limitations of the oral histories approach, therefore, are that the letters and diaries still in existence, written by only a minute number of men, and taking honesty and objectivity into consideration, mean that although insights into the hearts and minds of the soldiers and of the environment within which they lived can be gained, conclusions cannot be absolute.

**Methodology as synthesis**

The approach I have utilised in this study is an amalgamation of the above approaches. For many years, historians reiterated the C.E.W. Bean stance of the all-encompassing characteristics of the 1\(^{st}\) AIF. The Bean revisionists are important to my study because they recognise that:

... new histories can help give voice to the experiences of individuals and groups who have been excluded or marginalised by prior historical narratives.\(^{254}\)

This recognition and reparation is one of the underlining motivations for my study.

The feminist approach is relevant to this study because of its emphasis on exclusion. Those excluded have been cast into passive, supportive and feminised roles. I argue that those excluded are not only women, but that sections of the AIF have been left from the historical agenda because of the perceived lack of masculinity and heroism making their stories uninteresting and not worth the effort. There is the belief ‘the real Australians were ... men who had passed the test of the trenches’.\(^{255}\) This

---

\(^{253}\) Robson quoted in Blair, *Dinkum Diggers*, p.11.


means those who did not prove their masculinity by fighting were not ‘real Australians’. The Cochrane analysis of fund-raising for the Simpson memorial is particularly pertinent to my argument because of his suggestion that Simpson’s location within the feminine sphere of care giving resulted in a lack of donations. My argument follows the same reasoning: that baking is perceived as within the feminine sphere, and is therefore a non-masculine activity, which has resulted in the bakers’ exclusion from Anzac historiography.

I have drawn on the statistical approach by examining the enlistment attestation papers of just over 42 per cent of the 723 bakers I identified. Collating the information allows the comparison of the bakers with Robson’s AIF, Welborn’s three Western Australian battalions, and Blair’s 1st Battalion. These comparisons have allowed me to argue that, although there are slight differences that can be justified by specific circumstances, the bakers were virtually no different in demographics than the majority of the AIF.

The commemoration of Anzac is of vital importance to my study because of the emphasis on tragedy, but also heroism and masculinity. The Australian War Memorial, the largest memorial to war in Australia and the winner of the Major Tourist Attraction Award for the third consecutive year in 2003, excludes the Australian bakers of WWI by controlling the display of items within its confines.256 Captain John Treloar of the Australian Records Section accepted a great deal of bakery equipment from Captains John Miles and William Nash of the 2nd and 3rd AFBs, but the only piece of cooking equipment the Memorial believes worthy of display is a German field kitchen of the same era.

I have employed what I identify as the oral histories approach by reading as many diaries, letters and first hand accounts as possible, as well as unit diaries, routine orders, and operational records. I wanted to determine what fighting soldiers of the AIF thought of support troops such as the bakers, and conversely, how support troops positioned themselves within the pugilistic arena of WWI. I also needed first hand accounts of life within the bakeries and all that this entailed, and thoughts about the bread, both from within and outside the bakeries.

The synthesis of these five very diverse approaches means my study can introduce new evidence that can influence our assumptions of the past. There were achievements within the AIF in addition to those attained by the fighting combatant, even if they were purely complementary to maintaining those in the lines. The historiography of WWI has been myopic in that to date, it has characterised the Anzac using the vocabulary of masculinity and national ideals, and has therefore done a disservice to all of those who have been, either deliberately or unintentionally, ignored and omitted, or misrepresented.257

257 Thomson, ANZAC Memories, pp.215-216; Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.5.
Chapter 3

Like a symphonic orchestra

‘... like a symphonic orchestra, production flowed ... Not one piece of equipment stood unused for long’.¹

The actions of the Australian Field Bakeries of World War One do not lend themselves to the hyperbolic claims of heroism and masculinity that are viewed as befitting those of the fighting combatant of the AIF. They were, however, of importance to the war effort. This chapter does not fall into the category of ‘unit histories’, which Neville Lindsay states have been ‘sketchy, patchy and mostly very defective’, although I document the formation of the 1st Australian Field Bakery (1AFB) and then its work on Lemnos and Imbros while serving the Gallipoli campaign.² I outline the problems the men encountered while carrying out their duties. I summarise the formations of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th Australian Field Bakeries, and detail the actions and problems of the 2nd and 3rd AFBs at Calais, and the 1st, 4th, and 5th AFBs at Rouen. The concentration of this study on 1AFB at Gallipoli and the 2 and 3AFB at Calais is dictated by availability of primary source material.³ I outline the reorganisation of 1918, and the move to Le Havre that separated the Australian units. I consider the problems experienced with supply.

² Neville, Equal to the Task, p.426.
³ Captain Prior of 1AFB wrote a detailed diary during the Gallipoli campaign, but almost nothing after the move to Rouen, France, except numbers of men on duty. This is possibly due to his subservience to the Imperial OIC at Rouen. At Calais, Captain John Miles of 2AFB was promoted to OIC within a short time, which undoubtedly necessitated a more thorough record keeping.
Formation of the Australian Army Service Corps & 1st Australian Field Bakery

The General Officer Commanding the Commonwealth Military Forces from 1902 to 1904, Major General Sir Edward Hutton, believed that:

... a military force cannot be of any practical value for purposes of war without a carefully-organised and pre-arranged system of Supply and Transport.4

He therefore recommended to the parliament the formation of an Australian Army Service Corps, which was approved on 1 July 1903.5 Although British General Sir Ian Hamilton was ‘not impressed’ by Australian troops upon his inspection in 1914, he said the Australian Army Service Corps was ‘a highly satisfactory and efficient branch of the Commonwealth Service’.6

The 1912 plan for the Australian Army Service Corps meant that it was to include Mechanical Transport companies, Supply Columns, horse-drawn Divisional Trains, Depot Units of Supply, and Field Bakeries and Butcheries.7 On 10 February 1913, a Minute Paper was issued declaring the decision to establish Bakeries and Butcheries to be attached to the Military Districts of Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria. Each Bakery was to produce 1,000 pounds (lbs) of bread each day.8 On 1 December 1914, Adelaide café manager Lieutenant John G. Prior of the 22nd Australian Regiment was appointed Officer In Charge of the 13th Australian Army Service Corps Field Bakery, later known as the 1st Australian Field Bakery, and ordered to gather the required number of men from each state together at the 3rd Military District in Victoria. He began training the personnel on 4 December and by 21 December had enough men, had completed the heavy training, and baking equipment was expected to arrive at any moment.9

4 Quoted in Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.21.
5 Quoted in ibid, pp.21, 23.
6 Quoted in Welborn, Lords of Death, p.38; quoted in Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.29.
7 AWM 26 in Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.32.
9 The 11th, 13th, 19th, and 21st Companies AASC were disbanded in early 1916 to form the field bakeries, butcheries, and depot units of supply, for the 1st and 2nd Australian
The trip to Egypt and the Camp

On 22 December 1914, although the arrival of their equipment had not eventuated, Lieutenant Prior and 96 Other Ranks boarded the troopship Berrima, which cast off from Port Melbourne. Several of the men had very little time between enlistment and leaving Australia. Of the 96 Other Ranks Lieutenant Prior gathered together, twenty-one enlisted on or after 8 December 1914, and nine enlisted on or after 16 December. One baker, Private Harold Wilkinson, enlisted on 21 December 1914, the day before the Berrima sailed.10

Christmas festivities aboard the ship were apparently very successful and 28 December found them in Albany, Western Australia, awaiting the arrival of the rest of the convoy. After leaving Albany Harbour with the convoy, the bakers busied themselves by assisting the ship’s cooks, taking on and beating all comers at boxing, and presenting concerts.11 Lieutenant Prior was promoted to Captain on 13 January 1915.12

On 3 February 1915, less than one month later, 1AFB disembarked, left for Cairo, Egypt, and marched out to Abbassia. It was in Egypt that training for all units was to be completed and equipment assembled in readiness for the relocation to France. This strategy later changed with the formulation of the Gallipoli plan.13 Upon arrival in Egypt, 1AFB still had no equipment, a problem that was not rectified for some months.14 Captain Prior states that 1AFB offered their help with baking, but that it was

11 *1AFB: Diary*, 31 December 1914.
12 Ibid, 13 January 1915.
13 Lindsay, *Equal to the Task*, p.204.
14 *1AFB: Diary*, 3 February 1915.
I can only presume that those who refused assistance were the Imperial Bakeries on duty at the camp, because on 9 February Colonel John Monash directed the 4th Infantry Brigade at Heliopolis, Egypt, to draw all bread rations at 6.45 a.m. each day. This bread was baked and supplied by the Imperial Bakeries. The 1AFB consequently spent most of February with training and general duties. On 26 February, Captain Prior was ordered to take two sections, sixteen men, with complete equipment, to leave with the 3rd Infantry Brigade within two days. Prior managed to purchase and borrow enough equipment to begin bread baking, and on the 28th left with the 3rd Brigade for Alexandria, embarking the Malda on 1 March and baking supplies of bread for the troops whose destination was unknown.

It is around this time, according to Neville Lindsay’s history of the Australian Army Service Corps, that the 1AFB was using ovens supposedly positioned at the foot of the pyramids for ‘Napoleon’s Army of the Nile in 1798’, to bake bread for the Australians at Maadi Camp. Lindsay is not adamant his report is accurate. He includes a photo that he labels as ‘Napoleon’s ovens, Maadi Camp 1915’. The same photo on the Australian War Memorial website gives the description:

Afternoon of 1918-03-11. Visit of ‘D’ Troop 1st Australian Wireless Signal Squadron to lines of sanitary section, Makina near Basrah. Here models of cookhouses, incinerators, latrines, etc. had been built of mud and kerosene tins and inspection was intended to show troops what they could do in event of their having to fix up a camp for themselves.

15 ibid, 4 February 1915.
16 AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/4, Correspondence regarding rations for patients at No 1 Australian Auxiliary Hospital, Harefield, 1916. Also a Brigade order by Colonel Monash commanding Aerodrome Camp, Heliopolis, Egypt, 1914, 1914 – 1916.
17 1AFB: Diary, 4-28 February 1915.
18 ibid, 3 February–3 March 1915.
19 Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.204.
20 ibid.
I cannot explain the anomalies between claims of Maadi in Egypt and Makina in Iraq, and Napoleon’s ovens and mud and kerosene tins. It seems likely that the Officer in Charge of 1AFB, Captain John Prior, who was always on the lookout for excitement and was so meticulous with his account, if aware of such an historical connection, would have recorded it in his Unit Diary.

**Lemnos**

By 6 March 1915 the *Malda* was anchored at Lemnos, a small island situated to the north east of Athens in the Aegean Sea, and the bakery was ordered to supply the 9th Infantry with 1,000 rations each day (see Map 1).\(^2\) Within two days the short sightedness in the general planning of this order became apparent when it was cancelled due to the inability to get the bread ashore. The bakery was instead ordered to supply the troopship *Nizam* with 310 rations daily.\(^3\) Those men not on baking duty carried out landing practice, although heavy seas and high winds often made returning to the *Malda* very difficult.\(^4\)

By 20 March the bakery was baking and distributing by boat a total of 1,000 rations every day to the troopships of the convoy, the *Malda, Suffolk*, and *Nizam*, working in three eight-hour shifts and using only a small galley oven.\(^5\) On 21 March, Captain Prior received orders to disembark all but three of his Unit for onshore baking purposes. Again, the lack of forethought behind this order became apparent when they had to wait five days for boats to become available to take them ashore. Once on shore, ten field ovens, which were placed there by the Imperial Bakery only days before, were considered a ‘Godsend’ as Captain Prior had been unable to obtain more than five at Cairo. His joy at finally being able to bake bread for the 9th Infantry was

---

\(^2\) *1AFB: Diary*, 6 March 1915.  
\(^3\) *ibid*, 8 March 1915.  
evident when he proudly stated that ‘we have put down 2,000 rations of 1¼ lbs [using] Royal Yeast Tablets with potato ferments’. The next day, Prior was able to pronounce that their product was a ‘very satisfactory loaf’.26

MAP 1: Lemnos, Imbros and the Dardanelles27

After the 9th Infantry embarked on 8 April, the bakery was down to supplying only themselves and the 1st Stationary Hospital.28 Despite the hospital packing up to embark for Helles, it still drew supplies from the bakery for four days, and, coupled with providing 410 rations of bread to an Imperial Ammunition Column in the harbour, baking supplies became very short. The hospital personnel returned on 18 May and resumed taking bread supplies for staff and wounded. Mule carts were brought into operation and they became a valuable addition to the Australian depot. There was a mishap when one of the mules, together with cart, fell from the pier into the water, necessitating a rescue by some of the bakers who had to dive in the water and release

26 1AFB: Diary, 21-27 March 1915.
28 1AFB: Diary, 9 April 1915.
the mule from its harness.\textsuperscript{29} When the Australian pier, already noticeably too small for daily operations, became congested with stores and equipment, traffic with the mule carts was extremely difficult.\textsuperscript{30}

Not surprisingly, within a short while Lemnos Island was considered unsuitable for base operations. The harbour and water supply did not meet requirements and strong winds raged. Medical historian Arthur G. Butler maintains that many men believed the fly problem was worse at Lemnos than Gallipoli. It was decided to use the island only as a gathering place for troops where preparations for the landing and attack could take place.\textsuperscript{31} From August 1915 until the end of the Mediterranean campaign, Lemnos Island was used as a hospital base, as a congregation point for reinforcements and the sick and wounded returning to their units, and as a provisions depot.\textsuperscript{32}

On 23 April 1915, Captain Prior realised that something was ’doing very soon’ due to the increased movement of ships in the harbour. This movement continued throughout the 24\textsuperscript{th} until the harbour was almost empty, and Prior readied the troops under his command to ’pack up and go forward at very short notice’.

This readiness was in vain, and Prior’s note in his diary for 25 April was that the ’whole island has been trembling and the roll of gunfire is terrific’. The heavy gunfire continued and the 1\textsuperscript{st} Stationary Hospital, established in early April as a tent hospital for 200 men, and Prior, were told to expect many wounded Australians. Those who did arrive were not Australians but around 110 Turkish prisoners of war, of whom thirty were injured. Prior

\textsuperscript{29} ibid, 19-20 May 1915.
\textsuperscript{30} ibid, 23 May 1915.
\textsuperscript{32} ibid, p.380.
noted that they were a ‘fairly miserable lot’ who were extremely frightened at the prospect of being badly treated.33

**Imbros**

The standard ration issued to troops at Gallipoli consisted of meat, biscuits, bacon, jam, sugar, tea, cheese, rice, and dried vegetables. Bread was considered something of an ‘extra’, available for issue if possible.34 A conference at General Headquarters on 21 May determined that Anzac was to be provided with bread on alternative days.35 At around the same time, the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force established its headquarters at Imbros Island.36 Captain Prior received orders on 27 May that he was to pack up his now full compliment of bakers, although leaving behind eight men (one Section), and move to the Island.37 This island is to the north east of Lemnos Island, and, at 24 km from Gallipoli, was significantly closer to Australian action at Gallipoli than Lemnos at 100 km.38 The group arrived at Kephalos Harbour, Imbros Island, on 30 May, and received orders to disembark and set up the bakery as soon as possible. Only one barge was available for transporting their equipment ashore and most of it, therefore, was hauled by hand. The equipment that would float was thrown overboard and swum ashore by the bakers. Due to the lack of availability of transport, once the equipment was landed on the Island, the 30 tons were carried the 800 yards inland by wheelbarrow. They immediately began to put down their camp on the allotted site, and received permission to dig a well and use Turkish prisoners as a fatigue party.39 Private Valentine Crew, a 22 year old from Yass, New South Wales, was the bakery’s first
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34 AWM 25, Control Symbol 367/159, *[Gallipoli] Returns showing details and totals of 4 days reserve rations issued from “B” Depot on 18-19 July 1915 to various units* (Brighton Beach, Gallipoli), 1915.
37 **1AFB: Diary**, 27 May 1915.
38 Lindsay, *Equal to the Task*, pp.210-211.
39 **1AFB: Diary**, 31 May 1915.
casualty when he was knocked down accidentally and rendered unconscious, and was taken to the troopship *Arcadia* with a head injury.\(^{40}\)

On 3 June Captain Prior was notified that he was Officer in Charge of the Army Service Corps on Kephalos Beach. The first few days of June were spent clearing and cutting out rocks to make level ground for the siting and building of the ovens, erecting marquees and digging trenches. On 4 June the bakery made the dough for 1,000 rations, and Prior announced the first bread to be ‘very satisfactory’ to all, including those at the General Headquarters Camp situated on the island two miles to the north west of the bakery.\(^{41}\)

**Relocation**

Upon arrival at Imbros Island, Captain Prior accepted the site allotted to the bakery with reluctance, as he believed it was far too small for their purposes.\(^{42}\) The bakery itself was extremely cramped, and the hills to the south prevented the smoke from lifting and clearing away from the camp.\(^{43}\) Dough for 22,000 rations was made on 8 June, and the bakers found the work very heavy going.\(^{44}\) There was often an immense amount of dust blowing and the general conditions made bread baking extremely difficult.\(^{45}\) The Director of Supplies and Transport pronounced the camp as ‘satisfactory’ after a formal inspection on 12 June, but Captain Prior was still unhappy with the site.\(^{46}\) On 13 June, although the Camp Commandant maintained he could not allot the bakery camp a new site, Captain Prior made the independent decision to move it about 100 yards to the north and began moving immediately (see Map 2). The Director of Supplies and Transport declared the move and the new site very pleasing,


\(^{41}\) *1AFB: Diary*, 3, 4 June 1915.

\(^{42}\) *ibid*, 30 May 1915.

\(^{43}\) *ibid*, 8 June 1915.

\(^{44}\) *ibid*, 1-8 June 1915.

\(^{45}\) *ibid*, 8-9 June 1915.

\(^{46}\) *ibid*, 12 June 1915.
and was very complimentary of Prior’s decision. He said that he liked to see a Commanding Officer think for himself and shift when he believed it necessary.47

**MAP 2: Plan of Camp & 1AFB Imbros: 23 June 1916**48

---

**Bread and Anzac**

There were many complaints from the troops on Anzac about the quality, quantity, and variety of rations they were receiving, and in June and July the health of the men declined and they became noticeably weaker.49 A memo from John Monash to the Medical Officer on June 8 suggested that, at that time, the ‘greatest desideratum’ was bread. He claimed that the issue of bread would reduce the quantity of meat required

---

47 *ibid*, 13-14 June 1915.
48 Based on plan drawn by Captain J.G. Prior in *1AFB: Diary*.
and would greatly relieve the difficulty in 'masticat[ing] the hard biscuits'. Although the decision to provide bread to Anzac on alternative days was made at a conference at General Headquarters in May, and 1AFB was relocated accordingly, the Monash memo suggests that the matter was still being discussed in early June.  

Responsibility of the Australian Army Service Corps at Anzac was largely one of supply, with fresh bread and meat delivered from offshore. On 6 and 7 June Prior visited the Australian operation at Anzac Cove to organise delivery and issue of bread for the use of combatants. The boat in which Prior was travelling was caught up in some shellfire as it approached the beach, but there was neither damage nor injuries inflicted. Prior visited Anzac again on 18 June to determine whether thirty days of all reserve rations could be stored somewhere within easy reach but out of harm’s way. After consultation with General Carruthers, it was decided to make the depot in the Gully below the Sphinx (see Map 3). This Gully thereafter assumed the name of 'Reserve Gully'.

The 1AFB began baking bread for, and made its first consignment to, Australian troops at Anzac on 9 June 1915, the day after Monash’s letter to the Medical Officer. The 14,000 rations were towed from Imbros to Anzac on a barge. Although the bakery had bread ready for delivery the next morning, the sea was too rough for the barge to make the crossing. The weather at Imbros was not so different to that at Lemnos; the seas were too rough for shipping on two out of every three days. Night time

---

50 AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/55, Draft of Letter from John Monash to A.D.M.S., in Correspondence regarding complaints of rations by units. Report on scale of rations. Scale of winter rations. 1915, 8 June 1915.
52 Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.209.
53 1AFB: Diary, 6–7 June 1915.
54 ibid, 14–18 June 1915.
55 Butler, Army Medical Services, I, p.325.
deliveries from Imbros were considered safer, minimising the danger of presenting 'obvious targets'.

MAP 3: Anzac Cove showing Reserve Gully & The Sphinx

56 Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.211.
57 Based on map in AWM224, Control Symbol MSS284, Part 2, 2nd Australian Field Ambulance; Narrative by Col. Chambers, (1915-16), 1916.
Until the end of June Anzac received between 14,000 and 14,676 bread rations every day and the bakery also supplied General Headquarters and any troops on the island with around 1,000 bread rations daily. When the 8th Infantry Battalion visited Imbros on 12 July, Prior was astonished and unhappy to learn from them that the Australian forces on Anzac believed the bread they were receiving from Imbros on a regular, if not quite daily basis, was being baked by an English Bakery Unit, the existence of an Australian bakery being completely unknown to them.58

C.E.W. Bean states that Lieutenant-General Sir William Birdwood’s Assistant Quartermaster General, Lieutenant-Colonel H.O. Knox, gave the order that bread was to be supplied to the Australians and the New Zealanders on alternating days from 1 September. The reason given was that transport could not be provided for a daily issue. Bean expresses the view that, ‘It is difficult to believe that with energy this could not have been overcome’.59 Although Lieutenant-Colonel Knox did send a piece of correspondence dated 1 September, stating this decision and the reasons for taking it, an extract of the War Diary of the Deputy Assistant Quartermaster General on 7 June stated that ‘bread [was to be] issued to troops [1st Australian Division] every second day’.60 It is reasonable to conclude from the correspondence and reported remarks from the Director of Supplies and Transport, that many, including himself and probably the 1AFB, were unaware that the Australians were not receiving bread rations on a daily basis. There were some sharp comments from Director of the Medical Services AIF, Colonel Howse, concerning the irregular supply received over the whole of August to the middle of September. He stated that, on many days, bread was not received at all, and on others, only half a ration. It would appear there was a communication

58 1AFB: Diary, 12 July 1915.
60 AWM 38, Control Symbol 3DRL 6673/151, Memo from Colonel Howse to D.A.& Q.M.G., in [Official History, 1914-18 War: Records of Charles E.W. Bean, Official Historian] Papers, 1915-23; include notes by Bean and medical reports and papers on rations, dental matters and the administration of the Australian Army Medical Corps in Egypt; also include letters from A.G. Butler, 13 June 1915.
breakdown because the bakery was advised on 4 August to cease deliveries to Anzac until further notice, but Anzac seemed unaware of this order and were still expecting deliveries. What can certainly be concluded from the 1AFB Diary is that the bakery was extremely anxious to supply bread to the troops at Anzac, and only orders to cease, rough seas or the unavailability of transport prevented this from occurring on a daily basis. There is never any mention in the diaries of Captain Prior’s awareness that the Australians and New Zealanders were being supplied with bread every second day.

On 3 August Anzac received 17,768 bread rations and, because Kephalos Beach became increasingly crowded with troops and the pier was blocked with parties practising embarkation and disembarkation, Prior realised an action was imminent. He was therefore not surprised when advised on 4 August that Anzac was not to receive any more bread until further notice. He retained a full day’s reserve, 40,000 rations, on hand, in the event of an unexpected request from Anzac. The 11th Imperial Infantry Division embarked on 6 August and, with the convoy, ‘sailed in the direction of the Gulf of Xeros’, but left its bakery and heavy transport vehicles behind on Imbros.

The action that Captain Prior believed was imminent and which began on 6 August was the offensive to capture Lone Pine and Sari Bair while the British attacked from Suvla Bay. This unsuccessful and disastrous exercise resulted in 12,000 British and Empire casualties between August 6 and 10, with 2,000 Australian deaths. Prior’s desire to join the ‘lively’ action taking place ‘from Helles to the Gulf of Xeros’ was evident when the bakery spent 7 August packing its surplus equipment and readying

61 1AFB: Diary, 4 August 1915.
62 Memo from Colonel Howse to D.A.& Q.M.G., 13 June 1915; 1AFB: Diary, 10 June–4 August 1915.
63 1AFB: Diary, 3-4 August 1915.
64 ibid, 5 August 1915.
65 ibid, 6 August 1915.
66 Dennis, Australia Since 1890, pp.116, 127, 144.
for a quick move ‘in case’ they were required at Anzac Cove.\textsuperscript{67} They were not needed, however, but later on in the afternoon, Imbros Island received 400 Turkish prisoners who, apparently, were very excited to see the excellent bread as they were marched past the bakery.\textsuperscript{68} Over the 8\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} August, approximately 6,000 wounded were handled at Kephalos Beach.\textsuperscript{69} The 8\textsuperscript{th} saw the bakery again not baking, but able to fulfil an almost instant demand for 10,000 rations for Anzac. Prior was extremely proud to receive a compliment from his superior praising his bakery’s ability to satisfy any demand as soon as it was made.\textsuperscript{70} More Turkish prisoners, around 200, were brought ashore on 9 August, and Prior commented that they appeared very pleased to be on Imbros and out of the action.\textsuperscript{71}

Anzac resumed its requirement of bread on 14 August, wanting 15,048 rations.\textsuperscript{72} The bakery was asked to provide Suvla Bay with 30,000 rations daily, commencing on 15 August, but because of the unavailability of transport, Suvla Bay received its first shipment of 15,000 rations on 24 August.\textsuperscript{73} Thereafter, Anzac and Suvla Bay were able to receive bread rations whenever seas were calm enough and transport was available.\textsuperscript{74} Prior was having some trouble with the British bakers’ incompetence, his men were being hospitalised with illness, and he was asked to provide 20,000 rations daily to Anzac.\textsuperscript{75} Wanting to accommodate Australian troops with the Australian-manufactured superior product and with Headquarters and the hospital refusing all but Australian bread, Prior was understandably concerned that his bakery, being so undermanned due to illness, was being stretched in too many
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different directions. He believed that those of his men who were left were ‘game & splendid fellows’.76

English journalist Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett and a naval photographer by the name of Ernest Brooks visited the camp on 9 September.77 By the next day, with a non-existent water supply, Prior was ordered to retain all bread on hand for combatants and the sick, with Headquarters forced to forego their daily supply. Headquarters was extremely unhappy and reluctant to accept this edict.78 On 13 and 14 September the erratic water supply was available long enough for 1AFB and two British bakeries to mix the dough for 140,000 rations.79

On 22 September Prior reported the bread as ‘slightly tainted’ with the flavour of the dried potatoes they were using to make the yeast, but concluded it was unavoidable.80 He became ill with dysentery on 20 September and by the 23rd was reporting a ‘difficult day’ where things were going astray, whereupon he felt ‘unequal to the task of keeping things straight’.81 On 28 September Prior was too ill to leave his bed and directed operations from that base. It was an unpleasant day, with the hot reverse wind blowing the smoke and heat from the ovens straight at the bakers trying to work. Despite these trials, however, the men ‘carried on their job without hesitation’.82 The next day found those winds still blowing, Prior still in bed with jaundice to accompany his dysentery, his batman also ill, and the Casualty Clearing Station too full to accommodate them.83 The next two days were also windy, but the bakers stayed hard at their work to ‘keep up the bread supplies to their Comrades at
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Anzac & Suvla. Captain Prior, still ill in bed, eventually made the decision to hand command of the Bakeries over to one of the Imperial bakers.

October brought with it a kafuffle about shortages in bread sacks. The bread was packed into sacks of 36 loaves at Imbros Island, and carried by trawler to Anzac where it was unloaded and handed directly to the Divisional Train. Pilfering was obviously occurring somewhere between Imbros and the Reserve Supply Depot, and at times, the sacks were significantly short, resulting in constant and serious complaints. On 6 October, the Supply Officer Brighton Beach wrote a letter of complaint to the Officer in Charge of the 1st Australian Divisional Train, charging a shortage of 236 bread rations. This officer replied that he believed this figure to be impossibly high because only days previously he had inspected the entire consignment of sacks with only ten loaves missing overall. He groused that his staff had neither the space, time, nor personnel to carry out detailed inspections. He suggested that, in future, the Brighton Beach Quartermaster should count the loaves carefully before taking the sacks away from the Depot. There was also a suggestion that the bread could be packed into barrels as a means of preventing pilfering, but the 1st Australian Division declared itself satisfied with the sacks after the 1st Divisional Train took steps to ensure the sacks were 'properly sewn'.
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The weather, water supply, and illness continued to cause the bakers hardship, however they turned out full bread rations of around 20,000 for Anzac, between 40,000 and 45,000 for Suvla Bay, and between 744 and 21,157 for local requirements, whenever possible.\(^{88}\) The 41st Imperial Bakery left Imbros Island on 4 October for Mudros, and Prior was ordered to accompany them to supervise baking operations there. Because the Medical Officer pronounced him as unfit for duty, he was advised to proceed at a later date. He eventually sailed for Mudros on 6 October, and there is very little information recorded in the Unit Diary from that date.\(^{89}\) By 17 October, the Australian Field Bakery was depleted to 54 Other Ranks but still managed to produce 14,080 1¼ lbs bread rations.\(^{90}\) Hugh Fairclough states that officers in charge could order one-half of a gill (71 ml) of rum for each man every day, although this was rarely supplied at Gallipoli.\(^{91}\) On 18 October, there is a rather intriguing entry in the 1AFB diary. Prior states that ‘Authority asked for a daily issue of Rum to all ranks of the Bakeries’.\(^{92}\) Unfortunately, there is no further mention of rum or whether he was granted this authority.

The 1AFB ceased production of bread on 8 December 1915.\(^{93}\) It moved from Imbros Island back to Tel-el-Kebir to bake bread for those evacuating Gallipoli, and for troop arrivals from Australia. In January 1916 it was joined by 2AFB, and in March it moved to Rouen, France.

**Adversities**

Some battalions were withdrawn from Anzac in or after July 1915 and sent to Imbros Island for a brief rest, incorporating between a three and nine-day spell. Captain Nott,
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the medical officer of the 10th Battalion, described Imbros as ‘a perfect holiday picnic’.94

Undoubtedly, Captain Prior would have disagreed most strongly with this statement. Although not on the frontlines as fighting combatants, the 1AFB consistently faced adversities in the performance of its duties. The first was with equipment, which did not arrive from Australia. In the meantime, 1AFB used the small ovens of the Malda and those the British had left behind in addition to the few Prior could arrange at Cairo. April 1915 began with orders for increased output, and, as the men were working with only three dough troughs, none being available at Cairo, Prior requested engineers to make more. Notification was finally received on 15 May that the missing equipment had finally arrived in Egypt although it did not meet up with the bakery until 26 May, almost four months after it began its overseas operations.

The weather during the 1AFB’s service of the Gallipoli campaign caused a considerable amount of anxiety and frustration. Although there were extremes of temperatures, the wildness caused the most problems. At Lemnos, as soon as they were able to go ashore, apart from their baking, they spent the first few days cutting longer tent pegs to secure their bakery in the strong winds.95 The cold, wet, bleak weather eventuated in the bakers working up to their knees in mud and water, but eliciting from them ‘not a single complaint’.96 Rain and heavy winds on 13 April brought down the marquees and spoiled some of the bread.97 At Imbros, the often-bad weather and its resultant rough seas caused the bakery much concern in many areas of its daily work. Butler asserts that pier facilities at Kephalos ‘were even more primitive than at the Peninsula’.98 Part of the pier was blown away on 16 June, and a violent dust storm on 29 June had Prior complaining that the conditions made baking extremely difficult, as they had to concentrate all of their energies on keeping their
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marquees standing. Dust storms were also very trying as the dust covered ‘everything’, and made baking very difficult. Captain Prior was often glad to ‘ring down the curtain’ on his horrible day.

At Imbros, firewood was often in very short supply if the barge was unable to make the distance from the wood supply ship to the shore. This shortage often interrupted baking requirements and rations to Anzac were subsequently reduced. On 16 June, as the doughs were already mixed and Captain Prior would not allow them to be wasted, the bakery had no choice but to use grass to fire the ovens to bake its bread. Prior mobilised the Turkish prisoners to collect the grass from the Imbros hillside in bread sacks. The bakery made 3,000 rations from the grass-fired ovens, but Anzac did not receive any because of the rough seas. Prior described it as ‘a hell of a day’. There was no baking the next day as wood fuel was again unavailable, but Anzac received 14,000 rations from the reserve stock. On 23 June, the Greek firewood contractor Goulandris was finally able to land his wood ashore, much to the delight of Captain Prior but to the wrath of the Intelligence Officer, who was furious the contractor had been allowed to enter the harbour.

The increasing population on the island and Prior’s rapidly diminishing supplies of wood fuel induced him to attempt to obtain a reserve. He sent a fatigue party from the 11th Imperial Infantry Division out on woodcutting duty, but suggested that the Turkish were much harder workers. He was still trying to get a reserve stock together on 19 August and 26 September, and on 25 October Prior had enough wood
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in reserve for three days. The only time wood supplies are mentioned from here on are deliveries on 19, 25 September, 2, 8 October, and 3 November. The delivery on 25 September could not be offloaded because a boiler blocked the pier.

At Imbros, the wells providing the water supply were up to a half a mile from the camp, and the water had to be carried in by hand. Very frequently, men struggling to carry water back to the camp in the middle of the night fell, with their buckets, into a hole, with the predictable result of a thorough drenching, the outpouring of profuse, unprintable bad language, and the necessity to return to the well for more water. Bakery water supply troubles were alleviated on 9 June 1915 when Captain Prior acquired a water cart and a large iron tank in which to store their water. At the end of June, however, Prior became very anxious about the bakery’s ‘uncertain’ water supply. It came from only 2 ft below ground, was black in colour, and smelled ‘very foul’. Prior believed it was making a significant impact on the men’s health, with dysentery ‘becoming rather too prevalent to be comfortable’. Interestingly, when the 14th Battalion, including Australia’s first Victoria Cross winner Albert Jacka, visited Imbros Island for a rest in July 1915, several, including Jacka himself, were admitted to 1 Stationary Hospital within a few days of their arrival. The bout of diarrhoea landing them there has been blamed on the change in diet, which supposedly played havoc with their digestive processes. I believe, however, especially taking Captain Prior’s concerns into account, it is possible the vile water was to blame for the illnesses.
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Water supply troubles continued with the water at the southern end of the oven bins being condemned as unfit for use mid-way through July. The shortage severely curtailed the production capacity of the bakery, and engineers on the island tried to formulate ways to connect the bakery to a water supply ship.¹¹⁶ At the end of July the water supply also caused Prior much concern and the future supply looked very precarious.¹¹⁷ Prior continued to be troubled by the water supply, which was regularly failing and then being restored. It caused a complete cessation of baking on 27 August, but the reserve stock allowed for 20,000 rations to be sent to Anzac, with Suvla Bay receiving none. On the 28th, although there was still no water and therefore no baking, the reserve stock was able to supply Anzac with 14,976 rations and Suvla Bay with 29,952 rations.¹¹⁸ By 4 September, water and flour supplies were again causing problems. Since they had to be transported by ship, the imminent arrival of bad weather meant the supplies could be severed at any moment and with little warning.¹¹⁹ The water supply was the first to cease and was off from 7 to 13 September.¹²⁰ On 13 September the water supply problem was remedied just long enough, before it went off again, for three of the bakeries to mix the dough for 60,000 rations. When it came on again on the 14th, dough for 80,000 rations was mixed. The water supply was to start and stop at irregular intervals several times over the next two weeks, causing Captain Prior much frustration.¹²¹

The water supply worries appeared to be nearing their end when a condensing plant was brought ashore on 27 September. Captain Prior reported enthusiastically that at last he would have a regular water supply. All spectators appreciated the efforts of the Arab labourers who hauled the boiler ashore and up the causeway. One can only
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imagine this ‘performance’, which resulted in the causeway being jammed, and traffic for flour and fuel still being blocked the next day, to the consternation of Captain Prior who had very little of either in reserve.122 There are no further notations of water deficiencies in 1AFB’s diary, so it appears that the condensing plant must have alleviated problems for the duration of the bakery’s stay on the island.

At Lemnos and Imbros Islands there were regular problems with the supply or quality of bread-making ingredients. Captain Prior was often at his wit’s end wondering how his bakery was going to continue with its responsibilities. He often received useless supplies that reveal the lack of baking knowledge or expertise within the general avenues of supply. An example is the quantity of Italian compressed yeast that arrived on 28 April deemed useless because it had been kept in cold storage. Instead, the bakery easily brewed its own yeast from hops and potatoes, and believed it could continue doing this without difficulty.123 There was also trouble with the quality of the flour, it being very dark in colour and low in the gluten required to give bread a light texture and sponginess.124 Prior concluded that it had been stored in the ship’s hold for too long. The poor calibre of the flour immediately showed up in the quality of the bread produced.125 After a week of issuing reserve stock, supplies of flour arrived at the bakery on 24 May, just in time for the acute shortage to avoid having any impact on bread production.126 On 19 July, together with the poor quality flour, the bakery began to have trouble in fermenting its own yeast. Although Prior had been particularly optimistic about the chances of the bakery’s continuing success in the brewing of its own yeast, the dried potatoes received were unreliable because they were a mixture of
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various vegetables.\textsuperscript{127} It was not long, however, before he was able to announce that the bakery was producing 'splendid bread' and that 'all [was] well'.\textsuperscript{128}

There seems to have been a constant need for 'makeshift' materials, which wearied the bakers, particularly Prior. On 25 July 1915 Captain Prior's supply worries continued when he was forced to burn a lorry load of Italian compressed yeast that had again been kept in cold storage and was therefore rendered 'quite putrid'.\textsuperscript{129} The British Royal Yeast cake tried by the Australians did not produce satisfactory bread, but by 29 July Prior was able to state that the bakery was working 'back on the old style', which was furnishing a very good loaf.\textsuperscript{130} At the end of August, together with the Imperial Bakeries and the musty and mouldy flour that was causing a lot of trouble with the finished bread, Prior concluded he really had his hands full.\textsuperscript{131} On 16 September Prior met with some of his officers to discuss the fate of 151 tons of damaged flour received. It was agreed it was unfit for use, and was subsequently sold to the Greek contractor Goulandris, from whom Prior purchased almost all of his supplies, for £65. The condemned flour was an untimely loss, especially when Suvla Bay began ordering and expecting 40,000 bread rations nearly every day.\textsuperscript{132}

**From formation to Rouen and Calais**

**2\textsuperscript{nd} Australian Field Bakery**

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} Australian Field Bakery (2AFB) was assembled at Marrickville, New South Wales, in September and October 1915, from the Military Districts of Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia.\textsuperscript{133} Civil Servant and militia officer John Miles, aged 44 years, was commissioned on 30 September 1915 and appointed Officer
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in Charge of the bakery on that date with the rank of Honorary Lieutenant.134 Before assembling in New South Wales, each quota trained in their respective Military District for any duties they might have to perform, including rifle exercises, range shooting and bayonet fighting, and attended lectures on musketry and demonstrations on entrenching. The men of the 2AFB wanted to be able to ‘creditably acquit [them]selves in supplementing the activities of [their] fighting comrades’, and their efforts were rewarded when Colonel Renaclatti, the Commandant, reported that the company appeared ‘soldier-like and fit’.135

In preparation for the unknown conditions in which they would be required to bake bread, each district experimented with building improvised ovens and achieving a good loaf. The State Commandant was so impressed with the bread baked in Victoria, he arranged for samples to be sent to the Minister of Defence for comparison with bread baked by contractors. The Minister replied with a ‘very gratifying report’, recognising the ‘superior quality and condition’ of the bread baked in the improvised ovens.136

The 2AFB embarked and sailed on the S.S. Suffolk on 27 November 1915.137 Most of the important equipment requirements for bread making, such as dough troughs, could not be secured before sailing, much to the chagrin of Captain Miles. The voyage was uneventful, with the men passing the days undertaking duties, attending lectures on baking operations in the field, and learning how to build fires and make yeast.138 The Suffolk arrived at Suez on 3 January 1916, and the men disembarked for Tel-el-Kebir three days later. Their limited stores, including blankets, tents and water
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proof sheets, were unloaded later in the day to be sent on to the Unit’s destination. That these items did not arrive for three days meant that the men endured ‘severe discomfort’ by having to sleep under inclement skies on cold, wet sand.  

The lack of baking equipment meant that the Unit could not bake for the troops arriving in Tel-el-Kebir from the Gallipoli campaign. Instead, all consumed the ‘inferior quality of bread’ being baked at nearby Zagazig. General Sir Archibald Murray, who was recalled to England just two months later after his disastrous attack on Gaza at a cost of 6,000 British casualties, visited Tel-el-Kebir on the 15 January 1916, inspected the 2nd Division to the sound of bugles, trumpets and bands, and was apparently very happy with the whole parade. While awaiting its equipment, the 2AFB spent its days in a monotony of marching and drilling. On 18 January the bakery was attached to the 2nd Divisional Train, of which it was a sub-unit, for a few days. The men helped in the Supply Depot until the Train moved from the camp. Finally, on 26 January 1916, it was ordered to move to the other end of the camp to assist the 1AFB, having recently arrived from Imbros Island, with its duties.

Captain Miles was temporarily appointed as Officer in Charge of the two AFBs, and 2AFB finally began baking bread on 28 January 1916. His description of the baking operations reveals a definite unhappiness at the situation in which the Unit found itself: there was not enough equipment for both bakeries, and the 1AFB treated the 2nd like ‘interlopers’. Although Butler has described the Tel-el-Kebir camp as a ‘fine military camp’, it is doubtful the many of the AIF and the bakers would have agreed.

---
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sand was an unending annoyance for the soldiers because it made its way into ‘everything from eyes to clothes, guns and food’. The bakery was situated very close to a horse track wherein the passing horses kicked up clouds of dust that landed on the dough and was cooked into the bread. The dust also badly affected the men’s health. Captain Miles suggested, with a chiding manner, that Field Bakeries needed to be situated as ‘far away as possible from all general traffic’. He wrote a letter to the Assistant Director of the Medical Services suggesting that the road for the horses needed to be diverted. He also drew attention to a native laundry established close to the bakery’s operations, whose wastewater ran into a drain and lay there stagnating to become ‘a nuisance’.

On 11 March 1916, after losing one-third of its strength to the newly formed 5th Australian Field Bakery (5AFB), 2AFB and most of its equipment entrained for Moascar Camp at Ismailia where they were vaccinated against typhoid. On 17 March, the Unit, together with those men from the infantry who professed to be bakers, sailed on the S.S. Arcadian for Marseilles, arriving five days later on 22 March. The next day the Unit entrained for the three-day trip to Calais, arriving on 26 March in the middle of a ‘blinding snow storm’. At No. 1 Camp in Calais, each man was supplied with two blankets and accommodated in tents. After the warmth of their previous location, they all suffered greatly from the cold. The next day, the men were supplied with baking clothing, and immediately began work at the Calais Bakery.

---
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The 4th and 5th Australian Field Bakeries

The 4th and 5th AFBs were raised abroad at Tel-el-Kebir. The 4AFB began with 33 men taken on strength from 1AFB. Of these, Honorary Lieutenant and Quartermaster Eric Isaachsen was appointed as the bakery’s commanding officer, and Staff Sergeant George E. Allen was appointed Acting Warrant Officer class 1 and Master Baker.150 Through Routine General Orders, applications were called for experienced bakers to make up the required strength of 92 Other Ranks. Such men were transferred in from infantry units until 21 April 1916.151 The Unit Diary indicates that 37 of these passed a test in baking. It makes no mention of any failures. It is intriguing that Captain Miles of 2AFB reported that there was no opportunity to test those making up the numbers of his bakery, whereas there appears to have been many opportunities afforded Lieutenant Isaachsen and the 4AFB for this purpose. At the same time men were transferring into 4AFB, the bakery had begun duties on 10 March 1916, assisting 1AFB and a little later, the 5AFB.152 The 4AFB left Tel-el-Kebir for Serapeum, Egypt, on 29 March 1916, where it pitched its tents, began working in the Supply Depot, and was inoculated against typhoid.153 It went back to Tel-el-Kebir two weeks later, erected ovens, and finally began baking bread on 18 April, which was issued locally and to Serapeum.154

The nucleus of the 5AFB was formed by a detachment of 32 men from the 2AFB. Warrant Officer Joseph H. Pye of 1AFB was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant, and appointed as the bakery’s commanding officer.155 Upon the recommendations of Prior and Miles, 18 men were promoted to Non-Commissioned Officer status. Those
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required to complete the 5AFB’s numbers transferred in from infantry and reinforcements, Light Horse Regiments, Engineers, and Artillery Details. The bakery immediately began working with 1AFB at Tel-el-Kebir, taking over completely on 21 March 1916. By 10 April 1916, the bakery was still twenty men short of the required numbers and measures were taken to rectify this shortage. Lieutenant Pye does not mention examinations for bread making in the diary, but does specify that 22 per cent of the personnel were not bakers wherein they had to be trained enough to handle the ingredients and make an acceptable loaf.

