

Reconnaissance

TWENTIETH-CENTURY NEW ZEALAND WAR HISTORY AT CENTURY'S TURN*



MORE THAN 25 YEARS AGO, in the opening chapter of his now classic book *The Face of Battle*, John Keegan traced the lineaments of military history and issued a series of cautions to its practitioners. Military history, he argued, was deficient in subject matter and technique. Keegan depicted a body of work strong of arm but weak of brain and heart, overly concerned with generals, logistics, strategy, weapons and weapons systems. The conventions of the field allowed little scope for analysing the experiences of men at war. Citing the official British military history of the Somme as an example ('an exhaustive account of one of the world's greatest tragedies without the display of any emotion at all'), he charged official military history with bloodlessness and featurelessness. Combat histories were hamstrung by jingoism and derring-do narrative conventions. Over-written, they over-simplified the motivations and behaviour of soldiers in the interests of 'general grand effect'. Emphasizing history's liberal pedigree and its humanist vision, Keegan challenged writers of military history to think about the conventions of their field and search for ways of rendering a variety of military experiences understandable.¹

For most New Zealand historians the publication of James Belich's *The New Zealand Wars* signalled the local arrival of a new type of military history.² Based on a 1982 doctoral thesis, *The New Zealand Wars* was a rare instance of a 1980s revisionist military history that self-consciously analysed the racial discourse evidenced by military conflict. Though the details have been disputed, it remains the standard work on the meaning of the wars.³ Nevertheless, in the years that have elapsed since its publication, historians of New Zealand's twentieth-century wars have been slow to follow Belich's lead towards a more explicit analysis of war's role in racial discourse or its impact on New Zealand society as a whole. Too often the connections between war and society are made only in passing, or treated as statements of historical verities rather than theses to be proved. War, we are told, brought us to self-consciousness as a nation, but the details of the process (particularly the way it worked itself out in the messy periods between wars) remain indistinct.⁴

Keegan's assessment of military history's challenges provides a starting point for an examination of recent publications in twentieth-century New Zealand military history, broadly defined. Having explored questions about the relationship of war and New Zealand society for more than 15 years I have just introduced a graduate course about New Zealanders and the wars of the twentieth century. Developing the course has meant systematically reading the recent work about New Zealanders and New Zealand at war. It has been a profitable exercise. As so often happens, reading has generated as many questions as answers. Many

times it has brought me back to Keegan's vision of a military history — and, by extension, a history of the relationship between war and society — that is at once empirically grounded, textually self-aware and attentive to the experiences of those caught up in war.

Keegan's critique of military history was, of course, informed by changes affecting the practice of history as a whole. The shifting grounds of the so-called 'new social history' encouraged experimentation across the discipline, not least of which were forays into what was called 'new military history'.⁵ The terrain of new military history, like 'new' social history, was never definitively mapped; indeed part of its appeal lay in open horizons. Prior to the 1970s military history had been dominated by battle-focused, usually top-down accounts of campaigns, leaders, strategy, tactics, weapons and logistics. According to Peter Karsten, one of the early innovators, the newness of 'new' military history amounted to a 'full-fledged concern with the *rest* of military history . . . recruitment, training, and socialization of personnel, combat motivation, the effect of service and war on the individual soldiers, the veteran, the internal dynamics of military institutions, inter- and intra-service tensions, civil-military relations, and the relationship between military systems and the greater society'.⁶ Karsten did not prioritize race or gender in his catalogue of innovations but broadly speaking the 'war and society' mode of new military history incorporated studies of war's impact on women, indigenous and non-white peoples, though it still remains unusual for military historians, old or new, to treat white men as gendered or racialized subjects.⁷ 'New' military history was also attentive to the methodological currents influencing the discipline from quantitative social science and later literary theory.

These developments were not universally welcome. In the United States, where there is the greatest concentration of English-language scholars working in military history,⁸ the enthusiasms of those like Peter Paret who hailed the potential for interdisciplinary cross-over between military history and social and cultural history were tempered by the defensiveness of military historians committed to the conventional paradigm. John Lynn's 1997 survey article, 'The Embattled Future of Military History', denounced social and cultural analysis in history as the 'exaltation of theoretical complexity, novelty and the all-too-frequently-trivial . . . signs of disillusionment and decadence in the historical profession'.⁹ Writing in a less polemical manner, the British military historian Jeremy Black remarked on a predisposition among military historians to feel persecuted, but nonetheless judged the field as suffering from the anti-militarism of the scholarly community.¹⁰

But what of New Zealand? In the past five years or so several landmark publications have been produced in New Zealand military history, along with an impressive number of useful case studies and popular histories. Rather than suggesting an embattled field, the success of these publications testifies to the extent of public interest in, and indeed, public funding for, New Zealand military history. They illustrate a primary commitment to narrative forms of history, an ongoing interest in experiences of military service and an increasing sensitivity to the variations in those experiences. Like all histories they are products of certain times and places. Audience matters. Military histories are still more likely to

define their unit of analysis as the corps than society in general, include a Roll of Honour than a historiographical debate, and exhibit a clear divide between the magisterial hardbacks produced as reference works and the illustrated histories intended for more general consumption.

The *Oxford Companion to New Zealand Military History* is the most impressive of the recent publications. Comprising over 600 pages of entries by more than 60 contributors on topics ranging from Abyssinia to 'Z' Special Unit, it is a marvellous reference work.¹¹ It caters to a wide variety of historical tastes with a good selection of biographical material, campaign and unit histories, excellent maps and handy tables for the terminologically and technically challenged. In addition to the standard reference fodder there is also a selection of informative overview essays on diverse topics: literature and war, military history and historiography, religion and war, military slang and war memorials. Though it stops short of the American companion volume which offered essays on 'peace history', 'culture, war and the military', 'society and war', and disciplinary views of war from political studies, psychology and international relations, the scant research base for the writing of such essays makes this a prudent choice.¹² The range of topics in the *New Zealand Companion* and the overall quality of the book is even more remarkable when it is noted that despite the assistance of his advisory committee and contributing authors, it still fell to the volume's editor, Ian McGibbon, to write the majority of the entries.¹³

