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1. Introduction

“Centuries before Europeans first set foot on the continent we now call Australia, the Greeks, the Arabs, the Chinese and the Indians had elaborate ideas about a land somewhere south of Java. These ideas were the product of imagination rather than experience” (White 1981:1).

“This is the land of dreaming, a land of wide horizons and secret places” (Perkins 2013:16).

Numerous representations of Australia have centred on the bush and the white Anglo-Saxon man as the ideal Australian. However, these representations appear vulnerable upon inspection. For example, simply looking at the confusion and division over the beginnings of this so-called Anglo-Saxon nation exposes the fragility of the entire construction. Did this Australia ‘begin’ when Captain Cook ‘discovered’ the Eastern coast of Australia in 1770 or should it be traced back to the arrival of the First Fleet in 1788 or even the act of federation in 1901? And if the nation is claimed to have begun with the first stomp of a European boot upon the continent then why not trace its birth back to William Dampier who travelled there in 1688? Perhaps his disappointment upon finding neither gold nor spices, and his description of the local inhabitants as “the miserablest [sic] people in the world” (Dampier 1698:463) has a part to play.

There is, in fact, a constant struggle over the dominant form of representation in the discursive realm—what Bell calls the ‘national mythscape’ in his article “Mythscapes: memory, mythology, and national identity”. Bell defines the national mythscape as “the discursive realm, constructed by and through temporal and spatial dimensions, in which the myths of the nation are forged, transmitted, reconstructed and negotiated constantly” (2003:75). As national identity is involved in questions of power, politics and a raft of other themes and topics it is a subject that is often manipulated and constructed.

This way of selectively choosing what represents a nation’s identity is not applicable to Australia alone. Stuart Hall writes that questions of identity are always questions of
representation, invention and the “silencing of something in order to allow someone else to speak” (1995:5). For more than a century it was claimed that Australia was an Anglo-Saxon nation, which resulted in those who would claim it is in fact Aboriginal and Torres-Strait Islander being entirely left out of the conversation. Likewise, those who travelled from Greece, Italy and China, to name a few, and made critical contributions to the nation were silenced, forgotten and pushed to the margins of society. Hall’s claim of representation being a dialectical process that forgot at the same time as it remembered and spoke at the same time as it silenced could be a fitting summary for the near 200 years that followed the arrival of Europeans, a time that included the White Australia policy, which intentionally favoured immigration from ‘white’ countries, as well as horrific discrimination against Australian Aborigines.

This thesis spawned from my being born in Australia and my interest in what some of the most common Australian myths are. After conducting a survey on the most important aspects of Australian identity, Tranter and Donoghue write of “the salience of three historical categories […] - bushrangers, Anzacs and sporting heroes” (2007:170). My thesis will focus on Ned Kelly—a 19th century Australian outlaw—the Anzacs\(^1\) and sport, and what is similar in each of the myths.

The first section of my thesis will define the central theoretical terms that my work is built upon. Chapter 2 will look at how Barthes defines myth and its ability to make connotative terms appear denotative as it transforms the constructed into the natural. Chapter 3 will define the exact forms of violence that will be applied in this thesis and chapter 4 will examine national identity, golden ages and beliefs in a sacred land, the role nationalism plays and the struggle for cultural hegemony. The over-arching argument will be that myths attempt to fix national identity and make it appear natural and eternal.

\(^1\) Anzac refers to the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps that was formed in the First World War.
The remaining sections in my thesis will look at practical examples of the theoretical terms already mentioned. Chapter 5 looks at dominant representations of Australian identity including the depiction of violent men in the bush as ideal Australians and the marked absence of women and non-whites. Chapter 6 examines the Anzac myth and the continuation of the idea that ‘true Australians’ can be found in the bush as well as the significance of Australia’s actions in World War I. Chapter 7 will look at Ned Kelly and the similarities he has with the bushman and Anzac ideal. It will also examine the changing attitude towards Kelly that can be found in paintings such as Sidney Nolan’s iconic *Ned Kelly Series* (1946) as can be seen in Figure 1, literature such as Peter Carey’s *True History of the Kelly Gang* (2001) and film.

*Figure 1* Ned Kelly by Sidney Nolan
Finally, chapter 8 analyses sport and the presence of the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths on the sporting field as well as the role sanctioned violence plays in the construction and expectations of how an ideal Australia sportsman should act.

In this thesis I argue that the violence that is present in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths is part of the creation of a ‘masculine’ identity, one that is often found either battling the natural elements of Australia, striving to overcome sporting difficulty or injustice, or even fighting distant wars in the defence of empire, freedom or the Australian way of life. This particular ‘masculine’ identity is often in states of flux, often unclear and therefore required to be constantly redefined and represented, and often used in struggles of politics and power.

What makes the violence being dealt with in this thesis—whether that be violence in the terms of military might, violence committed by an outlaw against the police or violence upon the sporting field—of particular interest is that in the Australian mythscape it is violence that is presented in a positive light. It is the accompanying part of the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths that often goes unnoticed, unanalysed, natural and accepted as truth. It is an assumption that the true Australian essence can be found in men that are linked with the bush and violence, and there is a marked similarity in the representations of ideal Australians in each of the three myths I examine.

This thesis asks how it is that war, banditry and rule breaking in sport can be applauded—so much so that the annual Anzac day dawn service that takes place on the shores of Gallipoli is probably one of the most sacred events in the Australian calendar, Ned Kelly is seen as a folk hero despite killing several men and robbing many others, and wild brawls in games of football are expected and encouraged. The thesis also asks what part violence plays towards the construction of a particular dominant form of Australian identity.
2. Myths: Naturalizing the Artificial

“Myth does not deny things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it purifies them, it makes them innocent, it gives them a natural and eternal justification, it gives them a clarity which is not that of an explanation but that of a statement of fact” (Barthes, 1972:143).

In the following chapter I will explain the relevance of myth to my work and how Roland Barthes, in particular, describes the term. I will comment on myth’s ability to make us understand cultural texts while imposing a meaning upon us, and its manipulative function as it transforms history into nature.

Barthes’ concept of myth builds upon the idea in semiology that a sign is made up of a signifier (the material form) and signified (the mental concept). While the sign is the result of the association between concept and form, myth turns the sign into a mere signifier (Ibid. 113). For example, a slouch hat, as depicted in Figure 2, is simply a particular form of head covering, and yet for Australians it is imbued with notions of the heroic bravery of the Anzacs, of Australianess, of the Battle of Gallipoli etc. because of the role myth plays in the nation.

A shared cultural code is one of the most important aspects of myths. Myth’s ability to be appropriated by only a certain group of readers (Ibid. 118) is due to the level of connotation that it exists upon. The readers must form similar associations with certain symbols in order for the myth to function. To continue with the previous example, a slouch hat to a person who has never heard of the Anzacs is merely a peculiar style of head covering. It holds no connections to Australian identity, masculinity, military or heroism that many Australians may associate it with and which can be seen in Figure 2.

---

2 Barthes writes that, in language, there is a proportionate ratio between the volume of the signified and the signifier, while myth can spread over a large expanse of signifiers (1972:119).
The three myths that I will be analysing in my thesis all draw upon historical figures and attempt to attach characteristics that appear natural and eternal. These myths copy each other in an attempt to link a certain version of Australian history to the present day. In the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths, ideal Australians are depicted as masculine, physically superior and violent. The essential Australian spirit that is described in each myth forms a chain of signifiers that spans hundreds of years. As can be seen in Figure 3, footballers today often run onto the sporting field through banners honouring fallen soldiers. Figure 3 can be read as the attempt to build a connection between the Anzacs and today’s rugby league players. Barthes described this action as one of the core characteristics of myth—that they involve a tireless attempt to have people recognize themselves in the myth’s image and that, although the myth includes dates, the myth appears as eternal (Ibid. 156). Australia, according to these myths, is symbolized in these references to past myths and these myths demand that people emulate them in contemporary society in order to live up to this idealisation.
Barthes wrote that myths can be read as either retrospective historical forms or in a manner that traces “yesterday’s myths down to their present forms” (Ibid. 137). This is what I will do in my thesis as I trace a myth of Australian identity that starts with the early European settlers to the role they play in present day society. Myths have a profound effect on history, transforming it into nature (Ibid. 128) and replacing its own characteristics with those promoted by the myth. For example, the characteristics of the Anzacs become distilled, the story of Ned Kelly becomes simplified and the actual thoughts and motivations of Ned Kelly and the Anzacs are replaced with the message carried in the myth. Myth puts the numerous details attached to Ned Kelly and the Anzacs at a distance and turns them into figures that support the myth in contemporary society. Barthes describes this as myth’s ability to turn historically figures into “speaking corpses” (Ibid. 132). Ned Kelly and the original Anzacs, though long dead, are constantly brought up in myth.
Myth can be thought of as a system of communication rather than an object or idea (Ibid. 107). This enables everything to be labelled as a myth, not only oral speech, but also, photography, cinema, sport and shows (Ibid. 108). The actual figures and symbols in the Ned Kelly, Anzac and sporting myths are important for this thesis, but perhaps more so is how the discourse is carried out about them.

Another characteristic of myth is its flexibility due to it always being a signifier that is descriptive and imaginary, arbitrary and natural at the same time (Ibid. 121-122). Myths are based upon history and are yet shapeless associations that are often unstable (Ibid. 118). For example, the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths have changed over time and still remain as prominent in Australian culture as ever. These two myths have changed due to historical context, political necessity and the demands of the myth producers and readers. Each year brings forth another ‘authentic’ account of what really began the story of Anzac. This ‘authentic’ capturing of the true meaning of the myth will then be torn down and replaced with another myth, as this thesis will reveal in later chapters. It is the very openness and flexibility of myths that enables them to be reinterpreted and live on.

In summary it can be said that myths have a commanding power, not only being subject to the interests of groups, but also having itself a force that changes the perspective of realities and enflames emotions (Kapferer 1988:47). According to Barthes, myths are constantly involved in a game of hide-and-seek between meaning and form (1972:117). An example of this can be seen when considering that the Anzacs were a mixed group of Australians from all different parts of the country and with all different cultural backgrounds and yet the Anzac myth constantly attempts to deny this and impose a white normative identity. This attempt is carried over into the Ned Kelly and sporting myths in order to form a single narrative of history that is simplified and natural. It attempts to say that the first settlers of Australia were white, masculine, physically superior and violent, and this idealised version of Australian identity continued to appear in the guise of the Anzacs, Ned Kelly and in sport.
2.1 Mythscapes

Not only do myths play upon connotations that are constantly in flux, but myths are also involved with ideas of national identity. In many cases, for example, when an Australian sees a slouched hat, or bites into a hard-as-a-brick Anzac biscuit or hears the word Gallipoli there is not only the cultural repertoire that was mentioned in the previous chapter being drawn upon but also notions of what it is to be Australian. Bell writes of the importance of personal and collective identity and how membership of a particular nation creates a powerful sense of belonging as well as, when such national identity is recognized, being necessary for the “formation of the inside/outside, self/other, us/them boundaries that define the topography of nationalist sentiment and rhetoric” (2003:64). The terms slouch hat, Anzac biscuit and Gallipoli are all parts of a myth that is proclaimed as eternal, true and unquestionably part of Australian identity. They are items that belong to ‘us’ and not to ‘them’, despite the fact that several other nations participated in the Gallipoli campaign, ate hard biscuits during the First World War and wore hats similar to the slouched hat of the Australian military.

Bell defines a nationalist myth as “a story that simplifies, dramatizes and selectively narrates the story of a nation’s past and its place in the world” (Ibid. 75). However, we also have to be careful when discussing concepts such as a governing myth of a nation, which should always be seen in the context of relations of power and not reduced to a singular, essentialist identity (Ibid. 73). For example, although the Anzac and Gallipoli myth is a powerful symbol for Australian identity, it should not be forgotten that it is contested by a variety of subaltern myths such as class, age, race and gender.

---

3 These three items are, in order, the typical hat worn by the Australian army (as seen in Figure 2), a popular biscuit that is supposed to resemble the hard consistency of military rations in World War I, and the famous battle that took place from 1915 – 1916 and supposedly gave birth to the Anzac legend.
An example of a contested governing myth of Australia is the so-called history wars over how the British settling of Australia and its early history afterward should be treated. From one perspective, the British settlement is depicted as being fairly bloodless and militarily unopposed by the original Aboriginal inhabitants while the other side claims that it was a form of invasion tantamount to genocide. Renowned Australian historian Geoffrey Blainey said in a speech given in 1993 that:

To some extent my generation was reared on the ‘three cheers’ view of history. This patriotic view of our past had a long run. It saw Australian history as largely a success. […] There is a rival view, which I call the ‘black armband’ view of history. In recent years it has assailed the generally optimistic view of Australian history (Blainey qtd. in Warhaft 2004:268).

Prime Minister John Howard⁴, whose government held office for 11 years from 1996 – 2007, took up the term ‘black armband’ and made it commonly known via constant references in the media. The term was used to attack the ‘navel gazing’ of the left-wing opposition and to support a resurgence of nationalistic feeling and subsequent military actions in Iraq, Afghanistan and East Timor. Later, governments would contest this view of Australia, proving that, if myth can be considered as discourse, it is always contested and unstable.

The constant contest between conflicting myths is fought upon a discursive realm Bell refers to as “the mythscape.” Bell describes the mythscape as:

The temporally and spatially extended discursive realm wherein the struggle for control of people’s memories and the formation of nationalist myths is debated, contested and subverted incessantly. The mythscape is the page upon which the multiple and often conflicting nationalist narratives are (re) written; it is the perpetually mutating repository for the representation of the past for the purposes of the present (2003:75).

The three myths that this thesis analyses are just a few of many myths of Australian identity, although they are perhaps the most dominant ones as they represent the most powerful members of Australian society—white men with British backgrounds. Once control

---

⁴ John Howard headed a centre-right party and was the second longest serving Prime Minister in Australian history. He took power after 13 years of left-wing government that addressed issues of multiculturalism, Aboriginal rights and took a critical view of the European settlement of Australia.
of the mythscape has been won, the dominant myth subsumes other types that do not fit and supports power structures within the nation (Ibid. 76). For example, the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths that I analyse leave out Aboriginal and other non-white citizens as well as women and, instead, focus merely on the assumption that Australian began with male British pioneers. The three myths attempt to link successive generations of Australians to these white men who supposedly built the country from nothing. They then attempt to use this representation of the past as an example to be emulated by the present, and by doing so solidify their own position within the nation’s power structures.

### 3. Violence Defined

“For the world did not change, this violence had always existed and would never be eradicated, men would die under the boot and fists and horror of other men until the end of time, and all human history was a history of violence” (Flanagan 2014:295).

There is a large amount of violence included in the myths that make up the cultural pillars of dominant Australian identity. This violence often goes unnoticed or is a key tool in the political strategies of politicians, the identity politics of art and the nation or tactics employed by sporting teams.

This chapter will define what is actually meant by violence, in particular the types of violence that are alluded to in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sporting myths.

Violence has often been linked to masculinity, sometimes even claiming an essentialist, genetic-based source of behaviour (Cf. Wrangham & Peterson 1996). Such work that compares primate to human behaviour and identifies rape, murder and genocide as necessarily male assumes a predisposition towards violence based on an essentialist idea of
gender. Steven Pinker even goes so far to suggest that the problem is simply too many males, writing:

From the time they are boys, males play more violently than females, fantasize more about violence, consume more violent entertainment, commit the lion’s share of violent crimes, take more delight in punishment and revenge, take more foolish risks in aggressive attacks, vote for more warlike policies and leaders. And plan and carry out almost all wars and genocides (Pinker 2011: 684).

The weakness of this form of argument is that it ignores the fact that women for much of history have been denied positions of power that would make possible such decisions that Pinker accuses only males of making. Of course males have voted and planned the most wars throughout history when 50% of the population were denied the right to vote or lead. The other fundamental error is in making the essentialist claim that males are all the same and their violence derives from a biological commonality. Where violence and masculinity is mentioned in this thesis it is done based on the idea that gender is a social construction.

As this thesis deals with myths it also incorporates the many forms of representation that violence appears in. The representation of violence has also been a major area of study together with ideas of imitation and moral dissolution ranging from Aristotle’s theory of catharsis that suggested a release of violent energies through the powers of theatre to the ‘hypothermic needle model’ that claimed that watching violent television breaks the audience’s inhibitions and makes them susceptible to committing crime (Csaszi 2008:3). However, the focus of this thesis is not upon the reception of violence, but more on the myths themselves. Naturally, here there is the danger of attempting to second-guess a true meaning of each myth, but this thesis will more concentrate on the changing form of the myths themselves rather than try to find a solitary truth in each one.

In “What Violence is”, Newton Garver first differentiates between violence and force, claiming the latter is used in acts of rescue and surgery while violence is “much more closely connected with the idea of violation” (1968:817). Moving forward from the understanding of violence as amounting to the violation of the rights of one’s body, their autonomy and their
property as an extension of their person, violence can be divided into four distinct forms—overt personal, covert personal, overt institutional and covert institutional (Ibid. 818).

An example of personal violence is a physical assault on the body—an attack on a human body that is clearly an attack on a person without that person’s consent (Ibid.). Clear examples of overt personal violence would be rape, mugging and murder with more unclear examples being police arrests and corporal punishment by parents. For the purposes of this thesis, overt personal violence would be a fitting description for how Ned Kelly robbed banks and shot police in the 19th century as well as many cases of violence in sport. The way the growing myths in both of these cases have dealt with the issue of overt personal violence will be dealt with in their relevant chapters. However, what is clear is that physical attacks on other people took place in Ned Kelly’s life and on the sporting field.

Overt institutional violence deals with war, both international and civil, as well as capital punishment and riots. The Anzac myth finds much of its foundation and determining characteristics in this type of institutional violence, a form of violence that is directed not at the bodies of individuals but rather an organized force dubbed ‘the enemy’.

Covert violence is often harder to detect than the obvious overt types. Examples of covert personal violence would be psychological abuse—a violation of their autonomy. Often the difference between overt and covert personal violence is the threat. In covert violence the person under threat—do so or I will harm you in some way—is not physically attacked but, instead, sustains an attack upon their dignity (Ibid. 819-821). The chapter on sporting myths will deal with many cases of overt and covert personal violence. Threats and verbal abuse are a common feature of sport, used to either intimidate the opposing side or even to encourage members of the abuser’s own team.

