

University of East London Institutional Repository: <http://roar.uel.ac.uk>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Stephenson, Andrew

Title: Palimpsestic Promenades: Memorial Environments and the Urban Consumption of Space in Post-1918 London

Year of publication: 2005

Citation: Stephenson, A. (2005) 'Palimpsestic Promenades: Memorial Environments and the Urban Consumption of Space in Post-1918 London' Australian and New Zealand Journal of Art, 6(1) pp.42-61.

Link to published version:

<http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=598684034330121;res=IELHSS>

'Palimpsestic promenades': Memorial environments and the urban consumption of space in post-1918 London.

Andrew Stephenson

Whilst the end of the Great War and the Armistice in November 1918 marked out a traumatic moment in British and Western European histories, simultaneously many writers and critics claimed it as a turning point that would launch a 'new renaissance' for the visual arts in Great Britain under state and government patronage.¹ The two most enduring emblems of this artistic renewal were commemorative sculptures and collections of state commissioned war art such as those now housed in the Imperial War Museums in London and Salford.² In the post-Armistice years, almost every parish of the 16,436 in Great Britain commissioned some form of commemorative sculpture to be located in a central public space and/ or incorporated within a respectful memorial environment. Dedicated to upholding the collective memory of those local citizens who had fought and given their lives in the conflict, these memorials were often positioned on consecrated land in churchyards or outside churches. Alternatively, they were found in prominent positions, most usually in town squares or on village greens. Extolling the virtues of national resilience during wartime and dedicated to venerating social ideals for future generations to aspire to, these civic monuments were financed by public subscription as well as by private donation.³

At the same time, the formats that these memorial sites might take was overseen by local government and military representatives and monitored by diocese wardens as well as major private donors. Although there was no explicit legislation passed by the British Government directing the selection criteria for the artist, the materials they should employ and the features and scripts they should display, proposals were vetted by professional bodies such as the Royal Academy's War Memorials Committee and the council of the Royal Society of British Sculptors.⁴ Nevertheless, any decisions about scale and landscaping were subject to local planning regulations and council bye-laws. The outcome was also substantially informed by popular taste with the opinions of local people - notably ex-servicemen and widows - ratifying the whole selection and construction process and being extensively reported in the local and national press.

Given the huge number of memorials erected, they obviously exhibited a diversity of styles and formats with some recording details and rank of those who died whilst others provided no specific mention of the deceased whatsoever. Equally remarkable was the fact that although they frequently depicted military personnel or personifications of peace, valour or sacrifice, the memorials did not contain the bodies of the killed soldiers from abroad. Exhumations and the repatriation of the deceased had been banned during the war and this restriction continued after its cessation. Instead, the British and colonial dead were buried in huge cemeteries near the battlefields in Northern France and Flanders that from 1917 came under the control of the Imperial War Graves Commission.⁵ As a consequence there was an urgent need to build permanent memorials to the fallen in Great Britain in order to register their valour as well as to provide a focus for mourning. Especially on or around Armistice Day, 11 November, these memorial sites became the centrepieces of elaborate military and civilian parades

that confirmed commemoration in peace-time as a meaningful acknowledgement of self-sacrifice and re-shaped it as an act of responsible citizenship on the part of combatant nations in the post-war era.

As Alex King has argued in his essay 'Remembering and forgetting in Public Memorial of the Great War', 'the function of commemoration is to give authority to one interpretation of social reality against competitors... Officials as holders of municipal or state power, remain the dominant power in these negotiations'.⁶ Given the previously unimaginable scale of bereavement and human loss that the Great War produced, the main issue for government officials and artists alike was what was the most decorous and respectful representations of sacrifice to employ. Practical considerations in response to the growing desire of the British public to commemorate by means of ritual processions involving the laying of flowers or wreaths by local war veterans, war widows and other community groups, also had to be accommodated. Official publications such as A. Clutton-Brock's On War Memorials (1917) and exhibitions such as the Victoria and Albert Museum's two-part War Memorial show (Summer 1919) offered guidance on the most appropriate sculptural forms and Christian symbolism that a nation in mourning should adopt whilst safeguarding the sensitivities of female mourners, war widows and bereaved families.⁷ Linked to this design issue were issues of precedence: how previous Victorian funerary devices, pre-war idealised forms for depicting martyrdom and earlier conventions linked to male sacrifice could be modernised and made relevant to the scale of the Great War.

What emerged in response to government and professional guidance and popular reaction was that two simple rules were to be rigidly adhered to. First, by demonstrating the 'birthrights of our own flesh and blood', '[Memorials] of the British School...[should be]...executed by a sculptor of purely British descent'.⁸ Second, that in the planning of memorial environments and when selecting monumental forms and styles, foreign precedents should be disregarded. Not unsurprisingly, it was insisted that 'We shall naturally avoid the limitations of the German' and any signs of 'Germanness' in manufacture or embellishment.⁹ In addition, subjects such as homicidal acts or depictions involving extreme violence that was unbecoming to the military dead and might give a dishonourable impression should also be avoided.

In Spring 1919, it became clear that it was necessary for a national memorial to the British Empire dead of the Great War to be erected in the capital in preparation for the international Peace Celebrations that were to be held in London on 19 July. Cabinet records underline government anxieties about the need to retain close control over the selection of the artist involved and over the location and sculptural format employed in case this might produce a processional 'Siegesalleé' in central London.¹⁰ Initially it was decided that a temporary 'catafalque' be designed to stand in Whitehall. The Prime Minister, Lloyd George, approached the British architect Edwin Lutyens in early June since Lutyens had had experience of designing Boer War memorials in South Africa. Lutyens rapidly produced a design for a structure some thirty three feet high made of wood and plaster with a sarcophagus on top. Submitted for approval to the Chief Architect to the Government Office of Works, Sir Frank Baines, this design was only slightly amended by Lord Curzon before being given government approval. It was this

monumental structure lined with flags that was unveiled on 19 July and marked out the saluting point for both Allied troops and their leaders during the Allied peace procession.¹¹

Nevertheless, the main focus for the 1919 peace celebrations remained the Mall where a series of commemorative pylons had been erected with the names of key naval and land battles and British victories along the route from Trafalgar Square to the Queen Victoria Memorial in front of Buckingham Palace. Culminating in a review by the King outside the Palace itself, the Peace procession was a highly militaristic event and comprised of contingents of Allied troops displaying the latest in tanks, guns, mortar launchers and military hardware. However, what was noteworthy was that for weeks after the procession, mourners and pilgrims continued to bow their heads and stand in silence or lay wreaths at Lutyens's temporary monument. Contemporary press reports noted that contrary to expectations, it was the temporary Cenotaph in Whitehall, rather than the Queen Victoria Memorial in the Mall or Nelson's Column in Trafalgar Square which had emerged as the site where people felt closer to the bereaved. Events and mass media coverage confirmed that the Mall was now seen as 'an avenue of triumph' whereas the Cenotaph had been elevated as the 'national shrine'. 'From a memorial', declared the Leeds Mercury, 'it [the Cenotaph] has become a shrine'.¹²