Lieutenant Pye highlights the problems faced by the bakery: it was dusty, and there was a severe deficiency of equipment. The firewood was the wrong sort because it was hard and therefore difficult to split, and was also unsuitable for field baking conditions. The heat was unbearable with temperatures in the bell tents an average of 118 degrees Fahrenheit, and the men were extremely bothered by the abundance of flies. Lieutenant Pye was not wholly unhappy with the situation however. There were only two crimes committed, both by the same man - an Absent Without Leave (AWOL) and an incidence of drunkenness. After receiving orders to stop baking in preparation for the impending move to France, Lieutenant Pye expressed himself as more than happy with the quality and quantity of the product his men had turned out, especially as twenty of them had to be taught the trade after their transfers. On 20 June 1916, the 5AFB moved its operations from Tel-el-Kebir to Marseilles via Alexandria, arriving nine days later. The Unit arrived at Rouen, France, on 3 July 1916, and ‘marched in’ to ‘Bakeries South Rouen’ on the same day.
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3rd Australian Field Bakery

On 1 April 1916, one month after the 4th and 5th AFBs were raised ‘in the field’ at Tel-el-Kebir, and at the same time as the 3rd Australian Division was in the process of being formed in Australia, Lieutenant William Nash was commissioned to form the 3rd AFB in Sydney.\(^{163}\) Approximately twenty men were already in the camp, enlisted to provide reinforcements for the 1st and 2nd AFBs already on active service in France. Most had only been in camp for a short while, around two weeks, and this group formed the basis of the new bakery.\(^{164}\) It was expected that the bakery would be manned completely with New South Welshmen, but embarkation orders received only six weeks after the initial orders of formation meant that twenty men had to come from Victoria and Tasmania to make up the numbers.\(^{165}\) Most of these men had only just enlisted and had no military training. They trained in drill, physical training, and musketry and rifle use, and their baking skills were tested at the State Bakery at Stanmore, Sydney.\(^{166}\)

The 3AFB embarked the Demosthenes and sailed for, what they thought was Egypt, on 18 May 1916. A week later, at Albany, Western Australia, the men learnt that England was their destination.\(^{167}\) The trip was, by Lieutenant Nash’s account, fairly uneventful. They disembarked at Plymouth on 21 July 1916, nine weeks after leaving Sydney, and were welcomed with ‘rolls and tea’ by the Mayoress of the City.\(^{168}\)

The 3AFB spent the next four months at the Larkhill Camp on the Salisbury Plain, undergoing training, particularly in the use of Aldershot ovens, at the already
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established field bakery manned by the 67th Imperial Field Bakery.\textsuperscript{169} Much of the Unit’s stores were missing after disembarkation at Plymouth and Captain Nash spent three months trying to have them found or replaced.\textsuperscript{170} The 3AFB took over the operations of baking at the Larkhill Camp, and averaged a turnout of 25,000 lbs of bread every day. In October and November the weather was foul, firewood was scarce, the supply of necessary items was unreliable, and a large number of the men were ill because of the extremes in the temperature and the tough situation. The 3AFB left for Calais, arriving, via Rouen, on 26 November 1916. Because the Calais Bakery was desperate for more workers, the 3AFB began its ‘arduous and exacting work with long hours’ the very next day.\textsuperscript{171}

Army Service Corps historian Neville Lindsay states that after some training in Egypt, the ‘1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} Divisions were moved to France’.\textsuperscript{172} He adds that:

The field bakery and butchery units allotted to each division were employed in civil facilities or constructed static installations at Rouen to achieve optimum operating conditions.\textsuperscript{173}

On the same topic, C.E.W. Bean states:

The bakeries, butcheries, and depot units of supply, as they landed, were directed chiefly to Rouen, one of the main British depots.\textsuperscript{174}

The problem with both of these assertions is that they are wrong. The 1\textsuperscript{st}, 4\textsuperscript{th}, and 5\textsuperscript{th} AFBs went to Rouen from Egypt, while the 2AFB set up at Calais and 3AFB joined it from Australia and Larkhill Camp in November 1916.\textsuperscript{175} The two bakeries at Calais did not move to Rouen until August 1918.\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{169} ibid, p.iv.
\textsuperscript{170} ibid, pp.iv-vi.
\textsuperscript{171} ibid, p.vii.
\textsuperscript{172} Lindsay, Equal to the Task, p.219.
\textsuperscript{173} ibid, p.221.
\textsuperscript{176} 3AFB: Diary, pp.x-xi; 5AFB: Diary, 18 August 1918; 2AFB: Diary, 4-6 August 1918; AWM 26, Control Symbol 498/23, [Operations file, 1914-1918 War] Final Offensive, 1\textsuperscript{st} Australian Field Bakery, Aug to Oct 1918.
Calais Bakery

As discussed in the Introduction to this study, Captain Miles began writing the 2AFB diaries on 1 December 1917 after requests from Captain John Treloar of the Australian War Records Section. His diary finishes on 30 November 1918. Captain Miles also prepared a brief outline of the history of the 2AFB from mobilisation to 1 December 1917. It can be observed from this that a detailed account of events is only available for twelve months of the war – nine months of the 2AFB at Calais, and 3 months while it was at Rouen. The diary entries are usually bereft of information – habitually providing only the strength of the Unit. Captain Miles included in the diary copies of correspondence he considered important. There is little from the 3AFB records, since Captain Nash, the Officer in Charge, stated that a meticulous recording of events was unnecessary because it was already being done by Captain Miles.177 Other information is, however, gathered from the records of Captain Nash and the 3AFB, and the diary of Private Hyndman from Marrickville, New South Wales, of 3AFB.

The Calais Bakery was a large, four storey brick building, which had, before the outbreak of the war, been a paper factory.178 The bakery was a proper ‘Field Bakery’ in that everything was done by hand. The upper two floors were used for dough making, the second floor was also used for dough making as well as moulding the bread, and on the ground floor were the 48 large and 48 small Hunt steam ovens, fuelled by coke.179 Large chutes transported the dough from the upper floors to the moulding room, and the finished product was taken to the bread store and then loaded onto the ‘bread train’ on the track next to the bakery.180 The yeast was stored in an underground room as this was considered the best way for keeping it at the required cool temperature. A brick room with lighting and fans for cooling purposes was

177 AWM 16, Control Symbol 4379/15/28, Letter from Captain Nash to Captain J. Treloar, in 3rd Australian Field Bakery, 1 March 1918.
eventually built in its place. Yeast was brewed every day in a tent dubbed the ‘brewhouse’ to guard against an interruption in supply of compressed yeast from England. Flour came from Calais and Dunkirk, was brought in by rail, and stored close to the bakery.\textsuperscript{181} Some time later, another 39 ovens were installed outside the bakery to guard against an interruption of supply if the main building was hit in an air raid. As it increased its output, the Calais Bakery was a major source of bread to the armies.\textsuperscript{182} When the 2AFB arrived on 27 March 1916, ten British Field Bakeries were already working in the building under the supervision of two British officers and a Master Baker. The bakers worked in two shifts, with the first marching to the bakery at 1 a.m. and the second at 11 a.m.\textsuperscript{183}

On 21 November 1916, the 3AFB embarked in England for France, arriving at Calais on 26 November. The Calais weather was stormy and the men were weary from the voyage and moving the equipment and provisions. Because the bakery was in dire need of the extra labour, the 3AFB began working almost immediately.\textsuperscript{184} The Officer in Charge of the 3AFB, Captain Nash, states that the ‘conditions … [were] very exacting and laborious’.\textsuperscript{185} He provides a description of the amount and type of work required, which is very similar to that of Captain Miles, with 250,000 lbs or 3,200 bags of flour being specified as the average amount of flour needing to be moved every day.\textsuperscript{186} Captain Nash reiterates Captain Miles’s belief that the amount of work required of the men, particularly in the cold French climate, resulted in a ‘very high percentage of casualties’.\textsuperscript{187}

\textsuperscript{181} 3AFB: Diary, p.viii.
\textsuperscript{182} ibid, p.ix.
\textsuperscript{183} ‘War Records’, in 2AFB, p.5.
\textsuperscript{184} 3AFB: Diary, p.vii; PRO1251, Papers: Thomas James Hyndman. Note that Private Hyndman’s diary states that he arrived at the Calais Bakery on 25 January 1917.
\textsuperscript{185} 3AFB: Diary, p.ix.
\textsuperscript{186} 3AFB: Diary, p.ix; ‘War Records’, in 2AFB, p.6.
\textsuperscript{187} 3AFB: Diary, p.ix; ‘War Records’, in 2AFB, pp.5-6.
From the beginning, Captain Miles was unhappy with the running of the Calais Bakery, and did everything he could to institute changes (see below). In January 1917, Captain Miles was appointed as Officer in Charge of the Calais Bakery and immediately introduced changes to its operation.\textsuperscript{189} At the end of July 1917 Miles and the new Master Baker, Steele, instituted a system of three eight-hour shifts per day. Unlike the two-shift system, when rosters were only changed every two or three weeks, these shifts were rotated, so each man only spent one week at a particular shift. The changes also meant that the men had more leisure time.\textsuperscript{190} The two-shift system, which regularly had the men working up to 16-hour days, also ensured that many men missed at least one meal or went 12 hours without anything to eat. There was

expectation that the new system would bring relief in this matter.\textsuperscript{191} The changes were explained to the men in advance, together with a warning that if each shift did not produce its expected quota of bread, the old system would be re-instituted.\textsuperscript{192} This threat obviously worked wonders, because Captain Nash reported that, although the Army Service Corps manual laid down an expected daily output per bakery unit of 26,000 lbs, the 3AFB regularly produced 40,000 lbs.\textsuperscript{193} The Calais bakery, which had been producing 370,000 lbs every day, now produced 400,000 lbs or more.\textsuperscript{194} Captain Miles reported that the men were harder working and much happier, with far fewer reporting for Sick Parade.\textsuperscript{195} The bakery itself was less crowded, and fewer troughs and ovens, and consequently less fuel, were required daily to bake the necessary amount of bread.\textsuperscript{196} Private Hyndman, the author of the only diary by a baker held at the Australian War Memorial, mentions that they 'Started 3 eight hour shifts at Boulangerie', but makes no comments as to his thoughts on the efficacy of the new system.\textsuperscript{197} Historian Steve Karoly describes the American bakeries as, 'like a symphonic orchestra, production flowed ... Not one piece of equipment stood unused for long'.\textsuperscript{198} This statement could just as easily be used to describe the Calais Bakery, where the equipment was in use 24 hours every day.

The sections of the bakery were organised so that if there were any problems with the dough or bread due to neglect or other reasons, they could be easily and 'immediately traced to the individual concerned'.\textsuperscript{199} A dough maker from the section that made the dough brought it down from the upper floors to the moulding room. An

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{191} Letter from Miles to Base Records, in \textit{2AFB: Diary}, p.1.
  \item \textsuperscript{192} 'War Records', in \textit{2AFB}, p.6.
  \item \textsuperscript{193} \textit{3AFB: Diary}, p.x.
  \item \textsuperscript{194} Letter from Miles to Base Records, in \textit{2AFB: Diary}, p.1; \textit{3AFB: Diary}, p.x; 'War Records', in \textit{2AFB}, p.7.
  \item \textsuperscript{195} 'War Records', in \textit{2AFB}, p.6.
  \item \textsuperscript{196} ibid, p.7.
  \item \textsuperscript{197} Hyndman, 'Diary', 29-30 July 1917. \textit{Boulangerie} is French for Bakery.
  \item \textsuperscript{198} Karoly, \textit{1916 Field Bakery Schedule}.
  \item \textsuperscript{199} 'War Records', in \textit{2AFB}, p.9.
\end{itemize}
officer inspected each dough and if shoddy work was revealed, the culprit was warned and his name entered into a ‘complaints book’. A second complaint against a dough maker earned him a reprimand.\(^\text{200}\) After the dough was moulded into a loaf and before it entered the ovens, the number of the section was pricked onto the top. This provided a vent for the gas to escape, and allowed for easy identification if the loaf was subsequently found to be ‘improperly cooked’.\(^\text{201}\) Captain Miles reports that although a huge number of loaves were baked at the bakery, there were very few substandard loaves discovered and therefore hardly any complaints of neglect or shoddy work.\(^\text{202}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.1: Total Strength Calais Bakery February 1917(^\text{203})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th Imperial FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Imperial FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th Imperial FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd AFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd AFB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In February 1917, the Master Baker provided the numbers in Table 3.1 to Captain Miles.\(^\text{204}\) It can be observed that the strength of the bakery is 949 men. In Captain Miles’s report of the 2AFB’s arrival at Calais, written in December 1917, states that the Australian Unit ‘made a total of 12 Field Bakeries at work in the one building’.\(^\text{205}\) Table 3.1 clearly indicates there are only three Imperial Field Bakeries. The strength of these bakeries, at 255 each, is much greater than the 93 men in each of the AFBs.

\(^\text{200}\) ibid.  
\(^\text{201}\) ibid, pp.9-10.  
\(^\text{202}\) ibid, p10.  
\(^\text{203}\) Letter from Master Baker to O.C. Calais Bakery, in 2AFB: Diary, 28 February 1917, p.2.  
\(^\text{204}\) ‘War Records’, in 2AFB, p.6; 2AFB: Diary, 18 January 1917.  
\(^\text{205}\) ‘War Records’, in 2AFB, p.5.
With a contingent of between 930 and 950 men, the Calais Bakery produced around 400,000 lbs of bread every day. At the end of 1917, its largest daily output had been 443,784 lbs, feeding 560,000 troops. With a staff of 1,300, Captain Miles believed the bakery was capable of producing 600,000 lbs of bread every day. There were ovens available for this surge in output if required, but by the end of 1917, the necessity had not eventuated.\textsuperscript{206} Figures provided by Captain Miles maintain that the normal daily output was 390,144 lbs, and forced daily output was 423,808 lbs.\textsuperscript{207}

The diaries indicate that, the enemy aside, life at the bakery was, if not monotonous, at least predictable. In October 1917, Captains Miles and Nash wrote that ‘nothing has eventuated of historical interest, nor have any important orders been received’.\textsuperscript{208} Captain Miles’s entries into the Unit diary rarely indicate anything other than strength of the Unit, and air raid warnings or aerial attacks. In March 1918, Captain Nash wrote:

\begin{quote}
I find it difficult to give, anything in the way of an illuminating diary. The work here is carried on day after day, with very little to disturb the serenity or perhaps, the monotonous regularity of the daily duties.\textsuperscript{209}
\end{quote}

Writer Alexander Irvine notes that the men worked without speaking.\textsuperscript{210} Needless to say, anything out of the ordinary drew a response from at least one of the diarists, usually Private Hyndman. Boxing was deemed enjoyable entertainment where one could gamble on the outcome.\textsuperscript{211} On 7 February 1917, there was a boxing display with the price of admission of one franc for officers, 50 cents for warrant officers and

\textsuperscript{206} ibid, p.7.
\textsuperscript{207} ‘Captain J. Miles, Normal and Forced Output’, in 2AFB: Diary, 1917.
\textsuperscript{208}AWM 16, Control Symbol 4379/15/27, Letter from Captain J. Miles to Australian War Records Office, 20 October 1917, in 2\textsuperscript{nd} Australian Field Bakery; Letter from Captain Nash to Australian War Records Office, in 3AFB, 21 October 1917.
\textsuperscript{209} Letter from Captain Nash to Australian War Records Office, in 3AFB, 1 March 1918.
\textsuperscript{210} Alexander Irvine, ‘11,000,000 Loaves a Week’, (clipping) in Hyndman, Diary. An Alexander Irvine, born 1863, died 1941, parson and writer, was an army chaplain in Flanders during World War One.
\textsuperscript{211} Kerr, Private Wars, p.260.
sergeants, with the rest paying 20 cents. Private Hyndman does not mention this display in his diary, suggesting he did not attend. He notes a concert at the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) on the evening of the 26 June 1917. Less than two weeks later, Hyndman comments that he could see the flotilla of ‘aeroplanes, airships, destroyers, etc.’ accompanying King George V back across the English Channel after his visit to the front. Christmas 1917 was the first time since the Australians arrived at the Calais Bakery that all ranks were given 24 hours off duty. It was a white Christmas, and certainly a treat for the Australians regardless of the extreme cold. Private Hyndman records that it was a holiday at the bakery with ‘A good Xmas dinner and Enjoyable time. Would not think there was a War on’. Less than two weeks later, on 6 January 1918, the personnel of the bakery was called together to hear, read aloud, a Proclamation from King George V, designating the day as ‘a special day of prayer’. Private Hyndman was being detained in the Medical Hut with bronchitis at the time, so his reaction to the Proclamation, if he had one, cannot, unfortunately, be determined. On 4 May 1918 the men were offered another concert at the YMCA.

This meagre account of entertainment and special days cannot be considered all encompassing; Captain Miles never mentions provision of entertainment in his Unit diary, and Private Hyndman appears to have only made note if he attended the event. The bakers, however, were allowed out of camp after 5 p.m., and frequented the local cafés and estaminets (taverns). The estaminets were very popular with the Australian soldiers because women who served ‘Belgian beer and French wine, [and] fried eggs

---

213 Hyndman, ‘Diary’, 3 July 1917.
214 ibid, 14 July 1917.
215 2AFB: Diary, 25 December 1917.
217 2AFB: Diary, 6 January 1918.
219 ibid, 4 May 1918.
and chips as a staple’ operated them. The times spent at the estaminets were a refuge in an otherwise cold and lonely winter.\textsuperscript{220} As outlined below, the statistics of AWOL and drunkenness indicate that some of the men readily availed themselves, often to excess, of the opportunities for entertainment. When Private Hyndman was en route to Calais in January 1917, he noticed upon his arrival at Etaples, a sign prominently displayed that said ‘Out of Bounds to Australians’.\textsuperscript{221} Unfortunately, Hyndman does not elaborate on what it was that was out of bounds, but it indicates that the Australians may have, as British Field Marshall Sir Douglas Haig constantly maintained, shown a ‘lack of discipline’, at Etaples.\textsuperscript{222} On 1 February 1917, Lieutenant-Colonel B.J.G. Woods, Officer in Charge of the Army Service Corps at Calais, ordered the Café Ransom Loveoue on the Rue de l’Anere in Calais out of bounds for all British personnel, which of course included the Australians, for a period of three months for permitting gambling on the premises.\textsuperscript{223} It is not unreasonable to presume that many of the Australian bakers at the Calais Bakery left the camp whenever possible to give themselves some respite from the monotony of work and the pressures of regular air raid warnings and aerial attacks.

The boredom of tedious work, together with the constant bad weather at Calais, is revealed by an amusing sequence of entries in Private Hyndman’s diary (Table 3.2).\textsuperscript{224}

\textsuperscript{221} Hyndman, ‘Diary’, 6 January 1917.  
\textsuperscript{222} Quoted in Andrews, \textit{Anzac Illusion}, pp.102-103.  
\textsuperscript{224} Hyndman, ‘Diary’, 1-9 August 1917.
TABLE 3.2: Hyndman Diary 1 – 9 August 1917

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-Aug-17</td>
<td>Raining day &amp; night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-Aug-17</td>
<td>Rainy weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-Aug-17</td>
<td>Still raining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-Aug-17</td>
<td>Three years of this Greatest War in history. Still raining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-Aug-17</td>
<td>Showery weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-Aug-17</td>
<td>Showery weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-Aug-17</td>
<td>Showery weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-Aug-17</td>
<td>Showery weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-Aug-17</td>
<td>Showery weather.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private Hyndman’s poignant note for 22 September 1917 perhaps sums up his, and no doubt others’ feelings and hopes:

Big British and Australian Advance on the Flanders Front. Great success and best reply Hun peace note.\(^{225}\)

The end of the war, of course, took another 14 months. Private Hyndman had been returned to Australia as medically unfit, discharged, and was back at home with his wife and two children by that time.\(^{226}\)

**Adversities**

Units ‘reinforced themselves by making “demand” on the Australian Base Depot’ at either Étaples or Le Havre, and a problem besetting Captain Miles was the return of his men after their release from hospital.\(^{227}\) In May 1916, he advised the Australian Records Section that he had received notification that three of his men, upon their release from hospital, had been sent to Base Details rather than back to their Unit. He provided the names and Service/Regimental numbers of these men, and requested that they, and any other of 2AFB men in the same situation, be sent back to the bakery upon release.\(^{228}\) The reply Captain Miles received stated that, if possible, this was what usually happened. The letter then contradicted its previous statement when it went on to provide the names of two men who, upon release, had been sent to the

\(^{225}\) ibid, 22 September 1917.


\(^{228}\) Letter from Lieutenant J. Miles to Australian Records Section, 3rd Echelon B.E.F. France, in *2AFB: Diary*, 9 May 1916.
1AFB at Rouen. Captain Miles immediately wrote again to the Records Section, reiterating the necessity of the return of, not just the original three men, but also these other two. He then suggested that more of his men had been sent elsewhere upon their discharge from hospital, and that he required all men belonging to the 2AFB to be sent immediately back to the Unit.

In another letter to the Records Section written a few days later, Captain Miles complained that when men were sent off to hospital, he was not informed as to their whereabouts or the date of their discharge. He explained that this made it very difficult to apply directly for their return. He also named one of the men who had not returned, Private Leslie Godber, a 19 year old from Carlton, Victoria. Private Godber had been in hospital with influenza, and upon release, was one of the two sent to the 1AFB. Captain Miles stated that Private Godber was ‘only a young lad’ and that he had promised the boy’s parents that he would look after him. There is no reply from the Records Section in the diary, but Private Godber’s dossier indicates that he was transferred to the 1AFB on 22 June 1916, not long after Miles requested his return. This suggests that, regardless of Captain Miles’s request, Godber never returned to the 2AFB. It also suggests a certain disregard for Miles’s requests.

One year later, Captain Miles was still having trouble procuring the return of his men after hospitalisation. In reply to a letter he wrote complaining that his men were taking too long to return, if they were returned at all, he was advised that his men would be sent back as soon as they were discharged and fit, and without ‘undue
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delay’. Captain Miles, needless to state, did not allow this reply to go unchallenged. He wrote back, suggesting that although it was stated his men would be returned, it was not happening. He informed the Records Section of the names of nine bakers who had not returned to the Unit after being sent to a convalescent camp and said the bakery was undermanned and very busy. Either the men were returned or Captain Miles realised the futility of his requests, because there is no more correspondence between him and the Records Section on the subject.

In February 1918 Captain Miles expressed his frustration with the 'bread checkers'. The job of these men was to record the amount of bread issued, and because the Companies supplying the checkers were transitory, very few men gained the experience to perform to an acceptable standard. Upon checking, Captain Miles found that 62, instead of the required 50 loaves, were frequently placed into large bags, and 22, instead of 20 loaves, were placed into the small bags. Miles believed that a group permanently assigned to the bakery should carry out the job of bread checking. His request for these changes was denied.

The output of the bakery was decreased from time to time as flour supplies became scarce, a scarcity was expected, or they were reduced for some reason. In this case, the bakers received a day’s respite from their normal duties. Often the flour received from England was of substandard quality, resulting in a loaf that was too dark in colour and did not store well. On 15 February 1918, the steamer carrying the flour, the River Araxis, collided with the breakwater as it evaded a collision with
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another vessel.\textsuperscript{241} One thousand bags of flour were damaged by water, but using this first avoided what could have been a substantial loss.\textsuperscript{242}

Although 1,200 lbs of yeast was used at the bakery every day, only 1,064 lbs of compressed yeast was brought in daily from England. The bakery personnel brewed the rest.\textsuperscript{243} Yeast caused them all kinds of problems because of its nature. It had to be unpacked and removed from the railway immediately upon arrival, stored away from everything else, if possible in a ventilated room, and kept cold but never allowed to freeze.\textsuperscript{244} It could remain viable for four to six weeks if stored in water, kept cool and away from ‘destructive agents’.\textsuperscript{245} It was at its prime strength at five days old, but deteriorated thereafter, so it was used as soon as possible if still around after five days. There were many remedies to salvage as much of the yeast as possible if a problem occurred.\textsuperscript{246}

On 6 August 1918, Captain Miles was given final confirmation and instructions regarding the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} Field Bakeries’ move to Rouen. The 3AFB left Calais on 14 August and the 2AFB on 25 August.\textsuperscript{247}

The Rouen Bakeries

As previously stated, there is not a great deal written in the 1\textsuperscript{st}, 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} AFB diaries at Rouen, whereas the records of the 2AFB at the Calais Bakery incorporate quite a lot of material, specifically correspondence. There were two bakeries at Rouen: Bakeries North on the north bank of the Seine River, and Bakeries South on the south bank.\textsuperscript{248} The three AFBs sent from Egypt to Rouen in 1916 were sent to Bakeries South, but

\textsuperscript{241} ibid, 15 February 1918.
\textsuperscript{242} ‘General’, in 2AFB: Diary, February 1918, p.3.
\textsuperscript{243} ‘War Records’, 2AFB, p.8.
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\textsuperscript{246} ibid, p.2.
\textsuperscript{247} 2AFB: Diary, 4, 6, 14, 25 August 1918.
\textsuperscript{248} 3AFB: Diary, p.xi.
within a short while, the 4th and 5th AFBs were moved to Bakeries North although they did not work together at that site until 24 April 1918. Of the 1AFB at Bakeries South, there is very little known. Combining the diaries of the 4th and 5th AFBs at Bakeries North furnishes a little more information. The diaries record the formation of each unit and provide daily information from November 1917.

At Bakeries North the railway track ran alongside the bread store and a daily average of two trains, each with seven or eight carriages, carried the bakery’s output. Until the middle of 1918, the bread was stacked into large bags that held fifty 2 lb loaves. After this time, smaller bags that held only twenty-five 2 lb loaves were used. This change transpired because many of the personnel the Australians labelled ‘B class’ could not carry the large bags (see below). The Australians did not like the new system as they had to handle twice as many bags and the job took about two hours longer than it had previously. The smaller bags were harder to stack and more easily crushed than the larger ones. Around 40 men, mostly Australian and class ‘A’, worked in the bread store bagging the bread, tying and labelling the bags, and loading them onto various parts of the train.

Christmas and New Year of 1917 were organised for all of the men of the Rouen bakeries to enjoy themselves. Each man received a Christmas package: a ‘handsome leather wallet’ from the Australian YMCA, and some ‘comforts’, including ‘several cases of Xmas cheer’, from the Australian Comforts Fund. The diaries record that the celebrations were very successful. Private William C. Sewell, a baker with 249 5AFB: Diary, 4, 7 July 1916, 24 April 1918.
250 ‘Breadloading from breadstore to rail transport’, in ‘Appendix No. 1’, in 5AFB: Diary, 1 August 1918; 4AFB: Diary, 28 April 1918.
251 ‘Breadloading from breadstore to rail transport’.
252 4AFB: Diary, 24-25 December 1917, 1 January 1918; Appendix No. 13: Details of rationing and accommodation’, in 5AFB: Diary, 31 December 1917.
1AFB at Bakeries South, who enlisted in November 1914, drew the menus for Christmas and New Year 1917 reproduced below.\textsuperscript{253}

\textbf{ILLUST. 1: Rouen Bakery Christmas 1917 Menu – Front & Back covers}\textsuperscript{254}

As can be noted, the front page of the keepsake represents two soldiers, an Australian and a New Zealander, toasting each other in an orderly fashion. The last page of the memento, ‘The End of a Perfect Day’, reveals the same men, beer bottles in hand, singing, arm around each other and barely able to stand – possibly close to the truth. As can be ascertained by an examination of the menu (Illustration 2), those who decided upon its contents encompassed as much patriotism as they could in the names of the items.

\textsuperscript{253} NAA, B2455, \textit{W. C. Sewell}, Canberra, 2001; \textit{1AFB: Diary}.
\textsuperscript{254} Menu drawn by Private William C. Sewell, in \textit{1AFB: Diary}.
ILLUST. 2: Rouen Bakery Christmas 1917 Menu

ILLUST. 3: News Year’s Eve 1917: Rouen Bakery
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When the 5AFB started work at Bakeries North on 12 July 1916 with the Imperial Bakeries, its equipment was being stored for the duration at Bakeries South. The Imperial Bakeries did not provide 5AFB with enough ovens or equipment for the unit to work as a whole, so some worked with the Imperial Bakers, and the rest, between 35 and 40 men, worked together in a small group.\(^{257}\) Captain Pye was upset about the situation because he could not specify the number of loaves the 5AFB baked as a unit, and it is obvious from all of the diaries that the Australians took great pride in their prowess at baking and the numbers of loaves they produced.\(^{258}\)

Captain Pye is the only AFB Officer in Charge to detail the accommodation of his men. The corporals and Other Ranks were housed in ‘Alwyn huts’ 21 ft by 7 ft, with seven men to each hut. Sergeants lived with Imperial officers of the same rank in a separate hut, and senior non-commissioned officers lived in booths, partitioned from the huts. Each man had a fold-up bed, which, Captain Pye believed, were responsible for a drop in all sicknesses.\(^{259}\) These long and narrow huts obviously provided each Other Rank and corporal with just enough room to sleep on his fold-up bed. It can be ascertained that the accommodation was not spectacular, but compared to the 2\(^{nd}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) AFBs whose men lived in tents, they were probably very acceptable.

**Australian Field Bakery Reorganisation of August 1918**

The AFBs were reorganised in August 1918 when the two stationed at Calais, the 2\(^{nd}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) AFBs, joined the 1\(^{st}\), 4\(^{th}\), and 5\(^{th}\) AFBs at Rouen.\(^{260}\) This reorganisation occurred because the Imperial Field Bakeries left Rouen.\(^{261}\) On 4 August 1918, the 2AFB was advised to prepare to move to Rouen, and two days later, those at the Calais Bakery were advised that the 3AFB would leave for Rouen on 14 August with the 2AFB

\(^{257}\) *5AFB: Diary*, 12 July 1916.  
\(^{258}\) ibid.  
\(^{259}\) ‘Details of rationing and accommodation’, in *5AFB: Diary*.  
\(^{260}\) *3AFB: Diary*, pp.x-xi; *5AFB: Diary*, 18 August 1918; *2AFB: Diary*, 4 & 6 August 1918; *Final Offensive, 1AFB, Aug to Oct 1918*.  
\(^{261}\) *Final Offensive, 1AFB, 4 August 1918*.  
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following on 25 August. The 6th and 7th Imperial Field Bakeries, previously stationed at Rouen, replaced the two AFBs at Calais. The 1AFB moved from Bakeries South to Bakeries North where the 4th and 5th AFBs were working, and 3AFB joined them from Calais. The 2nd Field Bakery was moved to Bakeries South, where it was joined by the 1st New Zealand Field Bakery. This means that, after the reorganisation, the 1st, 3rd, 4th and 5th AFBs were together at Bakeries North and the 2AFB was at Bakeries South.

Major John G. Prior of the 1AFB was appointed as Officer in Charge of Bakeries North Rouen, and Captains Nash, Isaachsen, and Pye were with him. It was a ‘purely Australian’ organisation. Bakeries North was a fully mechanised bakery, with the dough and moulding made by machine, and using steam ovens. It produced around 200,000 lbs of bread every day, which was packed and loaded onto an average of 15 railway vans 24 hours after it was cooked. It was forwarded to ‘Sections’ at the front and also supplied to Paris. The men worked in two shifts, from 4 a.m. to 1 p.m., and from 1 p.m. until 10 p.m. Because Bakeries North, for the first time, was now a ‘purely Australian’ organisation, it was thought that no ‘other element should enter into contact’. Everyone, therefore, from bread loaders, to administrative staff, to regimental police, to cooks, to boot repairers, was Australian personnel. The bakers were accommodated in wooden huts.

262 2AFB: Diary, 4 & 6 August 1918.
263 Captain A.C. Cooper, ‘Organisation Colonial Field Bakery, Rouen’, in 3AFB: Diary, 7 August 1918.
264 1AFB: Diary, 5AFB: Diary, 18 August 1918; 3AFB: Diary, pp.x-xi; 5AFB: Diary, 18 August 1918; 2AFB: Diary, 26 August 1918; Final Offensive, 1AFB, 4 August 1918.
265 3AFB: Diary, p.xi; Final Offensive, 1AFB, 24 September 1918.
266 3AFB: Diary, p.xi
267 3AFB: Diary, p.xi; Note that Major Prior states that Bakeries North had a full working capacity of 250,000 lbs of bread per day, and that this was ‘normal’ - Final Offensive, 1AFB, 24 September 1918.
268 3AFB: Diary, p.xi; Final Offensive, 1AFB, 24 September 1918.
269 3AFB: Diary, p.xi.
270 ibid.
Major John Miles of the 2AFB was appointed to command Bakeries South.\textsuperscript{271} Lieutenant W.Y. Lloyd of the 1\textsuperscript{st} New Zealand Field Bakery was with him.\textsuperscript{272} The work at Bakeries South was carried out entirely by hand, and was, like the Calais bakery, a 'Field Bakery'. It had 36 Perkins Field Ovens, each with a capacity of producing 300 lbs of bread every ninety minutes, making a total of 10,800 lbs for every round of baking. The bakery averaged an output of 64,000 lbs of bread every day. This bread was distributed to local troops and the hospital, the larger Units receiving theirs directly, and those drawing less than 100 lbs every day receiving their supply from the 'Detail Issue Store'.\textsuperscript{273}

The Australians working at Bakeries North and South took great pride in 'their all being together', and they remained together at Rouen until January 1919.\textsuperscript{274} At Armistice on 11 November 1918, Captain Pye of the 3AFB, based at Bakeries North, made this entry into his diary:

> The scenes were the wildest and what exactly happened can better be imagined than described.\textsuperscript{275}

Despite the lively jubilation, the bakeries sustained their output. In December of 1918 as the troops began to find their way back to England, however, there was a decrease in bread requirements. The output of Bakeries North dropped from around 200,000 lbs every day to around 95,000 lbs. By the end of the month, issue by the railway vans was ceased, but because so many troops had moved into Rouen and the neighbouring areas, and Bakeries South could not cope with the influx, Bakeries North added its output to the supply. Bakeries North subsequently reduced its output to between 80,000 and 90,000 lbs every day.\textsuperscript{276}

\textsuperscript{271} 3AFB: Diary, p.xi; Final Offensive, 1AFB, 24 September 1918.
\textsuperscript{272} Final Offensive, 1AFB, 24 September 1918.
\textsuperscript{273} ibid.
\textsuperscript{274} 3AFB: Diary, p.xii.
\textsuperscript{275} ibid, p.xi.
\textsuperscript{276} ibid.
Christmas 1918 was obviously a different type of celebration than that of 1917. Armistice had been declared, the war was over, and the men were looking forward to returning to Australia at the earliest opportunity. A 3AFB baker, Private Leslie N. Gartrell, drew a card celebrating the occasion. It is reproduced below. The details of the card are difficult to distinguish but there is a possum, kookaburra, and koala up the top, and a kangaroo with a German pith helmet at its feet at the bottom left. The kangaroo is wearing a slouch hat and is holding an Australian flag. The four flags intertwined with the words 'Our Victorious Xmas' are those of England, Belgium, the United States of America, and France. The space allowed for the addition of the sender’s name at bottom right suggests the card was reproduced in some quantities. Perhaps some of the Australian bakers and other soldiers of the AIF sent these cards back to loved ones in Australia.

**ILLUST. 4: 1918 Christmas Postcard: Our Victorious Christmas**

---

277 Postcard drawn by Private Leslie N. Gartrell, in *IAFB: Diary.*
Move to Le Havre – January 1919

In January 1919, the 2nd and 3rd AFBs were ordered to move their operations from Rouen to Le Havre. A new army bakery had been established at Cologne in Germany, and several of the Imperial Bakeries working at Le Havre were relocated there. Because the output from Rouen had been decreasing because of dwindling demand due to demobilisation, the two AFBs moved to Le Havre to assist with operations. They left Rouen on 13 January 1919, arrived at Le Havre the following morning, and commenced duties the same day. With the two AFBs leaving Rouen, all of the Australian bakers felt a sense of loss, as Rouen was the first and only time throughout the course of the war that the five Australian Bakeries had worked together in the same area.

At Le Havre, the two AFBs were, once again, under Imperial management, but without any discernable conflict. Four sections of Imperial troops remained at the bakery, and the six sections from the 2AFB and the four from the 3AFB meant that an extra ten sections were on hand. The 1st New Zealand Field Bakery also moved from Bakeries South to the Le Havre Bakery and commenced work there one week after the Australians’ arrival. The AFBs, however, were not at full strength; illness and leave had greatly reduced the numbers, and they would continue dwindling as demobilisation commenced, theoretically first with those who had enlisted in 1914 and 1915, and then with those who enlisted the following year.

The bakery at Le Havre was a number of small buildings, with oven rooms attached to dough rooms for ease of operation. Supplies such as flour, yeast, coke, and wood were transported in. Procedures and techniques were much the same as those at Calais except there was only one day shift of eight hours. The dough makers commenced their duties at 9 p.m., and the bread makers began at 6 a.m., finishing at

---

278 3AFB: Diary, p.xii.
279 Ibid.
two in the afternoon. The Le Havre outfit made around 23,000 lbs of bread every day, although, as numbers of troops, and therefore demand varied, so did the bakery’s output. Accommodation at the camp was good and clean, and the units were granted greater freedoms, probably because the war was officially over. German prisoners of war, sixty of whom were employed at Le Havre, began carrying out various tasks at all field bakeries in France.\textsuperscript{280}

Driver Wallace Campbell wrote home to his mother in February 1919 from the Australian Army Service Corps Training Depot at Salisbury:

The demobilisation is proceeding very slowly. Those in authority are making a very poor job of it, and the boys are getting very much dissatisfied and restless. I fear that there is likely to be trouble. The men will not stand the slowness of the methods. The whole business is a muddle from the start and it has not finished yet.\textsuperscript{281} Private Charles Jackson and some men of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Australian Mechanical Transport Company decided to strike until those in charge allowed those who had seen service at Gallipoli go home first. They returned to their duties after receiving an assurance that ‘Gallipoli originals’ would be on their way back to Australia within one month. Many men took the opportunity to tour France.\textsuperscript{282} Gradually, as transport became available, the Australians were returned to Australia.

\textbf{Conclusion}

This chapter documents the formations of the five Australian Field Bakeries and their actions during the Gallipoli and Western Front campaigns at Lemnos, Imbros, Tel-el-Kebir, Calais, Rouen and Le Havre. The fighting soldiers needed bread for health reasons, but because of transport limitations, the Australians on Gallipoli only received supplies every second day, and then only if the weather did not prohibit delivery. The weather at the other locations, whether unbearably hot and windy, or freezing cold, triggered various health problems. The Bakeries often had to make their bread with

\textsuperscript{280} \textit{ibid.}
\textsuperscript{281} Letter from Wallace Campbell to Mother, in Campbell & Hosken, 20 February 1919, p.190.
makeshift ingredients because of shortages or rotten and inferior materials. When any of the Australian bakers spent time in hospital, the Officers in Charge had real problems getting them back in a reasonable amount of time. Consequently, the Bakeries nearly always worked at under full strength. Although the men of the Australian Field Bakeries and their actions cannot be described as heroic, they were an integral component in the supply of food to the men of the AIF.
Chapter 4
The bakers and the AIF: demographics

In researching the Australian Field Bakeries, one of the most pressing tasks was to identify the names of the men who spent time in any of the five units. Names were gathered from an examination of Nominal Rolls and Reinforcement Lists, Unit Diaries, Routine Orders, and any other document that disclosed such information. I identified the surnames of 723 men (see Appendix 1): often the information provided was little more than a surname, a Service/Regimental number, and a brief notation of, for example, illness, or Absent Without Leave. A name or Service/Regimental number was often recorded slightly differently from that of a previous notation, and it was difficult to ascertain whether this was a new record, or whether an error had occurred. In these instances, I attempted to obtain the correct information from the Australian War Memorial’s Commemorative Roll. This Roll, although the product of an almighty undertaking, contains errors in itself, is often out of alphabetical order, and there are omissions. It would be an extremely onerous task to examine each of the 330,000 records on this Roll.¹

Nominal Rolls and Reinforcement Lists are an excellent source of information because they detail the age, marital status, date and state of enlistment, home address and that of the next of kin, the date of leaving Australia and the name of the transport, as well as other information including the Service/Regimental number. To obtain more

¹ An example of this is the record of N. Short. Sometimes the name was spelt with one ‘t’ and at other times with two. At times the Service/Regimental number provided was 2446, and at other times, 3247. The AWM’s Commemorative Roll lists him as Nathaniel Shortt, service number 3247, and there is no record for N. Short with either service number. This does not necessarily mean, however, that N. Short does not exist and that these men are not two separate identities.
information, it is necessary to examine the service dossiers of each soldier. The National Archives of Australia is currently in the process of restoring, repackaging and scanning the service dossiers of Australian World War One soldiers, and making them available on its Website for download. In this way, it was possible to gather information on approximately twenty of the bakery members. The rest of my information was extracted at the National Archives office in Canberra by personally ordering and inspecting each dossier, concentrating, (as did Lloyd Robson in ‘The Origin and Character of the First A.I.F., 1914-1918: Some Statistical Evidence’, Suzanne Welborn in Lords of Death: a people a place a legend, and Dale Blair in his history of the 1st Battalion, Dinkum Diggers: an Australian Battalion at War), on the attestation papers and casualty/record of service forms. The attestation papers disclose such background information as age, marital status, place of birth, trade and apprenticeship, previous military service, height, weight, unexpanded and expanded chest measurements, eye and hair colour, and distinguishing marks. The casualty/record of service forms impart such information as arrivals and departures, admittance to hospital and illness, crimes and punishments, promotions, and commendations. Using these two processes, I was able to gather full information on 307, or 42.46 per cent, of the bakers. Together with other sources, I was able to extract full or useful partial information, other than name and Service/Regimental number, on 467 or 64.59 per cent of the bakers in some cases, and 404 or 55.88 per cent, in others.
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2 Robson, ‘Origin and Character’; Welborn, Lords of Death; Blair, Dinkum Diggers.
3 At the National Archives of Australia, I literally requested the personal service dossiers in alphabetical order of the bakers’ names, and 307 is when time put aside for such research ran out. Most of this information, therefore, derives from those bakers with names in the first half of the alphabet. There is no reason to assume that this information would vary greatly from that if using the whole alphabet.
4 It should be noted that after Armistice, many soldiers were taken on strength into one of the bakeries for ration purposes while they were awaiting their return to Australia. Within a few days, these men were struck off strength and boarded their transport. These soldiers are not included in my register of 723 bakers.
My reason for extracting this information was to determine if there were any inconsistencies between the statistics of the AIF as examined by various authors, and those men allocated to the bakeries. In 1973, Lloyd Robson analysed 0.55 per cent of the 416,812 attestation papers each AIF soldier completed upon enlistment, making 2,291 papers examined. Joan Beaumont asserts that Robson’s conclusions have been acknowledged as ‘generally sound’ even though they have been ‘drawn from a relatively small sample’. Jeffrey Grey, however, believes Robson’s small sample should be ‘treated with caution’. Suzanne Welborn’s 1982 text, Lords of Death: a people a place a legend, focuses on the war experience, and its impact upon Australian society. She analyses statistics of 1,500 men in three Western Australian Battalions. In 2001, Dale Blair wrote an informative and exploratory history of the 1st Battalion, Dinkum Diggers: an Australian Battalion at War. He provides information on 1,030 men, such as Occupation, Religion and Promotion, which can be compared to my figures.

In this chapter, the statistics of the bakers are analysed and compared to that of the AIF as analysed by Robson, Welborn’s three Western Australian Battalions, and those provided by Blair’s 1st Battalion and medical historian A.G. Butler when applicable. I also break down the details of those 307 bakers of which I extracted full details, into year of enlistment, and compare them with each other. It should be noted that the AIF and bakery figures cover recruits from all states whereas Welborn’s figures cover only three Western Australian units.

---

7 Grey, Military History, p.282.
8 Welborn, Lords of Death.
9 Blair, Dinkum Diggers.
Age at enlistment

TABLE 4.1: % Age at enlistment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30-34</th>
<th>35-39</th>
<th>40+</th>
<th>Unkwn</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butler (343,250)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robson AIF (2,291)</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welborn WAB (1,500)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers (467)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 467 (64.6%) of bakery members

Several conclusions might be drawn from these figures: the first is that Butler and Robson’s figures are very similar – which is what would be hoped. Another conclusion is that the bakers, as a group, drew fewer young recruits between 18 and 19, and more recruits over 40 than the AIF and Western Australian Battalions.

Robson notes that January 1917 saw a significant increase in the enlistment of 18 and 19 year old men, to the extent that an officer, Captain Burkett, believed that the improvement in enlistment at this time was the result of ‘baby boys’ volunteering their services.12 Welborn states that the average age for the AIF was 26.4 years, which is the same figure for the Western Australian Battalions.13 The bakers have an average age of just over 27 years, so it might be more apt to conclude that the lower percentage at the younger age group, and the higher at the older age group, average out to approximate the mean of the AIF and Western Australian Battalions. Robson reveals that, at 58.4 per cent, the majority of the AIF was aged between 20 and 29 years. The majority of the Western Australian Battalions, at 60.4 per cent, and the bakers, 62.3 per cent, were also between the ages of 20 and 29 years.14

Table 4.2 (below) reveals the impact the war had on the age of recruits. The percentage of AIF recruits aged 18 and 19 increased slightly during the middle period,
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11 Butler, *Army Medical Services*, III, Table No. 28. Note: Butler includes the numbers of the Australian Navy and the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force in his statistics; Robson, ‘Origin and Character’ p.743; Welborn, *Lords of Death*, p.188.
13 Welborn, *Lords of Death*, pp.53, 188.
but lowering the age limit to recruit extra men made a significant impact in the final period. This impact is not indicated by the bakery figures, which were relatively stable throughout.

TABLE 4.2: Date of enlistment in the AIF classified by age in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Aug 1914 - Jun 1915</th>
<th>July 1915 - Aug 1916</th>
<th>Sep 1916 - end war</th>
<th>Total of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIF</td>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>AIF</td>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>AIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. %</td>
<td>no. %</td>
<td>no. %</td>
<td>no. %</td>
<td>no. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>58 10.5</td>
<td>9 6.0</td>
<td>149 13.2</td>
<td>22 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>243 44.2</td>
<td>67 44.4</td>
<td>412 36.5</td>
<td>97 35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>121 22.0</td>
<td>30 19.9</td>
<td>252 22.3</td>
<td>71 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>72 13.1</td>
<td>23 15.2</td>
<td>126 11.2</td>
<td>34 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>38 6.9</td>
<td>13 8.6</td>
<td>92 8.1</td>
<td>24 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+</td>
<td>17 3.1</td>
<td>9 6.0</td>
<td>98 9</td>
<td>25 9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkwn</td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0.1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>550 100</td>
<td>151 100</td>
<td>1130 100</td>
<td>273 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 467 (64.6%) of bakery members

The numbers of the AIF aged between 20 and 29 fell over the course of the war although this group made up 58.4 per cent of the total. This same group made up 62.3 per cent of the bakery total. Overall, the AIF recruits aged 35 and over make up 14.75 of the total, and those of the bakery, 16.5 per cent of the total. I can conclude that the ages of the bakery recruits were slightly older than the AIF recruits were. It is possible that older and perhaps more cautious recruits volunteered for bakery duty because it was perceived as less hazardous. It is more likely that baking apprenticeships ensured that the age of trained enlistees was older than those who enlisted into non-skilled areas. Of the 136 men enlisting in the bakeries who detailed an apprenticeship, 24 or 17.7 per cent did not state the length and 81 per cent completed two or more years. Of these 110 men or 81 per cent, ten men, or 9.1 per cent, completed apprenticeships over more than five years. I believe this is the most
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15 *ibid.*
16 *ibid.* Robson chose to break enlistment into these three specific periods: the first being when very little effort was needed to encourage recruitment; the second is during the period of a vigorous recruiting drive in Victoria during which Prime Minister Hughes was actively encouraging the introduction to conscription; the third is from the announcement of the first Conscription plebiscite until the end of the war.
likely explanation for the slightly higher average age of the bakers compared to the AIF.

Figure 4.2 also reveals that the first and last periods attracted almost the same number of AIF enlistments – 24 per cent in the first, and 26 per cent in the last. Almost 50 percent of the AIF enlisted in the middle period. One-third of the bakers, however, enlisted in the first period, 59 per cent in the second, and only 9 per cent in the third. It may perhaps be concluded that either the strong appeals for reinforcements did not make as great an impact upon civilian bakers as those in some other professions, or most of the experienced bakers had enlisted by September 1916.

Marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.3: Marital status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Butler’s figures include only those Australians posted overseas. Figures available for 467 (64.6%) of bakery members.