Finally, covert institutional violence is a form of violence often perpetuated by the state. Example of this kind of violence would be racism, slavery and colonial oppression. The everyday violence of the ghetto, for example, is one that requires little overt violence, but
instead systematically denies the options and autonomy of large segments of society. It is the routine oppression that goes on, largely unnoticed, everyday (Ibid. 821). Although this form of covert violence is not explicitly visible in the three myths this thesis will examine, it does play a part in the background that influences these myths.

Australia’s long policy of institutional racism included the early claims of *terra nullius* or ‘nobody’s land’ that claimed legal right to a land that had never been subject to sovereignty of any state. The term was used by British settlers in their claim over the Australian continent, completely dismissing the over 40,000 years of Aboriginal settlement and entitled rights. Additionally, there was the white Australia policy that restricted immigration to white Europeans and legitimized discrimination against others. These forms of institutional racism have had a significant influence on the way the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths have developed as well as why they play such a central role in Australian society.

In summary, it can be said that violence in this thesis can be defined as violations of a person’s body, autonomy and property. The myths that this thesis will examine deal with slightly different forms of violence in each case: the Anzac myth deals with forms of overt institutional violence i.e., war, that also involves a setting that is covertly violent, the Ned Kelly myth deals with cases of overt personal violence such as murder and assault while sporting myths involve both overt and covert forms of personal violence, namely brutal attacks and verbal abuse.
4. What is a Nation?

“Thus I am driven to the conclusion that no ‘scientific definition’ of a nation can be devised; yet the phenomenon has existed and exists. All that I can find to say is that a nation exists when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation, or behave as if they formed one” (Seton-Watson 1977:5).

As this thesis examines the positive representation of violence as part of creating a certain type of myth that is also claimed to be representative of the nation, it is necessary to next turn to how we think of the nation and cultural identity. The nation, as mentioned in the quote above, is difficult to define. Anthony Smith attempts to do so by writing of the nation as “a named human population with shared myths and memories occupying a historic territory or homeland, and possessing a common public culture, a single unified economy and common legal rights and duties [emphasis in original]”(Smith 1996:581).

The nation, most commonly traced back to the French Revolution, is often based upon the grouping together of large amounts of people over large distances. This grouping of people makes use of group symbols and a national history that is based on a selective remembering or myth. The Anzacs, Ned Kelly and sport are common symbols associated with Australia and, as this thesis attempts to investigate, they each carry a myth of national history and identity. It is important to note, therefore, that the nation does not only encompass physical features such as land and people, but also, and perhaps more importantly, the ideas of the nation that are in peoples’ heads.

Benedict Anderson writes in Imagined Communities that the nation is an imagined political community because “the members of even the smallest nations will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their community” (1991:6). Despite these vast distances the inhabitants of a nation claim membership of a unique national community that offers something in common. The national identity of these members is formed discursively via politicians, intellectuals, the
mass media, education, militarization and sporting events that reify certain beliefs and convictions (Cillia 1999:153).

A sense of community stretches over large distances and yet is limited. The imagined community has boundaries that differentiate it from other outside nations, and claims sovereignty over only a certain part of humanity rather than all of humankind as, for example, many religions attempt to do (Anderson 1991:7). This imagined community not only claims membership between certain people, but also often to a certain language, to a certain leader, an imagined history and a specific territory.

Of importance here is the notion of difference. Seyla Benhabib writes, “identity politics is always and necessarily a politics of the creation of difference” (1996:5). This attempt at distancing the nation from foreigners is always offset by the reality that national identity is never one and eternal, but is, instead, “dynamic, fragile, ‘vulnerable’ and often incoherent” (Cillia 1999:154). Myths of national identity are, therefore, often repeated in an attempt to make them appear natural and set in stone. The myths that this thesis examines are examples of particular ideas of what the Australian nation is.

The origins of nations and nationalism rose out of a time when fractures in key pillars of culture were beginning to show, namely: that certain written languages offered access to truth, that society was centred around people such as monarchs who ruled by divine rule, and finally the idea that the origins of the world and men were one and the same (Anderson 1991:36). This idea may be hard to understand in some parts of contemporary society, which seem to assume that every person has a nationality, always has had a nationality and always will—an essential feature of every human.

Indeed, the origins of nations have been long argued over. Anthony Smith writes of four basic theories: nationalist theories that believe nations have existed as long as humans have existed, perennialist theories that propose that nation forms have changed over time but the identity of a nation is unchanging, modernist theories that claim that nations are entirely
modern and socially constructed, and post-modern theories that agree that nations are the product of modern cultural conditions but also argues that nationalist leaders select, invent and mix traditions from the past to justify their actions now (1995:18-19).

Expanding upon this idea of the nation, Stuart Hall writes that, “national identities are not things we are born with, but are formed and transformed within and in relation to representation [emphasis in original]” (Hall 1996:612). People are part of as well as creators of this community, so by saying that a person has a nationality is, perhaps, putting the cart before the horse. Instead, it can be considered that nationalities have people. A nation is not only to be considered as an artificial construction, but also as a structure that creates meanings itself as it is itself representative. Stuart Hall considers this meaning-producing nation to be a “system of cultural representation [emphasis in original]” (Ibid.). These representations, therefore, are much the same as the nations themselves—imagined communities that change over time and attempt to find similarity between different people with different backgrounds in different areas.

4.1 Nationalism: My Country Right or Wrong

Part of the driving force behind the Anzac, Ned Kelly and many of the Australian sporting myths is nationalism. If we can define nationalism as an “ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity and identity for a human population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential ‘nation’” (Smith 1996:578), then we can see its attempt to create cultural distinctiveness in its relations to other nations. This notion of nationhood and identity is shaped in relation to an Other and thereby creates such phenomena as ‘ways of life’, ‘us’ and ‘them’ (Clarke 2008:510). For example, Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths in Australia have involved a common attempt to differentiate the
nation from Britain. Despite strong political, economic and demographic ties these myths attempt to paint the British military as inferior to the Australian, the police (as representatives of the crown) as oppressive towards Ned Kelly, and Australian sportsmen as natural talents from the bush who are athletically superior in comparison to the British.

The differentiation between ‘us’ and ‘them’ not only occurs between nations, but internally as well as it continues the process of exclusion. Exclusion is common practice in nations, often pushing Aborigines, women and foreigners out of the political and public sphere (Calhoun 1994:311). Whenever a nation claims to be a certain people they will leave out many, and be defined by the very otherness of those they exclude because ‘Othering’ is always narcissistic in character. For example, by saying the Aborigines are uncivilised the white Europeans inferred that they were civilized. The Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths all involve Australians who are white, either Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Celtic and male.

The idea behind national myths such as Anzac and Ned Kelly is that it is ‘our’ (Australia’s) myth—a story that can only occur in Australia and has at its heart an essentialist quality. This requires, in many cases, a forgetting of history that may challenge or influence the myth. For example, the Ned Kelly myth is built upon a long history of British outlaw tales that include the Robin Hood myth. Ned Kelly’s actions, and the myth that developed after he died, were heavily influenced by what was expected of an outlaw e.g. that he treated women well, only robbed from the rich and had a justification for his violence. Likewise, the Anzac myth has become one mainly focused on white Australians from the bush although many more soldiers from other countries participated and many Anzacs actually came from the city (“Fact or Fiction: 5 common” 2015).

It is also important not to simply brand nationalism with a negative association. Nationalism can be a force for good as Anderson writes:

In an age when it is common for progressive, cosmopolitan intellectuals (particularly in Europe?) to insist on the near-pathological character of nationalism, its roots in fear and hatred of the Other, and its affinities with racism, it is useful to remind ourselves
that nations inspire love, and often profoundly self-sacrificing love. The cultural products of nationalism—poetry, prose fiction, music, plastic arts—show this love very clearly in thousands of different forms and styles (1991: 141)

To ignore these positive aspects of nationalism when analysing myths such as the Anzacs, Ned Kelly and sporting myths would be to ignore the great sacrifices made by soldiers in the defence of Papua New Guinea and Australia as well as the struggle of resistance against police oppression in 19th century Victoria and the inspirational success of players on the sporting field.

Perhaps the most significant part of the nationalist ideal of history is the concept of a ‘golden age’. This golden age is purported to be a time of virtue, heroism, beauty, learning, power and wealth, dignity and prestige (Smith 1996:583). The idea of golden age seems to be common for almost every nation on Earth, with slight variations on why it is a golden age, for example, it being a time of religious saints, great works of art, new legal codes or military power.

Anthony Smith writes that the golden age is not only a form of sickly sweet reminiscing back to the ‘good old days’, but provides a norm for the present day community that defines what the community is and what it is not (Ibid. 584). This phenomenon can be seen in many countries including Australia as politicians attempt to push through their ideas of how a nation should be by promising not so much a return to this golden age as a recreation of it in the modern day.

Concurrent with this idea of recreating the golden age is the idea that things currently are in decline. The golden age myth often begins from a time of desperate nothingness, a sense of the nation becoming lost and leaving its supposedly historical path towards greatness. Thus, the call for renewal not only shapes and forms a hagiographic version of the past, but also criticises the present and promises that the sons and daughters of these great ancestors have the ability to change things as was done in the past (Ibid.). Naturally, the politician has multiple benefits from this representation of the past as they can demand greater and greater
sacrifices that match the hardships that the nation’s forefathers went through in order to recreate the golden age. Examples of this can be seen when Australia participated in the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Upon leaving, Prime Minister Howard told the soldiers of the importance of the ‘Anzac spirit’, and visits to the troops by politicians often took place on Anzac Day.

Not only does nationalism claim sovereignty over the past in the form of a glorified golden age, it also often includes the idea of a sacred land. A specific geographical area is claimed to have particular connection with a group of people and past experiences that often include origin, liberation, settlement and golden ages. The sacred land is claimed to be a unique setting for events that moulded the nation, to have influenced the events themselves and, finally, to be the resting place for the forefathers and foremothers of the nation (Ibid. 589). An example of this would be Gallipoli, which was where the Anzacs first fought and has since become a highly valued symbol of Australian identity, for many a sacred land, and an annual destination for backpackers and politicians who wish to take part in the dawn service on Anzac Day each year on 25 April.

What is perhaps of particular interest for what can be called post-colonial nations is the influence not only of the actual land the nation claims sovereignty over, but also of the land of the former colonizing power. For example, Britain has considerable influence on Australian nationalism. Australia, being a fairly young nation if we trace its birth to 1788, is in a rather unique position of claiming golden ages and sacred lands despite its relatively short history. This historical disadvantage may explain the rather extreme nationalism that is at times visible in Australia and the positive representation of violence that accompanies its myths. Anthony Smith writes that such new nations may find themselves lacking in terms of ethno-symbolic resources and “may seek to compensate for these deficiencies by a more
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5 By post-colonial I refer to nations such as Australia and New Zealand that were founded by Great Britain in the late 18th century.
violent display of territorial attachments and the rediscovery, even invention, of a suitable ethno-history” (Ibid. 592).

The insecurity of history in a nation leads it to seek identity based upon some common form of origin or characteristics or ideal that is shared between its people. However, it should not be assumed that this will ever be a completed process that fits completely. Instead, as identity is constructed inside discourse it is always in a process of change and always characterised by over-determination, lack and articulation (Hall 1996:16-17). The representation of what a nation is appears always in change, always subject to the push and pull of historical negotiation. This identity then gives a certain sense of security, functioning as a “temporary point of attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us” (Ibid. 19). Thus, when many Australians bite into an Anzac biscuit they call up all the articulated cultural connections that accompany it including, but not limited to: patriotism, the military, war, masculinity, family and childhood.

However, the idea of identity should not be approached without caution. Stuart Hall writes in “Cultural Identity and Diaspora” of the importance of context, place, time, history and specific culture when it comes to cultural identity and describes two ways of thinking about it:

The first position defines ‘cultural identity’ in terms of one shared culture, a sort of collective ‘one true self’, hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed ‘selves’, which people with a shared history and ancestry have in common […] Cultural identity in this second sense, is a matter of ‘becoming’ as well as of ‘being’. It belongs to the future as much as the past […] Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power (1990:223-225).

In summary, it can be said that national identity is a site of continual ideological and discursive conflict as it legitimizes the views and actions of certain actors. Just as myths are constantly fighting for dominance in the discursive realm of the mythscape, so is national
identity constantly fragile and unstable. The Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sporting myths have changed over the years and so has the idea of what and who an Australian is.

4.2 National Myths Today: Struggling for Cultural Hegemony

Stuart Hall highlights a struggle over cultural hegemony that is waged significantly in popular culture. This struggle is, according to Hall, never about pure victory or domination, but is more of a constantly shifting balance in the relations of culture—an area that is marked by the struggles and politics of difference, the production of new identities and new appearances on the political and cultural stage (Hall 1992:467-468). The changing Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths that are constantly reproduced can be seen as a part of this struggle for cultural hegemony. For example, the idea of who Australians are has changed greatly over time. Ned Kelly was seen by a part of society at the time of his death as a murderer. Since then, the Ned Kelly myth has depicted him as a ‘true’ Australian who could survive in the bush better than the city police and fought for justice. Likewise, the Anzac myth has changed from one of loyal soldiers serving the British Empire to a myth of national origin that depicts Gallipoli as the birthplace of the Anzac spirit, as a site where Australia discovered what its ‘authentic’ identity was.

The question of who Australians are has often been in reference to Britain. From the beginning of European settlement until the 1970s, Australia was dominated by the White Australia Policy that attempted to only allow immigration from Western Europe (preferably from the United Kingdom). The White Australia Policy was replaced in 1973 with a multicultural focus that encouraged immigration from neighbouring Asia. This change, plus the increasing criticism of British military mistakes at Gallipoli and the surrender of Singapore in the Second World War that led to the imprisonment of thousands of Australians in Japanese death camps caused Australia to distance itself from Britain. In the 1990s the Keating
government looked towards Asia for its economic future after Britain, likewise, turned towards Europe.

Due to national identities being discursively constructed there cannot be a single natural identity and it cannot be stable and immutable. This instability is even more present in contemporary society as the world becomes smaller, communication becomes easier and faster, and globalization continues its march forward. This insecurity over identity put together with the complexities of global life seems to be feeding a need for the ‘rediscovery’ of the past and a return to patriotic feelings (Cillia 1999:170). This insecurity is nothing new—back in 1996 Stuart Hall was calling this phenomenon a ‘crisis of identity’ as old identities that stabilized the social world had been replaced with a fragmented subject that is no longer unified and by doing so is “undermining the frameworks which gave individuals stable anchorage in the social world” (Hall 1996:596). Not only are the changes important to note here, but also their speed as well. Traditional societies hold the past in high esteem, in a sense drawing a long thread that connects the many generations of the nation’s inhabitants and gives a sense of security in its continuity. On the other hand, modern societies are characterized by rapid and extensive change as a result of confrontation with information from different parts of the globe, often spawning new institutions that have no link to the past (Giddens 1990:37-38). In this highly volatile world it can be easy to understand why some people may find a sense of stability and long-term assurance to be lacking. As global marketing of styles, places and images becomes even more common in social life, identities become detached from specific histories and places (Hall 1996:622). For example, the idea of the self-made individual who is able to bring himself up by his boot straps on the frontiers of civilization can be found just as easily in Australia as in the United States of America. The identity is, in fact, not restricted to those two countries, but is up for grabs for any person in a supermarket of cultural homogenization (Ibid.).
The desire to return to a golden age is often manipulated for commercial and political means. Take, for example, the Anzac myth and its ability to legitimize violence (in this case overt institutional violence). Following a referendum over independence in East Timor, Indonesian militias attacked pro-independence East Timorese. In response, Australia sent military troops into the country to ensure security and stability. The Howard government and Australian media emphasised a link to the Anzac tradition of brave soldiers going off to fight as a basis for national pride (Pickering 2001:56). Criticising the military action would be, to some, a criticism of the Anzacs and, indirectly, of Australian identity, itself. Also, sporting events that take place on Anzac Day, such as the annual AFL game between Essendon and Collingwood, make large sums of money from record attendance levels and merchandising such as the framed picture featuring Anzacs and football players in Figure 4.

Figure 4 Anzac Day AFL Game Memorabilia
While it can be said that globalisation has ploughed the Australian cultural landscape with corporate logos, products and American television series this would ignore the fact that Australia has always been dominated by English games of cricket, American-influenced music and the Westminster political system. From the very beginning of the European colonization of Australia the nation has been subject to global forces that are not always negative, but are, in fact essential for its survival, whether that be economic, artistic or demographic. As Pickering writes in “Globalisation: A Threat to Australian Culture”:

Australian culture is not simply being towed down a one-way street to the global junkyard. Globalisation and national culture are involved in a two-way process where one frequently reinforces the other, whether through the hybridisation of popular culture or the promotion of human rights (Ibid. 57).

For a long time it has been common to say that globalization will lead to the end of the nation in economic, cultural and social terms. The idea is that globalization i.e., the idea of eradicating borders, will bring benefits from a neo-liberal perspective. The benefits will be for the rich and multinational trade communities in the developed world, however, and will therefore be claimed as democratic, liberal and progressive while attempting to stop refugees, asylum seekers and the poor from crossing the border (Turner 2007:6-7). The results are an aggressive border policy and increased nationalism as has been experienced in Australia. As Turner writes in “Shrinking the Borders: Globalization, Culture, and Belonging”:

We see the mobilization of new rationales for these strategies that insist upon defending the indissoluble sociocultural attributes of the nation concerned, a renewed focus upon political and cultural sovereignty as a means of dealing with anxieties about mutating national cultural identities, and the revival of defensive nationalism that is readily radicalized or otherwise regressively culturally legitimated. In this second movement, then, and particularly at the discursive level, the nation state returns with a vengeance as a means of regulating access to citizenship – or, more simply, limiting the population flows created by the economic and other instruments of globalization (Ibid. 7).

