Language in times of war and conflict

Australian National University
Conference room 1.01, Sir Roland Wilson Building
(Building 120) 120 McCoy Cct, Acton
13-14 November 2017

Image (above): The Right Hon. J.B. Chifley talking to Sergeant Pritchard, AWAS, the only woman interpreter of Japanese in the Australian Army, AWM 099452.

<u>Monday</u>

9.45-10.00   Acknowledgment of country and Welcome

10.00-10.30   Amanda Laugesen **Language and War: Historiography, Approaches, Methods**

10.30-11.00   Morning Tea

11.00-12.30   Session 1: Soldiers' Writing Cultures from the Great War to the Iran-Iraq War (Chair: Richard Gehrmann)

>   John Rice-Whetton (with Cara Penry Williams) **Discussions of death and violence in the writings of Australian WW1 soldiers**
>   Véronique Duché **Humour in French and Australian Trench journals**
>   Setayesh Nooraninejad **The writing culture of Iranian Soldiers during the Iran-Iraq War (1980-1988)**

12.30-1.30   Lunch

1.30-3.00   Session 2: Trauma, Memory, and Language (Chair: Sandeep Singh)

>   Neil Ramsey **Rancière and the Politics of War Literature: Pain, Trauma and Speech in Edmund Blunden's** *Undertones of War*
>   Bridget Brooklyn **Mnemosyne and Athena: the language of Dr Mary Booth in the First World War and after**
>   Peter Read '**Try to imagine what it was like': The changing language of post-Pinochet memorials**

3.00-3.30   Afternoon tea

3.30-5.00   Session 3: Interpreting and Official Language in Wartime (Chair: Catherine Fisher)

>   Georgina Fitzpatrick **Interpreters and Australia's War Crimes Trials, 1945-51**
>   Ludmila Stern **Language of war: Interpreting challenges in war crimes trials**
>   John Moremon **"It is with deep regret …": Official Language and Casualty Notification following the Libyan campaign, 1941**

6 for 6.30   Book Launch: *Memory and the Wars on Terror: Australian and British Perspectives* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017) by Jessica Gildersleeve and Richard Gehrmann (eds.) at MUSE, East Hotel, 69 Canberra Avenue, Kingston.

INFORMAL DINNER AT MUSE TO FOLLOW

Tuesday

9.00-10.30   Session 4: Propaganda and Communication in War (Chair: John Moremon)

>   Graham Squires **Language & Propaganda - De-Constructing the Myth of the 47 Samurai**
>   Catherine Fisher **The Hard Road: Dame Enid Lyons' Broadcasts during World War II**
>   Kevin Foster **Re-visioning Australian Second World War: Extending the Visual Language of the South West Pacific Campaign**

10.30-11.00   Morning Tea

11.00-12.30   Session 5: Cross-Cultural Communication and Alliances (Chair: Amanda Laugesen)

>   Sandeep Singh **A Question of Legitimacy: Australia and the Formation of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization**
>   Richard Gehrmann **Unfamiliar allies: Australian cross-cultural communication in Afghanistan and Iraq during the war on terror**
>   Ali Al-Bakaa **Linguistic mediation and risk management during the wartime: A personal insight of a former ADF interpreter during the Australian Defence Force military operations in Iraq, 2003, 2008**

12.30 Symposium ends

Language and War: Historiography, Approaches, Methods
Amanda Laugesen, ANU

Language in wartime has come under increasing scholarly scrutiny in recent years. Greater attention has been paid to the role of language in military logistics and planning, as well as considering the role and experiences of interpreters in war. Innovative approaches to thinking about how language functions in war and in our representations of war, from cross-cultural encounters to corpus analysis of solders' publications, have developed. In this paper, I will provide an overview of some of the recent scholarship, and discuss some of the approaches and methods of this exciting area of study.