Following a petition to the Cabinet from twenty-three members of the House of Commons to retain the Cenotaph as an enduring national shrine and as the centrepiece of an annual ritual of remembrance, it was agreed on 30 July 1919 that a permanent replica be erected on its present site in Whitehall.¹³ Lutyens's permanent version consisted of a severely geometrical, monumental empty tomb made of Portland stone decorated by laurel wreaths and by Union and military flags. Engraved upon its sides were the date and (upon Lloyd George's suggestion) the words 'To the Glorious Dead'. Whilst its detractors christened the Cenotaph a dreary 'tombstone', its supporters praised its unassuming and 'distinctively British' styling. As the Times applauded on 11 November, it perfectly fulfilled two of the criteria set out as appropriate for war memorials. It had been completed by a British subject (Lutyens) and the memorial was 'simple, massive, unadorned, it speaks of the qualities of the race...'.¹⁴ Lutyens's success was further reinforced when he received the Royal Institute of British Architect's gold medal in 1921. In his speech, the President J.W. Simpson applauded Lutyens's vision and extolled the Cenotaph's appropriate scale, simplicity and proportion:

'Precisely suited to its site and its surroundings, austere yet gracious, technically perfect, it is the very expression of repressed emotion...'¹⁵

With the unveiling of this permanent Cenotaph in Whitehall at the same time as the dedication of the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey on 11 November 1920, there was an emphatic shift in the pre-war memorial axes in the City of Westminster that revised the dominant westward spatial geographies of Edwardian London.¹⁶ What was produced was a memorial path that by-passed the 'great processional way' from Buckingham Palace, past the Queen Victoria Memorial down the Mall through the newly built triumphal Admiralty Arch into Trafalgar Square and to Charing Cross. Instead, this new commemorative route upheld the Cenotaph as the imperial and national shrine for British mourners and then moved southwards down

Whitehall to Westminster Abbey and to the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior. The politically significant and culturally meaningful nature of this 'continuous memorial avenue', as contemporary commentators dubbed it, was confirmed by the annual Armistice Day parade and in its accompanying ritual of two minutes silence in front of the Cenotaph instituted on the first anniversary of the cease fire at 11.00am on 11 November 1919.¹⁷

Cabinet records reveal that even as late as October 1919 the British Government had failed to fully realise the significance of the Armistice anniversary to ordinary people and to predict the enormous emotional response it would engender.¹⁸ As a key date to review the cost of the war to Great Britain, her colonies and her allies, what was required were modern forms of memorialisation that offset any sense of government culpability and military incompetence and in their place emphasized social harmony, national continuity and popular unity. In the face of a costly and disruptive war after which, as many war veterans, war widows and mourners asserted, nothing could ever be the same again, the disparity between government intention and popular reaction could not be easily ignored.

Even though officials hoped that the political economy of these imposing commemorative environments would re-affirm continuity, the modern rituals they generated had to be carefully orchestrated in order to shape and support an integrationist post-war public discourse. As Daniel Sherman has recently emphasized, 'the construction of memory as a form of representation is a political and social process'¹⁹ and it is one that is always rich and complex in its political associations. As Sherman has proposed, although in relation to post-war French culture:

'For commemoration to have the larger political and social resonance with which historians credit it, it must subsume individual memories and other cultural materials into a larger narrative about the commemorated event, in this case the Great War. To the extent that commemoration grew out of and sought to reshape both individual and collective knowledge of the war, moreover knowledges with a direct bearing on the future cast of [French] society, the oppositions it entailed were central to its larger stakes, power'.²⁰

To act together at a moment of national crisis did not automatically assure an agreed language of commemoration, especially given the post-war divide between those ex-servicemen who had enlisted and fought, and those civilians who had not. Private memories and personal dissent based on individual experience forged sometimes as a result of first-hand battle experience (as in male war veterans or women volunteers) or often not (as in the cases of those who remained at home), deflected intended patriotic meanings and the dominant expectation that commemoration would be a reassertion of the status quo.

Nowhere was the reproduction of the dominant memorial discourse more fragile and more exposed than in the cases of many young women, homosexual men, pacifists and conscientious objectors; groups who, for a variety of reasons, had often not experienced enlistment nor war at first-hand. Their diverse experiences frequently involving discrimination and scape-goating, rather than subscribing to post-war rhetorics of

national unity and imperial regeneration (and thereby assuring closure to the traumas of wartime) harboured memories that approached post-war modes of secularised commemoration in a more critical way. Their social positioning, political convictions and sexual preferences contributed to an outlook that questioned the post-war re-affirmation of a domesticated vision of British identity.²¹

With these ideas in mind, what I want to explore is the diversity of political meanings engendered by memorial sculpture and how its potential contradictions challenged the post-war desire to align a divided nation with the acceptance of a singular celebratory cause that had assured a just military victory for the British and her allies. Although not systematically against such a project, I shall argue that for certain passers-by, their pre-war political attachments and war-time experiences became vividly re-experienced within such locations. Set apart from those groups who were the main addressees of memorial sculpture - war widows, bereaved families and ex-servicemen - theirs could not have been any easy acceptance of the dominant commemorative narratives authorised by the state, but rather highlighted difference. For war widows and war veterans, any visit to the Cenotaph or the Tomb in Westminster Abbey was inevitably marked by two or more minutes silence that was remarkably profound: 'the silence of memory' (to use a phrase coined by Adrian Gregory)²² that was shaped by and through the bereavement of a lost member or members of family, community or fellow comrade in arms. For those who had not fought or who opposed warfare, what this silence reinforced was an absence of loss and their position outside these 'communities of the bereaved'. What was also highlighted was the gap between the first-hand experience of war, and their own very different experiences on the home front. Instead of memory comforting them through exposure to familiar rhetorics of idealisation and Christian martyrdom, such commemorative forms reiterated their ambivalent positions in relation to the status quo and their distance from the ideal of self-sacrifice celebrated within post-war British commemorative culture.

The end of the Great War on 11 November 1918 has also been distinguished by cultural historians as a major turning point in the history of death and in attitudes towards memorialisation and commemoration. As David Cannadine has concluded one of the key features in the aftermath of the hostilities was that 'inter-war Britain was probably more obsessed with death than at any other period in modern history'.²³ Given the scale of the casualties incurred by the nations involved - some 722,785 dead and 1,676,037 injured and/or wounded amongst the British troops alone - this phenomenon was shared across many nations even if it was inflected differently by distinct national and localised traditions; by alternative religions and across various shifting national and imperial identities in the post-war decades.