Publications in twentieth-century New Zealand military history have tended to concentrate on the two world wars, with only sketchy coverage of the period before 1914, or after 1945, but in recent years the chronological coverage has steadily improved. John Crawford and Ellen Ellis's short illustrated history of New Zealand's participation in the Boer War fills a long-standing gap in the literature.¹⁴ Chris Pugsley's study of the World War I Maori Pioneer Battalion is another valuable addition, as is his poignantly titled popular survey *Scars on the Heart*.¹⁵ Glyn Harper has written a book about New Zealanders' participation in the October 1917 Battle of Passchendaele and retold the history of New Zealanders' participation in World War I as a whole using soldiers' letters as his primary evidence.¹⁶ The second instalment of the two volume official history of New Zealand and the Korean war by Ian McGibbon appeared in 1996 to praise for its meticulous scholarship and balance between external affairs, domestic issues and combat operations.¹⁷ McGibbon has also completed a history of the Corps of Royal New Zealand Engineers and a guide to the memorials and battlefields of Europe's western front.¹⁸ *Kia Kaha*, a collection of essays on New Zealanders and World War II edited by John Crawford, first published in 2000, has been reissued in paperback.¹⁹ Laurie Brocklebank has written on Jayforce and Crawford and Glyn Harper have continued the history of New Zealand peacekeeping into the 1990s.²⁰ Julia Millen's *Salute to Service* traces the history of the Royal New Zealand Corps of Transport from colonial times until its disbanding in 1996.²¹ There are new books on the 1941 battle for Crete, and on New Zealanders' participation in the North African campaign of 1940–1943.²² The already large number of first-person accounts by veterans, particularly veterans of World War II, continues to grow apace. They are also being supplemented by an increasing number of diaries and letters published by the families of deceased soldiers.²³

Histories of New Zealand at war feature prominently among the current projects of the History Group in the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, with a planned study of New Zealand and the Vietnam war contracted to Roberto Rabel, a history of the New Zealand artillery from 1840 commissioned from Alan Henderson and another volume forthcoming on New Zealand Forces in South East Asia, 1949–1966. A history of the Returned Services Association is also being prepared under History Group auspices. The Second World War Oral History project, set up in response to a suggestion by the Prime Minister, Helen Clark, that readable oral histories of World War II were needed to stand alongside Maurice Shadbolt's *Voices of Gallipoli*, has resulted in two books already, with more on the way.²⁴

There is also a great deal of research in progress in the universities. Recently submitted MA and PhD theses have considered the experiences of New Zealand World War I nurses, military aircraft purchasing, British-New Zealand relations during World War I and the memory and commemoration of war in the period between the world wars.²⁵ It seems World War I is a burgeoning topic of current graduate student research, with the October 2002 issue of the *New Zealand Journal of History* listing work in progress on photography, voluntary organizations, mobilization, demobilization, the role of the New Zealand Division on the western front, defence policy, masculinity and commemoration. Other students currently enrolled in New Zealand universities are researching an array of topics in military and related histories including war brides, logistics in the New Zealand wars, women in the New Zealand wars, gender and the New Zealand wars, New Zealand and the Spanish Civil War and the New Zealand Third Division.²⁶

On the face of it this is a thriving field. Yet here too there seems to be a sense among practitioners that military history has paid its dues to the historical profession but not received full membership. The entry on 'Military history and historiography' in the *Oxford Companion to New Zealand Military History* by the Australian scholar Jeffrey Grey opens with a claim that 'military history has always been a minority interest among New Zealand historians and remains a neglected subject in the country's universities'. He takes the *New Zealand Journal of History* to task for having published too few articles about military history, 'almost all of them with a social history emphasis'.²⁷ In a forthcoming essay, Ian McGibbon, the most prolific New Zealand military historian, chastises the New Zealand historical profession for a pervasive 'disdain' for military history. Quoting a 1996 statement of Roberto Rabel's in support of his claim that military history has been unfairly treated, McGibbon suggests that the prevailing view is that 'war history is "outdated, narrow in focus, boring and intellectually challenged rather than challenging"'.²⁸

McGibbon's frustration is understandable. Having worked long and hard to produce a large corpus of quality publications he is entitled to recognition for his contribution to New Zealand history. His feeling that too few others share his research interests is one that will be familiar to many other New Zealand historians but I am not sure his comments, or those of Grey, are accurate. It is helpful and productive for historians working in the universities to hear how others think we could do our jobs better but I am concerned at the implication

of intellectual disdain. It seems to hark back to an earlier period, when social historians may have oversold their subject as a corrective to narrowly conceived (and often caricatured) 'traditional' forms of history, rather than reflect the current situation. I also wonder whether it is not also a transference of the antagonisms of more polarized historical communities, such as that in the United States, rather than an accurate reading of the trajectory of New Zealand history. These caveats aside, I agree there are marvellous opportunities open to historians who want to study the relationship between war and New Zealand society.

Given the relatively small numbers of professional historians working in New Zealand, scholars often find themselves pressed to cover large topics without the assistance of companion works to supplement and contextualize their findings, let alone complementary studies to offer divergent interpretations of the same topic. We are all familiar with the frustration of conference programmes that seem to offer papers in an array of specialized fields, but nothing in our own area of interest. The coverage of topics in New Zealand history seems to be scattershot. There are concentrations and fashions of course: nineteenth-century race relations, welfare and liberalism seemed to dominate the agenda in the 1970s and early 1980s. Women's history received a lot of attention in the mid to late 1980s.²⁹ Public history and treaty-claims history were the growth areas of the 1990s.³⁰ In the late 1990s gender and cultural history gained prominence.³¹ Each wave of scholarship produced its own backlash. In the deregulatory 1980s welfare history seemed a little passé; by the post-feminist mid-1990s so, too, did women's history; treaty-claims history and 'race relations' history also lost some of their shine with accusations of victim-centeredness and neo-colonialism. The recent interest in cultural history is an implicit critique of the limitations of social history. In some respects the comparative neglect of military history in recent decades reflected its mid-twentieth century centrality to the New Zealand historical enterprise. The very success of military history, particularly the massive output of official history following World War II, encouraged a belief that the war had 'been done'.³²

Yet Grey and McGibbon have a point. New Zealand universities have not routinely taught courses on New Zealand military history. Clearly some of the reasons for the patchy coverage of New Zealand history in New Zealand universities relate to size. At the University of Auckland, in one of the larger history departments in the country, seven staff currently teach New Zealand history, some part-time, some with teaching commitments in other fields and all with their time divided between teaching, research and administrative responsibility. At any one time up to a third of the staff will be unavailable for teaching because of study leave or outside research contracts. The department's New Zealand history programme offers introductory courses on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries at stage one. In these and in the stage one paper about Maori tribal histories, military matters are integrated into the broad narratives of migration, settlement and modernity. Specialist courses for upper level undergraduates cover the history of the Treaty of Waitangi, the social history of European New Zealanders, New Zealand legal history, gender relations, social welfare and racial ideology. If the failure to dedicate a specialist course to a subject is to be taken as evidence of disdain then that disdain must also extend

to economic history, the history of women, cultural history, sports history, literary history and biography to name but a few possibilities. Patently this is not so. Rather, the teaching programme reflects a pragmatic balance between staff research interests, perceived student demand, and commitments to service teaching in other fields.