Associate Professor Amanda Laugesen is Director of the Australian National Dictionary Centre at the ANU and is a historian and lexicographer. She is the author of numerous books and articles, including several publications on war slang (most recently the book *Furphies and Whizz-bangs: Anzac Slang from the Great War*, 2015). She has also published on the social and cultural history of war (*Boredom is the Enemy: the Intellectual and Imaginative Lives of Australian Soldiers in the Great War and Beyond*, 2012), and the history of publishing and print culture (*Taking Books to the World: American Publishers and the Cultural Cold War*, 2017). Amanda is also the editor of numerous dictionaries, and was Managing Editor of the *Australian National Dictionary* (2016).

Session 1: Soldiers' Writing Cultures from the Great War to the Iran-Iraq War

Discussions of death and violence in the writings of Australian WW1 soldiers
John Rice-Whetton, University of Melbourne
Cara Penry Williams, La Trobe

WW1 writing is said to generally detail routine duties rather than describing the harrowing experiences of soldiers (e.g. Powell, 1994; Ziino, 2006). This is understandable as potentially a reaction to censorship and also the role of correspondence in providing a connection to home and reassuring loved ones more than anything else (Hanna, 2003; Lyons, 2003). This connection is perhaps of increased significance for Australians, who may have waited more than 50 days for post (compared to 3–6 days for European soldiers) (Hanna, 2014; Hunter, 2013). The scarcity of accounts of death and violence, despite most soldiers likely being regularly confronted by them, makes the accounts all the more important. This paper explores the language used to describe death and violence in a corpus of WW1 letters and diaries, consisting of approximately 110,000 words by 22 Australian soldiers. The materials were donated to the Australian War Memorial and transcribed for a research project examining the use of passive structures (Rice-Whetton, 2015). There are similarities in the accounts in their acceptance and minimisation of violence and death (e.g. *a bullet or bomb must find me soon*). This is achieved through structures such as the passive voice (with BE and GET), zero copula (e.g. *2 men ∅ killed & 2 ∅ wounded*) and the use of euphemism (e.g. *get in the way of a bullet*). This paper provides a linguistic perspective on the de-emphasising of death and violence.

John Rice-Whetton is a PhD student in linguistics at the University of Melbourne, with research interests involving a sociolinguistic, constructional approach to grammatical variation and change. His honours research project involved the creation and analysis of a corpus of Australia WWI soldiers' letters and diaries, exploring whether passive constructions with *get* represent Irish influence on Australian English. His current research project remains on these passive *get* -constructions, now being investigated in a broader range of corpora across different varieties of English.

Cara Penry Williams is an early career researcher with a broad range of interests within and around linguistics, encompassing a primary research focus on sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. Her PhD project explored the social meanings of variation in Australian English. After teaching extensively in linguistics, applied linguistics, and academic skills at the University of Melbourne, Cara is currently a lecturer in linguistics at La Trobe University.

Humour in French and Australian Trench journals
Véronique Duché, University of Melbourne

In the First World War, young Australians volunteered to fight and joined the Australian Imperial Force. For many of them it was their first encounter with foreign countries and languages. These soldiers had to learn not just the language of the Allies, but also that of the enemy. In this paper, I will analyse how the language of the enemy was used in humoristic Australian and French trench journals such as *Aussie* magazine (1918–1919), *Bochophage* and *Rigolboche* (1915–1918). What vocabulary was used in these non-official periodicals to describe the German enemy and convey humour at their expense? Which German words were incorporated into the everyday language of the soldiers? Did both French and Australian soldiers refer to the enemy in similar terms? Recent scholarship has shown that the use of French words contributed to the *Digger* identity. Did the German vocabulary have the same influence on the Australian soldiers' sense of humour?

Véronique Duché is A.R. Chisholm Professor of French at the University of Melbourne. She has published extensively on French literature, in particular fictional works published between 1525 and 1557, and edited several sixteenth-century novels. She has recently directed the first volume of the *Histoire des Traductions en Langue Française. XVe et XVIe siècles (1470-1610)* (Paris, Verdier, 2015). Her research focuses on theoretical problems and issues concerning genre (Middle Ages and Renaissance) and Translation into French during the sixteenth century. She also has strong interests in Australian Soldiers during the First World War.