Table 4.3 suggests that 2 per cent more Western Australian Battalions were unmarried than the AIF, albeit Welborn and Butler’s figures are very similar. There is a marked dissimilarity between their figures and those of the bakers, which has a much higher percentage of married men. Robson provides only percentages rather than numbers, but his percentages for Marital Status, at 82 per cent single and 16 per cent married, fall between those of Welborn and Butler.\(^\text{18}\)

Table 4.4 (below) indicates the marital status of the bakers classified by date of enlistment. As stated above, Robson does not provide the numbers but concludes that


the first period was high in unmarried recruits and low in married recruits. This is because, in the early stages, there was a decision to exclude the enlistment of married men. This decision, however, was overturned shortly afterwards.\textsuperscript{19} Robson concludes that overall, 82 per cent of recruits were unmarried, 16 per cent were married, with 2 per cent unknown, and that the second and third periods do not vary significantly from these figures.\textsuperscript{20} The bakery figures suggest that I can draw the same conclusion as Robson for the first period when 77 per cent of recruits were unmarried. In the second and third periods, however, the numbers of unmarried recruits fell, and those of married recruits rose, to the extent that one-third of all bakery recruits was married. This is twice as many married as Robson, Welborn, and Butler (Table 4.3). There is a correlation between the slightly older average age of the bakers and their marital status. Older men are more likely to be married than younger men are, and it possibly suggests that skilled workers may have been considered an attractive spousal proposition. It might be that married men were more likely to volunteer, and their wives more amenable to their absence, if they were certain they would not be posted to the frontline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.4: Marital status of bakers classified by date of enlistment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Married Widowed Unstated TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.  % no.  % no.  % no.  % no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug’14-Jun’15 116    76.8% 33  21.9%  2  1.3% 0  0.0% 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul’15-Aug’16 178    65.2% 89  32.6%  6  2.2% 0  0.0% 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep’16-end War   26     60.5% 15  34.9%  1  2.3% 1  2.3% 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL            320    68.5% 137 29.3%  9  1.9% 1  0.2% 467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 467 (64.6%) of bakery members

This supposition is contradicted by the case of Private Claude Mannering of South Yarra in Victoria. Born in Yorkshire, England, 26-year-old carpenter Private Mannering enlisted in Melbourne on 15 July 1915. He was assigned to the 19\textsuperscript{th} Australian Army Service Corps, Field Bakery Section, and sailed with that unit on the

\textsuperscript{19} Blair, \textit{Dinkum Diggers}, p.21.
\textsuperscript{20} Robson, ‘Origin and Character’, pp.739, 743.
Suffolk on 27 November 1915. By the time Private Mannering reached Fremantle, Western Australia, however, he needed his appendix removed. On Christmas Eve, his wife, Isabel Mannering, wrote a letter to Lieutenant Colonel Hadley, the Staff Officer for Invalids at No. 8 Australian General Hospital in Fremantle:

... I was not informed by the Defence Dept about [the operation], & I think being his wife, they should have asked my consent whether they could do it over there at Fremantle. I have never been asked my consent regarding him joining the Army ... I would be pleased, if you would grant him his discharge, as I refuse, to consent to his sailing for the fronts (sic).21

The reply from Hadley denied Mrs Mannering’s request:

... He is progressing favorably (sic) and will be fit for duty in about six weeks from date ... he will, when fit, be sent to Camp in this district for return to Active service.22

Because of a period of four months between Private Mannering’s enlistment and embarkation, I can only presume his wife knew that he had been allocated to the 19th Australian Army Service Corps, Field Bakery Section, and not a high risk infantry regiment. In any case, Private Mannering never left Australian shores. He requested and was discharged within a few months because of chronic rheumatism.23

Place of birth

**TABLE 4.5: Place of birth**24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIF no.</th>
<th>AIF %</th>
<th>WAB no.</th>
<th>WAB %</th>
<th>Bakers no.</th>
<th>Bakers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.S.W.</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q’ld</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.A.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>22.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.Brit.</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 307 (42.5%) of bakery members

---

22 Letter from Lieut. Col. Hadley to Mrs. I. Mannering, in *ibid*, 7 January 1916.
23 *C. Mannering*.
Table 4.5 reveals that a much higher percentage of the bakers were born in New South Wales (NSW) than the AIF and the Western Australian Battalions (WAB). As expected the WAB percentage is particularly low, since they were raised in Western Australia whereas the bakeries were primarily raised in NSW and Victoria. The AIF and bakery figures reveal that almost 55 per cent and 61 per cent of all enlistees were born in either NSW or Victoria respectively – the most populous states (see Table 4.6). Although the figures for South Australia are similar for all three groups, very few Queenslanders and Tasmanians enlisted in the WAB. Those born in unspecified countries have similar percentages in all three groups. A greater percentage of the WABs were born in Great Britain than in the AIF and bakers. The fascinating aspect of the WAB figures is that there are more men born in Victoria (25.3 per cent) and Great Britain (30 per cent), than in Western Australia (22.5 per cent). Welborn provides figures for the 1911 Census, wherein 19 per cent of the Western Australian population were born in the United Kingdom (UK). There was a sizeable migration of British to Australia in the few years before the war, and by 1914, the number would have been somewhat higher. Of the three units for which Welborn provides figures, those born in the UK constitute one third of the 11th and 28th Battalions. This suggests that those born in the UK and living in Western Australia volunteered at a higher rate than did Australian-born eligibles. The WAB have a 7 per cent higher rate of those born in Great Britain and a 22 per cent higher rate of those born in Western Australia than do the bakers. The explanation, as above, lies in the WAB being recruited in Western Australia, whereas the bakeries were assembled mainly in NSW and Victoria.

26 Welborn, Lords of Death, p.190.
Place of enlistment

Robson is very interested with the results his study produced regarding the numbers enlisting from each state in relation to the date, because, in 1915 there was a charge that Victoria was not ‘pulling its weight’.\(^\text{28}\) Before examining enlistment, it is necessary to look at the population of Australia’s states and territories in 1915.

TABLE 4.6: Population of Australia by State and Territory - 1915\(^\text{29}\)

![Population Pie Chart]

Of an Australian population of nearly five million, NSW and Victoria were the most populous with 38 and 29 per cent respectively. To the charge that Victoria did not contribute its share of men, Robson concludes that NSW produced fewer volunteers in the first period than Victoria and more in the final period. The charge that Victoria was not providing its share led to a rigorous appeal for recruits in June 1915.\(^\text{30}\) It is therefore worth comparing the AIF figures with those of the bakers to determine if this anomaly is still noticeable.

TABLE 4.7: Date of enlistment classified by place of enlistment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aug to Jun</th>
<th>Jul to Aug</th>
<th>Sept to end</th>
<th>TOTAL of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIF</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Bakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q’ld</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.A.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkwn</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 307 (42.5%) of bakery members

Bakery figures confirm Robson’s concern regarding the disparity between his study and the official claims. There is a staggering variance in the bakery recruitment figures in the first period. Whereas the AIF figures reveal that Victoria signed up over 3 per cent more recruits than did NSW, the bakery figures indicate that the difference was a whopping 20 per cent more. The AIF figures reveal the opposite is true of the second and third periods. In the second, NSW recruited 8 per cent more men into the AIF than did Victoria. Of the bakers, almost 27 per cent more enlisted in NSW than in Victoria in the same period. In the final period, the AIF recruited 20 per cent more in NSW than Victoria, and the bakery almost 86 per cent more. All of these figures support Robson’s argument that the ‘significant decline in Victorian enlistment towards the end of the war points to the conclusion that the state may have been bled white earlier’.

TABLE 4.8: Total enlistment classified by place of enlistment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Bakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q'd</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.A.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkwn</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 307 (42.5%) of bakery members

NSW carried 38 per cent of the total population, but contributed 36 per cent of the AIF. Victoria, Queensland and South Australia were also slightly short of contributing their share. Western Australia, the Northern Territory, and the Australian Capital Territory contributed more than their share of the population to the AIF, and Tasmania was only .1 of a per cent outside an equitable contribution. Altogether, NSW and Victoria contributed 63.7 per cent of the AIF compared with carrying two thirds of the total population. In comparison, NSW contributed well over its share of bakers, Victoria precisely the same percentage as its population, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania less than their share, and again, the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory contributed more than their share. Altogether, NSW and Victoria contributed 78 per cent of the bakers, compared with carrying 67 per cent of the population.

Although just over one-third of the AIF enlisted in NSW, almost one-half of the bakers signed up in that state. Percentages enlisting in Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and Other are similar in both the AIF and the bakeries. Fewer bakers enlisted in Queensland and Western Australia than the AIF. These figures suggest that appeals to occupational bakers to enlist and enter the Field Bakeries were concentrated especially on NSW and to a lesser extent, Victoria, or those enlisting from other states tended to go into the AIF rather than the bakeries.
Occupation

Of those volunteers sent to the bakeries, almost 85 per cent were employed in the baking trade. The figures at Table 4.9 reveal that, as the war continued and reinforcements were transported to replace and relieve, the vast majority of those sent to operate the bakeries were trained in the baking trade.32

TABLE 4.9: Occupation at date of enlistment – bakeries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of War</th>
<th>Baking Trade</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug’14-Jun’15</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>80.79</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul’15-Aug’16</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep’16-end war</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>95.35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>84.37</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 467 (64.6%) of bakery members

It is possible that the extremely high figure of 95 per cent after September 1916 was in response to a specific call for trained bakers to operate the bakeries in France. This suggests that, after complaints from the officers in charge of the bakeries, particularly Captain Miles, on being sent untrained men (see below), those formulating and directing the placement of volunteers recognised that men trained in a specialised field, such as bread making, should be posted to arenas where their skills could be utilised. It also suggests that, as argued in Chapter 3 of this study, bread was recognised as an important and necessary staple of a soldier’s diet, and it was necessary to ensure the bread was made by those well trained in the practice.33

Robson and Welborn provide a categorisation of occupation at date of enlistment. It is difficult to know exactly which occupations were encompassed in the category of Industry, whereupon 20 per cent of the AIF and 11 per cent of the WAB

32 These figures were taken from all documents indicating a bakery member’s occupation at date of enlistment.
33 'Extract from the War Diary of the 1st Divisional Train’, 6 September, 19 October 1915, in [Records of Arthur G. Butler] Notes and correspondence relating to rations at Anzac.
fell into this group. Presumably, those employed in the baking trade fell into this category.

**TABLE 4.10: Enlistment classified by occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIF no.</th>
<th>AIF %</th>
<th>WAB no.</th>
<th>WAB %</th>
<th>Bakery no.</th>
<th>Bakery %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baking Trade</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 467 (64.6%) of bakery members

Table 4.10 indicates that the three occupational groups figuring most prominently within the AIF are Industry with 20 per cent, Labourers with 21.7 per cent, and Primary with 17.1 per cent. The WAB figures reveal a significant number employed in the Labourer, Transport, Industry, Commerce, Clerical, and Mining occupational groups. The most striking feature of the WAB figures, however, is the large number employed in the Primary category, which is 27 per cent. Robson and Butler's figures reveal that Primary, at 17 per cent, was third among the most represented occupational groups in the 1st AIF, and conclude that 'those engaged in primary production formed only a small part of the A.I.F.' This same conclusion cannot be reached using the WAB figures, where those engaged in primary production make up over one quarter of the three battalions.

---

34 Robson, 'Origin and Character', pp.738, 748.
The bakeries were staffed with trained men, wherein almost 85 per cent were previously employed in the baking trade. The three occupational groups figuring most prominently in the bakeries besides Industry are Labourers 3.6 per cent, and Transport and Primary at 1.7 per cent each.

**TABLE 4.11: Enlistment in NSW and Victoria classified by occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIF</th>
<th>BAKERIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Vic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>% of 2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>% of 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baking Trade</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>635</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 reveals that 289 of the 404 bakers for which I have these details, enlisted in either New South Wales or Victoria. The Table specifies enlistment in NSW and Victoria classified by occupation and indicates more variety of occupation in the AIF than the bakeries. Over 90 per cent of those enlisting in NSW into the bakeries were employed in the baking trade, with this figure almost 65 per cent in Victoria, which, interestingly, is lower than any other state. This indicates that NSW supplied the majority of those bakery recruits experienced in the trade. Western Australia and Queensland are next on the list of states for supplying experienced bakers at 80 per cent and nearly 78 per cent respectively. Of those recruited in Victoria and subsequently posted to the bakeries, almost 10 per cent are labourers, compared with fewer than 3 per cent in NSW. This may reveal that the Victorian recruitment managers, needing to fill quotas, were not as concerned about experience as those in
the other states were, or there may have been an anomaly in the classification of occupations.

**Egalitarianism**

Egalitarianism is a fundamental premise of the Anzac legend because of the belief that Australia was a classless society, and that this naturally transferred over into the AIF. Robson devotes several pages to a discussion of the democratic concept prevalent in Bean’s histories of the AIF, which Bean believed was reflective of the Australian ‘bush ethos’. Robson opposes the notion that officers came from the same social ranks as their men, and argues that occupation was highly important when it came to promotion. Dale Blair suggests that men whose backgrounds were similar to their unit’s officers had the highest likelihood of promotion.

Table 4.12 (below) indicates that 48.34 per cent of those in the baking trade received promotions. This compares favourably with the AIF wherein 22.5 per cent of those employed in Industry received promotions throughout the course of the war. A further 38.46 per cent of the bakers employed in Industry received promotions throughout their service. All of these promotions from the baking trade and Industry, however, were from the Other Ranks to Non-Commissioned Officer ranks. None was promoted to Officer status compared with 2.6 per cent of Robson’s AIF employed in Industry who did receive such promotions. Table 4.12 indicates that, outside of the baking trade, those employed in the Clerical, Commerce, and Professional occupational groups experienced high rates of promotion, especially compared with those employed in the Labourer and Mining areas. Blair notes that ‘The reading and writing skills associated with higher education and white collar occupations, were advantageous to

---

38 ibid, pp.747-748.
39 Blair, *Dinkum Diggers*, p.35.
40 Robson, ‘Origin and Character’, p.748.
promotion’. These findings concur with Robson’s conclusions, that there were ‘significantly few’ men from the occupational groups of Labourers and Mining who made it into the ranks of Non-Commissioned Officers (NCO) and Officers. These figures indicate that claims of social equality within the ranks of the AIF and the bakeries are clearly incorrect when related to promotion.

### TABLE 4.12: Bakery Officers and NCOs classified by occupation

| Occupation                  | Officer NCOs | % of Other Ranks | % of TOTAL | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|------------------|------------|
| Baker                        | 145          | 49.32            | 160        |
| Baker (Master)               | 2            | 100              | 2          |
| Baker (Operative)            | 6            | 100              | 6          |
| Baker/Chef                   | 0            | 1                | 1          |
| Baker/Cook                   | 1            | 33.33            | 3          |
| Baker/Driver                 | 1            | 100              | 1          |
| Baker/P’Cook                 | 0            | 2                | 2          |
| Baker’s Assist               | 0            | 2                | 2          |
| Baker’s Foreman              | 1            | 100              | 1          |
| Biscuit Baker                | 0            | 2                | 2          |
| Bread Carter                 | 1            | 25               | 4          |
| Cook                         | 1            | 50               | 2          |
| Labourer w.Bak. App.         | 0            | 2                | 2          |
| Maker’s Improver             | 0            | 1                | 1          |
| Pastrycook                   | 2            | 25               | 8          |
| Army                         | 2            | 100              | 2          |
| Clerical                     | 2            | 100              | 2          |
| Commerce                     | 3            | 43               | 7          |
| Domestic                     | 1            | 100              | 1          |
| Industry                     | 5            | 38.46            | 13         |
| Labourer                     | 1            | 5.88             | 17         |
| Mining                       | 1            | 16.67            | 6          |
| Primary                      | 1            | 25               | 8          |
| Professional                 | 1            | 85.71            | 7          |
| Transport                    | 2            | 25               | 8          |
| Other                        | 1            | 25               | 4          |
| **TOTAL**                    | **331**      | **51.66**        | **331**    |

Note: Figures available for 404 (55.9%) of bakery members.

### Religion

The religious denomination of the enlistees can help disclose the social origin of the 1st AIF and whether the denomination had any bearing on promotion. It is worthwhile

---

41 Blair. *Dinkum Diggers*, p.35.
42 Robson, ‘Origin and Character’, p.748; See also Grey, *Military History*, p.86.
43 These figures were taken from all documents indicating both a bakery member’s former occupation and their rank at enlistment and discharge.
looking at the Australia-wide statistics from the 1911 Census before those of the 1st AIF.

**TABLE 4.13: Religious affiliation in Australia - 1911**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Population %</th>
<th>AIF %</th>
<th>WAB %</th>
<th>Bakers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meth</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Prot</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the statistics in Tables 4.13 and 4.14, there appears to be an inconsistency between the population declaring affiliations with the Church of England, Other Protestants and Roman Catholic, and the numbers who volunteered. A greater number of Anglicans volunteered than percentage of population. If Presbyterians, Methodists and most of the Other category are linked, minus point one or two for
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Salvation Army and Greek or Russian Orthodox, the reverse can be concluded about Other Protestants – fewer volunteered than percentage of population. The same is true about the Roman Catholic category.

A comparison of Butler, the AIF, the WAB, and the bakers’ figures suggests they are comparable in all areas with the exception of Church of England and Methodist in the WAB study and the Roman Catholic in the bakeries. A greater percentage of Anglicans enlisted in the three WABs than Butler and Robson’s AIF, and the bakeries. The reverse can be said about the Methodists. Anglicans made up almost 50 per cent of enlistments, but in Western Australia, something, perhaps ties to England, encouraged Anglicans to enlist in a far greater ratio to population than the other states. Table 4.5 has already indicated that Western Australia, at 30 per cent, had a higher than average percentage of English-born volunteers. The high number of Anglicans in Table 4.14 may indicate that the first of these statistics is responsible for the second.

### Table 4.15: Date of enlistment classified by religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIF no. %</td>
<td>Bakers no. %</td>
<td>AIF no. %</td>
<td>Bakers no. %</td>
<td>AIF no. %</td>
<td>Bakers no. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>550 100</td>
<td>1130 100</td>
<td>273 100</td>
<td>587 100</td>
<td>43 100</td>
<td>24 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>259 47.1</td>
<td>555 49.1</td>
<td>127 46.5</td>
<td>250 42.6</td>
<td>21 48.8</td>
<td>3 1067 46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meth</td>
<td>82 14.9</td>
<td>133 11.8</td>
<td>47 17.2</td>
<td>92 15.7</td>
<td>7 16.3</td>
<td>1 308 13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>54 9.8</td>
<td>124 11.0</td>
<td>36 13.2</td>
<td>63 10.7</td>
<td>3 7.0</td>
<td>1 242 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>18 3.3</td>
<td>49 4.3</td>
<td>12 4.4</td>
<td>33 5.6</td>
<td>4 9.3</td>
<td>0 100 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>18 3.3</td>
<td>124 11.0</td>
<td>36 13.2</td>
<td>63 10.7</td>
<td>3 7.0</td>
<td>1 242 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 0.5</td>
<td>2 0.7</td>
<td>3 1.1</td>
<td>5 0.9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 10 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkwn</td>
<td>36 6.5</td>
<td>28 2.5</td>
<td>2 0.7</td>
<td>20 3.4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>19 103 4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In Table 4.14, Other consists of Prot and Other, which, in Table 4.15, has a separate category for each. Figures available for 467 (64.6%) of bakery members.
Robson believes it is impossible to know whether events in Dublin, Ireland, at Easter in 1916 discouraged Roman Catholics from volunteering.\textsuperscript{46} He concludes that the rebellion, with the resultant severe retaliation by the British government made ‘no significant change ... in the number of Roman Catholics joining the A.I.F.’, ‘no matter what anyone claimed.’\textsuperscript{47} The statistics in Tables 4.13 and 4.14 suggest that fewer Roman Catholics enlisted than percentage of population, but this does not confirm any link to the Easter Rebellion, because Table 4.15 indicates that the percentages before and after the Uprising are very similar. A lower percentage of Roman Catholics joined the bakeries than the AIF. Table 4.15 reveals this is true of all periods. In the bakeries, however, the percentage of Roman Catholics enlisting increased after the Uprising. Of the four bakers from Ireland who volunteered, all did so before the Easter Uprising. These figures tenuously imply that the Uprising dissuaded the Irish from volunteering to serve in the bakery units, but did not affect other Roman Catholics. Bakery enlistment figures for this final period also reveal a very slight decease of volunteers in the total of Protestant religions, not including Anglican.

An overall comparison of the figures in Table 4.15 suggests that the religious affiliation percentages of the AIF and the bakers are reasonably similar. There are differences throughout the three periods, but, as stated, the overall figures are alike. The figures do highlight an inconsistency: 4.5 per cent of the AIF left the line at religion on their attestation papers blank, compared to less than 1 per cent of the bakers.

**Promotion**

Together with occupation, Robson believes religion is another aspect influencing promotion within the 1\textsuperscript{st} AIF. Although Table 4.16 is very revealing, he offers a caution on these figures because one quarter of the AIF’s officers did not record their religion

\textsuperscript{46} Robson, ‘Origin and Character’, p.741.
on their attestation papers. The large discrepancy between the AIF and officers’ non-recording of religion on their attestation papers suggests the possibility that those aspiring to promotion were more hesitant that this knowledge might be used against them.

Robson indicates that just over one in five (21 per cent) of all Anglicans in the AIF was promoted, and concludes, as does Jeffrey Grey, that being a Roman Catholic significantly reduced the chance of promotion to Officer and Non-Commissioned Officer status. Dale Blair reaches the same conclusion regarding the low ratio of Catholic officers in the 1st Battalion. As 19 per cent of the AIF was Roman Catholic, there is a disproportionate amount of promotions to those of Protestant religions and all other categories besides Jew. Only one, or 11.1 per cent, of the nine volunteers of the Jewish religion in Robson’s study, was promoted, and then only to the rank of Non-Commissioned Officer. This in itself is noteworthy because the commander of the Australian forces, Major General John Monash, was Jewish. Anti-Semitism was rife in Australia at that time, and Australia’s Governor-General, Sir Ronald Craufurd Munro-Ferguson, referred to Monash as a ‘competent Jew’. His competency, amongst other things, undoubtedly explains his high rank, despite his religion.

### TABLE 4.16: Officer and NCOs of the bakeries classified by religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>NCOs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Religion Promoted</th>
<th>Other Ranks</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C of E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meth</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Prot</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 404 (55.9%) of bakery members
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49 Robson, ‘Origin and Character’, p.749; Grey, Military History, p.86; Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.35.
50 Quoted in Carlyon, Gallipoli, p.124.
Within the bakeries, those of Protestant religions had approximately a fifty per cent chance of promotion throughout the length of their service. Roman Catholics and Jews have low rates of promotion and appear to have been differentiated from their Protestant counterparts. A comparison between two bakers, Abraham Joseph Cunningham and Francis George Cunningham, may illustrate this apparent anomaly.\(^{51}\)

A.J. Cunningham was seven years older than F.G. Cunningham. Both of these men were trained bakers, the former having trained for three years and the latter for four years. A.J. Cunningham was married and F.G. Cunningham was single. A.J. Cunningham was shorter and weighed less than F.G. Cunningham. Both of these men enlisted in Sydney, A.J. Cunningham three weeks after F.G. Cunningham. Despite this, their Service/Regimental numbers are almost consecutive. Neither man had any previous military training. They both served for four years before discharge in August 1919. Although A.J. Cunningham went AWOL and contracted venereal disease (VD) during his service, both of these were after his promotion from Corporal to Sergeant. His first promotion was during the reorganisation of the bakeries in March 1916, and the second occurred in February 1917. Neither of these men had an extensive amount of sick leave: A.J. Cunningham was hospitalised twice during his service – once in 1916 for an unknown illness and the other, after Armistice, for venereal disease. F.G. Cunningham was hospitalised once – for influenza in June and July in 1918. Neither of these men has any notation on his record for crimes committed apart from A.J. Cunningham’s AWOL for which he received a reprimand. There are three differences between these men: one is their marital status, the second is their age, and the other is their religion. A.J. Cunningham is Church of England, and F.G. Cunningham is Roman Catholic. It is conceivable, unless marital status and age were significant, which has not been indicated, and all other things being relatively equal or in F.G. Cunningham’s favour, that his religion is the reason he never received a promotion during his four

\(^{51}\) NAA, B2455, *A.J. Cunningham*, Canberra, 2001; *F.G. Cunningham*. 
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years of service. As Robson concludes, this information induces questions and speculation about the ‘democratic’ nature of the AIF. Notwithstanding, it has not had any bearing on the Anzac legend.52

Welborn compares Robson’s figures concerning promotion of Roman Catholics and the other religious groups with the three Western Australian Battalions in her study. I have included the bakers’ statistics in the same format, in order to evaluate and form conclusions.

TABLE 4.17: Religion and rank on discharge or death53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Non-Comm. Officers</th>
<th>Other Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robson - AIF - 2291</td>
<td>RC 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC difference -3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welborn West. Australian Btns - 1500</td>
<td>RC 7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others 9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC difference -2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers - 404</td>
<td>RC 0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others 1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RC difference -1</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 suggests that the Western Australian Battalions were subjected to a similar differentiation concerning promotion as the AIF. It also reveals that promotional prospects of bakers of the Roman Catholic denomination were much lower than the AIF or WAB. The contrast in the number of Roman Catholics to Non-Commissioned Officers, and therefore those remaining at Other Ranks, is significant to the conclusion that there is a disproportionate allocation of promotions to those of Protestant religions.

Dale Blair’s history of the 1st Battalion is useful to this study. Blair concludes that men of rural backgrounds received almost double the Battalion percentage of promotions to sergeant and lieutenant, possibly because these men of the ‘bush ethos’
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53 Welborn, Lords of Death, p.198; Robson, ‘Origin and Character’, p.748.
were associated with ‘independence of thought’. His figures also acknowledge a bias against Roman Catholics in the Battalion’s commissioned ranks. Blair speculates that this lack of selection may have reflected a suspicion that Roman Catholic allegiance to Britain and Empire was questionable, but agrees with Robson that the Easter Uprising in Ireland did not have any influence on the enlistment of Roman Catholics.\(^{54}\) He suggests, however, a reason for the inequitable distribution of promotions. He hypothesises that Roman Catholics in the 1\(^{st}\) Battalion ‘may not have been forceful in seeking advancement’, especially compared to Methodists who ‘might have been more active in seeking leadership roles’.\(^{55}\)

**Height**

**TABLE 4.18: Height %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>1st Bn %</th>
<th>Bakers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6'0&quot; and over</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'9&quot; and over</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>17.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'6&quot; and over</td>
<td>46.87</td>
<td>47.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'3&quot; and over</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>28.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'0&quot; and over</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 307 (42.5%) of bakery members

Table 4.18 compares the height of the 1\(^{st}\) Battalion with that of the bakers. Blair notes that height has been ‘ignored in Australia’s Great War literature’, and concludes that officers and sergeants of the 1\(^{st}\) Battalion were usually taller than Other Ranks.\(^{56}\) His figures support his conclusion: 25.88 per cent of the 1\(^{st}\) Battalion were 5 ft 9 ins or above, but 60.86 per cent of officers and 44.05 per cent of sergeants were of this height or taller. Blair claims that, because of a better diet and living conditions, upper and middle classes were superior in physique to the under classes. He suggests that a man’s height, and therefore class, education, occupation and religion were of great

---

\(^{54}\) Blair, *Dinkum Diggers*, p.25.

\(^{55}\) *ibid*, p.36.

\(^{56}\) *ibid*, p.28.
importance in the choice of officers, proposing that the AIF was not as egalitarian as has always been claimed.\textsuperscript{57}

Comparisons can be made between the 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion and the bakeries. The 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion has 25.88 per cent of its men over 5 ft 9 ins, compared to the bakers’ 19.22 per cent. The average height of the bakers was 5 ft 6 ½ ins. The majority of both groups, almost 50 per cent in each case, were between 5 ft 6 ins and 5 ft 8 ½ ins. Between 5 ft and 5 ft 5 ½ ins, however, there is a significant difference: the 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion with 24.99 per cent, and the bakers with 31.93 per cent. That the 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion includes more men over 5 ft 9 ins, and less men under 5 ft 5 ½ ins, suggests a number of possible conclusions: shorter men tended to enter the baking trade; taller, and in all probability, physically stronger men, were assigned to fighting combatant units, with shorter men to non-fighting units, particularly if trained in a specialised industry.

**Return to Australia**

This section of the chapter affords me the opportunity to give further details about some of the bakers. The following Tables examine the dates of return to Australia of the 307 bakers whose service dossiers were accessed, applying the date of enlistment as the defining tool, and comparing with other statistics if available. This is to uncover trends only apparent by direct comparison.

Alistair Thomson states that due to the scarcity of ships and the fear that a ‘sudden influx’ of men would disturb the social and economic order in Australia, many ‘Australian soldiers waited in Europe for up to a year after the Armistice’.\textsuperscript{58} Greg Kerr asserts that the men were transported home on a “first come, first go” basis.\textsuperscript{59} This

\textsuperscript{57} ibid, p.29.
\textsuperscript{58} Thomson, *ANZAC Memories*, p.106.
\textsuperscript{59} Kerr, *Private Wars*, p.242.
raises the question of whether returns to Australia were organised upon duration of enlistment.

**TABLE 4.19: Return to Australia classified by enlistment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>% of period</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>% of period</td>
<td>no.</td>
<td>% of period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 (45)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Jun 1915 (33)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Dec 1915 (120)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Jun 1916 (81)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Dec 1916 (19)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917 (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 307 (42.5%) of bakery members

Table 4.19 conveys the information that 246, or 80 per cent of the 307 bakers in the study returned to Australia between October 1918 and December 1919. Of the 15 men who enlisted in 1914 and returned between October and December 1918, 14 were returned on Special 1914 Leave. There were, however, 17 men or 37.8 per cent of those who enlisted in 1914, still awaiting their return at the beginning of 1919. The statistics for the January to June 1915 period indicate that the men who enlisted early were not given any preferential treatment when it came to their return. Only 6 per cent were returned in the first quarter of 1919, compared with 13.6 per cent of those who enlisted a full 12 months later, and 12.5 per cent of those who enlisted 24 months later. Over 60 per cent had to wait until the second quarter of 1919. None of those enlisting in 1917 was sent home before the first quarter of 1919, and the one person who enlisted in 1918 was returned in the second quarter of 1919. Over 62 per cent of the 1917 enlistees had to wait until the third quarter to be returned. Some of those who enlisted in 1914 were assigned an early return, but for the rest of the enlistees their return seemed to be arbitrary. The greater part of both the AIF and the bakeries returned to Australia in 1919.
TABLE 4.20: Returned to Australia %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1917</th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>1919</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1922</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butler of 264,373</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers of 289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler of 264,373</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sick,wounded,age</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have included Table 4.20 because it reveals that the men of the AIF were returned in greater numbers than the bakers were over the course of the war. It also reveals that, until 1919, the great majority of those returning were either ill, wounded, or over or under age. The percentage of the AIF and the bakeries returned by the end of 1919 reveals few left after the end of that year – 3.85 per cent of the AIF, and 1.04 per cent of the bakers. Most returning after 1919 were probably administrative or support staff, but not the bakers.

Tables 4.19 and 4.20 reveal that a greater percentage of the AIF than the bakers returned to Australia in time to join in celebrations to commemorate the war’s end. Richard Nile notes that the celebrations were ‘commensurate with their status as heroes and victors’. He continues, however, that most of the AIF were still abroad when the festivities began. Most of those returning later in 1919 and 1920 arrived to private homecomings and a country trying to return to normal with an emphasis on ‘civilian matters’. The majority of the bakers, 198 men or 68.5 per cent, was in this second group that missed most of the celebrations.

Conclusions

There are a great many similarities and some differences between the bakers and the AIF. I believe the differences can be explained by the nature of the bakers’ work. The bakers drew fewer young recruits and more aged over 40 than the AIF, but the average age of each group was very similar with the AIF at 26.4 years and the bakers at just over 27 years. The majority of each group was aged between 20 and 29 years.

There are slight differences in ages and the timing of enlistments throughout the course of the war.

There were more married men in the bakeries than the AIF, possibly due to the relative safety of the work compared to the fighting combatant, but more likely because of their years of apprenticeship before enlistment. There were more bakers than the AIF born in NSW but the statistics reveal that the majority of each group were born in either NSW or Victoria. The two groups were made up of men with similar statistics of places of birth. The bakery statistics support Robson’s claim that Victoria pulled its weight during the first eleven months of enlistment, and that NSW recruited more from that time onwards. The bakeries had a greater percentage of their men enlisting in NSW than did the AIF, less than Queensland and Western Australia; Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory, were very similar. Victoria and NSW contributed a larger proportion of bakers than they did the AIF.

The large majority of the bakers were employed in the baking trade at time of enlistment, and the bakeries did not have the variation of occupations of the AIF. This is due to the specialisation of the bakers’ work. The enlistment of men previously employed in the baking trade increased as the war continued. Victoria supplied less trained bakers pro-rata than did NSW, Western Australia, and Queensland.

Almost one half of those previously employed in the baking trade received promotions compared with just over one-fifth of those employed in Industry before enlisting in the AIF. No trained bakers were promoted beyond NCO status compared with a small percentage of those previously employed in Industry in the AIF. The bakery statistics are consistent with Robson’s findings of social inequality within the ranks of the AIF. Both groups’ highest rates of promotions were more likely to come
from the Clerical, Commerce, and Professional occupational groups, especially compared to the Labourers and Mining areas.

The AIF and the bakers have similar religious affiliations. The bakery figures support Robson’s assertion that the Easter Uprising in Ireland did not significantly reduce the number of Roman Catholic enlistments. No Irish-born, however, joined the bakeries after the Uprising. The bakery figures support Robson’s conclusion that Roman Catholics received disproportionately fewer promotions than Church of England and other Protestants. Anglicans had a better chance, and Roman Catholics a lesser chance, of promotion, in the bakeries, than they did in the AIF.

Early enlistment did not necessarily mean an early return to Australia. Most of the members of the AIF and the bakeries had returned to Australia by the end of 1919. The percentages of those who returned in 1917 and 1918 are similar, but a larger percentage of bakers returned in 1919 than the AIF. This is because a greater percentage of the AIF returned over the course of the war due to illness, wounds, or over or under age.

These statistics indicate that there are a great many similarities and few differences between the AIF and the men of the bakeries. Those differences can be explained by the nature of the bakers’ work and their living conditions. Chapter 5 compares the bakers’ experiences, values and attitudes to those of the AIF to determine if their acts, thoughts, and experiences were similar or different.
Chapter 5
The bakers and the AIF: experiences, values and attitudes

Chapter 4 argued that the bakers and the AIF were alike in nearly all demographic features. This chapter argues that the similarities extended beyond vital statistics and that the values, attitudes, and some experiences of the bakers were analogous to those of the AIF that have been heavily documented. These similarities include a shortage of uniforms, risks endured during transport to the war zones, characteristics such as a tendency towards larrikinism and disrespect for authority with emphases on AWOLs and other crimes, leadership, initiative and resourcefulness, the attitudes towards the other nationalities, particularly the British, and the all-encompassing yearning for letters from Australia.

Uniforms

Throughout the war there was a continuing difficulty in acquiring uniforms. While the 1st Battalion was readying itself to leave Australia, its commanding officer Colonel H.N. MacLaurin complained of the shortage and allocation of the proper attire. There was also a scarcity of overcoats.\(^1\) Captain Reginald Hugh Knyvett of the 59th Battalion, author of ‘Over There’ With The Australians (1918), wrote that, at first, they had ‘no real uniforms, but used to parade in blue dungarees and white cloth hats’. He described his battalion as ‘uniformly hideous’, and said that other soldiers nicknamed them the ‘keystone soldiers’ because they looked as comical as the Keystone Cops.\(^2\)

Some Australians were issued with British uniforms, to make do until the proper ones became available. The men accepted these uniforms under protest, and regarded the

---

\(^1\) Butler, Army Medical Services, I, p.267; Blair, Dinkum Diggers, pp.39, 41.
\(^2\) Captain R. Hugh Knyvett, ‘Over There’ With The Australians, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1918, pp.44, 54.
issue of them a major insult. There was a great deal of mocking directed at those forced to wear these uniforms. Dale Blair states that, once in France, they rejected the 'Tommy stuff' completely, and refused to wear it.³

The bakers, particularly those of 3AFB, also had troubles with obtaining the correct uniform – in this case that of the Army Service Corps. The 3AFB was assembled so quickly that most of their drilling, musketry training, and training for baking under field conditions was performed without their having been provided uniforms. During the frantic weeks before sailing, the men were issued uniforms, although they ended up with a miscellany of Army Service Corps mounted uniform and infantry dress, none other being available.⁴

**Transport dangers**

All of the convoys leaving from and for Australia faced dangers from enemy shipping, as did those travelling in and around the war zones. Because of the threat posed by the German light cruiser SMS *Emden*, four warships escorted the first convoy of ships leaving Australia for the war. The convoy left King George Sound in Albany, Western Australia, on 1 November 1914. In a history of Gallipoli written for children, writer Dale Collins acknowledges the danger faced by the fleet of crowded transports.⁵ The destructive *Emden*, which hunted the shipping routes of the Indian Ocean for allied shipping, was responsible for capturing or sinking twenty-one, mainly commercial, vessels.⁶ Nine days out from Albany, the HMAS *Sydney* left the convoy to investigate an unknown vessel near the Cocos Islands. In the ensuing battle with what turned out

³ Blair. *Dinkum Diggers*, p.130.
⁴ *3AFB: Diary*, p.i.
⁶ Australian War Memorial, SMS *Emden*, in *Australian Military Units*, [http://www.awm.gov.au/units/unit_12749.htm], date accessed 20 October 2003; see also Odgers, *100 Years of Australians At War*, p.44; 'The End of the Emden', in *Diggers At War*, Southdown Press, Melbourne, Victoria, no date, p.31 – states the number sunk or captured by the *Emden* was 24 Allied ships.
to be the *Emden*, the *Sydney* sustained some early damage, which resulted in four
dead and twelve wounded.⁷ Within a short while, however, the *Sydney* was able to
report that the *Emden* was 'beached and done for'.⁸

There are accounts of enemy shipping, or fear of enemy shipping in many of
the first-hand documentations of war experiences. An example is Roy Kyle’s *An Anzac
Story*, published in 2003, when the boat taking his battalion from Alexandria to Mudros
meandered for three days in order to avoid submarines. Kyle states that, 'He was
successful and we arrived safely'.⁹ In August 1915, the *Southland*, carrying 1,600
Australian troops, including some from the Medical and Service Corps, left Egypt for
Lemnos Island. Two days later, only twenty miles from Mudros Harbour, it was
torpedoed by a German U-boat resulting in the deaths of thirty-seven men due to
either the explosion or from drowning.¹⁰ Greg Kerr relays an account of a group of
Australian soldiers sailing to Marseilles dressed in life belts and having their boot laces
undone in case of an attack by a German submarine.¹¹ Guns were fitted to all Allied
ships carrying troops to France because of German submarine movements in the
Atlantic Ocean and North Sea, and ships taking Australian reinforcements to France
hugged the South African coastline in an effort to decrease the threats.¹²

The 3AFB’s trip to England on the *Demosthenes*, although fairly uneventful,
was worrisome because the ship experienced some mechanical problems causing it to
travel much slower than normal, and in one instance, forcing it to stop in the middle of

---

⁷ Australian War Memorial, ‘HMAS Sydney’, in *Australian Military Units*,
[http://www.awm.gov.au/units/unit_12593.htm], date accessed 20 October 2003; see
also Carlyon, *Gallipoli*, p.121. Note: the AWM states that the *Sydney* knew it was going
after the *Emden*. Carlyon states that the *Sydney* was after an unknown vessel.
⁸ Quoted in Carlyon, *Gallipoli*, p.121.
⁹ Roy Kyle, *An Anzac’s Story*, Bryce Courtenay (ed.), Penguin Books, Camberwell,
Victoria, 2003, p.129.
¹⁰ ‘They Never Reached Gallipoli’, in *Diggers At War*, Southdown Press, Melbourne,
Victoria, no date, pp.6-7.
¹² *ibid*, pp.172, 177.
the ocean for a day. Upon leaving Cape Town, South Africa, the *Demosthenes* formed part of a convoy consisting of four ships and an armed liner. Unfortunately for those aboard the *Demosthenes*, three weeks later, the convoy had to leave them behind, as the vessel was still experiencing engine trouble. Travelling unescorted was extremely unsettling to those on board as they worried about their safety. Captain Nash recorded his fears: 'It was very fortunate that no hostile submarine sighted us, as it would not have been then possible to have escaped by speed'. A ‘good old British destroyer’ appeared alongside near France, and accompanied the vessel to Plymouth.

On the way home from England and France in 1918, Private Hyndman wrote that his transport was ‘in [the] danger zone’, and therefore all lighting was extinguished.

None of the 307 bakers’ dossiers I accessed mentions a loss of life because of any skirmishes with enemy shipping. The *Southland* and other episodes do, however, demonstrate that, like the AIF, members of the Army Service Corps, possibly including bakers, were at risk from enemy shipping.

**Larrikinism and disrespect for authority**

Larrikinism and disrespect for authority within the AIF are interrelated and have been well documented. Alistair Thomson maintains that, ‘in Egypt and in Europe … absence without leave, drunkenness, and disrespect to officers were common AIF offences’. Historian Greg Kerr writes:

> When the *Kanowna* berthed at Fremantle for coaling, an order prevented all shore leave. But indignant troops refused to allow the coaling to take place until the Major agreed to let them go ashore. The Brigade got their leave and returned drunk, almost to a man … Private Frank Lesnie, of the 17th Battalion … remember[s]: ‘I witnessed 24 fights in 3 hours, which was followed by a general scrum. We retired that night some with black eyes, others with a few bruises and aching limbs’.

---

13 3AFB: Diary, p.iii.
14 ibid.
15 Hyndman, Diary, 6 October 1918.
16 Thomson, *ANZAC Memories*, p.32.
Particularly during voyages, authority was considered ‘irksome’ and an ‘unwarranted imposition’. Author Bryce Courtenay states that when the AIF arrived in Egypt:

The result was military anarchy. They took to missing parades. Absence without leave and drunk and disorderly charges were routine. They gambled, fought and caused major disruptions in Cairo ... Charges of insubordination were so numerous that company commanders found them almost impossible to process. Assaults on the local population, theft, damage to property and general mayhem was the order of the day.

Once they realised the acoustics at the Muslim citadel produced a substantial echo, the Australians ‘fell foul of the fastidious attendants’. There were two riotous rampages involving the Australians in the Haret el Wasser red light district of Cairo: one on 2 April 1915, and the other in July 1915. The Australians also regularly hijacked the local trams and took them for high-speed joy rides throughout the city. Jeffrey Grey states that the men made ‘a considerable nuisance of themselves’, and historian James Wieland asserts that ‘violent assault and theft, rape, arson, and uncontrollable drunkenness were not uncommon’ behaviours of the AIF in Egypt. Courtenay also asserts that the men of the AIF:

... firmly believed that out of hours their time was their own and that restricting them to camp ... was unreasonable.

E.M. Andrews suggests that, while documenting larrikinism, historians have underestimated the 'more ruffian element' of the AIF. He recounts the thoughts of a corporal from the Lancashire Territorials, who wrote that the Australians were:

... a disgrace to the Army, nothing but an undisciplined mob ... and we are all confined to Barracks through them. They are all mad drunk having their Easter holidays but we dare not do as they do, they do as they like.

Wieland explains that C.E.W. Bean expunged incidents of these behaviours from his official histories.
Captain Prior of 1AFB was always trying to keep his men under control, knowing that a lack of legitimate projects would promote bad behaviour in a number of them. Two weeks after leaving Albany, Western Australia, while en route to Egypt, although the port is unnamed by Prior, he noted in his diary that ‘the lads [were] very lively and need[ed] watching’, and that some had ‘got ashore via the anchor chain’.26 On 18 April at Lemnos, he noted that ‘Stray men from boat parties have been causing trouble in the village last few days, but have put on extra police and ‘all is well’ now’.27 On 11 September 1915, Prior, well aware of idle hands, was becoming worried as to how to keep his men occupied and out of trouble if water shortages could not be alleviated and baking could not recommence very soon.28

Historians such as E.M. Andrews, Dale Blair, Jeffrey Grey, Jane Ross, and Richard White have recorded the enthusiasm with which the Australians went AWOL.29 Andrews states that over 70 per cent of those AWOL on the Western Front in December 1916 were Australians.30 Dale Blair maintains that of the 177 crimes committed in the 1st Battalion from 1 April to 5 June 1916, almost 50 per cent were for AWOL.31 Grey maintains that of ‘667 convictions for desertion in the British Expeditionary Force’ in the first half of 1916, over 25 per cent of these were Australians.32 Richard White asserts that ‘Overstaying leave and absence without leave were endemic’.33 Butler states that the number of incidences of Absence Without Leave have never been compiled.34

26 1AFB: Diary, 13 January 1915.
27 ibid, 18 April 1915.
28 ibid, 11 September 1915.
31 Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.65.
34 Butler, Army Medical Services, III, p.91.
TABLE 5.1: Absent Without Leave - Bakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWOL</th>
<th>no. of men</th>
<th>% of men</th>
<th>Total Incidences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 307 (42.5%) of bakery members

Table 5.1 reveals that 71 men, or 23.1 per cent of the baker sample, went AWOL once. One man went AWOL ten times. It can be seen that 137 or 44.6 per cent of the 307 bakers perpetrated 322 separate instances of AWOL. Conversely, this means that 55.4 per cent did not absent themselves throughout their service or were not caught. Of the 137 men whose records are marked with AWOL, 112 or 82 per cent of them recorded three or less than three instances. Just under one-half of the offenders, 71 men, recorded only one instance. Nine men, or just less than 7 per cent, committed 22 per cent of the AWOLs between them.

TABLE 5.2: Punishments for AWOL - Bakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forfeiture of Pay</th>
<th>Pun.Comp./Detntn</th>
<th>Admonished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>77.02</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>FGCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>Reduced rank</td>
<td>Charge Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there were only 322 AWOLS, there are 448 punishments. This is because an offender would often receive more than one punishment. Only a small percentage of these 322 instances of AWOL were awarded an admonishment, which
was the least severe of the punishments. Twenty-four, or almost 7.5 per cent of the AWOLs received a reprimand or a severe reprimand, which were slightly higher up the hierarchy of severity. The punishment most often awarded for AWOL was a forfeiture of pay: 77 per cent or 248 AWOLs received this penalty. Approximately half of this 248, that is 122 or nearly 38 per cent of all AWOLs, were also awarded time in either detention or the Field Punishment Compound. Butler records that, in the AIF, 37,034 Courts Martial for Absence resulted in conviction. Only three of the baker’s absences record that Courts Martial resulted.

In the AIF, a crime was anything contrary to orders.

Table 5.3 indicates that there were 161 crimes committed by 91 bakers in the study. Just over 50 per cent of these fall into a category I have entitled Various. This means that the particular offence occurred once, and occasionally twice, throughout the bakeries over the four years of the war. I offer two examples: in the first, a baker was caught urinating against the wall of the canteen, and in the second, two were caught smoking in the bakehouse. Almost 23 per cent of crimes in the above table were for bad conduct or disobedience, and 24 per cent were for drunk or drunk on duty. Robin Gerster asserts that ‘Drunken revelry was not unusual within the AIF. Indeed, it was almost a venerated activity’. A church service held at Lemnos Island before the Gallipoli landing was a resounding success with the Australians because each received a glass of whisky as they left the church. Many of the men returned to the church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures available for 307 (42.5%) of bakery members

35 ibid, p.90, fn.53.
36 Gerster, Big-Noting, p.58.
several times.\textsuperscript{37} The bakers were no different from the general AIF with regard to alcohol.

