

2011

The First World War between Memory and History: A Conference Retrospective

Christopher Schultz

Jonathan Weier

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/cmh>



Part of the [Military History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schultz, Christopher and Weier, Jonathan "The First World War between Memory and History: A Conference Retrospective." *Canadian Military History* 20, 4 (2011)

This Feature is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Canadian Military History* by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

The First World War between Memory and History

A Conference Retrospective

Christopher Schultz and Jonathan Weier

On 8 December 1914 a Royal Navy squadron of battlecruisers and cruisers annihilated the German East Asia squadron off the coast of the Falkland Islands. This was a significant victory that destroyed the only substantial German naval force outside of European waters, even if it was peripheral to the main combat theatres and subsequent commemoration of the war. Yet as Mark Connelly noted in the keynote address at an international First World War conference in London, Ontario, the battle was intensely celebrated at the time as a signal achievement.¹ The Western Front was ossifying into stalemated trench warfare, and the sober reality of a long war was replacing the optimism of August 1914 that everything would be settled by Christmas. But this engagement, fought by ships-of-the-line in broad daylight, was constructed by the contemporary media and subsequent authors in chivalric terms: a duel to the death between worthy opponents. Though the battle never received any grand treatment from the warrior-poets of the day, it restored confidence in Britain and elsewhere that heroism still had a place in war. In the decades after the war it was proclaimed as evidence that the Royal Navy still ruled the waves despite the fact that the Grand Fleet's one encounter with

Abstract: Long after the guns of the First World War went silent on 11 November 1918, the war continues to spark debate. The many points of contention were on full display at the "From Memory to History" conference, hosted by Western University in London, Ontario, over three days in November 2011. Scholars and enthusiasts from around the world gathered to share, debate and ultimately demonstrate that the war's many legacies are still open to interpretation, even as the centenary of the war's outbreak approaches. Perhaps the most crucial lesson learned is that both memory and history are malleable concepts, prone to revision, and there are numerous narratives in many disciplines that remain untold, even with an event as well-documented as the First World War.

the German High Seas Fleet was tactically indecisive. For Falkland Islanders in particular, the battle became part of a cultural narrative that was moulded to suit different circumstances and affirm their role in British history – even becoming a point of comparison for the events of 1982 and later.

Dr. Connelly gave his address at the close of a major international and interdisciplinary conference, hosted over the weekend of 10 to 12 November 2011 by Western University at the historic Delta Armouries Hotel in London, Ontario.

The date, 11/11/11, was conceived by organizers Steve Marti and Jonathan Scotland² to evoke the official ceasefire that marked the end of the First World War, on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month, 1918. The conference was among the first of many planned centenary events around the world, and Dr. Connelly's closing remarks reflect some of the conference's many themes, stretching across time and space, certainly, but also across the academic disciplines; evidently, the First World War resonates in a myriad of ways. This retrospective is an attempt to provide an overview of how scholars from different nations and different disciplines have discussed, and continue to discuss, the Great War, focusing on three main areas: the negotiation of individual and collective memories, the significance of historical revisionism in the process of commemoration and remembrance, and a discussion of the concepts of authority and ownership in the interpretation of past events. From the cross-disciplinary programme and participation of scholars of different backgrounds (national, professional, ethnic, and otherwise) it became clear that the memory and history of the First World War is certainly a living process, undergoing continual revision and reinterpretation. In the pages that follow, we hope

that we have done justice to the many thoughtful and stimulating presentations. Any omissions have been the result of the imperatives of economy, not lack of interest, and we hope that those not explicitly mentioned will be able to locate themselves in these discussions, at least implicitly.³