The writing culture of Iranian Soldiers During the Iran-Iraq War (1980-1988)
Setayesh Nooraninejad, ANU

The Iran-Iraq war was the second longest conventional war of the twentieth century which produced exceptional circumstances of ordinary people separation. Within this context letter writing became the most popular writing practice as it was the easiest way to communicate, especially for soldiers on the battlefield and their families. Among the letters, a large number of soldiers' farewell letters from

that period are kept in war museums and many of them were recently published widely by the government and promoted fervently in Iran. So far, soldiers' farewell letters have been published in some 36,000 books and there has been no study of these texts and certainly no academic research conducted. This paper seeks to contextualise this genre in the framework of ordinary writings and scribal culture. It aims to unravel how writers organised their texts, what social grammar was obeyed in their writing, what was the preferred narrative strategy they drew on, and what models influenced their language and written form. I will argue that they used writing 'mostly' as passive contributors of official propaganda through copying a form of writing that was provided for emulation purposes in battlefield.

Setayesh Nooraninejad is a PhD candidate at the Centre for Arab & Islamic Studies (Middle East & Central Asia), the Australian National University, with research interests in history of scribal culture and writing practice.

<p align="center">Session 2: <u>Trauma, Memory and Language</u></p>

<p align="center">*Rancière and the Politics of War Literature: Pain, Trauma, and Speech in Edmund Blunden's* Undertones of War
Neil Ramsey, UNSW (Canberra)</p>

What does Jacques Rancière's philosophy of politics and speech offer to our thinking about the language of war literature? Following theorists of violence such as Elaine Scarry and Hannah Arendt, it has become commonplace to propose that language and war are fundamentally opposed, the brutality of violence is inherently resistant to the production of meaning and truth (or if language and war are linked, this can only be as a degradation or corruption of language that forces it into a form of meaningless violence). I want to suggest that Rancière's thinking on language, witnessing and trauma, in particular his emphasis on equality and speech, can offer a different perspective on this relationship between war and language. I do so by examining these concerns in relation to a classic text of war literature, Edmund Blunden's fictionalized account of his military experiences during the First World War, *Undertones of War* (1928). A reading of the text in terms of the traumatic unspeakability of violence would emphasize the ways in which Blunden laments the inadequacy of his account to provide coherence, and locate him as a figure of traumatic repetition who must continually retrace the grounds of his wartime experience. Indeed, Paul Fussell displaces Blunden's narrator altogether as a subject of his work, finding meaning rather in Blunden's work as an anti-pastoral in which the truth of war resides in the blasted landscapes of trench warfare. As Rancière's work on trauma suggests, however, such incoherence, what he terms mute speech, is also inherently about the endless multiplicity of meaning. It is this proliferation of meaning that may help us think about a politics of war and language because it is here that orders of discourse are disrupted and those who have no place in political discourse are given a place. War may be indecipherable, but paradoxically it is also teeming with the language and activity of thousands. Rereading Blunden from this perspective, we can see how his incoherence is less about the inarticulate cry of pain, than a means for opening up political debates of visibility and speech that can move between anchoring and freeing Blunden from the grounds in which he finds himself.

Dr Neil Ramsey is a Senior Lecturer in English Literature at the University of New South Wales, Canberra. He works on the literary and cultural responses to warfare from the eighteenth century to the present day. His first book, *The Military Memoir and Romantic Literary Culture, 1780-1835,* was published by Ashgate in 2011. His most recent, a collection co-edited with Gillian Russell, *Tracing War in British Enlightenment and Romantic Culture*, was published by Palgrave in 2015. He is currently completing a monograph on military thought of the Romantic era, the research for which was funded by an Australian Research Council Postdoctoral Fellowship that he held from 2010-2013.