In this time of paranoid nationalism that is attempting to replace multiculturalism and globalization in Australia, it can be no surprise that the common national myths come to the fore—Anzac, Ned Kelly and sport. All of these three myths are linked to an Anglo-Saxon view of Australia, all have been presented as representative of the Australian nation, true and
eternal throughout much of the country’s history and all allude to an image of Australians as being white, male and violent. The myth goes that a return to the golden age of Anzac will spawn a rebirth of Australia through war in this time of lost identity, a return to Ned Kelly’s justified violence will preserve the Australian identity against faceless outsiders, and violent sport will ensure that men remain ‘real’ men. The myths are based upon three assumptions. First, that Australia has a singular essentialist core. Second, that the formation of the nation was once complete and not always in progress and, finally, that Australian identity needs to be defended (Ibid. 10-11). The method to defend Australian identity is often suggested to be a return to a golden age by praising and honouring the idealized Australians in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths.

Identity, however, is rent by numerous divides of class, gender and ethnic groups, a division that, when one remembers the way the self is defined by the Other, is itself necessary for defining what the national identity is (Hall 1996:615-617). Questions of identity are always questions of discourse and therefore questions of power and struggle. In this world of rapid change and shifting identity the struggle over national identity will continue ad infinitum.
5. Australia as an Imagined Community

“The Australasian will be a square-headed, masterful man, with full temples, plenty of beard, a keen eye, a stern and yet sensual mouth. His teeth will be bad, and his lungs good. He will suffer from liver disease, and become prematurely bald […] His wife will be a thin narrow woman, very fond of dress and idleness, caring little for her children but without sufficient brain power to sin with zest. In five hundred years—unless recruited from foreign nations—the breed will be wholly extinct: but in that five hundred years it will have changed the face of nature and swallowed up all our contemporary civilization.” (Clarke 1878)

The quote above is representative of the scientific obsession with categorisation that existed in the 19th century. This obsession saw nationality in concrete terms, for example the swarthy Italian was passionate, the tall German arrogant. Physical, racial, moral, social and psychological characteristics were attributed to national ‘types’ that would influence the discussion of who or what an Australian was until as late as the 1950s (White 1981:64). Australia was believed to be a nation colonised by hereditary criminals and subject to the racist bigotry of the time of Social Darwinism. Under fears that the Australian climate would degenerate the Anglo-Saxon race, active discrimination against Aborigines and Chinese was encouraged. According to this mode of thinking, only a re-stocking of the population with Anglo-Saxon blood could save the country. Richard White writes, “As long as racial purity was maintained, as long as only the noblest racial strain was permitted to flourish in Australian soil, then the future of the Australian branch of the British race was secure” (1981:71).

Since that time, ideas of Australian identity have changed from one based on the British Empire and the Anglo-Saxon race to one of Australianness and multiculturalism. However, dominant representations of Australian identity, in particular the myths this thesis analyses, still contain a predominance of white males with Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Celtic backgrounds.

Surveys conducted from the 1970s onwards have revealed three central aspects of Australian identity: social equality or the belief that nobody should think that they are better
than somebody else (this is most visible in the tall poppy syndrome that cuts down any
celebrity or successful person in Australia who starts to think greatly of themselves),
individualism or the belief that great things are the result of work by exceptional men, and
threat, whether than be the Japanese or Indonesians to the north (the great ‘yellow peril’ that
formed the basis of the White Australia Policy) or feminists, pacifists and ‘the chattering
classes’ within (Phillips 1998:285-289). The other major themes that are commonly
associated with Australian identity, and are present in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting
myths, are the popularity of masculinity, sport and the military. Four surveys are of particular
note: Emmison (1997) found that most Australians believe there is a unique culture in
Australia, Ray (1985) found Australians generally agree with chauvinistic ideas of Australian
patriotism, McAllister (1997) found that a majority of Australians were very proud of the
nation’s sporting achievements, and McAllister (1985) found that people who were very
proud of Australia were also supportive of the army and going to war for Australia. Naturally,
we must be careful of confirmation bias and the timing of the studies, but perhaps what is
most striking is what is not represented throughout a majority of surveys conducted in
Australia from 1970 to 1998. There is a clear lack of support for feminism, little distaste for
nationalism, little support for cultural achievements such as history, arts and literature, and
little criticism of the military (Phillips 1998:284-296). What we are left with is an imagined
Australian community that is white, male, sporting and violent.

Early land reformers in the 19th century had the picture in mind of a nation that could
agriculturally support itself, a place built upon the cultivated British ideal of civilization and
family. This yeoman ideal placed men at the forefront, tending to their crops and livestock
and teaching their children while, in fact, it would more likely be women who would perform
these tasks (Macintyre 2009:98). The man remained the boss, however.
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6 The chattering classes is a derogatory term used by political commentators to refer to
politically active academics from the metropolitan middle-class who do little more than talk
about social, cultural and political matters.
This agricultural paradise turned quickly into a hell as squatters took over the best land, bribery acquired much of the rest and genuine landowners struggled to cultivate land that was often unsuitable for agriculture and not helped by a lack of equipment, capital and expertise (Ibid.). This lack of success would have further consequences as men left their families to find wage labour far away. Subsequently, women and children were left to work the stubborn ground in, at times, horrible conditions. This primitive scene was perhaps best described by the Australian poet, Henry Lawson, whose journey into the bush provided him with innumerable experiences of poverty and despair to draw upon. In *Up the Country* he writes: “Land where gaunt and haggard women live alone and work like men / Till their husbands, gone a-droving, will return to them again; / Homes of men; if home had ever such a God-forgotten place” (1978:151). Clearly, the imagined agricultural community of Australia was one that had failed to meet expectations.

The Australian bush soon became an entity that had to be overcome in order for the nation to flourish, and men were seen at the time of settlement as the only people who could achieve this. The association between masculinity and the bush, and femininity and the domestic sphere lingers on to this very day. Men are often depicted as at war with the bush, struggling to ‘conquer’, to ‘overcome’ it, to ‘tame’ it. The focus is squarely put on exterior scenes that are linked with masculinity as the site of nation building, while the feminine domestic setting remains invisible (Lloyd 2013:1045). The Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sporting myths seem to support this binary opposition in that they all feature strong men who are at home in the bush rather than in domestic settings.

A common Anglo-Australian trope is that of the landscape as a dangerous phenomenon, a place where white women and children disappear and vast deserts kill men (Duncanson 2009:25). On one hand, the land is empty, and, on the other, it kills. This emptiness not only represents a land that is void of vegetation but also one that is absent of civilisation, a distinct lack of acknowledgement of Aboriginal settlement. *Terra nullius* was
for long the legal basis of Australian settlement, claiming that there were no prior owners of
Australia before the Europeans came and so giving permission for their colonization of the
land. In fact, research shows that Aboriginal people never welcomed the arrival of Europeans
and that serious conflicts erupted as settlers arrived in large numbers and battled over hunting
grounds to plant their crops. The notion that Aborigines fought back overturned any idea of
*terra nullius*, white dominance and what it meant to be Australian (Knellwolf King
2014:185).

However, we still see the lingering image of the dangerous empty landscape in
Australian cultural representations despite the overturning of *terra nullius*, and
acknowledgement of Aboriginal presence in Australia before European settlement. The
image of a dangerous empty landscape continues on, a landscape that requires men be violent
and hard in order to survive. For example, this scenario of man battling against the elements
to conquer the land can be seen in two, perhaps at first glance, seemingly vastly different
movies: *Crocodile Dundee* (1986) and *Priscilla Queen of the Desert* (1994). *Crocodile
Dundee* has a main character that is wild, violent and strong, able to wrestle crocodiles and
defeat New York hoodlums with his large knife and unflappable personality. He is the master
of the Australian environment and comes to use his violent, physical talents to master the
urban domain as well, and, naturally, win the girl. Additionally, *Priscilla Queen of the Desert*
features the key moment where three drag queens, after penetrating the Australian bush in a
bus adorned with Western materialistic regalia stand tall, gazing down over the red sands of
King’s Canyon. Once again, through violent struggle (the elder main character must threaten
violence to defend the other two against assault) the characters have conquered the Australian
landscape. Once again, the Australian identity is one that is violent and male.

The bush was a central theme in the Heidelberg School of painting—a form of
impressionism in Australia during the late 19th century. An example of this art movement can
be seen in Frederick McCubbin’s *Down on His Luck* that attempts to capture the harshness of the Australian bush and the life of the, often lonely, man who spends his life working there.

![Frederick McCubbin's *Down on His Luck*](image)

*Figure 5 Down on his Luck by Frederick McCubbin*

The Heidelberg School’s focus on the bush as a representation of Australia, and the harshness of the environment in the paintings, was a source of inspiration for Peter Weir’s *Picnic at Hanging Rock* (1975) and Ken Hannam’s *Sunday Too Far Away* (1975) as well as many other films. The bush as symbolic of ‘true’ Australian identity can also be found in Baz Luhrmann’s *Australia* (2008), Peter Weir’s *Gallipoli* (1981), Nicolas Roeg’s *Walkabout* (1971) and several other films that cast rural Australia as the holder of the essential Australia spirit. The bush has also been prominent in poetry such as Henry Lawson’s *Up the Country* (1892) and Banjo Paterson’s *In Defence of the Bush* (1892), where both poets accused each other of failing to capture the true essence of the bush and Australian identity. The common thread in all the representations, whether that is in art, literature or film, is that the Australian
bush is harsh, violent, and the home of true Australian identity as opposed to the feminine
domesticity of the cities.

It is interesting to note that the Australian outback is often depicted by people who had
limited, if any, contact with the bush. For example, Henry Lawson made one trip into the
outback and then spent his remaining years writing in Sydney, the Heidelberg School painters
barely left the Melbourne suburbs and the creator of Crocodile Dundee was a painter on the
Sydney Harbour Bridge.

If the bush is representative of Australia, then the bushman must be the ‘true’
Australian. According to the perspective that believes Australia began with European
settlement, the early pioneers were able to master the bush and so take on the role of nation
creators that is characteristic of Anthony Smith’s previously mentioned theory of golden ages.
These pioneers of Australia become idealised citizens, and their masculinity, violence and
ability to survive in the bush are reflected in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sporting
myths.

The violent man conquering the bush is not only restricted to official discourses and
media representations. Particularly rural blue-collar Australians are enfranchised by the
masculine imagery of jackeroos and the pioneers who conquered the bush and the results are
reflected in groups not only limited to the country. A study by Tim Phillips and Phillip Smith
found that after interviewing 6 social groups—regional city, urban blue-collar, urban white-
collar, rural blue-collar, urban elderly and non-English speaking background (or NESB)
women—a down-to-earth, rough, and outdoor nature was indicated as an important part of
being Australian, citing men such as Bryan Brown, local grazier Joey Wilson and Paul Hogan
as examples (2000:207-211).

The other example of ‘Australianness’ that came out of the surveys conducted by
Phillips and Smith was that of organisations, particularly sporting and volunteer ones, while
those dedicated to helping the environment and political parties were not named by the six
groups interviewed as part of the study. Sporting clubs, rural bush fire brigades and the military were prominent examples of Australian clubs and organisations in each group (Ibid. 212-213), with violence or battle a common feature. Even the NESB women—a group that could be considered marginalised in Australian society—were found to have named organisations such as the R.S.L.\(^7\) as good examples of what Australian is, saying that the R.S.L. “went to war for Australia to make Australia more … To make it a lot better for everyone else to live on” (Ibid. 212).

Here we see a mixing of the man from the bush myth with the military. This phenomenon is common in depictions of the Anzacs who are represented as Spartan heroes who spawned Australia’s golden age as they stormed the cliffs of Gallipoli in 1915. These heroes, much like the bush pioneers, are seen in this myth as giving birth to a nation—the soldiers through their self-sacrifice and war, and the bushmen through their fight against nature—with an emphasis on physical rather than intellectual achievement that can also be seen in popular sport in Australia. They become important figures in the Australian myth that depicts a nation built by outdoor physical white men who had to fight and sacrifice themselves in order to create. As Tranter & Donoghue write in the conclusion to “Colonial and post-colonial aspects of Australian identity”—their analysis of the 2003 Australian Survey of Social Attitudes:

> The powerful influence of Australian military and sporting ‘heroes’ echoes the clamour of classical Greeks and Romans for glory and games. The heroic deeds of national heroes such as ANZAC soldiers, and sporting heroes like Sir Donald Bradman, are enhanced and embellished over time until they take on a mythical quality (2007:166-180).

> The change in mythical national identity from the bushman to the soldier took place at the end of the 19\(^{th}\) century, when the idea that the Anglo-Saxon race would degenerate under the Australian sun was turned on its head. Instead, the sun and outdoor life was

---

\(^7\) The R.S.L., or Returned and Services League of Australia is an organisation designed to support former and current members of the Australian Defence Force. It organizes Anzac Day ceremonies and runs, very profitable, licensed clubs in all major Australian towns.
contrasted against the unhealthy urban lives of the citizens back in Europe and used to explain the “vigorous frame, manliness of bearing and stamp of independence of the average Australian” (White 1981:75-83).

Australian nationalism, built upon the bushman myth that sharply contrasted harsh bush life with feminine or British domesticity, had now become the dominant form of representation. Australian men were deemed by Australian writers to be physically fit and disrespectful of authority while the Englishman was painted as effete and restricted by his environment and class. One of the particular instances of this was in the field of sport, which the chapter on sporting myths will analyse, as Australia began a long tradition of fierce rivalry with England, particularly in cricket. Sport was also important for the military. National fitness at the time was seen as linked with military superiority, healthy schools meant healthy soldiers for the British Empire, and numerous statues and poems were created to glorify the military’s heroes (Ibid. 72).

The Boer War in Africa at the end of the 19th century had lasting influence on the idea of identity throughout the British Empire. The Empire’s troops had, instead of simply steamrolling over their opposition, found a formidable opponent. At the same time there were changes in terms of mass literacy and democracy, a time of Kipling, Robert Louis Stevenson and Boys’ Own Annuals. It was also a time when the Boy Scouts, youth hostels, school cadet corps, Rhodes’s Scholarships and rifle clubs were first founded (Ibid. 82). By 1914 Australia had compulsory military training for boys and the third highest defence expenditure in the world (Andrews 1993:23). The new values of this day were those attributed to men of action, with getting things done rather than good manners, all attributes that could be associated with the myth of Australian identity that can be found in Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sporting myths.

The bushman myth mainly centred on “outback employees, the semi-nomadic drovers, shepherds, shearer, bullock-drivers, stockmen, boundary-rider, station-hands and
others of the pastoral industry” (Ward 1958:2), but also was depicted as representative of an Australian ‘spirit’. C. E. W. Bean, perhaps the man most responsible for the invention of the Anzac myth, proclaimed that even city-bred Australians had the bushman’s vices and virtues at heart. He wrote that:

   The bush still sets the standard of personal efficiency even in the Australian cities. The bushman is the hero of the Australian boy; the arts of bush life are his ambition; his most cherished holidays are those spent with country relatives or in camping out. He learns something of half the arts of a soldier by the time he is ten years old (Ibid. 213)

   This was written despite that fact that most Australian citizens living in cities at the turn of the century would have little time or money to enjoy camping out in the countryside. Nevertheless, Australian identity was now linked with the bush and the military. Above all the bushman and the soldier shared several characteristics—they were physically strong, capable of violence, independent, and, perhaps most importantly, male.

   As Richard White writes,

   Men embodied these values. The emphasis was on masculinity, and on masculine friendships and team-work, or ‘mateship’ in Australia. All the clichés—man of action, white man, manliness, the common man, war as a test of manhood—were not sexist for nothing […] women were portrayed as a negation of the type, at best as one who passively pined and waited, at worst as one who would drag a man down (White 1981:83).

5.1 An Australia Without Women?

The three myths that this thesis examines are largely absent of women. Instead, there is a phenomenon of hegemonic masculinity in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sporting myths. R. W. Connell defines hegemonic masculinity as “the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (2005:236-237). In Australia, ironically a nation ruled by a Queen,
the cultural ideal takes shape in the form of Anzac soldiers, Ned Kelly and mostly male athletes. Women often have played little, if any, part in Australian identity.

Once again we see the way national myths changes and pulls history into line so that it supports a dominant cultural power structure. Gender as a social pattern can be a producer of history, changing the way Australia has been seen and what parts have been ignored. In terms of gender relations there is an example of covert institutional violence in that violence is part of a system of domination that maintains possession of social resources as well as overt personal violence that often is a way, for example in sport, of claiming or asserting masculinity (Ibid. 240-241). If we look at the violence in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths, they all are constructive in the process of developing a certain type of masculinity that remains dominant throughout Australian culture. As they remain praised and, as surveys have shown, they remain some of the most commonly known cultural myths in Australia, their violence becomes part of the ideal.

The masculinity that is dominant in Australian cultural myths has a few common characteristics that appeared in previous versions of the Australian bushman and soldier myths as well as today. One of the most famous is played by Paul Hogan in Crocodile Dundee whose violence is presented as gallant defending of women, his misogyny as shyness around women, and his racism and homophobia as ignorance and innocence from a ‘simpler’ time (Rayner 2007:110). Courtesy and protection of women is a key characteristic of Ned Kelly in his myth, too, as is his often violent behaviour. The characteristics of the men represented in myths such as Ned Kelly’s can also often be found in the larrikin stereotype. A larrikin is an Australian man who is fun-loving, dangerous and rebellious, often against the perceived threat of political correctness and globalization. He is often a prankster and involved in violent car crashes or fights, but saves the day and defends the girl (Gottschall 2014:868). His role as an ideal Australian can be seen in numerous films such as Kenny (2006) and Two Hands (1999).
The larrikin can be seen as the next step of the dominant Australian type following on from the bushman and the soldier. The larrikin has also been termed the ‘battler’ by Prime Minister John Howard to describe the ‘average’ Australian who works hard and fights his way through life to earn a living and has little time for the chattering classes. Although presented as a mainstream Australian, the battler is nearly always Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Celtic, he is the hegemonic masculine stereotype that continues the violent tendencies of the bushman and soldier and is marked by his modesty and working-class masculinity (Whitman 2013:51). This is the normative part of the Australian cultural myth of identity. The working class man’s averageness is held to be normal, eternal and not in need of introspection due to its naturalness. The mythical part of the identity is in the fact that it has little to do with actual working-class men, and is often proclaimed by politicians, the rich and famous. As Connell and Messerschmidt write, “hegemonic masculinities can be constructed that do not correspond closely to the lives of any actual men” (2005:838).