Some of the bakers’ crimes are appealing to a researcher looking back from a different century. Private Hubert Bond from Scottsdale, Tasmania, enlisted in December 1914 and was transferred from the 8\textsuperscript{th} Battalion to 1AFB in 1916. Before his transfer back to the 8\textsuperscript{th} Battalion in June 1918, he was AWOL five times and received a three-month gaol sentence from a Field General Court Martial. He was charged and found guilty of:

When on active service conduct to the prejudice of good order in that he said at Rouen on 2 July 1916 ‘Fuck the bastard police, who the fucking hell are they’.

Unfortunately, there are no details as to the cause of this outburst or to whom it was directed. It appears that his last AWOL, on 16 May 1918 when he was away for 45 minutes and for which he was awarded a forfeiture of three days pay, was the catalyst for his transfer back to the 8\textsuperscript{th} Battalion. Just over two months after his transfer, he was wounded in action. It cannot have been overly serious because, less than three weeks later, he required hospitalisation for VD. There are no additional entries to his casualty/record of service forms from his recovery from VD to his return to Australia and discharge in June 1919.\textsuperscript{38}

Private Aleck Halstead from Fullarton, South Australia, enlisted in August 1914 and was transferred from the 10\textsuperscript{th} Battalion to 5AFB after his involvement in the Gallipoli campaign where he received a gunshot wound to the arm on April 25, 1915. In September 1916, he disobeyed orders:

By carrying bread over two tiers high after being warned not to do so [and was insolent] to NCO. When asked by SQMS Churton for his regimental number he remarked 'Find Out'.

For this infraction, Private Halstead forfeited three days pay.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{37} Kerr, \textit{Private Wars}, p.88.
\textsuperscript{38} NAA, B2455, \textit{H. Bond}, Canberra, 2001.
Private Alfred W. Ascott from Essex, England, had spent two years with the Australian Field Artillery and seven years with the Canadian Mounted Police before enlisting at Chinchilla, Queensland, on 4 November 1914. He was assigned to the 5th Light Horse, but was discharged for reasons unstated twelve days later. He re-enlisted in Brisbane a further ten days later and was assigned to 1AFB. He left Australia with the bakery on 22 December 1914. Almost immediately upon arrival at Alexandria, Egypt, he jumped from a moving tram but was not hurt. His dossier reports ‘private trouble’. He was then held in detention at Abbassia, but managed to desert to England in March 1915, where he turned himself in to the authorities at Weymouth. He was either not punished for his absence for some reason, or the punishment was not recorded in his dossier. He deserted again, to the United States this time, and was subsequently absent for nine months, returning in March 1916. This resulted in a Field General Court Martial in April 1916, and his ‘bad conduct’ was punished by a forfeiture of 120 days pay and 120 days imprisonment with hard labour. While serving his sentence he received news that his two children had died. After his release from prison, he absconded for 52 days. His file states that he suffered from ‘melancholia’, was drinking heavily, and was mentally unstable. He was sent to Warrington Asylum in May 1917, and was returned to Australia ‘Medically Unfit’ in July 1917.40

Private Henry Darbyshire, a young man from Yorkshire, England, enlisted in February 1915 and served at Gallipoli with the 5th Battalion. In August 1915 he received wounds from a bomb blast that were to trouble him for the next two years. He was transferred to 1AFB in 1916 and was promoted to Lance Corporal on 1 April 1917. In October of that year, he made a complaint that there was ‘insufficient food for night workers’. The intriguing aspect of this complaint and subsequent harsh punishment, is that Private Darbyshire’s record of service states that this was an

40 NAA, B2455, A.W. Ascott, Canberra, 2001. The Borough of Warrington is in central England to the east of Liverpool.
‘incorrect complaint’. There is no record with whom the complaint was lodged, the complaint being investigated, or why Private Darbyshire believed the night workers to be insufficiently supplied. Complaints of insufficiency of food were not looked upon with a great deal of favour or even the need for investigation. An example is similar complaints from the 38th Battalion at Larkhill Camp in England on 15 November 1916, which were dismissed as having ‘not the slightest foundation’ a few days later.41 For his complaint, Private Darbyshire was reduced in rank from Lance Corporal to Private – the complaint obviously seen as a serious violation of the behaviour expected from a non-commissioned officer. Private Darbyshire was in trouble again in July 1918 for an exhibition of larrikinism. He was awarded seven days in the Field Punishment Compound for ‘causing an obnoxious noise on church parade and insolence to superior officer’.42

Private William Clark, also known as William Philip, from Leith, Scotland, has an intriguing dossier. He enlisted in April 1916 and was one of the few of the 307 bakers in the study who was never hospitalised during his service. He was AWOL four times and committed three crimes while he was with 4AFB, several involving liquor. He was transferred to the 19th Battalion on 30 December 1917, probably to curb his behaviour. He was AWOL four more times after transfer but did not commit any further offences. He was discharged in April 1919 because of premature senility. He was Court Martialled in June 1920, over fourteen months after discharge, for reasons I have been unable to determine.43

41 NAA Melbourne, Control Symbol AIF112/6/59, Barcode 4009073, Series B539, Copies of Despatch No. 53 from OC. AIF HQ London; see also AWM 15, Control Symbol 3623, [Australian Imperial Force Depots in the United Kingdom Headquarters (Salisbury Plain), Central registry files] Rations – re complaints as to the insufficiency of rations issued to AIF troops on Salisbury Plains, 1916.
Private Clark’s dossier can be compared with that of Private Charles A.G. Gardner from Coonabarabran, New South Wales. Private Gardner enlisted in March 1916 and served with the 4th and 5th AFBs. He was hospitalised four times, twice with VD, was AWOL seven times, and committed two offences involving liquor. He returned to Australia in June 1919, and after discharge in September 1919, there are no further additions to his dossier. The variance in treatment and punishment of these two men exposes the shortcomings of the casualty/record of service forms. Sometimes important activities, actions, illnesses, and injuries occurred with no significant documentation on the individual dossier. At the same time, there is no corresponding evidence in the unit diary, so any conclusion or inference, if indeed one can even be developed, must remain mere speculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5.4: Punishment for crimes – bakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forfeiture of Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Reprmand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 outlines the 168 punishments employed by the bakeries’ officers in charge and other authorities in response to the 161 crimes committed. It should be noted that some crimes were awarded more than one punishment. Just over 13 per cent of the crimes received an admonishment, a reprimand, or severe reprimand. Field punishment, detention, and prison constitute nearly 37 per cent of all punishments. Forfeiture of pay was imposed nearly 38 per cent of the time. These percentages reveal that pay forfeiture and detention were the most favoured forms of punishment.

---

within the bakeries. The least utilised punishment was imposition of costs, which accounted for 2 per cent of crimes. This was imposed when bread was destroyed by neglect; the cost of the destroyed bread was required as restitution.

Jane Ross asserts that soldiers on leave or working at bases were inclined to undisciplined acts.\textsuperscript{46} Despite this, however, in June 1918 Captain Miles of 2AFB stated that:

\begin{quote}
The discipline of the bakers is very good ... Charges of drunkenness are very rare, and considering the close proximity of the town, with its large number of Cafes and Estaminets, this speaks volumes for the general sobriety of the men.\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

This report relates to only one month, and it is possible Captain Miles was merely placing the sobriety of his men on record for posterity. As indicated, however, almost 45 per cent of the bakers absconded at some stage, 30 per cent committed at least one crime, and, as mentioned below, 26 per cent were inflicted with VD. There are offences such as ‘causing a disturbance in a café’, that suggest a larrikin and possibly a ruffian element.\textsuperscript{48} Other bakers were punished for ‘burning flour sacks for lighting purposes’.\textsuperscript{49} Twenty-three of the incidents of AWOL also included drunkenness, and there were 39 crimes involving alcohol. One baker was punished for breaking ‘from escort and liquor in possession’ in June 1916, drunkenness in November 1916, drunk and AWOL in March 1917, and bringing liquor into camp in June 1917. He was also AWOL a further seven times.\textsuperscript{50} Another baker was charged with indecent behaviour for ‘exposing his person’.\textsuperscript{51} There are many more such notations on many of the bakers’ dossiers. Although there is obviously more to these incidents than is recounted in the dossiers, it can be claimed that, although Captain Miles was pleased with the sobriety of his men, just as there was a larrikin and ruffian element in the AIF, so there was in the Australian bakeries.

\textsuperscript{46} Ross, \textit{Myth of the Digger}, p.97.
\textsuperscript{47} ‘Supplement to War Diary for June 1918, in 2AFB: Diary.
\textsuperscript{50} NAA, B2455, \textit{W. Clark}, AKA \textit{W. Philip}.
Although there are apparently no comprehensive details of crime and punishment rates in the AIF, Dale Blair states that one-third of the offences between April and August 1915 was for insolence or disobedience. This is similar to the bakers if all of the infractions under 'Various' are taken into account. Blair also maintains that Australians ‘had the highest ratio per capita among men occupying military prisons in the British armies’ by the end of 1917. He suggests that the high number of courts martial indicates that officers relied heavily on the official disciplinary system. Butler states that, apart from AWOL, the offences that resulted in the greatest number of Court Martial convictions were for drunkenness, insubordination and disobedience, miscellaneous military offences, self-inflicted wounds, desertion and cowardice. Some of these do not directly relate to the bakers, but all except cowardice have been recorded on at least one baker’s dossier.

Jane Ross maintains that the men of the AIF were ‘loathe to accord absolute authority to any officer’. Dale Blair argues that:

... the autocratic and adversarial methods of military discipline were a feature of Australian army life. Resentments were expressed through frequent and varied acts of indiscipline. Direct confrontation with officers and NCOs marked many of these incidents. Refusal to obey orders, insolence, bad language and, in extreme cases, violence toward officers underpinned many of the soldiers’ ‘crimes’.

He concludes that indiscipline was endemic within the AIF. Although Table 5.3 (above) reveals that almost 23 per cent of the bakers’ crimes were for bad conduct or disobedience, there were a number of others included in the ‘Various’ category in that table. Altogether, there were 55 crimes directly related to disrespect for authority. As indicated by Table 5.5 (below) and Table 5.3 above, 34.16 per cent of the bakers’ crimes were for a disrespect for authority. I have not included crimes such as leaving a light on in the hut after lights out, smoking in the bakehouse, supplying a false name...

52 Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.65.
53 ibid, pp.181, 67.
54 Butler, Army Medical Services, III, p.90, fn. 53.
55 Ross, Myth of the Digger, p.55.
56 Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.189.
57 ibid, p.38.
and unit, talking on parade, or unshaven on parade, because they are indirect incidences of disrespect for authority.

**TABLE 5.5: Disrespect for authority - bakers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refuse to obey order</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting to the prejudice of good order</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insubordination</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene/abusive language to officer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to salute</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting arresting escort</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striking/threatening mess waiter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to strike NCO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broke from escort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfering with the police</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striking superior officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck officer of French army</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violently resisting MPs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bakers regularly perpetrated acts of indiscipline and direct confrontation, and therefore correspond to Blair’s outline of the disrespect to authority in the AIF.

**Leadership**

Associated with larrikinism and disrespect for authority is the aspect of leadership. Australians were very critical about the behaviour of their officers when in relatively casual settings: officers were expected to act fairly, be group-oriented, and to request the performance of tasks rather than bark orders. Officers and men lived together, and Bean explains the supposed good relations between officers and their men by stating that the Australian troops, by demanding good leaders with character and competence, ensured that officers were equal to the task, and therefore they responded to them. He said in later years that the leader of an Australian unit made every difference to its efficacy. As long as he was ‘a man in every sense of the word’, the Australians, who were ‘hero-worshippers to the backbone’ would follow him with respect and discipline. The legend attributes promotions from the rank and file as

---

evidence of the AIF’s egalitarian nature. Bean states that, in terms of promotion, what mattered was:

… manners sometimes, and education often … but it mattered not whether a man was a labourer or barrister, tradesman or clerk, mechanic or farmer, engine-driver or policeman, baker or stockbroker – the average battalion commander … had his eye only on those qualities that fitted him for leadership – intelligence, courage, reliability, and strength of will.60

Blair argues that relationships between officers and men in the AIF were not as ‘harmonious’ as Bean and the Anzac legend proposes.61 Bean states that all new recruits, ‘when given an order, were always inclined to ask, “Why?”’ but that this tendency was short-lived.62 Courtenay asserts that:

These were young men who were not accustomed to unquestioning obedience or to following orders, particularly when they thought them an insult to their intelligence.63

Some officers imitated the behaviour and speech of British officers, thereby emphasising perceptions of class.64 The men considered themselves targets of their officers’ self-importance and bossiness. As early as January 1915, Sergeant Larkin of the 1st Battalion wrote in a letter that:

Suffice it to say that there would be very few here if the men were free to leave or had anticipated how they would be treated.65

Private J. Ridley of the same battalion wrote that:

… it is a very hard blow … to be a private and serve under people who in many cases know very little of military work.66

Alistair Thomson acknowledges that some Australian soldiers shot ‘bad’ officers.67 As asserted in Chapter 4 of this study, class, occupation and religion played major roles in determining promotions, which suggest that the AIF was not as egalitarian as has been claimed.
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Jane Ross states that, ‘It should not be thought that the non-fighting officers were all inherently bad ... [however] routine does not call for inspirational leadership’. General Monash condemned ‘base bureaucrats’, many of whom had been found incompetent and sent from combatant units to those such as ‘lines of communication’.

The Officers in Charge of the Australian Field Bakeries seem to have been reasonably well chosen. Some punishments they imposed, however, reveal arbitrariness and inconsistencies. Dale Blair asserts that some of the 1st Battalion’s officers also exhibited these tendencies, sometimes with ‘a spirit of vindictiveness that reflected a mutual loathing’. Two privates from 1AFB were AWOL for 1 hour; for each, this was his fourth AWOL. Both bakers were Tasmanian-born, both were Anglicans, both were in their early twenties, they were unmarried, and they had been with 1AFB from enlistment. The second had been hospitalised once with VD at the time of the offence. The first baker received a punishment of forfeiture of 14 days pay; the second, a forfeiture of three days pay. The main difference between the two, and probably the explanation for the harsher penalty, is that 14 months earlier, the first had faced a Field General Court Martial for ‘conduct to the prejudice of good order’, for which he had received three months imprisonment.

Another example highlights the inconsistencies between punishments awarded by two of the officers to men in their bakeries. One was with 1AFB, and the other was with 5AFB. The first was 24 years of age and born in England, and the second was 19 and born in Victoria. Both were Anglicans and unmarried. Both men were only AWOL once during their service. The first was AWOL for 20 minutes and returned drunk. The other was AWOL for 30 minutes. The first man received a reprimand from Captain Prior. Lieutenant Pye, however, confined the second to barracks for 30 days.

---
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second punishment seems quite excessive, especially compared to the first, and suggests the ‘vindictiveness’ noted by Blair in some instances.\textsuperscript{71}

With regard to bakery leadership, I am particularly interested in John Miles of 2AFB and Officer in Charge of the Calais bakery. He was a civil servant prior to enlistment, and I suspect was unused to receiving orders. He imposed forfeitures of pay for most short AWOLs, but after the third or fourth AWOL for the same man, or longer periods of absence, the penalties were much harsher. The unwillingness of the AIF to salute, to the point that it “gradually became extinct” towards the end of the war, has been well documented.\textsuperscript{72} Interestingly, the only two crimes of ‘failure to salute’ in the bakers’ records were from the 2AFB, so it is apparent that Miles expected the men to salute him and regarded the orders on saluting seriously. Captain Miles was often confrontational, particularly if he believed his authority was being usurped or the men under his charge were being unfairly treated. Although very much a bureaucrat himself, he seemed to take particular delight in challenging others’ rulings, especially if they were British. It also seems that he delighted in pointing out errors made by other bureaucrats. Once something riled him, the letter writing began, and he was very reluctant to lose or wear a reprimand by a higher-ranked bureaucrat. Captain Miles was a hard taskmaster and a strict disciplinarian who, however, supported his men when confronted with army bureaucracy and pettiness.

**Initiative and resourcefulness**

Dale Blair maintains there are ‘few examples ... to sustain claims that Australian soldiers were more individual and resourceful in combat than those of other nations’.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{73} Blair, *Dinkum Diggers*, p.134.
He suggests that if initiative and resourcefulness were truly national characteristics, the AIF’s deeds that supposedly exhibited such traits need to be of a much higher quality than those that have been variously described.\textsuperscript{74} The Anzac legend holds, however, that, along with ‘independent action ... courage, physical strength, comradeship, and pride in their own abilities’, initiative and resourcefulness were enduring characteristics of the ‘typical Anzac’.\textsuperscript{75} They were ‘more resourceful and possessed more initiative than other soldiers (particularly the English)’.\textsuperscript{76} Examples advanced to support the claims of initiative and resourcefulness include, ‘jam tin bombs to supplement a lack of grenades [and] the use of time-delay triggers on rifles to cover the withdrawal from Anzac’, Albert Jacka’s attack at the Poziéres windmill, wherein he and a few men attacked a large group of Germans, thereby retaking the line and freeing over forty Australian prisoners, and ‘peaceful penetration’, described by Bill Gammage as ‘persistent and aggressive patrolling against German positions, killing and wounding men, occupying ground, and shattering morale’.\textsuperscript{77} Colonel Sutton of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Australian Field Ambulance described Private John Simpson Kirkpatrick as having shown initiative in using a donkey to carry the slightly wounded to the aid post.\textsuperscript{78}

Although the Australian bakers did not have the opportunity to display the same types of improvisational and resourceful skill and daring, they exhibited these characteristics in their own field of service. They were able to brew their own yeast from hops and potatoes when their stock was rancid, mouldy or in short supply, mix various available and perhaps inferior flours together to effect the best loaf possible, use whatever equipment was placed at their disposal regardless of its efficacy, use
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grass to fire ovens when wood was unavailable, and perhaps most importantly, organise shifts to ensure productivity and relative contentment amongst the men (see above). Hugh Fairclough states that without the initiative and improvisation that were outstanding characteristics of the men of the Army Service Corps, the ‘story of the war could well have been different’. 

**Relationships with other nationalities**

Little has been detailed on the subject of the AIF’s relations with nationalities other than the British. There are snippets here and there documenting a specific soldier’s attitude towards a certain race or a soldier’s understanding of another race’s thoughts of the Australians. Sometimes a small note in a personal or unit diary or on a soldier’s dossier is all that is available, which of course, means that the same behaviour or thoughts cannot be concluded for the whole of the AIF.

Before England declared war on Germany, the two countries considered themselves as having a shared heritage. From 1914 on, however, the Germans were increasingly represented as being ‘a hostile race’. The Australian government conducted an anti-German propaganda campaign to inflame the society’s insecurities and emotions, with the result that the Australians detested the Germans well before they faced each other in battle because they were the ‘territorial plunderers who had started the thing in the first place’. By the time the Australians arrived in France they had a real hatred of the ruthless and ‘evil Hun’ who was a brutal, barbaric, and crafty adversary. Bean asserts that the Australians were aware that the Germans in France

---
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were going to be a far more fearsome adversary than the Turkish at Gallipoli; their intelligence and snipers’ accuracy were very ‘formidable’.  

Greg Kerr maintains that one-off events were seized upon to characterise the brutality and sadism of the German race. He says that ‘The stories got worse’ but that no one ever seemed to have witnessed them directly. Describing Germany as ‘the Caliban of nations’, Captain Knyvett of the 59th Battalion states that:

... the German is a beast who wantonly destroys and takes sheer joy in slaying, burning, and smashing, destroying for destruction’s sake, and killing for the sight of blood.

Kerr quotes a Private Makeham as having made the same type of claim, as does Noel Carthew with Frank Carthew, who also reflects that ‘they are supposed to be a civilized nation and kultured (sic) at that’.

Bean asserts that although the Australians moderated their feelings toward the Germans once they had ‘enforced contact’ after engaging in heavy fighting, their attitude stayed ‘fierce to the end’. Kerr also claims that a number of Australians thought more of the Germans after ‘personal dealings with them’. He writes that a Corporal Bailey believed that the Germans did not attack the Australians with as much ferocity as they did the English. It is interesting that some fighting combatants tempered their feelings towards the Germans. This may explain non-fighting combatant Private Hyndman’s sentiments towards the Germans over the duration of the war; his expressions increase, rather than decrease in vitriol as the war continues.
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Hyndman nearly always refers to the Germans as ‘Fritz’ in his diary, but saves stronger language for his postcards home, particularly those addressed to his wife. In a postcard on 22 September 1916, Hyndman tells his son that ‘We will soon beat these Germans’. In March and May of 1917, Hyndman refers to giving ‘Fritz’ a ‘hot’ time. By June of 1917, he refers to them as ‘cowardly Huns’ and ‘Hun dogs’. He writes that the mail lost at sea is ‘some more of the Huns dirty work (sic)’ and that he has read that:

... the cowardly dogs are still baby killing in London & other English towns with there Taubes dropping bombs on poor innocent woman & children (sic). In April 1918 he writes to his son, Reg, that ‘the people in Aussie should be so thankful to the Lord they are away from these cowardly Huns’.

The postcards Private Hyndman chose to send home from England while training and before being sent to France were very different to most of those sent from wartime France. The English cards have children on the front, sometimes dressed in quasi-military uniform. Most of those sent from France to his wife and children convey a distinct anti-German sentiment. One sent in March 1917 has a statue of a cherub fountain with the male cherub urinating onto a German helmet. In another dated 3 June 1917, a small, pretty, tearful female child is hiding behind a boy dressed in military uniform holding a gun. A sleazy boy in German uniform and helmet stands close by. The caption reads, ‘NOT LIKELY! Elle n’est pas pour toi!’ (She is not for you). The German helmet features on many of the cards, and is usually placed in a position where it is disrespected. The sentiment on most of the cards is that the Germans are barbaric, are after the local women, and are going to be beaten by the ‘British’ forces.
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That some fighting combatants re-evaluated the Germans after having contact, suggests a realisation by them that the Germans, by fighting, were merely performing their duties to their homeland, as were themselves. Private Hyndman never came closer to a German than the Taubes that regularly bombed the bakery or the town. He, therefore, was not exposed to any type of contact that might have resulted in mutual respect. Regarding a similarity of feelings of the AIF and the bakers towards the Germans, it is difficult to make a definitive conclusion. Some men quite clearly softened their views to some extent, while others’ views, as Bean asserts, remained ‘fierce to the end’.

Hyndman’s views may or may not correspond to those of the other bakers. This is, of course, the historian’s perennial problem with a lack of surviving evidence.

Bryce Courtenay maintains that the first few convoys of the 1st AIF believed that Egypt ‘was the land of sin, sand, shit and syphilis, and they thought even less of its native population’ who were ‘wily wogs’. They thought the Egyptians were ‘a nation of thieving cowards up to no good who couldn’t fight their way out of a wet paper bag’.

Corporal Collins of the 1st Battalion wrote that Cairo was ‘a bugger of a place you can smell the natives they are worse than the goats (sic)’. The Officer in Charge of the 2nd Field Ambulance, Lieutenant-Colonel Alfred H. Sturdee, wrote a special ‘Corps Order’ on 4 December 1914 to his men, which outlines larrkinism and bad behaviour towards the Egyptians:

Permission was asked on 3.12.’14 from G.O.C. for controlled parties to go ashore. This was granted on morning of 4.12.’14 – but owing to the nature of reports received from ashore, of the throwing of potatoes, onions, & other missiles at passing boats & at Port Officials, & men going ashore without permission – this privilege cannot be now availed of.
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The next day, 5 December 1914, Sturdee punished the seven culprits by locking them up for 48 hours.99 Peter Cochrane reports that, after the Gallipoli campaign, while the AIF was amassing and reorganising in Egypt before moving on to France, the men continued to ‘harass and intimidate the poor “Gypos”’.100 There is a tantalisingly brief note on the dossier of Private Leonard Brownbill of 4AFB, recording that he received a detention of seven days because of ‘interfering with natives on route march’.101 The manner of this interference, and whether it included throwing ‘potatoes, onions, & other missiles’ cannot be ascertained.102 There is no doubt that these two incidents were not isolated, and that the Australians, as a group, did not think much of the Egyptians. Historian Greg Kerr states that the Egyptians were ‘mistrusted and despised’, and that the Australians were either ‘roughing them up, upturning their stalls or … teaching them how to swear in English’.103 Suzanne Brugger and Jeffrey Grey suggest that the intolerances and biases of the Australians towards their own indigenous population and minority groups were applied to the native population in Egypt. The Australians behaved boorishly, and sometimes violently, towards the Egyptians.104

An incident on 23 August 1915 exposes the difficulties dealing with, or perhaps the attitudes of, AIF officials towards Egyptians. On 23 August 1915, the Egyptian engineers assisting those on Imbros Island mutinied and guards were called in. Ten Egyptians were killed and several wounded in the fracas although there were no casualties to the British on the island. Captain Prior believed another outbreak was imminent if those in charge of the Egyptian workers did not exercise great care.105 It is clear that Prior lays the blame for this mutiny at the feet of ‘those in charge’, especially
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when he expresses his great sorrow at ‘Capt Lord & Lt Brommelle of Egyptian Engineers’ leaving the island just over two weeks later on 9 September. He said their ‘association ha[d] been most cordial’.\(^{106}\) This incident reveals both the positive and negative in the relationships between the Australians and the Egyptians.

To the Australians of 1AFB at Lemnos and Imbros Islands the Greeks were a mixture of amusement, bemusement, and frustration. Greek Easter celebrations at the end of March and the beginning of April 1915, complete with fireworks and the firing of guns, caused disquiet amongst the 1AFB, who believed at its commencement and before their investigations, that it was an alarm heralding some kind of war action.\(^ {107}\) There is a tone of amusement or perhaps a slight ridicule in Captain Prior’s recording of a ‘great demonstration by the Greeks [on 7 April] in honour of some national anniversary’.\(^ {108}\)

Bryce Courtenay maintains that, at first, the Australians ‘equated Johnny Turk with the Egyptians and, subsequently wrote them off as just another bunch of wogs’.\(^ {109}\) By the end of the Gallipoli campaign, however, the Australians held a grudging respect for the Turkish troops.\(^ {110}\) Upon evacuation, Major-General A.J. Godley left a letter for the Turkish commander requesting respect for Anzac graves. Many Australians also left meals for the Turks.\(^ {111}\) At Imbros Island labour in the form of Turkish prisoners or Greek refugees was accessible to the 1AFB. Upon arrival, 1AFB immediately gained permission to dig a well and utilise a fatigue party of Turkish prisoners.\(^ {112}\) On 16 June, Prior had the Turkish prisoners out on the Imbros hillsides collecting grass in bread
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sacks because of a shortage of firewood. That same month, Prior employed a group of Greek refugees to load bread.\footnote{ibid, 16, 27 June 1915.} He was advised on 16 August that he could no longer use Turkish prisoners for packing bread and chopping wood, these chores to be performed instead by Greek refugees. Prior was most unhappy with this order as he believed the Turk to be an excellent and reliable worker. The Turkish prisoners, not surprisingly, were also dismayed to learn they were leaving the bakery precinct, probably knowing the move was to somewhere less comfortable. Prior proclaimed 17 August a ‘bad day’ and he labelled the labour of the Greek refugees as ‘rotten’.\footnote{ibid, 16-17 August 1915.} Greek refugees were labourers on the island for the rest of the bakery’s stay. They chopped wood and were used as general fatigue parties, with thirty allocated to each of the five bakeries – one Australian and four British - on the island.\footnote{ibid, 24, 30 October, 5, 13 November 1915.} Prior paid one of the Imbros locals to take the sheep he had purchased on to the local, grassy hills, and look after them.\footnote{ibid, 17 August 1915.} The AIF and the bakers shared similar thoughts of the Turks and the Greeks.

The 1AFB had pleasant dealings and a good working relationship with the French bakery at Lemnos Island. At the end of March 1915 the 1AFB and French bakers met, became friendly, compared working methods, and Captain Prior fraternised with French officers.\footnote{ibid, 30 March, 2 April 1915.} By 29 April, Prior’s annoyance at his bakery’s not being utilised to its fullest extent was apparent when he noted that the French bakery was supplying bread to their troops at Helles, and although he had the bakers and the ingredients, the men at Anzac were living on ‘hard biscuits’.\footnote{ibid, 29 April 1915.} Prior believed that, compared to the Australians, the French bakery was an extremely well equipped concern that put their own ‘show entirely in the shade’. Despite this, the French major
in charge declared the Australian bread the ‘best’, although Prior thought this compliment may have been merely a French courtesy. The French also baked a special coarse wholemeal loaf for the Turkish prisoners with which the latter appeared very delighted.\textsuperscript{119}

There is no doubt that in Europe, as in Egypt, many Australians behaved badly during their leisure time. There are, however, monuments and cemeteries all over France attesting to the thankfulness of that nation to Australia’s participation in World War One.\textsuperscript{120} There is also no doubt the Australians thought highly of themselves. Historian Richard Reid asserts that the Australians spread confidence throughout the local population, particularly while looking at the backs of the retreating British troops. Reid recounts an overheard assurance to some French women by a member of the Australian 3\textsuperscript{rd} Division while cleaning his rifle before heading into action: ‘Fini retreat, Madame – beaucoup Australiens ici!’ (\textit{Stop retreating, Madame – many Australians are here}).\textsuperscript{121} Private Hyndman and the bakery diarists do not make comment on their feelings for the French. A letter home from New Zealander, Ira Robinson, pronounced that he ‘didn’t fancy the Froggies at all’\textsuperscript{122}.  

The soldiers from New Zealand did not like to be mistaken for Australians, and there appears to have been, even then, a trans-Tasman rivalry. Jane Ross states that the New Zealanders believed themselves ‘the elite of the Dominion troops, and told stories of rallying panic-stricken Australians’.\textsuperscript{123} New Zealander Ira Robinson wrote home to his family that:

\begin{quote}
... the Australian soldier has a rotten name everywhere he goes ... caused I guess by a few bad eggs among them. Everywhere they are recognised as first class fighters, but the N. Zealanders are equally as good and have a much better name
\end{quote}
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when on leave; they are better behaved somehow. There are 1700 Australians in
camp here now with V.D. so you can guess how they behave’.124

Robinson also tells his family of a wounded Australian soldier who was shot in the jaw
after being in France for only one week. He says that although the injury was
supposed to prevent him eating hard food, ‘the sinner eats more than any of us and is
as fat as a hog’. The Australian was also:

... an awful skite and to hear him talk you would think he had put in at least a
couple of years at the front.125

Dale Blair and Robin Gerster also maintain that the Australians ‘had an inflated view of
themselves’.126 Robinson notes that the Australians called the New Zealanders ‘Pig
Islanders’, and thinks it might be because they would cause trouble if deprived of food
or blankets.127 Andrews states that the war brought the Australians and New
Zealanders ‘closer together’.128 There is nothing in any of the bakery diaries about the
New Zealanders or ‘Pig Islanders’, except that 2AFB was working with the 1st New
Zealand Field Bakery at Bakeries South at Rouen and then at Le Havre. The
relationship between the two bakeries was probably quite cordial.

C.E.W. Bean likened the Australians to the American and Canadian forces
because of their ‘independence and strong determination’.129 He includes excerpts from
an Australian officer who believed the Americans thought similarly to the Australians
and were very ‘sensible’. Another thought they were ‘fine looking men ... who felt as
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much at home amongst Australians as amongst his own countrymen’. Bean reports that after America entered the war:

... a Digger asked: "Are you going to win the war for us?" "Well," came the quick answer, "we hope we'll fight like the Australians." When an order came through advising two American regiments that they were going to train with the Australians, their colonel reported:

There were great manifestations of joy ... [The men were told] You will be fighting along with lads who always deliver the goods.

New Zealander Ira Robinson was quite impressed with the American forces. He called them 'good chaps', 'good scrappers', and 'quiet, decent sort of chaps' who were 'very keen' and who took 'no prisoners'. Anzac Wallace Campbell wrote that, if not 'for the Americans the case would be hopeless'. In June 1918, members of the 4th Australian Division believed the Americans with whom they had had contact, the 33rd Division, to be 'an independent, alert, energetic lot of men, and splendid fighters'.

Eric Andrews suggests that the Canadians 'were widely regarded as possibly the finest troops in the British armies', a view supported by soldier turned writer and lawyer W.H. Downing, who maintains that the French-Canadians were the 'fiercest fighters in the war', followed closely by the Australians, the Highlanders, and the English-speaking Canadians. Andrews suggests that the Scots and the Australians had a very good relationship. Driver Claude Ewart of the 4th Field Artillery Brigade noted that the Australians and the Scots were always the ones called upon to do the 'hard

---

131 Quoted in ibid, p.262.
132 Quoted in ibid, p.263.
134 Letter from Wallace Campbell to Mother, in Campbell & Hosken, Four Australians at War, 2 June 1918, p.179.
135 Quoted in Butler, Army Medical Services, II, p.673.
fighting’. He said the Australians and the Scots had a mutual admiration for the other’s abilities.\textsuperscript{137}

There is very little recorded by Captain Miles and Private Hyndman about bakers of other nationalities. The 3\textsuperscript{rd} Canadian Field Bakery arrived at Calais on 24 December 1917 and commenced duty the same day.\textsuperscript{138} Private Hyndman does not mention this in his diary, but records earlier, on 30 August 1917, that ‘B & C Bakers are now working in Bakery’.\textsuperscript{139} On 13 April 1918, Private Hyndman wrote that ‘Thousands of American Troops arrive at our camp to meet Fritz in this Big Battle’. Five days later he wrote that the American bakers had commenced duty at the bakery.\textsuperscript{140} The Americans were still there on 4 July 1918, because Private Hyndman noted that it was ‘American Independence Day. The Yanks have a day off’.\textsuperscript{141} Captain Miles does not mention this arrival, commencement of duty, or the oddity of a day off due to national holiday during war, in the unit diary. Bean states that the same day, 4 July 1918, was chosen as the date the Americans would join an attack with the Australians for the first time, so it is clear that not all of the American troops had the day off.\textsuperscript{142} There is no other mention in any of the diaries of further comings or goings from the bakery until the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} AFBs left for Rouen in August 1918.

**Australian and British relationship**

It has been well documented that the British and the Australians were disenchanted with each other almost from the very beginning. Andrews maintains this disenchantment began within four days of the commencement of the Gallipoli campaign because:
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\textsuperscript{140} *ibid*, 13, 18 April 1918.
\textsuperscript{141} *ibid*, 4 July 1918.
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The Australians regarded the British as old-fashioned, incompetent and arrogant; the British looked at the more casual Australian discipline, and thought it made the Anzacs worse soldiers.\textsuperscript{143}

It soon became apparent to the Australians that England and the English were not what they had been led to believe by their parents and at school. They began to regard Australia, even more than they had before the war, as ‘God’s own country’. They hated England’s terrible climate, the class system and the immense differences between the poor and the rich, the separation and discrimination between officers and men, they believed they were treated in a condescending and patronising manner, and Australian currency was refused.\textsuperscript{144} One soldier wrote that ‘they ought to give England to Germany and apologise for the state it is in’.\textsuperscript{145} The Australians, once they experienced the reality, were very disillusioned with ‘myth of the homeland’, and became more and more convinced they were from the best country in the world.\textsuperscript{146}

Bryce Courtenay believes the charge at the Nek on 7 August 1915 has become a ‘symbol’ of Great War British inadequacies. While the carnage that followed the charge occurred, ‘The English troops at Suvla, plainly visible from The Nek, were making tea while the Australians willingly sacrificed their lives’.\textsuperscript{147} Historians Kevin Fewster, Vecihi Başarın, and Hatice Hürmüz Başarın, contend that while the Australians are still paid tributes by the Turkish for their accomplishments, they are also ‘pitied for being led by British officers, many of whom are claimed to have been halfwitted’.\textsuperscript{148}

The Australians were quite shocked and disillusioned with the class-ridden society and social pretences they encountered both on Gallipoli and in France, and in
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Britain during their periods of leave. In 1917, Sergeant Archie Barwick of the 1st Battalion described a group of British soldiers as "a mob of kids" headed by "incompetent and useless officers", and had no uncertainties of his own men's supremacy. In a letter to Australian Prime Minister Andrew Fisher on 23rd September 1915, Australian journalist Keith Murdoch said that although the Australian troops had confidence in General Birdwood and some other British officers, they had 'nothing but contempt' for the general staff and Hamilton. Murdoch suggested that this was hardly surprising considering the British promoted according to social status rather than talent. Bean agreed that Murdoch was only acknowledging what the Australians on Gallipoli were saying about the British leadership. The Australians resented the military etiquette expected of them towards the 'very cliquey and stuck-up' English officers who spoke in carefully modulated phrases, lived very well, and appeared to be having 'a right good time' while insisting on petty discipline and showing indifference and callousness towards their men. Lieutenant J.M. Aitken of the 11th Battalion, described the young British officers as 'quite unbearable', with several 'affect[ing] monocles'. The British were very fastidious about military etiquette and the saluting of a senior officer, which was resented by the Australians, who demonstrated a great reluctance to salute. They often jeered at, or 'from devilment saluted cinema doormen, railway guards, hotel porters, and any other civilian under a peaked cap', mocking the old-fashioned, class-based British system which kept people 'in their place'.
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By 1918, Bean had decided that British army weaknesses could be blamed on this fundamental flaw of British society. British Cabinet adviser Sir Maurice Hankey said he believed that it was the:

... meticulous clinging to our obsolete, undemocratic standard of what they are pleased to call discipline – saluting etc. – that has made the English Army so rotten that it has never achieved one successful offensive in the whole course of the war.\footnote{Barrett, ‘No Straw Man’, p.152.}

Keith Murdoch described the Australian troops on Gallipoli as being ‘sacrificed needlessly because of muddled staff work’ of the British.\footnote{Fewster, ‘Ashmead-Bartlett’, p.24.} The Anzac legend therefore provides two answers to the question of bad British soldiering. One is that officers were promoted regardless of ability and therefore, because of their incompetence and mismanagement, made some atrocious decisions that meant ‘Australian and New Zealand Army Corps were sacrificed to that pure British incompetence’.\footnote{Bean quoted in Fewster, Gallipoli Correspondent, p.182.} The other is that the physique and general mental state of the ordinary soldier, assigned to ‘hovels or slums’ because of their station in life, were not just unfit for soldiering, but ‘deserve[d] to be crushed through [their] very weakness and lack of ability’.\footnote{Bean quoted in Barrett, ‘No Straw Man’, p.113; Lawrence quoted in P.A. Pedersen, Book Review, ‘R. East (Ed.), The Gallipoli Diary of Sergeant Lawrence of the Australian Engineers – 1st A.I.F., 1915’, in Journal of Australian Studies, No. 12, June, 1983, p.84.} Laffin states that the battle plans devised by the British for use at Bullecourt on 11th April 1917 were so ‘foolhardy’, they were ‘later used by British instructors as an example of how not to plan an attack’.\footnote{Laffin, Australian Battlefields, pp.118-119.} Bean summed it up by stating that ‘the British nation has not the brains to make war. It is much better at manufacturing socks’.\footnote{Bean quoted in Fewster, ‘Ashmead-Bartlett’, p.182.}
The Australians and the New Zealanders believed they were being used more often than other troops and did far more than their fair share with little or no acknowledgement.\(^{163}\) Ira Robinson wrote:

> It is the limit. We have been in the line for nine weeks now instead of eighteen days, while in the villages behind us there are Tommies who have never been in at all yet. The heads are afraid to put them in – they cannot be trusted … and in the face of this the King says New Zealand and Australia are not doing their bit.\(^{164}\)

In 1916, the Australian governor-general, Scottish-born Sir Ronald Munro-Ferguson, stated that Australia was not contributing her fair share and stressed the role and status of the British.\(^{165}\) In 1917 after complaining that the dominion troops were receiving too much publicity, the London *Times* ran a follow-up article stating that the editors were happy ‘to note that [there was] new and general recognition that … the bulk of the work has been done by English troops’.\(^{166}\) The English newspapers ceased the practice of naming each of the dominion troops involved in victories, and instead, designated them as ‘British’. The Australians believed this appellation masked their successes and made it seem that the British soldiers were superior.\(^{167}\) Sir Douglas Haig believed that the Australians and Canadians ‘derive[d] obvious pleasure’ from public acclaim, unlike the English and Scots, who had no need for such applause.\(^{168}\) Historian John Williams, however, illustrates what he calls the ‘new Anglo-centric mode of reporting’ with the example of a German railway cannon captured by the Australians, which was featured in a photographic display in the French weekly *L’Illustration* on 24 August 1918. Credit is given to the Australians for its capture and the words ‘Captured by AUS’ are clearly distinguishable on the side of the cannon. One week later, the
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Figaro newspaper featured the cannon, but with the words 'Captured by the British Fourth Army, August 8th 1918’ painted on the side in large white letters.169

In 1929 when British staff officer Cecil Aspinall-Oglander wrote a history of the Gallipoli campaign, his first draft reported that, on that first day, many Australians had given up the fight and straggled back to the beach.170 Bean retorted that although some men of ‘weaker fibre’ undoubtedly retreated from the frontline, most were motivated to stay because their mates were trusting in their strength and tenacity and they had to ‘be true to their idea of Australian manhood’.171 Although many Australian Gallipoli veterans agreed with Aspinall-Oglander, and suggested he had underestimated the confusion and occurrences of straggling, newspapers such as the Queensland Daily Guardian screamed headlines such as ‘Vilest Libel of the War’. The report stated that the official British history had accused the Australians of being a ‘disorganised rabble’.172 For the sake of what Alistair Thomson calls ‘imperial goodwill’, Aspinall-Oglander agreed to alter his history and remove:

… anything to which objection was raised [in their] anxiety not to say one word which could hurt the susceptibilities of Australia or give the impression that the magnificent behaviour of the Australian troops on Gallipoli was not fully appreciated in [England].173

There is no doubt however, that while there were attempts to restore or maintain ‘imperial goodwill’, British histories of the war give Australia and its contribution ‘scant reference’.174

The Australians believed the British used them as ‘cannon fodder’ or ‘shock troops’. Geoffrey Serle uses this reasoning to explain the high Australian casualty rate compared to the other Empire armies. Laffin refers to the AIF being used as a

169 Williams, ‘Seven Battles’, pp.34, 38-39.
173 Quoted in ibid, p.633.
174 Laffin, Australian Battlefields, p.128.
‘battering ram’ at Pozières, wherein 23,000 Australian officers and men were killed.\footnote{Laffin, \textit{Australian Battlefields}, p.89; see also Serle, ‘Digger Tradition’, p.151.} There were many ‘terrible blunders’ by British strategists and also the opinion that they could not devise any better tactics than frontal assaults against machine guns, to the cost of thousands of Australian lives.\footnote{Laffin, \textit{Australian Battlefields}, pp.55, 56.} Private E.L. Cuddeford, a despatch runner with the AIF’s 9\textsuperscript{th} Battalion on the Western Front, told Alistair Thomson that the Australian forces were used to excess:

Any tough corner, the Australian troops were pushed into it. The British troops were kept out of it. We objected to it, while we were pushed into everything dirty and rough and the British troops weren’t there to help us.\footnote{Quoted in Thomson, \textit{ANZAC Memories}, pp.40, 240.}

Australian troops believed they had to capture ground and trenches and then go to the trouble and danger of recapturing it after the British had run away or failed to keep it. The Australians had to ‘make good their neighbours’ failure’.\footnote{Bean, \textit{Official History}, VI, p.933; see also Andrews, \textit{Anzac Illusion}, pp. 55, 176; Ross McMullin, ‘The Black Day of the German Army 8 August 1918’, in \textit{Wartime: Official Magazine of the Australian War Memorial}, No. 3, Spring, Canberra, 1998, pp.24-25.} Andrews recounts a story of chaos after a panicked British 47\textsuperscript{th} Division moved back without orders. As the Australians were trying to ‘force their way through the retiring masses … [British] officers retreating in great haste’ warned them that the enemy was not far behind. As:

\ldots a car containing nine red-tabbed officers [sped] down the road in indecent haste [they] received a volley of abuse from the “Diggers” going in the opposite direction.\footnote{Andrews, \textit{Anzac Illusion}, p.174.}

Historian Ross McMullin also tells of an incident on 8\textsuperscript{th} August 1918 whereupon, after an:

\ldots undistinguished performance by the British III Corps … two [Australian] sergeants and four privates did what the III Corps could not … capturing hundreds of prisoners.\footnote{McMullin, ‘Black Day’, p.25.}

The Australian bakeries had their own troubles with the British. On Imbros Island on 22 July 1915, Captain Prior of 1AFB noted that 5,000 of Kitchener’s troops had come ashore. Prior described their poor looks, small stature, and paltry training.\(^{181}\) This description is in concert with Bean’s account of the physical differences between the English and Australian troops wherein he displayed a marked admiration for the stature, bravery, and fighting prowess of the Australians. Bean remarked on 10 September 1915 that ‘[the British] have neither the nerve, the physique, nor the spirit and self-control to fit them for soldiers’.\(^{182}\) It should be remembered that, throughout the war but particularly in the first year, height requirements for the Australians were much more stringent than those of the British, which were set at five feet.\(^{183}\) It would appear that, to some Australians at least, the differences between the English and Australian troops were marked and immediately noticeable. On 24 July Prior expressed his belief that his life was ‘tormented’ by medical officers and inspectors, but especially by the ‘brainless officers of the K’s Army crowd who seem[ed] to be perfectly unable to realise what they are at’. Prior did not think they would stand much of a chance once they met ‘Abdul’.\(^{184}\)

The 4\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) AFB diaries note that a reorganisation of Bakeries North at Rouen was instituted in April 1918. Approximately fifteen men from each of the two bakeries were allocated to flour carrying and bread loading because these duties were too arduous for the personnel of the British bakeries. The diarists note that many British soldiers were classed as ‘B’, whereas the Australians were ‘A’ class. Within these medical classifications, ‘A’ signified ‘fitness for service, ‘B’ temporary unfitness, and ‘C’ permanent unfitness’.\(^{185}\) The bags of bread weighed around 110 lbs, and the work was
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continuous and laborious. It therefore demanded physically strong, ‘Class “A” personnel’, which, according to the bakers, did not apply to many of the British.186

The 11th Imperial Bakery joined 1AFB on Imbros for duty and rations, but baked its bread at a different site to the Australians although under the command of Captain Prior.187 Prior rated the 11th’s first bread on 30 July as ‘fairly good’.188 He was unimpressed, however, that their choice of yeast was unsuitable for hot climates and consequently did not produce satisfactory bread. He also believed that the Imperial Bakery was ‘out of the running [being] quite up against their job, and need[ing] a lot of instructions’.189 The increasing population on the island and Prior’s rapidly diminishing supplies of wood induced him to attempt to obtain a reserve stock.190 He sent a fatigue party from the 11th Imperial Bakery out on woodcutting duty, but suggested ‘the Turk did twice as much work in a day as these chaps’.191 Again, Prior was uncomplimentary about the British troops. Between 11 and 13 August, the small quantity of bread baked was courtesy of the Australians, the English bakers suffering very severely from the heat and dysentery.192 There is an implication here that although the Australians were also suffering the same conditions and complaints, they were working stoically while the British wilted and retired to their sick beds. On 17 August Prior wrote that the British bakers were ‘all at sea’ at baking, with their finished product eliciting complaints from all quarters. Prior was advised to teach the British ‘how to do things’ but struck a snag when they greatly resented being instructed by Australians.193

186 4AFB: Diary, 28 April 1918; 5AFB: Diary, 1 April 1918.
187 1AFB: Diary, 25 July 1915.
188 ibid, 25-30 July 1915.
189 ibid, 31 July 1915.
190 ibid, 3 August 1915.
191 ibid, 2-3 August 1915.
192 ibid, 11-13 August 1915.
193 ibid, 17 August 1915.
On 24 August 1915, the same day that Suvla Bay received its first shipment of bread rations from Imbros Island, Captain Prior was advised that three additional British Field Bakeries were going to report for duty within a few days. The 50th Imperial Bakery reported the next day and was ordered to hurry with its setting up. Prior spent the day at General Headquarters arranging the duties of the 50th and other bakeries due to arrive.\(^\text{194}\) The 10th, 41st and 51st Imperial Bakeries reported on 29 August, which, together with the 11th, 29th, 50th Imperial Bakeries and Prior’s ‘good’ 1AFB, were now under Prior’s command. The new bakeries did not have the skill to brew their own yeast and needed instruction.\(^\text{195}\) Together with the British under his command and the musty and mouldy flour that was making an inferior loaf, Prior concluded that he really had his hands full.\(^\text{196}\)

There is an interesting phenomenon with the Australians’ identification as ‘British’. On 20 May, a week before leaving Lemnos for Imbros, Captain Prior notes that a French major told him that ‘Ze English are bad beginners but they are good finishers’. Prior notes that this is ‘We British as seen through French eyes’.\(^\text{197}\) Once on Imbros Island, however, particularly after the arrival of the Imperial bakeries, Prior is very conscious of the source of 1AFB, differentiating between the hardiness of the Australians compared to the British, who were knocked about from heat and dysentery.\(^\text{198}\) Two months later, when many of 1AFB were hospitalised, Prior praised those left who, despite the ‘havoc’, worked on like ‘true Australians’.\(^\text{199}\)

When 2AFB arrived at the Calais bakery, it was under the command of a British master baker. According to Captain Miles, this unnamed master baker was very ‘rigid’ in attitude, with ‘stereotyped methods’. The Australians were most unhappy with the
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bakery working system; a feeling apparently reciprocated by the master baker and English bakers towards the Australians. The bakers worked in two shifts, with the first marching to the bakery at 1 a.m. They often did not finish baking until 2 or 3 p.m., and then had to carry the next day’s flour requirements, around 3,200 bags, from the flour store to the bakery’s dough rooms. This first shift usually worked until around 5 or 6 p.m., which made it a very long and arduous day. The second shift reported to the master baker at 11 a.m., even if he was not ready for their labour. He would then send them back to camp until the first shift had completed their duties. Additional duties included washing empty flour sacks, transporting and storing coke for use in the fires, and other such tasks that could have been executed by untrained workers.

