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Abstract

New Zealanders served in large numbers in three campaigns during the Great War of 1914-1918. Much has been written by historians, both past and present, about the experiences of the soldiers in two of these campaigns: Gallipoli and the Western Front. The third of these campaigns, Sinai and Palestine, is perhaps the least well known of New Zealand's Great War war efforts, but probably the most successful.

This thesis is an investigation of how Imperial the New Zealanders who served in the Mounted Rifles brigade were. By this it is meant; were the soldiers characteristic of the British Empire, its institutions, and its ethos? Or were they different, reflecting distinctly New Zealand ideals and institutions? Central to this investigation were the views and opinions held by the New Zealand soldiers who served in the Mounted Rifles brigade in Sinai and Palestine from 1916-1919 regarding the British Empire. Several areas have been identified to provide the necessary information: - how the soldiers fought in Sinai-Palestine, what they thought of different cultures and ethnicities, their opinion of the British Empire, their pastimes, and the soldier myth of New Zealand and its origins. In each of these areas, comparisons have been drawn with other Imperial formations in the theatre, notably units from the United Kingdom and Australia.

These five key areas have provided clear answers to the question of how Imperial the soldiers were. It is demonstrable from the evidence presented and conclusions reached that the soldiers of the Mounted Rifles were Imperial soldiers, shaped and reflecting the institutions and ethos of the British Empire. They thought and acted similarly to the English and Australian soldiers in almost all areas examined. Where evidence could be found about other British Empire formations, such as the Sikhs and the British West Indians, it is also evident that the New Zealanders acted similarly to them. In their conscious thoughts and actions, it is evident that the Mounted Rifles acted in accordance with many of the British Empire's institutions and its ethos, once more indicating an Imperial connection. Some areas investigated, such as the New Zealand soldier mythology, upheld as distinctly New Zealand, have been demonstrated to be linked to an Empire wide colonial mythology, evolved from an English root, and owing itself to New Zealand's participation in the British Empire. The Imperial mentality of the Mounted Rifles was present in almost everything they did, and it seems certain that they were characteristic of the British Empire.
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<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.I.F.</td>
<td>Australian Imperial Force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.L.H.</td>
<td>Australian Light Horse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.D.</td>
<td>Anzac Mounted Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.R.</td>
<td>Auckland Mounted Rifles regiment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M.R.</td>
<td>Canterbury Mounted Rifles regiment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.E.F.</td>
<td>Egyptian Expeditionary Force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.C.C.</td>
<td>Imperial Camel Corps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Z.E.F.</td>
<td>New Zealand Expeditionary Force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Z.M.G.S.</td>
<td>New Zealand Machine Gun Squadron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Z.M.R.</td>
<td>New Zealand Mounted Rifles brigade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Z.T.A.</td>
<td>New Zealand Territorial Army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.M.R.</td>
<td>Otago Mounted Rifles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.M.R.</td>
<td>Wellington Mounted Rifles regiment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeomanry</td>
<td>English Territorial Yeomanry Cavalry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yilderim</td>
<td>Collective term for the Turkish-German army forces in the Middle East.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In October 1918, the Ottoman Empire spectacularly self destructed. At the Battle of Meggidi, two Turkish armies were destroyed by the Egyptian Expeditionary Force's advance along the plains. A third Turkish army surrendered at Amman. The destruction of these armies brought an end to the Sinai-Palestine campaign, and the surrender of the Ottoman Empire to the Allied and Associated powers. The successful conclusion of the campaign had come about through three years of constant fighting, starting in early 1916. In January 1916, the main British war effort against the Ottoman Empire had switched theatres from the Dardanelles campaign to the creation of a new army, the Egyptian Expeditionary Force, based in Egypt and tasked with protecting the Suez canal against Turkish attack.

The New Zealand Mounted Rifles brigade were an important part of the E.E.F. from its very beginning. The N.Z.M.R., roughly 2,000 New Zealanders and 150 Englishmen, was grouped with three Australian Light Horse brigades to form the Anzac Mounted Division.1 The brigade fought in nearly every major battle, action, and raid during the campaign, and was instrumental in many of the early British victories in Sinai. Once the brigade entered Palestine, it continued to perform vital and important work as part of the spearhead of British forces. From 1916-1919, over 4,500 New Zealand men passed through the brigade, and casualties numbered approximately 400 dead and 1,200 wounded.2 When the reinforcements are added to the number already in the brigade, around 6,500 men served in the N.Z.M.R. during the campaign, about six per cent of all New Zealand men sent abroad to fight during the Great War. New Zealanders also served in one of the most picturesque of the Great War's formations, the Imperial Camel Corps. This unit existed from 1916 to late 1918, and included two New Zealand companies, the 15th and 16th. Each company was approximately 175 officers and men. The 15th and 16th companies were part of the 4th brigade, I.C.C. and were companions of the N.Z.M.R. in almost all of its fights. In mid-1918, the I.C.C was disbanded, and the New Zealand companies became the 2nd New Zealand Machine Gun Squadron. This unit was attached to an Australian Light Horse brigade and took part in the final battle against the Turks, the Battle of Meggidi.

