Eucalypts of Hodogaya: Organic cultural diplomacy at Yokohama War Cemetery

Located within a former Hodogaya recreation park about 5 kilometres west of the city centre, the 27-acre Yokohama War Cemetery is the primary commemoration and remembrance site for Commonwealth Allies of the Second World War within mainland Japan. Alongside Hiroshima Peace Park and Tokyo’s Yasakuni Shrine, it serves to remind both foreign nationals and locals of war’s consequences. Yet beyond official narratives, its establishment in the peripheral city of Yokohama, rather than Tokyo, Japan’s imperial, cultural, and political heart, remains relatively unknown.

This article aims to understand better Australia’s significant role in this war cemetery’s creation. Under the auspices of the Australian War Graves Service, Australian and Japanese designers and the contractors of both nations
collaborated to create a significant setting for deceased servicemen and women. Whilst ostensibly another of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission's (CWGC) many such sites throughout the world, Australian involvement offers an alternative interpretation of its conception.

Pursuing the theme of “organic cultural diplomacy,” this study examines this important Australian contribution to our region through those factors leading to the allocation of the site and subsequent masterplan, asking why this cemetery differs considerably from the conventional war cemeteries. It also unveils the many unknown modernist architects, landscapers, contractors, and officials who put aside their differences and post-war sensitivities to collaborate while recording and analysing the considered detailing and construction of the memorials using local stones and cast-bronze fenestrations.

Set deep within a hinoki pine and sakura-shrouded hillscape, the former Yokohama City Children’s Amusement Park (Jido-Yuenchi) now accommodates five national burial grounds comprising British, Australian, Indian Forces, a joint New Zealand–Canadian section, and a post-war section. Within are found the remains of 1,555 Commonwealth servicemen, casualties of the Second World War and its immediate aftermath, most of whom perished whilst prisoners of war (POWs) in Japan. Australia’s prominent role in overlaying this Western cemetery template on an existing parkland is evident in a backdrop of towering Tasmanian snow gum eucalypts, the whole ensemble modified with conspicuously Japanese garden features. Its hybrid outcome is equally reminiscent of two contrasting cultures of memorialisation: the uniform grid layouts of the Imperial (now Commonwealth) War Graves Commission—called “silent cities” by English poet Rudyard Kipling—and the forest model advocated by their counterpart, the German War Graves Commission (Volksbund Deutsche Kriegsgräberfürsorge).

It is tempting to interpret these dispersed gridded sections as illustrating the post-war dissolution of the temporarily forged imperial force into self-conscious national identities. Australians, for example, identified as British subjects until the Nationality and Citizenship Act of 1948. Comparing the interred numbers at Hodogaya with those at Kanchanaburi, Thailand (6,858) and Kranji, Singapore (4,461) substantiates most casualties occurring in Japanese-occupied wartime territories where Australians defended British imperial interests. Of the 8,031 Australian casualties of the war with Japan, Hodogaya accounts for only 277, mainly relocated from Ambon, Hainan Island, and Japan’s POW camps. Similarly, the stone cenotaph Yokohama Memorial within the Indian Forces section recognises the combined contribution of those from present-day India and Pakistan, whose wartime contribution has been consistently marginalised. Furthermore, the post-war section occupying Hodogaya’s highest ground displaced a local cenotaph and burial ground dedicated to the war-dead of Imperial Japan.

This paper raises questions useful for examining what we consider Australia’s most significant transnational design intervention post-war, exploring inter alia why its history has been neglected by architectural historians, along with the circumstances, inspirations, and people involved. Its wider commemorative context is Japan’s post-war creation of the internationally recognised Hiroshima and Nagasaki peace parks, as well as the Chidorigafuchi National Cemetery (Chidorigafuchi Senbotsusha Boen), and the controversial Shinto Yasukuni Shrine, both in Tokyo, commemorating all those who died in service
of Japan. Historian Joan Beaumont, exploring Hodogaya as an example of how a major commemorative site might slip into a lower place in the hierarchy of war memory, attributes Australian ambivalence towards and flagging interest in this cemetery to several factors. These include Japan’s physical and cultural distance for veterans and next-of-kin; a visceral dislike of Japan on account of the considerable number of wartime casualties and mistreatment of POWs; and, significantly, the marginality of Yokohama for Australian narratives of the war centred on former conflict sites and/or prison camps. The notion of burying comrades and family members in Japan was repugnant to many Australians due to the inhumane treatment many prisoners endured, revealed after repatriation and from War Crimes Trials but, as Beaumont also observes, as a result of Australian racism and wartime anti-Japanese propaganda. Indeed, the ambivalence of Hodogaya has compounded the anonymity of its creators, despite its international significance as the pre-eminent resting place for Commonwealth service personnel of the Pacific War. The cemetery appears as an anomaly within the broader constellation of national commemorative spaces, incongruously maintained by a foreign organisation in Yokohama, the capital city of Kanagawa Prefecture and the second largest by population in Japan. This work is a preliminary exploration of a broader topic regarding the architectural contribution to CWGC cemeteries throughout Asia, an effort at uncovering key contingent concerns and lines of analysis regarding creating and maintaining a subnational and extra-geographical commemorative space.