Australian cultural myths also seem to share certain characteristics in the way they deal with death. The death of an “Aussie hero” is a crucial component of national masculine identity in that it saves the man from having to deal with emasculation through ageing or feminization (Gottschall 2014:869-870). Ned Kelly, for example, remains dead at the young age of 25, untarnished by the responsibilities that maturity would have brought such as that of children and, astoundingly but in light of the hegemonic masculinity in Australian myths perhaps not surprisingly, contact with any women besides his mother and sisters. Much like a golden age, he remains as part of the national mythscape and is, therefore, able to be manipulated in order to support supposed national ideals. The numerous films and literature on Ned Kelly are prime examples of this struggle over what he means and the attempts to view him from different ideological perspectives. For example, *The True History of the Kelly Gang* by Peter Carey introduced themes that included transvestism, a borderline Oedipal relationship between Ned Kelly and his mother as well as a love affair with a prostitute and
the resulting secret child that must be smuggled away and remains the audience for Ned Kelly’s ‘true’ autobiography.

The death of Australian heroes can be seen in the numerous monuments that dot the country. These war memorials are, more often than in European countries, to be found in parks or nature and include the very plants themselves—for example, in Perth the Kings Park war memorial has trees with bronze plates to represent each individual soldier that died in the two world wars. Thus, the death of the hero is included in nature’s life cycle, inserting the sacrifice of the war hero into the very roots of the nation (Fiske, Hodge & Turner 1987:143). It should also be noted that the memorial to the male dead looks out over Perth, while that dedicated to women is hidden away out of view.

5.2 The Convict Stain

No analysis of Australian cultural identity would be complete without a mention of the convicts. Indeed, the transportation of approximately 168,000 convicts to Australia before 1868 (Clark 1986:109) undeniably left some mark. Many have proclaimed that Australians trace their anti-authoritarianism back to the early convicts, a golden age population of true men who were humble, physically strong and had no great love for titles and braggarts. However, this is a narrative that ignores Aborigines, women and the vast part of the nation whose ancestors did not come to Australia shackled and beneath the lash. In fact, Tasmania, the state with the highest proportion of convicts and therefore supposedly the most anti-authoritarian, became actually “the most conservative, the most traditional and Anglophile of the colonies, the most un-Australian in outlook, with a working class submissive, unprotesting and apolitical” (Hirst 2008).

Some have then moved their focus to the Irish convicts who rebelled against British oppression both at home and in Australia. This image will be expanded upon in the Ned Kelly
chapter, but it is enough to say that the attempt to find an explanation or legitimization for a normative Australian cultural identity in Irish rebels will follow the same mistaken essentialist path that the previous convict myth took. All of these searches for Australian forbears are attempts to find a golden age, a perfect eternal time that fits the contemporary ideology and supports the dominant hegemonic identity. They are at the centre of the battle over Australia’s mythscape and have been for many years an attempt to link Australians today with the creators of the nation via a spiritual kinship. As Anthony Smith writes,

The aim is to recreate the heroic spirit (and the heroes) that animated ‘our ancestors’ in some past golden age: and descent is traced, not through family pedigrees, but through the persistence of certain kinds of ‘virtue’ or other distinctive cultural qualities (Smith 1999:58)

The convicts in Australia serve this very purpose, although their position in Australian society has changed vastly over the years. Having a convict in the family tree was for many a mark of shame for the entire family. Dubbed the convict stain, it was an embarrassment not only for families, who even went so far as to create fictional family trees to hide the criminal ancestor, but also in international relations, in particular with Britain. Indeed, the derogatory term that comes quickest to tongue from English sports fans is ‘convict’ and Australians with Middle-Eastern roots have often been heard murmuring to Anglo-Saxon Australians that ‘they came on planes; you came in chains.’

However, there are many who take pride in their ancestors being part of a small minority in Australia’s multicultural society. The claim to convict ancestry involves the essentialist claim of a bloodline that links them to the nation’s founders as well as a socially constructed identity that boasts a special affinity with Australia—a popular sentiment among younger, less educated and less wealthy Australians (Tranter & Donoghue 2003:558-573). It is no longer a shame to admit to being descended from convicts, the stain is largely gone and, much like claims to Aboriginality that were based more on cultural and emotional affinity (Macintyre 1999:261), those claiming a connection are increasing in number. Admitting to
convict ancestry is not merely an admission of fact, but a process of self-identification for many.

The process of self-identification has become more prominent as the country becomes more multicultural. Fears over immigration have provoked a swing to the ethnic view of national identity in the late 20th and early 21st century. Perhaps most famously this was reflected in the success of anti-immigration politician Pauline Hanson who stoked fear of Australia being ‘swamped by Asians.’ In an attempt to fight back against the perceived threat from outside, some parts of Australia supported the then Prime Minister John Howard’s idea of what Australian national identity is. This identity is based on the very myths this thesis analyses, including Anzac and Gallipoli as well as the core national value of mateship (Ahluwalia & McCarthy 1998:81). This identity looks back to a golden age (here the 1950s) and claims the superiority of Anglo-Saxon traditions such as the Westminster parliamentary system and the English language. In a visit to Great Britain John Howard said that, “there is no nation in the world with which we share as much history, language, culture, patterns of humour and even sporting rivalry as Great Britain. To Australians, the British heritage is immense” (Howard 2003).

This emphasis on Australia being an Anglo-Saxon nation is one based on fear in a rapidly changing world. It not only relies on a perceived threat from the outside that will destroy these Anglo-Saxon traditions, but also from politically correct forces within, what Howard described as a “school of history which ignores or trivializes all those parts of the past which can’t be conscripted into glorifying a politically correct version of the present” (Howard 1995:6). The emphasis on closeness to Anglo-Saxon culture has also lead Australia to war, as Australia joined the United States and Great Britain in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. Here we see real results of Australian myths, in particular the Anzac myth, being used to support overt institutional violence.
Pauline Hanson, who claimed to be representing a self-evident common sense, went on to highlight the supposed threat that Australian identity was under. After being sacked by the conservative Liberal Party, Hanson founded her own One Nation Party, claiming it gave ordinary Australians the chance to fight back against “those who have betrayed our country, and would destroy our identity by forcing upon us the cultures of others. The chances to turn this country around, revitalize our industry, restore our Anzac spirit” (Hanson 1997). Once again the appeal to the eternal Anzac spirit that supposedly lives on in every ‘true’ Australian, once again the appeal to a golden age to shape the events in contemporary society, and once again the representation of an Australian identity that is insular and under threat.

The Howard government continued this mythical view of Australian identity, an identity that was proclaimed to be natural in comparison to the politically correct and socially engineered identity created by the left wing government that preceded them. Howard proclaimed that his vision of Australian identity was unifying rather than decisive, that his vision was based on common values rather than the wishes of special interest groups (Johnson 2007:196). Howard’s Australian identity is based upon key features found in the Anglo-Saxon/ Anglo-Celtic version of Australia namely, individualism, history and mateship as represented in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths. Mateship, the bond of friendship between Australian men (and nominally granted, though unrepresented, between Australian women) is often repeated as being a core value of Australia so much so that John Howard, unsuccessfully, attempted to have it included in Australia’s constitution. Mateship is often claimed to be a spiritual linked back to the Anzacs, the early bushmen and pioneers as well as the convicts who first came to Australia.

The idea of mateship has evolved over time from a look back to an idealized time that only required face-to-face trust and the possibility of a brotherhood of man in the future to a form of socialism among white men that struggled against tyranny, and at the same time implying both physical and intellectual exclusions of women (Dyrenfurth 2007:212-213). The
term is often used to denote those who are ‘truly’ Australians, and by doing so excludes women and non-whites. As time went by, the idea of socialism in mateship has largely been replaced by the violent self-sacrifice of the Anzacs while still remaining as a tool to legitimate and reproduce hegemonic masculinity (Ibid.). Australian white men are now depicted according to this narrative as battlers, Anzacs or simply under threat from outside and within.

In summary, it can be said that the particular Anglo-Saxon/ Anglo-Celtic version of Australian identity is one that evolved over time, but has kept several continuing features. It is a clear example of a myth that pulls history into line to support the current dominant ideology, a myth that is characterized and supportive of hegemonic masculinity and excludes all else from the history and current view of Australian national identity.

From the first convicts, to the bushmen, to the Anzacs and then to the battlers today, a link is highlighted that both connects its members to the golden age of foundation as well as mythologizing the past and making its artificialness appear natural. Australian history is depicted as one that has been under threat from foreigners outside and weak intellectuals within, a nation where physicality and masculinity is seen as the key to success. The ‘true’ Australian is a physical man who is outside the domestic sphere and uses violence to overcome his enemies, whether they are enemy soldiers or the very landscape itself. Violence is what makes an Australian man truly Australian in this narrative, it is what has made him able to physically carve a nation out of the empty desolate bush as well as spiritually and emotionally give birth to the nation through fiery self-sacrifice on the shores of Gallipoli. It is a myth that controls the past in an attempt to manipulate the actions of the present. The inherent message is that only a return to this violent masculinity will save Australia in the future and ensure that the spirit of Anzac lives on.
6. Anzac

“The mettle that a race can show
Is proved with shot and steel,
And now we know what nations know
And feel what nations feel”
(Paterson 1915)

“This Short History of Australia begins with a blank space on the map and ends with the record of a new name on the map, that of Anzac” (Scott 1947).

The First World War was one of the bloodiest conflicts in Australian history. Of the 330,000 soldiers who served overseas during the conflict 60,000 were killed and 160,000 officially listed as wounded (Holbrook 2015:20). The seminal moment for the Anzac myth on the shores of Turkey, the Battle of Gallipoli, resulted in 8,709 dead and 18,235 wounded Australians (Michael Hall 2002:83). World War I also spawned a myth of national origin for Australia that was as manipulated and constructed as any other myth of national identity.

On 25 April 1915 at 4.30 A.M., Allied soldiers landed on the shores of Gallipoli. The first wave of Australian and New Zealand troops landed at Ari Burnu (later named Anzac Cove) before dawn in a failed attempt to seize the strategically important high ground and were soon joined by 21,000 more Anzacs. Alongside the Anzac Corps were the British 29th Division and the French Army Corps—in total a 75,000 strong force that included Maori, Sri Lankan, Sikh, Nepalese, Algerian, Moroccan, and Senegalese soldiers. Dysentery and other diseases combined with deaths due to combat forced an eventual evacuation from the peninsula. Besides the Australians, 86,500 Turkish; 21,000 British; 9,798 French; 2,431 New Zealander; 1,350 Indian and 49 Canadian soldiers died at Gallipoli (“Gallipoli and Australian Identity” 2000:4-6). The Anzac myth that would grow from this battle would largely ignore all but the Australian casualties, even going so far as to ignore the roles played by Aboriginal Australians, non-white Australians, the British (not including criticisms), the French, the
Turkish defenders and the New Zealanders (Andrews 1993:3). This is despite the fact that 50 Aboriginal Anzacs are buried at Gallipoli and 500-800 served during the First World War (Van Dyk 2008) as well as the fact that more British served at Gallipoli than Australians and the British evacuated the peninsula long after the Anzacs had left (Hart 2007).

Anzac Day, that marks the first landings at Gallipoli on April 25, has since become arguably the most important day in Australia, even more important than the national day that marks the landing of the First Fleet on 26 January (Kapferer 1988:121) and is commemorated with dawn services, marches, sporting events and rock concerts throughout the country.

Although Anzac Day and the Anzac myth are supposed to encompass all Australian and New Zealand soldiers past and present, the focus of the myth is mostly fixed upon the Battle of Gallipoli.

Australia’s dependence on Britain drew it into the First World War. Australia at the time was considered a part of Britain, both racially and politically. Foreign policy was largely decided by politicians in Britain and so when Britain went to war in 1914 Australia’s declaration of war soon followed. The outbreak of the First World War was met with great enthusiasm in Australia and the Australian Imperial Force was created with British generals in charge. After joining together with New Zealand forces to form the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZAC) the troops were dispatched to the Middle East in an attempt to capture Istanbul. The plan was to land ashore and dismantle the numerous forts that linked the Dardanelles, a strait of water that led to the Turkish capital. By the end of the campaign the only impressive part was the withdrawal five days before Christmas that enabled the Allied forces to leave without the Turkish even knowing, the rest was a litany of errors in command and execution (MacIntyre 2009:158-159).

This military defeat was followed by more casualties on the Western Front and resulted in a marked decline in volunteers from 166,000 in 1916 to only 45,000 in 1917 (Ibid. 162). Prime Minister Hughes subsequently called for a referendum on conscription and,
despite his efforts to fight against ‘socialist, radicals and feminists’, failed to bring compulsory military service to Australia, making the nation “one of the few combatants to maintain a volunteer force and the only one to have rejected conscription” (Ibid. 165). In the Anzac myth, however, there is little to no description of the vast masses of Australians who recoiled at the incompetent waste of life and the notion of being forced to fight.

In the construction of the Anzac myth the focus would be placed upon the ‘Digger’—a word used to tie the Anzac volunteers to the gold field miners of Australia’s past and one used ever since to describe Australian soldiers. The Digger is a tough joker who is disrespectful of authority, practical rather than intellectual, able to battle and conquer without complaining, and is unashamedly male (Rainbird 2003:24). The Digger was the ultimate form of masculinity, an embodiment of the Anzac spirit that is above all an individual and yet nationalistic at the same time, and one that would find itself at the centre of D.H. Lawrence’s novel Kangaroo in the form of “dangerous uniformed men who meet in the dark forbidding bush” (Ibid. 30).

Upon examination the Digger can be seen as the vessel that carries the spirit of the early bushman and pioneers that were supposedly representative of Australian identity. He was, much like the colonial soldiers in the Boer War, touted as a superior fighter and athlete due to the harsh environment in which he grew up. Indeed, Australians were described as always fighting, whether that be in drought, fire, against unbroken horses, cattle or other men and so their violent nature and superiority in war was seen as a natural result of this (White 1981:125-126).

Much like the bushman, the focus on the Anzacs is on physicality rather than intellect. Take, for example, the description of Australian soldiers in Trooper Bluegum at The Dardanelles:

In a huge marquee in Roseberry Park were a score of virile young Australians stripped for the fray. Sun-tanned bushmen they were for the most part, lean and wiry, with muscles rippling over their naked shoulders (Hogue 1916:19).
The prevalent Social Darwinist thinking of the time would also be used later to compare Australian soldiers to their British allies. In this line of thinking the Australian race descended from either the hardened pioneers who carved the nation out of the brutal Australian bush or from the most enterprising, healthy and entrepreneurial who left the industrial decay of Britain to find their fortune in Australia. The Australian man was proclaimed to be a natural fighter, whose violence is an evolutionary trait gained in a rugged land as opposed to the ‘weaklings’ back in Britain (Garton 1998:87).

Before 1914, war was looked upon favourably by some in Australia. Many, including the Labor Prime Minster Billy Hughes who was himself dubbed ‘the Little Digger’ due to his aggressiveness in politics, claimed that war would save Australia from degeneracy and give birth to a new great Australian. Australia had only become a nation in 1901 and many clamoured for the baptism of fire that would give birth to the great Australian man. As Richard White writes:

The national pride of a newly inaugurated nation demanded that he be a hero. And as a hero he was expected to display the conventionally heroic qualities of the day, the qualities of the idealized ‘New Man’, the boy scout, the Boys’ Own Paper mixture of independence, manliness, honesty, curiosity, wholesomeness, a certain ordinariness and decency...With the landing at Gallipoli in April 1915, the ready-made myth was given a name, a time and a place. (1981:127-128).

The benefits of the war would then pass down through the generations as per the Social Darwinist thinking of the time. As E.J. Brady wrote, “The breed that stormed and held the heights of Anzac will grow stronger and more self-reliant as their generations follow—Their well fed, well-developed bodies will house vigorous and intellectual minds. They will be just, powerful and humane” (1918:101). Here is an example of myth pulling the past into a narrative that can manipulate not only the present but the future as well—the identity of the Anzacs in the past will be a model for how the Australians of the future should be.

The fight over the identity of the Digger was not a one-sided affair, however. For example, the father of the Anzac legend C.W. Bean argued that the Digger was the hero of the
bush whose life differed little in the countryside or at war. Although most of the Anzacs came from the city, Bean described them as stoical warriors who withstood enemy shellfire the same way they withstood fire and drought back home (Kent 1985:379). On the other hand, the most famous Australian general Sir John Monash proclaimed that it was the democratic institutions, education and instinct for sport and adventure that made the Digger great (White 1981:132). The resulting Anzac myth is one that has mixed both of these arguments. Anzacs, whether that be actual soldiers or simply ‘real Australians who have the Anzac spirit supposedly within them’, are often represented in contemporary Australian society as adventurous sportsmen who have respect and sympathy for the battling famers out in the bush. The farmers themselves use Anzac day as the optimal time to begin sowing wheat in Australia (Green 2015) and the day is also marked by the Anzac Day Clash—an annual Australian Football League match between Collingwood and Essendon that regularly draws more than 100,000 spectators.

It can be said that the historian C.W. Bean is the father of the Anzac myth. As editor of *The Anzac Book*, that was first published in 1916, Bean was the first to paint the picture of the Anzac as tough, inventive, loyal, chivalrous and gallant. Bean was certainly essential to the creation of the Anzac myth because out of the 36,000 - 41,000 Australians who served at Gallipoli only 150 answered his call for contributions (Andrews 1993:61). It would be up to Bean to decide how the Anzacs would be described and what would be left out. His book was originally conceived of as entertainment for the troops during the winter months, but was interrupted by the evacuation and turned into a commemorative souvenir of the heroic, but failed offensive (Kent 1985:378). Bean’s Anzacs were giants with exceptional courage and physical endurance that took on a mythical status and made the book an enormous success. Within months Bean’s book had sold in excess of 100,000 copies and been distributed to soldiers spread out through Europe as well as to the public back in Australia. Bean even
insisted upon several hundred copies being reserved for museums and libraries throughout Australia (Ibid. 389-390).

