

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

defined “elite” (p.245); instead, he suggests, public engagement was genuine, wide-ranging, long-lasting and should be taken seriously as indicating ordinary people’s views. Loveridge makes a fairly compelling case for reconsidering the war years as part of a consensual continuum. His work would have been richer for much more thoroughgoing engagement with international scholarship and comparison with overseas societies.

One particularly positive aspect of Loveridge’s approach is his effort to set the war years in their surrounding context. After an introduction setting out the basics and his terminology, subsequent chapters feature a common structure in which the author charts pre-war attitudes and ideas, assesses their use during the war years and considers their post-war ‘legacy’. Through this structure, Loveridge illustrates substantial continuities. Chapter One discusses ‘Greater British nationalism’ (p.28). For Loveridge, New Zealand culture (by which I presume he means, primarily, Pākehā culture) remained closely wedded to Britain. He suggests that modernization in late nineteenth-century New Zealand prompted consideration of what it meant to be a New Zealander. At the same time, however, enhanced trade and communication with Britain merged with continuing cultural familiarity with British tropes. He notes continuing and substantial references to a ‘British’ war in the press, suggesting that if the intention was to persuade New Zealanders to serve, authors would not harp on Britain unless this reflected public affinities. Loveridge concludes by questioning suggestions that war service fostered a separate identity: ‘The central comprehension was of a conflict fought by a pan-British people for the survival, or triumph, of a British Empire to which New Zealanders had contributed and in which they excelled’ (p.66).

Chapter Two considers anti-alienism. Loveridge suggests New Zealand British identity always excluded groups, including Europeans, Asians and Australians. Using a phrase previously exploited by Andrew Francis, Loveridge suggests that being ‘truly British’ meant not being something else. Before the war, Germany was one of several ‘Others’ and comparisons permitted positive as well as negative elements. After 1914, however, Germans were the primary target of abuse and remained criticized after 1918, though others eventually superseded their role. Again, the author suggests anti-German sentiment was less top-down fabrication than an attitude shared by many civilians.

Chapter Three explores the perception that New Zealand men were particularly well suited for warfare. Loveridge stresses that similar ‘mythology’ was expressed during the Boer War and maintained in the subsequent development of ‘militarist’ societies and organizations. Loveridge is reasonably persuasive in insisting that the ‘archetype of clannish, introspective men, uncomfortable with too much formality and ceremony around rank ... is a continuation of pre-war ideals’ (p.125). The author also briefly discusses public ‘mythology’ surrounding Māori participation and ideas of a ‘martial’ race, unfortunately omitting any mention of Franchesca Walker’s 2012 *War and Society* article on this subject – it is unclear whether this was missed, ignored or discounted. Ultimately, Loveridge suggests that before, during and after the war, New Zealand men were held to possess special characteristics. Once again, he emphasizes continuity, rather than disjunction, of attitudes.

Extending this notion of special attributes, Chapter Four examines the treatment of 'shirkers' (a portmanteau for men not seen to be doing their duty, one way or another). By 1914, New Zealand culture embraced physical fitness and acceptance of duty as masculine traits. Unfit or unwilling men thus found themselves outside prevailing attitudes and, once war commenced, acceptable conduct. Conscientious objectors, for instance, failed to make headway with public consciousness because many people could not comprehend their lack of conformity. Harsh treatment of such groups reflected wider public attitudes, not top-down imposition.

Chapter Five extends observations on New Zealanders' sense of special character to women's wartime roles. Loveridge suggests that due to pre-war enfranchisement, the 'prize' (p.171) awarded to women elsewhere in the world was already obtained. Nonetheless, the war saw a continuation of women's pre-war roles. The 'woman behind the man' (p.177) was expected to encourage and support her husband or son to do his part, and possibly to confront those who would not. Later, women were also asked to undertake war work, though Loveridge notes that the number of newly employed women does not indicate a flood to the workforce. Like the employment of German women noted by Ute Daniel (a point not mentioned by the author), the increase in female employment was less substantial than earlier in the century. Loveridge concludes that despite limited shifts of rhetoric, women's primary perceived role after the war remained that of mother.