Private Hyndman complained about the amount of work expected of the bakers. After his first day’s work on 28 January 1917, when he worked from 4 a.m. until 5 p.m., he wrote that he was ‘very sore and tired after carrying flour from [the] store’. The next day, working the same hours, was a ‘very hard day flour carrying’, and a few days later, after working twelve hours, he wrote:

4000 bags to be carried about 100 yards. 80, 140, and 220 lb bags … Very hard work. More like slaves than soldiers.

Captains Miles and Nash tried in vain to alter the system of working. On 19 August 1916, Miles wrote to the officer in charge of the bakeries, pointing out what he believed to be a ‘gross injustice’ to his men. He pointed out that the men on the morning shift were regularly woken at 3 a.m. to commence work at 4 a.m., and, after completing their baking duties, carted flour until 7.15 p.m. Having to be up again by 3 a.m. the following day meant that they were completely ‘worn out’. He argued that labourers could perform flour-carrying duties. He suggested that, if the long hours
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were not alleviated, ‘the whole of the men will be laid up’, and concluded his letter with a threat to take the matter to the medical officer. Captain Miles did not receive a reply, and he was quite justified in maintaining that his attempts to make conditions easier for his men were disallowed.

Another cause of complaint from the Australians was the lack of recognition afforded their experience, and thereby a lack of discretion allowed by the master baker. Although the Australians were held responsible for their finished product, they were not allowed any flexibility in the making of the bread. Captain Miles states that the Australian bakers ‘acquitted themselves in a very capable manner’, working much faster than the British bakers while turning out a ‘creditable loaf’. The master baker discouraged the fast pace of the Australians by insisting that those sections that had finished, wait until all sections had completed their daily duties. This meant that the Australians usually had to sit around in soggy clothing for one or two hours. The conflict between the master baker and Captain Miles, and the Australian and British bakers, is clearly affirmed when Miles declares that ‘Australian units should work separate from other Armies, and under the control of their own officers’.

In January 1917, Captain Miles was appointed as officer in charge of the Calais bakery. He overcame the problems with the running of the bakery, which had been instituted since the commencement of operations in June 1915, with great difficulty. In March 1917, he formulated a report that articulated the detriment of the current
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system on the men’s health. The senior medical officer wrote a letter of support, stating that the long hours were inadvisable for maintaining good health. He stated that carrying flour for five or six hours after a full shift of baking duties was ‘beyond endurance’.209 This report was obviously common knowledge to the Australians at least, because Private Hyndman wrote that the ‘MO makes a report on work being too heavy’.210 Shortly after the report, permission was given for labourers to carry the flour and coke, and the practice of washing flour bags was discontinued.211 On 8 April 1917, the master bakers at the Calais and Boulogne bakeries were exchanged.212 Private Hyndman wrote that the autocratic British master baker at Calais was sacked. He continued that this was ‘a good thing for the poor Bakers. D.C.M. for Killing white men’.213 Neither of the two Australian officers confirms Hyndman’s statement that the master baker was sacked, but both agree the change was for the better.214 On 5 April, Private Hyndman wrote that the new master baker, Sergeant-Major Steele had begun, and that the ‘conditions of work [were] now much better’.215 Captain Miles states that the new master baker had different ideas and ways of working and more consideration for the men than did his predecessor.216

**Letters from Home**

Mail from Australia was of great importance to the men of the AIF and the bakeries. Many diaries and letters scold those in Australia for the dearth of letters received, blame the authorities for their inefficiency in delivering mail, or lament the rumour of a
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ship’s sinking with bags of Australian mail. Suzanne Welborn states that the men of the AIF:

... asked for newspapers and particularly the Bulletin, which they devoured, tobacco, cigarettes, biscuits, but most of all, for the family to keep on writing.\(^{217}\)

A letter from Harold Campbell of the Provost Corps read:

You can’t imagine the new life it puts into one’s body to receive a letter after waiting so long. Of course, we have had a lot of mail go down lately – a good many boats are torpedoed now.\(^{218}\)

Private Leslie G. Chandler of the Australian Medical Corps was a prolific diarist and letter writer. He always acknowledged letters from home and often noted their scarcity. On 7 July 1916, he reminded those at home that he had not received ‘a letter for about 2 months’.\(^{219}\) Lieutenant Charles Carthew of the 8th Light Horse was killed at the Nek on 7 August 1915.\(^{220}\) A condolence letter noted that he had a ‘grand, strong face’ and that he must have had ‘a hero’s death’.\(^{221}\) Charles Carthew was also a prolific letter writer, and, like Les Chandler, noted their regularity. On 1 May 1915, while at Heliopolis camp in Cairo, he wrote:

I still haven’t had a letter what the duce (sic) is up, and [brother] Fred hasn’t had one letter either except from Harry in W.A.\(^{222}\)

On 4 June he wrote, ‘Haven’t had any mail for ages’, on 11 June, ‘Wish they would send our mail along it’s a beggar’, on 15 June, ‘A fellow appreciates letters I can assure you’, and in July, ‘Letter just came to hand – great rejoicing in camp’.\(^{223}\)

It is hardly surprising that the men of the Australian bakeries felt the same longing for mail as the rest of the AIF. Deliveries to 1AFB at Lemnos and Imbros

---

\(^{217}\) Welborn, Lords of Death, p.102.
\(^{218}\) Letter from Harold Campbell to Mother, in Campbell & Hosken, Four Australians at War, 24 January 1917, p.129.
\(^{221}\) Letter from Viva Mulder, in Carthew, Voices from the Trenches, 11 September 1915, pp.71-72.
\(^{222}\) Letter from Charles Carthew to Mother, in ibid, 1 May 1915, p.24.
\(^{223}\) Letters from Charles Carthew to Mother, 4, 11, 15 June 1915. Letter from Charles Carthew to Nell, undated but is reproduced between letters dated 5 and 20 July, from ‘The Trenches’, in ibid, pp.27, 30, 31, 39.
always elicited an entry into the unit diary. Having left Australia just before Christmas 1914, they received their first delivery of mail from Australia almost four months later on 10 April 1915.\textsuperscript{224} On 17 May, Captain Prior was disappointed that a huge sack of mail was only for wounded combatants with nothing for the bakers.\textsuperscript{225} He noted that 4 August brought a ‘big mail … [that] gave the men something to think about for a while’, and added that ‘Mails are a Godsend these days’.\textsuperscript{226} On 17 September Prior noted that a large Australian mail had arrived.\textsuperscript{227} Unfortunately there are no further entries in the AFB diaries about the receipt of mail. Private Hyndman, however, always noted his diary with news that Australian mails had been lost. On 7 July 1917, he wrote ‘News of Australian mails lost at sea – left Australia May 27\textsuperscript{th}. A few weeks later he recorded, ‘News of Aust Mail leaving Aust. on June 19\textsuperscript{th} lost at sea’. In September he noted, ‘News of Aust. Mail lost at sea off Cape Farewell leaving Melbourne for London. 465 bags of mail lost’.\textsuperscript{228} He was always appealing to his family to write, and wrote about receiving, or not receiving mail, in every postcard. The detail of the lost mails in Hyndman’s diary reveals the depth of the loss that such news evoked in the men. It also reveals that, not surprisingly, the AIF and bakers shared a longing for mail from home.

**Conclusion**

The men of the Australian Field Bakeries were very similar to the fighting combatants. The two groups shared the same values, attitudes and many of the same experiences. Both groups endured shortages of the correct uniform, and both groups faced danger when being transported to or from Australia or around Europe or the war zones. Both had a large group of men who carried out acts of larrkinism and showed a disregard and disrespect for authority. Most of the bakers’ AWOLs were awarded a forfeiture of
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pay, and over one-third received time in detention or the Field Punishment Compound. Most crimes were committed only once or twice throughout the course of the war in the bakeries. Over one-fifth of crimes were for bad conduct or disobedience, and nearly one-quarter were for drunkenness. This is very similar to the crime breakdown of the AIF. Both experienced some leaders who would discipline strongly while defending their men, and some leaders who would over-discipline with petty authority. Within their own spheres of activity, the AIF and the bakers exhibited initiative and resourcefulness. Both groups had the same sorts of relationships with, and gripes about, other nationalities, particularly the British, and both relied on mail from Australia to keep up their morale. When these parallels are examined together with the similarities in vital statistics, after allowing for the different duties of each group, it can be concluded that the two groups were very alike in most respects.

Although the AIF and the bakers were alike in demographics, ethos and some experiences, there is undoubtedly a perception that the non-fighting combatant did not face any real danger nor undergo significant deprivation. These perceptions are acknowledged in Chapter 7. The next chapter, however, recounts the dangers and deprivations faced by the bakers, and reinforces my argument that although the bakers did not suffer the horrendous conditions of trench life at Gallipoli or on the Western Front, they still suffered air raids, freezing conditions, leaking tents, poor food, and hard labour. In other words, some lives behind the lines were not as easy as many combatants believed.
Chapter 6
Dangers and Deprivations

The bakers of the Australian Field Bakeries are absent from the historiography of World War One. I believe one reason for this is that the ‘feminised work’ of the bakers has been perceived as lacking masculinity, and because they were not involved in the direct fighting of any battles, have never been considered heroic. These are two of the two main characteristics of the much-acclaimed Australian Anzac. As discussed in Chapter 7, the image some fighting combatants and highly ranked officers held of their non-fighting comrades was often uncomplimentary, usually because it was believed they had an easy ride and were never in the position to risk their lives. This chapter argues that although the bakers did not experience the atrocious environment of battle at Gallipoli and the Western Front, they suffered a number of dangers that risked their lives, such as raids from hostile aircraft and working in an unsound building, and deprivations such as freezing conditions, leaking tents, poor food, and hard labour. These and other dangers and deprivations led to the majority of the bakers being hospitalised at least once during their service. In other words, some lives behind the lines were not as easy as many combatants believed. Contrary to the appearance of the bakers’ relative safety and comfort, the men of the Australian Field Bakeries faced regular danger and deprivation.

Air raids and Shell Shock

The Field Bakeries were not exempt from the experience of air raids and shell shock. Shell shock was a name for conditions of war neuroses. It had a variety of different names, including shell concussion, nervous shock, and hysteria.¹ Shell shock brought

¹ AWM 25, Control Symbol 885/1, ‘Precis of paper on “Shell Shock” to be read at the second Meeting of Fourth Army Medical Society at South Midland C.C.S., on Sunday
with it a stigma of weakness or shirking, and was seen as ‘a failure of character and manhood’. Peter Cochrane reports that army generals attempted to ban the use of the words ‘shell shock’ because they believed ‘it was a refuge for cowards’. A letter to the commanding officer of No. 4 Stationary Hospital in January 1917 instructs him that men diagnosed with shell shock were to be sent back to their units as soon as possible, and that these men were to be informed that there would be no evacuations to England. This implies that men faked the condition for ‘blighty’ or time away from fighting. A letter marked ‘SECRET’ from General Headquarters advised that:

It has too often happened that officers and men who have failed in their duty have used such expressions to describe their state of noneffectiveness … It should be for a Court Martial to decide whether the evidence as to the existence of actual disease is such as to justify absolving the offender from penal consequences … all cases of nerve failure should be retained in the Army area until they have been carefully investigated and have been found to involve no disciplinary aspect.

It was established that some men had been improperly diagnosed with shell shock when they had ‘merely [been] bruised by trenches being blown in and by [being] buried’. Author H.C. Miller believed that shell shock victims were ‘“mother’s darling” boys’ who had been ‘psychologically stunted at an earlier developmental stage’. From these few examples, it can be ascertained that there was very little compassion for those who suffered shell shock.

---


2 Kerr, Private Wars, p.165; Cochrane, Australians at War, p.61.

3 Cochrane, Australians at War, p.60.

4 AWM 25, Control Symbol 885/1, Letter from OIC Shell Shock cases, 4 Stationary Hosp. To Commanding Officer, No. 4 Stationary Hospital’, in [Shell shock and neuroses] Reports on functional nervous disturbances resulting from exposure to shell-fire. Symptoms and remarks on diagnosis etc, 1917, 29 January 1917.

5 AWM 25, Control Symbol 885/2, ‘Extract from G.H.Q. letter – SECRET – AX1549 to all Armies From G.H. Fowke Adjutant-General, in Correspondence relating to shell shock and neuroses generally. Report from 9th Field Ambulance regarding men coming from the line, 14 October 1916.

6 AWM 25, Control Symbol 885/5, Letter from D.D.M.S. 1st A. & N.Z. Army Corps to The A.D.M.S. 1st Australian Division, in [Shell shock and neuroses] Result of enquiry into shell-shock cases at Corps Rest Station, Vadencourt. A report by the OC Corps Rest Station on shell-shock injuries, 1916, 18 August 1916.

7 Quoted in Garton, The Cost of War, p.159.
The 1AFB experienced the incursion of ‘hostile aircraft visitor[s]’ over the duration of their Imbros service. The first came at 10.30 in the morning of 13 June. The aircraft flew low over the island, apparently taking note of the whereabouts of General Headquarters and the bakery, and appeared to be taking photographs. The navy opened fire upon the visitor and missed, but Captain Prior believed the rapid fire delivered by his non-commissioned officers seemed to have the desired effect and frightened the aircraft away. Whether this was the real outcome of the rifle fire from Prior’s non-commissioned officers is unknown, but it indicates a desire to be included in ‘the action’ and a possible ‘big-noting’ of their importance.

On 18 July, ‘Fritz’ dropped a bomb only 100 yards from the bakery’s ovens, which fortunately did not explode. Two other bombs were dropped just inside the harbour. September ushered in a period of German Taube activity. The Taube was an old aircraft almost obsolete by the beginning of the war. It was good for reconnaissance because it was almost invisible at 1,200 feet. Its weaponry, however, was at best, minimal. The Taube raids at Imbros were generally directed towards General Headquarters or the airfield. Bombs and steel darts were dropped, usually inflicting little damage. A raid did, however, result in seven casualties on 16 September, although none was Australian. Sometimes the Taubes were driven off by fire from warships in the harbour, but generally the fire did not reach the planes and they completed their bombing runs and then left the area.

On 28 September the island experienced two air raids, one each at three and nine o’clock in the morning. During the latter raid, one man was killed and several

---

8 1AFB: Diary, 13 June 1915.
9 Ibid, 18 July 1915.
10 Fiddlers Green, WWI German Stealth Observation airplane, [http://www.fiddlersgreen.net/aircraft/WWI/taube/htm], date accessed 6 November 2003.
11 1AFB: Diary, 16 - 18 September 1915.
were wounded. Again, none was Australian.\textsuperscript{12} Early in the morning of 5 October, a raid from ‘hostile aircraft’ dropped bombs near the bakery but there was no damage or casualties.\textsuperscript{13} Once Captain Prior sailed for Mudros on 6 October, the unnamed diarist recorded very little of daily occurrences besides amount of bread produced, numbers of men available and in hospital, and the weather conditions. The nature and number of aircraft threats after 6 October 1915, therefore, are unknown.\textsuperscript{14} Once the Australians moved to France, those at the bakeries in Calais and Rouen experienced regular air raids and aerial attacks.

Situated on the north coast of France, Calais is less than 40 kilometres (km) from Dunkirk and 46 km from the border with Belgium. It was 45 km from the frontline, and close to several arenas of war such as 95 km from Zeebrugge and 70 km from Ypres, as well as directly opposite Dover, England, on the English Channel (see Map 4 above). Calais was ‘near the seat of war’, and was frequently bombarded by German airplanes, usually Gothas.\textsuperscript{15} The name ‘Gotha’ was indiscriminately applied to all German bombers from 1916 onwards.\textsuperscript{16} Many of Private Hyndman’s diary entries make mention of these Gotha air raids and the resultant anti-aircraft rejoinder.\textsuperscript{17} He noted his enjoyment of the sight of shells bursting in the air above the bakery\textsuperscript{18} The officers viewed the situation seriously, with the men ordered to erect shelters and make dugouts for protection from bombs and shrapnel, and instructed in infantry drill.\textsuperscript{19} Although the air raids occurred day and night, the work in the bakery continued throughout the bombardments. On 21 April 1917, Hyndman marvelled after an attack
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that ‘we escaped Shells all around Bread factory and our camp’.\textsuperscript{20} None of the personnel of 2 or 3AFBs was killed during these raids, although Private Hyndman notes an injury on 27 September 1917 to Private Albert Goode from Rockdale, New South Wales, when he states that ‘Goode gets hit in the cheek’ from ‘shrapnel falling like rain’.\textsuperscript{21}

The end of 1917 and the first half of 1918 saw an increase in German attacks.\textsuperscript{22} On 8 December 1917 and 30 January 1918, bombs were dropped close to Private Hyndman’s living quarters and dugout. Not surprisingly, Hyndman ceases to be appreciative of the ‘shells bursting in the moonlight’.\textsuperscript{23} One of the bombs dropped on 5 December landed very close to the bakery building, which sustained minor damage.\textsuperscript{24} On 19 December 1917, a corporal from the 16\textsuperscript{th} Imperial Field Bakery was killed, several were wounded in another raid, and a number of civilians were killed in the same attack.\textsuperscript{25} On 20 March 1918, Private Hyndman wrote, ‘Over 100 bombs dropped in the Town and Camp. A great number of casualties, 50 Chinamen Killed’. On 1 April 1918, he wrote that a:

\begin{quote}
Hun Moonlight Air Raid at 3am. Dropped a number of bombs in our camp Killing 3 officers and a big number of Troops Wounded.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

Captain Miles reported that the three killed were officers from other units in the camp.\textsuperscript{27}

Although both Captain Miles and Private Hyndman noted aerial attacks in their diaries, the numbers for each month rarely correspond. This might be explained by suggesting that Private Hyndman wrote his diary every day, whereas Captain Miles or
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his clerk possibly made the entries into the 2AFB unit diary every few days, weeks, or even at the end of each month.\(^{28}\) Because of the difficulties in ascertaining the number of air raid warnings and aerial attacks in one day, the following averages indicate the number of days in the month these warning and attacks occurred, rather than the number of attacks in the month. Many days, however, had two and three attacks.\(^{29}\)

Private Hyndman’s diary reveals that the average number of days under attack for the first seven months of 1917 was 2.4 per month. The average for the last four months was 7.3 per month.\(^{30}\) Private Hyndman’s average for the first six months of 1918 is 4.2 per month, and Captain Miles’s average for nine months is 6.3 per month.\(^{31}\) Private Hyndman was confined to hospital and convalescent camp for most of May and part of June 1918. This explains the disparities in the two averages for 1918. Although Hyndman was in camp for most of July 1918, I believe the low total of two days noted, which is at variance with Captain Miles’s total of eight days, can be explained by suggesting that his almost complete lack of any diary entries had more to do with his ill health than a lack of noteworthy incidents. In August 1918, Private Hyndman was in England being classified as medically unfit by the medical board.\(^{32}\)

Private Hyndman records the occasions when the sounds of the war can be heard from the bakery. Although there are many such instances, some examples are 14 February 1917, when he reports that ‘Big guns can be heard from Dunkirk and along the coast’, and 28 February 1917, when:

\[^{28}\] An example of making intermittent entries into the unit diary is April 1918. Captain Miles did not return from England to the Calais bakery until 19 April 1918, however he has initialled all April entries, up to and including that date.

\[^{29}\] 2AFB: Diary, 18 February, 6, 9, 15 May 1918. For example, 9 May: air raid 1 a.m. to 3.20 a.m., warning 4 p.m., and raid 11.30 p.m. to 12.47 a.m. 15 May: air raid warnings 12.50 p.m., 1.40 p.m., 4.45 p.m., and air raid 10 p.m. to midnight.

\[^{30}\] Hyndman, Diary, 1 January – 31 December 1917. Note that there are no figures for August 1917 because Private Hyndman was on leave.

\[^{31}\] Hyndman, Diary, 1 January – 30 June 1918; 2AFB: Diary, 1 January – 31 August 1918.

\[^{32}\] Hyndman, Diary, August 1918.
Plenty of gun firing can be heard at our camp from along the coast and towards Dunkirk ... Gun firing at Zeebrugge.33

His postcards home often include comments such as ‘big guns can be heard in the distance. They are going night & day’, or ‘Your Daddie can still hear the big guns roaring’.34 On 26 April 1917, Hyndman reports that he was ‘Watching a British ship sinking in the Channel by the Huns’, and on 21 May he could hear ‘Big guns roaring in the distance night and day along the coast – probably Zeebrugge’.35 On 17 June he wrote that a ‘Little after 3am the Greatest Explosion in History could be heard at our camp’.36 This explosion was undoubtedly the detonation of ‘mines containing one million lbs. of TNT [which had been laid] beneath German positions on an outlying ridge at Messines’, about 60 km from Calais, which has been described as ‘the greatest exploit ever conceived in military mining’.37 While not in the thick of the frontline action, there is no doubt that those at Calais were not untouched by the war’s progression.

The nightly sleep of those working on the day shift was often severely disturbed by air raid warnings and attacks. Hyndman records that on 3 September 1917, there was a:

Big German Air Raid in the moonlight from 9pm till 3am Tuesday morning. Many lives lost and great damage done to Town. Our Air Guns and Searchlights were going all the time.38

On 6 September 1917, an attack resulted in over one hundred German prisoners killed or wounded and also a ‘great number of other deaths’.39 Although bombs were only occasionally dropped onto or in very close proximity to the bakery, and the conditions and risk certainly cannot be compared to the nightmare of the frontline trench warfare,

---

33 ibid, 14, 28 February 1917.
34 Postcard from Hyndman to his wife, 4 June 1917; postcard to Jim, 27 June 1917; postcard to Gracie, 23 August 1917.
35 Hyndman, Diary, 26 April, 21 May 1917.
36 ibid, 7 June 1917.
37 MacLeod, ‘Phantom soldiers’, p.31; Kerr, Private Wars, p.159.
38 Hyndman, Diary, 3 September 1917.
39 ibid, 6 September 1917.
those working at the Calais bakery were not removed from the wrath of war, and cannot be likened to some units and administrative staff who were never in the vicinity of any type of war action. Those at the Calais bakery were granted leave once a year, and, at all other times, were under ‘frequent and severe’ attacks, and therefore at risk.\footnote{‘War Records’, in \textit{2AFB: Diary}, p.7.}

The 2AFB joined the British Field Bakeries at the Calais bakery in March 1916. It is reasonable to presume that the constant air raid warnings and aerial attacks in the area had been occurring from the commencement of the war before Private Hyndman began recording them in his diary in 1917 after the 3AFB arrived. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that the constant stress of the warnings and attacks had a negative psychological impact on the bakers. Of those bakers’ dossiers examined, only two were hospitalised with what was officially called ‘shell shock’, and one was hospitalised with ‘trench fever’. These hospitalisations, however, occurred either before the men’s transfers into the Field Bakeries, or after their transfers out.\footnote{NAA, B2455, \textit{N.C. Baker, M. Camp, G.E. Eggleton}, Canberra, 2001.} This would appear to suggest that the air raid warning and aerial attacks made no significant impact on the bakers. Nevertheless, I believe men were affected in greater numbers than has been noted on their dossiers, either because their distress was diagnosed under different names or because it was unrecognised or ignored since they were not in the frontlines.

On 12 February 1917, Private William W. Hill of 3AFB was hospitalised. Private Hyndman records that ‘Pte Hill sent away for observation (lost his reason)’.\footnote{Hyndman, \textit{Diary}, 12 February 1917.} Private Hill’s dossier discloses that he was only at the Calais bakery with the 3AFB a few weeks before his hospitalisation. Private Hill believed he was going blind. Historian Stephen
Garton states that one of the symptoms of shell shock in World War One was hysterical blindness.\textsuperscript{43} The staff quartermaster sergeant’s statement reads in part:

... he looked at me with a vacant stare ... He said "They are going to shoot me, and I want you to get 3 of my own mates to do the shooting".\textsuperscript{44}

Two of Hill’s workmates submitted statements detailing their perceptions of his frame of mind. Sergeant William Scott said:

Pte W.W. Hill was wandering about ... in a strange manner ... He began talking a lot of nonsense about someone going to shoot him. He said that all the blind and lame would be shot on the hill near the camp and that he was to be shot, and expressed the wish that some of his own mates would shoot him.\textsuperscript{45}

Private Charles Spencer said:

He said to me he was going to get a cleaver and cut two Sgts. in halves, and that there was a boat picked out to take back all men without legs (sic) and arms, also the Blind to Australia and on the journey it would be mined ... he also made a remark about a firing party who would be picked out to shoot him.\textsuperscript{46}

E.W. Montgomery diagnosed him with delusional insanity and said:

He seems to be frightened that he is going to be killed ... He says that some person whispered into his ears that all the people who were blind were going to be shot. He thought that he was going to be shot by the cook, who had a spite at him (sic). He said the cook was beside his bed last night laughing and jeering at him. Says if he had had a chopper he would have cut him in two. He thinks they are going to tear his eyes out.\textsuperscript{47}

Captain Fred Clindenmy of the Royal Army Medical Corps said Hill was:

... very excited, shouting that the cook is going to shoot him ... heard voices whispering that he was going blind ... Will not give a reasonable answer to any question. Continually using filthy language & wanting to be shot ... he becomes very agitated & emotional when speaking about the bloody cook who he says is going to cut his head off. He says he will murder the bastard cook ... Sleeps badly, sees the cook through the window.\textsuperscript{48}

Within eleven days of Private Hill’s delusions beginning, he had been ‘Recommended for discharge as permanently unfit’. Captain O. P. Naifer Pearn of the Royal Army

\textsuperscript{44} ‘Statement of Staff Quartermaster Sergeant B.A. King’, in \textit{W.W. Hill}, 13 February 1917.
\textsuperscript{45} ‘Statement of S.Sgt. W. Scott, 3\textdegree Field Bakery A.I.F.’, in \textit{ibid}, 14 February 1917.
\textsuperscript{46} ‘Statement of Pte Charles Spencer’, in \textit{ibid}, 14 February 1917.
\textsuperscript{48} Captain F. Clindenmy, R.A.M.C., ‘Medical History’, in \textit{ibid}, 22 February 1917. I cannot find any record of this Captain either on the AWM Nominal Roll or in the National Archives RecordSearch.
Medical Corps said that Private Hill was ‘A simpleminded man’ who had ‘Always been of a worrying & nervous disposition’. He suggested that active service was normally the supposed cause of such a psychological disturbance, and in this case, although Private Hill had ‘Never been under fire’, the cause was the ‘stress of [the] campaign’. By July 1917, Private Hill was on his way home, his condition had ‘Improved’, and he had been ‘Rational since embarkation’.

As outlined in the Introduction, my grandfather, Private Francis G. Cunningham of 2AFB, returned from the war a nervous wreck. He was from Dubbo in New South Wales, and worked with 2AFB throughout the four years of his service. He was hospitalised once, in June and July 1918, with influenza. Upon his return to Australia in August 1919, his sister had to look after him ‘as if he were a baby’. His nerves were so shattered and he was so severely disturbed he could not digest, and therefore not keep down, any food other than bread soaked in milk. This diet continued for six months. After he was again able to eat solids, he gained employment, but, feeling claustrophobic and unable to work in any type of building, he chose to work outdoors for the Railway Department of New South Wales. He blamed the frequent warnings and attacks while cooped inside the Calais bakery for ensuring that he never undertook baking again for the rest of his life. The medical examination he had on 1 July 1919, before discharge, noted he had no disabilities. Many soldiers hid their disabilities in order to be processed and discharged faster, so either he was able to hide his precarious mental state or the medical examiners did not look very closely.

The same ‘secret’ letter from Headquarters referred to above, directed that shell shock was not to be diagnosed until it had been established that the person

49 Captain O.P. Naifer Pearn, R.A.M.C., ‘Medical History’, in ibid, 13 March 1917; ‘Proceedings of a Medical Board on an Invalid’, 13 March 1917.
51 F.G. Cunningham.
52 Audrey D. Smith, Interview with the author, 30 August 2001.
affected had been ‘exposed to the effects of a specific explosion’.53 Initially, therefore, shell shock was believed to be ‘a physical injury to the central nervous system caused by proximity to an exploding shell’.54 It was soon realised, however, that many of those affected had not been near the frontline.55 Privates Hill and Cunningham are only two examples from a large group of bakers. Although there is no substantiation that their psychiatric problems were caused by the impact of ‘frequent and severe’ air raid warnings and aerial attacks, sometimes exceedingly close to the camp, fatalities of other bakers, soldiers, civilians, prisoners, and labourers, and damage to bakery buildings and the town of Calais, inevitably brought an uncertainty of life expectancy that was lasting and more acute than has been recognised in non-fighting combatants.56

Dale Blair suggests that the diagnosis of ‘Pyrexia’ or ‘fever of unknown origin’, was generally categorised as a ‘non-battle casualty’, which, if not attributable to any other illness, could have been ‘considered psychosomatic and a likely reaction to the stresses of active campaigning’. He says pyrexia, therefore, was a legitimate ‘war neurosis or nervous disorder’.57 There were four bakers with ‘PUO’ or Pyrexia of Unknown Origin, recorded on their service dossiers. These diagnoses may have been a form of shell shock.

---

53 Extract from G.H.Q. letter – SECRET.
57 Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.147.
Private Verdi G. Schwinghammer of the 42nd Battalion wrote a letter to his parents in Grafton, New South Wales, on his way back to his unit from leave. He spent some time at the camp at Calais. After experiencing an air raid there, he wrote:

It was without doubt one of the most dreadful nights of suspense I have ever experienced. An air raid is the most dreadful of all the horrors this war has produced, and the majority of us soldiers would rather be in the front line and put up with huge shells from the guns, than experience an air raid.

From shells we have a fair chance of escape, but it’s a dreadful feeling to lie in one’s tents and huts and hearing the planes humming overhead and not knowing what minute a bomb is going to fall on you. A bomb will kill at 150 yards – sometimes further – from where they are dropped … We … could only lie in our tents and await results … The Hun planes being only a few hundred feet above us; and yet we couldn’t see them.58

As previously explained, after the 1AFB moved to Rouen, Captain Prior wrote a diary with a very meagre account of the unit’s experiences. The officers in charge of the 4th and 5th AFBs, however, detailed frequent air raid warnings and aerial attacks for a few months of 1918. There is also a fascinating entry in Sapper Arthur Wilson’s diary for 27 December 1917. He wrote:

... Bread ration again about only seven to a loaf instead of the six the day before. It is rumoured that Fritz had dropped a bomb on the bakery at Rouen.59

There is nothing about this bombing and damage in the AFB diaries, so the rumour was probably just that. Captain Isaachsen of 4AFB recorded that in May, June and July 1918, air raids were made on Rouen on a regular basis, always at night and usually around midnight. The bombs were usually dropped close to or on the town, but rarely resulted in significant damage.60 On 5 June, trenches 6 feet deep were dug as a precaution against casualties. Sand bags and Aldershot ovens were used to cover the trenches. On 1 July 1918, Captain Isaachsen wrote:

Hostile aircraft alarm from 12.15 am to 1.30 am. All ranks were ordered to take cover in the trenches for protection against shrapnel which was falling over the camp from the anti-aircraft guns.61

Captain Pye recorded the same incident in the 5AFB diary:

58 Schwinghammer, A Soldier’s Experience, pp.1-2.
59 PRO1549, Papers: Sapper Arthur Wilson, 27 December 1917.
60 4AFB: Diary, 27, 28, 29 May, 2, 3 4 June, 1 July 1918.
61 ibid, 1 July 1918.
At about 12.10 a.m. an enemy air machine was heard which appeared to be directly above the Bakery. About two minutes afterwards the defence guns put up a strong barrage. Personnel not on duty immediately took cover in the trenches provided for that purpose, and work in the bakehouse was suspended for nearly ninety minutes. The “all clear” signal sounded at about 1.30 a.m. As far as could be ascertained several bombs were dropped, one landing on the Guard Room of a German Prisoners’ Camp, killing four French soldiers.62

Interestingly, Corporal James A. Gildea of 1AFB was officially reprimanded for disobeying the order to take cover during this air raid.63 Captain Pye made a similar entry to that above, for a raid on 31 July 1918, and on 13 August, reported that:

Considerable damage was done to more than 18 buildings. Resulting in the death of 6 and many injured according to local reports.64

The bombs, in these instances, fell close to the Rouen bakery, but did not inflict any casualties on its personnel. Although there is a dearth of information in the AFB diaries about air raid warning and aerial attacks at Rouen, it can be established by the notations made that they occurred frequently.

It is possible that those at Imbros and the Calais and Rouen bakeries became, to a certain extent, used to the air raids and the feelings of dread they engendered. Three or four years, however, of such raids must have played havoc with the men’s psychological health. Historian Eric Leed maintains that many men who had not been hospitalised throughout the course of the war ‘broke down after the conclusion of hostilities’.65 Alistair Thomson states that ‘There was a staggering incidence of mental disorder among returned diggers’, and a Repatriation Report of 1919 stated that ‘No man who passed through the battle zone returned to the Commonwealth in a normal condition’.66 This concurs with an observation by historian Jim McPhee that nearly all men ‘experienced shell shock to some degree – the slightest being the shakes, or

62 5AFB: Diary, 1 July 1918.
64 5AFB: Diary, 13 August 1918.
65 Eric J. Leed, No Man’s Land: Combat & Identity in World War I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979, p.188.
66 Thomson, ANZAC Memories, pp.108-109; Quoted in Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.166.
bleeding from the ears, ranging to complete dementia’. It is most likely these ‘returned diggers’ included non-fighting combatants, and that other bakers had similar experiences to Privates Hill and Cunningham.

**Accidents and Anguish**

On 14 March 1917, there was an accident at the Calais bakery. The top floor, made from concrete and used for short-term storage of flour, together with one hundred tons of flour, collapsed onto the men working below. Captain Nash reported that nine men were injured. Private Hyndman, however, states that the number was twelve. It can be considered fortunate that, whatever the number, none was killed. The injured men were off duty while they recuperated. The blame was placed squarely onto the new Chinese labourers, who had only recently been employed to carry the flour. The accident caused a delay to bread production, however a part of the bakery that had been used as a civilian flour store was brought into use, and production was back to normal within a few days. The top floor remained out of use from that time onwards.

During the war, a man named Alexander Irvine wrote a newspaper article that Private Hyndman cut out and included in his diary. Unfortunately, the title of the newspaper and the date of the article are unknown, but it was apparently published prior to the accident. Although the bakery visited by Irvine is unnamed, he is clearly describing the one at Calais. His article is entitled ‘11,000,000 Loaves a week’. With remarkable prescience or perhaps just an observant eye, Irvine writes:

> About six baker-shops turn out the bread for the British Army in France. I was in one of them yesterday. Before the War it was a German jute mill. It has not been deemed advisable to introduce machinery – the floors would not stand the strain.

Although the Chinese labourers were blamed for the accident, it is possible that, with the age and noticeable instability of the building, storage of one hundred tons of flour
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on an upper floor could be held responsible. The rickety old building aside, the weather and living arrangements also caused the bakers’ hardships.

The winter of 1916-1917 was the coldest for thirty years. A letter home from Lieutenant Arthur Thynne of the 2nd Pioneer Battalion at the end of January 1917 said:

... it's very cold indeed. The snow lays think on the ground which fell a fortnight ago, and everything is frozen hard. We cannot get water from the supply.

Captain Miles states that the 2nd and 3rd AFBs’ first French winter was very hard on the men, with many hospitalised from illness. In January 1917, around the same time Arthur Thynne wrote home and in the middle of the European winter, Captain Miles wrote to the medical officer at the camp to draw his attention to the isolation tent, which was leaking and in a poor state. He explained that five of his men were housed in the tent, and with its many holes, the rain was making their clothes and bedding extremely wet. Miles requested a replacement tent. The medical officer tersely replied that he was aware the tent was faulty and explained he had been endeavouring to get a replacement. He hoped the exchange of new for faulty would occur the next day. It can be supposed that the new tent the medical officer promised Captain Miles arrived before long because there is no further correspondence on the matter. Miles was very impressed with the bakers’ discipline and few incidences of crime, particularly with the hard work and cold weather endured by all.

In January 1917 while at Etaples, Private Hyndman diarised that his feet were ‘very sore with cold & frost-bitten’, and that he had ‘Rheumatism in feet & legs. Feet swell with cold Boots’. The ‘Water in taps & buckets [was] frozen’, and it was ‘bleak’
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and 'Black frosty weather'. The men were issued with an extra two blankets, making a total of three, but for the men sleeping in huts and tents, it was still very cold. Within a few days Hyndman was at Calais, noting that it was 'Still very cold & windy', there was a 'Snowstorm & cold weather', and 'Bitterly cold frost weather. Feet very sore & frost-bitten'. A postcard home in February stated that it was 'very cold' and 'hard to keep [his] fingers warm'. As late as 7 March 1917, Private Hyndman was noting that it was 'Blowing a gale all day & very cold ... Carried one of the boys out on a stretcher very sick and run down'. A year later, he was noting the weather was 'Bitterly cold & blowing a snowstorm', and 'Blowing a blizzard & snow'.

While Private Hyndman was at the Army Service Corps camp at Etaples for two weeks in January 1917, he noted the weather was 'Very cold. Snow & rain. Blankets wet through, tent leaking a treat'. This entry reveals that the poor standard of the tents was not isolated to the camp at Calais. Notwithstanding the freezing weather and the condition of the tents, the food was substandard and of insufficient quantity.

Private Hyndman often complained about the quality and quantity of food provided. While at Etaples on the way to Calais, he noted the meals were 'very good'. Once at Calais, however, he said there was 'Not enough tucker to work on. Plenty [of] Jam & Bread, Bread and Jam'. Obviously, there was no want for bread by the men working at the bakery, however the rest of the food was 'very poor, mostly Bully Beef and greasy stew'. He grumbled that the food at the camp was 'very badly cooked', and that the mess was not large enough to accommodate the large number of men,

---

75 Hyndman, Diary, 16, 19, 23, 24 January 1917.
76 ibid, 6, 25 January 1917.
77 ibid, 25, 28 January, 1 February 1917.
78 Postcard from Hyndman to Gracie, 12 February 1917.
79 Hyndman, Diary, 7 March 1917.
80 ibid, 8 -9 January 1918.
81 ibid, 9 January 1917.
82 ibid, 20 January 1917.
83 ibid, 10 February 1917.
84 ibid, 6 February 1917.
meaning that those awaiting their meal were kept outside ‘in all weathers’ until it was their turn to come inside and eat. 85 He was still complaining a month later that there was ‘not enough food to keep strength up’, and again a few weeks later, that the ‘tucker [is] still very poor, not enough to work hard on’. 86

Finally, after three months of complaints, there was some relief regarding the meals: in April 1917 Private Hyndman wrote that there had been an ‘alteration in [the] cooking ... [with the] food now much better’. 87 In May 1917, the Instructor in Catering inspected the cookhouse and master cook catering to the Calais bakery. Both passed with flying colours, with the cookhouse assessed as ‘scrupulously clean’, showing ‘absolutely’ no evidence of waste, and the master cook graded as ‘Yes, very indeed’ satisfactory, with all meals also classed as satisfactory. 88 Food is only mentioned once more in Hyndman’s diary, and that was in September 1917 when he was ‘Paraded before Cpt. Miles about short issue of food’. 89 This probably means that Hyndman was in trouble, but I cannot determine whether Hyndman made a complaint or did not dish out enough if he was on serving duty. It does seem that the quantity and quality of the food at Calais camp number 1 improved after the changes were brought about in April 1917.

Labour

Chapter 3 detailed the labour of 1AFB at Lemnos and Imbros Islands. The men faced many obstacles and adversities in their anxiety to supply Anzac and Suvla Bay, the least of which was the reticence of General Headquarters on Imbos Island to accept any bread other than that baked by 1AFB. Chapter 5 noted in detail the problems between the working methods of the British master baker at Calais and those of
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Captain Miles and expected by the Australians. Private Hyndman’s diary entries for the first few months the 3AFB was at Calais, are probably indicative of the bakers’ thoughts regarding the gruelling amount of work, especially moving large quantities of sacks of flour, expected from them. Hyndman frequently complained that he was ‘Very sore & tired’, or ‘Tired & foot sore’. It is worth repeating that, while the British master baker was in control, the men worked very long hours – sometimes 17 or 18 at one stretch. The 2AFB was at Calais for more than eight months before Private Hyndman and 3AFB arrived, and so struggled to cope with the master baker’s methods for a long time before the switch in master bakers was arranged.

All of the Australian bakers worked at least one shift per day. They were occasionally granted a half day off, but, because bread supplies were required daily for the fighting combatants, the production line could not cease for any reason. The bakers also carried out the same duties day after day without variation. Although fighting combatants were spelled after a brief time in the frontlines, the bakers only began receiving a two week leave once it was realised the war was going to continue longer than had been expected. Before that time, well into 1917, the bakers never had a respite.

Wounds, injuries, and hospitalisation

The baker study reveals that 51 or 16.6 per cent of the men suffered 59 wounds and injuries. Together with ten deaths, this means that 20 per cent were ‘Battle Casualties’. Twenty-two of the twenty-four gunshot wounds, however, occurred when the soldier had transferred out of, or had not yet transferred into, the bakeries. Of the 331,781 men who ‘Took the Field’ in WWI, 215,045 or 64.82 per cent were casualties. There is a massive difference between the total casualty figures of the bakers and the AIF, the non-fighting role of the bakers providing the explanation.
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TABLE 6.1: Casualties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FATE</th>
<th>Bakers no.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Safely</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wounded/Injured</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of Wounds/Disease</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demobilised London</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not leave Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures are available for 307 (42.5%) of bakery members

Not all of the men of the Australian bakeries returned home. Of those numbered in the above Table as arriving home safely, 56 returned to Australia before Armistice because of illness or disability. This is a significant number considering the nature of the men’s employment. Four men were killed in action, however these occurred after transfer to fighting combatant units from the bakeries. Of those who died of wounds, all occurred after transfer from the bakeries with the exception of Private Andrew Egoroff who died, as was determined by the Board of Inquiry, of a self-inflicted revolver wound on 30 May 1918.92 Dale Blair and Greg Kerr maintain that ‘Signs of breakdown’ as revealed by a noticeable escalation in officially recorded instances of self-inflicted wounds, occurred in 1917 and 1918.93

Butler mentions that Australian and British soldiers suffered over 900 different diseases during the war.94 He asserts that the incidence of gastro-intestinal infections was 396.07 per thousand men, other infections 606.77 per thousand, other diseases 452.78 per thousand, and wounds and accidents 453.21 per thousand. These total a staggering 1908.83 per thousand men.95 The casualty/record of service forms of the AIF reveal that nearly all spent time in hospital, and the same can be stated about the

93 Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.179; Kerr, Private Wars, p.164.
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bakers.\textsuperscript{96} Forty men, or 13 per cent of the 307 in the baker study, were either not ill or not ill enough to be hospitalised, during their periods of service. The remaining 267 or 87 per cent of the bakers were hospitalised 617 times for 101 different ailments, and 144 times for ailments not specified on their casualty/record of service forms. Table 6.2 lists those of the 101 ailments that caused nine or more hospitalisations of the bakers.

**TABLE 6.2: Hospitalisation of bakers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bakers no.</th>
<th>% of ailments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App/app'tomy</td>
<td>10  1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronchitis &amp; laryngitis</td>
<td>63  8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dys/Gast/Ent</td>
<td>38  5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenza</td>
<td>128  16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumonia</td>
<td>15  2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>9  1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumps</td>
<td>15  2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheumatism</td>
<td>17  2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scabies</td>
<td>17  2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonsillitis</td>
<td>28  3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VD</td>
<td>116  15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 reveals that the incidence of appendicitis and appendectomy within the bakeries is quite low. Dr Sandy Craig of the Carolinas Medical Centre, North Carolina, writes that ‘The incidence of acute appendicitis is around 7% of the population in the US and in European countries’. She also says that it is related to the amount of fibre in the diet and occurs more frequently in males than females.\textsuperscript{97} Taking into account that this was written in 2003, and that the ration in WWI was at a subsistence level only with no emphasis on dietary fibre, it is surprising there were so few incidences of appendicitis.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{96} Welborn, *Lords of Death*, p.183.
\textsuperscript{98} AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/12, Letter from B.B. Cubitt, War Office, to O.C. Troops Wareham, in [Rations] Notes impressing on all subordinate Commanders the necessity for economy in food and prevention of waste. Suggestions by General Birdwood on economy of bread, 1917, 13 March 1917.
Of the number of those affected with bronchitis and laryngitis, there were few at Imbros Island. Those who enlisted in the July to December 1916 period, however, had a particularly high incidence of both ailments.