Bean was able to create such a mythical image of the Anzac by describing how frightful conditions were and how monumental the task before the Anzacs was while leaving out reports of Anzacs who did not follow orders or acted in an ‘unbecoming’ manner. His personal diary contains several reports of soldiers running rather than advancing against the enemy. Also left out were detailed descriptions of the dangers of war as told by the soldiers themselves, the need for officers to threaten their troops with firing squads to make them advance, tales of drunkenness or brawling amongst themselves as well as any sense of personal anguish or loss (Ibid. 378-385). Bean was determined to depict the Anzacs in the most favourable light while he was compiling his history of their actions in World War I and for this he was criticised. The official British war historian James Edmonds pointed out the amateurish qualities of the Anzacs early in the war and wrote to Bean to inform him that, “You must differentiate between 1916 and 1918, in which latter year the Australian leading and staff work are classic” (Kelly 2012:7).

Anzacs were not only depicted as warriors from the bush, but also bore many similarities to ancient Greeks. The home front expanded upon this representation where women were essential in manufacturing, preparing aid packages for the troops and also for recruitment. For example, one of the women’s organizations that attempted to enlist recruits for the military, the United Service League, “echoed the women of ancient Sparta with its injunction that their men should ‘Return on or with your shield’” (MacIntyre 2009:162).

The location of the Gallipoli campaign itself brought its own associations with Greek heroes. The Anzacs were not only youthful and strong like the ancient Greeks, but they also were travelling to the source of Western Civilization in what can be seen as a symbolic act of defence against the oppressive Turks as is so often depicted in Western romantic conceptions.
of the wars between Greece and Persia as well as in the liberation of Jerusalem in 1917 that the Anzacs took part in (Kapferer 1988:127-128).

The way the Anzacs were described as travelling back to the birthplace of Western civilization was expanded upon as the Anzac myth grew. An example can be seen in Patsy Adam-Smith’s *The Anzacs*:

They sailed to Mudros, the harbour of Lemnos Island. On the island’s peaks Agamemnon, King of Mycenae, had lit a chain of fires to signal to Clytaemnestra, his queen, that he had taken nearby Troy. Here, to the one place consecrated by poets to the conflicts of heroes, to the forces and passions personified by the Olympian gods and goddesses, half Europe, half Asia, came the new men, bred beneath a cross of stars that Herodotus had not known of when he portrayed the localised war at Thermopylae as global conflict. It is the most famous arena of the word, the birthplace of Iliad. Men had tried their mettle here before Australia was dreamt of (1978:58).

Comparisons between the Anzacs and early defenders of the West continued in the archaeological findings that were sent back to Australia from Palestine. For example, the War Memorial in Canberra displays the Shellal Mosaic—part of one of the earliest Christian churches. There is also an inscription found commemorating Athenian casualties from the 440s B.C. in their war against the Thracians at Gallipoli that is accompanied by a note that reads, “applicable to the British, Australian, and New Zealand soldiers killed in the same locality more than 2300 years later” (Kapferer 1988:132).

Other examples of depicting the Anzacs as Greek warriors can be seen in the 1916 poem by H.L. Galway entitled *The Australiad*—a portmanteau of Australia and *The Iliad*—and the comparison of prisoner of war Weary Dunlop to Ulysses by his biographer (Garton 1998:91). Finally, 100 years after the Allied landings at Gallipoli package deals for tourists wishing to visit the area for Anzac day are available that stop at all of the most important Anzac battlefields as well as a visit to nearby Troy (Scates 2002:8).

The Anzac myth also extolls the necessity of violence. The violence that was required to overcome hardship and give birth to something greater can be found in the myth of the bushman, the convict, the bushranger (for example, Ned Kelly), and the Anzac (Michael Hall
The Anzac myth also entails the need for Australia as a nation to be reborn or resurrected from death. Violence is seen in the myth as a requirement for the creation of both Anzac and Australian identity (Kapferer 1988:127). The trial by fire and rebirth in World War I can be seen in the 6 steps Kapferer finds most represented in the Anzac myth: first, the dangerous journey to the Middle East; second, the arrival in Egypt and the sighting of the Pyramids, which is followed by the Anzacs rioting in the brothel area of Cairo; third, the horrific losses at Gallipoli; fourth, the retreat and return to Egypt made by Anzacs who are now hardened veterans; fifth, the success of the Anzacs in taking Jerusalem and Damascus; and sixth, the victorious end to the war (Ibid. 126). The Anzacs have gone from the depths of war to emerge as conquering heroes much like the bushmen who struggled to build a European nation out of the wild Aboriginal Australia that existed before white settlement.

The hardships the Anzacs went through are also seen as a necessary part of the battlefield tourism trips taken to Gallipoli, and to the area where Australia fought against the Japanese in World War II in Papua New Guinea named the Kokoda Trail. Many travellers to Gallipoli sleep outdoors to experience what the soldiers must have experienced and troubled youths are encouraged to ‘walk the Kokoda Trail’ in an attempt to appreciate the hardships the Anzacs endured in World War II and copy their resolve.

Battlefield visits have become a popular part of overseas travels for many Australians. For example, in April 2000 13,000 - 16,000 travelled to Gallipoli for Anzac Day (Hannaford & Newton 2008:3). They can be called pilgrimages if we define the term as a physical journey to a “non-local, historically and/or mythically significant shrine or site that is the embodiment of cultural ideals” (Ibid.). An example of this can be seen in the unity at a cultural centre that one traveller found at Gallipoli:

I was a tourist in Istanbul but the moment we got anywhere near the site we were pilgrims. I forgot I was in Turkey for quite a while, with so many Australian voices. There is a bar in Çannakale called the Anzac bar where young backpackers hung out and people recognised us in the street, calling out ‘Hey, Aussie.’ That doesn’t happen
when you are a tourist, but when you are a pilgrim it does (Cahir qtd. in Hannaford & Newton 2008:8).

Descriptions of the trip to Gallipoli can take on a religious quality, for example, Bruce Scates writes of the visit to the Australian memorial there and how “Anzac pilgrims file inside in solemn procession, past massed names of the missing carved carefully in stone, to a small wooden table that serves as altar, archive and chapel” (2007:312). However, official representatives of the church are largely absent at Anzac Day commemorations and more important seems to be the undertaking of a pilgrimage by young people to find an essential Australian quality that will connect them to the Anzacs and the bushman myth (Michael Hall 2002:84). The linking of the present to the golden age of Anzac can be seen in the way Prime Minister Howard at an Anzac Day service in 2000 commented on the dying of the final Anzacs who fought at Gallipoli and how the commemoration of the battle is not a reminder of an unsuccessful military campaign but “always about young Australians, exactly like those with us here today” (Grattan 2000:1).

Alongside a link to the deceased Anzacs is the idea of Gallipoli as sacred land, reflecting Anthony Smith’s argument that nationalism involves a golden age and a unique setting for events that moulded the nation (1996:589). The area is a significant part of an Australian cultural identity myth in that the landscape’s heat, flies and lack of water can be seen as a reflection of the Australian environment that the first European pioneers struggled with and conquered (Hannaford & Newton 2008:2). The similarities between the landscape in Australia and Gallipoli are also reflected in Peter Weir’s film Gallipoli (1981) when we see the youthfulness and energy of the soldiers against the desolate background of the Australian desert, the sands around the Pyramids and the beaches of Gallipoli (Haltof 1993:5). These representations of white men alone in a harsh environment that requires them to be violent to conquer continues the myth of an Australia populated by violent white men and absent of any others such as women or non-whites.
Similarities and attachment to the Gallipoli site have even brought up questions of sovereignty in Turkey each time Turkish authorities attempted to build monuments of their own at the site. John McQuilton, after studying the architecture of the Gallipoli site, noted that several of those who made the pilgrimage were affronted by the Turkish memorial at Gallipoli and also noted an almost unanimous feeling among the Australians and New Zealanders at Anzac Cove that the site was “theirs” (McKenna & Ward 2007:150-151). Australians lay claim to the area where Australians died in battle. The pilgrimage to the final resting spot of the Anzac heroes further enhances the sacredness of the area. This sanctity is reflected in an interview between Bruce Scates, who is an academic investigating pilgrimages to cemeteries of the Great War, and Kate F. from Newcastle:

Kate F: today when we were walking around and that I just had tears in my eye the whole time … it was really really moving and it’s, it’s like a Mecca basically, like a pilgrimage for Australians.

Scates: Pilgrimage is a big word.

Kate F: Well, look around you, there’s a fair few people here and you don’t get that many people outside of Australia coming together. I think to me it’s a spiritual thing, definitely. I didn’t come here to party. I came here to commemorate what they did, what they did for us. (Kate F. qtd. in Scates 2002:8-9).

The sanctity of war memorials has also been prominent in Australia where popular opinion plays a large role in how and where the memorial is placed. Shortly after World War I, in 1919, the state government of New South Wales created a Public Monuments Advisory Board to ensure that all war memorials were in good taste, dignified and of artistic merit (Iglis 2008:143-144). Also, the central symbolic building in Australia is the Australian War Memorial in Canberra and was inspired by the creator of the Anzac myth, C.E.W. Bean, who wanted to make the facts of Anzac beyond dispute (Kapferer 1988:122).

If all war memorials can be deemed to hold such importance to Australia, then Gallipoli must be the holiest. There, on Anzac Day, the Dawn Service begins. The word ‘service’ may sound religious but there is little or no religious aspect of Anzac Day (Seal
2007:140). For example, the ode, part of a poem written by Laurence Binyon, is effectively secular:

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. (Binyon 1931:210)

The service is usually attended by Australian and New Zealand Prime Ministers, and entails readings, hymns, an ode, the playing of ‘The Last Post’, a period of silence and the raising of the flags from half mast to full (Hannaford & Newton 2008:4). Alongside the ‘official’ commemoration is the, often controversial, tradition of sleeping on the graves of the dead Anzacs. The graves are often, but not restricted to, those of an ancestor and young Australians sleep there on Anzac Eve in order to heighten the experience of a link to the past (Ibid. 5).

If the Battle of Gallipoli can be considered part of the golden age that Antony Smith claimed was an essential part of national identity building, then the significance of national origin in the reasons for the pilgrimage are understandable. There is also evidence of the insecurity young nations may feel for their own history, and the need for a concrete sense of where such new nations come from. For example, an operator of one of the tours to Gallipoli said that,

I feel I could go there every year of my life. It is a time to give myself a moment, just like going to church. Time to stop and give yourself time to think about what makes us free and what makes us in this position of being able to travel and get around the world … To stand there is to get a different understanding of what faith you have. It is just that these blokes gave me a place to stand. It is a type of faith, understanding, that for me (as an Australian) that there is something concrete about where I come from. And they made a mark so far from home, to be held up as gods, as they were … called immortal, ‘six foot ten and bullet-proof … but not bullet proof’ (Abay qtd. in Hannaford & Newton 2008:7).

The Anzac myth is a central part of Australian national identity that declares the nation to be whole and unified and borne out of the same suffering that the nation’s founders, bushrangers and explorers had to endure (Kapferer 1988:23). The Anzac myth also elevates the Australian soldiers above others, making them out to be heroes who only failed due to the
incompetence of their British commanders. The juxtaposition of Australian mastery in violence and poor British leadership developed not only from the social Darwinist thinking that has already been mentioned but also out of Bean’s *Anzac Book* and the newspaper articles written by Keith Murdoch, father of media mogul Rupert Murdoch (MacIntyre 2009:160). Keith Murdoch, in a famous letter to Australian and British authorities, reported on the censorship of reporting at the time, the poor quality of British officers and the contempt the Anzacs held for them. His letter only came into public light by being published as an official state paper in Britain. Murdoch wrote in the letter that, “The continuous and ghastly bungling over the Dardanelles enterprise was expected from such a General Staff as the British Army possesses, so far as I have seen it. The conceit and self-complacency of the red feather men are equalled only by their incapacity” (Murdoch 1915).

The Anzac myth has changed from the first attacks at Gallipoli. The idea of an event being the origin of national identity in this case involves a shift from the nation being thought of as British to Australian. Although Federation had taken place in 1901 Australia at the time of Gallipoli was still a collection of states that shared British heritage rather than a distinctive nation. Most Australians at the time were of British descent and one in five had been born in the United Kingdom. Britain was called home, British furniture, architecture and fashion was copied and the thrill of a lifetime was to return back ‘home’ to England (Andrews 1993:12). It was only at the end of the war that Australian officers such as Monash proudly flew the Australian flag and could boast of an Australian army under the control of Australian officers.

The anti-British phenomenon grew markedly in World War II when the British surrendered at Singapore in 1942 and Australian Prime Minister John Curtin stated that ‘Australia looks to America, free of any pangs as to our traditional links or kinship with the United Kingdom’ (MacIntyre 2009:193). Britain, having up till then refused to send reinforcements or take the Japanese threat to Australia seriously, was now seen as a distant
indifferent motherland. For Curtin, the USA was a much closer and more reliable source of security.

After the war the myth of Australian superiority over Britain and the hero-like descriptions of the Anzacs at Gallipoli increased as Britain turned away from its commonwealth towards Europe (Meaney 2001:89). The European market was much more lucrative for Britain, and Australia, too, saw its future success in closer geographical regions. The slow cutting of ties to Britain was reflected in the Anzac myth, as it became less a story of service of the empire and more a myth of national origin. In order for the nation to be born it had to prove to itself that it was better than the old mother country. Hence, the tale of the Anzacs in World War I became one of a group of elite soldiers that, when finally able to shed the constricting incompetent leadership of British officers, were able to show they were greater than other nationalities.

Slowly the ranks of the Anzac Day marchers began to thin as the original soldiers passed away. By the 1960s it was commonly thought that the entire commemoration of Gallipoli and Anzac Day would soon become extinct. This was not only due to the passing of the original Anzacs, but also due to the smaller crowds that were attending Anzac Day ceremonies each year and the changing attitude towards the military itself that was taking place during the 1960s.

From 1962 until 1972 the Australian military was involved in the Vietnam War. The war’s atrocities, unclear frontlines and elusive enemy did not affirm the masculine warrior ideal, however. There were no descriptions of heroic Anzacs storming enemy shores and no victory parade for the returning heroes when the war ended. Instead, the horrors of the Vietnam War that were now broadcast via television directly into Australian homes like no war before portrayed masculinity as violent and disruptive (Garton 1998:93).

The era was also a time to challenge the social and moral values of this generation’s parents and grandparents. In 1958 an article in Sydney University’s newspaper *Honi Soit*
described Gallipoli as a routine beach landing that, in contrast to the jingoistic nature of the Anzac myth, was shown as much reverence as gambling at a racecourse by the Australian public (Holbrook 2015:22). The newspaper article served as inspiration for Alan Seymour’s play *The One Day of the Year* (1960) that depicted a university student’s shame at his veteran father’s xenophobia and reverence for a war that was in the son’s eyes a fiasco (Holbrook 2015:22). Criticism of the glorification of war can also be seen in a letter to the *Australian Women’s Weekly* at the time:

I pose the annual questions of youth: What is Anzac Day? What does it stand for? The march is always very touching, but I object to the oldies’ attitude. One is subjected to a barrier of intolerance when one tries to discuss Anzac Day logically. I admire the Anzacs’ courage, but am appalled at the glorification of war. If Anzac Day were only to recall bravery in the face of defeat, it would be a true tribute to those killed, but it is inherently much more. It is a day when bigotry is displayed, as well as courage. (“Letter to the editor” 1969 qtd. in Holbrook 2015:23).

From the 1980s onward, however, record numbers have begun to attend the Anzac Day parades. The original Anzacs may have died off, but large crowds now come to watch descendants march alongside current members of the armed forces and the parade has taken on an even more militaristic appearance in that the veterans wear uniforms rather than civilian clothing that was common until the 1980s (MacIntyre 2009:160-161). An article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* described the recent transformation of Anzac Day as a “flag-draped tear-stained national festival” that seeks to “affirm a national character, to turn the Gallipoli generation into a vision of idealised Australianess” (“Anzac: a day to quell ardour for desperate glory” 2008), while in *The Australian* Mark McKenna describes a general militarisation of Australian history and culture that holds military displays at sporting events, includes a tendency in the media to extol the virtues of soldiers past and present, and turns Gallipoli and the Kokoda Track into popular battlefield tourist sites (McKenna 2007). In McKenna’s opinion, Australia has “lost the ability (or inclination) to debate Anzac Day. It has become an article of national faith and communion, a sacred parable we dare not question […] the day has become holier than December 25” (Ibid.). The Anzac myth has intruded into
almost every part of Australian life, from the raising of the flag every morning at public schools and cash prizes from the government for students who excel in Anzac-related activities to the national cricket team visiting the trenches at Gallipoli and the comparison of today’s military in the War on Terror with the Anzacs in World War I (Ibid.).

The renewal in popularity for all things Anzac has also involved the efforts of the R.S.L. to enshrine and protect the Anzac legend (White 1981:135-136). Soon after the R.S.L.’s creation in 1916, legislation that made use of the word Anzac for commercial purposes illegal was introduced and in 1921 Anzac Day became an official national holiday (McDonald 2010:292). Both acts were the result of heavy lobbying by the R.S.L. Later, the Returned Services League was the loudest voice in the outcry against the inclusion of a female figure representing Australia at the Sydney War Memorial. The group was also the force behind the creation of secret right-wing armies in the 1920s and 30s, and the first to contrast the heroic Anzacs against ‘disloyal’ elements such as gays, trade unionists, pacifists, communists and the Irish (Ibid. 136-137). The Anzac had become a mythical defender of the status quo largely due to the works of the R.S.L.

Finally, a major reason for the sudden popular trend in Anzac commemoration has been the support from the political side of Australian society. Although John Howard has been the most famous proponent of the Anzac myth, there were politicians who championed the cause much earlier. In 1990 Bob Hawke became the first Australian prime minister to visit Gallipoli on Anzac Day. The prime minister’s pilgrimage with a group of veterans to commemorate the seventy-fifth anniversary of the dawn landing was broadcast live to television audiences back in Australia (Holbrook 2015:26). The success of the event made Gallipoli and the Anzac myth a politically safe topic once again in contrast to the criticism of the 1960s. Since that time all but one Australian prime minister (Paul Keating) have made the pilgrimage to Gallipoli on Anzac Day.
Since Bob Hawke’s first visit to Gallipoli the Anzac myth has seemingly become a necessity for national electoral campaigns. For example, John Howard’s fascination with Anzac and his insistence that it is the core of Australian national identity (McDonald 2010:294) has been one of the core principles of his political life. During Australia’s involvement in the War on Terror Howard also paid an annual visit to the troops on Anzac Day. Likewise, Labor Prime Minister Paul Keating travelled to Papua New Guinea in 1992 to thank the local tribesmen for the help during World War II and, in front of a large press contingent, kissed the ground of the Kokoda Trail that had served as a battleground and final resting place for the Anzacs who fought against the Japanese.