Following the Armistice, any return to late Victorian and Edwardian funereal traditions and mourning practices seemed to many post-war commentators in Britain outmoded and irrelevant given the scale of events and popular emotion. Whilst the demand for memorials was enormous, the formats employed by 'the war-memorial industry' frequently appeared over-stylised and inappropriate to the experience of modern

warfare. During the war, the impulsive appearance of temporary street shrines and wayside crucifixes, often incorporating photographs and personal mementoes, had signalled the emergence of less staid vernacular forms of mourning not least because of the lack of access to human remains around which traditional burial rituals revolved.²⁴ In addition, given the previously unimaginable scale of loss that the Great War had produced, there were concerns about over-commercialisation and about the quality of manufacture of mass produced memorials. What was needed were updated memorial forms that registered the huge sacrifice of and enormous respect for the dead, but which retained and allowed for some degree of individualised response.

In central London, the City of Westminster was the area in which the major state memorials of the Cenotaph in Whitehall and the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey were situated and where ever since national commemorations have been held on the anniversaries of the Armistice. The location of these memorials in Whitehall and near the Houses of Parliament meant that, as I have already noted, there was a displacement of earlier processional axes in the metropolis. Over-riding Edwardian London's 'great processional way' from Buckingham Palace to Trafalgar Square and Charing Cross, as David Lloyd has shown, '[i]n the 1920s and 1930s, the Cenotaph and the Grave of the Unknown Soldier replaced Trafalgar Square as the central place in London' not only for the British, but for citizens from throughout the British Empire.²⁵ It quickly attained the status, claimed the Glasgow Herald in November 1920 of being 'one of the Empire's hallowed places'.²⁶

Whilst the annual Armistice Day service defined British national and imperial identity by staking out a conspicuous memorial route through the heart of London, some contemporary commentators recognised that it was, at the same time, symbolic of the many other processional routes to war memorials, churches and chapels that had grown up throughout the country. Although few permanent memorials had been erected within the first year of the Peace, the speed of construction was remarkable. By 1928 according to C.S. Cooper's The Outdoor Monuments of London. Statues, Memorial Building, Tablets and War Memorials, there were at least sixty within a five mile radius of Charing Cross.²⁷ By 1931, so plentiful were such sculptural landmarks and memorial markers that one commentator described how 'every English highway is now one continuous memorial avenue. The cumulative effect upon the traveller's mind is almost inconsiderable'.²⁸

Although used as a state memorial route only temporarily around key dates such as 11 November and on the anniversaries of great battles (such as the Somme or Verdun), the symbolic importance of such processional avenues as theatres for national remembrance was quickly established through the presence of King George V, the Prime Minister and leading politicians and state figures from home and abroad. It is revealing that when in October 1920, disabled and unemployed ex-servicemen demonstrated against the government's treatment of war veterans, the location chosen for this public display of their feelings of betrayal and bitterness was Whitehall close to the recently built Cenotaph. In the following year, another large crowd of over twenty-five thousand unemployed and disaffected ex-servicemen demonstrated on Armistice Day by again marching to the Cenotaph through Whitehall waving their medals.²⁹

The centrality of the Cenotaph as the hub of national remembrance was reconfirmed when the suggestion of a two-minute's silence in front of the Cenotaph by Sir Percy Fitzpatrick, a former high commissioner to South Africa, was supported by the King and taken up by the government. As a relatively modern 'invented tradition' surrounded by rhetorics of religion, Empire, King and country, the patriotic sentiments and populism associated with the Armistice parade generated strong opinions. As Evelyn Waugh recorded in his diary on Tuesday 11 November 1919:

'At 11am today we had the King's amazing proposition of two minute's silence to commemorate last year. It was really a disgusting idea of artificial nonsense and sentimentality. If people have lost sons and fathers they should think of them whenever the grass is green or Shaftesbury Avenue brightly lighted, not for two minutes on the anniversary of a disgraceful day of national hysteria'.³¹

The Silence, as it became known, was a highly political gesture. It occupied a distinctive position in the service as an overtly public moment of personal contemplation on the topic of bereavement, sacrifice and mass death.³² This new cultural form in attempting to make commemoration 'visible', government orchestrated and politically 'meaningful', simultaneously left these minutes open to re-inscription by personal memories and desire. At such moments of capture and intensity as the Armistice day's silence provided for, London's crowded streets and their spatial environments became haunted by other stories. As the Daily Herald on 11 November 1922 asked of its readers:

'What will you be thinking of while silence falls upon the country for two minutes at eleven o'clock today. Perhaps a son or a husband, of a brother or a close friend who died in the belief that the war was to make a better world'.³³

With the radio broadcasting of the memorial service from the Cenotaph in 1928, the two minute's silence achieved even greater symbolic significance as the nation was able through the medium of radio to co-ordinate and to synchronise its ceremonies and to hear the silence following the last strokes of Big Ben at eleven o'clock in London reverberate across the nation.³⁴

Nevertheless, although the state carefully orchestrated the Armistice parade and ritual protocols, the dominant narrative could incorporate less prescribed imaginings. As one contemporary journalist recalled after the Armistice Parade, the projection of more personal meanings onto the 'empty' shell seemed to be encouraged by the blank and austere severity of Lutyens's memorial. In particular, with the piling up of over one hundred thousand wreaths and floral tributes, the formal geometry of the monument was recast:

'[During the two minutes silence, the Cenotaph] was no longer a cenotaph, an empty tomb. You could vow that the deep flowers took the shapes of the dead they covered, and the sweet heavy scents spread from a flowered battlefield'.³⁵

As a newsreel film of the 1919 Armistice day procession illustrates, given the size and social diversity of the crowd and the heightened emotionalism of the event, issues of appropriate decorum and how to behave during the two minutes silence were significant.³⁶ For royalty and politicians, public experience and social background dictated a sombre and stoic public decorum and respectful bodily posture. Likewise for

the military personnel present, drilling and regimentation secured a uniformed and dignified gravitas maintained in orderly ranks and evidenced by disciplined behaviour. Amongst the civilians in attendance, especially the war widows and demobbed war veterans, their behaviour was less restrained and less predictable. From the evidence of the film, sobbing, sighing and talking plus the sounds of police horses repositioning punctuated the two minutes silence. Newspaper reports also recorded that two women shrieked hysterically throughout the ceremony contravening codes of appropriate behaviour for such an event. Furthermore, legal records documented that one man committed suicide overcome by the scene at the Cenotaph.³⁷

This new and emotional post-war reaction to death contrasted markedly with the brevity and seemly reserve that funeral crowds had adopted during the war. To some reviewers, such emotionalism seemed excessive and un-British, and far beneath the standards for public behaviour that were to be expected. For others, the immense scale of war death and the extreme trauma of bereavement mitigated against such harsh judgements on public behaviour, and the collective outpouring which the Armistice parade and the entombment of the Unknown Warrior allowed for, seemed cathartic demonstrating a solidarity amongst those who had been bereaved as well as those who had not. The scale of the 1920 event again took organisers completely by surprise with thousands of mourners and pilgrims eager to file past the Cenotaph or to pay tribute to the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey. It is estimated that over 1,250,000 people visited the Abbey in the period on or after Armistice Day 1920, and many more would have paid their respects at the Cenotaph since it did not demand long hours of queuing to gain access.³⁸