1 At establishment the brigade comprised 2,421 men. This included three regiments of Mounted Infantry, a Machine Gun Squadron, horse drawn artillery, and various detachments of ambulance, vets, signallers, engineers, etc. The only non New Zealand unit was the artillery, provided by the Somerset battery, Royal Horse Artillery. There were 154 men in this unit. During the campaign, the 3rd Australian Light Horse brigade was detached and helped form the Imperial, later Australian, Mounted Division.

2 The casualties of the brigade during the Sinai-Palestine campaign were as follows: The Canterbury regiment lost 145 dead, the Wellington regiment 118 dead, and the Auckland regiment 131. The Wireless troop lost 1 dead, and the signallers 8. This made a total of 403 known deaths. Numbers for the Field Troop of Engineers and the Machine Gunners are not known.
Despite the numbers of men involved in the N.Z.M.R. and the I.C.C., and their part in the overwhelming victory gained by General Allenby in October 1918, there has been little written about the brigade in modern times. Nicholas Boyack and Christopher Pugsley have briefly mentioned the brigade in their books *Behind the Lines* and *On the fringe of the hell*. The purpose of these books was not an in-depth examination of the brigade's achievements and actions in the Middle East, and as a consequence it received scant attention. Two theses also mentioned the brigade, Bryan Dunne's examination of New Zealanders as soldier-tourists in the Second World War and Paul Enright's thesis on New Zealand and the formation of Israel. However, a similar problem is evident here as with Boyack's and Pugsley's books. The brigade is peripheral to the main topic of each thesis, and thus receives scant attention. This seems to be the sum total of recent New Zealand works which discuss the brigade.

Many more books were written immediately after the Great War which described the brigade in great detail. The purpose of these books was to commemorate the brigade and its constituent units during the Great War and to entrench its achievements in to the national institutional memory. A full brigade history was produced by Colonel C.G. Powles, who also wrote a history of the Canterbury Mounted Rifles regiment. A.H. Wilkie produced the official history of the Wellington Mounted Rifles, and C.G. Nicol the history of the Auckland Mounted Rifles. Nicholas Annabell composed the history of the New Zealand Engineers and signals units, Jonathan Luxford wrote about the machine gunners, and H.T.B. Drew included a piece about the veterinary corps in his book. John Robertson authored a history of the I.C.C. These books were campaign histories, providing excellent descriptions of the battles and fights the New Zealanders participated, but little additional information about the men themselves. Only one unofficial description of the campaign was discovered. This was written by A.B. Moore of the A.M.R. His book, *The mounted riflemen in Sinai and Palestine*, provided excellent descriptions of what the soldier's thought about the regions they were travelling through, as well as being less formal than the official campaign histories.

The work contained in this thesis is part-way in filling an important gap in New Zealand's World War One historiography. Most of the modern New Zealand works on the Great War concentrate on either the Gallipoli campaign or the New Zealand Division. These were the two major thrusts of New Zealand's war effort, so it is perhaps natural that they

---

6 J. Robertson, *With the Camelliers in Palestine*, Dunedin, 1938.
occupy a dominant position. However, the part played by the N.Z.M.R. in the Great War should not be forgotten or glossed over. For this reason alone, this thesis is an important addition to New Zealand's historiography.

New Zealand historiography of the Great War has focussed on the experience of war felt by New Zealanders in two areas; the Western Front and the Dardanelles. These areas are focussed upon because of both the "nation building" experience of the Gallipoli landings, and because the vast majority of New Zealand's war effort went towards maintaining the New Zealand Division in France. Characteristic of these experiences are those contained in The Great Adventure, edited by J. Phillips, N. Boyack, and E.P. Malone. In this book, the mud, death, devastation, lack of hope, and disillusionment with established society are immediately evident in almost all the stories related by the men investigated as they went through the carnage of Gallipoli and the Western Front. Christopher Pugsley's book, On the Fringe of Hell, is another book reminiscent of this genre. Other books which discuss New Zealand in the Great War sought to put a nationalist viewpoint on its war effort. In Gallipoli: the New Zealand story, Christopher Pugsley mentioned the national connotations of the Gallipoli landings, and argued that New Zealand's experience of war created a national identity within the Dominion. Nicholas Boyack also argued for a nationalist interpretation for New Zealand's war effort, and his book Behind the Lines features several attempts at finding national undertones in many different events. Sir Keith Sinclair's A Destiny apart argued that New Zealanders were indifferent to the British Empire, that it was an abstraction, and that most of the men in New Zealand saw themselves as New Zealanders only, not as citizens of the British Empire. These conclusions have been applied to all New Zealanders who fought in the Great War. New Zealanders, however, participated in large numbers in a third campaign, arguably the most successful, and certainly very different from the Western Front and the Dardanelles. The differences when compared to the Sinai-Palestine campaign seem to have been the root cause for the divergence of opinion, but these differences, both of men and campaign, are not examined by any of the authors. Many of the soldiers who participated in the Sinai-Palestine campaign do not seem to have corresponded to the conclusions aired by the authors mentioned above.