However, Keating’s reverence for Kokoda was contrasted by his disdain for Gallipoli and the attempts to mark it as a place of origin for Australia. On Remembrance Day at the Australian War Memorial the former Prime Minister claimed that, “There was nothing missing in our young nation or our idea of it that required the marital baptism of a European cataclysm to legitimise us” (2013). Five years earlier, Keating had said the idea that Australia was born at Gallipoli was “utter and complete nonsense”, which in turn was refuted by Prime Minister Kevin Rudd (a member of Keating’s own party) who responded to Keating by saying that Gallipoli was “part of our national consciousness…part of our national psyche…part of our national identity” (Gartrell 2008). The difference in viewpoints from members of the same party can be explained by the growth in popularity of the Anzac myth over time—Keating was in power in the early 90s and Rudd in the early 2000s. By this time, support of the Anzac Myth had become a political necessity.

In summary, the Anzac myth attempts to set out what an ideal Australian is—a warrior hero that uses his natural fighting skills and physical superiority to save Western civilization and carve out a nation for himself. By doing so it also risks forgetting the horrors of war and, instead, celebrating conflict as a defining experience. The Anzac myth pulls a nation’s past into an understandable chain of events while being producer and product of the nation’s
citizens. It offers a thread of violence stretching from the first act of conquest by white Australians over the Aborigines and the environment to the actions of its soldiers at war (Fiske 1987:138-139). The constant push by politicians then to remember the conflicts of the past are part of an exhortation to take part in military interventions such as the War on Terror in the present day (McDonald 2010:299-300). Indeed, the task of living up to the Anzac heroes of Gallipoli has been brought up as recently April, 2015 when Prime Minister Tony Abbott, speaking at the aptly named Gallipoli Barracks in Brisbane, farewelled Australian and New Zealand troops bound for Iraq (Medhora 2015). According to the Anzac Myth Australia’s heroes travelled to the ancient lands of Troy for their baptism of fire under incompetent British command—an act that links them to Western civilization while at the same time criticizing the old world for its waste of Australian life. Gallipoli has become sacred land, a place of origin and a message to future Australians that national identity is revealed in violence.
7. Ned Kelly

“Ned Kelly is confirmed as Australia’s best-known colonial figure and folk hero. Immortalized in Sidney Nolan’s paintings and mythologized in various cultural milieu, Kelly has transcended bushranging to symbolize a romantic and rebellious aspect of Australian identity” (Tranter & Donoghue 2008:373).

“Neglect this and abide by the consequences, which shall be worse than the rust in the wheat of Victoria or the druth of a dry season to the grasshoppers in New South Wales [sic] I do not wish to give the order full force without giving timely warning, but I am a Widow's Son outlawed, and my orders must be obeyed” (Kelly 1879:39).

In the following chapter I will analyse the Ned Kelly myth and comment on the similarities to the Anzac/bushman trope. There are several characteristics that are shared in the Anzac and Ned Kelly myth such as a focus on physicality over intelligence, the ability of men to survive outdoors in the bush, and the use of violence to overcome difficulties. I will comment on the cultural script that is linked with an outlaw myth shared in Britain and the United States of America, and the way the Ned Kelly myth has been moulded to fit this script. Finally, I will examine the prominence of Ned Kelly in Australian culture and the role his myth plays in Australian identity.

Ned Kelly was the last and most famous bushranger in Australian history. The image of Kelly in his distinctive helmet and suit of armour (as depicted in Figure 6) has become symbolic of Australian identity. For example, in the opening ceremony of the Sydney Olympic Games in 2000 dozens of performers in mock-armour and pyrotechnic rifles escorted Australian celebrities around the stadium. Although the images may have been puzzling to many foreigners, Nigel Jamieson, the creator of the performance, was adamant that Ned Kelly is the most famous and best representation of Australia and that he is a “Robin Hood of our culture” (Jamieson qtd. in Seal 2002:148).
Figure 6 Ned Kelly’s armour

Ned Kelly was the third of eight children born to Irish parents\(^8\) in Victoria, Australia in 1854. Northeast Victoria at the time was suffering as the growth of manufacturing drew business and administration to the colonial capitals (Ibid. 34). The influence of railways and a change from a grazing to a farming economy made only those with a little capital, farming skills and land near railways successful. The rural area Ned grew up in did not enjoy these advantages. His family were subject to the abuses of the ‘selection system’ at the time that provided uncultivated farmland to those with limited means to acquire it themselves. Poor

---

\(^8\) His father, John “Red” Kelly, was transported to Australia for stealing pigs and his mother, Ellen Quinn, was born in Australia. The large Quinn family would be instrumental in Kelly’s ability to receive advance warning of police searches for his gang.
selectors were then left to develop and defend the land against rich graziers who often encroached upon properties. A common complaint from poor selectors was that any stray animal could be impounded by rich property owners and then only released upon payment by the poor selectors no matter whether the rich owners had taken them illegally or not. The inability to pay for the return of important sources of income led many poor farmers to cattle stealing in order to survive.

The difficult work of tilling the land and the constant battle over property boundaries often brought the Kelly family into conflict with the law. The police in Australia in the second half of the 19th century has been described as more unpopular than that of any other English-speaking country and accused of being “corrupt, besotted, cowardly, brutal and inefficient” (Ward 1958:144-145). The increasing centralisation of power in the capital made the policing of rural areas difficult and, together with the belief that the police were on the side of rich squatters, bankers and shopkeepers, gave poor selectors a sense of distrust of the police (Seal 1996:150-151).

By the time he was twenty-three Ned had been charged six times with offences ranging from assault and robbery, aiding the bushranger Harry Power, receiving a stolen horse, and being drunk and disorderly as well as resisting arrest (Seal 2002:XIV). Claims of police harassment and corruption arose due to the fact that his family members were also often in trouble. For example, his maternal uncles served five years apiece for cattle stealing and grievous bodily harm, his paternal uncle served fifteen years for arson and his younger brother five years for cattle stealing. Police records show that between 1856 and 1880 thirteen members of the extended Kelly family were arrested a total of seventy-two times, forty-one of which were dismissed by courts due to lack of evidence (Ibid. 34). This set up an antagonistic relationship between the police and the Kelly family.

On April 15, 1878, Ned Kelly was apparently living a quiet life working at a timber mill when he was called back to the family home. According to Constable Alexander
Fitzpatrick it was discovered that Ned’s brother Dan, who was wanted for horse stealing, was hiding at his mother’s house. Fitzpatrick claimed that Ned Kelly, in an attempt to resist his brother’s and his own arrest, shot him in the wrist while his mother, Ellen, hit him over the head with a coal shovel. Ned, in turn, claimed that Fitzpatrick had arrived at the family home drunk and had attempted to make a pass at his sister, succeeding only in shooting himself with his own pistol. Ned and his brother, Dan, fled to the bush while his brother-in-law, a neighbour, his mother and her baby were taken into custody. A £100 reward was placed on Ned’s head and his mother, with her baby, was sent to prison for three years.

The Fitzpatrick incident is a turning point in the Ned Kelly myth today and at the time. It is where the myth becomes one of resistance against oppression and injustice. The popular opinion at the time appeared to be that Fitzpatrick was a liar and the police were harassing the Kelly family. The arrest of his mother would be a constant source of anger for Ned and his self-proclaimed reason for turning to banditry. This sentiment is found in numerous ballads about Ned Kelly, one of which is entitled ‘Kelly Was Their Captain’ and includes the lines “When Ned amongst them recognised his old and vitreous [sic] foe; Then thoughts came of his mother with a baby at her breast, And it filled Ned’s heart with anger, and the country knows the rest” (Ibid. 41).

In October 1878, four policemen were dispatched to hunt down the Kelly gang that included Ned and Dan Kelly, Joe Byrne and Steve Hart. Three of the four policemen were killed in a shootout at Stringybark Creek and the Kelly gang quickly became the most wanted gang in Australia. The Victorian Felons Apprehension Act, a medieval institution of outlawry that gave the police the power of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, came into effect. Under the act, anybody deemed to be an outlaw could be shot on sight and the police had the right to commandeer any horses, arms or supplies to assist their pursuit of the outlaw (Ibid. 42).

After raids on several banks, Kelly sympathisers were gaolled and Ned wrote to the newspapers and Victorian parliament appealing against his unfortunate circumstances. One
fifty-six page letter, known as the Jerilderie Letter and thought lost for over one hundred years but now held at the National Museum in Canberra, that was written after robbing a bank in Jerilderie details Ned’s life until that point and his claims of police harassment. Ned describes the Victorian police as “a parcel of big ugly fat-necked wombat headed, big bellied, magpie legged, narrow hipped, splay-footed sons of Irish bailiffs or English landlords” (Kelly 1879:30).

After a year avoiding the police, the Kelly gang attempted to derail a train of police at a town named Glenrowan. The gang took a group of people hostage at the Glenrowan Inn and prepared to sabotage the nearby train tracks. Unfortunately for Ned, one hostage he had released immediately ran to stop the train of police officers and warn them of the trap ahead. In the ensuing battle, all but Ned were killed and the famous suits of armour made their one and only appearance. After being shot in the legs and groin Ned was arrested and executed on November 11, 1880. His last words, “Such is life”, were actually never spoken, but have become an integral part of the myth that has subsequently arisen. Upon hearing his sentence Ned said to Judge Redmond Berry (incidentally the man who had sentenced his mother to prison) that he would see him in the afterlife soon, a fact that would ring true and become a part of the mythical status of Ned Kelly when the Judge died only seven days later (Seal 2002:106).

One of the first points of consideration when comparing the Ned Kelly and Anzac myths is the similarity in terms of associations with the bush. Australian outlaws are known as bushrangers, a group who emerged after European settlement and vanished by the end of the 19th century. The word ‘bushranger’ was first used by the Sydney Gazette in 1805 to describe a group of escaped convicts who were robbing travellers in the bush (Macdougall 2002:115). At first, bushrangers was a term used to describe the ability of escaped convicts to survive in the bush and this was soon applied to law-abiding citizens who shared this skill as well. The term was for many a positive one and these bushmen soon became the ‘ideal Australian’, able
to exist in the Australian environment much better than the urban European settlers (Ward 1958:136). Bushranging gained much public sympathy in the early 19th century due to the often harsh treatment of convicts by their masters who used the cat-of-nine-tails as a common tool of discipline. Roger Therry, judge of the supreme court of New South Wales commented that, “Bushrangers, it is known, have been the terror of New South Wales. Of some hundreds of them who passed through our criminal courts, I do not remember to have met with one who had not been over and over again flogged before he took to the bush” (qtd. in Ward 1958:138).

Public sympathy for bushrangers also increased due to the common practice of stock stealing that was for many the only way to survive on small plots of uncultivated land. As Russell Ward writes, “Every bushman, more or less, was a thief upon occasion […] According to his own code, however, the theft of certain kinds of property, especially livestock or food from government, squatters, or ‘swells’, was at worst a trifling peccadillo and at best a moral and praiseworthy act” (1958:150).

What can be observed here is the emergence of an identity that is held to be ‘truly Australian’—even if the nation had not at that time taken formal shape. The identity is one that is recognizable in all of the myths this thesis is analysing. The bushranger, or bushman, is above all masculine and able to survive in the outdoors. The violence he uses is an accepted and often praised characteristic. His violence is placed on a pedestal and his bush skills make him “the most thoroughly ‘colonized’ of all white dwellers in Australia” (Ibid. 153) in the 19th century. In one of the most urbanized countries on earth the belief that the ‘real’ Australia is to be found in the bush is still a strong one. Ned Kelly was the epitome of this myth (Seal 2002:2) and as the last of the bushrangers his story takes place in a period where, not including the far north and parts of the interior, the age of discovery and excitement of pioneering life had passed (Ibid. 143).
Ned Kelly would become part of the bushmen myth that was promoted by newspapers such as the *Bulletin*, poets such as Henry Lawson and Banjo Paterson and then further developed by the creator of the Anzac myth, C.W. Bean as mentioned in chapter 5. Ned Kelly, as personification of the bushmen myth, is seen as uniquely Australian and contrasted with the moral decay and negativity of city life (Ibid. 155). The bushmen myth contrasted the freedom of the outdoors to the responsibilities of urban life and the Kelly myth adds this to romantic notions of outlawry that had been brought over from Britain.

There is a long tradition of bandit heroes that can be traced back to 14th century Britain and would be later embraced by British highwaymen in the 17th and 18th centuries as well as American outlaws such as Jesse James (Ibid. 13). One example is Robin Hood, who robbed the rich to benefit the poor. Whether he truly existed or not, what is more important is that his image became the archetype repeated in folklore, song, story, cinema and television (Ibid.).

One of the most important parts of both the British and Australian outlaw tradition was the emphasis on women not being harmed (Ibid. 21). The Kelly myth is conspicuous by the constant repetitions of how Ned never “interfered with women” (Ibid. 126) and the absence of women except for his mother. The asexuality of Ned seems to be a major and yet often unspoken part of the myth. Peter Carey who included a fictional love affair with a local prostitute in his book *The True History of the Kelly Gang* as well as an underlying Oedipal narrative between Ned and his mother contested the absence of any romantic interest for Ned. Romantic tales seemed to be quite prevalent after Ned’s death, so much so that his brother, James, was forced to write a letter denouncing these tales and emphasized that “My brother was so devoted to his mother that he had no ‘girl’” (J. Kelly qtd. in Kenneally 1945:201). It may be true that a twenty-seven year old man had had no love interest in his short life, but I would argue that the complete absence of women besides his mother and a few mentions of his sisters is part of the attempt to contrast the Ned Kelly myth with the supposed moral decay of urban life. Ned, as representative of the ‘authenticity’ and ‘purity’ of the bush, is also a
personification of the Australian identity that is masculine and absent of women and found in the bushmen, Anzac and sporting hero myths of Australia.

It also appears that Kelly was aware of many of the ‘rules’ of outlawry that would make him an acceptable bushranger to the local community. Acting honourably ensured a support network for outlaws that would give advance warning of police searches, help in the hiding of stolen goods or the gang members themselves and misinformation to put the authorities on the wrong track (Seal 2009:78). Ned seemed to have known this as the women who were involved in holdups all commented on how well he treated them. Mrs Scott, wife of one of the bank managers Ned robbed, stated on several occasions how gentlemanly and courteous Ned was (Seal 2002:107). Courtesy appears to be a common virtue in the folklore relating to outlaws and is often connected with a sense of ‘manliness’. The act of courtliness positions the man in a protective role and the woman in a passive one. Courtesy also, together with bravery, boldness and daring gives some justification for the violence the outlaw commits (Seal 1996:8). Ned’s gentle treatment of women can be seen as an attempt at easing the blow of robbery while also attempting to create an image of himself that is likened more to Robin Hood than a bloodthirsty criminal. Although the media remained mostly critical of him during his lifetime, his support came from the same social groups found in the Robin Hood myth, stories of Jesse James and other outlaw traditions, namely the economically disadvantaged and oppressed. In Ned Kelly’s case the oppressed and poor were mainly Irish selectors who were attempting to “maximise their economic positions on usually inferior land after the New South Wales and Victorian free selection acts of the 1860s” (Ibid. 5). The Ned Kelly myth since his death has often focused upon him as friend of the underdog and avenger of the victims of corrupt law and power (Seal 2002:11). The myth also mixes elements of stories of Irish nationalism and oppression by claiming Ned is Irish, although he was born in Australia, as evidenced in the following song from 1976:
Ned Kelly was an Irishman, Kate Kelly she was bold,
They never robbed a poor man, but banks they robbed of gold.
It’s come along my hearties and together we shall roam,
We’ll make for yonder mountains, yon gullies or yon plains,
Before we’ll work for government, bound down in iron chains (Edwards 1976:245).

Ned also returned a watch that one of accomplices had stolen from a customer who was caught up in their robbery as well as a horse that another customer had claimed was vital to him. He ensured that those under the control of his gang were not harmed and declared his moral correctness in speeches and letters. His ability to stoke popular support among the local population resulted in a (futile) petition against his execution that was signed by more than thirty thousand citizens of Melbourne (Seal 2009:76).

Much of the Ned Kelly myth is consistent with other myths from the outlaw hero tradition. Graham Seal finds twelve identifiable elements in the outlaw tradition that is expressed in ballad, story, art, literary media and other cultural forms. The elements include the outlaw being forced to defy the law by oppressive forces; sympathy from one or more social groups; the outlaw rights wrongs; the outlaw only kills in self defence; the outlaw is courteous to his victims, the outlaw distributes loot amongst the poor; the outlaw eludes the authorities with flair and often in disguise; the outlaw employs some kind of magic; the outlaw is brave and strong; the outlaw is ultimately betrayed; the outlaw dies bravely and, finally, the outlaw may be said to have escaped execution (Ibid. 75).

The Ned Kelly myth appears to include eleven of these twelve elements\(^9\). In his letters and speeches Ned claimed that he was forced to become an outlaw by the corrupt Victorian police and his support among the local population seems to confirm this accusation. He also attempted to right wrongs by stealing only from banks and rich landowners as well as burning mortgage documents and claimed that the three policemen that he killed at Stringybark Creek

\(^9\) The use of magic seems absent although newspaper reports in his time seemed to imbue him with devil-like supernatural powers (Seal 2009:76)
were only shot in self-defence. Ned is depicted in the myth as a strong brave man who avoided the police for more than a year and, in the end, was betrayed by the hostage he released in good faith. His final words, “such is life”, were entirely fictional and yet became part of a myth that matched the demands of a brave death as expected in the outlaw tradition. Davey and Seal describe Ned Kelly, as he appears most commonly in the Kelly myth, as “a man wronged by the police and the government…brave, clever, an outstanding bushman who outsmarts the police at almost every turn, who offers no violence to the poor and weak and eventually ‘dies game’” (2003:168-169).