The same balancing act influences the course offerings in New Zealand history at other universities. Before they retired from teaching, Laurie Barber offered military history courses for many years at the University of Waikato and Erik Olssen taught a paper about World War I at the University of Otago. War was a major theme of Keith Sinclair's section of the master's course in New Zealand history at the University of Auckland. Waikato currently has an upper-level course on the nineteenth-century New Zealand wars, as does Massey University, but these are the only 'stand alone' New Zealand war history courses. At all universities twentieth-century military history is incorporated into the general histories of New Zealand offered to first year students and features in upper level courses designed around broad topics or problems, including courses with comparative dimensions. Thus Victoria University teaches a paper about World War I that incorporates British, Australian and New Zealand material. The University of Otago's 'Hist 220: Packaging the Past' uses the history of World War II as an example of the way histories are commemorated and interpreted in the public domain. Other courses integrate war into the study of New Zealand nationalism, women's history and religious history. Military and defence issues define some of the themes of the University of Canterbury's comparative study of Australian and New Zealand history, while Gallipoli also features as a 'defining moment' in a course about the invention of 'Kiwi culture'. Vincent Orange has regularly taught a course about World War II.³³

McGibbon attributes the relative neglect of military history in the universities to the 'vice-like grip of social history on the academic historical profession', adding somewhat peevishly that 'the fact that much military history is social history is generally unacknowledged'.³⁴ Again this is a claim that I would like to dispute, but in a spirit of collegiality and common endeavour, not in defence of a hegemonic social history. While social history has clearly had a powerful effect on history writing and history teaching, the difficulties of integrating military history into university courses in New Zealand history have as much to do with the genre conventions of military history writing as with a failure on the part of social historians to see the connections between war and society. Military history, at least as practised in New Zealand, tends to be narrative in form and book-length in presentation.³⁵ Texts of this type are difficult to integrate into university courses geared to teaching students skills of historiographical debate, primary document analysis and problem-centred historical conceptualization because they avoid open historiographical debate and explicit social science-derived theorization in preference for the construction of linear accounts of important events. An emphasis on skilled historiographical analysis is one of the clear legacies of social history's influence on university history teaching; but the issue here is one of means to an end not an end to historical study of certain topics. Students are taught historiographical analysis to give them a sense of history's constructed and contested nature. It provides the means of

distinguishing histories woven out of the disciplined interplay of a historian's subjective beliefs, chosen theories and the available evidence from histories built on unsupported assertions and untested assumptions. It is easier for the students if we do this using books and articles such as Miles Fairburn's *The Ideal Society and Its Enemies* and the special issue of the *New Zealand Journal of History* produced in response to it — to take one of the 'set-piece' debates in New Zealand historiography — than if we use histories with their arguments threaded through the warp and weft of the narrative.³⁶ Our best students move on to the critique, and indeed the construction, of such implicitly historiographical writing — narratives of military endeavour included — at graduate level.

There is also a question of the origins and intended audiences of military history as practised in New Zealand, and academic history as taught in the universities. No one is more aware than McGibbon, a 20-year veteran of the History Group and its predecessor entities, of the genealogy of New Zealand war history as official history, beginning with the abortive early twentieth-century attempts to write a history of New Zealand's participation in the Boer war, the official histories of World War I through James Cowan's classic *The New Zealand Wars*, the massive series of volumes on World War II and the subsequent work by McGibbon and his colleagues on the latter half of the twentieth century.³⁷ As McGibbon notes in the opening paragraph of his survey of official war history in New Zealand, the intention has been to provide the public with accounts that record and memorialize New Zealand participation in armed conflict.³⁸ Much of the best work in New Zealand military history has been produced as public history and though many public historians do find time to contribute to academic journals, they are not generally paid to write academic articles.³⁹ Books matter more in the world of private contracts and government-funded research.⁴⁰

For better or worse, historical work inside the academy is often at cross-purposes with that from without. This is not so much a judgement about intellectual challenge or scholarly worth, but about our different priorities. Discussions of methodology and historiography, bibliographies, even footnotes strike many outside readers as abstruse and pedantic, but they are the basic tools that we use to teach our students about the constructed and contested nature of the past. The official histories, to their credit, retain footnotes and bibliographies, but they tend to text that minimizes historical debate in favour of the production of a streamlined and authoritative narrative of events. These conventions, I contend, produce history with 'an assured tone . . . a world in which the war's participants might have preferred to have lived, where the outcome of the conflict is known and where an overarching "objective" reality makes fear and worry manageable'.⁴¹ It is a kind of history which appeals to a large segment of the reading public: history where recounting the salient facts is more important than showing how the author arrived at his or her interpretation of what those facts are. Authorial interventions, theoretical concerns, and the idiosyncrasies of source material and genre convention are rendered invisible or irrelevant.

Let us state the case clearly. New Zealand military history is not intellectually backward, nor is it generally regarded with disdain. In many ways it testifies to the profitable relationship between war history and other branches of the discipline. The changing questions asked by war historians have clearly been

shaped by social history's agenda; their broadened source base partly attributable to its methodological innovations. Women, Maori and prisoners of war all feature more prominently in recent histories, as do experiences of rank-and-file and non-combatant soldiers. Because of the far-reaching impact of war on New Zealand society, social historians ignore the work produced by military historians at their peril. Nonetheless, many of the 'big' questions that dominate the intersections between social history's agenda and that of military history remain unanswered. There is still a marked reluctance to connect the history of twentieth-century warfare with the making of twentieth-century masculinity, or to move beyond consideration of the many notable achievements of the Maori Battalion and the Maori war effort organizations to an examination of military service's impact on Maori-Pakeha relations. War's impact on the regional and ethnic identities of all New Zealanders, Maori and Pakeha, also deserves attention.⁴² There is also a curious silence about the impact of mass military mobilization on New Zealand patterns of class relations and social stratification.

To take one recent example, the reluctance to connect the history of military endeavour to New Zealand history generally, or to do so only at the level of superficial assertion, is evident in Glyn Harper's recent book on New Zealand experiences in World War I. Compiled from the letters sent back to New Zealand by servicemen, the book is divided into five chapters each detailing a different phase in the war: Gallipoli, the battles on the western front of 1916 including the Somme, the Sinai-Palestine campaign, the failed offensives at Ypres, Messines and Passchendaele in 1917, and the final phases of the war on the Western Front in 1918. Each is prefaced by a short narrative account of the relevant campaign, then the rest of the chapter is compiled from selections from between six and 20 letters, arranged in chronological order and edited, 'to concentrate on the essential information they contain and to avoid repetition'.⁴³ But what were the areas of concentration and repetition? What shared tropes shaped these men's descriptions of experiences that by many accounts verged on the indescribable? How did they censor and finesse the presentation of events for a home audience? How do these letters compare with those of soldiers of other nationalities? Is there anything distinctively New Zealand about this discourse? The richness of the material presented is beyond dispute, but using these letters to construct a more personalized, 'history from below' narrative of the war barely touches the surface. The bold generalizations in the volume's introduction make the letters' predictable chronological structure and the minimal commentary on their themes and subtexts difficult to justify. We are told World War I caught New Zealand up in a global whirlwind that would change 'the lives of millions of people on a scale never witnessed before'; 'this war affected [New Zealanders'] lives like no other'; 'the legacy of the war, with its destruction, horror and suffering, was overwhelming and irreversible'.⁴⁴ Sweeping claims are made with no supporting references or consideration of alternatives. Military service, we read, was 'the single greatest shared experience of New Zealand males in the last hundred years'; old certainties (including 'such ideals as the conviction that war reinvigorated nations, created character, was manly, glorious and that relatively bloodless victory was possible') eroded or vanished entirely. 'Notions of duty, honour, sacrifice and Empire all suffered too'. New Zealanders no longer tried

to mirror Britain, 'New Zealand nationalism and a sense of identity had been born'.⁴⁵ Yet all this provocative and visionary assessment of the impact of New Zealand society and culture is averred as prefatory rhetoric, not developed by analysis of the evidence presented in the letters. For the most part, the work of interpretation is left to the reader.