**Approach**

The abrupt end of the Asia–Pacific War on 2 September 1945, following the atomic devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, exerted extraordinary pressure on the Allied powers, including Australia. The Imperial Japanese Armed Forces surrendering throughout Southeast Asia, the Far East, Oceania, and the wider southwestern Pacific, set in motion operations to locate and liberate POWs, identify the missing, and commence recovery and burial procedures of those who had perished. The Australian War Graves Service (AWGS), from its Melbourne headquarters, and well-placed through its active graves’ recovery and registration units stationed across northern Australia and liberated parts of Papua New Guinea, mobilised a wide-scale public works division by which to design and construct numerous war cemeteries and memorials throughout the wider region. Comprising recently demobilised local architects, engineers, and horticulturists, this design unit under the stewardship of Brigadier Athol E. Brown would, by mid-1946, materialise as the CWGC’s ANZAC (Australian and New Zealand Army Corps) Agency.

Whereas much has been written about the celebrated architects of the CWGC from its founding in 1917 and its work following the Great War, these otherwise unidentified Melbourne architects reverted to their domestic careers by the mid-1950s. The legacy of their completed works, particularly Yokohama, provides an opportunity to explore an Australian design approach somewhat distinct from the traditional architectural and horticultural guidelines imposed by the London-based CWGC. Their transnational collaboration with Japanese architects, gardeners, and contractors, and use of local building materials and construction methods, are part of a larger history of Australian influence overseas—and Asian influence on Australian memorial practices post-war.
Australian intervention in this major commemorative project highlights an important point of differentiation from previous imperial collaborations, significantly shaped by its shared Pacific campaign with United States (US) forces: the urgency to defend the Australian continent and its immediate north and southwest Pacific territories. These changes defined a more bounded sensibility of Australian post-war nationhood and agency as an independent entity within the Commonwealth, as evident in Hodogaya’s layout. Unlike those uniform imperial grids encompassing Britain’s allies within France’s Villers-Bretonneux, Egypt’s El Alamein, or Thailand’s Kanchanaburi war cemeteries, Hodogaya’s burials are organised by nationality in segregated sections, each with their memorial and only connected by landscaped pathways. Whereas CWGC cemeteries throughout Asia are typically located at former battlefields (Kohima), POW camps (Thanbyuzayat), or alongside hospitals (Kranji), the AWGS selected an established public garden in Yokohama. Reminiscent of the inspiration to create a piece of England in a “foreign field,” expressed sentimentally in Rupert Brooke’s poem, “The Soldier,” in Australia’s case, the more careful implantation of the national presence suggests other ways of interpreting this geopolitically exceptional space. These design choices and gestures indicate an emerging hybrid Australian commemorative practice rooted in the Pacific geography and open to local adaptations that are not necessarily mandated but were encouraged for CWGC cemeteries.

This study’s framing draws on several recent historical studies of the Pacific War, in particular, efforts at expanding a field of inquiry previously dominated by military historians, by identifying diverse mnemonic social and cultural perspectives on the war. The most recent addition to this growing research area is Huang, Lee, and Vickers’ Frontiers of Memory in the Asia–Pacific, which includes Anoma Pieris’ chapter on “organic heritage diplomacy” through an exchange of native flora between the creators of Australia’s Cowra Japanese Garden and Japan’s Naoetsu Peace Park, which this paper validates. These examples are important precedents for politicising these sites’ physical designs and material characteristics as part of a dynamic social heritage whose meanings and representations are never static—and whose organic transformations over the years negotiate memorialisation through cultural diplomacy, often based on individual design choices regarding planting and materials. They contribute to an emerging and rapidly expanding field of critical heritage studies particularly sensitised to issues of dissonant heritage, and Paul Connerton’s “incorporating practices,” where embodied movements through gardens choreographed in ways that build associational narratives offer a deeper understanding of intangible aspects of place memory. From an architectural viewpoint, landscaping and building memorials can be regarded as a similarly embodied practice. Such observations are particularly useful if we study Hodogaya’s audience and the contrast between a public park, Japanese-style strolling garden, and a Western military cemetery.