Those who served at Anzac were hardest hit with dysentery, gastritis, and enteritis. By June and July 1915, more men were going down with these illnesses than there were replacements and reinforcements, and Butler describes the ‘wave of intestinal disease’ as ‘quite out of control’.99 Les Carlyon states that by August 1915, 80 per cent of the troops at Anzac and Helles were suffering with dysentery.100 By September, there were so many flies, they ‘followed the food into the mouth’.101

At the end of June and beginning of July 1915, when dysenteric diarrhoea and green ‘corpse flies’ were plaguing and weakening the troops on the slopes of Gallipoli, Captain Prior of 1AFB at Imbros became extremely concerned about the prevalence of dysentery amongst his men. The numbers of afflicted continued to increase, and he was very perturbed when he had to include his own name on this ever-increasing list.102 The ‘awful plague’ of flies also worried Prior to the extent that he suggested that if only they could be rid of them, ‘life might be worth living’.103 In July, there was an acute spread of dysentery and malaria amongst his men, to the extent that the daily sick parade usually incorporated around 20 per cent of the total strength of his unit.104 Prior believed that although impossible because of the required output, 50 percent of his men needed a break from their duties.105 On 25 July, the men of the bakery were inoculated against cholera.106 On 11 to 13 August, the Australians did all of the baking because the English bakers were suffering very severely from the heat and
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dysentery.\textsuperscript{107} Five of Prior’s men were taken to hospital with violent abdominal pains and high temperatures.\textsuperscript{108} Captain Prior noted with regret that dysentery claimed the life of its first baker, from the 10\textsuperscript{th} Imperial Bakery, on 14 September.\textsuperscript{109} Meanwhile, the numbers of 1AFB continued to diminish because of dysentery and other illness. Down from 96 Other Ranks in December 1914 to just 61 with 39 in hospital by the beginning of October 1915, the 1AFB continued, despite the ‘havoc’ to work like ‘true Australians’.\textsuperscript{110} By 9 November 1AFB was depleted to 53 Other Ranks, with one officer and 49 Other Ranks in hospital.\textsuperscript{111}

The bakers were not afflicted in the same numbers as the fighting combatants with dysentery, gastritis, and enteritis. At one stage, 80 per cent at Anzac were afflicted, but it is unknown how many of these were subsequently hospitalised. Bill Gammage states that by the end of July 1915, 5.3 per cent had been evacuated with the disease, which, by mid-August, had risen to 8.9 per cent.\textsuperscript{112} Just over 50 per cent of the 1AFB at Imbros were hospitalised. These statistics suggest that the bakers were hospitalised more readily than those fighting at Anzac. The evidence indicates that the bakers were still affected in large numbers. There was another significant outbreak of dysentery in the summer months of 1918.\textsuperscript{113}

It has been estimated that the influenza pandemic of 1918-1919 killed over 70 million people worldwide.\textsuperscript{114} Three separate epidemics affected the Australian troops. The first began around May 1918, lasted for twelve weeks, had an incidence of 97 per one thousand troops and six complications per one hundred cases, and had a mortality
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rate of three of every thousand affected. The second epidemic began around August 1918, lasted eleven weeks, had an incidence of 116 per one thousand troops and eleven complications per one hundred cases, and had a mortality rate of 25 of every thousand affected. The third epidemic began around January 1919, lasted eight weeks, had an incidence of 75 per one thousand troops and twelve complications per one hundred cases, and had a mortality rate of 45 of every thousand affected. The epidemics of influenza of Australian troops on the Western Front seem to have followed much the same course as in the AIF depots in England. The dates of the three epidemics were obvious in England, as the epidemics came in ‘three distinct waves, with a well marked interval of freedom between each wave’. They are less obvious outside of England; for example, does the notation belong in the second or third epidemic when a baker is sent to hospital with influenza in early December 1918? I have, therefore, had to make a few arbitrary decisions, but I believe the statistics in Table 6.3 (below) are relatively accurate.

The victims of the highly infectious first epidemic had sore throats, headaches, and a loss of appetite. The suffering lasted only a few days, and doctors called it ‘three day fever’. Very few died. The second and third epidemics were far more serious. One fifth of victims developed bronchial pneumonia or septicaemia, and a large percentage died. There were more ‘respiratory complications’ with the third epidemic because of the harsh weather. All of the armies involved in the war lost a great number of men from their ‘camps, transports, and the field throughout the war’.
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Although influenza was the most diagnosed illness during 1915, Butler believes that the imprecise use of the term in peace and war means that this disease was not related to the later pandemic. The senior doctor at the 2nd Australian General Hospital suggested that it was the ‘ubiquitous dust in which the men spent most of their lives’ that was the most likely cause of the cases of influenza suffered in Egypt.

In June 1918, Captain Miles wrote in the 2AFB diary that over past weeks there had been an epidemic of influenza resulting in up to 130 men of the Calais bakery being admitted to hospital. He expressed his gratitude that the influenza only seemed to last ‘three to four days’. When Captain Nash reported the epidemic in his diary, he said it had resulted in 150 admissions to hospital. In the 3AFB alone, 27 men were in hospital, and three were ill. Captain Ivor Williams of the 21st Battalion wrote on the 26 June 1918 that 80 per cent of his men had contracted influenza. The Calais bakery had around 940 men attached. If 150 men were in hospital with influenza, this is approximately 16 per cent of the men. Although Captain Williams does not specify that his 80 per cent had been hospitalised, there is a very big difference between the 21st Battalion and the bakeries.

**TABLE 6.3: Epidemics of influenza in the bakeries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>May-18</th>
<th>Aug-18</th>
<th>Jan-19</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influenza</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibilities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 is an analysis of the instances of influenza revealed by the study of 307 bakers’ service dossiers. It can be seen that over 50 per cent of the cases of influenza occurred well outside of the three epidemic periods. These illnesses were not
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related to the later pandemic. As stated above, the bakers were hospitalised 144 times for unnamed diseases; the files were noted with ‘sick’. These are included in Table 6.3 under ‘Possibilities’ if the dates matched those of the epidemics. If the two totals are added together, the prevalence of influenza throughout those periods in the bakeries is well over 20 per cent. These figures suggest that the bakers contracted influenza in high numbers. The confined spaces of the bakeries may have facilitated the spread of the disease. An interesting feature of the bakers’ records is that some men have influenza at Gallipoli, again in 1916, and again within the dates of two of the three epidemics.

Butler states that cases of pneumonia occurred all year round, and occasionally large numbers were afflicted. He notes that influenza sometimes resulted in broncho-pneumonia, particularly in the last two epidemics. More men of the AIF had pneumonia than did the bakers. It may be that the AIF suffered more bouts of pneumonia, or that more of their bouts of influenza developed into pneumonia because of the living conditions.

Combatants in both campaigns, but particularly the Western Front, usually lived in squalid conditions. The men of the AIF, regardless of their designation, were expected to bathe and change their underwear every ten days at the very least. Unfortunately, this plan was ‘almost completely disorganised’, and in any case, soap and water were ‘almost absent’. Butler describes one of the results of living in such close proximity to each other as the ‘verminisation’ of such a group of men. This verminisation was so speedy and undiscriminating in its choice of subject, that it bore ‘a close resemblance to the spread of “germs” in epidemic “disease”’. One of the explanations is that an infested man was only evacuated if he was too sick to be
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useful. One of the major problems of such close personal contact was scabies, a highly contagious infestation of the skin by mites. There were frequent scabies inspections and special scabies treatment posts. Although working and sleeping in close proximity, the bakers’ cleaner living conditions undoubtedly explains their low rate of scabies.

Butler states that after ‘gastro-intestinal and inspiratory infections’, venereal disease (VD) was the next greatest ‘cause of disability from sickness’. The figures for VD in Table 6.2 do not make any allowance for admissions caused by relapse. The AIF had a relapse rate of one in every six or 16.4 per cent. The relapse rate for the bakers is unknown. Cairo offered ‘sensual and venal enticements’ that many of the AIF had never encountered, and many of the well-paid Australians were tempted to patronise the local brothels. Private Geyer from Bendigo called it ‘the most imorial (sic) place in the world’. Butler maintains that between December 1914 and April 1915, over 2,000 men were incapacitated with VD. Alistair Thomson states that almost 6,000 Australians were treated for VD in the year ending February 1916. It can be imagined that there would have been an addition to these numbers when the 2nd Division arrived in Egypt and before all moved on to France. By June 1916, almost 1,500 cases of VD had returned to Australia from overseas, and almost 7,000 had arisen within Australia in the military camps. Historian Stephen Garton maintains that
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around 50,000 Australians contracted VD.\textsuperscript{137} This is indicative of the depth and severity of the VD problem. In October 1916, a hospital was established at Bulford in England specifically for the treatment of VD.\textsuperscript{138}

There is another way of looking at this however. Butler states that ‘The total incidence [of VD] on 330,714 embarkations works out at 158 per thousand’\textsuperscript{139} The records of 307 bakers reveal 116 incidences of VD. The result is a staggering 378 incidences of VD per thousand bakers – more than twice the rate per thousand of the AIF. A possible explanation for the massive differentiation in incidences per embarkation is that the bakers were town-based and had more opportunity for socialising than the fighting combatants. It must be noted that the bakers’ sample is quite small, and that this result and explanation are only tentatively suggested.

\textsuperscript{138} Butler, \textit{Army Medical Services}, II, p.455.
\textsuperscript{139} Butler, \textit{Army Medical Services}, III, p.180.
Table 6.4 illustrates that 17.6 per cent of the bakers studied were hospitalised once for VD. One baker was hospitalised four times for the complaint. Altogether, 26.1 per cent of the bakers were hospitalised for VD. Conversely, 73.9 per cent of the bakers were not hospitalised for VD.

**Conclusion**

The bakers at Imbros, Calais and Rouen faced a steady barrage of hostile air raids and attacks. It is possible greater psychological damage resulted from these raids and attacks than has ever been noted or even acknowledged in non-fighting combatant units. The conditions in which the bakers worked were not only dangerous because of hostile aircraft; the building at Calais was unsound and collapsed onto them, injuring some. They lived in holey and leaking tents in freezing conditions, and the food was often extremely poor and in insufficient quantity. They worked long hours without respite. This is certainly not suggesting that the bakers did it harder, worked longer hours, or faced worse conditions than those on the frontlines. It is merely a reminder that they, like their fighting comrades, regularly faced dangers and deprivations.

It is understandable that, due to the nature of their employment, the bakers suffered far fewer casualties than the AIF. In general, the longer the service, the more chance the bakers had of being hospitalised for illness. There is not as great a differentiation of diseases in the bakeries as in the AIF, but nearly all participants in each group spent some time in hospital. One-quarter of the bakers were hospitalised with VD, but their rate per thousand men appears much higher than the AIF.
Chapter 7

Image and Self–image

The image the bakers had of themselves was often at odds with that held by fighting combatants who were often far from complimentary about non-fighting combatants and the role of their participation within the Australian war mobilisation. Bread was identified as a vital component of the daily ration although feelings towards it varied greatly. The bread allowance was reduced several times over the course of the war because of shortages and cost. The men of the Australian Field Bakeries were proud of their work habits, their superior knowledge of baking and flour, their finished product, and their ability to overcome shortages of flour, yeast, water, and wood. There was a need for validation, however, and visits and favourable comments by high-ranking officials or prominent people were always a highlight of the bakers’ experience. The relations between fighting and non-fighting combatants were often strained. There is no doubt that many fighting combatants believed ‘they were a great deal worse off than soldiers in the services who could get out of the front line’.¹ When positions within the bakeries became available, however, many fighting combatants were quick to volunteer in order to leave dangerous situations.

As a masculinist myth, the Anzac legend excludes, amongst others, those whose tasks were perceived as feminine or women’s work. It is possible that baking bread, particularly in the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, was believed by many to be within the woman’s realm or an unmanly pursuit, and is another reason for the bakers’ invisibility within WWI histories. After it was decided to employ women at the Calais Bakery to take over some of the tasks, thereby freeing up a number of men whose labour could be used elsewhere, possibly the frontlines, Captain Miles was

¹ Fairclough, Equal to the Task, p.32.
territorial and patriarchal when it came to the bakers’ expertise and space being invaded by women. While this decision to employ women was successful in England and Rouen, it never eventuated at Calais.

The bakers also performed a range of duties and undertook responsibilities other than baking bread. This raises the question of whether their labour was more valuable than has been appreciated. There were, however, few awards bestowed on bakery members regardless of their accomplishments.

**Bread and the bread ration**

There is no doubt that bread was an important and essential component of the AIF’s diet. The feelings towards the bread received, however, varied greatly. The high incidence of dysentery at Anzac led to an official inquiry as regards the possible cause or causes.² It was recognised quite early in the campaign that the provision of enough food to keep the soldiers in ‘good physical condition’ was a most ‘vital necessity’.³ After the first consignment of bread to Anzac on 9 June 1915, Corporal C. Smith of the 14th Battalion AIF wrote his impressions of the bread:

… It was at reserve Gully that we received our first issue of bread. Will I ever forget it? Not much, certainly, but sufficient to vary the monotony of the everlasting hard biscuits, popularly named ‘Anzac wafers’. This bread was baked at Imbros Island, twelve miles distant, and represented another step in the progress of peninsula comfort. One was apt to forgive the higher command petty indiscretions when in the possession of this staple commodity.⁴

On 13 June, Private Burt of the 5th Battalion wrote home:

We are getting good tucker … We got served out with some white bread today which is a change from armour plate biscuits.⁵

Captain Prior would have been unhappy to learn that on 24 July 1915, the 2nd Field Ambulance on Gallipoli received a Corps Order from its commanding officer,
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Lieutenant-Colonel A.H. Sturdee, stating that food was being wasted. The proof for this assertion was that the Lieutenant General Commanding was noticing, while on his rounds, large quantities of meat and bread being thrown away in the trenches. Bread was obviously valued by some more than others, as evidenced by another of Corporal C. Smith’s diary entries:

One day I was helping to unload bags of bread – bread, by the way, always reached us in this manner – when one bag accidentally fell into the water. (No, this was not a pre-arranged ‘accident’!) We soon rescued it, however, but not before the salt water had saturated the contents. We delivered the bag and explained matters to the Q.M. [Quarter Master] and that worthy laid the loaves in the sun to dry. He soon discovered though, that the bread was unfit for issue in the ordinary way, so made us a present of it. Didn’t we appreciate that extra issue! Salt water made little difference to us!7

On 5 September 1915, a report from the Medical Advisory Committee was received which concluded that the prevalence of diarrhoea was affected ‘by the monotony of the ration and the absence of bread’. This was notwithstanding a claim by the 1st Divisional Train, the transport supply column, that bread was received regularly, averaging ‘three times weekly’.8 The 24th Battalion’s Private Roy Kyle, however, wrote that he ‘remembered only once, possibly twice, being issued with bread during [his Gallipoli] stay’.9 The Medical Advisory Committee recommended baking on board ship to either replace or supplement field bakeries. The report was not well received by the then Medical Officer Arthur G. Butler. He responded by pointing out to the Deputy Quartermaster General that:

... fresh meat [was] always available and order was issued to this effect on 7th July, but ANZAC [did] not avail themselves of it – bread has always been issued as much as asked for, also onions and potatoes.

---

7 Smith, Chapter 6 ‘Beach Fatigues’.
8 AWM 38, Control Symbol 3DRL 6673/151, Extract from Report of Medical Advisory Committee (Report of a sub-committee (Lt.-Col. G.S. Buchanan and Lit.-Col. A. Balfour) on inquiries at Anzac – Mudros, [Official History, 1914-18 War: Records of Charles E.W. Bean, Official Historian] Papers, 1915-23; include notes by Bean and medical reports and papers on rations, dental matters and the administration of the Australian Army Medical Corps in Egypt; also include letters from A.G. Butler, 5 Sept 1915.
9 Kyle, An Anzac’s Story, p.176.
Butler finished his critique of the report by stating that ‘no army has ever had so good or varied a ration’.\textsuperscript{10} By 19 October, the 1\textsuperscript{st} Divisional Train was able to assert that ‘the regular issue of fresh meat and bread appears to have reduced the sickness and was much appreciated by the troops’\textsuperscript{11} An extract from E.J. Rule’s account of Gallipoli, \textit{Jacka’s Mob} (1933), dated 14 November 1915, was somewhat dismissive of the rations received however, including bread:

... when our rations did arrive, we found them so unappetising that enjoyment of them was out of the question. Men ate them as a duty, not as a pleasure. Bread arrived in such small quantities, and so smashed up by the mules bumping the sides of the saps, that it was often issued out by the handful, as crumbs. When it was on issue to our section, we always drew straws and the winner had the lot. It was better for one man to have a feed than for a dozen to get a taste.\textsuperscript{12}

This perspective is certainly a contrast to Corporal Smith’s declaration that bread ‘represented another step in the progress of peninsula comfort’. After Corporal Smith was injured and was taken on board a hospital ship, he wrote:

Then ... a nurse and orderly brought along trays containing slices of bread and butter and cups of tea. Bread! Butter! The former I had certainly tasted – in limited quantities – in Reserve Gully, but, as for the latter, had not even seen any since leaving Egypt nearly five months ago! The daintily cut slices soon disappeared, but more were forthcoming.\textsuperscript{13}

Smith also relates the chorus of an apparently popular song often performed by the men at concerts:

\begin{verbatim}
Bread and jam for break-fast,
Bread and jam for din-ner,
Bread and jam for tea again,
That's why our boys are getting thin-ner.
Pity the boys of the British Army,
Bread and jam will send them balmy,
All the boys at Anzac Cove are
Fed-on Bread-and Jam.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{verbatim}

\begin{footnotes}{\footnotesize
\item[10] Butler, \textit{Army Medical Services}, I, p.243.
\item[12] E.J. Rule, \textit{Jacka’s Mob}, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1933, pp.6-7; see also AWM 41, Control Symbol 332, \textit{[Official History 1914-18 War; Records of Arthur G. Butler]} Notes, extracts and copy of correspondence relating to supply and rations, 1918.
\item[13] Smith, Chapter 8, ‘A Final Advance’.
\item[14] \textit{ibid}, Chapter 9, ‘Lemnos Island’. Song sung to the tune of \textit{Men of Harlech}.
\end{footnotes}
It appears that bread was indeed a boon to the troops on the peninsula, providing comfort and helping reduce illness, while, at times, due to its method of transport, it arrived in short supply or in an unappetising condition.

The bread in France also received both poor and rave reviews. Historian Joyce Swinton states that the soldiers on the frontlines rarely went hungry, but their food was a most ‘unappetising diet of bread, cheese, jam, hard biscuits and ‘bully beef’.15

Jim Knight, an Australian soldier said however:

... we didn’t get much to eat. We got a loaf of bread to thirteen men, a spoonful of margarine each, a spoonful of jam and half an orange.16

Historian Denis Winter maintains that food was the ‘prime comfort’ to the men in the trenches. Unfortunately, however, it often arrived in a less than tempting condition. A soldier recalls:

Eaten by the reflection of the enemy’s flares in the stagnant water outside, it consisted of bully beef dug out of the tin with my knife, bread that had, of course, been carried in a sand-bag whose bearer had fallen into various shell-holes, from darkness and fatigue; if he had not been hit, and which therefore tasted of the contents of shell-holes, this is, human remains, various chemicals, excreta, well-manured Belgian farm soil, and rain-water-and, to finish with, cheese that survived it all.17

In the middle of the cold 1916-17 winter, Lieutenant Eric W. Simon of the 15th Battalion wrote in a letter that:

The bread came frozen so hard an ordinary knife made hardly an impression on it and we gave up trying to cut it and broke it instead.18

Other problems with bread beset the soldiers at times; Sapper Arthur Wilson noted his diary on 31 July 1918, that while away from their camp, some:

... poddy calves had chewed [their] ration bag through, eaten one loaf of bread, all the jam, ¾ tin of syrup and well licked the remaining loaf of bread.

He worried that the group would be very hungry by the time they received their next issue of rations.\textsuperscript{19}

In July 1916 Lieutenant B.W. Champion of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion was in Domart, France. He noted that the bread at the local French \textit{boulangerie} was ‘sweetish and stodgy [and] not up to Army standard’.\textsuperscript{20} A 1917 letter from Headquarters, however, suggested that the bread baked by the Army bakeries could have a ‘greater proportion of the by-products of wheat’ because the men enjoyed the wholemeal bread they bought at French village bakeries.\textsuperscript{21} In April 1917 Lieutenant Champion wrote in his diary that the ‘wounded Huns’ thought the Australian ‘Army bread was like cake – their black coarse bread was awful, and tasted like sawdust’.\textsuperscript{22} That same month, Birdwood wrote:

\begin{quote}
Unfortunately, bread-stuffs, which are the most important, are just the item which I know the men most value, for the only complaint I have ever heard about rations is “not enough bread”.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

A month later Birdwood wrote:

\begin{quote}
In going around my battalions, as I frequently do, and asking about rations, etc. the only complaint I hear is “Can’t you get us some more bread, Sir?”\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

Butler states that the men never tired of bread.\textsuperscript{25} Those soldiers who complained that the bread \textit{always} arrived with ‘the flavour of chemicals, excrement and dead bodies as a garnish’, were probably exaggerating, while no doubt Birdwood would have heard

---

\textsuperscript{19} Papers: Sapper Arthur Wilson, 31 July 1918.

\textsuperscript{20} 2 DRL/0512, Diary, \textit{Lieut. B.W. Champion. 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion A.I.F. 11/5/1915-August 1918}, 26 July 1916.

\textsuperscript{21} AWM 25, Control Symbol 221/5, Letter from Major General Commanding 1\textsuperscript{st} Australian Division – to 1\textsuperscript{st} A.N.Z.A.C. – Confidential, in \textit{[Cooks and Cooking] Correspondence dealing with "The Conservancy of Food-stuffs and prevention of waste". "Remarks regarding improvements on economies in Rations", 27 April 1917.}

\textsuperscript{22} Diary, \textit{Champion}, 6 April 1917.

\textsuperscript{23} Confidential Letter from General W.R. Birdwood to General ??? in \textit{Remarks regarding improvements on economies in Rations}, 26 April 1917.

\textsuperscript{24} AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/12, Letter from Lieutenant General Sir W.R. Birdwood Headquarters 1\textsuperscript{st} Anzac Corps, in \textit{[Rations] Notes impressing on all subordinate Commanders the necessity for economy in food and prevention of waste. Suggestions by General Birdwood on economy of bread, 1917}, 3 May 1917.

\textsuperscript{25} Butler, \textit{Australian Army Medical Services}, I, p.243.
complaints about the bread at some stage during his visits to his battalions. Major-General John Monash, as Commander of the 3rd Australian Division, stated:

I may say that no body of Australian troops has had expended upon them a greater amount of expert care in the matter of their feeding, and from first to last not a vestige of any complaint has ever reached me from any unit in the division ... The condition of the men of the Division is an absolute answer to any suggestion that their feeding has not been in every way ample and satisfactory.

The bread was baked in 2 lb loaves, and each man was supposed to receive between 14 and 16 oz each, that is, two would share a loaf (see below). It appears that Jim Knight’s claim that he had to share a loaf of bread with twelve others was not a common occurrence.

In early 1917, the relevant authorities were becoming anxious that the Army was going to run out of food or be forced to decrease the food ration because German submarines were affecting supply ships. In terms of bread production, there were many letters and memos sent about overcoming the shortage of flour and discussing the bread ration. On 26 April General Birdwood wrote, in a confidential letter, that oatmeal should be recommended as a substitute to flour. Bread could be replaced by oatmeal or rice. There was also the suggestion that oatmeal cakes could replace bread if they could reach their destinations without breaking. It was also considered that wholemeal, rather than the more expensive white flour, would make a substantial saving. Many directives went out about wastage and saving scraps of bread. A letter from the War Office stated:

The seriousness of the food situation at present cannot be over stated ... Broken pieces of bread from the men’s mess rooms or dining tents are to be carefully collected and portions not required for the provision of bread-puddings and baskets placed on the cooking ranges; the quantities thus collected should then be stored in sacks and finally disposed of through Army Waste Products Limited ...

---

26 Winter, Death’s Men, p.102; Letter from Birdwood, 3 May 1917.
28 Letter from Birdwood, 26 April 1917.
29 Letter from Major General Commanding 1st Australian Division – to 1st A.N.Z.A.C., 27 April 1917.
The Quartermaster General suggested that scraps of bread could be transformed into puddings, and directed that all 'spare pieces [should be] returned to the cookhouse for [that] purpose.\textsuperscript{31} It was also suggested that scraps of bread could be used as a substitute for rice or tapioca.\textsuperscript{32} In another letter, an Officer in Charge stated that 'Any man found wasting bread in any way will be severely dealt with'.\textsuperscript{33} It concerned the authorities that it was left 'lying around' so that portions became 'dirty and uneatable' (\textit{sic}), or that it was 'wasted by men using clean pieces to wipe they (\textit{sic}) knives upon'.\textsuperscript{34}

Another problem that caused waste of bread was the damage to the loaves during transportation. It was not just the mules that caused the bread to break up or become squashed, the packing and carriage brought about the same problems. The Major General Commanding the 1\textsuperscript{st} Australian Division suggested that the Field Bakeries could be moved closer to the front so the bread had a shorter distance to travel.\textsuperscript{35} There is no record that the AFBs were even aware of this suggestion. Certainly, they were never moved nearer to the frontlines. General Birdwood suggested instead, that crates or baskets would alleviate the broken bread problems, or, if they proved unsatisfactory, smaller bags should be used. This is an interesting reason for the introduction of smaller bags, because, when the size was changed in April 1918, the Australians believed it was because the British soldier, with his lack of physique, could not carry the larger ones (see above). It was suggested that the bread

\textsuperscript{31} AWM 25, Control Symbol 351/2, ‘J. Bailey Lieutenant and Quartermaster. Third Australian General Hospital Detail of No. of Calories and cost of each item of diet’, in "Food Diet". Feeding of patients in hospital, Army Council Instruction, 1917-1919, 19 August 1918.
\textsuperscript{32} ‘Army Council Instruction No. 928 of 1917’, in ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Letter from OIC Messing, Royal Flying Corps to Commanding Officer No. 30 T.S., in Correspondence regarding the issue and custody of iron and reserves of rations. The iron rations on the man. 1916-1917, 16 August 1917.
\textsuperscript{35} ‘Suggestions’, in Letter, "Remarks regarding improvements on economies in Rations", 27 April 1917.
sacks were thrown around, resulting in damage to the bread, but one officer pointed out that the bread was damaged because men sat on the sacks after delivery.36

In June 1917, the Supply Depot received a letter from the Assistant Provost Marshal, who complained that the bread delivered to the Australian Military Police Barracks was ‘soddy and doughy’ because it was packed while warm. Two weeks later another letter stated that lately, the bread had been arriving ‘in a sour and uneatable (sic) condition’.37 In May 1917 the Commanding Officer of the 70th Battalion wrote a very detailed letter when a counting and weighing of the loaves received revealed a shortfall of ‘62 lb 5 oz’ of bread.38 In December 1917, the Captain of the 10th Brigade notified that 100 lbs of bread had been ‘Destroyed by bursting bomb’.39 In June 1918, the Officer in Charge of the 1st Field Ambulance attached a Medical Officer’s certificate to prove his claim that the ‘120 lbs Bread ... was unfit for human consumption’.40 Even if the bread was damaged or inedible, the commanding officers were soon quick to point out a shortfall or the bread being a victim of the war, in order to gain replacements.

36 Letter General Commanding Fifth Army to Quartermaster General, in [Rations] Notes impressing on all subordinate Commanders the necessity for economy in food and prevention of waste. Suggestions by General Birdwood on economy of bread, 1917, 7 May 1917; Letter from HQ Lines of Communication to Base Commandant Havre, in [Rations] Notes impressing, 3 August 1917.

37 AWM 25, Control Symbol 2/16, Letter from Assistant Provost Marshal to Officer I/C Supplies, 6 June 1917; Letter from Assistant Provost Marshal to Supply Depot, 21 June 1917, both in [Records of the Assistant Provost Marshal] Rations. Nov 1916 – May 1918.


39 AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/41, ‘Notification of Supplies lost through exigencies of Active Service – Captain A. Galbraith, 10th Brigade, 3rd Australia Division’, in [Rations] Notification of supplies lost through exigencies of active service, 1918, approx. 18 December 1917.

40 ‘Notification of Supplies lost through exigencies of Active Service – Lt Col Brennon, OC 1st Field Amb AIF, 1st Australia Division’, in ibid, approx. 7 June 1918.
The provision of food was always a concern to those at ANZAC headquarters, and the quantity of bread in the daily ration underwent several changes over the course of the war. Bread rations were reduced from 20 oz of bread to 16 oz in February 1917.\textsuperscript{41} In April a recommendation went out to ANZAC headquarters recommending that bread rations be decreased from 16 oz to 14 oz for first line troops, and to 12 oz for troops in the second line. It was expected that with 2,500,000 British troops in France, this would save ‘115 tons a day of breadstuffs alone’.\textsuperscript{42} It appears, however, that the recommendation was not agreed upon until almost one year later, because it was Special Order No. 3581 of 5 February 1918 that reduced the bread ration from 16 to 14 oz.\textsuperscript{43} An undated circular that logically must have been formulated after February 1918, directed further changes to the ration. It stated that the Army or Cavalry Corps should receive 13 oz bread, and those at General Headquarters or on Lines of Communication should receive 11.5 oz. If a man worked more than eight hours in any one day, he was to be compensated by an extra 3 oz of bread.\textsuperscript{44}

In January 1918, the ration for Australian troops was 16 oz of bread every day. As noted above, this was reduced in February 1918 to 14 oz for each man. At the same time, meat, sugar, tea, and salt allotments were also reduced. It was recognised, however, that the bodies of soldiers under 19 years of age needed extra fuel because

\textsuperscript{41} AWM 27, Control Symbol 392/14, ‘Scale of Rations and Forage – British and Dominion Troops’, in [Supply Services] Scale of Rations and Forage, 1917.
\textsuperscript{42} AWM 25, Control Symbol 221/5, Confidential Letter from General W.R. Birdwood to General ??, in [Cooks and Cooking] Correspondence dealing with "The Conservancy of Food-stuffs and prevention of waste. "Remarks regarding improvements on economies in Rations"; 26 April 1917.
\textsuperscript{43} AWM 27, Control Symbol 392/17, ‘Scale of Rations’, in [Supply Services] Scale of rations – Comparison of American, Australian and New Zealand, 1918.
\textsuperscript{44} AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/54, ‘Circular issued with G.R.O. 4994 – Amendments to Ration Pamphlet S.S.571, (a)’, in [Rations] Correspondence and statements regarding feeding strength of Australian Corps troops; July 1918. List of units, men rationed, animals rationed at "A", "B" and "C" dumps also at Boulainville and Salonel dumps. No 6 Australian MT Company (Corps troops) 1918, 1918.
they were still growing. The rations for bread, meat, sugar, and bacon remained unaltered for these young men, with only the tea and salt rations reduced.\textsuperscript{45}

Australian soldiers in detention received a greater allotment of bread than did their free comrades. This suggests that other allotments in the ration, such as meat and bacon, were reduced for these men. A 1917 letter details three scales of bread rations: If a soldier was in detention for seven days or less, he received 24 oz of bread every day. If he was detained between eight and forty-two days, he received 18 oz of bread on Sunday, Monday, Wednesday and Friday, and 22 oz on the other three days. If he was in detention for more than forty-two days, he received 24 oz of bread every day.\textsuperscript{46} If German prisoners of war were employed, they received 9 oz of bread every day, but if not working, received 4 oz.\textsuperscript{47}

Some time after September 1918, an officer wrote complaining that the ‘present ration [was] insufficient for the A.I.F., in A.I.F. Depots under [his] Command’. He went on to argue that Canadians, New Zealanders, Dominion troops, and troops from the United States, were all receiving larger rations than the Australians.\textsuperscript{48} He expressed his ‘reluctance’ to ask for more, but said he was worried about the health and strength of his men. He reminded the authorities that ‘Australians are by habit very heavy meat-eaters’.\textsuperscript{49} In February 1919, the bread ration was increased from 14 to 15½ oz.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{45} ‘Scale of rations’, in [Supply Services] Scale of rations – Comparison of American, Australian and New Zealand, 1918.
\textsuperscript{46} AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/34, ‘Detention Diet’, in Correspondence regarding the issue and custody of iron and reserves of rations. The iron rations on the man. 1916-1917, 16 August 1917.
\textsuperscript{47} AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/17, G.R.O. 80, in [Rations] Circulation on examination, evacuation and feeding of civilians in captured territory. Feeding of prisoners of war, 1917, 12 April 1918.
\textsuperscript{48} ‘Scale of rations’, in [Supply Services] Scale of rations – Comparison of American, Australian and New Zealand, 1918.
\textsuperscript{49} ibid.
Those in charge of the supply of food recognised that hospital patients recovered strength faster and could be released to rejoin their units, with reasonable calorie intake. In January 1918, there were two scales of bread for the hospitalised. Those on ‘Ordinary’ and ‘Light’ diets received 12 oz a day, with those on ‘Milk’ diets receiving 9.5 oz. In August 1918, these were altered; the least seriously ill received 11 oz of bread per day, with the more seriously ill receiving 12 oz of bread split between breakfast and lunch. The civilian staff of the hospitals received 9 oz of bread every day, and military personnel, who included medical officers, nurses, orderlies and female volunteers such as the Voluntary Aid Detachment (VAD) and the Women’s Legion, received 14 oz per day.

The bakers’ self-image
Notwithstanding the criticisms of their bread, noticeable throughout all AFB diaries, but particularly the 1AFB diary at Imbros and the 2AFB diary at Calais, is the pride the men have in themselves and their abilities. As discussed above, their work habits ensured they finished their allotted tasks faster than bakers of other nationalities did. It is clear the Australian diarists were confident the Australian bakeries had the best and most highly trained men of all dominion bakeries. Their willingness to share their superior knowledge with bakers of other nations was not always eagerly seized; some were resentful of being taught by Australians. The Australians were able to blend an

51 AWM 25, Control Symbol 829/22, Letter from Commandant. The Administrative A.I.F. Headquarters TO The O.C. No. 1 Auxiliary Hospital, A.I.F., Harefield, in Ration balance sheet for No 1 Australian Auxiliary Hospital. Quantity of food consumed per head per diem, 1917. Cost of rations for each period: 1 April – 31 June; 1 July – 30 September; 1 October – 31 December, 1917, 21 January 1918.
52 AWM 25, Control Symbol 351/7, ‘Army Council Instruction No. 159 of 1918’, in [Food] Details of calories and cost of each item of diet, No 3 Australian General Hospital. Comparative return of food stuffs allowed and issued to patients, 1915 – 1918; ‘Lieutenant and Quartermaster J. Bailey of Third General Hospital, “Varying the Diet”’, in Cooking in the Field, France, 1917, p.3; Letter Commandant. The Administrative A.I.F. Headquarters To The O.C. No. 1 Auxiliary Hospital, 21 January 1918; Letter from Lieut. Colonel H.J. Wright A.Q.M.G. TO No. 1 Australian Auxiliary Hospital, Harefield, in Ration balance sheet for No 1 Australian Auxiliary Hospital, 9 February 1918.
assortment of flours to ensure a quality loaf of bread, brew their own yeast, and overcome other shortages in supplies when they became apparent.\textsuperscript{53} Despite their confidence in their own knowledge and abilities, they appear, like most people, to have been in need of validation and reassurance that their work was necessary and appreciated.

In March 1915, Captain Prior was happy to note a visit from some officers of 11\textsuperscript{th} Battalion, Brigadier Colonel MacLagan and his staff, who visited 1AFB at Lemnos Island. Prior recorded that these officers were so pleased with the quality of his bakery’s bread they took as much as possible with them for use on the headquarters and minor casualty ship \textit{Ionian}.\textsuperscript{54} General Headquarters on Imbros Island was supplied daily with fresh bread from 1AFB. After the Imperial bakeries arrived on the island and began baking, Captain Prior was under strict instructions to ensure that the bread delivered to headquarters was baked by the Australians. On 8 July 1915, whether it was mischief-making on behalf of the person who distributed the loaves, or just plain bad luck, the General at headquarters received what was described as ‘the worst loaf that could be found’ on his breakfast table. An explanation was demanded from Captain Prior, and subsequently his non-commissioned officers were severely reprimanded. Prior reported to headquarters the next day for money with which to make purchases, with some apprehension. He was pleasantly surprised that the ‘worst loaf’ was not mentioned and that he received compliments about the work of his unit.\textsuperscript{55} Whenever Prior was able to fill a demand for large amounts of bread by using that in storage, often while not baking due to shortages of supplies or other reasons, he noted the compliments from his superiors that his bakery was able to satisfy any demand as soon as it was made.\textsuperscript{56} After an inspection of the Australian bases on 5 September

\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Final Offensive, 1AFB,} 22 October 1918.
\textsuperscript{54} \textit{1AFB: Diary,} 28 March 1915; Butler, \textit{Army Medical Services, I,} p.124.
\textsuperscript{55} \textit{1AFB: Diary,} 8-9 July 1915.
\textsuperscript{56} \textit{ibid,} 8 August 1915.
1915, the director of supplies and transport clearly delighted Captain Prior with his proclamation that the Australian bakers were ‘absolutely the best of Bakers on the show’.\(^5\)

When 2AFB arrived at Tel-el-Kebir in January 1916, their baking equipment had not arrived. This meant it could not bake for the troops arriving back from the Gallipoli campaign and the men of the 2\(^{nd}\) Division arriving from Australia, all being forced to consume the ‘inferior quality of bread’ being baked at nearby Zagazig.\(^5\) Captain Miles does not state in the diary who made this bread at Zagazig, but the diaries of all of the Australian bakeries confirm that there was quite a rivalry between themselves and civilian and other bread-making facilities, with great pride being taken in their superior knowledge, work habits and loaf of bread.\(^5\) Early in 1916, a telegram was sent to the officer in charge of the Australian bakeries, probably Captain Miles, at Tel-el-Kebir. The message was on behalf of General Sir William Birdwood, who was ’very grateful for the excellent quality and regular supply [of bread] you have always sent’.\(^5\) This message offers support for Dale Blair’s claim that Birdwood played an important role ‘in the creation of Australian morale’.\(^6\) Before moving on to Rouen, Captain Pye of 5AFB received a letter commending the 5AFB for its services:

> ... put on record my appreciation of the very excellent work done here by Lieut Pye and his men. In spite of great heat sickness and difficulties with the wood, this bakery has always turned out good bread ... I cannot pay the 5\(^{th}\) a greater compliment than by saying that it has done all that I could have expected.\(^5\)

This letter was originally sent to the senior supply officer of the 5\(^{th}\) Australian Division. He sent it on to the commanding officer of the 5\(^{th}\) Divisional Train with the notation,

\(^{57}\) ibid, 5 September 1915.

\(^{58}\) ‘War Records’, in 2AFB: Diary, p.3.

\(^{59}\) ‘War Records’, in 2AFB: Diary, p.3; 1AFB: Diary, 30 July 1915.

\(^{60}\) AWM 224, Control Symbol MSS247, ‘Messages and Signals from ADC to General Birdwood to Officer IC Bakeries Tel-El-Kebir, in 5th Australian Field Bakery: War diary, 5 March 1916 – 31 July 1917, undated.

\(^{61}\) Blair, Dinkum Diggers, p.75.

'For your information – above is very gratifying’. The recipient then sent it on to 5AFB with the notation, ‘This speaks volumes for the work your Bakery has done, & I am very pleased’.63 The compliments 1AFB received at Lemnos and Mudros, and the bakeries received at Tel-el-Kebir, make it clear their efforts were appreciated, and that the bakers wanted the appreciation placed on record.

At Calais, the officers in charge of the 2nd and 3rd AFBs, Captains Miles and Nash, took a great deal of pride and satisfaction in the work performed by the men in their charge, and the product they turned out. Bearing in mind that Captains Miles and Nash believed that nothing of ‘historical interest’ had occurred at the bakery, and that there was ‘very little to disturb the serenity or perhaps, the monotonous regularity of the daily duties’, it can be appreciated that they may have thought their efforts and those of their men were not appreciated. They were, therefore, very eager to place awards, visits and inspections by famous and important people, and any resultant praise and recognition, on record.64

A highlight of Captain Miles’s history of the unit, before he began daily documentation on 1 December 1917, was a visit to the bakery by the Prime Minister, William Morris Hughes, on 31 May 1916. There was also a visit on an unspecified date by ex-Prime Minister Andrew Fisher. Miles also records that ‘a large number of Staff offices and others’ and a ‘large number of prominent people’ visited the bakery in 1916 and 1917. These visitors were apparently very keen to observe the processes adopted ‘for feeding the troops’.65 Miles reported that those visiting the bakery also included:

Representatives of the press from America & other parts of the world; visitors of note from France, Russia, Italy, Japan, Spain, Switzerland and many other parts of the world; a large number of Union representatives from various trades in England.

---

63 Hand-written notes on Letter from Beaumont to Senior Supply Officer.
64 Letter from Miles to Australian War Records, 20 October 1917, in 2AFB: Diary; Letter from Nash to Australian War Records, 21 October 1917, 1 March 1918, in 3AFB: Diary.
All of these visitors, ‘generally speaking’, had the ‘highest praise’ for the personnel and workings of the bakery.\textsuperscript{66}

Another prominent person whose visit brought excitement and much desired approval, was General Birdwood, who visited the bakery in the afternoon of 16 August 1917. He inspected and interrogated the men, and in reply to his inquiries, was told that, ‘in all cases’ they were ‘perfectly satisfied and contented’ with the conditions.\textsuperscript{67} He was ‘highly pleased’ to hear that the reorganisation culminating in the three-shift system was working so well, and his original diary records the visit and declares that the ‘Bakeries [are] very good under Capt. Miles’.\textsuperscript{68} General Birdwood visited the Calais bakery twice in both 1917 and 1918, usually mentioning the visit and his impressions in his diary. He also inspected the Rouen bakery in June 1918 and conveyed his thanks and approval for the work being done.\textsuperscript{69} Captains Miles, Nash and Pye, together with Private Hyndman, report these prestigious and successful visits in their diaries. To them at least, visits by a person of great eminence, provided absolute validation.

On 28 January 1918, the Second Secretary to the American Embassy, Mr Thaw, visited the bakery. Captain Miles did not record Mr Thaw’s judgement of the operation, and Private Hyndman did not even record the visit.\textsuperscript{70} Because Captain Miles was always very gratified and consequently swift in recording praise from visiting dignitaries, this lack of notation indicates that the opinion of the Second Secretary was not considered very important, that he was not impressed with the operations, that he did not make public his evaluation, or that Miles’s previous comments about visitors having, ‘generally speaking’ the ‘highest praise’ for the working of the bakery, sufficed in this
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instance. The same can be said about the visits of officers from the Cambridge Staff School, who visited in January and again in February, and the Lord Mayor and Aldermen from Sheffield who toured on 4 February 1918. There were also visitations from journalists Mr Briantchininov from the Russian publication *Novoic Vremen*, and Mr Segen from the French *Le Brest*, Canadian Staff officers, Arctic explorer Roald Amundsen, a Naval attaché, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the London Stock Exchange and Lloyds, a party of French administrative officers, twenty-five officers from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Corps Infantry School, the Marquis of Carisbrooke, and twenty-six Dominion journalists. There are no notations recorded of opinions of these visitors. I believe, however, because these visits are recorded in reasonable detail when there is very little else noted, it was very gratifying to those at the bakery to have so many visitors and so much interest shown in its workings.

The inspection of the cookhouse and master cook catering to the Calais bakery by the instructor in catering in May 1917 was discussed above. The same type of inspection was made of the cookhouse catering to the Australian and New Zealand bakeries at Rouen, approximately 180 men, in January 1918. The cookhouse was as flawless as the Calais cookhouse eight months earlier. The deputy assistant quartermaster general included the report with a memo that declared ‘The Base Commandant [was] gratified to see such satisfactory results’. That these reports are incorporated into the unit diaries reveals that these positive findings were just as gratifying to the bakery officers in charge of the cookhouses.

In formulating his summary of 3AFB’s labour and efforts at Calais, Captain Nash was modest but enthusiastic about his unit’s:

---
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... splendid devotion to duty ... in the face of most exacting conditions, bad housing and at many time inferior and insufficient food.

It is likely that because the bakeries’ officers, and no doubt the personnel, believed 'nothing ... of historical interest' ever happened at the Calais bakery, and that it was very hard to write ‘anything in the way of an illuminating diary’, Captain Nash believed it doubtful his men would ever receive adequate recognition for their efforts if he did not place it on record himself.75

Perceptions of non-fighting combatants

It is significant that the bakers devalued their contribution. They understood, just as historians of the war have understood, that ‘fighters are easy to present dramatically as men-of-action’.76 Writer and poet William Baylebridge claims that the only role in war fit for a man is one where he puts his life on the line.77 Bill Gammage said that 'Within the A.I.F., ... the real Australians were ... men who had passed the test of the trenches'.78 Cultural historian Joanna Bourke argues, however, that a good soldier had to be an efficient killer.79 There is no doubt that the feats of Victoria Cross and Distinguished Conduct Medal winners make more exciting reading than the mixing and baking of bread doughs. C.E.W. Bean was the first historian to make the conscious decision to concentrate solely on the fighting combatant. Although Bean’s histories are entitled Official History of Australia In The War Of 1914-18, he described them as ‘official histories of the Australian infantry’.80 Robin Gerster believes it was Bean’s ‘almost undiscriminating reverence for the Australian soldiers’ that resulted in the emphasis on the fighting combatant.81 Ken Inglis said that Bean wanted his official
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histories to be ‘a monument to the men who fought’ (my emphasis). Bean explained his focus when he declared that he wanted ‘to distribute the credit as widely as possible among those who deserve it’. He obviously believed that only the infantry deserved any credit. Jane Ross and Dale Blair concur that historians, from Bean to present day, have concentrated on the fighting combatant, the ‘man of action’. Hugh Fairclough states that historians have emphasised and described the ‘activities of large formations’ of fighting men. Eric Andrews believes that many aspects of the war have been ‘hidden or ignored’ because, as Ross states, ‘The front-line is the stuff of dramatic action; base-camps and staff conferences are not’.