This brings us to another area of emerging concern, the way in which oral history, diaries and memoirs are being pasted into the writing of New Zealand military history. Part of Keegan's attack on the conventions of war history was directed at the emerging social history of war. Though generally supportive of efforts to describe war from the vantage point of ordinary soldiers and civilians, Keegan warned that the testimony of participants, whether drawn from diaries, letters or oral interviews, was no substitute for interpretation: 'At worst, they are mined for "interest", to produce anthologies of "eye-witness accounts" in series with titles like *Everyman at War (The Historian as Copy-typist would be altogether more frank)*; at best, they serve as the raw material for what is not much more than anecdotal history'.⁴⁶ Keegan, quoted with approval in Harper's introduction, might be less than pleased by the technique of juxtaposition in lieu of analysis that characterizes the bulk of Harper's book.

Recent local efforts to supplement the official histories of World War II with new material drawn from oral history interviews need to be approached cautiously. In her foreword to Megan Hutching's *Inside Stories: New Zealand Prisoners of War Remember*, Prime Minister Helen Clark clearly situates the History Group's oral history project within the idiom of 'new' military history's experiential mode:

This is the second publication in a larger project in which the oral histories of New Zealand veterans of the 1939–45 conflict are being recorded . . . an attempt . . . to capture the memories of those who had fought in that war while they were still among us.

Although there is a fine series of official histories of New Zealand's effort in the Second World War, those volumes naturally focus upon the decisions of generals and the movements of battalions. They tell less of the hopes and fears, and the excitement and boredom, of the ordinary soldier. I believe that to understand war and its place in our history, we need to understand how it has affected individual human lives. Only oral history can reveal this personal meaning.⁴⁷

Clark's foreword is worth quoting at length because it illustrates the slippage that can occur between the well-meaning and vitally important project of recording the memories of those touched by war and the ongoing, also vitally important, but analytically distinct task of understanding how experiences of war affected individual lives and society at large. The memorial aspects of official histories of war carry with them their own priorities. Critical analysis, with the risks of reductionism and generalization that it entails, is not always appropriate. Asked about her decision to present lengthy selections from the interviews organized by individual informant rather than shorter excerpts geared to thematic discussion, Hutching commented on the special nature of the project: 'The reason for the publication will always determine how the interviews are used.' Unlike her earlier book on British migration to New Zealand, where the

interviews were 'another source of evidence' presented via 'short quotes as you would with written sources', the World War II interviews 'are a commemoration as well as being a reflection of some of the experiences of some of the people who went away in the war'. The interviewer's questions are retained in the published transcripts to remind readers that she is shaping the encounter. Yet the interview transcripts cannot simply be read as primary sources, because they have been 'VERY heavily edited', though, 'of course . . . you [the reader] have no idea of how heavily (or otherwise) they have been edited'. Books like *Inside Stories* are, in Hutching's view, 'a way of presenting people's experience without analysing what it means or meant to the interviewee'.⁴⁸

The broadening of the source material on which our war histories rest is important. Collecting the material and publishing it in transcript form is better than not collecting it at all. But Keegan is correct; the role of the historian is fundamentally hermeneutic. The copy-typist's approach to oral history and private testimony is more excusable in publications produced by journalists and historically minded amateurs like Jim Sullivan or Lauris Edmond, to cite two examples close to my own work.⁴⁹ It is less comprehensible in books written by professional historians, even when the books are intended for general audiences. Commemorating and memorializing war requires that we approach these sources with respect but it does not preclude analysis. Given the technical, personal and interpretive challenges there seems to be a clear need for the professional historians to reflect on their practices, editorial and otherwise, and to share their reflections with others. Publishing interviews or letters edited into relatively seamless accounts of 'what happened', or narratives punctuated by the interviewer's questions, only skims the surface of what goes on in the interaction between memory, public recitation and interviewer/transcriber/editor's interventions.⁵⁰ 'The trouble with narrative — telling stories, making histories', as Greg Dening has pithily remarked, 'is that it is so easy but thinking about it is so hard'.⁵¹ Yet it seems to me that unless we take the work of analysis more seriously we will never bridge the gap between the generalizations about the macro-level impact of war on New Zealand society and culture and the treasure trove of micro-level material generated by individuals caught up in war.

Recent publications by oral historians specializing in war history suggest that untangling the skeins of myth and memory may be particularly complicated. The reflections of those who have interviewed veterans suggest that reading between the lines — or more accurately — listening between the lines of veterans' stories is necessary to tease out the interplay between 'cultural script' and personal experience. Because there is less of a consensus about the cultural meaning of the war as a whole, the Vietnam war has stimulated the most debate about the interaction between 'cultural script' and oral evidence, but testimony about, for example, World War II, where there is less debate about the overall significance of the conflict, are just as likely to be structured by narrative conventions and cultural shibboleths.⁵² Penny Summerfield's *Reconstructing Women's Wartime Lives: Discourse and Subjectivity in Oral Histories of the Second World War* is a salutary example of how much insight can be gained by returning to one's interviews a decade or more after a project is 'finished'.⁵³ Closer to home, Gaylene Preston's film *War Stories Our Mothers Never Told*

Us is a wonderfully evocative illustration of the way the passage of time both enriches and reshapes interviewees' understandings of the past. Books as diverse as Nicholas Boyack's *Behind the Lines: The Lives of New Zealand Soldiers in the First World War*, the volume of McGibbon's *New Zealand and the Korean War* on combat operations, Mark Johnston's *At the Front Line: Experiences of Australian Soldiers in World War II* and (I hope) my own *The Women's War: New Zealand Women, 1939–45* also show how manuscript material and oral history can be used analytically, but we are only just beginning to delve into the intricate agendas and unconscious desires that shape oral history narratives of wartime experiences.⁵⁴

Clearly there is little to be gained through mutual recrimination, but it does seem worth refuting the idea that the relative neglect of matters military by New Zealand academics is a simple matter of intellectual disdain or a tyrannous conspiracy on the part of social and cultural historians. We need many kinds of engagement with the topic of war in New Zealand history. War, it has frequently been asserted, made New Zealand into a nation and New Zealanders into a nationality. Yet the meaning of New Zealanders' engagement with the wars of the twentieth century is complicated, and too little analysed. When it is alluded to, it is too often by vague or unsubstantiated references to national legacies, not changing intimate relationships or ideas about the wider world.