Perhaps one of the most pervasive themes of the conference was the tension between private and public commemoration or recollection, or rather the differences between the personal and the collective memories of war. The very concept of “memory” is troubled by these differences; many presenters demonstrated that “memory” of an event, or at least the memory of the participants or witnesses, may move in at least two directions. James Hurst, from the Australian National University, in discussing the accuracy of A.B. Facey’s famous Anzac memoir, *A Fortunate Life* (1981), showed that “memory” is a product of multiple, intersecting viewpoints.⁴ Hurst demonstrated, through careful analysis of Facey’s service records, that Facey could not have witnessed many of the things he depicts in his memoir. But who says he must have witnessed them in order to claim them as part of his experience? After all, Hurst shows that most of Facey’s claims are supportable according to other records, official and otherwise. In other words, what is often claimed as one’s own cannot, from any verifiable epistemological position, be claimed absolutely: Facey, like many other veterans, produced his memoirs from a set of personal experiences compounded by hundreds of other circulating narratives, both of his time and also undoubtedly in the years that followed.

Hurst’s compelling portrayal of Facey’s confluence of personal and collective knowledge was certainly not unique at the conference, and such a confluence presents interesting

challenges to historians who would like to claim they can “read” the straight facts in any given text, training manual, or government policy. These are the products of much larger repositories of human knowledge—a matter that can perhaps be most clearly demonstrated in the study of the visual arts, wherein the creative impulse of the artist is often most consciously on display. Michele Wijegoonaratna, who studies the work of German war artist Otto Dix at New York University’s Institute of Fine Arts, showed in an analysis similar to Hurst’s treatment of Facey’s memoir that Dix’s paintings are the product of personal horrors experienced during the war.⁵ They are also, however, an explicit attempt at collectivizing the German experience of war on the Western Front writ large, but also violence and death more generally in human existence. Dix, as Wijegoonaratna reminded us, was a consummate researcher and was highly sensitive not only to European history, but also to his craft’s history. Like so many artists, Dix is all too easily imagined as a solitary craftsman, depicting a skewed view of the world through tortured eyes. Yet it is far more truthful to say that human beings have seen the world in these terms for millennia, and Dix’s remarkably personal accounts are part of a much greater collective of human experience, albeit recontextualized to suit modern circumstance. Between Wijegoonaratna and Hurst, it becomes evident that the distinctions between brush-strokes and pen-strokes are ones best reflected on in terms of degrees of intent, rather than as fundamentally different processes.

As a final point in the hybridization of personal and collective experience, and a point that shifts this discussion toward the broader topic of historical revisionism, one must consider the sites of war: the battlefields. Joanna Scutts, of Columbia University, did so with her presentation on

battlefield tourism on the Western Front.⁶ Scutts showed that the intrusions of tourism and its attendant trappings and businesses were seen as exploiting the solemnity of war spaces. It must be recalled, of course, that soldiers themselves often behaved like tourist-consumers – one contradiction among many. In any case, Scutts discussed many attempts to control would-be visitors, mostly through vague interpretative or behavioural instructions. From the outset of large-scale visitation to battlefields, distinct but related tensions arose about resulting threats to traditional or romantic mindsets about the war dead and their resting places. Private mourning and loss was immediately subsumed by collective experience, a pseudo-theological sanctification of the sites that tended to overwhelm private use. This collective sanctification in turn resisted the effects of mass tourism, mass commerce, and the march of progress over the graves of those who once marched to war. What is more interesting for the historian is to consider how people of all kinds negotiate the simultaneous experience of the tourist trap’s neon-lighted entryways (to which one must add museums and other cultural locales) and the simple wooden crosses on perfectly manicured lawns.

This negotiation extends allegorically; it is part of what is so compelling about discussions of memory and history in the First World War. Of the many scholars’ names consistently cited at this conference, Jay Winter and Jonathan Vance have for decades made this case, with Winter’s assertion that the war itself was part of a plurality of experiences.⁷ For his part, Vance demonstrates that the war extends well into past, present, and future.⁸ One name that did not come up at the conference, but which is equally part of that same group of scholars is Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau, who

advocates that war must be seen as a totality.⁹ It would seem that the scholars of the First World War who attended this conference were doing just that, moving beyond national paradigms, beyond simplified notions of linear time or places of fixed meaning, and extending into an inter-disciplinary context that takes this discussion beyond purely military, political or diplomatic terms. The First World War is an event remembered or commemorated through a multitude of different lenses. The memoir or the painting, the monument or the book, are all as important as the empirical reconstruction of past events because these are all matters of real impact. Some of these impacts are highly personal; others may be political, cultural, or even economic.