Amongst the more explicit socio-spatial cues these authors investigate are tensions emerging from the creation, maintenance, and reception of such sites, greatly influenced by seminal intellectual interrogations of spaces like Hiroshima by Lisa Yoneyama and literature on places of pain and shame. Many of these studies acknowledge the dual legacies of war cemeteries as recipient spaces for the remains, both of lives lost in battle and as POWs. Kenneth Helphand’s Defiant
Gardens or Connie Chang’s Nature Behind Barbed Wire illustrate how, in fact, embodied practices of garden-making by prisoners during the war, as acts of resilience, affirmation, or resistance, or simply as pragmatic strategies, precede these commemorative landscapes, adding depth and meaning to memorial gardens created after the war that venture beyond prescribed military designs.16

While equally capable of provoking reflection on war’s unnecessary traumas and with it inviting reconciliatory actions, a contemplative garden space’s aesthetic beauty may diminish the war’s more violent residual effects on families and communities, displacing or masking sites with difficult histories. Beaumont observes the beauty of Hodogaya’s garden was appropriated by Australian authorities to reassure families of those buried there.17 This ambiguous tension, most profoundly represented at Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, is equally present at Yokohama War Cemetery. As with the Cowra Japanese Garden, which in many ways inverts the commemorative hierarchy of international, national, and sub-national memorials by introducing a Japanese strolling garden to an Australian country town, the cemetery at Hodogaya fluctuates between its official and diplomatic use for annual commemorative events and as a recreational space for locals enjoying the ambience created by the cultivated landscape, most prominently of towering eucalypts. Introducing eucalypts as a segue into a broader narrative of Australia’s role in war graves creation post-war, this study offers insights into AWGS and its successor ANZAC Agency’s involvement, the relatively unknown designers, and Hodogaya’s selection for this important transnational commemorative space.

Hodogaya

One of eighteen wards in greater Yokohama, Hodogaya was a considered choice. Its Edo period location along the Tōkaidō road was encapsulated in woodcut prints by Katsushika Hokusai and Utagawa Hiroshige. The landing place for American naval officer Commodore Matthew Perry in 1853 and the capital of the Kanagawa Treaty Port from 1859, Yokohama has a long history of engaging with foreigners. In 1854 it established the Yokohama Foreign General Cemetery, containing numerous graves of foreign servicemen who had died in Japan. Similarly, upon entering Japan soon after the surrender, General Douglas MacArthur landed at Atsugi Aerodrome in the adjacent cities of Yamato and Ayase in Kanagawa. He established his initial headquarters in Yokohama while residing in the Hotel New Grand. The US Armed Forces created their largest temporary military cemetery on the Yokohama Country and Athletic Club sports fields in nearby Yamate, whilst a requisitioned building in the downtown Yamashitachō district became the central Mausoleum.18 Furthermore, whereas the first contingent of Australian troops was stationed in distant Kure, Hiroshima Prefecture, upon arriving in February 1946, AWGS personnel were already operating alongside their US counterparts, making use of their burial grounds for consolidating Commonwealth remains. These first six months were decisive in establishing a working knowledge and logistical base in Yokohama, pending only a formal decision.