The nation is not the only point of reference for studies of the links between war and society. Elsewhere in this issue Peter Gibbons argues for the opening up of New Zealand history to macro-historical analyses that 'eschew' the nation and microhistorical analysis that examines the individual subjectivities of 'ordinary' people. This may be nowhere more appropriate than in the history of twentieth-century war, because of the way war simultaneously forced a global consciousness on New Zealanders and faced individuals with a series of personal and societal choices that reframed their sense of self and the world. The sociologist Edward Tiryakian has suggested that for sociologists at least war is the 'covered side of modernity', the topic without which no study of modernity can be complete.⁵⁵ The same could be said of history. Despite the extent of our knowledge about the experience of warfare in individual campaigns and for discrete military units we are still struggling to find ways of tracing the history of war's profound effect on veterans and the societies they returned to; ways of writing and understanding that encompass the universalizable aspects of these international phenomena, as well as their national and personal specificities.

This is no easy task. Many of us working on the wars of the twentieth century have a deep sense of their enduring impact without the scaffolding of primary research and secondary argument with which to shore up our wider claims. Thus in the last 12 pages of his chapter on the legacy of Passchendaele Glyn Harper grasps for ways to substantiate his sense of the terribly personal nature of the emotions provoked by the war and their pervasive influence on the post-war world. Yet this section of the chapter is clearly the weakest, jumping from soldiers' letters home, to a grieving mother of three dead sons, a paragraph about the impact of the war on New Zealand families generally, four on veterans' post-war suffering, then statements about 'the mistrust, suspicion, hostility, almost contempt, that New Zealand has demonstrated towards its

military past', the psychology of repressed memory and the scale of New Zealand's World War I losses. This is too much, too quickly and with too little supporting evidence. It contrasts starkly with the more tightly written narrative that comprises the earlier parts of the book and the nuanced descriptions of the war weariness and despair overtaking the New Zealand troops in 1917.⁵⁶ Similarly, many of the published histories of World War II tend to focus on war as a sequence of distinct actions in the life of the nation and in the lives of individual nationals — a concatenation of enlistments, embarkations, enemy engagements and repatriations with far-reaching consequences yet set apart from the course of normal events. It is hard to find ways to marry these narratives of extraordinary circumstances with histories of their aftermath and too easy to substitute rhetorical flourishes for those histories. Summing up the legacy of the Second New Zealand Expeditionary Force's desert war Matthew Wright argues for recognition of the enduring 'social' impact of the campaign: 'Around one in three of New Zealand's young men served there. The campaign defined not only their war but their peace. Battlefield camaraderie and shared experiences forged the relationships between men who went on to build the post-war nation.' But do we really know this for sure; and how did the process work? Were non-combatants excluded from building the post-war nation? Many returned soldiers thought otherwise, feeling that men who had stayed in New Zealand in fact had a post-war head start.⁵⁷ In order to substantiate claims such as Harper and Wright's about the legacy of war we are going to have to do a great deal more work to plot the vectors of military experience in the course of individual lives and collective cultural ideals.

There is no need to turn this essay into a catalogue of the unexplored reaches of New Zealanders' twentieth-century wars but it is worth emphasizing the extent to which issues of war and society, neglected in the history of the war years themselves, have received even less attention in the writings on interwar and post-war years. The experience of veterans in the aftermath of New Zealand's wartime mobilizations is woefully understudied. There are theses that deal with the mechanics of repatriation and rehabilitation,⁵⁸ but much work remains to be done on the ongoing social and cultural impact of the military mobilization. Radio journalist turned psychologist Alison Parr collected interviews with New Zealand veterans of World War II as the basis of her book *Silent Casualties: New Zealand's Unspoken Legacy of the Second World War*. Deborah Challinor has begun the task of examining the impact of Vietnam war service.⁵⁹ Bereaved families, as well as the families who were left with the tasks of comforting and supporting traumatized ex-soldiers also deserve historical study. As yet we have no counterparts to Joy Damousi's *The Labour of Loss: Mourning, Memory and Wartime Bereavement in Wartime Australia*, her *Living With the Aftermath: Trauma, Nostalgia and Grief in Post-war Australia*⁶⁰ or Stephen Garton's *The Cost of War: Australians Return*.⁶¹

We also need to know more about gender, race and class, the triumvirate of variables that fuelled so much of the first flush of social history. Jock Phillips' path-breaking book *A Man's Country?* gave due weight to the place of war service in the development of New Zealand masculine identity but little has been done to develop his insights subsequently.⁶² Gender is about the activities of men

as well as women; race and ethnicity should feature in our histories of the whole of New Zealand's military endeavour, not just the history of the Pioneer and Maori Battalions. For a society rife with myths about compulsory war service as a route to social equality we are woefully short of studies that analyse the impact of compulsion, let alone the dynamics of voluntary recruitment outside the years of compulsory service, the social background of New Zealand's officer corps, or the relationship between war service and social mobility.

Memory and commemoration are subjects of increasing historical curiosity and studies of war have contributed greatly to their eminence.⁶³ In New Zealand we are beginning to ask more questions about the way certain events have been inscribed into our national culture while other memories remain relatively inchoate. Gallipoli has functioned as *memento mori*, heroic folk tale and political parable, but what has its prominence done to the surrounding cultural landscape? Glyn Harper's book on Passchendaele comments on the way the articulation of an image of Gallipoli as the touchstone of Anzac military sacrifice has obscured a full appreciation of the significance of New Zealanders' experiences in the trenches of Europe.⁶⁴ But why was Gallipoli such an attractive image? What other *tableaux and oubliettes* in our military history can we identify to help comprehend the shaping of national memory and cultural identity?

Media studies could also contribute greatly to our knowledge of the way understandings about the past change over time. Scott Worthy's work on newspaper reporting of early Anzac Day ceremonies traces the genealogy of New Zealand commemoration.⁶⁵ Undoubtedly the work of the National Film Unit was pivotal in shaping the way the general public experienced World War II, but we need to know more about its historical interventions. The populist visual histories of war produced in the 1990s by companies such as Communicado would also make an interesting case study.⁶⁶ Roberto Rabel has recently reviewed a monograph examining the ways in which Australian memories of the Vietnam war are entangled with American media images and models of commemoration; it will be intriguing to see how these issues are played out in work on New Zealand's Vietnam involvement.⁶⁷ How have other media inscriptions and lacunae affected popular memory?