A perfect demonstration of the collision of multiple perspectives was found in the paper on the French Canadian political climate during the First World War by Geoff Keelan of the University of Waterloo.¹⁰ Keelan's premise, following from a claim made by Jonathan Vance, is that while English Canada generally agreed (and may even agree, still) on a set of basic values associated with the First World War, the same cannot be said of French Canada. As Keelan pointed out, for English Canada the war has very much become part of a dominant narrative of national formation and shared values. In this interpretation, French Canada is seen to be represented by the valour of the Royal 22e Régiment and its participation in the important moments of Canada's First World War. Additionally, central figures in Québec politics are reduced to caricatures of their actual complexity; it is conveniently forgotten in both French and English Canada, for instance, that Henri Bourassa was initially a supporter of the war, and not one of its principal detractors. The moral interpretation of that fact depends ultimately on one's

perspective, but one may simply state that Bourassa, like many French Canadians of his generation and subsequently, was sceptical of English Canadian values and priorities. Moreover, just as Bourassa had to negotiate the complexity of his own character within a broader political framework, so too must historians situate their discussions within broader debates. As Keelan demonstrated, periodic revision is fundamental to crafting meaningful histories.

In many ways this is part of an ongoing battle that seems to dog the public memory and scholarship of the First World War. Canada, because of its explicitly poly-ethnic culture and post-colonial status, makes a useful point of reference for such discussions. Is this a triumphal history of military victory and the birth of a Canadian nation? Or, as Mary Chaktsiris of Queen's University claimed,¹¹ do these narratives always and necessarily do damage to groups – Canadians all the same – who do not fit the paradigms of the narrative? Chaktsiris, for instance, noted that reductive national narratives, especially when they are of the heroic, English-speaking and masculine variety, tend to omit and even forcibly exclude war's detractors, ethnic minorities, and the contributions of women during wartime. As Timothy Winegard of Western University, Katherine McGowan (University of Waterloo), and Scott Sheffield (University of the Fraser Valley) all noted in their panel on indigenous memories, one of the most glaring exclusions from this Canadian mythology is the experience of aboriginal Canadians during the First World War.¹² For Winegard in his survey of First Nations participation, this is a heroic history of bravery, loyalty and contribution that did not fit into the dominant, white, post-war narrative. For McGowan, in her study of the wives of aboriginal men who enlisted

from one community in Northern Ontario, this is a history of racial and gender exclusion, while for Sheffield this was a history of veterans' benefits deliberately withheld – part of a complete lack of a recognition for the wartime contributions of aboriginal peoples. We might be wise to recall, when discussing the advent of Canadian nationhood as it is commonly understood, that even the simplest of births is often dolorous and painful.

Bart Ziino of Deakin University in Australia,¹³ and Elizabeth Kemp Baker, an American Councilwoman and biographer of her Great War veteran father,¹⁴ brought a different perspective: how the discovery of correspondence and diaries of loved ones can lead to a reawakened sense of the person. As with national narratives, the contemporary records can also reveal hidden and traumatic details, forcing a wholesale re-evaluation of that person. James Wallis of the University of Exeter noted in his presentation on the Great War's role in the creation of family histories that new details or revelations can be made to suit a particular family narrative, or else, if they clash with an established narrative, may be ignored entirely.¹⁵ Revision, then, is not necessarily a process of improvement, or even elaboration of any given narrative: it may be subordinated to both major and minor mythologies.