Whilst the Cenotaph harboured no corpse, the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior contained human remains disinterred and repatriated from the battlefields of Northern France and Flanders. In a carefully orchestrated procession captured in newsreels and extensively described in the contemporary press, the body of the Unknown Warrior placed in a coffin of English oak was returned via Boulogne Quay on the destroyer Verdun to Dover on 10 November 1919. Amidst large crowds and highly emotional scenes, and following precedents established for the state burials of royalty or national heroes, there was a formal funeral procession through the streets of London before interment. The accompanying entourage arrived from the coast by train to Victoria where the coffin was placed on a gun limber pulled by six black horses for the procession to the Abbey. Covered by the Union Jack flag and with a simple trench helmet, belt and bayonet placed on top, over a thousand members of the armed forces including the Guards Bands and the Pipers of the Scots Guards followed the body in procession through the London streets. Behind these ranks were over four hundred representatives of war veterans and ex-servicemen groups as well as leading military commanders deployed as pallbearers.³⁹

In the absence of corpses to bury, the Tomb provided a surrogate body for those who had been bereaved, especially war widows. At its dedication on Armistice Day 1920, as the Minutes of the Memorial Committee (1 November 1920) underscore, priority at the service in Westminster Abbey was given to women:

'a) to women who had lost a husband and a son

- b) to women who had lost only sons
- c) to other widows'.⁴⁰

As Adrian Gregory has argued, the order of these priorities is revealing with bereaved Members of Parliament being the only fathers present alongside a small number of male members from the armed forces. This hierarchy reiterated Lord Curzon's reasoning in cabinet discussions that since the dedication was a funeral service of sorts, 'the bereaved were more deserving of consideration' than war veterans, ex-servicemen or military personnel.⁴¹ As the rhetoric of memorialisation evolved and was established in the years immediately after the Armistice, it became clear that in such memorial environments the bereaved, usually women, were the main subjects of address. It also became obvious that the language of consolation used in such commemorative services adapted imagery of christian idealism and imperial destiny to the cause of national service and personal sacrifice, again aimed primarily, though not exclusively, at women.

Given what some commentators perceived as the increasing militarization and bureaucratization of the Armistice Day services at the Cenotaph throughout the early 1920s, this prioritizing of the bereaved, especially bereaved women, at the Tomb acted as a counter-balance to demilitarise remembrance signalling different emphases at play in Westminster Abbey from those dominant at the Cenotaph in Whitehall. Such a distinction seems to have been recognised by war veterans who focussed their attention upon the latter rather than the former. Although never declared, newspaper reports speculated endlessly about the identity of the body contained within the Tomb. They carried stories of women who firmly believed that their husbands or sons were indeed buried in the tomb. And it was noted by journalists that in the cards attached to flowers and wreaths placed in the Abbey rarely were they addressed to the Unknown Warrior but more frequently to named deceased family members or to those lost missing believed dead.⁴² Throughout the interwar decades, these two locations in central London - the Cenotaph and the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior - became established as the most significant sites of national pilgrimage. Established at the heart of Empire, closeby the seat of British Parliament and within the sacred chapel where the Kings and Queens of Britain were crowned and buried, these arenas infused the residues of Imperial and state histories into modern rituals of remembrance that were performed and consumed annually.

To consider the intricate ways in which narratives of memorial environments, urban space and subjectivity intersected, I want to turn to the role that sculpture might occupy in these transactions. As Alex Potts has argued in his essay 'Male Phantasy and Modern Sculpture', modern sculpture achieves an alluring immediacy both through its literal presence within the viewers' world and through its close spatial proximity to the viewers' body. At the same time, sculpture generates a complex and contradictory tension in that its materiality offers a resistance to this intimacy and to the aesthetic promise of 'unmediated communion between object and viewer, of an unframed experience of the thing in itself'.⁴³ As Potts maintains, this anxiety is particularly acute when the sculptural form represents a human figure since its apparently three-dimensional 'realness' makes the sculpted body amenable to projective fantasies and

imaginings that break down the distance between viewing subject and viewed object.

Whilst neither the Cenotaph nor the Unknown Warrior's tomb employed figurative sculptures, the ordinary soldier was one of the most numerous and familiar features on British war memorials. The Royal Artillery Memorial located at Hyde Park Corner not far from Whitehall was a conspicuous example of his incorporation into a commemorative site. Unveiled by Prince Arthur, the Duke of Connaught, on 18 October 1925 in the presence of huge crowds, this memorial had been commissioned by the Royal Artillery War Commemoration Fund to remember the 49,076 men of the artillery ranks who had died in the Great War. Forty three feet long, twenty one feet wide and thirty feet high, the imposing main structure was designed by Lionel Pearson with four life-size artillerymen, and elaborate side panels and pedestal friezes completed by the sculptor, Charles Sargeant Jagger. Surmounted by a larger than life howitzer made of Portland stone, this monument subsequently became known as the 'special "Cenotaph" of the gunners'.⁴⁴

What attracted particular discussion in Jagger's work were the four bronze pedestal artillerymen; one placed on each side of the memorial's base: a driver on the western side; a gunner on the eastern side; an artillery officer on the southern side and, most provocatively, wrapped in the Union Jack, the recumbent figure of a dead gunner at the northern end. As Jonathan Black has shown, Jagger's vivid depiction of 'war without the gloss' was highly controversial.⁴⁵ In his critics' eyes, the figurative sculptures came too close to being seen as 'real' men and the Portland stone howitzer was too convincing as a replica of one of the most effective killing machines of the Great War.

What had convinced the RAWCF's committee of professional soldiers to accept the sculpture was the evidence of Jagger's own army record and the fact that he had been decorated with the Military Cross for exceptional bravery in action. When countering press criticism that Jagger's characterisation was 'coarse' and 'callous' in its realism and his men 'stocky, sordid, bluntly formidable figures' and too close in conviction to 'real tommies', it was argued that the sculpture was the privileged testimony of an infantryman who had experienced the war directly.⁴⁶ Jagger's approach was that of an artist who had not just observed war, as some war artists had, but of one who had actively participated and knew its sacrifices at first-hand. This claim for Jagger's memorial as incorporating front-line observation and as embodying the voice of authenticity was evidenced in the 'strong and realistic' modelling, in the inclusion of the convincing mock howitzer and in the accuracy of the relief detail. In an article in the London Illustrated News on 3 October 1925 accompanied by photographs showing Jagger working on the monument, the artist's integrity was robustly defended:

'The sculptor's main idea has been to combine art with history so that the memorial may form a record of uniform and equipment, as well as ordnance and weapons used in the war...The side panels employ much detail including field guns, trench mortars, Lewis-guns, rifles, signallers, and warning posts'.⁴⁷