The strategic policies determining the location and composition of the permanent war cemetery in Japan were issued by the Australian Army Headquarters in Melbourne to the British Commonwealth Occupation Force (BCOF) as Memorandum No. 47325 on 4 July 1946.19 Within the eight broad guidelines,
two key decisions underpinned the selection of Hodogaya; the first disallowed the repatriation of remains, thus necessitating the creation of overseas cemeteries, and the second appointed the AWGS on behalf of the Commonwealth Allies to establish war cemeteries in Japan. Concurrently, the CWGC established the ANZAC Agency on 1 June 1946, taking over AWGS’s post-war responsibility for Australasia, Borneo, New Guinea, and the southwest Pacific. Brown was promoted to Brigadier and appointed its inaugural Secretary-General. Only two of the guidelines—Cemetery Site and Burials—directly affected design: the former mandated the permanent burial ground must be located within the greater Tokyo–Yokohama area and be accessible post-war for tourists and visiting relatives/next-of-kin of the deceased; furthermore, it had to lend itself to a "satisfactory beautification scheme." The Burials policy directed that, where possible, the deceased would be interred by nationality, inevitably ensuring distinct spatial zones within the overall masterplan.

The Australian Lt-Gen Horace Robertson’s first duty, assuming command of BCOF in June 1946, was the selection of a large recreational park in Hodogaya as the site for the permanent Commonwealth war cemetery. One of a number of possible sites proposed by AWGS, Robertson’s “delightful little valley” met both principal criteria as set out in the guiding memorandum. This 11-hectare parkland was conceived in 1923 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the promulgation of the local school system, and completed in 1929 with funds raised and donated by the City of Yokohama and the general public (including teachers and children). The undulating topography accommodated a youth house, swimming pool, archery range, and a large athletic field, amongst other facilities, and also served as ski slopes during winter (Fig. 2). An 18-metre-high stone chūkonhi (monument for lost souls) adorned with a bronze eagle and dedicated to the fallen soldiers and sailors of the Sino–Japanese and Russo–Japanese wars on the hillside to the north overlooked the athletic field. The occupation forces soon demolished this feature because it signified Japan’s militaristic ideology. Its stone blockwork, though, was salvaged and repurposed throughout the park.

Fig. 2 Anonymous (1935). The athletic field in the Yokohama City Children’s Amusement Park with a Japanese memorial in the background. [Postcard, Yokohama Urban Development Memorial Museum Collection]
Designing a war cemetery

The Yokohama War Cemetery is arguably one of the CWGC’s most expansive and unique commemorative sites. Initial survey drawings prepared by the US Eighth Army indicate a terrain interwoven and interconnected by organic pathways following its natural contours and connecting various sporting and recreational facilities without assuming a *tabula rasa* (Fig. 3). A discordant array of individual cemetery plots was imposed on this layout. Indeed, whilst not uncommon to concentrate the dead in Commonwealth war cemeteries by their nationalities, Yokohama’s physical segregation of the burial grounds coupled with recumbent instead of upright headstones suggests a willing subservience to the landscape. The architects, carefully working within the site’s physical constraints, chose the most level plateaus, ensuring the terrain’s minimal disruption through earthworks. Although interconnected through pathways, this segregation precluded initial ideas of a single common monument as the focal point for the cemetery (Fig. 4). Individual crosses of sacrifice and a memorial in the Indian Forces section present each national cemetery as part of a contiguous and dynamic spatial ensemble, rather than a static destination. An Australian design team was tasked with creating an idyllic setting thousands of miles from home in their former adversary’s homeland.

![Fig. 3 Yokohama War Cemetery layout (1952). [Drawing, National Archives of Australia, NAA A2909 AGS2-2-65 Part 2. Courtesy CWGC Archive](image)
The ANZAC Agency’s inaugural offices were in a nondescript 1920s neo-Baroque office building at 434 Collins Street, Melbourne. In keeping with the principles outlined in Sir Frederic Kenyon’s 1918 report to the CWGC, titled “War Graves: How the Cemeteries Abroad will be Designed,” Brown assembled a team of professional and technical staff, most of whom had returned after serving during the war. They included University of Melbourne architecture graduates Peter Spier, Brett Finney, Robert Coxhead, Clayton Vize, and Alan Robertson, and English-born horticulturist Alec Maisey.26 Robertson had, until recently, been a prisoner in Japan. Over the following decade, this group would design and construct new war cemeteries and memorials throughout mainland Australia and beyond, including New Guinea (Port Moresby, Rabaul, Lae), Malaysia (Labuan), New Caledonia (Bourail), and Indonesia (Makassar).29 There was also the Tatura German Military Cemetery and Japanese Military Cemetery in Cowra.

