

challenging, wide-ranging and often brilliant account of our human–animal culture and aims at a more specialized academic readership.

LYDIA WEVERS

Victoria University of Wellington

How We Remember: New Zealanders and the First World War. Edited by Charles Ferrall and Harry Ricketts. Victoria University Press, Wellington, 2014. 296pp. NZ Price: \$40.00. ISBN: 9780864739353.

The renewed public and academic attention the centenary of the First World War has brought to the subject should come as a welcome opportunity for scholars of New Zealand's domestic war effort to expand the very limited scholarship on the topic. Amid a flurry of publications already emerging from the centenary, promising to flesh out this literature, comes Charles Ferrall and Harry Ricketts's *How We Remember: New Zealanders and the First World War*. It is an eclectic collection of 20 short essays addressing how the First World War has been remembered – or, perhaps more to the point, how it has been misremembered and reimagined in New Zealand popular memory.

As Ferrall and Ricketts note in their introduction, the cycles of revision of the war in British historiography are well known. New Zealand's First World War scholarship has been subject to much less sustained attention, being centred almost exclusively on the front-line soldier experience. However, recent years have seen a slow emergence of some excellent re-evaluations of New Zealand's broader response to and experience of the war, particularly on the home front. Notably, John Crawford and Ian McGibbon's *New Zealand's Great War: New Zealand, the Allies, and the First World War* sought to kick-start renewed discussion of the domestic experience of the war in New Zealand. In its wake, recent works by Steven Loveridge, Gwen Parsons and Graham Hucker have skilfully questioned accepted myths of New Zealand's cultural and psychological responses to the war, war enthusiasm, the nature of dissent, and the treatment of returned soldiers, taking approaches similar to the British First World War scholarship, such as those of Adrian Gregory, John Horne and Catriona Pennell. *How We Remember* therefore emerges as part of this growing re-evaluation of New Zealand's First World War experience, seeking to 'demonstrate just how diversely we actually remember the First World War' (p.13), while also challenging accepted myths surrounding New Zealand's war effort. Each of the 20 chapters is a short study, framed by reflections on personal connections to the war by the authors. While several contributions integrate this personal reflection and scholarly revision effectively, elsewhere the balance between the two is less successful.

Many essays in the collection offer genuinely fresh and timely re-evaluations of New Zealand's war effort. Notably, Christopher Pugsley's chapter on the changing

nature of public memory, and various senses of national ownership, of the Gallipoli Peninsula (by both New Zealanders and Turks), told through reflections on his various visits to the battle site over a number of years, is a standout, and particularly apposite as the much-hyped Gallipoli anniversary approaches. Similarly, Ferrall's and Jane Tolerton's chapters, both exploring the disparity between previous writing on veterans' responses to Gallipoli and the evidence of recently revisited oral history archives, provide significant challenges to accepted understandings of the battle as fundamentally illusion-shattering for the New Zealand soldiers involved. Such challenges to the fundamental pillars of accepted understandings of the meaning of the war to New Zealand will hopefully only encourage a deeper reassessment, to which Ferrall and Pugsley's promised monograph on these oral history responses will surely contribute.

John Horrocks's chapter on contemporary memorialization of the war, while somewhat overstating the unanimity of New Zealand's war enthusiasm, provokes important questions of New Zealand's national maturity and understanding of its history heading into the centenary. Jock Phillips's chapter on the changing meanings assigned to Anzac Day in New Zealand is similarly effective, setting New Zealand developments against the timeline of responses to the war elsewhere, and suggesting the reasons for New Zealand's stalled fixation on a particular reading of the Gallipoli myth. Each of these chapters illustrates the urgent need to question and rethink some of New Zealand's most deeply held myths and illusions of the war.

Other chapters in the collection make interesting inroads into traditional focus areas for New Zealand First World War historiography, such as Monty Soutar's and John R. Broughton's chapters on the war experience of the Māori Contingent, and Jane Hurley's detailed chapter on the treatment of captured New Zealand prisoners from the Gallipoli campaign. Together these contribute to a necessary widening of focus on the New Zealand experience of the Gallipoli campaign. 'Beyond Gallipoli', Anna Rogers' chapter on New Zealand nurse Fanny Speedy, and Paul Diamond's chapter on the post-war scandal of wartime Whanganui mayor Charles Mackay, speak to the breadth of under-explored New Zealand experiences of the war. Diamond's chapter in particular, while slightly overreaching in its attempt to draw the scandal of Mackay's homosexuality into the wartime context, operates successfully as a detailed and revealing dissection of the various tensions at work in small-town New Zealand communities during the war. Similarly, Redmer Yska's chapter on the editorial exploits of the rebellious weekly newspaper *Truth* speaks to the complexity of wartime opinion in New Zealand, also suggesting a greater subtlety and management of censorship in New Zealand than has been so far accepted. These short chapters prove the variety of responses to and experiences of the war still to be uncovered on a local scale in particular, which might complicate and enrich broader understandings.

Despite these strengths, *How We Remember* is undermined by a lack of focus and editorial strictness in a proportion of its remaining chapters. The chapters that make personal recollections of the war their outright purpose tend to throw up the most problems, and create a distractingly uneven tone across the collection. For instance, John Campbell's reliance on accepted myths surrounding the war as the bad forerunner

to the noble Second World War in his opening chapter, along with its undertones of mistrust towards historiographical reconsideration of such myths, is likely to rankle many readers grounded in recent scholarship. While the chapter does provide a fairly telling example of current public memory surrounding the war, it remains vague and tonally out of touch with the more rigorous chapters elsewhere. Likewise, Simon During's and John Priestley's chapters – meditations on the war's impact on their family lives – both tend to wander, and circle around traditional interpretations of the war. Along with Dave Armstrong's chapter on the process of staging his First World War play *King and Country*, these chapters often support myths questioned elsewhere in the collection, and maintain assertions at odds with current historiography, and indeed with other chapters in the same collection, on issues such as war enthusiasm, censorship and dissent.

While such a variance in tone and approach is unsurprising, and perhaps not entirely out of place, in such a broad yet personal collection, the issues of these chapters become problematic when they distract from other more rigorous chapters, making the overall purpose, contribution and tone of the collection rather unclear. This may be primarily a structural issue. In general the essays are dispersed without a clearly discernible thread or progression. Greater structural tightness, either thematically or by balancing the more personal recollections against revisions grounded in primary research, might have made the collection's contributions to scholarship clearer, and made the shift between capturing present-day New Zealand memory of the war, and re-evaluating and challenging it, less jarring.

Ferrall and Ricketts have certainly contributed to a conversation in New Zealand historiography that will hopefully grow in intensity. Though uneven, *How We Remember* makes a timely contribution by providing a revealing insight into just how much work is still to be done with regard to understanding New Zealand's experience of the war, and at its best rises to that challenge, suggesting important and innovative ways forward.

GREGORY HYNES

Pembroke College, Oxford

Calls to Arms: New Zealand Society and Commitment to the Great War. By Steven Loveridge. Victoria University Press, Wellington, 2014. 332pp. NZ price: \$40.00. 9780864739674.

In this confident and assertive book, Steven Loveridge aims to address a 'dearth of cultural histories of the New Zealand home front and a need for studies which engage with the rich international debate [about First World War societies]' (p.8). In his view, existing accounts of New Zealand's war incorrectly suggest that evidence of consent or support for the war was caused by top-down manipulation by a 'hazily