In Potts' terms, this response signals an over-identification that highlights the narrowing of any objective distance between viewer and sculpted body. Such a collapse between Art and life could testify to a dissolution of sculpture's proper aesthetic boundaries,

ultimately producing dissatisfaction and disappointment. Too life like by far, the figures appeared to be no more than 'dolls' in uniform on a pedestal and the carved howitzer, an ornate military replica. Moreover, if one crucial role of the sculptural aesthetic was to counter an over-masculinisation of the body and to defer the threat of unhealthy sexual desire, then Jagger's 'rough' privates were troublesome indeed, not least for their failure to respect the sensitivities of the female mourner.⁴⁸

Nevertheless, Jagger's work was supported by key members of the Armed forces because it avoided the overly glamorous, excessively theatrical and saccharine 'fashion-plate' characterisation of military masculinity that many active servicemen found sentimental and offensive in a number of war memorials. As General Sir Ian Hamilton argued in a letter to the Morning Post, many memorials had to their detriment incorporated 'the best looking lads with delicate Greek features and smooth chests. The result has been all over England a sort of bastard Greek sculpture. Now these Royal Artillerymen ...on the memorial...are the real thing and not only the real thing, but the real thing in the rough'.⁴⁹

Whilst not exactly what Hamilton was complaining about, produced in the same year though unveiled in 1926 and occupying the same space between the Wellington Memorial and St. George's Hospital just opposite Jagger's work was the Machine Gun Corps Memorial. By the Professor of Sculpture at the Royal College of Art and Jagger's tutor whilst he studied there, Francis Derwent Wood, the memorial depicted a full size nude figure of David with his right hand on his hip and his left hand holding an impressive ceremonial war sword. On either flank of the bronze, contrapposto-stanced youth were decorative wreaths that discretely covered the artefacts of military service: machine guns, helmets and military packs. In contrast to Jagger's stark realism, Wood's restrained classical nude clearly emulated the sculptural precedents of Michelangelo, Donatello and late 19th century aestheticism. It elevated ancient Greek and Renaissance exemplars rather than contemporary uniformed tommies as providing the correct models for depicting the beautiful and the manly in modern British masculinity.⁵⁰

Unlike the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior which was aimed chiefly at women mourners, the two military memorials at Hyde Park Corner were primarily, though not exclusively, addressed to men although as I have underlined there was no consensus about how British heroism should be configured. Applauded by military commanders such as Hamilton and the RAWCF's committee, the Royal Artillery Memorial through its gritty realism and its minute detail appealed to a viewer who had, like Jagger, experienced fighting at first hand and who would recognise the accuracy of trench warfare transcribed into convincing sculptural form. To its detractors, however, the monument was too close to life and Jagger's vulgar realism marked out a 'callous' approach that dishonoured the dead and would upset female mourners. By representing 'the real thing in the rough', even a soldier's corpse, Jagger's sculpture had not only ignored appropriate artistic and aesthetic precedents, but, according to some observers, it had failed to adhere to agreed codes of decency and propriety applauded in public memorials.

By contrast, Wood's David transcended the brutish by adopting the ideal proportions of

the contemplative adolescent under the guise of a historical hero. For Hamilton, it was not the nudity that was controversial nor the allusion to David's victory over Goliath, but the vapid characterisation and shallow veneer of Antiquity that it espoused. As he had stated in the press, works like Wood's David with 'delicate Greek features and smooth chests' produced 'a sort of bastard Greek sculpture' that seemed ill-suited to the job of characterising British fighting men and to commemorating Great War bravery.

As younger generation sculptors such as Jagger developed contemporary languages in opposition to these earlier sculptural conventions and aesthetic legacies, the issue of how to appropriately portray decent British manliness on large-scale memorials was a complex one. As the sculpted male body became the vehicle for and the focus of remembrance, male physique, manly proportion, racial features and masculine styling assumed particular significance. Moreover, Wood's mixture of naturalism and classicism demonstrated an indebtedness to late Victorian Aestheticism that was increasingly unserviceable as the means of fashioning military authority. Tarnished by associations with effeminacy and intellectualism, government statistics further discredited it by revealing that 'artistic types, highly strung people and imaginative city types' had been more likely to break down under trench warfare than ordinary working-class men.⁵¹

Within the multivocality of British commemoration, one urban community with a particular fascination in the sculptural male body and in military masculinity that so far has not been mentioned is homosexual men. Whilst sexual geographies remain difficult to map in inter-war London because of the illegality of homosexuality and the illicit nature of sexual tourism, the memorials at Hyde Park Corner like those in Whitehall were positioned close to the well-known cruising areas of Trafalgar Square, St. James's Park, Speaker's Corner and Hyde Park Corner. Whilst the fountains in Trafalgar Square were an established location for picking up 'renters' or ruffs', other 'trolling' grounds were Birdcage Walk running from Parliament Square south of St. James's Park up to Buckingham Palace, the public baths in Great Smith Street near Westminster Abbey, and the toilets and bushes on Hyde Park's eastern fringes paralleling Park Lane.⁵² For those homosexual men whose interests focused on soldiers - especially the potent homoerotic appeal of the Household Cavalry and Guards Regiments - the public houses near the Wellington Barracks across from Buckingham Palace and 'The Grenadier' pub on Wilton Place close to the Knightsbridge Barracks were favourite haunts for encountering off-duty guardsmen.⁵³

Given the evidence of a contemporary homosexual man, Montague Glover, a veteran of the Artists Rifle Regiment who was awarded the Military Cross for Bravery during the Great War and who worked after graduating in Architecture from London University as an Assistant in the War Graves Commission from 1923-26, these vicinities in the heart of the City of Westminster spawned and supported vibrant homosocial and homosexual communities.⁵⁴ Operating alongside and overlapping with an avowedly public urban culture, these metropolitan spaces mapped out a sexual economy encountered only fleetingly through a cautious, if recognisable, system of glances, gestures and slang. What is apparent from Glover's letters, biography and photographs is that this clandestine London incorporated many of the major commemorative thoroughfares and memorial sites into its geographies and that its communities appreciated the erotic and

aesthetic components of military memorials and their commemorative rituals.