Between the private and the public, the collective and the individual, one invariably encounters revisionism. The poles in such debates are not absolute, but highly malleable. The question that emerges is for whom do we write, or build, or paint? As the conference presentations demonstrated, there is no simple answer. Even in cases where similarities of design are apparent, such as the development of a Canadian national narrative, one encounters conflict and debate. This was a matter at the heart of Université de Moncton

literary scholar Thomas Hodd's paper on poet Charles G.D. Roberts' involvement in Lord Beaverbrook's *Canada in Flanders* series.¹⁶ Hodd noted that the third volume, written by Roberts, as opposed to the first two written by Beaverbrook himself, is almost always dismissed by historians of the First World War, primarily because of Roberts' lyrical, heroic style. This style was intentional, as Roberts felt that the Canadian Corps' battlefield success was building a nation, an endeavour in which he was participating by capturing that achievement. Roberts, drawing from the ancient Greek notion that history is a literary genre, was deliberately evoking the classical national narratives of Herodotus, Thucydides, Homer, and the like. It is ironic, Hodd observed, that Roberts' efforts have been discounted by historians who often continue this same narrative.

If cross-disciplinary squabbles about tone and diction are one source of debate about the objectives of historical narratives, consider then, as Bette London of the University of Rochester did, how the interpretation of capital offenses during wartime has provoked debate in Canada.¹⁷ It is common knowledge for most scholars of the First World War that executed soldiers have been given a blanket pardon for their offenses in Canada. As London demonstrated, their omission from the historical record (and, consequently, from monuments) has made their cases unique and problematic; paradoxically, adding them to the record has caused them to be counted among their fellows, thus losing their distinctiveness. There are mixed feelings about such ventures, as London discussed. After all, does a veteran with a long and distinguished service record want to be remembered alongside a chronic deserter, a rapist, or a murderer? These were the crimes of some of the men shot at dawn, although many

others were executed on the basis of trumped up charges of cowardice. Clearly, London's argument hinges on this question of commemoration: "For whom?" Justice, or at least compassion, for the wrongfully accused can be said to have won out, but there is no viable method to assess many cases because the records of courts-martial are often unclear or incomplete.

London's debate revolves around the tensions between the official narrative and the familial – a direct challenge by private memory against the ostensible coherency and fairness of officialdom. This matter may be pushed further still, as Marzena Sokolowska-Paryz of the University of Warsaw did in her paper on detective fiction and the First World War.¹⁸ Sokolowska-Paryz looked at a number of contemporary writers who would challenge the very idea of pursuing a murderer in the trenches – an act which seems absurd given the context of killing as a desired goal of waging war. This kind of incongruence, it is contended by the authors Sokolowska-Paryz studies, does not fit into the nation's collective sense of its moral superiority. Kellen Kurschinski (McMaster University) and Kerry Neale (University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence Force Academy) would likely agree with such an assessment of a troubling narrative, albeit in relation to disabled and disfigured veterans, respectively.¹⁹ Kurschinski's paper found that the idea of a downtrodden disabled man did not fit the burgeoning triumphal storyline of Canada's war effort. Disabled vets were portrayed as self-starters and highly adaptable, when in fact they struggled immensely with their physical problems, often in the midst of institutional incomprehension. Neale's presentation, looking at facially disfigured vets in the British Empire, painted a similar picture, including the lacunae in the response of institutions that served veterans.

While many personal experiences and those of subaltern groups were either not incorporated into "official" narratives or obfuscated by them, that does not mean that the official narratives are irrelevant, or should be entirely abandoned. They still have an important place in ongoing debates, because those narratives embodied ideas and values that were important to many at the time and continue to be important. Indeed, these more official accounts interact with more personal ones. On the Friday evening of the conference, Matt Symes and Nick Lachance from the Laurier Centre for Strategic and Disarmament Studies presented their newest book, co-authored with Terry Copp, *Canadian Battlefields 1915-1918: A Visitor's Guide*.²⁰ As Symes and Lachance pointed out, there is a continuing appetite not just to visit the battlefields but to understand what happened there in order to give substance and context to personal reflection and commemoration. London's, and Symes and Lachance's respective presentations highlighted the tensions between the private and the collective, what is at stake both personally and collectively when private persons share in public ritual, and, most important, how commemoration – and, more fundamentally, historical understanding -- is an ongoing process of negotiation.

