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The modern condition is portrayed by Marshall Berman as a life of paradox, a contradiction between a ‘will to change’ and the ‘dread of a world in which “all that is solid melts into air”’. In the early twentieth century, this paradox of modern living was inculcated as an experience of human flesh. As part of the physical culture movement, the effort of bodybuilding to shape corporeal borders acted paradoxically as a buttress against the sense of decay and uncertainty which permeated the ‘air’ of modernity, and yet was inherently defined by the anxiety against which it reacted. Through the culture of the physique, the embodiment of modernity involved both constructive and deconstructive impulses. The transformation desired by bodybuilding was underscored by the ‘dread’ of bodily fragmentation and the dissolution of the masculine self. War exacerbated a fin de siècle fear of bodily degeneration, offering dramatic visible evidence of its existence. The impact of the first world war on male bodies and minds strengthened the calls for corporeal as much as social and national regeneration. Modern classicism offered hope to the degenerate white male body through the culture of bodybuilding. The war also occasioned some significant philosophical and aesthetic shifts within bodybuilding culture which, in part, reacted against the nineteenth century predilection for a sanitised asexual classicism. Through a reempowered and modernised classicism, bodybuilding established new standards for the male body, propelling modern masculinity from the Victorian past into a technological and sexualised future.

Whilst classicism and modernism are usually seen as opposing ideas or movements, in the 1920s and 1930s they converge. The bodybuilding boom was part of that convergence. This cultural shift in Australia mirrored a global western trend. Bodybuilding schools and gymnasiums grew rapidly in Australia after the war, such as Tom Macguire’s School of Boxing and Physical Culture in Newcastle, George Beattie’s School of Physical Culture in Melbourne, Karl Saxon’s Physical Culture College and the Weber and Rice School. Alfred J Briton’s Physical Culture Institute in Sydney and Walter Withrow’s School circulated monthly publications in this period. Physical culture encompassed a range of exercises designed to strengthen the body and mind, such as wrestling, boxing, archery, classical posing, Dalcroze eurythmics, gymnastics and Greek revival dance. It also included bodybuilding which focused upon the toning and accentuation of muscles by the repeated action of flexing and releasing, and particularly through the use of weights.

During the nineteenth century, physical culture and bodybuilding constituted part of a wider movement of health and fitness in Europe, America and Australia. Ecclesiastical in origin, the tomes of Victorian physical culture often emphasised the interior of the body as a spiritual vessel, a Christian container of morality and purity. Classicism was conscientiously deployed by Victorian physical culture to
further the socio-moral codes of Christianity. Greek art and sculpture inspired hygiene and morality, whilst appreciation of the classical form was clinically aesthetic and deliberately desexualised so as to deter any improper knowledges of the body. When attention was paid to the exterior flesh, it was informed by notions of ‘muscular Christianity’ and the ethos of imperialist masculinity predicated upon class assumptions of gentlemanly competition. However, the experience of war saw a significant shift away from the Christian ethos of bodybuilding. Instead an anti-Victorian, self-consciously pagan and much more phallically charged masculinity developed. Despite the nationalist machismo of bodybuilding, war did not make the Australian man. Rather, it proved the inadequacies of the muscular Christian when pitted against the amoral and indiscriminate effects of modern warfare.

The first world war significantly undermined confidence in the male instinct, by demonstrating that the primitive energies of the male body (virility, physical strength and aggression) were no match for modern technological warfare. The male instinct was a Nietzschean value that had fashioned both bodybuilding and masculinity since the late nineteenth century. However, the flesh of men had been ravaged by tanks, machine guns, mustard gas, hand grenades and other developments made in projectile ballistics, which seemed to compromise this instinctual masculinity. It was declared that all the fit men had been ‘mutilated, gassed, killed, or reduced to nervous wrecks’ which left an entire generation of rejects to populate the next generation. Eugenically paranoid, Australian bodybuilding literature often quoted statistics on the number of so-called ‘mental defectives’ and their alarming breeding rates.