The reception of Jagger's and Wood's work, like that of the Cenotaph and the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior, reveals numerous post-war tensions: tensions between generation of sculptors whose artistic languages, figurative or not, exploited different traditions and aesthetic frameworks; tensions in the altered approaches to memorials of those who had seen active service and those who had not, and tensions between the sexes and between groups of different sexual preferences regarding the most appropriate artistic means needed to memorialise the Great War dead. 'They were a wall unto us' extolled the Illustrated London News captions over photographs of Jagger's Artillery Memorial: the dilemma was how military masculinity might be represented within the evolving visual idioms of the war memorial to convey this sacrifice and how sculptural forms could be conveniently married to post-war social and political ideals in the eyes of its spectators.⁵⁵

In The Practice of Everyday Life (1984) Michel de Certeau draws attention to the complex ways in which pedestrians experience and negotiate the spaces of the modern city.⁵⁶ He describes how in contrast to the systematic layouts of the city favoured by town planners and urban cartographers (evidenced in clear street maps and neat grid patterns) street walkers transform the metropolis as they move through it by erratic changes in direction and unpredictable manoeuvres. As their bodies respond in unruly motion and unpremeditated gestures to the objects, people and circumstances they encounter, any imagined coherence and urban logic is disturbed. In the chapter 'Walking in the city', de Certeau emphasizes how street walking approached through such a framework can be figured as an 'absence:

'To walk is to lack a place. It is the indefinite process of being absent and in search of a proper. The moving about that the city multiplies and concentrates makes the city itself an immense social experience of lacking a place...'⁵⁷

Employing the term 'trajectory' to suggest both a movement through and simultaneously, a transcription of these changes, de Certeau asserts that mirroring the structures of language such 'trajectories form unforeseeable sentences, partly unreadable paths across a space...the trajectories trace out the ruses of other interests and desires that are neither determined nor captured by the systems in which they develop'.⁵⁸

In order to grasp these subjective ways of streetwalking in greater depth, de Certeau introduces a crucial distinction between two forms of urban circumlocution: between what he terms a 'trajectory' and a 'tactic'.⁵⁹ The first, the trajectory, is a kind of tracing of volition across 'proper' sites and 'named' locations. It records acts of decision making, however casual or arbitrary, within the urban environment and conceives of them as plotted in a quasi-behavioural way. The second mode, the tactic, is a more provisional operation. It is a strategy for city locomotion that is constantly frustrated by watching out for casual opportunities and promiscuously engaging in unpredictable revisions. In its re-orientations, the subject frequently eschews a knowledge based on systematic geography and official routes in favour of one open to the vicissitudes of chance and desire; to licit and illicit exchanges. As a consequence, it is possible to reconceive of

Whitehall, Parliament Square and Hyde Park Corner not only as centres of government, established religion and monarchy, but as spaces that are continually rendered foreign and insecure. As the tactic is able to 'insinuate itself into the other's place, fragmentarily, without taking over its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance', the social and sexual significance of metropolitan space and place is reformed.⁶⁰

Elaborating these proposals further, de Certeau argues that crucial to any interrogation of urban spatial orders and their signifying practices, three factors demand consideration: the believable (understood through knowledge and legend), the memorable (recorded within memory) and the primitive (re-emerging in dream).⁶¹ In a phrase that has direct links to the study of commemorative environments, de Certeau declares:

'The memorable is that which can be dreamed about a place. In this place that is a palimpsest, subjectivity is already linked to the absence that structures it as 'existence' and makes it be "there"'.⁶²

Retaining these different ways of recording and interpreting metropolitan mobility, of appropriating otherness, and of shaping sexuality and subjectivity within urban spaces it is possible to conceive of the Armistice Day parade, the laying of wreaths and floral tributes at the Cenotaph, the two-minute Silence followed by trumpet solo and gun salute, the procession to the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior in November 1920 and the unveiling of the Royal Artillery and Machine Gun Corps memorials as less secure forms of performance than might be envisaged; ones in which the reproduction of particular commemorative identities was not guaranteed. Following de Certeau, as a form of trajectory through the metropolis, such rituals of remembrance were also constantly open to unforeseeable change precipitated by an unexpected view of a once familiar sculpture; by a casual, unrehearsed social interaction, or by the reconfiguring of the city landscape as a sexualised space. Although scheduled to take place at a historically significant time and date through a highly symbolic, predetermined route, and at the same time, designed to produce respectful mourning in an impressive memorial avenue marked by imposing sculptures of historical and contemporary figures, participation throughout remained a tense and intense affair open to alternative inscriptions.

As Steve Pile emphasizes in The Body and the City. Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity (1996), it is clear that the state-sanctioned rituals at the Cenotaph, the Tomb and the military memorials made the politics of urban space more conspicuous:

'Monuments in trying to make urban space incontestable both by closing off alternative readings and by drawing participants into the presumption that the values they represent are shared...make visible power relations, but they do so in ways which also tend to make and/or legitimate and/or naturalise those relationships'.⁶³

That such visibility opened up the rituals of remembrance to alternative possibilities seems equally plausible at this enormously complex and contested historical moment. It exposed a memorable that was not always about an uncritical endorsement of state-sanctioned histories or shared social values. Rather individual responses emerged palimpsestically through the potency of location and sculptural forms to give shape and meaning to intense memories of imagined bodies lost in war. Intended to install

idealised social bonds and to reaffirm heroic national histories, instead urban trajectories opened up the city spaces to new pleasures and desires: to the possibility that the Tomb might contain his body; to the fantasy that the wreaths and flowers at the Cenotaph might evoke the dead on a Flanders battlefield; to the longings that a troubled intimacy with strangers in front of Jagger's 'rough' privates or Derwent Wood's restrained classical David might stimulate, or to the homosocial bonds that at least two minutes of heightened emotionalism in front of Lutyens's stark monument might allow for.

In her 1930 book on street rambling entitled Street Haunting. A London Adventure, Virginia Woolf declares that wandering through the streets of London constitutes one of the greatest of all modern pleasures.⁶⁴ Ostensibly about going out to buy a new pencil, Woolf records the fluctuating desires and fantasies that urban loitering experienced in the form of window shopping, browsing in second-hand book stalls or searching through antique markets, generates. What is perhaps remarkable in her promenade from Bloomsbury to the Strand is that there is no mention of nor attention paid to the war memorials that so prominently marked London thoroughfares and which she could not have ignored had she undertaken such a walk in real life. In Woolf's imaginative psycho-geography of London, memorials attract no attention nor play any significant part. In her address to the modern young women reader, they are, therefore, conspicuous by their absence.

In 1925, the British Legion believed that commemoration was declining in popularity and that there was a need to re-assert the debt that post-war British society owed to war veterans for their national loyalty and self-sacrifice during their military service.⁶⁵ The visibility of ex-servicemen as beggars on London streets and as disabled demonstrating in front of the Cenotaph signalled in public the failure of the government to respect and reward responsible citizenship.⁶⁶ Against the 'rough' naturalism of Jagger's powerful, stoic and able bodied artillery men and contrasting with the idealism of Derwent Wood's ephobic David, the spectacle of maimed and disfigured war veterans was a startling visual reminder. It was a reminder of how in spite of the different masculine aesthetics offered by memorial figuration, the Great War had physically remoulded the male body in less aesthetically pleasing ways as evidenced in the scarred faces, the mangled anatomies and the mutilated human limbs of the war disabled.⁶⁷