Mnemosyne and Athena: the language of Dr Mary Booth in the First World War and after
Bridget Brooklyn, WSU

The proposed paper will examine Booth's commemorative language during the First World War, and compare the language of commemoration with the language of patriotism and imperial loyalty.

The commemorative work of Mary Booth, a feminist noted for her instigation of a women's ceremony as part of Sydney's early Anzac Day observations, has been the subject of some historical analysis to date, notably in works on war grief by Joy Damousi and Tanja Luckins. My researches into Booth's activities suggest, however, that more emphasis needs to be placed on the political nature of her commemorative activity. During the war and after, the language of commemoration emphasised imperial national concerns under the general rubric of 'Anzac', itself a linguistic shorthand that she applied to aims that were more political than commemorative in tenor.

Bridget Brooklyn is a lecturer in the History and Political Thought discipline of the School of Humanities and Communication Arts, Western Sydney University. Her research interests are Australian history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including Australian imperial loyalty, eugenics and feminism. She is currently researching the life and work of conservative political activist and eugenicist Dr Mary Booth.
.

'Try to imagine what it was like'. The changing language of post-Pinochet memorials
Peter Read

This paper examines the signage on leading Santiago memorials that deal with the victims of the Pinochet dictatorship, to identify three main formulations in the discourses of memorialisation that have taken place since the end of the dictatorship. For the first decade after 1990, the Chilean government used the power of the state to restrict the language of memorialisation to no more than a brief recital of the names of the dead and the disappeared and with some indication of individual affiliation with a political party. In the following ten years, that included the accession of the socialist Michelle Bachelet to the Presidency, the growing pressure from families and survivors was represented in a series of new memorials whose inscriptions drew on the rhetoric of human rights in order to condemn the actions of the dictatorship. The third and very recent changes to the form of memorial narrative focus on the experiential dimension of memorialization

whereby the experience of the victims is highlighted and the viewer is invited to respond empathetically with what the victims endured.

In addition to his work in the history of Aboriginal Australia, **Peter Read** travels to Chile annually to research the way that the post-Pinochet period is remembered through memorials constructed during the period known as the Transition to Democracy. He published with Dr Marivic Wyndham, *Narrow but Endlessly Deep. The struggle for Memorialisation in Chile since the Transition to Democracy. (*ANUPress 2016). He is an Adjunct Professor in the Australian Centre for Aboriginal History, ANU.

<div align="center">

Session 3: <u>Interpreting in Wartime</u>

</div>

<div align="center">

Interpreters and Australia's War Crimes Trials, 1945-51
Georgina Fitzpatrick, University of Melbourne

</div>

In the aftermath of the Second World War, three hundred trials were held in Australian military courts in eight locations around the Asia-Pacific region, 1945 to 1951. The accused were mainly Japanese but also Korean and Taiwanese colonial subjects of the Japanese emperor. The military lawyers for the prosecution and for the defence (until Japanese lawyers began appearing) were English speakers. So too were the Members of the Court who, with the President of the Court, gave judgement after hearing the evidence. The proceedings were conducted in English. Witnesses at the trials, apart from those speaking the aforementioned languages, included indigenous speakers from remote parts of Papua and New Guinea or a Pacific island, Indian or Chinese prisoners of war liberated by the Allies, Chinese civilians from Rabaul, and the occasional German missionary. Not surprisingly, this Babel Tower of languages was an enormous challenge to those running the Australian war crimes trials. The possibilities of misunderstanding were limitless. This paper will explore the efforts made to offer some level of interpretation and will also recount the stop-gap measures put in place to cope with this challenge. From the paths of recruitment to the serendipitous interventions of a multilingual bystander, bandaids were applied. Based on interviews and personal papers of some of the Australian Army interpreters as well as some of the exchanges in court, I will outline the situation and offer some observations on the process.