Eric Hobsbawn finds similarities in many stories of outlaws across all nations. He dubs a group of peasant outlaws, whom the states calls criminals but the peasants celebrate, ‘social bandits’, distinguishing them from common robbers and members of organized crime groups (Hobsbawn 1972:17-18). Hobsbawn draws upon the famous story of Robin Hood, who stole from the rich and gave to the poor and remained largely an idealization of criminality as the industrial revolution had made the highwayman of past extinct. The social bandit, as champion of the poor copies the traditions and rules that are common in the outlaw tradition in order to keep the support of the local population and later becomes a creation of the tradition itself as the myth of the criminal grows and mixes with other tales of outlawry.

The Ned Kelly myth entails many elements of the outlaw tradition and many elements of Hobsbawn’s study of social bandits. Kelly arises from a pastoral area that is the site of class feuds and the threatening absorption of larger economies. Hobsbawn found this a common background to the appearance of social bandits as pre-capitalist economies transitioned into capitalist ones (Ibid. 23). Hobsbawn sees social bandits as the righter of wrongs and defenders of the traditional order of things rather than as revolutionaries (Ibid. 26) and, although some historians such as Seal (2002) have suggested that Kelly proposed a new form of republic in his Jerilderie letter, Ned appears to be chiefly interested in having the injustices of the Victorian police force exposed. Kelly is also a male youth between puberty and marriage that
refuses to yield to force or social superiority, something that Hobsbawn found to be a
common feature in the histories of outlaw Diego Corrientes as well as Pancho Villa
(Hobsbawn 1972:33-35). Finally, Hobsbawn also finds a common feature in the clothes and
outward signs of the outlaw, a visual code that announces, “this man is not tame” (Ibid. 36).
Ned Kelly’s suit of armour is probably one of the most famous representations of this
sentence in the history of outlawry, his bullet proof steel and disguised face is protection
against police weapons and a continuation of the outlaw tradition of disguise.

What becomes clear is that the Ned Kelly myth has many influences. These influences
have had effects over the years since Ned died, but also influenced Ned’s actions while he
was alive. Ned’s behaviour is entirely in keeping with other social bandits in other countries
and seems to follow the rules of outlaw traditions that ensured a local population would be on
his side. Due to this support his violence is given some sense of justification and therefore
makes Kelly an acceptable representation of Australian identity.

An example of this would be his image as a righter of wrongs that can be traced back
to the folkloric tradition of rough justice—dubbed ‘rough music’ in England or ‘charivari’ in
French. Charivari is a spontaneous demonstration of public dissatisfaction that demands
justice be done when the courts and legal authorities have failed (Seal 1996:200). This may
result in exile such as the custom of ‘tar and feathering’ on the American frontier or the tale of
Robin Hood who attempts to defeat the ‘false’ King and restore the old fair world. There are
quite a few examples of Australian outlaws fighting against corrupt policemen such as Ben
Hall, Captain Thunderbolt and Frank Gardiner, although none are as locally\(^\text{10}\) and
internationally well-known as Ned Kelly or as violent in their struggle against authority

\(^{10}\) An Australian Survey of Social Attitudes regarding the ten best known bushrangers asked
1914 Australian adults over the age of 18 for their opinion. Ned Kelly was the most popular
with 68.2% naming him first and only 6.6% for the second most well-known, Ben Hall
(Tranter & Donoghue 2008:379).
Ned’s rough justice is violent, but, for many, justified in a society where the police are of no help.

Slowly, after Ned’s execution, the myth began to grow and take on more nationalistic tones. What is most interesting is the way the Ned Kelly myth mixes traditions of outlawry and social banditry with those of the Australian bushmen and Anzacs. They all are comfortable out in the bush, are pragmatic and willing to use violence and have a focus upon the physical rather than the intellectual. For example, parts of the Kelly myth emphasize Ned’s victories in bare-knuckle boxing and his singular ability to bear the weight of the entire suit of armour that his fellow gang members could only wear parts of. Also, the actual writing of the Jerilderie Letter has been questioned and often attributed to Joe Byrne. Nevertheless, the awkward grammar and long run-on sentences have become a marker of Ned’s unique bushman qualities and was copied in Carey’s *True History of the Kelly Gang*.

Ned’s killing of Sergeant Michael Kennedy, Constable Thomas Lonigan and Constable Michael Scanlan at Stringybark Creek on October 26, 1878 is still the most polarizing point of the Ned Kelly myth. Whether the shooting was an act of just defence or a piece of wanton killing is a matter of endless debate. As oral tradition and ballads were the most common medium of telling the Ned Kelly myth in the early years it is perhaps most fitting to read the description of the events leading up to the shooting in a song from 1879 entitled *The Kelly Gang, Outlaws of the Wombat Ranges*. The song has since been recorded many times and was possibly written by Kelly gang member Joe Byrne himself:

```plaintext
A sergeant and three constables set out from Mansfield town
Near the end of last October for to hunt the Kellys down;
They started for the Wombat hills and thought it quite a lark
When they camped upon the borders of a creek called Stringybark.

They had grub and ammunition there to last them many a week,
And next morning two of them rode out, all to explore the creek,
Leaving McIntyre, behind them at the camp to cook the grub
And Lonergan [sic] to sweep the floor and boss the washing tub.

It was shortly after breakfast Mac thought he heard a noise
```
So gun in hand he sallied out to try to find the cause,
But he never saw the Kellys planted safe behind a log
So he sauntered back to smoke and yarn and wire into the grog.

But Ned Kelly and his comrades thought they'd like a nearer look
For being short of grub they wished to interview the cook;
And of firearms and cartridges they found they had too few,
So they longed to grab the pistols and the ammunition too.

Both the troopers at a stump alone they were well pleased to see
Watching as the billies boiled to make their pints of tea;
There they joked and chatted gaily never thinking of alarms
Till they heard the fearful cry behind, 'Bail up, throw up your arms

The traps they started wildly and Mac then firmly stood
While Lonergan [sic] made tracks to try and gain the wood,
Reaching round for his revolver but, before he touched the stock
Ned Kelly pulled the trigger and he dropped him like a rock.

Then after searching McIntyre all through the camp they went
And cleared the guns and cartridges and pistols from the tent,
But brave Kelly muttered sadly as he loaded up his guns,
Oh, what a bloody pity that the bastard tried to run (Qtd. in Seal 2002:44-45).

The song attempts to meet the demands of outlaw tradition and social banditry by
avoiding detailed descriptions of the deaths of the three police. Later, Ned gave a description
in the Jerilderie letter of how he fatally shot Scanlan immediately when he reached for a gun
and wounded Kennedy after a short chase that then required Kelly to commit a coup de grace.
The Ned Kelly myth and the song above largely leave out the details of the policemen’s
deaths and their identity while focusing on McIntyre fleeing. The message can be read as one
of Kelly being a heroic user of violence while the police are quick to retreat.

The argument over whether Ned Kelly was a murderer or a social bandit is reflected in
the clash of myths over the incident at Stringybark Creek. The site bears a small plaque that
was erected by the Victorian Police Force in 2001 and features the names of the policemen
without mention of Ned. Likewise, supporters of Ned Kelly rarely mention the names of the
men Ned killed or seek to delve into their story, but, instead, focus on constant reminders of
how well Ned treated others.
The two natures of the Ned Kelly myth when it comes to violence can be found in descriptions of the man himself. There are many descriptions of him winning bare-knuckle boxing matches, treating captives well and famously saving a drowning boy when he was a youth himself (for this he would receive a green sash as a reward—one that was found under his suit of armour during his shootout with the police many years later). On the other hand, he was a killer of men and arrested for assault and disorderly behaviour. The ability to be both appears to ensure that the outlaw is neither seen as weak nor hated (Hobsbawn 1972:63). The mere threat of being able to be terrible seems to be an important skill for the outlaw as evident in Ned’s Jerilderie letter, where he describes horrific vengeance while attempting to assure the reader that he is a just man: “they knew well I was not there or I would have scattered their blood and brains like rain I would manure the Eleven mile with their bloated carcases [sic] and yet remember there is not one drop of murderous blood in my veins” (Kelly 1879:23).

The re-working of the past is a strong part of outlaw tradition and seems to play a direct role in the Ned Kelly myth. Guidelines for outlaw behavior make communally sanctioned violence and law breaking possible (Seal 1996:182). Ned Kelly is able to remain part of the same Australian identity applied to the Anzacs and sporting heroes by depicting him as an avenger of his mother and the poor against the corrupt police and authorities. The other element involved here is a contrast between the countryside and the city, the supposed freedom and purity of the bush and the moral decay of the city. Ned Kelly as a bushranger remains an ideal male figure, a symbolic representation and enforcement of whiteness, masculinity and violence in Australian history as well as an anti-imperialist working-class subaltern (Basu 2011:37).

Since his death, Ned Kelly has become a powerful image of Australian identity. Ned’s armour, in particular, is a provocative symbol that makes him stand out among other bushrangers as well as alluding to European medieval knights and the pre-capitalist world that Ned fights for in the Ned Kelly myth (Tranter & Donoghue 2008:385). His suit of armour
appears without fail in all books, poems, ballads and films on Ned Kelly as well as the famous series of paintings by Sidney Nolan (Seal 2002:131).

Sidney Nolan’s “Ned Kelly” series began in 1946 and hints at a comparison to the trials and crucifixion of Christ (Ibid. 139). The 27 paintings depict Ned Kelly’s life and contain allusions to themes of justice and betrayal. 1946 was a time when Australia was beginning to explore its own ideas of nationhood and deal with the alleged betrayal of the British surrender of Singapore in WWII. The paintings were first exhibited in 1948 and included quotations from various historical sources. Nolan did not claim to depict the historical story of Kelly in his paintings but, instead, wanted to reflect the violence in the world at the time and the way one person’s actions can change the world (“The Ned Kelly Series Gallery” 2015). The paintings revived the Ned Kelly myth and played a strong part in immortalizing the image of his helmet and making Ned part of the Australian artistic landscape. Nolan found the ideas of being “game like Kelly” and landscape to be of particular importance in his series of paintings and therefore focused on parts of Ned’s life where he battled against the authorities while incorporating bright colours to depict the harsh sunlight of Australia (Ibid.).

Once again the bush plays a large part in the Ned Kelly myth—Nolan himself described the story of Ned Kelly “a story arising out of the bush and ending in the bush” (Nolan 1948:20). The “Ned Kelly” series by Sidney Nolan is a perfect illustration of the Australian identity that is built upon a common theme found in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sporting myths, namely one that is above all masculine, violent and linked with the bush. The spirit of Ned Kelly is claimed to be an essentialist identity that is shared by the early bushmen, the Anzacs and Ned Kelly himself. In this way the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths merge into one—the description of an Australian man who is able to survive in the bush and use violence to defeat his enemies could be used interchangeably for the Ned Kelly
myth and for the Anzacs in their myth as evidenced by a book published sometime in the 1930s by Henry H. Neary:

The Kellys became a sort of tradition in Australia […] Until 1915 their memory was regarded in a somewhat heroic light but after the advent of the Anzacs and their deeds at Gallipoli and the deeds of the Light Horse in Egypt and Palestine, this country found itself with a new and much worthier tradition—the tradition of Anzac, with its spirit of mateship, sacrifice and courage. All the same, it was the same daring blood that inspired the bushmen of the first A.I.F. that had enabled the Kelly gang to defy the police for so long and gave them the courage to fight to the death when cornered […] they had two great attributes in their bushmanship and bravery (39).

Ned Kelly has, over time, become a national figure. The attitude of the press towards him has changed from largely critical to mainly sympathetic (Tranter & Donoghue 2008:385), from overwhelmingly anti-Kelly in the literature spanning the fifty years after his death (Jones 1995:338) to a symbol of Australian spirit in the Olympic Games in 2000. Ned has appeared in numerous books, pamphlets, poems, songs and television series. By 1940 alone forty-two books on Ned Kelly had been published (Seal 2002:5). At least seven Australian films have been made based on his life, including the world’s first feature length film The Story of the Kelly Gang. Ned Kelly has also been adopted by Aborigines—the descendants of the trackers who assisted the police in finding his gang are now claiming their share of the reward, some Aborigines in the Northern Territory have conflated Ned Kelly with Jesus Christ, while Aborigines in Western Australian have adopted Ned as a symbol of defiance and struggle (Seal 1996:179).

In summary, the Ned Kelly myth is one influenced by traditions of outlawry, the Robin Hood myth as well as the myth of an essential Australian identity that is found in the bush and is, above all, masculine. The Ned Kelly myth is riddled with markers of family (Ibid. 12) such as the imprisonment of his mother and the membership of his brother Dan in the gang but is absent of any other females. It is also often marked by an acceptance of violence. The justification for his violence is based upon charges of corruption and a threat to his family structure and stability—a common feature in American and Australian outlaw hero
stories (Ibid. 13). Ned’s killing of the policemen at Stringybark Creek is often overlooked or justified as self-defence and his execution has become a symbol of bravery and struggle against authority. The transformation he has undergone over the years is evident in the fact that he appeared at the Olympics as a representation of Australia as well as the issuing of a postage stamp in his honour by the Commonwealth government (Ibid. 148).

Ned Kelly is the most recognisable 19th century Australian. His myth has been perpetuated in fictional (e.g. Carey 2001; Drewe 1991; Ridden 2000; Stafford 1998 et al.) and non-fictional (e.g. Brown 2005; Castles and Castles 2005; Jones 1995; Molony 2001; Seal 2002 et al.) accounts of his life. As Jones writes, “Ned Kelly has become a commodity to be packaged and promoted” (1995:339). Ned is a symbol of Australian identity alongside icons of the bush and the Digger (Seal 2002:158). In 2007 the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes found that, out of 2584 Australians over the age of 18, fifty-seven per cent found Ned Kelly to be either an important or very important symbol of Australian identity (Tranter & Donoghue 2010:195). He is the bushmen and Anzac myth personified and the making of his myth was taking place while he lived as he attempted to follow the rules of outlawry and seek support amongst the local population. The characteristics he shares with the early bushmen and the Anzacs provides a link back to a golden age of Australia. His myth supports the idea that there is an eternal Australian spirit that has appeared throughout Australian history and should be followed today. This spirit is male, physical rather than intellectual, disrespectful of authority, traces its roots back to Britain and Ireland, is skilled at surviving in the bush, and is willing and able to use violence to overcome obstacles.
8. Conclusion

“Serious sport has nothing to do with fair play. It is bound up with hatred, jealousy, boastfulness, disregard for all rules, and sadistic pleasure in witnessing violence. In other words, it is war minus the shooting” (Orwell 1945).

“As we sit and reflect on Thursday on the history and tradition of the ANZAC spirit, sport becomes one of Australia and New Zealand’s prime forms of celebration. Two fantastic ANZAC Day games will be played, celebrating both the past and present on the battlefield and to a lesser extend [sic] the rugby league field. We will stand in silence remembering those who made the ultimate sacrifice as the Last Post is played, and then not stop cheering until after the final whistle is blown on the field” (Trodden 2013).

Sport in Australia can be seen as the concluding synthesis of the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths, both in contemporary society as well as in this thesis. It is upon the sporting field that the expected behaviour that developed in the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths can most easily be seen. In this chapter I will describe the different forms of aggression that can be identified in sport, the way sport has been used to represent the supposed necessary violence and determination required to overcome struggles in life, the important role sport plays in gender identity and the representation of manliness, the rules that must be followed in sport and those that may be broken, the part sport plays in Australian identity, and the continuation of the bushman/Anzac spirit that is purported to live on in Australian sporting heroes.

Sport plays an important part in the representation of Australian identity. Although the sport that has the highest participation rates in Australia is walking (“Participation in Sport and Physical Recreation.” 2015), the most attended and the most commonly associated with Australia are Australian Rules Football (AFL), cricket, rugby league and rugby union (“Most Popular Sports Attended.” 2010). These four sports commonly invoke the Anzac and bushman myth and promote an idealised image of violent rough men from rural areas.

‘Natural’ sporting talents who grew up in the country have long been held in high regard in Australia. Examples such as the cricketer Don Bradman (the most successful Australian sportsman due to his batting average being double that of any other cricketer), Phil
Hughes and the Queensland rugby league team are often in the media with a de-emphasis on the training that was required to get them to the top of their sport. The binary opposition in Australian sporting myths involves the city being associated with training, technique and modern equipment, and the bush with natural talent and eccentricities. Examples of this would be Don Bradman and Phil Hughes’ unique styles of batting that would have been corrected if they had been trained to play in the city but are lauded for their ‘bush style’. Don Bradman grew up in country Australia and taught himself how to play. His unique style of holding the bat, although technically ‘wrong’, enabled him to keep the ball on the ground and avoid dismissal. This eccentricity and his nickname ‘the boy from the bush’ is juxtaposed with the urban cricketers who emerge from cricketing academies with textbook batting techniques but records significantly worse than ‘the Don’.

The focus on ‘natural athletes’ can be traced back to myths that saw the bush as the birthplace of physical superiority. In the sporting myth these athletes, much like the bushmen and Anzacs, are superior due to natural ability derived from growing up in the bush (Mewett 1999:372). According to the myth, the bush is the ‘real’ Australia as opposed to the city. The bush is the forge where ‘real’ Australians are made. Therefore, athletes from the bush are seen as drawing their abilities from this natural fount of the essential Australian spirit rather than the modern training, sport academies and exercise equipment that belong in the city. Many athletes from the bush are represented as idealized examples of Australian identity, sharing the same characteristics as the Anzacs and Ned Kelly. They are physical rather than intellectual, able to use violence to overcome obstacles and are masters of rural and bush areas. Examples of this would be the cricketers Matthew Hayden and Andrew Symonds who combined their sporting careers with hunting and fishing television shows that took place in the Australian bush.