With the overseas sites, a transnational contribution of regional labour, materials, and manufacturing skills played a significant role. Post-war limitations on shipping and construction materials would see Singapore-fired clay bricks, Gosford limestone, and bronze fenestrations from Melbourne, amongst others, traverse the region to their intended locations. These architects sourced, selected, and specified their building and landscape features from within this wider regional marketplace, often having to improvise. They also provided hands-on supervision and construction knowledge to the predominantly semi- and unskilled labourers engaged by the local contractors. And having experienced the deprivations war produced, they were not burdened by the legacy of their profession’s predecessors, impressing upon them prescribed imperial cultural norms of practice or patrimony. Open to new ways of building and using local materials wherever possible, these architects set aside whatever reservations they may have had regarding non-anglophone societies and opened meaningful collaboration with their counterparts. In the case of Yokohama, this fostered working
relationships with Japanese architects Yoji Kasajima and Yoshio Iwanaga, the gardeners of the Tokyo Nursery Company, and the main contractor Yabashi Marble.

This meaningful cooperation is most evident in a Japanese aesthetic sensibility underlying the final cemetery “effect” because of Maisey and architects Finney and Coxhead’s conscious decisions that determined Yokohama’s landscape and material culture, respectively. By way of example, Maisey, in the preliminary stages, identified two features warranting considered intervention. Firstly, an unsightly open concrete drain runs alongside the main entrance, through the valley, a former swimming pool, ending at a series of interconnecting open ponds. Following feedback from inaugural site supervisor Jack Leemon and Tokyo Nursery gardeners, local rocks lined this drain creating a dry stream karesansui. A small, reinforced concrete and stone curved bridge soribashi was constructed spanning it (Fig. 5). This Japanese “effect” was subsequently featured in the unveiling ceremony’s official brochure.

Secondly, despite the prevailing sentiment that Commonwealth war cemeteries ostensibly reflected the transposed English garden, the CWGC had always provided measures to consider local conditions and climates; for sites outside Britain with varying concentrations of non-British remains to actively infuse
them with a variety of trees, shrubs, and plantings native to the deceased soldiers’ origins. Consequently, silver birches and oak trees ceremonially dotted Yokohama’s British section, sycamores and (curiously) eucalypts within the Canada–New Zealand section, respectively, whilst Indian cedar and Himalayan oak framed the Indian Forces plot. Often symbolic, the needed cultural emphasis was accomplished whilst Maisey’s vision drove the overall cemetery landscape scheme. Through thinning out overgrown shrubs and undergrowth and introducing numerous traditional Japanese tree species, including claret ash, atlas cedar, Japanese cherry blossom or *sakura*, *hinoki* pines, conifers, camphor, and cypress trees, Maisey reimagined this otherwise naturally vegetated sprawling Hodogaya parkland as a hybrid Japanese strolling garden.

There were also the eucalypts, the rapidly growing species synonymous with Australia but not unfamiliar to the Japanese. In the 1870s, global recognition of the eucalypts’ medicinal and anti-malarial properties saw variants of the Tasmanian blue gum, *Eucalyptus globulus*, imported to Japan, occasionally even appearing within religious compounds, such as Kamakura’s Buddhist Zuisen-ji Temple. A eucalyptus *hibakujumoko*, or atomic survivor tree, is located on the entrance bridge to Hiroshima Castle, having survived the blast. Renowned manga artist Keiji Nakazawa, a Hiroshima survivor, even dedicated a 1986 volume titled *Under the Eucalyptus Tree* to this species. And in 1939, as a gesture to improve their deteriorating relationship, the City of Yokohama and North Sydney Council exchanged what can be regarded as nationally representative native flora. To great fanfare and media coverage, North Sydney received 80 cherry trees, whilst 100 eucalypts arrived at Yokohama Port. Similar exchanges of diplomatic flora during the pre-war era can be traced between Japan and Washington DC, as well as the exchanges mentioned above between Cowra and Naoetsu. The temporal and ecological challenges of introducing and transplanting species in unfamiliar terrain and the intensive labour involved in sustaining them through extremes of climate or infestation have been well documented for these other scenarios. At the Yokohama War Cemetery, whilst officially planted within the Australian section, Maisey introduced many more eucalypts throughout, including lemon scented gums germinated from seeds on a BCOF farm in Shimogahara and Tasmanian snow gums from the cemetery’s nursery (Fig. 6). Many of the former
didn’t survive the harsh winter snow and frosts common in that part of Japan. Still, the snow gums slowly acclimatised and now tower over the entire war cemetery, imposing an unruly Australian identity on a manicured space.\textsuperscript{34}