Reconnoitring US military history in *The Journal of Military History* Michael Geyer lamented that in the aftermath of social history's advance there was at once 'more and less to the history of war', suggesting that the process of integrating military history into general history had reduced the former to mere 'background'.⁶⁸ In New Zealand a full decade later, we seem to be engaged in a struggle to recognize that we are in fact on common, though substantially uncharted, ground faced with joint tasks of reconnaissance and intelligence sharing.

DEBORAH MONTGOMERIE

The University of Auckland

NOTES

*I would like to thank Caroline Daley, Peter Gibbons and Erik Olssen for their comments on the relationship between social history and military history in New Zealand.

1 John Keegan, *The Face of Battle*, London, 1976, pp.27–46, quoted pp.31, 46.

2 James Belich, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, Auckland, 1986.

3 For reviews of Belich's book see Alan Ward, 'Review article, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*', *New Zealand Journal of History* (NZJH), 21, 2 (1987), pp.270–4; G.V. Butterworth, Review of *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 99, 2 (1990), pp.211–14; Bronwen Douglas, Review of *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, *Journal of Pacific History*, 24, 1 (1989), pp.120–2. Chris Pugsley's article, 'Maori did not invent trench warfare', *New Zealand Defence Quarterly*, Spring 1998, pp.33–37 and R.D. Crosby's *The Musket Wars. A History of Inter-Iwi Conflict 1806–1845*, Auckland, 1999, dispute some of Belich's claims about Maori tactical innovations in the wars of the early nineteenth century. See also Paul D'Arcy 'Maori and Muskets from a Pan-Polynesian Perspective', *NZJH*, 34, 1 (2000), pp.117–32.

4 Take, for example, Ormond Burton's claim that after the Turkish campaign 'New Zealanders had commenced to realize themselves as a nation', *The Silent Division*, Sydney, 1935, p.122. See also W.P. Morrell's *New Zealand*, London, 1935, p.112. W.H. Oliver's *The Story of New Zealand*, London, 1960, has Gallipoli 'add[ing] a high point of courage to the myth and legend of a nation barely born', p.169. The relationship between war and New Zealand nationalism is a major theme of Keith Sinclair, *A Destiny Apart: New Zealand's Search for National Identity*, Auckland, 1986. The process by which New Zealand developed a separate national identity described by James Belich in *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*, Auckland, 2001 is complex, with New Zealand's 'war of independence' not occurring until the ANZUS crisis of the 1980s, p.439, but due attention is given to the '18,000 Kiwi Christs' sacrificed in World War I, pp.116, 118, and the strong sense of collective identity fostered within the New Zealand Division during World War II.

5 John Whiteclay Chambers, 'The New Military History: Myth and Reality', *The Journal of Military History* (JMH), 55, 3 (1991), pp.395–406 is an account of the 1991 conference of the Society for Military History at which issues of the relationship between old and new styles of military history were discussed extensively. Peter Paret's 'The New Military History', *Parameters*, 21 (Autumn 1991), pp.10–18, a published version of one of the papers delivered at this conference contains a judicious appraisal of the dangers of 'manipulative or naïve uses of the term "new" obscuring the fact that some classic early- and mid-twentieth century military histories displayed the 'broad, integrative view of their subject' that characterized the best of the post 1960s 'new' military history.

6 Peter Karsten, 'The "New" American Military History: A Map of the Territory, Explored and Unexplored', *American Quarterly*, 36, 3 (1984), pp.389–418, emphasis in original; see also Edward M. Coffman, 'The Course of Military History in the United States Since World War II', *JMH*, 61, 4 (1997), pp.761–6.

7 See, for example, James MacPherson, *For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War*, New York, 1997, which analyses the civil war's impact on veterans' concepts of manhood but does not problematize whiteness despite noting the far-reaching effect of the recruitment of black fighting men and increasing abolitionist sentiments among Union rank and file, p.126. Similarly the impact of military service on sexual identity tends to be more often analysed in relation to homosexual men and lesbian women than heterosexuals of either sex. Leisa Meyer, *Creating GI Jane: Sexuality and Power in the Women's Army Corps During World War II*, New York, 1993 is a notable exception, balancing issues of race, gender, class and sexuality in its examination of the cultural anxieties created by the incorporation of women into the US military.

8 Between 1973 and 1988 over 3500 military history dissertations were completed in US universities, 1500 of them in history departments; Edward A. Goedeken and Jean-Pierre V.M. Herubel, 'Dissertations in Military History, 1973–1988: A Survey and Analysis', *JMH*, 56, 4 (1992), pp. 651–7.

9 John Lynn, 'The Embattled Future of Military History', *JMH*, 61, 4 (1997), pp.777–89. As part of a 1999 forum on the H-Net Discussion network h-war, John Lynn elaborated on the arguments in this article, linking his sense of a decline in interest in military history to neglect

of the history of international relations, and the 'over-gendering' of historical interpretation as the result of a desire to produce gender balance in history departments by hiring more women. John Lynn, 'Opening statement', 27 March 1999, <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=h-war&month=9903>. The Australian military historian Jeffrey Grey also participated in the forum saying that it was hard to escape a sense of 'despondency' about the state of military history 'especially as practiced in the universities', <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=h-war&month=9903>.

10 Jeremy Black, 'War and the World, 1450–2000', *JMH*, 63, 3 (1999), pp.669–82.

11 McGibbon, ed., with the assistance of Paul Goldstone, *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Military History*, Auckland, 2000.

12 John Whiteclay Chambers II, et al., eds, *The Oxford Companion to American Military History*, New York, 1999.

13 McGibbon estimates his contribution, produced with the assistance of Paul Goldstone, as 60% of the total text, *Companion*, p.xix.

14 John Crawford with Ellen Ellis, *To Fight for the Empire: An Illustrated History of New Zealand and the South African War, 1899–1902*, Auckland, 1999.

15 Christopher Pugsley, *Te Hokowhita a Tu: The Maori Pioneer Battalion in the First World War*, Auckland 1995; Christopher Pugsley and Laurie Barber et al., *Scars on the Heart: Two Centuries of New Zealand at War*, Auckland, 1996.

16 Glyn Harper, *Massacre at Passchendaele: The New Zealand Story, Auckland, 2000*; *Letters From the Battlefield: New Zealand Soldiers Write Home, 1914–1918*, Auckland, 2001.

17 Ian McGibbon, *New Zealand and the Korean War, Vol.1: Politics and Diplomacy*, Auckland, 1992; *New Zealand and the Korean War, Vol.2: Combat Operations*, Auckland, 1996.

18 Ian McGibbon, *New Zealand Battlefields and Memorials of the Western Front*, Auckland, 2001; *Kiwi Sappers: The Corps of Royal New Zealand Engineers' Century of Service*, Auckland, 2002.