While Symes and Lachance treated the confluence of personal and subjective histories with official and scholarly accounts, one of the final presentations featured yet another genre: speculative or alternative history. Nick Milne of the University of Ottawa discussed the important role of speculative or alternative histories in the period leading up to the First World War, and its use as a creative way of thinking about both history and literature.²¹ Milne pointed out that in the late 19th and early 20th century, popular British literature was rife with novels and

stories about the possibility of war with Germany. "Invasion" literature, most famously William LeQuex's *The Invasion of 1910*, published in 1906, helped shape British wartime attitudes well before the outbreak of hostilities.²² Indeed, the post-1918 memory of the First World War was prefigured in some respects by pre-war fiction. Perhaps more interestingly, very little alternative history has been written about the First World War in the past century, possibly reflecting the power of First World War mythologies and the seeming unimportance of agency in a war whose events had an air of awful inevitability, an inevitability whose outcome so often was military failure.

Yet the power of the memory of the First World War is certainly not universal. In a session on American perspectives, three panellists reminded us that unlike in Canada or Australia where the First World War has become a foundational myth, or in the United Kingdom where it often serves as an indicator of the tipping point into imperial decline and loss of world power status, the First World War is not prominent in collective memory of war in the United States. Edward Gutiérrez of the University of Connecticut noted that American veterans of the First World War were largely forgotten or ignored in the 1920s and 1930s as the US dealt with increasingly devastating social and economic problems that strengthened American traditions of isolationism towards the "Old World."²³ Indeed there was widespread consensus that participation in the First World War had been a tragic mistake. Public officials, according to Mary Osbourne (University of Kentucky), were reluctant to contribute to commemorative projects,²⁴ but so too were veterans themselves according to Kimberley LaMay (University at Albany-SUNY).²⁵ The Doughboys would become a footnote for America's more dominant, and certainly more popular, Second

World War stories. One hard fact is incontrovertible: the federal government instituted generous benefits for Second World War veterans that were denied their First World War brethren.

Forgotten or distorted histories are common throughout the historiography and public memory of the First World War. From Doughboys to nurses, French Canadians to First Peoples, in Canada and around the world, whole national or community histories have been left in obscurity. Veysel Simsek (McMaster University) pointed out in his paper on the public memory of the First World War in Turkey²⁶ that the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire after the war clouded perceptions of wartime events in a search for history more useful to post-Ottoman Turkish nationalism. This approach, in essence, has excluded those subjects of the Ottoman Empire who came from or lived in regions outside those of the modern Turkish state. Wolfram Dornik (Universität Graz) explored similar tensions in national memory by focusing on another dissolved Imperial giant, Austria-Hungary, and how its successor states have recalled the legacy of the Eastern Front – part of a twofold forgetting, both of the Eastern Front's wartime geography and of the imperial perspectives that were quite distinct from the perspectives of various nationalities that were concretized after 1918.²⁷

Conference participants raised an over-arching issue a number of times: in the face of conflicting personal and official histories, mythologies and omissions, how do we teach the history of the First World War across the educational spectrum? Robert Cupido of Mount Allison University, in a round table on pedagogy, argued that the teaching of the First World War is not about history, but rather is a commemorative exercise. The challenges of historical questions and the many nuances of approach and of argumentation are thus

subordinated to the reiteration of cultural mythologies. Laura Fasick of Morehead State University, noted that there is a strong presentist element in historical interpretation: the First World War is seen through the lens of current conflicts, like Iraq and Afghanistan. Ideas of futility that have abounded in the history and literature of the First World War, for instance, are resonating with students all too familiar with the futility of the War on Terror. Both Laura Fraser, a teacher and educational consultant, and Amy McNall, a history teacher at London Central Secondary School, suggested that among younger students the key is engagement. Both these teachers felt that all other questions had to be secondary to maintaining the interest of students, using contemporary pedagogical tools and continual innovation; Albert Vo, a student at Central Secondary, finished the panel by making a case for teaching the First World War as living history.²⁸