The implication was that returned soldiers were part of this degenerative pool yet also that these mental problems could be overcome through attention to the physical structure of the body. The idea that the fitness of the body could reveal the state of the human mind was popularised by bodybuilding culture and was due, in part, to a wider acceptance of theorists like Freud and Havelock Ellis, as well as the fashionable dissemination of psychoanalysis through the mass media. The war had also brought about a heightened social awareness of mental disorders such as neurasthenia (shell shock). Understood principally as a man’s disease, public awareness of shell shock enabled scrutiny of men’s minds as much as their bodies.
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The maxim of ‘an active mind in an active body’ was articulated *ad infinitum* in bodybuilding literature, which placed great pressure upon the strengthened mind-body relationship to act as a function of normative masculinity.

In response to the physical, psychic and cultural trauma of war, bodybuilding sought to heal the pain of the immediate past through the creation of a new civilised future, only now based upon a dialogue between modernism and classicism. Rather than a defensive retreat to nature, the new civilisation would combine all the benefits of modern technology and science with the culture and aesthetics of the classical past. Bodybuilding, therefore, presented the human body as the primary site for the values and forms of reconstructing civilisation after the war. Walter Withrow, of the Withrow Athletic Club and Physical Culture Institute in Sydney, declared ‘the war has lowered the physical standard of the male sex, but now the war is over, one of the first steps of the Government should be to see that the coming generation is given every opportunity to study the betterment of the human body and Hygiene’.10

Bodybuilding mythologised the corporeality of the war experience. Men were encouraged to write in with their heroic stories of degeneration and repair. One former digger confessed, ‘I was without hope in those days. I was a man who grovelled face to face with failure. I was cheek by jowl with depair ... I seemed to be but a part of my former self’. This fragmented self-identity he attributed to the war, because ‘a man couldn’t go through what most of us went through and come out unscathed’.11 Magazines and literature, the digger explicitly acknowledged, influenced him to rebuild his masculinity, to become ‘robust, dominant and self-confident’ through rigorous muscular exercise.12 Without reifying the discourse, it is worth considering the appeal of the literature through its combined use of sexual and military metaphors. Some bodybuilders even regarded fat men as cowards, it was assumed they could neither flee or fight, their inertia rendered them unheroic and impotent.13 It was against a cultural backdrop of increased medical, psychiatric and social critique of masculinity spurred on by the war, that the discourse of bodybuilding made some critical adjustments to modernity.

Bodybuilding claimed that men damaged by war could overcome injury and disease. ‘Before’ and ‘after’ photographs in magazines were used to advertise its curative effects. Walter Withrow’s student, OW Dunning of the AIF, was described as a ‘cot case’ with enteric fever in Egypt before being transformed by physical culture and bodybuilding. The use of this infantilising term served to accentuate his improved condition. His renewed strength was not only ‘the glory of man’ but he could not be deemed ‘normal’ without it.14 Dunning’s masculinity was restored to his body through its muscular rebuilding. Significantly though, whilst bodybuilding was intended to bolster racial, national and masculine identity, the ‘before’ photographs of wounded soldiers unwittingly affirmed the vision of the Australian soldier as a wrecked man, an emaciated flop. These images countered the mythology of the stalwart Anzac promulgated by CEW Bean’s epic retelling of Australian men at war and the hero-making literature which appropriated the Trojan war and the ancient Greek model of Homer’s *Iliad* for nationalist ends.15 Bodybuilding culture thus joined this war literature in compensating for the reality of war’s destruction of male bodies. In the aftermath of war, the rebuilding of masculinity through the enlargement of muscles symbolised the realm of the displaced phallus. In effect, the glamorous display of hard bodies was a compensation for masculinity’s recent losses.16 Thus despite the imposing body of the classical weight-lifter, his genitals and groin remained
Figure 4: ‘Flexed biceps/Mr Whitehead’s muscles’, Withrow’s Physical Culture Annual, March 1920, p 32.
exposed to injury, and he still needed to ‘protect [his] danger zone’ with the modern invention of ‘pal’ supportive underwear (see figure 1). The ‘pal’ was an expression of the acute need for masculinity to be protected and bolstered in a period marked by postwar fears of castration and loss, which continued to underscore the social meanings of bodybuilding.