Dr Georgina Fitzpatrick is currently an Honorary Research Fellow, School of Historical and Philosophical Studies, University of Melbourne. She is lead author (with Tim McCormack and Narrelle Morris) and historian contributing eleven of the 23 essays to *Australia's War Crimes Trials, 1945-51* (Brill Nijhoff, 2016). This book was recently shortlisted for the Premier of NSW's History Awards 2017 in the Australian History category. As the Research Fellow (historian) based at the Australian War Memorial, she worked from 2009-12 on an ARC Linkage grant, entitled *Australia's Post-World War II Crimes Trials of the Japanese: A Systematic and Comprehensive Law Reports Series*. This was a joint project of the Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, Melbourne Law School, the Australian War Memorial, and Defence Legal and led to the aforementioned edited book of essays. The Law Reports prepared by Dr Narrelle Morris are forthcoming. Dr Fitzpatrick received her doctorate in 2009 for her thesis, undertaken at the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University. It was entitled 'Britishers Behind Barbed

Wire: Internment in Australia during the Second World War' and is currently being prepared for publication.

Language of war: Interpreting challenges in war crimes trials
Ludmila Stern, UNSW

Since the major Nazi war criminals were put on trial in Nuremberg (1945), court interpreting has been the essential communication mechanism used amongst multilingual courtroom participants. It has played an equally important role in contemporary war crimes trials, those conducted by domestic and international courts and tribunals (International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, the International Criminal Court). In these contexts, two different worlds meet: that of the western-style courts and that of victims, witnesses, and perpetrators who often speak the rare languages of the countries of military conflict. The question I address here is this: what challenges do interpreters face when dealing with war crimes-related evidence, and how do participants from distant cultural and legal backgrounds achieve mutual understanding? Over the years, interpreting challenges in these settings have been largely the same: achieving equivalence when conveying military terms and local realia, conveying the semantics and pragmatics of the legal discourse and that of the vernacular language of lay speakers, and relating violence against civilians, in particular sexual violence (Fletcher 2011; Stern 1995, 2001, 2004). While some legal experts (Karton 2008, Namakula 2014) challenge the possibility of accurate interpreting in such trials, the success, or otherwise, of communication in the trials mentioned above has been shown to also depend on the communicative approach of interpretation users–counsel and judges. The understanding of the speaker's background and of the communication challenges has led some interpretation users to modify courtroom behavior and interviewing tactics. I conclude with several further thoughts about courts in general needing to adapt their interactive practices to the increasingly multilingual and multicultural superdiverse (Vertovec 2006) courtroom environment.

Associate Professor Ludmila Stern is the founder and the first convenor (2005-2010) of the Master of Interpreting and Translation at UNSW. Her research area covers interpreting in war crimes trials in domestic and international courts, such as the Australian War Crimes Prosecutions, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, and the International Criminal Court. Her current projects include 'From the Nuremberg Trials to the International Criminal Court. Interpreting in War Crimes Prosecutions.' She is the author of articles and chapters on court interpreting in domestic and international courts. She has been a Director on the NAATI Board of Directors (2010-Dec 2016), and is the Chair of the NAATI Technical Reference Advisory Committee (TRAC). Ludmila has been an invited speaker at seminars and workshops for interpreters, judiciary, lawyers, and court officials nationally and internationally. She presented at the ICTY, ICC, NJCA, Judicial Commission of NSW, DPP of NSW, Bar Association of NSW, and other organisations. Her historical research examines relations between the 1920s-1940s Soviet Union and western sympathisers, and includes the monograph, *Western Intellectuals and the Soviet Union, 1920-40. From Red Square to the Left Bank* (Routledge, 2007).