This thesis investigates the extent to which the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. and I.C.C were Imperial. Were the New Zealanders characteristic of the British Empire? or did they act

---

12 K. Sinclair, A destiny apart: New Zealand's search for national identity, Wellington, 1986, p 173,
13 For the purposes of this thesis, "Imperial" has been defined as "characteristic of an Empire", as taken from the Oxford Dictionary.
differently or distinctively from the other Imperial formations they encountered? It seeks to investigate how the New Zealanders viewed themselves, how they acted, and what activities they undertook as leisure. The aim is to discover whether or not the New Zealand soldiers acted as Imperial soldiers, whether they viewed themselves as distinctly and exclusively New Zealanders, as citizens of the British Empire who resided in New Zealand, or as British, no different from people who lived in Yorkshire or Kent. How the New Zealanders acted in the Middle East will also be examined. This examination will revolve around whether the New Zealanders conformed to how Britons were supposed to act in a less "civilised" region, or whether they acted in a distinctive, non-British way. The war itself, and how it was prosecuted, are important as these issues shed light on whether there was a distinctive New Zealand approach to fighting.

Most of this thesis has necessarily been comparative. The thoughts, actions, and methods of New Zealanders have been matched against those of Light Horse men and soldiers from Great Britain. Where these were the same or similar, it suggested that the New Zealanders were not distinctive, and corresponded to an Imperial view held by many citizens of Great Britain and the Dominions. This can be stated with a degree of certainty for it would be unlikely for the New Zealanders to have shared the same thoughts and opinions as the Australians, English, and Scots if they had not been closely related to Great Britain and Australia through the British Empire and its ties. Where they were different, it suggested that the New Zealanders possessed a distinctive identity or approach.

The personal opinions and views of the New Zealand soldiers have been gained from a number of sources. The campaign histories indicated some opinions, but were limited. The letters and diaries of the soldiers provided considerably more information about their views and opinions, and therefore form the basis of much of this study. Articles in the magazine produced by the A.M.D., the Kia Ora Coo-ee, also provided some information, as did oral interviews with ex-soldiers. These last two sources were, however, not as reliable as the letters and diaries. The Kia Ora Coo-ee was a joint production with the Australian units of the division, and thus do not represent exclusively New Zealand views, while the oral interviews suffer from the fact that the soldiers had to remember facts from over seven decades previous. Despite these limitations, the information gained by all of these sources did enable a broad picture to be constructed of the opinions held by the New Zealanders in the Middle East.

Material relating to units which served alongside the N.Z.M.R. was examined to provide comparison. Several ex-Australian servicemen wrote personal recollections of the campaign. These books, written by Ion Idreiss, Frank Reid, and Oliver Hogue, proved to be invaluable when the New Zealand impression/reaction was compared to those from other countries. The official Australian history of the campaign, The Australian Imperial Force in Sinai and Palestine, written by Sir Harry Gullett, was also useful. Ex-British soldiers wrote
histories and autobiographies relating to the campaign. These books, written by Vivien Gilbert, R Meinertzhagen, Lord Cobham, and L. Thomas provided a second group with whom the New Zealanders can be compared.

The N.Z.M.R. was chosen for this study for a number of reasons. The war which it fought was very different to that of the New Zealanders in France or the Dardanelles. The N.Z.M.R. could easily see that it was winning, for they were generally going forward while the Turks were generally being pushed back. This contrasts with France, where the soldiers seemed to have very little idea of who was winning and who was loosing. The chances of staying alive were infinitely better in the N.Z.M.R. Of over 6,500 men in the brigade, only 535 died, a much lower casualty rate than experienced by men in France. The chances of being killed in Sinai-Palestine were usually limited to periodic battles, while in France, death was ever present and seemingly random. The low death rate in Palestine resulted in greater continuity of soldiers during the campaign. It was possible, indeed likely, for a soldier to survive the entire campaign in Palestine, a feat rare in France. The warfare in the Middle East was very different to that in France. Movement was ever present, and new tactics were used, such as massed mobile infantry, and aerial support. These points indicated a combination of the old style Imperial war, such as seen in the South African war, with modern equipment. The men themselves had a different attitude to those in France. They were winning and surviving, which must have increased morale while producing a different attitude to the war than found in units on the Western Front.