Noel McLachlan states that those enlisting in the war ‘were encouraged from the start to think of themselves as an elite with the aura of heroes’. The emphasis on the front-line fighting combatant clearly reveals that a number of enlistees, such as those at ‘base-camps and staff conferences’, were not heroes, and because they did not put their lives on the line or were not efficient killers, were employed in roles unfit for men. This argument leads to a discussion of those omitted by the emphasis on the front-line, fighting combatant, also acknowledged by Lloyd Robson when he states that ‘Bean’s highly influential concentration on the soldier on the line leaves much unexplained’. Historian Jeffrey Grey states that the ‘teeth to tail’ ratio of the AIF was very high. Historian Richard Reid states that the AIF had around 50,000 men in its support units, which equates to a ratio of combat to support troops of 6.6 to one. Jane Ross, however, states that the ‘fighter/support ratio’ was almost ten to one, which
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would number at around 32,000 men.\footnote{Ross, *Myth of the Digger*, pp.40-41; see also Reid, *Beaucoup Australiens ici*, p.17.} Regardless of which of these is more accurate, it can be ascertained that the Australian force was heavily weighted with fighting combatants. This is also acknowledged by Joan Beaumont.\footnote{Beaumont, *Australia’s War*, pp.28-29; see also Bean, *Anzac to Amiens*, pp.198-199.} Approximately 2.9 per cent of the 331,781 men who left Australia with the AIF were members of the Army Service Corps, and, as mentioned, I have been able to identify 723 bakers.\footnote{Fairclough, *Equal to the Task*, p.28.} Alistair Thomson, Noel McLachlan, and Bill Gammage have argued that the war was ‘a dividing rather than a unifying experience’.\footnote{Gammage, ‘Anzac’, pp.63-64; see also Thomson, *ANZAC Memories*, pp.214-216; McLachlan, ‘Nationalism and the Divisive Digger’, p.306.} Although their arguments mainly relate to those who volunteered as against those who did not, including rejects, ‘shirkers’, females, and other generations, Thomson acknowledges that some of the members of the AIF have not been compatible with the Anzac legend’s ‘typical Anzac’ and ‘genuine digger’.\footnote{Thomson, *ANZAC Memories*, pp.215-216} Many of these atypical diggers were presumably those members of the support and administrative staffs, and, specific to this study, the bakers of the Australian Field Bakeries.

Most frontline, fighting combatants justifiably believed that support and administrative troops faced less danger than themselves.\footnote{Bean, *Official History*, I, p.552.} Whether it can be generalised that they all ‘despise[d] the base-camp men’, as Alistair Thomson claims, and ‘scorn[ed]’ them as Stéphanie Audoin-Rouzeau suggests, is difficult to ascertain, but certainly some felt that way and most believed it was an easy life compared to their own.\footnote{Thomson, ‘Steadfast Until Death?’, p.471; Stéphanie Audoin-Rouzeau, *Men At War 1914-1918*, Berg Publishers Limited, Oxford, 1995, p.7.} There are hundreds, probably thousands, of fighting combatants’ opinions of their non-fighting comrades recorded in letters and diaries. Two brothers, Harold and Wallace Campbell, joined the AIF. Harold was assigned to the infantry, and Wallace to the Motor Transport Company of the Australian Army Service Corps. Harold
was wounded and gassed before he was eventually killed in action in Belgium on 7 October 1917, and Wallace returned safely to Australia in June 1919. Harold’s letters home often mentioned the safety of Wallace’s position, although, as a driver with the Motor Transport Company, Wallace was not as safe as some were, the bakers for example. Harold wrote that:

[Walace’s] work is pretty safe. We generally say it is a cold-footed job, because they don’t, as a rule, get within rifle shot of the firing line, so it is pretty safe.

A few weeks later, he wrote in the same vein:

[Walace’s] work is a bloomin’ holiday compared to mine … Usually gets a good night’s sleep and plenty to eat, and that’s what I miss.

A letter from friend, William Mair, carried much the same sentiments:

… Wally … will never see a shot fired … he won’t even hear a shot fired, because … he belongs to the army Service Corp, which is a non-combatant corps, and are called ‘full belly soldiers’. And if he did have to go to France he would be miles behind the firing line.

Lieutenant Charles Carthew wrote home that his friend ‘Old Ewart [was] now R.Q.M., [which was] a nice safe job’. Officer Tristan Buesst noted in his diary that he was ‘glad’ he was in the infantry, being ‘one who goes through all the hardships of a campaign and runs every risk’. He described an infantry man ‘as the scullery maid who does all the dirty work in the great military kitchen’. Conversely, he described the batmen of his battalion as leading:

… a more secure and easier existence than the other men, because except in emergencies they stay behind in camp while the rest of us go up the line. The batman as a privileged being is therefore at once despised and envied by his fellows.
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Many of the infantry provided their own definition of the A.S.C., this being Army Safety Corps. These few examples reveal a distinct belief by fighting combatants that the service of men behind the lines was paradise compared to their own.

Greg Kerr suggests that men who held pacifist beliefs but still wanted to contribute, enlisted in the non-combat services. There is no doubt that the men in the support services knew they did not face the extreme dangers and hardships of the men on the frontlines. In a letter to his mother in June 1916 before leaving Australia, Wallace Campbell wrote:

One of my main desires is ... to claim [brother] Harold from the Infantry to the A.S.C. He has had enough of the trenches. He has done his share.

Six months later from Le Havre, Campbell wrote, ‘Men here from the front tell me that the A.S.C. is the best job up there, so that’s good news!’ There was another side, however, to a man’s acknowledgement that his service was a lot safer than others, and it forms the basis of Alistair Thomson’s argument that a man’s role ‘made for contrasting experiences of war and different identities as soldiers’. Thomson states that some of those he interviewed for *ANZAC Memories* were uncomfortable about the ‘relative safety and comfort of their service’. Train driver Charles Bowden, who transported soldiers and supplies from the French ports to the ‘railheads of the Western Front’, said:

... we weren’t what you might say, real soldiers, we never had any arms or any ammunition or anything like that.

One of the other men Thomson interviewed, Percy Bird, was transferred to clerical duties after being wounded. Bird’s new job left him feeling uncomfortable and second-rate compared to mates in his old unit, and Thomson asserts that the transfer to a
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non-combat role threatened Bird’s military identity and caused feelings of masculine inadequacy.\textsuperscript{110}

Some fighting combatants also believed, as did Bean and Baylebridge, that their numbers comprised a finer character of man than did those units out of the line. General John Monash wrote:

The best men naturally gravitate to the fighting front or the centres of munition supply, while all the subordinate and accessory services get into the hands of mediocre men and the inefficient.\textsuperscript{111}

Briton Rowland Fielding wrote home:

There was no humbug in the trenches and that is why the better kind of men who lived in them will look back upon them hereafter with something like affection.\textsuperscript{112}

Lance Corporal Henry Pepper of the 7\textsuperscript{th} Battalion believed that many members of the AIF, and by implication, non-fighting combatants, exaggerated or fabricated feats of bravery in their letters home, and wrote that ‘There will be a lot of heroes at home after this war who have never seen the front’.\textsuperscript{113} General John Talbot Hobbs was very scathing and dismissive of some members of the AIF. Hobbs became Australian Corps commander after General John Monash left to direct the AIF’s return to Australia. Hobbs warned Australians that war medals did not discriminate between deserved and undeserved recipients. He advised:

Don’t forget. criminals - base job men, men who [enlisted] because they had not enough backbone to stand the ridicule and banter they got from the women at Home but who never intended to fight & never did fight many of them - or the latecomers who with others disgraced Australia.\textsuperscript{114}

General Hobbs’s diatribe and the remarks of fighting combatants do not allow for those men trained in specific skills, such as the bakers, without whom the fighting combatants would not have coped even as well as they did. Bean acknowledges that
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the AIF was always able to enlist the number of men it needed from any particular line of work needed, and that they were ‘fine ones at that’. Interestingly, while General Hobbs was unappreciative of non-fighting combatants and warned Australians ‘against judging a man by the ribbons on his chest’, he organised his son, Mervyn’s, transfer from the position of gunner in the infantry to the staff at AIF headquarters in July 1915. As the General Officer commanding the 5th Australian Division, he then organised his son to be his Aide-de-Camp. On 20 September 1917, he nominated Mervyn for a Military Cross, which was subsequently awarded on 1 January 1918:

> For marked ability and devotion to duty ... His tact and cheerfulness have been of great value when dealing with Officers and other ranks of the Division ... He has carried out his duties of A.D.C. to the G.O.C. Division, since July, 1915, with ability, tact and energy.  

The Military Cross was normally awarded to junior officers who had exhibited ‘gallant and distinguished services in action’. General Hobbs was presumably oblivious to the irony of his son’s award and his warnings to Australians about judging a returned soldier by his medals.

> Although fighting combatants expressed feelings of superiority and were dismissive of the input of support troops, there is a discernable element of envy in many of the letters and diary entries. Alistair Thomson reports that his interviews with veterans revealed ‘envy and respect for the cunning of men who managed to keep out of the line’. Reginald A. Mills wrote home from hospital in December 1915:

> ... of course if I have to go to the front again I will willingly go but I am not one of those heros (sic) “dying to go back to the front again” ... I intend trying to get a clerical job in Cairo somewhere with the military depots if I [am not returned] to Australia.
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Reginald Mills was not sent home, because in April 1918 he wrote about Norman, his brother, who was a telephone mechanic at divisional headquarters:

... only wish I had a job like his as he is pretty comfortable, a thousand times better off than I am.121

The bakeries experienced a scurry of men from the infantry attempting to join their ranks when positions became available.

At Tel-el-Kebir in Egypt when the 1st and 2nd AFBs lost one-third of their strengths to form the 4th and 5th AFBs, both needed to bring their numbers back up to war establishment requirements. A call went out to the infantry and other units then stationed in Egypt for experienced bakers, and many men came forward. Captain Miles believed that many of those who came forward, hearing the bakeries were to relocate to France almost immediately, volunteered their services. At least two other explanations are plausible: once at Tel-el-Kebir, men who had been in the Gallipoli campaign claimed to be bakers and volunteered their skills in order to escape the hazards and hardships of the frontline. Alternatively, many left Australia before the decision to evacuate Gallipoli was made and were consequently transported to Egypt to amass with those returning from the campaign, before moving on to France and the Western Front. After their arrival, they had the opportunity to speak with those having just returned from Gallipoli, and learnt that it was, indeed, a dire experience. Regardless of whether the volunteers to make the bakeries up to strength did so to join the fray or to escape it, with no opportunity to test their baking skills, both bakeries ended up with many untrained men who could not perform the duties required of them.122

In a letter to the records section written 24 May 1916, Captain Miles directed that he did not want any more reinforcements because they were not bakers and he
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had enough men whose ‘services are really useless to me’ in the bakery already.\textsuperscript{123} In July, Captain Miles again requested those who were not bakers be transferred from the 2AFB or to the base depot to ‘be replaced by practical bakers’.\textsuperscript{124} He states that most of these non-bakers had applied for transfers out, but there is no record of a mass exit of non-bakers or an influx of trained men. The matter of non-bakers being posted to the 2AFB was raised again in November 1916. Miles wrote to the base depot advising amongst other things, that he had returned a non-baker to the officer in charge of reinforcements at Etaples. He notified that:

\begin{quote}
... it is useless sending reinforcements to this Bakery, unless they are practical Bakers, as all other than skilled Bakery work is done by labourers.\textsuperscript{125}
\end{quote}

The reply stated that the base depot had no way of determining by testing the men’s baking skills, and therefore had to rely on nominal rolls.\textsuperscript{126} These rolls were created from enlistment papers, and contained detailed information as supplied by the enlistee at date of enrolment. If the roll stated a man’s occupation was ‘Baker’, it was only because that was the answer supplied to that question by the enlistee. Many enlistees possibly stated they were bakers by profession in order to be allocated to a bakery unit.

In June 1917, Captain Miles informed Anzac headquarters that three non-bakers had been sent as reinforcements, explaining again that the men were ‘of little value’. With his usual subtleties, Miles stated that, because the bakers were working under such ‘high pressure’, it was ‘essential that only PRACTICAL BAKERS be sent’.\textsuperscript{127} The reply states that the three had previously been at the Rouen bakery where they

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{123}] AWM 4, Control Symbol 25/39, Letter from J. Miles to O.C. Australian Records Section, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Echelon, France, 24 May 1916, in 2AFB: Diary.
\item[\textsuperscript{124}] Letter from J. Miles to Australian Record Section, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Echelon G.H.Q. France, 1 July 1916, in ibid.
\item[\textsuperscript{125}] Letter from Captain J. Miles to O.C. Australian General Base Depot, 17 November 1916, in ibid.
\item[\textsuperscript{126}] Letter from Australian General Base Depot to Captain J. Miles, 22 November 1916, in ibid.
\item[\textsuperscript{127}] Letter from Captain J. Miles to A.A.G., 1\textsuperscript{st} ANZAC H.Q., France, 10 June 1917, in ibid.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
had been tested for their proficiency at baking, and that the officer in charge of the Rouen bakery would send a report on the outcome of these assessments.\textsuperscript{128} There is no record in the diary of these results. Of the three men, however, two names appear on other bakery documents. Of these two, I examined the dossier of one; this man certainly continued with 2AFB until his return to Australia in July 1919.\textsuperscript{129} Captain Miles wrote again in September 1917, complaining of being sent untrained men.\textsuperscript{130} He mentioned two of the three sent in June and awaiting test results from Rouen. Miles was subsequently ordered to send one of the men back to the base depot at Havre. It appears only one of the three passed his baking test to an acceptable level and two were returned to reinforcements. There are no more letters of complaint from Captain Miles on this matter, so he was only sent competent bakers from this time onwards or he realised the futility of his complaints.

Because the officers in charge of the bakeries, especially Captain Miles, had so much trouble with untrained men, it seems that many enlistees gave their occupations as 'Baker' or told their infantry leaders they were skilled in that area in order to bring about a transfer to one of the bakeries. Although frontline combatants were contemptuous and dismissive of support troops because of their relative safety, some were also envious and expressed their covetousness for such a position. In the case of the untrained men who were sent to the bakeries, they volunteered in the hope of avoiding the dangerous situations on the frontlines.

\textbf{Masculinity and mechanisation}

In 1990, Peter Cochrane wrote an analysis of the fund-raising efforts for the Simpson memorial at the Shrine of Remembrance in Melbourne entitled 'Legendary Proportions:
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The Simpson Memorial Appeal of 1933’. Cochrane explains the small size of the monument by recounting the difficulties of the fund-raising efforts. Although the proposed memorial had the backing of many, including various returned men and women’s organisations, some returned officers, the Red Cross, Victoria’s Premier, many churches and Scots, donations fell £650 short of the expected £1000, and plans for a life-sized statue were cancelled. At the time, a memorial to military hero General Sir John Monash was also being mooted. Understanding that Monash ‘fitted better into the stridently masculinist core of the Anzac tradition’, fund-raisers for the Simpson memorial marketed Simpson as the male equivalent to Florence Nightingale. Women and children seem to have been the main contributors.

Cochrane questions why the appeal failed to meet its expected targets. One of his answers is that ‘There was not enough spare change to go around’. Of more importance to this study, however, is Cochrane’s explanation that Simpson was not part of the masculinist myth:

... despite his unquestioned courage and heroism. He was identified with the ‘feminine’ qualities of care for the sick, of selfless giving, of saving life rather than taking it – ‘quietly succouring the wounded under fire’.

Cochrane says the donkey ‘further softened the Simpson imagery’. Cochrane speculates, therefore, that it was Simpson’s identification with the feminine qualities of care giving that located the appeal within ‘the woman’s sphere’, and attracted donations from women and children but failed to bring large contributions.

The same hypothesis appears apposite to Anzac historiography and the Australian Field Bakeries. Their work was and is perceived by historians as within the feminine sphere of kitchens, cooking, and care, falling well short of the masculinist and
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heroic Anzac. The fighting combatant was dismissive of support troops, and undoubtedly believed that 'the better kind of men' (my emphasis) were those who fought and risked their lives.\footnote{Fielding, \textit{War Letters to a Wife}.} When the employment of women at the Calais bakery was proposed, however, Captain Miles reacted with a hint of territorialism and a belief and expectation that work at the bakery was the men’s domain.

A proposal to mechanise the Calais bakery was kicked around for some time. This proposed mechanisation also allowed for the employment of women, thereby freeing up a substantial number of men for other duties. Women were not generally employed in Australian bakeries around the time of the outbreak of the war. Although the majority of bakeries were small, independent, family concerns, the women, if involved at all, were not involved in the heavy work of baking, but did the office work, bookkeeping, ordering and cleaning.\footnote{Go Grains, BRI Australia, 'History of the bread industry in Australia', in \textit{Go Grains BRI Australia}, [http://www.gograins.grdc.com.au/grainsnutrition/ie/16_1.html], date accessed 1 June 2004; John Jones, Miller’s Bakehouse, Melville Historical Society, Interview with the author, 23 May 2004.} Kit Watson, a woman who lived with her sister and brother-in-law at his bakery, recalls:

The family didn't help in the making of the bread unless the dough 'came' too fast and then everyone had to ‘punch’ the dough to ready it for the ovens.\footnote{Jean Nolan, 'Mrs Kit Watson', in 'Citizens of Canterbury', in \textit{The Canterbury Bell: Newsletter of the Canterbury Genealogy Discussion Group}, February 2000, [http://www.canterbury.nsw.gov.au/history/cantbell/feb00.htm], date accessed 6 June 2004.}

It was therefore uncommon, but not unheard of, for women and other family members to help in small, family bakeries. Before the war, it seems that most of the men of the Australian Field Bakeries would not have worked with women in a baking capacity on a regular basis.

In February 1917, Captain Miles asked his master baker to prepare a report on using women in the bakery if it became mechanised. His report stated that flour carting and stacking, carrying dough bags, and delivery and proper stacking of baked...
bread into cooling rooms, were too laborious and heavy for women. He reported that women would be able to wheel dough troughs from the machines to other areas of the bakery, feed dough from troughs to chutes, and place dough onto boards in readiness for the ovens.\textsuperscript{141} The master baker’s report concluded that becoming mechanised meant the bakery would need 317 less men, and the introduction of women would save another 25 per cent, or 156 men. This meant a decrease of 473 men from a total strength, at that time, of 949 men, a reduction of 50 per cent.\textsuperscript{142}

Captain Miles familiarised himself with this report on the employment of women in the bakery, and then wrote to the officer in charge of Army Service Corps personnel at the base supply depot. He reported that although he was agreeable to a 25 per cent female workforce, he did not want any women in positions of authority or responsibility. He insisted he could not ‘dispense with’ any of his ‘senior ranks’, particularly if they were to be replaced by women.\textsuperscript{143} He then laid down the ‘qualifications’ women should have if they were to be employed at the bakery:

1. Good physique.
2. Age not under 22 years and not over 35 years; ...
3. Each women (sic) should be dressed in smocks, should be provided with a belt, and wear white overalls made with white twill. Skirts should not be worn.\textsuperscript{144}

These qualifications relate to strength and practicality rather than wanting some young ‘good sorts’ around the place. In October 1917, over six months later, Captain Miles wrote another report on the employment of women at the bakery. He retyped exactly the information provided by the master baker in February, however he altered the number of men who ‘could be supplanted’ by women from 156 to 188 if the bakery
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was mechanised. He stated that the 444 men and 234 women would be capable of producing 390,000 lbs of bread every day.  

Private Hyndman never makes any mention of women employed at the bakery. Right through the 2AFB diary at Calais to date of leaving for Rouen on 25 August 1918, Captain Miles notes the strength of the unit and the number of deficiencies due to leave or illness. These two figures consistently tally to the one officer and 92 other ranks of the bakery’s war establishment. This indicates that women, whose service was to free up a considerable number of men, were never employed at the Calais bakery, although they were employed in field bakeries in England and Bakeries North at Rouen, which had an English officer in charge. Whether the final decision on the matter was due to Captain Miles’s attitude when it came to the men’s expertise and space being invaded by women, or another reason, women were never employed in the Calais bakery. Even in WWII, the use of female labour in British bakeries was only implemented ‘under pressure, with a great deal of apprehension and as a result of a National emergency’.  

In October 1917, Captain Miles was also asked to report on the effect a two-hour power failure would have on the bakery’s output if it was to be mechanised. He pointed out a two hour power failure would effect a loss of 32,384 lbs of bread. He also drew attention to the problems such a power failure would instigate, causing a greater loss of production. To avoid an explosion, the fires in the ovens would have to be extinguished, and it would take an hour, once the power was restored, to bring them back to the correct temperature. All machinery would naturally be idle, and with
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the reduction in personnel, there would not be the workers to continue manually. A power interruption in summer would have greater consequence than in winter because the bread would, in all likelihood, turn sour in the heat. Miles also said that such an interruption would play havoc with his eight-hour shift allocations.\footnote{Letter from Captain J. Miles to Assistant Director of Supplies, through O.C. B.S.D., 13 October 1917.}

There are no further notations or letters regarding the Calais bakery’s mechanisation. Private Hyndman noted the mechanisation in his diary in August 1917, but as it was still being discussed in October 1917, it seems that Hyndman was merely mentioning the possibility of such a mechanisation occurring.

On 12 February 1918, advice was received that a new bakery was going to be built at Les Attaques, a few miles out of Calais.\footnote{2AFB: Diary, 12 February 1918.} This bakery was going to be completely mechanised and capable of producing 800,000 lbs of bread every day, although only 500,000 lbs were going to be made unless there was an emergency.\footnote{AWM 4, Control Symbol 25/39, ‘General’, February 1918, in 2AFB: Diary, p.3.} Two nine-hour shifts, rather than the three eight-hour shifts already in operation at the Calais bakery, and 200 men and 270 women, rather than the 1,041 other ranks currently working, would be capable of generating this amount. It was hoped the new bakery would be ready for use by June 1918, with the present bakery retained for use should the need arise.\footnote{General’, in 2AFB: Diary.} In March 1918, Captain Miles was sent to Brixton, England, to learn about the machinery to be installed in the new bakery.\footnote{2AFB: Diary, 14 March 1918. It appears that another field bakery of 92 Other Ranks, perhaps Canadian (Hyndman, Diary, 30 August 1917), took the total of Other Ranks from 949 in February 1917, to 1,041 in February 1918.} Attached to the 2AFB diary is a very detailed account of the running of the Brixton bakery, the machinery in use, the personnel and their duties, bread ingredients, and temperatures for dough.\footnote{AWM 4, Control Symbol 25/39, ‘W.D. Bakery. A.S.C. Brixton. London’, February 1918, in 2AFB: Diary, pp.1-4.}
After Captain Miles finished at Brixton, he travelled around various manufacturing works for instruction and inspection of numerous pieces of machinery. His final visit was to the Aldershot bakery in Hampshire, which was using standard army equipment. With 27 men and 60 women employed, the average daily output was 72,000 lbs or 36,000 loaves.\textsuperscript{154} When this amount is compared to the 40,000 lbs each unit of 93 men was producing at the Calais bakery, it can be acknowledged that such machinery at the new bakery would make a significant impact in terms of amount of bread produced and a freeing up of men for other duties. Of the women employed at Aldershot, approximately two-thirds were skilled bakers, and the remainder performed repetitive tasks.\textsuperscript{155}

Captain Miles formulated a very detailed estimation of the workforce necessary for the new bakery. Of 91 persons on staff, which included an extra 10 per cent to account for illness and leave, 29 were male, and therefore, 62 were female. The third of these women who worked at baking were always to be under the supervision of non-commissioned officers; the other two-thirds were to be employed as cooks and orderlies. He assessed that the bakery would need, including this 91 staff, a total of 479 persons of whom 209 would be men.\textsuperscript{156}

All of the new plans expose the mindsets of Captain Miles and perhaps the bakers themselves, and those of the authorities towards Miles. The potential plans to employ women in either the old or the new Calais bakeries are important. Although the bakers’ work was perceived as feminised and centred within the woman’s sphere, as already suggested, Captain Miles had a nervous attitude towards such employment of women. At the old Calais bakery, he insisted he would not want any women in positions of authority or responsibility and insisted he could not ‘dispense with’ any of

\textsuperscript{154} \textit{2AFB: Diary}, April 1918, p.1.
\textsuperscript{156} ‘Estimated Personnel, For New Calais Bakery: Detail’, April 1918, in \textit{ibid}.
his 'senior ranks', particularly if they were to be replaced by women.\textsuperscript{157} He clearly did not want any of his men's authority usurped by women. At the new bakery, although 180 of the 270 women to be employed were skilled bakers, any who were going to work as bakers would be under constant supervision. It is clear Captain Miles saw the potential introduction of women as an imposition, and such women as being unable to perform the tasks required without male authority. It is also possible Miles believed that once women began working at the bakery, men might be transferred out to infantry, and therefore less safe, units of the AIF. Just as there is a gender bias in Anzac mythology, wherein the Australian bakers have not exhibited what has been emphasised as 'appropriate masculine behaviour', the issue of female employment within the Calais bakery reveals that Captain Miles did not see their own labour as feminised, and appeared to want women heavily supervised or excluded altogether.\textsuperscript{158}

Interestingly, women were employed at Bakeries North, Rouen, and it appears to have been successful. Ninety ‘bakeresses’ began working at the bakery in early January 1918, and while Captain Pye acknowledged that they ‘certainly relieved the men on such duties’, he stated ‘it [was] too soon to state whether they will be a success working in the Bakery’. He believed the women had to work the duration of the European summer before a ‘definite judgement’ could be made.\textsuperscript{159} In April 1918, Captain Pye noted that ‘Four of these girls’ were packing bread in the storeroom, which relieved two men from such duties.\textsuperscript{160} Women working alongside men are barely mentioned in the 4\textsuperscript{th} or 5\textsuperscript{th} AFB unit diaries, which suggests some possibilities: unlike Calais, where Captain Miles was the officer in charge, the Australian bakeries and their officers were only small spokes in the large wheel of Bakeries North, and therefore

\begin{footnotes}
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were not consulted for their opinions or approval before the employment of women; or the Australian men at Bakeries North were not as defensive as Captain Miles and grasped the opportunity of help from anyone, regardless of gender.

There is nothing in the unit diaries of Captains Miles and Nash to suggest that the new bakery was ever built. The 2nd and 3rd AFBs left Calais for Rouen in August 1918, and the 6th and 7th Imperial Field Bakeries, previously stationed at Rouen, replaced them at Calais. Plans for the new bakery were possibly abandoned due to the anticipated end of the war.

Other responsibilities

The bakeries, particularly the 1AFB while at Lemnos and Imbros, were often required for duties other than baking bread. The range of duties the bakers undertook reveals their expertise in a number of areas, and their willingness to assist where necessary. The duties also suggest that the men were involved in more than just the ‘feminised’ function of baking bread.

While at Lemnos Island and just prior to the first assault on Gallipoli, Captain Prior received orders from headquarters to take over the control of troops at Mudros. He was also to provide all essential police protection and ‘To arrest offenders and preserve law and order’. In May, Prior was requested and therefore complied with allotting some of his men to form a fatigue party to assist the 1st Stationary Hospital pack and embark for Helles. The party also assisted with transport. After the hospital’s return ten days later, some of the men of the bakery again assisted, this time with restoring it to working order. A few days later they helped two Imperial
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stationary hospitals and their equipment ashore and to set them up. They were employed with this for several days. At the same time, the bakery had to offload stores and provisions from barges in the harbour.\textsuperscript{165}

At Imbros Island, Captain Prior, as officer in charge of the Army Service Corps at Kephalos Beach, was required to order provisions for the troops on the island and for those on Gallipoli. After the men on Gallipoli expressed a desire for the opportunity to buy various items, Prior had to arrange the purchases and deliveries of firewood, live sheep and goats, hundreds of dozens of eggs, lime, and tons of charcoal, tinned fruits, biscuits, condiments, potatoes and fresh vegetables.\textsuperscript{166} Prior was also asked to organise as much rum, lime, juice, cigarettes and tobacco as possible for the troops on Gallipoli.\textsuperscript{167} As a café manager before enlistment, the expectation that Prior was competent in these matters is understandable. The bakers were often used as labour to unload these provisions, particularly the firewood.\textsuperscript{168} As well as buying live sheep and goats, one of Prior’s duties was to pay one of the Imbros locals to look after them on the grassy hills.\textsuperscript{169}

On 2 August, Captain Prior was unhappy when headquarters demonstrated the unimportance of ‘the bread supply question’ by taking some of his men to work as labourers on road-making duty on the island.\textsuperscript{170} The Australian and English bakers spent 10 August assisting in taking the wounded from barges and trawlers to the casualty clearing station on the island that was ‘filled to overflowing’. On 11 and 12
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August, they were still occupied with helping bring the wounded from the pier to the hospital.\footnote{ibid, 10-12 August 1915.}

After Armistice, many men enrolled in ‘vocational schemes’ to help them gain employment once back in Australia.\footnote{Kerr, Private Wars, p.242.} In 1919 after the director general of army education made arrangements, Bakeries North at Rouen admitted a number of non-commissioned officers and other ranks who either wanted to commence an apprenticeship in baking, or had begun a baking apprenticeship in Australia that had been interrupted by the war, and wanted to complete their training.\footnote{3AFB: Diary, p.xi; see also Bean, Official History, VI, p.1069.} Only a short while after the plan was instigated, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} AFBs moved to Le Havre, and instruction in baking, therefore, became the responsibility of the 1\textsuperscript{st}, 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} AFBs.

The 3AFB diary states the number of men who availed themselves of this opportunity as 150, and records were found for 108 men.\footnote{3AFB: Diary, p.xi; AWM 9, Control Symbol 69/1, ‘Nominal Roll of NCOs and men attached for “Instruction in Baking”, vide Aust Corps Memo G.116/159 of 29 December 1918’, in 1\textsuperscript{st} Field Bakery/4\textsuperscript{th} Field Bakery Nominal Rolls and Students, 1916-1919. The 3AFB moved from Rouen to Le Havre before nominal rolls for instruction were completed. It is probable Bakeries North was told to expect 150 men and this is what Captain Nash recorded. Only 108, however, eventuated.} There were two courses on offer, named “A” and “B” in the records. Of the 108 men, two never commenced their course, 43 commenced course “A” and 63 commenced course “B”. The records are unclear, but it appears almost 70 per cent completed course “A” and 56 per cent completed course “B”. Greg Kerr states that although all of the vocational schemes met with limited success, they consumed the days waiting to go home and served as ‘unofficial “debriefing” centres for fighters who were expected to simply adapt once they returned to Australia’.\footnote{Kerr, Private Wars, p.242.} Although not explicitly stated in the records, it appears that, regardless of whether a man was involved in either of the two baking courses, once he was next in line for return to Australia, he left the bakery school, rejoined his
battalion, and was on the next ship out. Similarly, if he left the course for health reasons, he did not return to it.176

The call on the bakers to assist with anything that needed doing, including giving instruction in baking and researching other bakeries for mechanisation processes, raises questions about the roles of non-combat support troops. It is clear that the bakers’ responsibilities extended beyond that of baking bread. The bakeries loaded and unloaded, and packed and unpacked their own and other units’ supplies and equipment, carried the wounded from barges to hospital, formed fatigue parties whenever necessary, made roads, preserved law and order, ordered provisions and deliveries for thousands of men, and passed on their specialised skills to others who aspired or intended to utilise those same skills upon their return to Australia.

It could be claimed that the men of the 1AFB at Imbros, by carrying the wounded from barge to hospital, were responsible for saving wounded combatants’ lives. By limiting the time before medical personnel examined the wounded, as well as freeing up the hospital personnel to work directly on injured soldiers, the bakers undoubtedly helped some fighting combatants survive their wounds. Although sometimes ridiculed and dismissed by fighting combatants and General Monash as the work of ‘mediocre men and inefficients’, baking was recognised as a specialised skill that would be a valuable addition to the résumé upon return to Australia.177

It can be argued that the bakers performed a more diverse range of duties, and were more valuable, than they have been given credit.

**Awards and recognition**

The Australian Field Bakeries were mainly overlooked when honours were awarded. There were very few opportunities for ‘pre-eminent gallantry ... cool courage and
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constancy ... [and] fearlessness in the face of danger’ and heroic acts of bravery on the never-ending production line of the bakeries, where loaves were mass-produced, and men performed the same actions day after day and week after week. Consequently, very few bakers received awards, not even those to which some were entitled.

On 7 April 1916 at the Calais shipping dock, Corporal Charles Davies of 2AFB, aged 29 from Glebe in New South Wales, saved two men from drowning. It was a particularly ‘dark and wintry’ night, the water was ‘icy cold’, and the rescue was ‘very dangerous’. Corporal Davies dived, ‘fully dressed’ into the water to save the struggling men, and if not for his actions and courage, both of the men would undoubtedly have drowned. Shortly after, he was awarded the Bronze Medal by the Royal Humane Society for his ‘conspicuous bravery’. Corporal Davies paid a price for his heroism: within ten days of the rescue, and again another four weeks later, he was hospitalised with unnamed illnesses, and was hospitalised on 30 May and again on 12 June with bronchitis. Captain Miles wrote to the 2nd Division AIF Headquarters, highlighting Corporal Davies’s bravery and suggesting they might like to publish the details of the heroic act in the Divisional Orders. There is no mention of this occurring in either Corporal Davies’s dossier or the 2AFB diary.

Captain Prior himself was ‘Mentioned in Despatches’. This award, although not a decoration, was ‘a mention’ in a Commander-in-Chief’s military despatch [which] took the form of a certificate. Captain Prior was mentioned in Sir Douglas Haig’s despatch of 7 November 1917 for:

---

178 Davidson, ‘Foreword’.
180 NAA, B2455, C. Davies; see also ‘War Records’, in 2AFB, p.6.
181 NAA, B2455, C. Davies.
182 Letter from Miles to HQ, 2nd Div. A.I.F., in 2AFB.
Distinguished and Gallant Services and Devotion to duty in the Field during the period Feb.26th to Midnight 20th & 21st Sept. 1917.\(^{184}\)

The ‘Mentioned in Despatches’ honour was announced in the *London Gazette*, and, a few months later, in the *Commonwealth of Australia Gazette*.\(^{185}\) Although there is correspondence missing, a letter from British General Headquarters dated 24 August 1917 to Lieutenant-General Sir W.R. Birdwood, makes it clear that Birdwood had written, requesting some type of official recognition for Captain Prior. This letter states:

> I am entirely in agreement with you as to the excellent work that Major Prior and his men have been doing ... the allotment of rewards of any sort to the Lines of Communication is so meagre that it is difficult to decide as to who should be recommended ... I am bearing in mind the work of the Australian Contingent.\(^{186}\)

Just over two months later, Prior was mentioned in Haig’s despatch. It is clear that Birdwood requested a more prestigious official honour for Prior, because a handwritten note dated 5 March 1918 from British General Headquarters states:

> ... received your letter about Major J.G. Prior. He is an exceedingly good man ... He was “mentioned” in the last Honours Gazette but I was unable to get anything more for him ... You may be sure I shall not forget Major Prior if an opportunity arises.\(^{187}\)

After his ‘Mentioned in Despatches’, John Gregory Prior did not receive any more official recognition or awards.

Warrant Officer George Edwin Allen was Mentioned in Despatches on two separate occasions: the *London Gazette* on 13 July 1916 and 17 June 1918, and the *Commonwealth of Australia Gazette* on 30 November 1916 and 7 November 1918.\(^{188}\)

The recipients of these awards received bronze oak leaves to be worn on their

---


\(^{187}\) Australian War Memorial, Letter from General Headquarters to Lieutenant-General Sir W.R. Birdwood, in *ibid*, 5 March 1918.

\(^{188}\) Australian War Memorial, *Honours and Awards*. 

261
campaign ribbons, and an official certificate. The second of Allen’s Mentioned in Despatches included the award of Meritorious Conduct Medal. This medal was originally awarded to warrant officers and senior non-commissioned officers, but from 1916 was also awarded ‘for acts of gallantry or meritorious conduct when not in the face of the enemy’. The citation accompanying Warrant Officer Allen’s award reads, ‘in recognition of valuable services rendered in the Forces in France during the present war’. With respect to George Allen, the award was one afforded all warrant officers and not of the ‘gallantry or meritorious conduct’ variety. If these medals were awarded for achievement of warrant officer and senior non-commissioned officer status, according to the *Honours and Awards* section of the Australian War Memorial’s website and the ‘Operational Service Awards’ list in Lindsay’s history of the Army Service Corps, at least twenty-five men of the Australian bakeries did not receive their due.

On 1 December 1917, Captain Prior wrote to AIF headquarters requesting acknowledgement by way of honours or awards for members of his bakery. On 8 December Prior received a formal and churlish reply rebuffing his request and suggesting that his recommendations should be made through the proper channels. Captain Prior hand-wrote a note at the bottom of this letter for posterity. It reads:

> With ref to the above, it is needless to add, no honours or awards have yet been made to members of Field Bakeries notwithstanding the fact that Australia’s First Field Bakery has rendered very valuable services, both at the Dardanelles & also in Egypt & France.

---

191 *SAFB: Diary*, 21 June 1918.
193 AWM 4, Control Symbol 25/38/1-20, Letter from Colonel D.A.G. A.I.F. to O.C. 1st Aust. Field Bakery, 8 December 1917; handwritten note by J.G. Prior, 2 January 1918, in *IAFB: Diary*. 
Major-General Cannon acknowledged at a conference in 1945 that very few men or officers from the Army Service Corps had ever been awarded decorations or mentioned in despatches. He argued that it was ‘not due to lack of good service or bravery’. As argued, the fighting combatant had little time for the non-fighting combatant, and neither, apparently, did those at the top of the bureaucratic tree who handed out awards. There is an argument, however, that bureaucrats awarded honours to other bureaucrats.

Captain Eric Isaachsen began with 1AFB in 1914, and was promoted to Honorary Lieutenant officer in charge of 4AFB during the reorganisation of 1916. He enlisted again in 1940 for service in the Second World War, and was assigned to Headquarters Western Command. Captain Isaachsen was named in the King’s Birthday Awards in 1944 and was awarded an Order of the British Empire (OBE) with this citation:

On the outbreak of the present war this officer was one of the first to offer his services … This Officer’s service … has been marked by energy, enthusiasm, efficiency and zeal. His discharge of his duties has at all times been in accordance with the highest traditions.

There is no mention of Isaachsen’s four years of service with the 1st or 4th AFBs in the conferring of his OBE. Isaachsen received his OBE for his administrative services during WWII, when his equally valuable services during the earlier conflict were ignored by those choosing award recipients at that time. The OBE to Captain Isaachsen raises the possibility that his position at headquarters might have influenced the decision.

Only a very few of the bakers received any kind of commendation or recognition, and they were officers rather than other ranks. In the case of Captain
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Prior’s ‘Mentioned in Despatches’, British Headquarters believed that it was through this award that ‘the Officers and Other Ranks serving under him’ received their reward.\textsuperscript{197} This uneven distribution is similar to the 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion where ‘Officers were more likely to gain awards than NCOs, who were, in turn, more likely to win them than private soldiers’.\textsuperscript{198} This indicates that officers, and to a lesser extent non-commissioned officers, had a greater likelihood than other ranks of being the recipients of military decorations, regardless of whether their unit was a fighting or non-fighting one. Some who did not support the system of honours maintained that luck and ‘how well one fitted into the grooves of AIF hierarchy’ were as important to receiving an award as courage.\textsuperscript{199}

The bakeries have received negligible recognition. The officers in charge of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} AFBs advised the Australian Records Office in London that:

The nature of the work performed ... ha[d] been consistently hard since arrival in France, [it did] not vary at all in the daily routine and there [were] no special features in connection with same that would be of any historical value or use in the preparation of War records.\textsuperscript{200}

They also said there was a ‘monotonous regularity of the daily duties’. Captain John Treloar of the Records Section assured them, however, that units such as theirs were invaluable, and that detailed diaries were necessary to afford the bakeries their due recognition within the history of the AIF.\textsuperscript{201} Despite the subsequent enthusiasm with which the bakeries’ officers in charge embraced the request for detailed diaries, machinery, photographs, and souvenirs, there is nothing on display in the public
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galleries of the Australian War Memorial. The War Memorial’s website does, however, embrace the bakers indirectly when it states:

... many other kinds of personnel made up the AIF ... All made crucial and significant contributions to the war effort, and to the importance and quality of Australia’s participation in the First World War.202

This is somewhat indistinguishable, and encompasses a large number of administrative and support troops, but it is, at the least, a slight recognition.

Alex (Alec) William Campbell of the 15th Battalion, landed at Gallipoli in late November 1915, spent a few days there before being hospitalised with influenza. He returned to the campaign on 19 December 1915, the day before the Australians were evacuated. He has achieved great recognition because of his longevity and his outliving every other Gallipoli veteran.203 At Campbell’s state funeral, Prime Minister John Howard bowed to his coffin.204 Alec Campbell was an interesting man. Too young at sixteen for enlistment, his parents reluctantly wrote a letter indicating he had their approval. Following his bout of influenza, he was hospitalised a further four times, the last with ‘right facial paralysis’. His record reveals he was AWOL four times, one of these accompanied by drunkenness. He was returned to Australia in June 1916, and his claim for a pension was rejected because his ‘incapacity [was] not the result of employment in connection with warlike operations’.205

From enlistment to discharge was less than twelve months of Alec Campbell’s life, and the amount of time he spent in ‘warlike operations’ was no more than a few days. Once it was realised the numbers of Gallipoli veterans were dwindling, and ‘these last heroes of our time were not going to be around much longer’, Campbell became
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the ‘property of the nation’ in his old age. Historian Jonathan King acknowledges that Campbell did not want or need the mantle of hero thrust upon him. King states, however, that Campbell’s importance to Australians was only because he was the last representative of those who fought at Gallipoli, and Australians needed the glory of the myth of Anzac. Member of Parliament Joanna Gash asserts that we as Australians are sustained and inspired by the memory and deeds of veterans like Campbell.

Alec Campbell gained a lot of attention during the last years of his life. He was branded and considered a hero although his service was very limited. I do not wish to denigrate Alec Campbell the man, or his service to his country, and, to be fair, I acknowledge that if the last man standing had been a baker with the Australian bakeries, he probably would have been afforded the same status and attention. There is no doubt, however, that Campbell gained attention and recognition that the bakers, even those who worked one long shift virtually every day of every week for four full years, have never been afforded.

Conclusion

Eric Andrews, who examined aspects of the war using a different slant on the topic to historians to that date, and exposed a number of illusions within the Anzac mythology, was still insensitive and dismissive of support troops. He wrote that:

Some had a pleasant war, particularly those in the bases, store depots or lines of communication, and look back on their time in the forces as one of the best in their lives.

As has been argued above, this all-encompassing generalisation is patently incorrect. Just like frontline combatants, some bakers and other support troops were affected for
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the rest of their lives. There is no doubt that those not engaged in frontline duties were considered by some to be a very different breed to the fighting soldiers. With troops passing through the camps on their way to or from the frontlines, such as the 42nd Battalion and Private Schwinghammer (see above), it is only to be expected that some might consider the bakers to be living the easy life. Although opinions of the bread varied, the bakers worked their shifts day in and day out, and took a great deal of pride in their work habits, their superior knowledge of baking and flour, the bread they produced, and their ability to overcome the shortages of supplies that reduced the soldiers’ daily allowance of bread as the war continued. At the same time, they had a need for validation, and recorded visits from prominent people and any favourable comments received with great zeal in the unit diaries. The masculinist myth of Anzac means their role may have been perceived as feminised, but the prospect of women working alongside in one of the bakeries received a subdued response. Although fighting combatants may not have had much respect for their non-fighting counterparts, it was a disregard and despising tinged with envy, as exposed by the rash of applicants when any positions became available. Although the bakers’ duties encompassed more than baking on many occasions, few received awards and recognition for their labour. Any real or imagined ostracism, regardless of its nature, no doubt engendered feelings in the bakers, either during or after the war, of being ignored and unappreciated despite their efforts. Their service has been perceived as unmasculine and unheroic, however if a baker had been the last Anzac to survive, he might have been classified a hero merely because of his longevity.
Chapter 8
Conclusion

When I began studying the five Australian Field Bakeries and the bakers who made up their numbers during World War One, I had pre-determined my conclusion. I recognised they had been omitted from the historiography of the war, and had concluded it was because they were not fighting combatants. I had also concluded that unless the non-fighting combatant was employed in dangerous and demanding activities, their apparent lack of the Anzac characteristics of masculinity and heroism accounted for their exclusion from the historiography. What I had also concluded, however, was that once I scrutinised the bakers, they were going to be dissimilar in every respect to the fighting combatant of the AIF.

I confess that I had never seriously explored and assessed the Anzac legend. This integral part of the Australian identity was so firmly fixed that I accepted most of it without reservation. I certainly knew there had been a mix of men within the ranks of the AIF, but for the main part, I accepted that the Anzacs, those men who gave Australia its place in the world and its ‘baptism of fire’, were the highest quality of men. I knew, because my grandfather was not a tall man, and, after all, he was the impetus behind my study, that once I began exploring the men of the Australian Field Bakeries, I was going to find that they did not measure up to the same high physical standards as the fighting men, and that their experiences, values, and attitudes, and everything else about them, would be diametrically opposite to those of the fighting combatant.

For well over twelve months, I fought with my statistics, trying to find or mould the huge differentiations I expected. I researched, again trying to discover and acquire
the information that would support my expectations. Rather than find a multitude of
differences between the men of the bakeries and the AIF, I found similarity after
similarity. Eventually, I was forced to admit that my pre-determined conclusion was
flawed and that I would have to reconsider.

That the men of the Australian Field Bakeries are so similar in nearly all aspects
to the men of the AIF probably should not have been so surprising. I have had the
photo, which is reproduced on the front page of this study, of some bakers of 2AFB, in
my possession for as long as I can remember. The gathering could be any group of
soldiers. They are not noticeably different in any respect to the men in any other photo
of Australian volunteers taken during the war.

I now, therefore, argue that the demographics of the bakers and the AIF are
analogous in nearly all respects, and dissimilarities can be explained by the nature of
the men’s employment. Their similarities include age, place of birth, and religion –
although slightly less Roman Catholics enlisted in the bakeries than the AIF.
Promotional opportunities in both groups were influenced by occupation, religion, and
height. The majority of both groups enlisted in New South Wales, followed by Victoria.
Heights were similar with around 70 per cent of each group over 5 ft 6 ins. The bakers’
average, however, was slightly shorter. Both groups’ return to Australia was beset with
haphazard arrangements that meant that early enlistment did not necessarily lead to
an early return. The few marked differences, that is, marital status wherein a greater
percentage of the bakers were married than the AIF, occupation at enlistment, which
was less varied in the bakeries, and more age-related returns to Australian as well as
for sickness and wounds in the AIF than the bakeries, can be explained by the nature
of the bakers’ specialised work. The other difference, that of place of enlistment, is
because the bakeries were raised chiefly in New South Wales, only calling on the other
states to meet number quotas.
The men of the AIF and the bakeries were not only similar in demographics, they were also very similar in experiences, values, and attitudes. Both groups were forced into a miscellany of uniforms because of an acute shortage, and all were at risk from enemy shipping while being transported. Both groups included larrikins, some with a 'ruffian element', who constantly disrespected the authority of their leaders with AWOLs, crimes, drunkenness, and outright disobedience. There was no guarantee of good leadership, although the bakers tended to do quite well in that respect with only few instances of unjust or unequal punishment. Both groups were able to demonstrate initiative and resourcefulness if the need arose, even if their solutions to problems were not of particularly high quality. The men shared the same feelings towards people of other nationalities, chiefly towards the Egyptians and the British, the latter of whom they believed to be class-ridden, incompetent and useless, and of inferior physique to themselves. They hated their German enemy and thought him brutal and destructive. Some of those who fought the Germans, however, altered their perceptions and did not feel quite as strongly as those who never went near the frontline. The men also shared a deep need for letters from their families and friends in Australia. It was not only these experiences, values, and attitudes the men shared, but also a number of dangers and deprivations.