The belief that the flesh of men could be made invulnerable is a fallacy that relied upon the fantastic future of technological advances and thus a faith in that which produced the body’s destruction in the first place. The hyper-masculine discourse of prosthetic technologies operated as an over-compensation for loss of limbs and the symbolic virility invested in them. Indeed, far from diminishing the status of man, the metal prosthetic limb had phallic potential and added a sexual mythology to the heroism of soldier masculinity. In Freud’s view, man was becoming a magnificent ‘prosthetic God’. But even he conceded that unless man could merge with his simulated limbs then the perfection of manhood was compromised. Prosthetics should strive for a sophisticated technological and utilitarian capacity, rather than act as a rather awkward adjunct to the human body. Bodybuilding culture similarly drew upon this widely circulating idea of ‘perfection as normality’. Indeed, the visibility of a man’s physical status delivered not only moral and mental, but also class, racial, national, and sexual information. Grounded in eugenics and social darwinism, bodybuilding also allowed that the laws of inheritance were not always absolute or intractable. A man could change his body and his mind, he could overcome his genetic destiny and defy the prehistory of the body itself. Will power and self-mastery were extrinsic factors which could enable the body to alter the course of heredity. The Sydney Physical Institute, for example, advertised that a man could even increase his height through its ‘scientific methods’. Many Australian bodybuilding groups embraced modern notions of change, transformation and innovation. Informed by discourses of degeneration, some bodybuilders responded to epidemics of influenza, venereal disease and a widespread fear of mental illness which was often understood as a hereditary condition. Some claimed their modernity through an emphasis on movement and activity, for ‘stagnation breeds disease’. ‘Activity is the law of life’ that neither young nor old were allowed to evade. If mental or physical decrepitude (fatness, obesity, aging, sickness) developed out of a stationary existence, then the antidote was energy and movement. As one former soldier stated, his sedentary life as a bank clerk represented a kind of ‘habitual morbidity’ but the development and movement of his muscles helped rid him of his terrible fears and enabled him to possess a ‘wonderful feeling of independence’. Much of bodybuilding culture in Australia offered the affectation of freedom through an expression of the body’s strong and resilient spirit which could be conveyed via the muscular movement of flexing and releasing.

Personal liberty, however, was often of little concern and some body cultures supported radical solutions to perceived genetic and racial problems. The urgency with which it was felt that physical and mental ‘defectives’ should be prevented from having children bordered on the hysterical. Segregation, sterilisation and institutionalisation were often proposed as the denouement. Poverty, ill health, war and disease seemed to have so jeopardised the health of the race that these forms of totalitarian legislation were called for by Alfred J Briton’s institute. Nursing the physically weak and mentally defective (often referred to as the ‘moron class’) to maturity and allowing them to reproduce their kind was criticised
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as indulgence. The muscular utopia’s emphasis on ‘perfection as normality’ allowed little social space for human frailty, disability or underclass sexuality. In the aftermath of war, the discourse of modern classical heroism had a homogenising world view that could not envisage a new civilisation with inequalities or differences. This perspective was at once utopic and annihilating; a paradox that operated at the core of modern classicism.