It would seem that Albert Vo's appeal carries substantial weight, as this paper has attempted to demonstrate. The debates surrounding the First World War continue to resonate, and are certainly alive in every sense. The themes we have identified in this paper speak to that concept of living history. We have attempted to provide a cross-section of the participants and, as is inevitable under the constraints of writing for a journal, we have had to omit many wonderful presentations; we hope their ideas continue to circulate, contributing to the wider discourses surrounding First World War studies. There will inevitably be tensions when addressing historical questions, and the presentations considered here are intended to demonstrate that there are many ways of contributing to these discussions. Certainly, we have taken for granted that there are distinctions which may be made between scholarly disciplines, and while this may irk some readers, we

can justify it according to the terms implicit throughout this article: the study of the First World War, and reflection upon its consequences, cannot be confined. Indeed, as Albert Vo stated, it should not be constrained. Historical debates find their way into spaces private and public, personal and collective; they inspire interrogation, questioning and revision in a myriad of forms, literary or otherwise; they are not capable of being owned. Historical inquiry is not kitsch, as Mark Facknitz from James Madison University might remind us: it is not a closed process, concrete, monolithic, or aesthetically totalitarian (as closed structures tend to be).²⁹ In other words, this is not so much about locating “the past as it really was,” to paraphrase Aristotle and von Ranke, but rather the past as it remains with us: from memory to history, certainly, but equally from history to memory.

Notes

1. Mark Connelly, “Let Us Die Manfully for our Brethren: Commemorating the Battle of the Falkland Islands, December 1914,” 12 November 2011, 19:00.
2. In addition to Steve Marti and Jonathan Scotland’s considerable contributions to the success of the conference, they surrounded themselves with a team of co-organizers from a variety of disciplines in Western University. They include Professors David Darby and Jonathan Vance, as well as PhD Candidates Brandon Dimmel, Felipe Quintanilla, Alicia Robinet, and the authors of this piece. The authors of this essay were constantly impressed at the hard work of this group, their impressive organizational skills, and are thankful for the opportunity to provide this contribution to the conference’s legacy.
3. For a full list of the presenters, please visit the conference’s web page: <<http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/mem2hist/>>. In addition to the presenters that could not be accommodated within the pages of this retrospective – indeed, any and all of them were worthy of further discussion – the conference organizers also had to make some very difficult decisions about who to invite to the conference. There was overwhelming interest in the conference, both by would-be presenters and by the community, and the organizers are thankful for their support.