It is unnecessary to detail the horrendous circumstances the fighting combatant lived through while at the frontlines, and it could never be claimed that the men of the bakeries suffered anything like these conditions. The bakers’ daily lives, however, still included risks and hardships that might not be expected or identified by frontline troops and administrative officials. Indeed, the bakers experienced some of the same types of dangers and deprivations as the AIF, even if less perilous. The bakers endured regular air raids and aerial attacks throughout their service and at all of their locations. Although none of the Australian bakers lost his life to one of these strikes, it was probably only good fortune, as bakers, labourers, and citizens and soldiers of other
nationalities within the same vicinities were killed. An Australian combatant passing through the Calais camp wrote that the aerial attack he went through at that camp was one of the most terrifying events he had ever experienced. It has been well noted that many of the AIF, including those who were not fighting combatants and did not spend time near the frontlines, suffered with shell shock. Although not specifically noted on the bakers’ casualty and service records, I believe an unknown number were afflicted with the disorder, which was misdiagnosed, undetected, or ignored.

Although the toppling of the top floor of the Calais bakery onto the men below cannot be compared to the severity and frequency of trench collapses, the bakers were very lucky to escape with their lives. Both groups endured cruel weather extremes for which they were, for the most part, unprepared. Some of the bakers at Calais had to sleep in leaking tents, which did not appear to elicit a great deal of sympathy. Many fighting combatants complained about the quantity and quality of the ration, as did the bakers. Those of both groups who complained publicly were punished for suggesting the food was not up to standard or provided in insufficient amounts. Just as the AIF was forced to carry out foolhardy orders from apparently incompetent British officers, so did those at the Calais bakery until the situation was rectified by the master baker’s relocation. Both groups worked long hours without respite.

While the bakers did not experience anything like the casualty rates of the AIF, nearly all men of both groups spent some time in hospital. The bakers do not appear to have been diagnosed with the same array of illnesses and diseases as the AIF, however those illnesses causing the most hospitalisations for the fighting combatant, such as gastric upsets, influenza, and VD, also beset the bakers in large numbers.

Masculinity is one of the two main qualities identified by historians as being characteristic of the Anzac. Alongside my claims of shared demographics, experiences, values and attitudes, one of the main reasons the bakers have been omitted from
Anzac historiography is because the nature of their skilled employment has positioned them, if not necessarily within the woman’s realm, certainly outside the area of masculinity. The bakers did not view their participation in the war in this light. They saw themselves as capable and knowledgeable workers who could overcome all obstacles with shortages and rotten or inferior supplies, able to meet a demand for bread at a moment’s notice. Interestingly, although Bakeries North at Rouen employed women in the last year of the war, Captain Miles at Calais did not warm to the idea when it was mooted for his bakery.

The historiography’s emphasis on thrilling deeds of heroism and the attraction of ascertaining the daring acts behind awards such as the Victoria Cross or the taking of Lone Pine or the town of Chipilly, naturally excludes those who never went near the frontlines. Australians were warned not to judge a returned soldier by the medals on his chest, and the unsubtle sub-text was that those who were non-fighting combatants did not deserve their medals or any resultant admiration from the Australian public. Certainly, fighting combatants, who looked at men such as the bakers with scorn and derision, did not consider the bakers heroes.

Many fighting combatants scorned and despised those whose employment meant they never operated near the frontlines. General John Monash felt compelled to condemn base administrators and men in the ancillary services, and soldiers wrote of the easy and danger-free life of the non-fighting combatant. War historian, C.E.W. Bean, also believed that only the fighters deserved recognition and his volumes set the tone of future Anzac historiography when he made a conscious decision to concentrate on the infantry soldier. Many other historians and writers have suggested that a soldier must place himself at risk, or be able to slaughter the enemy without apprehension, if his contribution is to be acknowledged. Some frontline men invented their own name for the initials A.S.C., this being Army Safety Corps. This scorn was tinged with envy,
however, and men from all units volunteered to increase the bakers’ ranks when positions became available. It is undisputed that the men of the Army Service Corps were aware of their relative safety compared to their fighting comrades. Of those men assigned to the Corps, the bakers were undoubtedly safer than most. It is perhaps this knowledge and a need for validation that brought an entry into the Unit diary whenever a compliment on their operation was communicated to one of the bakeries’ officers in charge.

Most visitors to the bakeries were impressed with the efficiency, work ethic, and bread produced. The Calais bakery seems to have had a constant flow of observers through, and General Birdwood visited the Calais and Rouen bakeries several times, and was very impressed with their operation. Birdwood pressed British General Headquarters for recognition for the bakers through an award to Captain Prior. Although Prior was subsequently mentioned in General Haig’s report, awards to the bakers were not a common occurrence. Whenever there were Australian loaves to be had, however, there was a scramble by Australian officers to ensure their own supply. It was acknowledged that the Australian loaf was of good quality and necessary to the well-being of the AIF.

Within the first few months of the Gallipoli campaign, bread changed from being an item to supplement the soldiers’ ration if possible, to a vital and necessary part of the men’s diet. Medical historian Arthur G. Butler states that the Army Service Corps ‘functioned with extraordinary efficiency’, with the ration, including bread, always ‘fully up to standard’. Despite this praise, there were times when the bread drew complaints because of its quality or quantity, because it was crushed to breadcrumbs by its journey, or because it was frozen solid with the cold. General Birdwood wrote on several occasions that bread was the only item in the ration of

which the men never tired and always asked for more. It is indisputably the nature of
the bakers’ work, regardless of their specialised skill, that has relegated their
contribution to obscurity and omission in the story of Australia.

There is no doubt that the bakers are incompatible with the ‘typical Anzac’, the
‘apophtosis [of which] … has proved endlessly resilient’. ² Dale Blair argues that
Australians continue to be bombarded with ‘serious historical distortions about the
performance of Australian … troops’, and that not all soldiers within the AIF shared the
same experiences and it is unreasonable to expect that they do.³ Just as the men of
the AIF, whether frontline troops or bakers, did not share the same experiences,
neither did they respond similarly to their experiences. Coming from assorted
backgrounds and occupied in so many diverse avenues within the AIF, this is only to
be expected. Variations, however, have been concealed by the ‘homogenising mould’
of the Anzac legend and those who cannot be ‘defined in terms of masculine and
national ideals’ are stifled, ignored, or omitted.⁴

I have to ask myself whether I believe the bakers are heroes. If a soldier has to
save a mate’s life at great risk to his own, or capture a German trench almost single-
handedly, I answer the question with a resounding ‘no’. What then, of a group of
skilled men, some of whom were away from Australia for well over four years? If all
men who volunteered can be considered heroes, particularly now as the few men left
who served on the Western Front pass away, it is for the reader to decide whether the
men of the Australian Field Bakeries can be identified as masculine and labelled heroic.
The bakers produced great quantities of edible bread with rationed ingredients that
were often in short supply and frequently of inferior quality. Whether they are judged
heroic or not, they made an essential contribution to the Australian war effort.

³ Blair, Dinkum Diggers, pp.71-72, 101, 188.
⁴ Audoin-Rouzeau, Men At War, p.12; Thomson, ANZAC Memories, pp.214-216.
Historians such as Alistair Thomson and Jeffrey Grey have identified ‘numerous silences’ in the historiography of World War One, and it is my hope that studies such as this will ‘fill the gaps’.  

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Other Names</th>
<th>Service Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABBOTT</td>
<td>Percival Henry/Albert</td>
<td>8217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKERS</td>
<td>Arthur Herbert</td>
<td>8167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKERS</td>
<td>George Ernest</td>
<td>11456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS</td>
<td>Peter Alexander</td>
<td>5338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHERN</td>
<td>Robert Henry Charles</td>
<td>5339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIKEN</td>
<td>Henry William</td>
<td>10155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBION</td>
<td>Charles Frederick</td>
<td>8136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDRIDGE</td>
<td>Bert Cecil</td>
<td>1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALDRIDGE</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>5031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLAN</td>
<td>James Alexander</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLAN</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>11504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN</td>
<td>George Edwin</td>
<td>5206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOR</td>
<td>Edgar Lawrence</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>11500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW</td>
<td>Victor Harold</td>
<td>10153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREWS</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREWS</td>
<td>Stanley Frederick</td>
<td>8137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSELL</td>
<td>Edward Thomas</td>
<td>3231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>Cecil Livingstone</td>
<td>13765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>Henry Walford</td>
<td>3458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCOTT</td>
<td>Alfred William</td>
<td>5224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATKINSON</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>9421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAILEY</td>
<td>H.W.</td>
<td>4137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAILEY</td>
<td>Walter Edward</td>
<td>6040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAIN</td>
<td>John Bruce</td>
<td>14203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>Bernard Arthur</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>David Arthur</td>
<td>3017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER</td>
<td>Norman Charles</td>
<td>2114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALDOCK</td>
<td>Reginald Henry</td>
<td>12492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALSDON</td>
<td>Frederick William</td>
<td>5269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>3454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBER</td>
<td>Herbert Henry</td>
<td>1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBOUR</td>
<td>William Tair</td>
<td>2373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNES</td>
<td>Charles Ernest</td>
<td>11499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRIE</td>
<td>David William</td>
<td>5205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRON</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>3687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTER</td>
<td>Alfred Beale</td>
<td>12199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTON</td>
<td>Albert George</td>
<td>5262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARTON</td>
<td>John Henry</td>
<td>12902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASS</td>
<td>Oliver William</td>
<td>11496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATES</td>
<td>Raymond John Edward</td>
<td>3015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYLISS</td>
<td>John Kelly</td>
<td>12384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAN</td>
<td>James Harold</td>
<td>2590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEARD</td>
<td>Victor Alexander</td>
<td>12739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAVIS</td>
<td>William Matthew Clifford</td>
<td>3025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECKINSALE</td>
<td>James Alexander</td>
<td>16075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL</td>
<td>Kenneth Cochrane</td>
<td>2335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENDALL</td>
<td>Thomas Noble</td>
<td>11469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENNETT</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENNETT</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>5235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON</td>
<td>Cyril Bernard</td>
<td>12196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERGMAN</td>
<td>Percy Ernest</td>
<td>5827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRYMAN</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>5299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST</td>
<td>Henry (Harry) Howard</td>
<td>14016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETTS</td>
<td>Frederick John</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEWLEY</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>11458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIGGS</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>8256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISHOP</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>2487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISSETT</td>
<td>Norman Harry Anderson</td>
<td>11432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAKE</td>
<td>Tasman Charles</td>
<td>11481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANCH</td>
<td>William John</td>
<td>15290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANCK</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>3025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAG</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>11446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOAG</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>8161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOND</td>
<td>Edward Arthur</td>
<td>4443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOND</td>
<td>Hubert</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOTON</td>
<td>James Trevor</td>
<td>25889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWDEN</td>
<td>Ernest Alfred</td>
<td>11459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWER</td>
<td>Arthur Clifton</td>
<td>3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWLEY</td>
<td>William James</td>
<td>12198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYES</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>4664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOYLE</td>
<td>Isaac Henry</td>
<td>5288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADBURY</td>
<td>George Walter</td>
<td>3013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADD</td>
<td>George Benjamin</td>
<td>3385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADLEY</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>6988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRADLEY</td>
<td>Walter Elgin</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAND</td>
<td>John Samuel</td>
<td>11450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRASHER</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>5244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRATTON</td>
<td>George Charles Stephen</td>
<td>14018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAY</td>
<td>Albert Edward</td>
<td>8228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAYBROOK</td>
<td>Albert John</td>
<td>8164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAYBROOK</td>
<td>Stanley Ernest.</td>
<td>5270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREEN</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>11522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE</td>
<td>Walter Ernest</td>
<td>10438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGGS</td>
<td>Arthur George</td>
<td>10151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRODIE</td>
<td>Charles Stephen</td>
<td>11519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>12204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Alexander Anderson</td>
<td>11442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Charles Henry</td>
<td>13771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Francis Charles</td>
<td>13766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Joseph Edward</td>
<td>11504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Percy</td>
<td>2111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Robert George</td>
<td>12486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Robert John</td>
<td>8138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>W. (see L.K. Podbury)</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>Wallace Charles</td>
<td>8163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN</td>
<td>William Frederick</td>
<td>14019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWNBILL</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>3031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>12491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCHANAN</td>
<td>William James</td>
<td>5240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCKHAM</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>8235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUCKLEY</td>
<td>Roby</td>
<td>8139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULL</td>
<td>William James</td>
<td>15511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLARD</td>
<td>Bertie Harry</td>
<td>1316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLOCK</td>
<td>Henry James</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGOYNE</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURK</td>
<td>William John</td>
<td>11448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNIE</td>
<td>N.E.</td>
<td>3543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNS</td>
<td>Alfred Thomas</td>
<td>14017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNS</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>8218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURRIDGE</td>
<td>George William</td>
<td>3473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSHE</td>
<td>John Joseph</td>
<td>14206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYRNE</td>
<td>Edward Ernest</td>
<td>11457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBOURN</td>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>8169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMOIN</td>
<td>Julius</td>
<td>12489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMP</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>5215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL</td>
<td>Clement Victor</td>
<td>2957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL</td>
<td>William James</td>
<td>3262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANNAN</td>
<td>James Oliver.</td>
<td>2125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>8166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTER</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>7422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTHEW</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH</td>
<td>Cecil John</td>
<td>10157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLE</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>3047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATER</td>
<td>Walter Enos</td>
<td>13767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAFFEY</td>
<td>William Thomas</td>
<td>8219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMBERS</td>
<td>Claude Arthur Coles</td>
<td>5246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMBERS</td>
<td>James Henry</td>
<td>9576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMBERS</td>
<td>William George</td>
<td>8165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPMAN</td>
<td>Thomas Rudolph</td>
<td>5271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPPELL</td>
<td>Francis Ernest</td>
<td>6764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEESEMAN</td>
<td>Arthur William Pierce</td>
<td>5227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHENERY</td>
<td>Charles Henry</td>
<td>5805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERITON</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>7879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDS</td>
<td>Thomas Noel</td>
<td>1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIPPENDALE</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>5826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTEY</td>
<td>Roy</td>
<td>14735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURTON</td>
<td>Clifford Hartley</td>
<td>8140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARK</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>4696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARK</td>
<td>William, AKA William PHILIP</td>
<td>11477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKE</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>5272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKE</td>
<td>William Babington</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARKE</td>
<td>William Pearson</td>
<td>11512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEARY</td>
<td>Henry William</td>
<td>9754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERY</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>3056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIFT</td>
<td>James Henry</td>
<td>2428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COATES</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>11516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLINSON</td>
<td>Leslie William Robert</td>
<td>3061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLINS</td>
<td>Henry Herbert</td>
<td>12730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLINS</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBES</td>
<td>Charles Victor</td>
<td>2594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOK</td>
<td>George William</td>
<td>5208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOK</td>
<td>William Marshall</td>
<td>5301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COONEY</td>
<td>John Joseph</td>
<td>7637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORKER</td>
<td>Maurice Henry</td>
<td>4760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORLETT</td>
<td>Robert Douglas</td>
<td>2531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSGROVE</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>12323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COWELL</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COWLING</td>
<td>Theodore Herbert</td>
<td>3262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COX</td>
<td>Alfred Percy</td>
<td>12706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COX</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>12322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COX</td>
<td>George Rupert</td>
<td>5076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAWFORD</td>
<td>Arthur Douglas</td>
<td>11509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAWLEY</td>
<td>Richard Henry</td>
<td>4378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREIGHTON</td>
<td>Clarence A.</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREW</td>
<td>Valentine Frederick Thomas</td>
<td>5273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROMBIE</td>
<td>James McClure Bradley</td>
<td>12197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROOK</td>
<td>Vivian Ebenezer</td>
<td>60419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSS</td>
<td>Alfred Christopher</td>
<td>5230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMBERLAND</td>
<td>Henry Joseph</td>
<td>5814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUMBERLAND</td>
<td>James Hande</td>
<td>11460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNNINGHAM</td>
<td>Abraham Joseph</td>
<td>8170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNNINGHAM</td>
<td>Francis George</td>
<td>8168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTMORE</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>4643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAINER</td>
<td>Edward Sylvester</td>
<td>2604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALLMAN</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>11510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANN</td>
<td>Joseph Henry</td>
<td>11455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARBYSHIRE</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>2056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARNELL</td>
<td>Ernest George</td>
<td>11493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIES</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>8172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIES</td>
<td>David John</td>
<td>8173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIES</td>
<td>Jabez Frank</td>
<td>2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAWSON</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>5274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>12203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENISON</td>
<td>William Joseph</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFEY</td>
<td>Thomas Edward</td>
<td>8239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DINE</td>
<td>Bertie Edward</td>
<td>12893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIXON</td>
<td>Arthur Cyril</td>
<td>8259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOBBS</td>
<td>Leonard Kelso</td>
<td>8174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAILLE</td>
<td>Fred Fox</td>
<td>4022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONKIN</td>
<td>Robert Henry</td>
<td>7876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONOHUE</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>10432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>30708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWDSWELL</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>3032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWLING</td>
<td>John William</td>
<td>1733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWN</td>
<td>Charles William</td>
<td>14021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWNES</td>
<td>Edgar Cecil</td>
<td>15510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOWNES</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>11505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOYLE</td>
<td>Charles Andrew</td>
<td>2296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAPER</td>
<td>William John</td>
<td>8229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRURY</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>10431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUGGAN</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>11454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNSTER</td>
<td>Archibald Ernest</td>
<td>8141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURAND</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>8171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWYER</td>
<td>William James</td>
<td>12484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYSON</td>
<td>Gordon James</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>8257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EATON</td>
<td>Ronald Lyle</td>
<td>15509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGAR</td>
<td>Leslie Andrew</td>
<td>8223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS</td>
<td>Charles Paul</td>
<td>5586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARDS</td>
<td>George Gibbons</td>
<td>8258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGGINS</td>
<td>Leslie Gormley</td>
<td>2309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGGLETON</td>
<td>George Edward</td>
<td>4415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGOROFF</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>2808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIOTT</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>10158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIOTT</td>
<td>Thomas Job Mills</td>
<td>2628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPHICK</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>1634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>James Herbert</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTON</td>
<td>Charles William</td>
<td>2483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYLES</td>
<td>Leslie William</td>
<td>15513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYRE</td>
<td>Charles Vincent</td>
<td>5217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAGAN</td>
<td>Richard Edward</td>
<td>2826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARNHAM</td>
<td>Walter John Singleton</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARRELL</td>
<td>Arthur Ernest</td>
<td>2811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARRELL</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>2812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAULKNER</td>
<td>George William</td>
<td>3346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERGUSON</td>
<td>James Alexander</td>
<td>11478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERN</td>
<td>Edward Leslie</td>
<td>12324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDLAY</td>
<td>John Alexander</td>
<td>3104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINN</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>5388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISKEN</td>
<td>Donald Blair</td>
<td>2235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZPATRICK</td>
<td>Robert Joseph</td>
<td>9424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZPATRICK</td>
<td>William Clifton</td>
<td>9579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLETCHER</td>
<td>Cecil Palmer</td>
<td>11837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLETCHER</td>
<td>Frederick Theodore</td>
<td>5302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLINN</td>
<td>Robert McMillan Forsyth</td>
<td>1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOYD</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>14020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLYNN</td>
<td>Henry Edward</td>
<td>5225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOTE</td>
<td>Edward Jackson</td>
<td>3301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORBES</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>5238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORSYTH</td>
<td>Allan Herbert</td>
<td>2522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORSYTH</td>
<td>James McMillan</td>
<td>9893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOULDS</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>11436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>2677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td>Sydney Bertram</td>
<td>7421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCISCO</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>5243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK</td>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRASER</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>4692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREAK</td>
<td>William Clem</td>
<td>3696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROST</td>
<td>Oscar Norman</td>
<td>2822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULTON</td>
<td>David Russell</td>
<td>2587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAFFEY</td>
<td>Edward Bath</td>
<td>8175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALLAGHER</td>
<td>Patrick James</td>
<td>3493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMBRILL</td>
<td>Walter Stanley</td>
<td>14739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARDNER</td>
<td>Charles Alfred George</td>
<td>12325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARTRELL</td>
<td>Leslie Norman</td>
<td>11498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARTRELL</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>5581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE</td>
<td>Henry Lionel</td>
<td>4198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHERASHE</td>
<td>Albert James</td>
<td>8224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBB</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILDEA</td>
<td>James Albert</td>
<td>5266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILL</td>
<td>Richard Job</td>
<td>5275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILL</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>8142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLESPIE</td>
<td>William John</td>
<td>12488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILLIES</td>
<td>William Edmund</td>
<td>11517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILSON</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>2417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOARD</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>11494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GODBER</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>8233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GODFREY</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>8176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GODSELL</td>
<td>John Joseph</td>
<td>6867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLBY</td>
<td>Albert French</td>
<td>11453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODE</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>11515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODMAN</td>
<td>William Alfred</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODWIN</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOQUE</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>11480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GORDON</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>5250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOULD</td>
<td>John Stanley</td>
<td>12894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAHAM</td>
<td>William Allan</td>
<td>4741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT</td>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>8260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Alfred Herbert</td>
<td>11490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREY</td>
<td>Fairman Ashby</td>
<td>16079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRICE</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>9751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFIN/GRIFFEN</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>8143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFITHS</td>
<td>Arthur Evan</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROOM</td>
<td>Valentine Patrick</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL</td>
<td>Frederick John</td>
<td>8624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td>5276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL</td>
<td>Ralph Henry</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL</td>
<td>Samuel James</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALL</td>
<td>William Edward</td>
<td>4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALSTEAD</td>
<td>Aleck</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMMOND a.k.a. WATSON</td>
<td>Thomas Edward</td>
<td>3538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANKIN</td>
<td>Frederick Alexander</td>
<td>8182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANLEY</td>
<td>Hubert</td>
<td>11461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANLEY</td>
<td>John Thomas</td>
<td>11452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANLON</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>9894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANSEN</td>
<td>Herbert Thomas</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARFORD</td>
<td>Horace Walter</td>
<td>5214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARPER</td>
<td>David Leslie</td>
<td>11487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARPER</td>
<td>Herbert Lewis</td>
<td>11488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARPER</td>
<td>Hugh Samuel</td>
<td>11443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIS</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>12731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIS</td>
<td>George Alexander</td>
<td>5221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRISON</td>
<td>Albert Edward</td>
<td>11462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>Allan</td>
<td>5289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARVEY</td>
<td>Edwin Norman</td>
<td>50067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HASSETT</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>5290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWKINGS</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>5242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAY</td>
<td>Charles Clement</td>
<td>11489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYWARD</td>
<td>Cornelius William</td>
<td>8144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZELL</td>
<td>Charles Edward</td>
<td>2680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIL</td>
<td>Leo Harry</td>
<td>8178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDERSON</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>5218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENNESSY</td>
<td>John Joseph</td>
<td>12895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERAN</td>
<td>Lee Leslie</td>
<td>9422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESKETH</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>12897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEWITT</td>
<td>Samuel Henry</td>
<td>8179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIATT</td>
<td>Joseph Henry</td>
<td>1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HICKS</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>3355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HICKS</td>
<td>Francis John</td>
<td>5291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGGINSON</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>5294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILL</td>
<td>Arthur Roland</td>
<td>6125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILL</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>3533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HILL</td>
<td>William Walter</td>
<td>11521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOGG</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>11438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLDEN</td>
<td>Edward Noel</td>
<td>4145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLDEN</td>
<td>Thomas Forrest</td>
<td>4146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOKE</td>
<td>Alan George William</td>
<td>11513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOKE</td>
<td>Sydney Levion</td>
<td>7131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOPER</td>
<td>Edmund Harold</td>
<td>8181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORAN</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>8177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORSLEY</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>4526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>5584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWROYD</td>
<td>Walter Robert</td>
<td>5598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUDSON</td>
<td>George Harry</td>
<td>5219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUGHES</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>8180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMPHREY</td>
<td>Stanley Gordon</td>
<td>3553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMPHRIES</td>
<td>Frederick George</td>
<td>14202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>Richard Wilfred Douglas</td>
<td>12896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDE</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>5253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYNDMAN</td>
<td>Thomas James</td>
<td>11503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNES</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>13762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRVING</td>
<td>James Dixon</td>
<td>8184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAACHSEN</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>5204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACOBS</td>
<td>Hubert Roy F.</td>
<td>4715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td>Harry Basil</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARVIS</td>
<td>William Alfred</td>
<td>2121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENKINSON</td>
<td>Harold Sydney</td>
<td>3821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNINGS</td>
<td>Charles Arthur</td>
<td>11495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBSON</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>3823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>Edgar Cecil</td>
<td>8261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>Norman Eustrom</td>
<td>3708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSTON</td>
<td>Alfred Alexander</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES</td>
<td>Albert Bert</td>
<td>2151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES</td>
<td>Arthur Allen</td>
<td>2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES</td>
<td>Bert William</td>
<td>3153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES</td>
<td>Percy James</td>
<td>1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONES</td>
<td>Turon</td>
<td>11463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOYCE</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>5255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDELL</td>
<td>Cedric</td>
<td>2392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE</td>
<td>Arthur Joseph</td>
<td>5211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUKES</td>
<td>Walter John</td>
<td>15512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEAN</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEATING</td>
<td>George Francis</td>
<td>6520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLAND</td>
<td>William Claude.</td>
<td>4316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLER</td>
<td>Maxamillian</td>
<td>5247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNY</td>
<td>John James</td>
<td>2686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENNY</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>7723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEOGH</td>
<td>Raymond Joseph Ross</td>
<td>11464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMMINCE</td>
<td>Russell William</td>
<td>12331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING</td>
<td>Allan Stanley</td>
<td>13764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING</td>
<td>Bernard Albert</td>
<td>11433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>5277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING</td>
<td>Horace Hurst</td>
<td>12487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING</td>
<td>Robert George</td>
<td>3785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KING</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>5234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNIGHT</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNIGHT</td>
<td>Reginald Harry</td>
<td>8145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAING</td>
<td>Thomas James</td>
<td>8185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMB</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>5239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMB</td>
<td>Walter Hamilton</td>
<td>8230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMKIN</td>
<td>Roy Mervyn</td>
<td>13763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMOND</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>8187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGLEY</td>
<td>Harold Ernest G.</td>
<td>2388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARACEY/LARACY</td>
<td>Edward Joseph</td>
<td>3820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARKIN</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>14741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARKIN</td>
<td>John Thomas</td>
<td>8186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARTER</td>
<td>Frederick Charles</td>
<td>5642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>5209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWES</td>
<td>Bertie James</td>
<td>11483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEANE</td>
<td>William Arthur</td>
<td>8189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>Benjamin Joseph</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>Frederick James</td>
<td>5241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>John Thomas</td>
<td>12485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEET</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>11520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEHMANN</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>5263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE</td>
<td>Alick</td>
<td>14209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDSAY</td>
<td>Charles Edward</td>
<td>5278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDSAY</td>
<td>Frank Alexander</td>
<td>8188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOADER</td>
<td>Harold Gordon</td>
<td>3721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOADER</td>
<td>Reginald William</td>
<td>3722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCKE</td>
<td>Frederick William</td>
<td>15083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>Joseph Alfred</td>
<td>5383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG</td>
<td>Reginald John</td>
<td>11435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGSTAFF</td>
<td>George Richard</td>
<td>3374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTHIAN</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>14208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUGHMAN</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>11482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOVELL</td>
<td>Bruce Hilton</td>
<td>2128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>Frederick Ernest</td>
<td>14579/14597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWDON</td>
<td>William Roy</td>
<td>10433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUDLOW</td>
<td>Thomas H.</td>
<td>5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNDIN</td>
<td>Frederick Albert</td>
<td>11437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKAY</td>
<td>Charles Findlay</td>
<td>11514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE</td>
<td>Leslie Keith</td>
<td>12335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKIE</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>11468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANN</td>
<td>Percy Reginald</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANN</td>
<td>William George</td>
<td>5254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANNERING</td>
<td>Claude</td>
<td>8226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHALL</td>
<td>Joseph William</td>
<td>5707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHALL</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>5279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN</td>
<td>William Charles</td>
<td>10152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASON</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>4371/4301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATHIESON</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>11472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTHEWS</td>
<td>Stanley Edgar</td>
<td>8234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCALPINE</td>
<td>Thomas Montgomery</td>
<td>3094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCBRIDE</td>
<td>John Hugh</td>
<td>14911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCAFFRAY</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>15084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDERMOTT</td>
<td>John C</td>
<td>8236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDONALD</td>
<td>Archibald</td>
<td>5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDONALD</td>
<td>Harry.</td>
<td>3177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDONALD</td>
<td>John James</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCEWAN</td>
<td>Louis Noel</td>
<td>11110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGILLIVRAY</td>
<td>Archibald</td>
<td>8190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGILLIVRAY</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGILLIVRAY</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGOVERN</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGOWAN</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGREGOR</td>
<td>Arthur Ernest</td>
<td>10156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGREGOR</td>
<td>Gregor</td>
<td>8792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCINERNEY</td>
<td>Sylvester George</td>
<td>11491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCINTOSH</td>
<td>John H.</td>
<td>12736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKAY</td>
<td>Henry Douglas</td>
<td>5258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEE</td>
<td>James William</td>
<td>7132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEE</td>
<td>Thomas Henry</td>
<td>7277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKENZIE</td>
<td>James Lawrence</td>
<td>3826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLEAN</td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>8241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLEAN</td>
<td>Thomas Swan</td>
<td>11486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCLEAN</td>
<td>William C.</td>
<td>5292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCMICHAEL</td>
<td>Robert Henry</td>
<td>5261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCNEILL</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>10434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSHANE</td>
<td>Herbert Henry</td>
<td>14210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCWHIRTER</td>
<td>Herman William</td>
<td>4261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCWHIRTER</td>
<td>Robert Richard Leslie</td>
<td>4265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAKINS</td>
<td>Edward James</td>
<td>2240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEALMAKER</td>
<td>Harold James</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERSKY</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>8146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILES</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILES</td>
<td>Herbert William</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLAR</td>
<td>John Charles</td>
<td>8220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLER</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>16081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILNER</td>
<td>Ernest William</td>
<td>5280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINARDS</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>9578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
<td>Charles Samuel</td>
<td>11466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>7639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONKS</td>
<td>Tasman John</td>
<td>5220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEITH</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>11451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORE</td>
<td>Cecil Herbert</td>
<td>11470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOORHOUSE</td>
<td>Stephen Arthur</td>
<td>11440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRISON</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORTIMER</td>
<td>Percy Gordon</td>
<td>7878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSELEY</td>
<td>Robert Redfern</td>
<td>2720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSES</td>
<td>Harry Ernest</td>
<td>7438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSS</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>1573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOYLE</td>
<td>Charles Percival</td>
<td>3176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULHEARNE</td>
<td>John Joseph</td>
<td>14211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULLIGAN</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>3847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULLINS</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>11465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURRAY</td>
<td>Raymond McLeod</td>
<td>8231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSTON</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>12737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPIER</td>
<td>George Ernest</td>
<td>8191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASH</td>
<td>Robert Bernard</td>
<td>11467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASH</td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYLOR</td>
<td>Victor Alexander</td>
<td>11444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIL</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>10437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWBERRY</td>
<td>Ernest Arthur</td>
<td>5267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWMAN</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>2622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWS</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>14013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWTON</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOBLE</td>
<td>John Darwell</td>
<td>12735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMAND</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>3099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTON</td>
<td>William Lauder</td>
<td>5281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKES</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>10435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKES</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>8194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'BRIEN</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>6987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'CALLAGHAN</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>3161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'HAGAN</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>5672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'RAFFERTY</td>
<td>John Thomas</td>
<td>13768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR</td>
<td>John Alexander</td>
<td>8192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBORN</td>
<td>Cromwell Rapston</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBORNE</td>
<td>Edward Vivian R.</td>
<td>9688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBOURNE</td>
<td>George Forbes</td>
<td>4243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'SULLIVAN</td>
<td>Patrick Peter</td>
<td>6682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTTO</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>7638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERGARD</td>
<td>Peter Maurice</td>
<td>5293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>684/664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALME</td>
<td>Richard Reuben</td>
<td>8195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>8147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALMER</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>5295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>John Cornelius</td>
<td>6547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKER</td>
<td>Gervis Henry</td>
<td>5231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKER</td>
<td>Wilfred Combs</td>
<td>11449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARR</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>8262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRIS</td>
<td>Henry Douglas</td>
<td>3311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATON</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td>12202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATTERSON/PATERSON</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>9591/2891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARCE</td>
<td>William John</td>
<td>15514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDDEY</td>
<td>Reginald E.</td>
<td>5229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDDIE</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>9577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEGLAR</td>
<td>Leonard William</td>
<td>4247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERKINS</td>
<td>Norman Roy</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRING</td>
<td>George Cornelius</td>
<td>5663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETERS</td>
<td>Raymond Harry</td>
<td>5228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETTIT</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>5222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILP</td>
<td>William Stanton</td>
<td>5922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE</td>
<td>Arthur Robert</td>
<td>5264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITT</td>
<td>Leslie Samuel W.</td>
<td>3212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITT</td>
<td>Robert Sheldon</td>
<td>7877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLLARD</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>3882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLLOCK</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>5296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTER</td>
<td>Isaac Leonard</td>
<td>14014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTTER</td>
<td>Edward Samuel</td>
<td>5216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWELL</td>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>11511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESTON</td>
<td>George Frederick</td>
<td>14204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIOR</td>
<td>John Gregory</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRUDENCE</td>
<td>Peter George</td>
<td>5223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUGH</td>
<td>Joseph Percy</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULLMAN</td>
<td>Ernest George</td>
<td>3617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCELL</td>
<td>Alfred William</td>
<td>12898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURCHASE/PURCHASES</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>4575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURSE</td>
<td>William Harold</td>
<td>2752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUTNEY</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>2861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PYE</td>
<td>Joseph Henry</td>
<td>5201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUICK</td>
<td>Harold Nicholas James</td>
<td>8216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUILLIAM</td>
<td>Frederick James</td>
<td>8196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADONICH</td>
<td>Albert George</td>
<td>5256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAND</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>8198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READFORD</td>
<td>Ray Harold</td>
<td>9423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REID</td>
<td>Archibald Henry</td>
<td>4589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REID</td>
<td>Bertie Norman</td>
<td>8197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REILLY</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>11518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICE</td>
<td>Daniel Matthew</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICE</td>
<td>Robert George</td>
<td>2358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDSON</td>
<td>Edward Fowler</td>
<td>8263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARDSON</td>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>11434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICKSON</td>
<td>Albert George</td>
<td>8352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RILEY</td>
<td>Walter Henry</td>
<td>5232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RITCHIE</td>
<td>Alexander James</td>
<td>8221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIX</td>
<td>Frederick Edgar John</td>
<td>9753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTS</td>
<td>Bertie William</td>
<td>12738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
<td>Albert George</td>
<td>3161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
<td>Alfred Thomas</td>
<td>11479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROPER</td>
<td>Herbert Lewis</td>
<td>4769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSE</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>5237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSS</td>
<td>Walter Keech</td>
<td>7276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWAN</td>
<td>George William</td>
<td>9892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWAN</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>9891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWE</td>
<td>Albert Victor</td>
<td>2988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROXBURGH</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>3513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSELL</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>8148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUSSEN</td>
<td>Harold Edward</td>
<td>5265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDERS</td>
<td>John Henry</td>
<td>12327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDILANDS</td>
<td>Richard James Honeyman</td>
<td>13770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCANLAN</td>
<td>John Patrick</td>
<td>8222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHULTZ</td>
<td>Albert Henry G.</td>
<td>4285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHWEIKHERT</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>4230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHWIND</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT</td>
<td>Joseph William Arthur Lawrence</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>11439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEARLES</td>
<td>Cornelius James</td>
<td>11507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELLEY</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>12733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWELL</td>
<td>William Allen</td>
<td>7636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWELL</td>
<td>William Charles</td>
<td>5282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWELL</td>
<td>William Irvine</td>
<td>5212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAW</td>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>8238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEA</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>3583/5583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEEDY</td>
<td>Patrick Francis</td>
<td>3451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIERLAW</td>
<td>William Alexander</td>
<td>5268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOEBRIDGE</td>
<td>Richard James</td>
<td>12328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOESMITH</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>14740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOESMITH</td>
<td>Richard George</td>
<td>11475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHORT</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>2446/3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHORTT</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>2446/3247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBBALD</td>
<td>William Thomas</td>
<td>12329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGGERS</td>
<td>Edgar Selwyn</td>
<td>8162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>Joseph Frederick</td>
<td>8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINCLAIR</td>
<td>James Robertson</td>
<td>1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEGGS</td>
<td>Thomas Jesse</td>
<td>5431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKINNER</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>12201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>David A.</td>
<td>1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>Bernard Henry</td>
<td>15515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>Frederick John</td>
<td>11431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>4539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>5207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>Nathaniel Chappell</td>
<td>4610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>Percy</td>
<td>12899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>3929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>Stanley Gordon</td>
<td>8227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARROW</td>
<td>Charles James</td>
<td>11485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENCER</td>
<td>Charles (Jr)</td>
<td>8183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENCER</td>
<td>Charles (Sr)</td>
<td>8264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANTON</td>
<td>Lionel Sumpton</td>
<td>5233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARK</td>
<td>John Hamilton</td>
<td>12900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STENTIFORD</td>
<td>Harry Hayward</td>
<td>13769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHENS</td>
<td>John Grey</td>
<td>2898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS</td>
<td>J.W.</td>
<td>15801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>2439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENSON</td>
<td>William Clarence</td>
<td>5297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENTON</td>
<td>Harold Edward</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART</td>
<td>Charles William</td>
<td>5236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>5202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWART</td>
<td>William Anthony</td>
<td>12200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRACHAN</td>
<td>William Christie</td>
<td>5252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATTON</td>
<td>Henry Edmond</td>
<td>8193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYLES</td>
<td>Thomas Henry</td>
<td>4777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STYMAN</td>
<td>Walter Edgar</td>
<td>5283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUGGATE</td>
<td>Albert Horace</td>
<td>2936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULLIVAN</td>
<td>William James</td>
<td>11492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTTON</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>12493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAN</td>
<td>John Whiteford</td>
<td>11501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWANSON</td>
<td>James Hamilton</td>
<td>3501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWANSTON</td>
<td>John Carl</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIT</td>
<td>Lawrence Peter</td>
<td>5259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>8203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELFORD</td>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>5249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY</td>
<td>Stanley Francis</td>
<td>6363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TETLOW</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIEBOT</td>
<td>John Thomas</td>
<td>5284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>Alaric Craic Davidson</td>
<td>3623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>Percy</td>
<td>3512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON</td>
<td>Albert Clarke</td>
<td>11471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON</td>
<td>Cecil Edward</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMPSON</td>
<td>John Ross</td>
<td>12178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THORNE</td>
<td>John Frederick</td>
<td>2826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THORNE</td>
<td>Sydney Edwin</td>
<td>8199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREADINGHAM</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIPPETT</td>
<td>Frederick Charles</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIPPETT</td>
<td>Peter Norman</td>
<td>5666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TISHER</td>
<td>Harold William</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TISHER</td>
<td>Richard William</td>
<td>2497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOBIN</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TODD</td>
<td>David Norman</td>
<td>8265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMLINSON</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>8149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWNSEND</td>
<td>Frank McPhail</td>
<td>3482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREGONNING</td>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>5285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRESIDER/TRESSIDER</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>2810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUDGEON</td>
<td>Edward Albert</td>
<td>11441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUCKER</td>
<td>Leonard Cecil</td>
<td>4894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUDOR</td>
<td>Christopher W.</td>
<td>4320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>8240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNIDGE</td>
<td>Arthur James</td>
<td>11445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYRRELL</td>
<td>Bertie Victor</td>
<td>5695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDELL</td>
<td>George Marshall</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALE</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>5257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANZETTA</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>6964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICCARS</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>2652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINALL</td>
<td>Frederick Thomas</td>
<td>7724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINNICOMBE</td>
<td>Walter George</td>
<td>8202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGSCHALL</td>
<td>Charles Robert</td>
<td>11497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIT</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>5248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALDEN</td>
<td>Herbert Long</td>
<td>8204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER</td>
<td>William Wallace</td>
<td>8206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALLACE</td>
<td>Vernon Samuel</td>
<td>5260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALLS</td>
<td>Frank Reginald</td>
<td>3634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTON</td>
<td>Joseph James</td>
<td>8237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>George Alfred</td>
<td>3931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARE</td>
<td>Alfred Joseph</td>
<td>10436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARE</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>3522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASSON</td>
<td>John Samuel</td>
<td>11502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTLE</td>
<td>Edward Gillie</td>
<td>5203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATKINS</td>
<td>Herbert Elizah</td>
<td>8232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATKINS</td>
<td>Leslie James T.</td>
<td>4295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATSON</td>
<td>Robert Lynsay</td>
<td>8266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATTERS</td>
<td>Bertie Glamwell</td>
<td>4360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATTERSON</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATTS</td>
<td>Amos Bernard</td>
<td>8205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATTS</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>2882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBB</td>
<td>Walter James</td>
<td>8225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEISE</td>
<td>Heinrich Carl Gustav</td>
<td>5213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WERNER</td>
<td>Charles Frederick</td>
<td>1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESSLER</td>
<td>Kenneth Henry</td>
<td>12901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEELER</td>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td>11447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEELER</td>
<td>Stanley Cecil</td>
<td>11474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHIGHT</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>5226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHIGHT</td>
<td>Sydney Harold</td>
<td>8267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>6866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>4371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>John [Brush Horace Reginald]</td>
<td>2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>Sydney Pleno</td>
<td>3638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITSON</td>
<td>Alexander Douglas</td>
<td>5251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHYLEY</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>11508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILKIE</td>
<td>William John</td>
<td>11484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILKINSON</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>5287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Alfred Wright</td>
<td>14015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
<td>Clarence Vacey</td>
<td>11473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>5298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
<td>William Arthur</td>
<td>6849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAMSON</td>
<td>Albert William Montgomery</td>
<td>8150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>OTHER NAMES</td>
<td>SERVICE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSON</td>
<td>Albert Cyril</td>
<td>8268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>Sydney Ernest</td>
<td>5915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODWARD</td>
<td>Francis James</td>
<td>15516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOLRIDGE</td>
<td>Arthur William</td>
<td>14205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORRALL</td>
<td>Philip Hurst</td>
<td>5286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRENCH</td>
<td>Frederick William</td>
<td>12490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIGHT</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>12734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIGHT</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>12732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG</td>
<td>Charles Edward</td>
<td>8269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG</td>
<td>Ernest Walter</td>
<td>11476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNG</td>
<td>Henry George</td>
<td>2451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS

Australian War Memorial, Canberra

Australian Imperial Force unit war diaries
4. Control Symbol 25/38/1-20. 1st Australian Field Bakery.
4. Control Symbol 25/41/1-29. 4th Australian Field Bakery.

Unit embarkation nominal rolls

Unit roll books

Australian Imperial Force Depots in the United Kingdom Headquarters

Australian War Records Section files and register of file titles
16. Control Symbol 4379/15/27. 2nd Australian Field Bakery.
16. Control Symbol 4386/28/2. 2nd Field Bakery.

Records of the Assistant Provost Marshal


Written records


25. Control Symbol 351/13. [Food] 5 gallon and 4 gallon types of containers, report by Captain H.W. Murray on food received in front line, note by Colonel Butler. 1916.

25. Control Symbol 367/159. [Gallipoli] Returns showing details and totals of 4 days reserve rations issued from "B" Depot on 18-19 July 1915 to various units (Brighton Beach, Gallipoli). 1915.


25. Control Symbol 829/20. Notes and correspondence on rations during operations. Statements of details that would be left behind in case of an advance. Supplies and water held in: a) supporting points, b) for troops in front line, c) other reserves, special "X" rations during emergency. 1915-1918. 1915 – 1918.


25. Control Symbol 829/29. Memorandums and correspondence regarding ration allowance for staff. Ration scale per head per diem. Diets for patients. Ration costs at No 1 Auxiliary Hospital. Also Army Council instructions regarding rations of civilian staffs of Military and War Hospitals in poor law institutions and asylums and civilian employees in Military Hospitals generally, 1917. 1917.

25. Control Symbol 829/34. Correspondence regarding the issue and custody of iron and reserves of rations. The iron rations on the man. 1916-1917. 1916 – 1917.


25. Control Symbol 829/41. [Rations] Notification of supplies lost through exigencies of active service, 1918. 1918.


25. Control Symbol 829/54. [Rations] Correspondence and statements regarding feeding strength of Australian Corps troops, July 1918. List of units, men rationed, animals rationed at "A", "B" and "C" dumps also at Boulainville and Salonel dumps. No 6 Australian MT Company (Corps troops) 1918. 1918.


Operations files


Records arranged according to AWM Library subject classification


**Official History, 1914-18 War: Records of C.E.W. Bean, Official Historian**


**Official History, 1914-18 War: Records of A.G. Butler, Historian of Australian Army Medical Services**


**Honours and Rewards**


**Unit manuscript histories**


224. Control Symbol MSS246. 3rd Australian Field Bakery: History from formation to 13 Oct 1917. 1917.


**Private Records**


National Archives of Australia, Canberra


P1868/1. T3128. WWI War Gratuity File: J.J. Gallagher.

SP 1092/1. Bundle 22. No. 41. 2nd Field Bakery & Butchery. Nominal Roll.

SP 1092/1. Bundle 22. No. 42. 2nd Field Bakery & Butchery. Nominal Roll.

SP 1092/1. Bundle 22. No. 43. 2nd Field Bakery & Butchery. Nominal Roll.

National Archives of Australia, Melbourne


State Library, Melbourne, Victoria

MS 9605/74 Mills, Reginald A. Letters.

MS 9839 Buesst, Tristan. War Diary of Tristan Buesst France and Flanders September 1916 – March 1918.


MS 10485 Blundell, Martin Petrie. Diary.

MS 10705 Packe, Edward, Pte. Diary.

PRIVATE COLLECTION

Set of thirty-one postcards from Thomas James Hyndman to his wife, daughter Gracie, and son Reg. Dated from 22 September 1916 to 1 June 1918. In the private collection of Dr John Moremon. Department of Veterans’ Affairs. Canberra.
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