It is with deep regret ...: Official Language and Casualty Notification following the Libyan campaign, 1941
John Moremon, Massey University

In the first months of the Second World War, Australia's newly formed Departments of Army, Navy, and Air agreed to establish a uniform casualty notification system that would be based on the use of telegrams in the first instance. This represented a departure from the system that was used in Australia during in the Great War, when soldiers accounted for the vast majority of battle casualties and the Department of Defence delegated to the churches the responsibility of notifying the next-of-kin of soldiers reported killed or missing. In April 1940, the Defence Committee (comprising the army, navy, and air force chiefs) agreed that the telegram-based system should be introduced and further they agreed on a format and the language to be employed in those telegrams. This paper explores the first large test of the wartime casualty notification system, which occurred in the wake of the 6th Division's campaign in Libya in January-February 1941. A public controversy erupted after the first round of casualty telegrams. This brought into question the official language employed and also the manner in which casualty news should be conveyed. For close to half a year after the Libyan campaign there was no uniform system, as federal, state, and local governments, the armed forces, the churches, and the public debated who was best equipped to deliver sensitive news and the language that should be used to confirm a death or to give a modicum of hope for those whose loved ones were missing.

Dr John Moremon teaches military history and defence studies in the Centre for Defence and Security Studies, Massey University, New Zealand. A graduate of the University of New England and the University of New South Wales, he has also been a historian in the Department of Veterans' Affairs and a senior researcher in the Australian Parliamentary research service. The proposed paper forms part of a project examining casualty notification and official advising of bereaved families during and after the Second World War (with focus principally on the Royal Australian Air Force). Its first published research output was a chapter, 'Aircrew Loss and Bereavement: Exploring Casualty Files of the Royal Australian Air Force, 1939-45,' in Tristan Moss and Tom Richardson (eds.), *New Directions in War and History: Debating Military History* (Sydney 2016), 88-103.

Tuesday

Session 4: Propaganda and Communication in War

Language & Propaganda - De-Constructing the Myth of the 47 Samurai
Graham Squires, University of Newcastle

As the army took control of the Japanese government in the 1930s, the indoctrination of students with militaristic values became an important feature of schooling. A favorite method was to incorporate in textbooks accounts of heroic individuals from the past who had demonstrated loyalty and self-sacrifice. These were intended as role models for the students. One such person was Oishi Yoshio, the leader of the 47 samurai of Ako who in 1703 had carried out a vendetta against

the person they held responsible for the death of their lord. In this paper I will deconstruct the popular image of Oishi and argue that it was based much more on fiction than historical fact.

Graham Squires is a senior lecturer at the University of Newcastle. His research interests include Japanese intellectual history, inter-cultural studies, and contemporary Japanese television dramas.

The Hard Road: Dame Enid Lyons' Broadcasts during World War II
Catherine Fisher, ANU

Dame Enid Lyons (1897-1981) was the wife of Australian Prime Minister Joseph Lyons (1879-1939), the first woman elected to the Australian House of Representatives, and a prolific broadcaster. This paper will examine the language of Lyons' World War II broadcasts and their importance as a means by which she exhibited leadership during the war effort. Radio became a tool of modern warfare during this conflict as its ability to quickly convey information and stir emotion through the expert use of speech made it indispensable for disseminating news and propaganda. Women broadcasters provided important information about the war effort, and their polished radio voices gave authority to their contributions to propaganda at home and abroad. Lyons in particular used her broadcasting abilities to boost morale, provide comfort, and crucially to demonstrate the importance of women's contributions to public discourse. Her radio talks exhorted women to rise to the challenge of the war effort, but also provided a crucial point of empathy for her listeners, who emotionally connected with her through the broadcasts. These broadcasts demonstrate the significance of radio in communicating not only information but emotion during the Second World War, as well as broadcasting's centrality to women's experiences of, and contributions to, the war effort.

Catherine Fisher is a PhD candidate, tutor, and research assistant in the School of History at the Australian National University. Her thesis examines the significance of women's broadcasting to the development of Australian women's citizenship over the mid-twentieth century. She was awarded a National Archives of Australia/Australian Historical Association postgraduate scholarship in 2016, and has been published in *Outskirts* and *Lilith: A Feminist History Journal*.