By the end of the decade, following the publication of a spate of books based on first-hand experience of the Great War by fellow combatants in 1927-28, the earlier claims made by and for British soldiers as exemplars of self-sacrifice, moral excellence and unquestioned patriotism became open to question. Generating considerable controversy, these published testaments stressed the human cost, undisciplined behaviour and morally feeble nature of the men fighting at the front. It left their military leaders and politicians under suspicions of incompetence and unprofessionalism. By 1929-30, not only did the power of earlier forms of historical memorialisation, its well-rehearsed rituals and its patriotic platitudes appear less convincing, but the history of remembrance took a new turn in the light of contemporary social and political events.⁶⁸

With the onset of the Depression and with the increasing realisation that the Treaties of Versailles and Locarno held few certainties in relation to European politics, idealistic commemoration rather than unifying national identity and reinforcing collective memory, rubbed against the glaring evidence of the betrayals of the past haunting the uncertainties of the present and fears about the future. Faced with the complex legacies of the Great War in the shifting politics of the late 1920s and 1930s, the annual Armistice Parade to the Cenotaph and its Silence became not only a moment of considered reflection, but an instance of recognition concerning the inability to speak meaningfully about the traumas of modern war; the repetition of which seemed increasingly immanent from 1933. In a similar vein, John Berger later in the 1970s reflected that:

'The sculptured war memorials are like no other public monuments ever constructed. They are numb...monuments to an inexpressible calamity'.⁶⁹

Maybe this response in the face of such stark and obdurate forms offers a way into understanding their absence in Woolf's essay. On the one hand, it reflected her feminist ideals and her avowed anti-militarism and, on the other, it signalled Woolf's own changing concerns with London as an arena for forging a conspicuously contemporary post-war feminine identity in a public culture freed from the grief and mourning of war and from its sexually inhibiting Victorian legacies. If the decade after the Great War marked out major shifts in attitudes towards remembrance and in the British approach to death, it also 'constituted a pivotal transition moment in the history of European gender relations during which Victorian gender arrangements met their final demise and a reformed gender order gradually was established'.⁷⁰ Just as the Great War had destabilised masculine norms and transformed attitudes towards manliness, it had also emphasized the gulf between the male and female experience of modern warfare (even when some men had not participated in it and some women volunteers had).

In the post-war years, this difference had manifested itself again in contested approaches to idealised images of male heroism and self-sacrifice, and in the different degrees of access young women, war widows, homosexual and pacifist men and war veterans had had to the public cultures of commemoration. Conservative calls supported by war veterans and many post-war governments to return to pre-war conditions within the family and womens' subordination in the workplace merely exacerbated these divides. They openly demonstrated the strong resentment felt by many returning soldiers about the gains made by women during the war and to their newly-found social and sexual freedoms.⁷¹ In Woolf's account, the liberation of the modern single women (like that of the metropolitan heterosexual man) is allied to financial independence, to social mobility and the potential pleasures of consumerism and to the sexual freedoms of 'sudden capricious encounters' with strangers who quickly vanish.⁷² It is not as a consequence of participating in a war to defend and uphold a discriminatory status quo nor to reinstate traditional family values that such gains were achieved. Nor did this stance readily subscribe to the idealism of Armistice Day or to its post-war rhetoric of slaughter as sacrifice being the harbinger of a new, more democratic social order.

In such dynamic and unpredictable memorial environments, bodies moving through

urban spaces sanctioned side-long glances that mobilised fears, pleasures and desires beyond those fully rehearsed and pre-scripted by military and government agencies. Whilst these rituals of remembrance held the potential for a brief, if casual and sometimes dangerous, intimacy with strangers in public places, they did so in ways that could not always be anticipated. Moreover, the evolving idioms of commemoration gave a license to look at bodies, sculptural or fleshy, real or imagined, mutilated or disfigured, in a new light. These updated ways of looking were informed by shifts in attitudes towards both male and female sexuality and they were inflected through experiential differences and modernised sexual manners. Such revisions could not always be restrained by the aesthetic conventions of monumental sculpture nor readily be harnessed in a compulsory way through the polite protocols of commemoration to the political exigencies of the post-war state.

Notes

1 For discussions of the Great War and national identity, see Paul Fussell, The Great War and Modern Memory, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975, 1977; Bob Bushaway, 'Name Upon Name: The Great War and Remembrance' in Roy Porter (ed.), Myths of the English, Cambridge: Polity, 1992, 137-167; Thomas Laqueur, 'Memory and Naming in the Great War' in John R. Gillis, (ed.), Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994, 150-167, and Jay Winter, Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning. The Great War in European Cultural History, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 1996. The notion of a post-war Renaissance in the Arts is examined in Sue Malvern's 'Witnessing, Testimony and Remembrance. Modern Art, Britain and the Great War' (forthcoming).

2 These artistic legacies are examined in Meirion and Susie Harries, The War Artists. British Official War Art of the Twentieth Century, London: Michael Joseph and Imperial War Museum, 1983; Richard Cork, A Bitter Truth. Avant-garde Art and the Great War, London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994, and Sue Malvern, 'War, Memory and Museums: Art and Artefacts in the Imperial War Museum', History Workshop Journal, no.49, 2000.

3 The most extensive analysis of war memorials are Derek Boorman, At the Going Down of the Sun. British First World War Memorials York: Ebor Press, 1988 and Alexander King, Memorials of the Great War in Britain. The Symbolism and Politics of Remembrance, Oxford: Berg 1998.

4 Christine Moriarty, 'Christian Iconography and First World War Memorials', Imperial War Museum Review, no. 6, 1991, 63-75.

5 For the history of the War Graves Commission, see Philip Longworth, The Unending Vigil. A History of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission 1917-67, London, 1967.

6 Alexander King, 'Remembering and Forgetting in Public Memorial of the Great War', in Adrian Forty and Susanne Kuchler (eds.) The Art of Forgetting, Oxford: Berg, 1999, 149.

7 Moriarty, 'Christian Iconography', 68-70.

8 Quote from Minutes of the Council of the Royal Society of British Sculptors, 28 June 1917.

9 The Church Times, 3 March 1916 quoted in Alexander M. King's Ph.D. thesis 'The Politics of Meaning in the Commemoration of the First World War in Britain, 1914-39',

University College, University of London, 1993, 191.

10 Ibid, 193-4. In the plans for the post-war re-development of the City of Westminster, concerns were expressed that it might look like Berlin's 'Siegesallee' in The Builder, 6 June 1919, 563.

11 For Lutyens's Boer War Memorials, see Alan Borg, War Memorials from Antiquity to the Present, London: Leo Cooper, 1991, 70 and for Lutyens's negotiations with the Cabinet about the Cenotaph, see Arts Council of Great Britain, Lutyens. The Work of the English Architect Sir Edwin Lutyens (1869-1944), London: Hayward Gallery, 1981-2, 148-155.

12 Leeds Mercury, 23 July 1919.

13 This petition and its consequences is discussed in David W. Lloyd, Battlefield Tourism. Pilgrimage and the Commemoration of the Great War in Britain, Australia and Canada 1919-39, Oxford and New York, Berg 1998, 54-55.