In order to rationalise its punitive and anti-humanist ideas, Australian bodybuilding culture often played up its democratising effect. Simultaneously, it manipulated upper class concepts of nobility and the liberal value of merit. Greek culture was a tabula rasa upon which such an array of disparate ideological messages could be inscribed — classist, democratic, fascist, socialist, nationalist, white supremacist and more. Bodybuilding magazines utilised the concept of the muscular body as a vehicle for upward mobility. In its postwar context, the classicism employed by bodybuilding was no longer understood as the rarefied privilege of the upper classes or the well educated. Instead, the affectation of the upper class operated as a subliminal marketing message throughout the literature, whilst maintaining the ethos of democratic accessibility. Bodybuilding appeared to be open to all men of all ages and classes. Corporeal wisdom attributed to Socrates, such as that ‘a sound mind in a sound body is a fitting foundation for all that is high and noble in human achievement’, formed part of an overall strategy which eluded class specificity altogether, precisely because it is ancient Greek and supposedly democratically and universally owned.

Bodybuilding institutions remodelled classicism with a dual purpose offering the spectacle of a privileged male body, different, superior and iconoclastic, yet also attainable, the democratic right of every man. Theoretically, the corporeal hierarchy of fitness and muscularity allowed the lower classes to compete for status and respect based on the outward appearance of their bodies. Outward signs of muscularity also relied upon both subtle and direct forms of exposure and performance in the public domain. The privileged status that athletes and sportsmen received was a similar function of this hierarchy. Bodybuilding, like the athletic contest, performed the social demonstration of masculinity by projecting such images as success, status, prowess, skill and individual mastery. In Australia, bodybuilding thus professed its ‘everyman culture’ yet was instructively individualistic and hierarchical.

From the 1920s, the perfect male body was increasingly represented as a powerhouse of sexed energy through its massified body. The Weber and Rice School used an image of Clarence Weber as Laocoon fighting the serpent to advertise the masculine power of bodybuilding (see figure 2). Strongman, Don Athaldo, suggested that as you watched your muscles grow into the body of an athlete so did the power of your masculinity: ‘picture yourself as the man you would like to be ... firm and slim ... with powerful bands of rippling muscle’ (see figure 3). Rather than a Victorian ideal of beauty that invested Christian modesty into voluptuous classical forms and asserted their sexual neutrality, postwar bodybuilding stripped its forms of their fleshy vulnerability and offered them strength and sexual dynamism through the activity of pumping muscle (see figure 4). The virility of manhood was therefore to be expressed through the hardness, mass and agility of the male body. Muscular tissues contained ‘life, rhythm, action’ which were the very essence of modern masculinity.
Modernity stripped the classical male body of its conventional neutrality but also undermined the eroticism of subtle suggestion. Masculine eroticism was now directly invested into the naked muscular form of the male body. Bodybuilding formed part of a wider demand for a much bolder masculinity. Inevitably, this masculinity was potently charged with phallic sexuality. Socrates’ notion that ‘we can do nothing without the body’ was repeatedly embellished, with nudity being promoted as a means of throwing off the encumbrances of conventional, restrictive Victorian clothing. Suits, stiff collars and corsets would be replaced by the muscular reinforcing of the flesh itself. Self-consciously anti-puritan, bodybuilding often claimed that it broke the shackles of propriety, canvassing its readers to send in nude poses or bodies semi-clad by loin cloths. Rather than using classical drapery or transparent chemise supposedly to transform the naked into the ideal nude, bodybuilding increasingly flaunted the naked male body as an outright object of desire and sexuality. Posers were encouraged to stand on pedestals and have the camera pointed at the middle of their bodies, so as to increase the impression made upon the spectator. The importance of photography in displaying the message of the muscular utopia cannot be underestimated here, especially with the advance of small handheld cameras in the 1920s. The bodybuilding industry provided an association with classicism that issued amateur and shop photography with the status of artform, whilst classical masculinity was given the spunk of modernity (made to look sexual, dynamic, larger than life), through the action of the camera. Mass produced photographs, retouched in the studio, also assisted the message that this super real body with its magnified masculinity was attainable for ordinary men. Moving away from its role as a conduit for the values of morality and chastity, the Australian bodybuilding magazine industry engaged the muscular and naked male body as an object of display, a socio-corporeal billboard upon which the visual signs of consumption and desire were exhibited. Muscular body was displayed in public forums such as music halls, theatres, circuses, and eventually cinemas, in magazines and postcards.