Although Hodogaya’s monuments are somewhat limited in scale compared to CWGC monuments across significant sites in Europe, North Africa, and Asia, their collage of local materials and the detailing affirm this study’s outcome. At the same time, no records have yet surfaced corroborating these findings; a thorough examination of the construction drawings and recent site investigation by Yabashi Marble reveal that the selected stone suggests a conscious Japanese cultural influence both Hokkaido-born Kasajima and University of Washington-educated Iwanaga imparted on their Australian colleagues. Unlike the emblematic homogeneity of a single stone in the architecture of many war cemeteries, sourcing materials throughout greater Japan for Hodogaya invites other geo-cultural meanings and associations into the site.

The volcanic Oya stone from the Oya-ishi region of Tochigi Prefecture used to line walls of traditional Japanese burial chambers constitutes the primary building block for this cemetery.\textsuperscript{35} Flourishing throughout the Meiji period (1868–1912), the stone had fallen out of favour until it clad architect Frank Lloyd Wright’s Imperial Hotel (1922) in Tokyo. Blue and yellow variants of Tatsuyama-ishi, another volcanic rock widely used for stone coffins in the Kofun period (300–538 AD), adorn wall interiors, door jambs, columns, and flooring. Inada, otherwise known as Himalayan granite and an important ornamental stone from Ibaraki Prefecture used extensively for pre-war civic buildings, including Hiroshima’s Atomic Bomb Monument, was used for the Cross of Sacrifice.\textsuperscript{36} For centuries, Mt Yoshino hardwood from Nara Prefecture formed the intricate structure of temples, including use for temple furniture, doors, and gates.

A hara-kafu-shaped transom, associated with roofing the traditional okurumayose (carriage porch) synonymous with Shinto temples, frames the doorway of the Records Building preceding the inner gates (Fig. 7). This distinctive motif in blue Tatsuyama stone reaffirms a Japanese design sensibility upon this otherwise foreign intervention—an otherwise subtle feature seemingly suggestive of the traditional English lychgate. Inside this room, holding the register of all those
interred, polished grey *Hototogisu* marble clads a stone lectern and a dedication panel behind it. Yabashi Marble, recommended by Iwanaga and appointed for Yokohama’s main contract, were the masons for the interior stone cladding of Tokyo’s National Diet building.37

**Conclusion**

This paper outlines some of the key concerns and valuable details of the several agents involved in the co-creation of the Yokohama War Cemetery as a culturally attenuated and materially hybrid, organic expression of diplomacy, a process of mutual acclimatisation to the place-making practices of a former foe. It lacks a deeper understanding, however, of the local council and community’s reception of the cemetery in the war’s aftermath. Given the likely economic and social burdens it might impose, the Yokohama city authorities initially questioned why such a symbolic and international memorial space was introduced to a subnational site.38 Was maintaining distance between Tokyo’s national memorials and the allied forces’ sites preferable, or was Yokohama selected because of its treaty port identity and US military concentration? Was accommodating a foreign cemetery considered a spiritual burden at a time when Japanese public sentiment was “embracing defeat”?39 Or did the mutual cultural opacity caused by Australia’s (like Japan’s) history of racial insulation and lack of a meaningful connection to that city circumscribe the cemetery’s dissonant presence in Yokohama? In a translated *Kanagawa Shimbun* newspaper article dated 9 June 1957, on the “New Hodogaya Park”—replacing the original relinquished to the Commonwealth and nearing completion adjacent to the northern boundary—it was reported that one reason the municipality approved this new recreation ground was that the “British Commonwealth Cemetery does not have the sadness of a Japanese cemetery and its proximity should not influence the minds of the children.”40 Moreover, the introduction of many Japanese features was not always welcomed nor always sustainable. On his visit in 1960, Brown found it “very pleasing to report that the ‘Japanese’ character of the cemetery is rapidly being replaced by the development of the cemetery more along ‘Commonwealth’ lines.”41

The architects and horticulturists developed a hybrid plan of planting and material practice to reconcile the many influences and cultural positions in cemetery design. The anonymity of these designers and the paucity of information about them may well be attributed to Australian ambivalence. Still, it also raises useful questions about the short- and long-term diplomatic purpose fulfilled by war grave sites and by those designers whose activities softened the post-war imperial footprint.
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