19 John Crawford, ed., *Kia Kaha: New Zealand in the Second World War*, Auckland, 2000.

20 Laurie Brocklebank, *Jayforce and the Military Occupation of Japan, 1945–1948*, Auckland, 1999; John Crawford, *In the Field of Peace: New Zealand's Contribution to International Peace-Support Operations, 1950–1995*, Wellington, 1996; John Crawford and Glyn Harper, *Operation East Timor: The New Zealand Defense Force in East Timor, 1999–2001*, Auckland, 2001.

21 Julia Millen, *Salute to Service: A History of the Royal New Zealand Corps of Transport and its Predecessors, 1860–1996*, Wellington, 1997.

22 Matthew Wright, *A Near-Run Affair: New Zealanders in the Battle for Crete, 1941*, Auckland, 2000; *Desert Duel: New Zealand's North African War 1940–3*, Auckland, 2002.

23 See, for example, Martyn Thompson, ed., *On Active Service*, Auckland, 1999; Antony Vercoe, *Yesterday's Drums: Echoes from the Wasteland of War*, Wellington, 2001; John MacGibbon, ed., *Struan's War*, Wellington, 2001; W.E.W. (Ted) Lewis, *I Was No Soldier: An Artist's War Diary*, Wellington, 2001.

24 Megan Hutching, ed., with Ian McGibbon, Jock Phillips and David Filer, 'A Unique Sort of Battle': *New Zealanders Remember Crete*, Wellington, 2001; Megan Hutching, ed., with Ian McGibbon, *Inside Stories: New Zealand POWs Remember*, Wellington, 2002. The History Group website gives an account of Clark's impetus for the projects <http://www.cultureandheritage.govt.nz/History/project/crete.html>.

25 J. Bryan, 'Women Who Cared: The Experiences of New Zealand Nurses and VADs in World War I, 1914–18', MA thesis, University of Auckland, 2001; M. Bartleet, 'New Zealand's Military Aircraft Purchases 1957–1981', MA thesis, Massey University, 2001; R. Kay, 'In Pursuit of Victory: British-New Zealand Relations During the First World War', PhD thesis, University of Otago, 2001; Scott Worthy, 'Communities of Remembrance: the memory of the Great War in New Zealand 1915–1939', MA thesis, University of Auckland, 2001.

26 *NZJH*, 36, 2 (2002), pp.224–8.

27 McGibbon, *Oxford Companion*, p.321.

28 Ian McGibbon, "'Something of them is here recorded": Official War History in New Zealand', in Jeffrey Grey, ed., *The Last Word: Essays on Official War History in the United States and the Commonwealth*, forthcoming Westport CT, 2003. I am grateful to Dr McGibbon for allowing me to read an advance copy of this essay. Pagination in citations is to the typescript, rather than the published version due out later this year. Rabel's quote is drawn from his essay, 'War Histories in the Future', *People's History*, 23 (1996), p.2.

29 For examples of the range of research in New Zealand women's history in the late 1970s and 1980s see Barbara Brookes, Charlotte Macdonald and Margaret Tennant, eds, *Women in*

History: Essays on European Women in New Zealand, Wellington, 1986 and Women in History 2, Wellington, 1992.

30 Bronwyn Dalley and Jock Phillips, eds, *Going Public: The Changing Face of New Zealand History*, Auckland, 2001.

31 Caroline Daley and Deborah Montgomerie, eds, *The Gendered Kiwi*, Auckland, 1999; Bronwyn Dalley and Bronwyn Labrum, eds, *Fragments: New Zealand Social and Cultural History*, Auckland, 2000.

32 It is anecdotal evidence at best but, for example, in the early 1980s I was discouraged from pursuing master's research on New Zealand women during World War II because the topic had been covered in Nancy Taylor's official history, *The New Zealand People at War: The Home Front*, Wellington, 1986. My proposal was approved after Mrs Taylor kindly allowed me to read the galleys of the relevant chapter.

33 Quotes and course descriptions are drawn from each History Department's webpage.

34 McGibbon, 'Official War History in New Zealand', p.16.

35 This is true of much of New Zealand history writing, though I think the tendency is more pronounced in the case of military history, partly perhaps because of the legacy of 'official history', but also because of the interests of the general reading public. Books about New Zealand at war seem to sell comparatively well.

36 Miles Fairburn, *The Ideal Society and Its Enemies*, Auckland, 1989; NZJH, 25, 1 (1991), pp.91–177.

37 Roberto Rabel, 'War History as Public History: Past and Future', in *Going Public*, pp.55–73.

38 McGibbon, 'Official War History in New Zealand', p.1.

39 On the question of the under-representation of military history in the pages of the *New Zealand Journal of History*, commented on by Grey, the *Journal* is, here as on other topics, dependent on its contributors. With the exception of special issues and the occasional commissioned article, published articles are selected from the contents of the *Journal*'s mailbag, subject to the recommendations of the anonymous peer review process. The NZJH may be perceived by those writing military history as an unsuitable forum for their work, but no editorial policy precludes the publication of work in this field. Articles on military topics are seldom received, but when received they go through the same process of peer review as other contributions. To my knowledge they have not been rejected at a greater rate than articles on other topics.

40 Bronwyn Dalley's essay 'Finding the Common Ground: New Zealand's Public History', in *Going Public*, pp.16–29, provides an extensive and illuminating account of the way public history is shaped by the various priorities of audience, funding and scholarly excellence.

41 Deborah Montgomerie, *The Women's War: New Zealand Women, 1939–45*, Auckland, 2001, p.14.

42 Noel Gardiner's World War II memoir, to take one evocative example, segues into a critique of the New Zealand political landscape targeting: 'young people nowadays, both Pakeha and Maori who think the world owes them a living', 'the surfeit of power groups, both capital and labour', 'the plethora of "anti" groups; protesters, the picketers and the stirrers', and asks 'Surely this is not what we fought for and so many of our mates died for?' Noel 'Wig' Gardiner, *Freyberg's Circus: Reminiscences of a Kiwi Soldier in the North African Campaign of World War II*, Auckland, 1981, p.177.

43 Glyn Harper, *Letters From the Battlefield: New Zealand Soldiers Write Home, 1914–18*, Auckland, 2001, p.95.

44 *ibid.*, pp.11–14. On the question of what the greatest 'shared' experience of New Zealand males may have been it is tempting to respond with a quip about everything being avoidable except death and taxes, but there are also other candidates. After the advent of compulsory primary education in the 1870s, schooling would be a contender, but so too would various forms of sexual activity, fatherhood, and the experience of being parented, as opposed to parenting. Soldiering although a common experience, retained a great deal of its cultural mystique precisely because it was not a universal experience.

45 *ibid.*, p.14.

46 Keegan, pp.33, 35. He continues (p.35.): 'Making up one's mind about anything, let alone a large and complicated body of material, is always a difficult and often painful task but it is one which many military historians would seem to shun altogether. The anecdotal historian avoids it, since he has already decided that his only responsibility is to entertain the reader and he can therefore discard whatever material he judges will not. The anthologist historian avoids it absolutely, usually justifying

this abdication of his function by the plea that he prefers to make up his mind for himself — as if someone he impropriates of only a fraction of the record is thereby put in any position to do so.’