The fantasy of the modern classical hero was promoted as a sexualised symbol of masculinity. It was the ‘pulsating energies of manhood’ that could make him ‘almost omnipotent in [his] possibilities’. Invoking an image of the heroic warrior, the editorial to Withrow’s Physical Culture entitled ‘Forceful Manhood’ asks, ‘Are you a good soldier or an inefficient weakling. Are you making a good fight for success? If you are it is due to the ... throbbing power ... in your body’. Masculine power was thus claimed through the function and form of the male body, and often reasserted the importance of heterosexual intercourse within the gender order. Moreover, the deployment of classicism in modern bodybuilding helped give the sexualisation of masculine power a certain legitimacy assumed from the past tradition and cultural heritage of Greece and Rome.

A prominent aspect of masculine sexual expression was found in the fashion of body posing for the camera. ‘Body Beautiful’ competitions were a staple part of the magazine industry, attracting amateurs as well as champions such as Geo A Collis, a wrestler from Tasmania (see figure 5). Male beauty was explored and advertised through bodybuilding’s narcissism. Despite its heterosexual and reproductive underpinning, bodybuilding culture maintained a significant homoerotic exchange in the appreciation and promotion of the sexualised man which derived from the need to be affirmed by other men, via magazine culture, through competitions, and in the social arena of the gymnasium or club. Whilst homosocial
subcultures had been part of the social structure since the nineteenth century, the homosociality of the gymnasium was tacitly legitimated by bodybuilding literature in the 1920s and 1930s. The eugenic emphasis on reproduction was not incongruous with the phallic sexuality of the body and the homosociality of the arena in which that sexuality was often expressed. The gymnasium provided a social and mental space for intimacy between men which was spared the scrutiny of psychiatry and psychoanalysis and the overarching judgementalism that defined homosexuality as abnormal. Indeed, bodybuilding literature often discussed psychological matters, which impressed the sanity and normality of the bodybuilder’s world and diverted attention from any heterosexual transgression. Although the texts assume that readers are white heterosexual men and women, the possibility is laid open for homosexual desire to be identified and shared across pages and between men

Figure 7: ‘Bar-bells Bring Physical Fitness’, *Health and Physical Culture*, September 1929, p 34.
especially through visual content (see figure 6). The camera lens brings into focus the abstract language of desire.

Since the late nineteenth century, developments in the style and techniques of photography facilitated the spectacle of masculine ocular exchange. The homosociality of this vision was heavily influenced by rapid developments in the magazine industry, as well as overseas fashions of consumer culture. Australian physical culture magazines reprinted material from European and American publications and appropriated styles of consumerist marketing. An extract from New York republished in Melbourne entitled ‘That Body of Yours — Are You Proud of Your Body?’ asserted the punitive voice of the medical profession. James W Barton, MD addressed his male readers in Australia with apparent scientific authority:

Have you been at the bathing beach and had the opportunity of seeing the human body just as it is, hidden only in part by the bathing suit. You have seen the strong, rugged bodies of the men ... As you looked at them you have made a mental picture of yourself as compared with them ... Do you know that ... you can change the contour of your body so that your own discomforted eye will notice the change.

The consumerism of the fetishised male body aided a ‘phantasmagorical’ spectacle that presented this superreal man as an illusion that could be purchased. Furthermore, the ‘discomforted eye’ acknowledged the processes of ocular exchange, and the role of visuality in social acceptance and self-pleasure.