The relationship between sports and violence has long been discussed and two opinions on their connection have become most prominent. The first theory is similar to the
idea of catharsis of Moore (1966) and Lorenz (1966), where an audience enjoys a violent spectacle in order to relieve any aggressive tension within themselves. Some researchers point to a drive-discharge theory that argues violent sports can be traced back to ancient times and functioned as a substitute for war in the discharging of aggression (Jewell et al. 2011:17). Purportedly, the audience watches athletes committing various acts of sanctioned violence upon the sporting field and vicariously lives out their own violent desires. A problem with the catharsis theory is that it assumes the audience and participants leave the sporting event more peaceful than when they entered. The long history of football hooliganism and various incidents of spectator violence during and after other sporting events seems to contradict the idea of aggression being discharged in a safe and contained manner.

The second theory is a cultural-pattern theory that argues violence in sports reflects aggressive tendencies within society itself. Therefore, according to this argument, ancient sports were so violent because the society, for example ancient Rome, itself was extremely violent (Ibid.).

Similar to this cultural-pattern theory is the idea sports violence is a “socially-constructed and learned behaviour which actually serves to legitimize and foster more aggressive behaviour” (Messner 1992:203). The prism through which I look at Australian sporting myths in this thesis is closer to these cultural-pattern/social constructivist theories. Sport in Australia and the sporting heroes that become so popular are often influenced by the myth of Australian identity that can be found in the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths. The same idea of an essential Australian spirit that is linked to the bush, is physically superior rather than intellectual and is violent can be found in Australian sport. Being violent in sport is often expected and excused because of the myth of the essential Australian bushman spirit. By being violent the athlete emulates idealized representations of Australian identity.

International sport has been a key area where representations of Australia are expressed, gaining extensive media overage and defining the nation by its success against
other countries (Bruce & Hallinan 2001:260). By the end of the First World War, and at the same time as the emergence of the Anzac myth, sport had become “a very important part of the physical, social, and mental landscape of most Australians, and central to an emerging Australian way of life” (Cashman 1995:53). Since then, enthusiasm for sport has become an Australian characteristic (Adair & Vamplew 1997:iix), at least if being Australian is based upon the normative representations of Australians that are supported by Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths. Once again the themes of physicality over intellectualism, practicality and violence come to the fore.

Australia is a nation that often appears “awkward about expressing a generalized patriotism” (Turner 1994:68), but sport is perhaps the scene for the most prominent patriotic displays in public. From the beginning of white settlement, sport was the way for Australia to show what its citizens were good at. The majority of the sports were imported from Britain and international games were a way of proving that the British race was not degenerating under the Australian sun like so many Darwinists had claimed but, instead, had improved. As Daniel Horne writes: “Sport was the first form of Australian foreign policy. Until the British got into some wars to which the Australians could send volunteers, it was the only way in which Australians could prove they were the best” (1970:156).

At international sporting events people lock into certain ideas of nationhood and the games themselves are often filled with symbols of nationalism (Mewett 1999:357-358). Examples of this would be the presence of the military at many rugby and AFL matches, signs commemorating the Anzacs that the players run through at the beginning of a game, the visit by the Australian cricket team to Gallipoli in order to capture and harness the Anzac spirit as well as the playing of the Last Post by a member of the military dressed in army uniform before Anzac Day games of rugby or AFL.

Alongside the obvious references to the Anzacs in Australian sporting events is a praising of violence that has been identified in the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths. Studies of
violence in sport often use the term aggression rather than violence as they attempt to grapple with the intention of the act itself. For the purposes of this thesis I will focus on acts of overt and covert personal violence that take place in Australian sport using the definition described in chapter 3.

Australian Rules Football, rugby league, rugby union and to a certain extent cricket all involve condoned acts of violence that take place within the written and unwritten rules of each sport. The unwritten rules are often more relevant than the written rules when it comes to interpreting the morality of a player’s actions (Stovitz & Satin 2004:216). For example, AFL players often attempt to intimidate opposing players with acts of violence that, if seen by the umpire, would be harshly punished (Grange & Kerr 2010:40). Instead, their ability to commit violent acts without getting caught can often be praised—for example, fighting back when a melee has started. To not fight back would not emulate the violent idealization of what an Australian is as represented in the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths.

Rules can often be interpreted freely and the events of each game require constant moral adjustment in order to achieve victory (Bredemeier & Shields 1986:19). For example, opposing players may be “temporarily and partially objectified by being psychologically transformed into obstacles to be overcome in the pursuit of victory” (Ibid. 23) and aggressive action to remove these obstacles may be morally permissible. What is morally permissible is often due to cultural expectations of what Australian sportsmen are. For example, the sharp divide that was common in England between upper class amateur cricketers and professional working class players was not accepted in Australia. Likewise, barracking or ‘sledging’ (the verbal insults hurled at and between athletes) has long been a well-known Australian sporting trait (Adair & Vamplew 1997:xii) as well as the acceptance of violent melees in rugby league matches like the State of Origin series between New South Wales and Queensland.

Part of the reason for violence existing in sport is because of the positive response from fans for it (Jewell et al. 2011:14). Aggressive and violent play intensifies the
entertainment value for the audience and multiple studies have found male respondents enjoyed violent sports rather than low risk ones (Comisky et al. 1977, Bryant et al. 1981, Sargent et al. 1998). Besides this economic basis, a theoretical explanation for the multiple motives behind the acts of violence by athletes is reversal theory. Reversal theory is flexible in that it reflects the regular reversal that a person’s emotions, motivations and the meaning they attach to situations undergo (Apter 1989:23). Whereas many other theories attempt to give one unchanging reason for why violence takes place in sport reversal theory highlights four different forms—play, anger, power and thrill aggression (Grange & Kerr 2010:37).

Play aggression involves acts that take place within the rules of the sport (Ibid.). An example of play aggression would be extra hard tackles or use of the hip or shoulder in rugby in order to incapacitate the opposing player. The violence here is committed out in the open and is sanctioned, and often encouraged, by all involved in the sport. Play aggression has taken place in numerous games of rugby league, for example the two opposing forwards Paul Harragon and Mark Carroll having to be stretchered out of a game after numerous heavy clashes, or the Australian cricketers, Dennis Lillee and Jeff Thomson, submitting opposing batsmen to aggressive spells of bowling aimed at their bodies with the intent to injure them and thereby remove them from the game.

Anger aggression takes place outside of the written and unwritten rules of the sport and is often a retributive act that takes the form of a sudden and angry physical response to some kind of altercation. Examples of this would be punches thrown after an illegal tackle in AFL or rugby.

Power aggression is aimed at the domination of rival players. It is a calculated form of intimidation that involves serious violent acts. An example of this can be seen in Figure 7 when AFL player Tony Lockett used his elbow to break an opposing player’s cheekbone or when Terry Lamb concussed the opposition’s captain in the 1988 rugby league grand final.
Finally, thrill aggression is gratuitous and is carried out for the immediate feeling of pleasure for the aggressor. Examples of thrill aggression would be the now expected melee that takes place in annual rugby league matches between New South Wales and Queensland.

Reversal theory’s descriptions are similar in some descriptions due to the dynamic nature of violence in sport. The various forms of aggression are not mutually exclusive and one form may soon develop into another (Ibid.). An example of this would be the premeditated brawl that took place in the 1995 New South Wales versus Queensland rugby league match. This annual series often depicts the New South Wales team as urban and the Queensland side as rural and representative of the hard bushman myth. The melee between the two sides was planned to intimidate the opposing side, appeal to the violent bushman myth that is attached to the Queensland rugby league team, inspire the Queensland side as well as turning quickly into pure thrill for several of the players (Barnhill 2012, Moore 2013).
The relationship between violence and sport is also part of the learned behaviour that the players and spectators are exposed to. Sport creates a world of justice that rewards hard work and talent (Oriard 1981:33). It creates an ordered world with rules, expected ways of acting and limited playing fields, a world where humans are able to strive and overcome great obstacles (Ibid.). In order to succeed in sports athletes learn the importance of dominance, control and power (Mărășescu 2012:152) as well as the success that violence brings.

Athletes model their own violent behavior on other athletes, receive encouragement for their violent acts by coaches and teammates and are taught from a young age that violent behavior is often vital for team success (Sheldon & Aimar 2001:304). An example can be seen in the case of Tony Lockett, the athlete previously mentioned as breaking the cheekbone of an opposing player. Lockett was banned for several matches for the incident, but then was hired by the team of the player who had his cheek broken as they were looking for more aggressiveness in their team. Lockett’s violence was overlooked and even seen as a boost for the side and instrumental in getting them to the finals that year. Likewise, Terry Lamb’s knocking out of the opposing captain was seen as what gave his team victory in the grand final. Photos of the incident and the celebrations afterward can be seen in Figure 8. Similar results have been found in ice hockey where illegal aggressive behavior has been found to benefit team performance (Ibid. 307).
Sport in Australia not only involves the learned behavior of violence, but also plays a part in the construction of gender identity. In particular, rugby and cricket were products of Britain’s expanding empire where sport was seen as a training ground for future soldiers, administrative leaders as well as an expression of masculinity (Dunning 1986:82). Sport was seen as a way to encourage rule following, respect for authority, the development of ‘respectable’ masculinity and as a diversion from ‘sinful’ pastimes (Adair & Vamplew 1997:134). Indeed, cricket is still referred to as ‘the gentleman’s game’, supposedly teaching young boys how to act in a gentlemanly manner i.e. not cheating or acting unfairly. Despite the prevalence of cheating scandals over the past twenty years, underhanded or unsporting behavior is still branded ‘just not cricket.’ This form of constructed masculinity would develop in rugby and AFL as well in regards to what type of violence was permissible. For many players, standing toe to toe and throwing punches at each other would be a fine example of ‘real’ men, or could even be seen as a form of punishment for one player who acted ‘unmanly’ by using violence stealthily (Ibid. 125).

Figure 8 Terry Lamb victorious in large part due to him knocking out the opposing team’s captain
The gender norms are most visible when ‘male’ and ‘female’ sports are compared. Sports such as gymnastics, ice-skating and synchronized swimming are generally considered to be sports for women and emphasize flexibility, co-ordination and balance while rugby and AFL—‘male’ sports—involves confrontations, aggressiveness, strategy and tactics (Hargreaves 1986:116). The discourse of female sport is loaded with stereotypical associations of femininity, while the discourse of male sport and war is synonymous. Sport in Australia was for a long time associated with ‘natural’ male attributes such as strength, fitness and skill while women’s sports emphasized recreation and relaxation (Adair & Vamplew 1997:50).

Sport is a gendering institution in that it ‘masculinizes’ male bodies and minds. Of course, before entering sports, boys are already exposed to gendering in earlier experiences and interactions with peers and family members (Messner 1992:174). Boys often know what a man should be and how sport should be played before beginning to play. Australian boys encounter a double gender construction based upon what a man should be i.e. physically strong and violent which happens to also be what an Australian man should be. The interaction between people and social institutions makes a boy’s choice to play rugby or AFL often appear natural as if it was what he was destined to do (Ibid. 163-164). His violent behavior upon the football field is an expected action, gains him praise from coaches, teammates and supporters, brings him success and legitimizes the violent aspects of hegemonic masculinity. Male violence in sport is not a genetic or biological category, but a learned behavior. As Messner writes, “in equating force and aggression with physical strength, domination, and power modern sport naturalized the equation of maleness with violence, thus lending support and legitimation to patriarchy” (Ibid. 205). For example, in colonial Australia several sports were based upon means of measuring ‘manliness’, with competitors kicking each other in the knees or shins in order to see who can inflict and withstand the maximum violence possible (Adair & Vamplew 1997:124). It must be said,
however, that many modern sports players do not have to be aggressive, but it is, instead, more of an aggressive culture existing in sports such as rugby that allows for violence (Atry et al. 2012:475) and seems to point towards violence being a learned behavior rather than a necessary one.

Australian identity also has a prominent role in sporting myths. As the Australian is seen as athletic, violent and above all masculine it is expected that men partake in sport. Indeed, 74% of Australians aged 15-17 years participate in sport and physical recreation with equal or higher rates for males in all age groups (“Participation in Sport and Physical Recreation.” 2015). In sport, boys learn to overvalue winning and competition, to control their emotions and endure pain without complaining, to use violence to achieve their goals and to brand any qualities that do not fit this norm as ‘feminine’ (Connell 1992:157). There are clear similarities between the male athlete, the soldier and the representation of Australian identity in the bushman/Anzac myth, namely a physically superior athlete who can overcome obstacles through violence. Therefore a gender norm is created that depicts ‘real’ men as violent and teaches that enduring pain is courageous while criticizing pleasure. Ideas such as ‘no pain, no gain’ and the admiration for workaholics put the success of the team or company above the feelings of the individual. Violence and pain is put on a pedestal and seen as a necessary component for success and what it means to be a man. Any avoidance or denial of this violent gender norm is dubbed ‘feminine’ or ‘unmanly’ (Sabo 1992:159).

In summary, it can be said that the Australian sporting myth is filled with learned behavior of violence that is supported by spectators, coaches and sporting participants. Violence can break out in sporting events due to intentional strategies designed to win the game, as an act of retribution often for another act of violence, as an act of intimidation or purely for the thrill of the aggressor as well as a desire to live up to gender and national norms. Violent behavior upon the sporting field is an accepted part of what is expected of men playing sport where the gender norm is that males are hard, violent and fixated on
success, above all else. Added to this masculine gender norm is the representation of Australian identity that can be found in the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths—linked with the bush, physical rather than intellectual, athletically superior, male and able and willing to use violence to overcome obstacles. The same mythical Australian that is derisive of British authority at Gallipoli or police authority in Victoria in the 19th century can be found on the sporting field. Here he uses violence when he can get away with it and becomes the idealized carrier of an essential Australian spirit.

The similarities between the Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sporting myths can be seen as evidence that the myths are, in fact, one and the same. The main characters from the three myths can be interchanged because they are all constructed to meet the required characteristics inherent in the most prominent myth of Australian identity. Although each myth takes place in periods decades apart, and in situations that are varied as war, criminality and athletics, they each seem to produce men who are physical rather than intellectual, disrespectful of authority, adept at surviving in the bush and able to use violence to overcome obstacles.

Myths are constructed from a series of connotations (in this case the bush, masculinity, physicality, Australia and violence) that are repeated until they begin to appear natural, eternal and to be taken for granted. In the myths this thesis analyses the bush appears as a source of Australian identity. Those who are skilled at surviving there appear to be more Australian than others and so in each myth there is a constant binary opposition between the ‘true Australians’ in the bush and the morally decadent urbanites. This opposition can be seen in the claim that the Anzacs were the embodiment of the bushmen pioneers who civilised Australia, that Ned Kelly could outwit the police from the capital because of his superior bushranging skills and the superior natural talent of athletes from the bush such as Don Bradman.
Myths serve to simplify and naturalize. This simplification avoids details that may serve to complicate the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths such as the fact that most Anzacs came from the cities, Ned Kelly could be seen as a murderer and thug, and most sporting heroes have come from the cities rather than the country.

Myths also create a purified history that connects the present day to a golden age of origin. In the case of Australia, myths serve to form an essential Australian spirit that stretches back to the first European settlers. Constant references to the Anzac spirit or the representation of bushmen or Ned Kelly as symbols of Australia help reinforce this connection to the past. Once again the myth simplifies by leaving out non-white settlers, bushmen and Anzacs as well as women.

In all of the myths violence is presented in a positive light. Violence is seen as a legitimate method of dealing with obstacles in life. In the case of the Anzac myth, violence is seen as necessary for the birth of the nation on the shores of Gallipoli. The exaltation of the Anzacs and the comparison to Greek heroes at the birth of Western civilization is repeated until it becomes a naturalized fact that is used as a model to emulate in contemporary society i.e. if today’s Australians acted like the Anzacs then a golden age would dawn. Anzacs and Gallipoli have become part of a golden age and a sacred land, a necessary reference point for any politician and the most important representation of an essential Australian spirit. Anzac Day is now the most important day of the year in Australia and references to the Anzac spirit are made in each military conflict Australia involves itself in.

Violence not only connects the three myths, but it also plays a central role in the masculine side of Australian identity. The absence of women from Australian myths is a key feature and so is the representation of men. According to the three myths, men are supposed to be athletic and violent. Violence marks bushrangers as free from the complications of city-life and representatives of true Australia. Violence is also essential for the most nationalistic of institutions in the county—sport. The behaviour of the athletes can be seen as a result of
the construction of what it means to be an Australian man in the Anzac and Ned Kelly myths. Violence brings success, is a characteristic of true Australians like Ned Kelly and gives birth to a nation. Violence is the rope that, according to the myth, connects today’s Australians to the golden age of origin. Violence in these myths is a necessary tactic to conquer and progress. Violence in these myths is placed upon a pedestal.
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11. Appendix

11.1 English Summary

This thesis looks at the three most prominent myths in the discourse over Australian national identity. By analysing the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths in Australia certain shared characteristics appear. For example, in each of the myths there is an idealised Australian that is male, physical rather than intellectual, linked to the bush and willing to use violence to overcome obstacles.

I apply Barthes’ theory of myth to explain how certain discourses take hold of the national mythscape and appear natural and eternal. Myths such as Anzac, Ned Kelly and Australian sport attempt to make connotations like violent behaviour, the bush and the ‘Anzac spirit’ appear denotative, as if the idea of an essential spirit that connects the early pioneers in the Australian bush with the bushrangers, Anzacs and contemporary Australians should go without saying. The three myths this thesis analyses attempts to simplify history and make it support dominant power structures within Australian society such as the idea that Australia is a white, male Anglo-Saxon nation.

Violence in each of the myths is praised. According to the myths, violence was seen as necessary for the first European settlers to overcome the harsh environment, for the birth of the nation through blood sacrifice at the Battle of Gallipoli, for Ned Kelly to resist the oppression of the police from the city, and for sportmen to achieve success. Violence is an expected and encouraged part of an idealised hegemonic masculinity that is seen as essentially Australian and is therefore a significant characteristic in the Anzac, Ned Kelly and sporting myths of Australia.
11.2 Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Diese Arbeit beschäftigt sich mit dem Diskurs der drei prominentesten Mythen der australischen Nationalidentität. Die Analyse zeigt bestimmte gemeinsame Merkmale der Themen Anzac, Ned Kelly und Sport auf. Ihnen gemeinsam ist eine idealisierte australische Figur, die eher männlich, mehr physisch als intellektuell erscheint, verbunden mit dem australischen Busch, und bereit ist, Gewalt anzuwenden, um Hindernisse zu überwinden.