47 Hutching, *Inside Stories*, p.6.

48 Megan Hutching to author, 14 February 2003, emphasis in original.

49 Jim Sullivan, *Doing Our Bit: New Zealand Women Tell Their Stories of World War Two*, Auckland, 2002; Lauris Edmond, ed., *Women in Wartime: New Zealand Women Tell Their Story*, Wellington, 1986. See also John Thomson, *Warrior Nation: New Zealanders at the Front, 1900–2000*, Christchurch, 2000; Tony Williams, *Cassino: New Zealand Soldiers in the Battle for Italy*, Auckland, 2002 for recent examples of war reminiscences packaged for a popular readership.

50 There is a huge literature on the way oral history interviews are influenced by the dynamics between interviewer and interviewee and on the way their analysis needs to be cognisant of ‘metalanguage’, symbolism and narrative convention. As starting points see Samuel Schragar, ‘What is Social in Oral History?’ *International Journal of Oral History*, 4 (1983), pp.76–98; Barbara Allen, ‘Story in Oral History: Clues to Historical Consciousness’, *Journal of American History* (JAH), 79, 2 (1992), pp.606–11 and the essays by Kathryn Anderson and Dana C. Jack, ‘Learning to Listen: Interview Techniques and Analyses’, Kristina Minister, ‘A Feminist Frame for the Oral History Interview’, Katherine Borland, ‘“That’s Not What I Said”: Interpretive Conflict in Oral Narrative Research’, and Marie-Francoise Chanfrault-Duchet, ‘Narrative Structures, Social Models, and Symbolic Representation in the Life Story’, in Sherna Burger Gluck and Daphne Patai, eds, *Women’s Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*, New York, 1991.

51 Greg Dening, *Performances*, Melbourne, 1996, p.33.

52 Patrick Hagopian, ‘Oral Narratives: Secondary Revision and the Memory of the Vietnam War’, *History Workshop Journal*, 32 (Autumn 1991), pp.134–50; Renate W. Prescott, ‘The Vietnam War and the Teaching and Writing of Oral History: The Reliability of the Narrator’, *The Oral History Review*, 26, 2 (1999), pp.47–64; Patrick Hagopian, ‘Voices from Vietnam: Veterans’ Oral Histories in the Classroom’, JAH, 87, 2 (2000), pp.593–601.

53 Penny Summerfield, *Reconstructing Women’s Wartime Lives: Discourse and Subjectivity in Oral Histories of the Second World War*, Manchester, 1998.

54 Nicholas Boyack, *Behind the Lines: The Lives of New Zealand Soldiers in the First World War*, Wellington, 1989; McGibbon, *New Zealand and the Korean War, Vol. 2*; Mark Johnston, *At the Front Line: Experiences of Australian Soldiers in World War II*, Melbourne, 1996; Montgomerie, *The Women’s War*.

55 Edward Tiryakian, ‘War: The Covered Side of Modernity’, *International Sociology*, 14, 4 (1999), pp.473–89. Tiryakian’s comments are directed at explaining the paucity of sociological interest in war but much of his argument is relevant to social history too because of its common engagement with the concept of modernization.

56 Harper, *Passchendaele*, pp.103–15.

57 Wright, *Desert Duel*, p.167. Wright is clearly concerned about the state of World War II historiography but does not detail his concerns. After suggesting that by the 1980s ‘the truths of New Zealand’s war had been buried beneath layers of myth, nostalgia and the obscuration of time’ and that subsequent efforts to demythologize the war have only thrown out ‘the truth along with the fiction’, Wright spends the rest of his conclusion discussing command decisions. John McLeod, *Myth and Reality: The New Zealand Soldier in World War II*, Auckland, 1986 is the only history cited in the supporting note. On returned soldiers’ feelings of dislocation and disadvantage see for example John Blythe, *Soldiering On: A Soldier’s War in North Africa and Italy*, Auckland, 1989, p.185: ‘[My bad] back might have earned a pension; instead I became the recipient of a row of unengraved war medals and an income tax demand’.

58 Jane R.M. Thomson, ‘The rehabilitation of servicemen of World War II in New Zealand, 1940 to 1954’, PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1983; R. Clarke, ‘Not mad, but very ill: The Treatment of New Zealand’s Shellshocked Soldiers 1914–1939’, MA thesis, University of Auckland, 1991; Ashley Nevil Gould, ‘Proof of gratitude? Soldier land settlement in New Zealand after World War I’, DPhil thesis, Massey University, 1992.

59 Alison Parr, *Silent Casualties: New Zealand’s Unspoken Legacies of the Second World War*, Birkenhead, 1995; Deborah Challinor, *Grey Ghosts: New Zealand Vietnam Vets Talk about their War*, Auckland, 1998.

60 Joy Damousi, *The Labour of Loss: Mourning, Memory and Wartime Bereavement in Wartime Australia*, Cambridge, 1999; *Living With the Aftermath: Trauma, Nostalgia and Grief in Post-war Australia*, Cambridge, 2001.

61 Stephen Garton, *The Cost of War: Australians Return*, Melbourne, 1996.

62 Jock Phillips, *A Man's Country? The Image of the Pakeha Male. A History*, Auckland, 1987, rev. ed., 1996.

63 For examples of the range of this work see George L. Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*, New York, 1990; Alistair Thomson, 'The Anzac Legend: Exploring National Myth and Memory in Australia', in Raphael Samuel and Paul Thompson, eds, *The Myths We Live By*, London and New York, 1990; Saul Friedlander, *Memory, History, and the Extermination of the Jews of Europe*, Bloomington, 1993; Ian Buruma, *Wages of Guilt. Memories of War in Germany and Japan*, London, 1994; Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan, eds, *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, 1999.

64 Harper, *Passchendaele*, p.114. As Harper notes, in his illustrated history, *New Zealanders at War*, Auckland, 1981, p.1. Michael King nominated Gallipoli, Crete and Monte Cassino as the three military events that have figured most prominently in New Zealand memory.

65 Scott Worthy, 'A Debt of Honour: New Zealanders' First Anzac Days', *NZJH*, 36, 2 (2002), pp.185–200.

66 *New Zealand at War* was a six-part television series that aired in 1995. The companion volume of the same title was authored by Paul Smith.

67 Roberto Rabel, Review of Jeff Doyle, Jeffrey Grey and Peter Pierce, *Australia's Vietnam War*, *JMH*, 66, 4 (2002), pp.1257–8.

68 Michael Geyer, 'War and the Context of General History in an Age of Total War: Comment on Peter Paret, "Justifying the Obligation of Military Service" and Michael Howard, "World War One: The Crisis in European History"', *JMH*, 57, 5 (1993), pp.45–163.