Men were encouraged to equip themselves with measuring tape, callipers and mirror, to inspect themselves and then make the comparison with photographs of athletes or classical sculptures. The visual relationship between men enabled masculinity to be critiqued, stabilised and consolidated. Bodybuilding competitions confirmed this process. Walter E Withrow instructed men to keep a sharp watch over their bodies, especially if they were over thirty. Gymnasiums plastered their walls with pictures of perfect men. These images enacted a dual vision, at once a mirror to mutual recognition and gender affirmation, yet potentially critical and undermining. Body cultures instructed men in the exactitudes of self-examination and mutual inspection. On the one hand, it affirmed the visual appeal of the male body, on the other it encouraged a certain paranoia concerning the returned gaze. Men of small statures, for example, were taunted as ‘undersized, puerile-looking beings ... ashamed of their natural deficiencies’. Embarrassed confessions of ‘sickly weaklings’ proliferate as men were encouraged to declare their ‘admiration for glorious manhood’. Such discriminatory criticisms asserted the primacy of body mass in the visual display of masculinity. Others confirmed that the transformation from ‘weedy youth to lusty manhood’ was to be experienced through the flesh (see figure 7). Weightlifters prompted the answer to the critical question: ‘If you are not strong, vigorous, quick, alive in every inch of your being, then what kind of a man do you call yourself’. The answer was that without strength and speed, you were not a man at all. For men, being light weight or thin was pathologised as a disability, but one that could be overcome. Similar exaggerations saw ordinary symptoms such as tiredness transformed into a disorder or defect.

Conversely, the constant self-inspection that bodybuilding required often encouraged a self-consciously positive image of Australian masculinity. Comparing the physical beauty of the Australian man with the ‘world standard’ of the ancient
Greek, an article pondered ‘How soon before Australia sets the standard of comparison’? 54 With a competitive spirit, it was debated whether the superiority of the Australian male body might out-classicise the ancients. The potent combination of science and art served to authorise this propaganda: ‘a number of world-famous doctors and artists agreed that Australia is producing the finest physical types in the world’. 55 Indeed, modern art and design were important partners in propagating the values of bodybuilding and hyper-masculinity. For example, we see this in the bodies of Napier Waller’s paintings and murals such as *Virgil* (1922), or the vitalist constructions of Rayner Hoff and Jean Broome Norton. The aesthetic of the modern classical body culminated in the olympian forearms of Max Dupain’s celebrated image of quintessential Australian masculinity, *The Sunbather* (1937). Similarly nationalistic, although including the eugenic fantasy of the perfect Australian family unit, is Charles Meere’s popular rendition of the muscular utopia in *Australian Beach Pattern* (1940). Like bodybuilding, these images have acted as monuments to classical beauty and racial homogeneity. They too must be understood in terms of the relationship between pleasure and desire and the implications of narcissism, voyeurism and fetishism inherent in representation. 56

The artist and viewer are socially bound by their shared sense of ecstasy derived from the scopophilic gaze or the pleasure derived from looking.

Drawing upon the image of the Anzac as a classical warrior, bodybuilder Alfred Briton, declared in 1931 that the ‘day of the hero is not dead, nor does Australasia lack in sons whose deeds of valour have earned for them that title ... In body he is perfect and beautiful. In brain he is alert and courageous ... Heroes are not of the past. They are to be found in all gymnasia, heroes being made to order’. 57 Yet it cannot go unnoticed that despite all the masculinist bravado of bodybuilding there was a great sense of passivity in the ‘made to order’ hero; a passivity based in the fiction of wholeness, of mental, corporeal and social cohesion, that bodybuilding promoted. Whilst the rebuilding of the masculine body was a potent image that sustained itself well into the twentieth century, the art of healing the trauma of war was a much more elusive design. Thus it was with compensatory intent that modern classicism assisted bodybuilding to resurrect the confidence of Australian men *through* the physical expression of their sexuality, to infuse society and the individual man with an invulnerable masculinity, and to create a classical heroism for modern life.
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