4. James Hurst, “As Free from Truth as a Frog from Feathers: Interpreting the Personal Narratives of the Gallipoli Campaign, Anzac, 1915,” 12 November 2011, 13:00-14:15.
5. Michele Wijegoonaratna, “Otto Dix and the Great War: Reality, Memory and the Construction of Identity in the Portfolio *War of 1924*,” 12 November 2011, 9-10:15.
6. Joanna Scutts, “Battlefield Tours, Battlefield Tourists: Then and Now,” 11 November 2011, 14:15-15:30.
7. See especially Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
8. See especially Jonathan F.W. Vance, *Death So Noble: Memory, Meaning, and the First World War* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997).
9. See especially Stéphane Audoin-Rouzeau and Annette Becker, *14-18: Understanding the Great War*, Trans. Catherine Temerson (New York: Hill and Wang, 2002).
10. Geoff Keelan, “The Forgotten Few: French Canadians and the Great War,” 11 November 2011, 15:45-17:00.
11. Mary G. Chaktsiris, “Silencing the Guns? Bridging Public and Historical Debates about the Great War in Canada,” 12 November 2011, 14:30-15:45.
12. Respectively, see Timothy Winegard, “Canadian Indians and the Great War for Civilization”; Katherine McGowan, “Question of Caste and Colour: Native Women and the First World War”; and Scott Sheffield, “The Great War and the Shaping of Indigenous Responses to the Second World War in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States.” 11 November 2011, 12:45-14:00.
13. Bart Ziino, “Dad’s War Diaries: Family Remembering and the Great War,” 12 November 2011, 13:00-14:15.
14. Elizabeth Kemp Baker, “Collateral Damage,” 10 November 2011, 19:00-21:00.
15. James Wallis, “Scales of Remembrance: Amateur Family History and the First World War,” 12 November 2011, 13-14:15.
16. Thomas Hodd, “The Writer-Soldier as Historian: Charles G.D. Roberts, the CWRO, and the *Canada in Flanders Series*,” 11 November 2011, 12:45-14:00.
17. Bette London, “The Names of the Dead: Shot at Dawn and the Politics of Remembrance,” 12 November 2011, 14:30-15:45.
18. Marzena Sokolowska-Paryz, “The Great War in Popular Detective Fiction,” 12 November 2011, 9:00-10:15.
19. Respectively, Kellen Kurschinski, “Broken Bodies and Shattered Nerves: Remembering and Forgetting the Disabled Soldiers of Canada’s Great War”; and Kerry Neale, “With Tin Noses and Copper Moustaches: Post-War Experiences of Disfigured Great War Veterans in Britain and the Dominions.” 12 November 2011, 10:30-12:00.
20. Book launch: Terry Copp (in absentia), Nick Lachance and Matt Symes, *Canadian Battlefields 1915-1918: A Visitor’s Guide* (Kitchener-Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2011), 11 November 2011, 19:00.
21. Nick Milne, “The War that Never Was: Alternate Histories of the Great War,” 12 November 2011, 16:00-17:30.
22. William Le Queux, *The Invasion of 1910* (London: E. Nash, 1906).
23. Edward Gutiérrez, “Faded Memories and Shaky Pens: Doughboys Remember the Great War in a Country that Forgot,” 12 November 2011, 14:30-15:45.
24. Mary Osborne, “Agents of Remembrance: The American Legion’s Role in the Origins of Indiana’s War Memorial, 1919-1925,” 12 November 2011, 14:30-15:45.
25. Kimberley LaMay, “A Story Untold: The Failure of State War Histories,” 12 November 2011, 14:30-15:45.
26. Veysel Simsek, “From ‘Backstabbing Arabs’ to ‘Deserting Kurds’: Reading Nationalism through Turkish Accounts of World War I,” 12 November 2011, 10:30-12:00.
27. Wolfram Dornik, “The Experience of the First World War in Eastern Europe by Austro-Hungarian Soldiers,” 12 November 2011, 10:30-12:00.
28. The plenary round-table on pedagogy consisted of Laura Fasick (Minnesota State, Moorhead), Robert Cupido (Mount Allison University), Amy McNall (London Central Secondary School), and Laura Fraser (independent). 11 November 2011, 8:30-10:00.
29. Mark A.R. Facknitz, “Kitsch and the Arrest of Collective Mourning,” 11 November 2011, 14:15-15:30.

Christopher Schultz is a PhD Candidate at Western University under the supervision of Jonathan Vance. His dissertation explores how the First World War’s participants responded to the institutional construction of war space and its objectives, with a particular focus on how allied participants created civic and social spaces in the trenches of the Western Front. Mr. Schultz has written on a variety of subjects related to war and culture, including theatre study guides, academic film criticism, and a review of Paul Gross’s *Passchendaele*, co-authored with Dr. Tim Cook, for *Canadian Military History*. His most recent academic article, on trench culture, was published in the Winter 2011 edition of the *Canadian Journal of History*.

Jonathan Weier is a PhD Candidate at Western University. Under the supervision of Jonathan Vance, his thesis will examine the war work of the YMCA. It will discuss the recreational, medical and religious services provided by national YMCAs in Canada, the United States and Great Britain during the First World War and how that war work shaped the identities of the national YMCAs within the larger context of an international service and mission organization. It will also investigate how YMCA staff and volunteers saw their gender, generational and religious identities impacted by their involvement in conflict.