Finally, in Chapter Six, the author notes the prevalence of 'sacrifice' as a cultural theme. Loveridge suggests commentary swiftly moved from acknowledging soldiers' sacrifice of their lives to calls for sacrifice at home and demands for equality of sacrifice. This language was then adapted so that conscription became a way to ensure equal sacrifice, not the compulsion of military service. Such ideas persisted in post-war suggestions that the better post-war world that was promised would be attained by New Zealanders matching soldiers' sacrifices in peacetime. The author concludes by observing that, though the New Zealand that fought the war was very different from that of today, we must strive to acknowledge and understand their perceptions of the war as a necessary and worthwhile endeavour.

Readers familiar with the war's wider scholarship will recognize considerable overlap with other histories. Despite Loveridge's observation about engaging with international scholarship, however, I found myself, as a historian of wartime Britain, frustrated by the limited comparison pursued in most areas. In particular, given his emphasis on continuing connections with Britain, I expected much more thoroughgoing comparisons. To give a few examples, his calls to take consent seriously and explore it carefully echo discussions by Jeffrey Verhey of Germany and Catriona Pennell of Britain; observations that people at home were aware of the realities of combat match those by scholars like Michael Roper or Helen McCartney;¹ and attention to the more censorious wartime culture in Chapters Four and Six ties in closely with the multi-authored cultural history of Europe, *Capital Cities at War* (2007). Nicoletta Gullace's groundbreaking observations on the distribution of white feathers are overlooked when Loveridge discusses this topic, as is much of the substantial scholarship on motherhood and the war. Finally, his emphases on 'sacrifice' and 'equality of sacrifice' deserve close comparison with work by, among others, Bernard Waites, John Horne and Adrian Gregory.² While Gregory's *The Last Great War* (2008) is cited in places,

his several chapters on sacrifice go unmentioned in Chapter Six. As with the omission of Walker's work, it is usually unclear whether this reflects conscious exclusion or oversight. Either way, regular opportunities to relate New Zealand experiences more substantially to transnational wartime experiences are unexplored. Thus, the full significance of Loveridge's work is not driven home. To what extent was New Zealand's cultural mobilization typical of wartime belligerence or unique? The author seems to have set out to write a national history in a larger historiography that is increasingly comparative or transnational. While his book still offers some compelling insights into wartime New Zealand society, therefore, it misses the chance to locate New Zealand events firmly alongside wider scholarship of First World War civilian experience. Having done so would have made for a much more potent contribution.

DAVID MONGER

University of Canterbury

NOTES

1 Jeffrey Verhey, *The Spirit of 1914: Militarism, Myth and Mobilization in Germany*, Cambridge, 2000; Catriona Pennell, *A Kingdom United: Popular Responses to the Outbreak of the First World War in Britain and Ireland*, Oxford, 2012; Michael Roper, *The Secret Battle: Emotional Survival in the Great War*, Manchester, 2009; Helen McCartney, *Citizen Soldiers: the Liverpool Territorials in the First World War*, Oxford, 2005. Of these works, only Roper's appears in the bibliography and notes, in brief reference to a different issue.

2 Bernard Waites, *A Class Society at War: England, 1914-1918*, Oxford, 1987; John Horne, "'L'impôt du sang": Republican Rhetoric and Industrial Warfare in France, 1914-18', *Social History*, 14, 2 (1989).

Holding On To Home: New Zealand Stories and Objects of the First World War. By Kate Hunter and Kirstie Ross. Te Papa Press, Wellington, 2014. 328pp. NZ price: \$49.99. ISBN: 9780987668851.

We are currently inundated by the First World War in many forms: books, apps, documentaries, movies, exhibitions and websites. We are encouraged to find out about 'our soldier', to understand the battles and geography of the Western Front and Gallipoli, and to commemorate the now unimaginable loss of life. *Holding On To Home* brings the war back home to New Zealand and aims to find the individuals within the military and patriotic machinery of the First World War. It does this through objects carefully selected from museum collections and archives throughout the country, as 28 museum collections are represented, from South Canterbury Museum to the Auckland War Memorial Museum.

From the beginning, Kate Hunter and Kirstie Ross emphasize the ideas of holding, of touch and of threads connecting those at home with their loved ones far away. As a