Re-visioning Australian Second World War: Extending the Visual Language of the South West Pacific Campaign
Kevin Foster, Monash University

Australia's fighting in the South West Pacific is well known to us all through a limited array of iconic photographs. These photographs have in turn supported a familiar narrative of Australian military virtuosity and moral rectitude–the accomplished jungle fighters' defeat of the perfidious Japanese and the exemplary treatment of his wounded. So far so formulaic. This paper will consider the uncertain relationship between this visual output and the instructions issued to the official war photographers of the Australian Army's Military History Section, detailing what they could photograph and how they should do so. The MHS photographers were responsible for by far the greater portion of the more than 250,000 Second World War images housed in the Australian War Memorial's archive, yet the photographers and their work remain little known. This paper will suggest why this is and provide some redress. Through the analysis of some

unfamiliar images from the war's less mythologised battles, the paper will propose that, detached from the immediate exigencies of propaganda and national morale building, these photographs can be used to support a radical re-visioning of Australia's war in the South West Pacific, a re-visioning that is more cognisant of how the brutal enmities of race shaped the fighting there and more accepting of the nation's subordinate role in a military sideshow.

Associate Professor Kevin Foster is Head of the School of Languages, Literatures, Cultures and Linguistics at Monash University. Educated in the UK, Canada, and Australia he has published widely on war, cultural history, and national identity and his work has appeared in a range of national and international journals. He is the author of *Fighting Fictions: War, Narrative and National Identity* (1999) and *Lost Worlds: Latin America and the Imagining of Empire* (2009) and the editor of *What Are We Doing in Afghanistan? The Military and the Media at War* (2009) and *The Information Battlefield: Representing Australians at War* (2011). His most recent monograph is *Don't Mention the War: The Australian Defence Force, the Media and the Afghan Conflict* (2013).

Session 5: Cross-Cultural Communication and Alliances

A Question of Legitimacy: Australia and the Formation of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
Sandeep Singh, UNSW (Canberra)

This paper discusses Australia's role in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization from 1954-1962, and contextualizes Australian involvement in the broader environment of the Cold War, especially in terms of its spread into the Southeast Asian region. Australia sought to actively engage with the defence of the region and balance its commitments among its traditional allies (Britain, New Zealand) and expand its engagement with newly independent Asian states, as well as the United States. SEATO offered an opportunity to tie these imperatives together; Australia saw the organization as a means to channel its broader grand strategy objective, forward defence. It attempted to do so by cultivating legitimacy for its involvement in SEATO in two ways, politically and militarily. The former meant communicating an agenda that presented the organization as constructive. The latter meant ensuring SEATO was a capable deterrent against Communist aggression. Both aims entailed consensus, but did not guarantee it. In the years of the formation of SEATO, language became a crucial element to the drafting of the treaty document, as well as conceptualising its structures. While planners did not always refer to legitimacy, the idea of it permeates the silence of the archival record, and all parties referred to notions of territorial demarcations and aggression, especially following the Geneva Agreements in mid-1954. However, languages of war often are subject to translations on the ground that do not correspond to the intended formulations of planners. Australia's attempt to cultivate legitimacy in and through SEATO reflects these conflicts and suggests an exploration of how the language of war is used in situations that present conflict and the development of alliances to deal with such, but in a Cold War setting.

Sandeep Singh is a PhD candidate in English and History with an interdisciplinary focus, at UNSW Canberra at ADFA. He previously did his Honours and Masters

Degrees at the National University of Singapore, in History. Sandeep works on the Cold War, more specifically with special reference to the relationship between art, power, ideology and nationalism in the Cold War. He is currently undertaking a PhD project assessing poetry produced by four different poets in the Cold War, and their relationship with political power. Sandeep has authored more than a dozen published reviews for the Empire in Asia: A New Global History project (Forthcoming, 2 Volumes, Bloomsbury, 2017-18), and has won three awards for graduate teaching at the National University of Singapore, across the fields of European, Singaporean, and Global History, as well as Political Studies.