14 The Times, 11 November 1920.

15 King, 'The Politics of Meaning', 198.

16 For a detailed analysis of the architectural redesign of Victorian and Edwardian Westminster as part of an Imperial metropolis, see M.H. Port, Imperial London. Civil Government Building in London 1851-1915, London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995, 23-25, 192-193.

17 E. Homberger, 'The Story of the Cenotaph', Times Literary Supplement, 12 November 1976, 1429-30 and Winter, Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning, 102-5.

18 Gregory, Silence of Memory, 8.

19 Daniel J. Sherman, The Construction of Memory in Inter-war France, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999, 2.

20 Sherman, Construction of Memory, 6.

21 See Raphael Samuel, 'Exciting to be English' in his Patriotisms. Britain 1900-1939: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity. Volume 1: History and Politics, London: Routledge, 1989, xviii-xxviii, and Lloyd, Battlefield Tourism, 9-10.

22 Gregory, Silence of Memory, 6-7.

23 David Cannadine, 'War and Death, Grief and Mourning in Modern Britain' in J. Whaley (ed.) Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death, London 1981, 189, 231. See Lloyd, Battlefield Tourism, 4.

24 Wayside crosses and street shrines had appeared from early 1916 and the Society for Raising Wayside Crosses was established in mid-1916. See Moriarty, 'Christian Iconography', 67.

25 Lloyd, Battlefield Tourism, 50.

26 The Glasgow Herald, 13 November 1920.

27 C.S. Cooper, The Outdoor Monuments of London. Statues, Memorial Buildings, Tablets and War Memorials, London: The Homeland Association, 1928.

28 I. Hay, Their Name Liveth. The Scottish National War Memorial, London, 1931, 4.

29 Gregory, Silence of Memory, 54-59.

30 Gregory, Silence of Memory, 9.

31 Evelyn Waugh, The Diaries of Evelyn Waugh, edited by Michael Davie, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1979, 1982, 37.

32 Gregory, Silence of Memory, 8-13.

33 The Daily Herald, 11 November 1922 quoted in Gregory, Silence of Memory, 60.

34 Gregory, Silence of Memory, 133-34.

- 35 The Daily Mail, 12 November 1919.
- 36 The newsreel film capturing the unveiling of the Cenotaph is in the collection of the Imperial War Museum, London.
- 37 Reported in the Leeds Mercury, 12 November 1920 and in the Daily Express, 16 November 1920.
- 38 Lloyd, Battlefield Tourism, 73.
- 39 Lloyd, Battlefield Tourism, 63-75.
- 40 Minutes of the Memorial Services Committee, 5 November 1920. Public Records Office, Cabinet Papers CAB 27/29, 22.
- 41 Minutes of Memorial Services Committee, 1 and 3 November 1920, Public Records Office Cabinet Papers CAB 27/99, 45, 48.
- 42 Gregory, Silence of Memory, 27-28.
- 43 Alex Potts, 'Male Phantasy and Modern Sculpture', Oxford Art Journal, 15.2, 1992, 46.
- 44 Richard Francis, 'War Memorials' in Sandy Nairne and Nicholas Serota (eds.) British Sculpture in the Twentieth Century, London: Whitechapel Art Gallery, 1981, 63-65.
- 45 Jonathan Black, 'War without gloss?: Masculinity, the feminine ideal and the image of the vulnerable British soldier in First World War memorial sculpture c.1919-1925', in Objects, no. 2, 1999/2000, 40-45.
- 46 Black, 'War without gloss?', 40.
- 47 The London Illustrated News, 3 October 1925, 626-627.
- 48 Potts, 'Male Phantasy and Modern Sculpture', 46.
- 49 Letter from General Sir Iain Hamilton to The Morning Post, 20 October 1925 quoted in Black, 'War without gloss?', 42.
- 50 Nairne and Serota, British Sculpture in the Twentieth Century, 44.
- 51 Report of the War Office Committee of Enquiry into Shellshock under Lord Southborough, 1922 quoted by Daniel Pick, The Rationalisation of Slaughter in the Modern Age, London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993, 251.
- 52 This notion of overlapping sexual geographies is explored in the special 'Sexual Geographies' of New Formations. A Journal of Culture/ Theory/ Politics, no. 37, Spring 1999, in the 'introduction' by Frank Mort and Lynda Nead, and with respect to homosexual cultures of a later period in Frank Mort's 'Mapping Sexual London: The Wolfenden Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution 1954-57', 92-113. The parameters of this territory in inter-war London draws upon James Gardiner, A Class Apart. The Private Pictures of Montague Glover, London and New York: Serpent's Tail 1992, 1995.
- 53 Gardiner, A Class Apart, 50-58.
- 54 Gardiner, A Class Apart, 9-10.
- 55 Illustrated London News, 14 November 1925, 957.
- 56 Michel de Certeau, 'Walking in the city', The Practice of Everyday Life, translated by Steven Rendall, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988, 91-110. My approach has also been informed by Dolores Hayden, The Power of Place in Urban Landscape as Public History, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995.
- 57 Certeau, *ibid.* 103.
- 58 Certeau, *ibid.* xviii-xix.
- 59 Certeau, *ibid.* 98-99.
- 60 Certeau, *ibid.* xix.

61 Certeau, *ibid.* 105.

62 Certeau, *ibid.* 105.

63 Steve Pile, *The Body and the City. Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity*, London: Routledge 1996, 213.

64 Virginia Woolf, *Street Haunting. A London Adventure*, San Francisco: Westgate Press, 1930. For a searching analysis of Woolf's position, see Rachel Bowlby, 'Walking, women and writing. Virginia Woolf as *flaneuse*' in Isobel Armstrong (ed.) *New Feminist Discourses. Critical Essays on Theories and Texts*, London: Routledge, 1992, 26-47.

65 Lloyd, *Battlefield Tourism*, 217. For the growth of the pacifist movement, see Martin Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain 1914-45. The Defining of a Faith*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980, 62ff.

66 Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning*, 80, 95.

67 Trudi Tate, *Modernism, History and the First World War*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998, 96. On shifting attitudes towards the male body and categories of disability, see Joanna Bourke, *Dismembering the Male. Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War*, London: Reaktion Press, 1996, 31-39, 250-252.

68 These books included R.C. Sherriff's *Journey's End* and Robert Graves's *Goodbye to all That*. For an analysis of the ways in which these books revised earlier and received histories of the Great War, see Hynes, *A War Imagined*, 424 and Gregory, *Silence of Memory*, 119.

69 John Berger, 'The Untellable', *New Society*, 11 May 1978, 317.

70 Brigitte Soland, *Becoming Modern. Young Women and the Reconstruction of Womanhood in the 1920s*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000, 6.

71 See Deidre Beddoe, *Back to Home and Duty: Women between the Wars 1918-39*, London: Pandora, 1989, 12-13.

72 Woolf, *Street Haunting*, 23.