Unfamiliar allies: Australian cross-cultural communication in Afghanistan and Iraq during the war on terror
Richard Gehrmann, USQ

During the war on terror, Australia became engaged as a military alliance partner in Afghanistan and Iraq. In both wars, these commitments were relatively small-scale and Australians were always engaged as subordinate elements of larger coalition formations. Australian soldiers had to manage the obvious challenge of linguistic and cross-cultural communication with unfamiliar Afghan and Iraqi allies, but linguistic and cross-cultural communication problems were also significant in relations with more traditional coalition allies. The American Iraq war commitment to a whole of nation struggle engaging large numbers of regulars, reservists, National Guard, and civilians was significantly different to the low level Australian deployments, and challenges emerged both from the management of American expectations and from everyday Australian interactions in an ultra-patriotic and at times chauvinist American military culture. Conversely, Australians in Afghanistan worked with the Dutch, an unfamiliar western ally whose liberal social values and consensus-/discussion-based military culture differed from Australian military expectations, as did their propensity to wear spandex tights while exercising. This paper will explore the social history of Australian military communication with allies, who ranged from unfamiliar East Europeans whose very appearance evoked memories of the Cold War to a British military astounded at the Australian disinclination to accept casualties.

Richard Gehrmann is a Senior Lecturer (International Studies) at the University of Southern Queensland, whose recent research covers contemporary war and society, and Australians in colonial India. With Jessica Gildersleeve, he is the editor of *Memory and the Wars on Terror: Australian and British Perspectives* (2017). His recent work on war and society has been published in *Peace Review*, *Popular Entertainment Studies*, *Australian Journal of Jewish Studies,* and in *Rendering the Unspeakable Past: Legacies of Violence in Modern Australia* (2016), *Trauma and Public Memory* (2015), and *Fashion and War in Popular Culture* (2014). He served in Iraq in 2006-07 and in Afghanistan in 2008-09 as an Australian Army Reservist, and is currently researching captivity during the war on terror.

Linguistic mediation and risk management during the wartime: A personal insight of a former ADF interpreter during the Australian Defence Force military operations in Iraq, 2003, 2008
Ali Jabbar Al-Bakaa, Monash University

This paper addresses the experience of Iraqi warzone interpreters as mediators during the Iraq war between 2003 and 2008. Social and political interaction in any

warzone requires the linguistic mediation provided by interpreters. This paper examines a personal insight of my lived experience as former Australian Defence Force (ADF) interpreter from a micro-level analysis in how language has been used as a tool of intercultural communication in armed conflict during the Australian Military Operations in Iraq. As part of a broader doctoral research project on the interaction of Iraqi interpreters and the Australian Defence Forces, this paper analyses moments in communication and miscommunication in order to develop a model for future training of local warzone interpreters. The findings of these testimonials will help the ADF to better understand the role of their former Iraqi local war zone interpreters which in turns provides significant contribution to ADF future military operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and any warzone interpreting contexts.

Ali Jabbar Al-Bakaa is a PhD Candidate in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, School of languages, Literatures, Cultures and Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Monash University. He is an accredited and practising interpreter (English, Arabic). He holds a master degree in Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers, Melbourne, awarded by Monash University, 2013. He also holds a Graduate Certificate of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) from Deakin University, Melbourne, 2011, and a Graduate Diploma of Interpreting and Translating Studies, from the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), Melbourne, 2014. The B.A degree of (Arts/Education) was awarded in English, from Thi-Qar, Iraq, 2006. He has published some journals in the field of creative writing from a micro level analysis. His fields of interest are war zone linguistic mediation studies, applied linguistics, systemic functional grammar, political conversation analysis, creative writing, and politics and social media analytics.