These points seem to have resulted in the formulation of a very different opinion towards the British Empire. The view of a bungling and inept British Empire, combined with personal disillusionment with it, so prevalent in units on the Western Front, does not seem to have been widespread in Palestine. The N.Z.M.R. seems to have had a very different opinion of the British Empire. The army which the N.Z.M.R. belonged to was very different to that found in France. In France, units were big, frequently over 15,000 men, resulting in limited interaction with men from other regions of the Empire. In Palestine, units were small and frequently grouped with others. This enabled interaction to often take place. While on leave, the soldiers were able to experience the size and scope of the Empire through merely walking down the street. These factors led to soldiers in the Middle East possessing a heightened awareness and more sympathetic view of the Empire when compared to those in France.

Aspects of the men in Sinai-Palestine, their war, and their attitudes have been identified as providing the best evidence for how Imperial were the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. The campaign itself will be examined, concentrating on how the soldiers fought and what sort of army they fought in. The racial attitudes of the New Zealanders will be examined towards three

---

14 This works out to be 8 per cent of the total number of men who served in the brigade.
15 These tactics are reminiscent of the German blitz krieg in World War Two.
different groups; the Arabs, the Jews, and the Indians, including a case study on the attack on Surafend in December 1918. The views held by the N.Z.M.R. and I.C.C. on the British Empire will be examined, focussing on three areas: what they thought of the Empire, whether they agreed with Britain annexing Palestine after the war, and comparing the campaign with the crusades. The pastimes of the N.Z.M.R. and I.C.C. will be looked at, and there will be an examination of New Zealand’s soldier myth, its origins and whether it was distinctive to New Zealand.

From the results gained in this thesis, it has become evident that the New Zealanders in the N.Z.M.R. and I.C.C. were Imperial soldiers, characteristic of the British Empire. While in the Middle East they fought as part of an imperial army and experienced at first hand the size, scope, and power of the Empire. The tactics used in the campaign were very similar to those used in the South African War just fifteen years previous. The New Zealanders, when matched against Said’s theories, were acting similarly to how an Englishman was expected. Their actions were in line with those of the Australians and English, and the combined attack on Surafend seems to have been directly linked to the imperial soldiers viewing themselves as British. Their views on British Indians corresponded with the Martial Races, an intrinsically Imperial philosophy. Their views on the Arabs, Jews, and Indians were generally similar to those of the English and Australians, indicating a commonality linked to common imperial ties. Their views on Britain and the Empire suggest that they viewed the Empire fondly, were imperialists, and did view the campaign as a crusade. Again, their views were similar to those of other British and Dominion soldiers. Their pastimes held more in common with other British Empire soldiers, including, not only the British and Dominion soldiers, but also Sikhs. Many of the sports played were distinctly English, and indicated a common Imperial culture permeating throughout the Empire. The final chapter, the soldier myth, investigates the idea of the New Zealand soldier mythology. It becomes evident that this mythology owed its roots to a British mythology, and was common throughout the Dominions and Self-Governing Colonies. Indeed, it seems likely that the soldier mythology could not have developed if it had not been for New Zealand’s participation in the most imperial of all wars, the South African War of 1899-1903.

These findings indicate that the New Zealanders of the N.Z.M.R. were Imperial soldiers, and they were characteristic of the Empire. They viewed the British Empire fondly and acted as Imperial soldiers regardless of whether this action was conscious or unconscious. Several differences did exist between the New Zealanders and other groups, but none of them were large enough to suggest that the New Zealanders had a distinctive identity. At times, the New Zealanders of the N.Z.M.R. and I.C.C. seem to have acted as if they were as British as men born in Great Britain. At other times, they acted as a citizen of the Empire, distinct from the Australians and English, but equally anxious to be part of the Empire. At no point did they
demonstrate a dislike of the Empire, a wish to be independent of their imperial ties, or an attitude at odds with the accepted norm of the British Empire.
Chapter One

It would be made readily practical in case of need for that Dominion to mobilise and use them for the defence of the Empire as a whole.¹

They are in first instance for home defence but may later be required for service abroad and must be volunteers for that purpose.²

Egypt is safer from invasion than at any time since the war began.³

The heat must have been 150 degrees Fahrenheit in the sun and the wind blowing off the land was like a huge fire.⁴

I'd rather stay here another year than think that there should be peace till Germany has been made to suffer at least for some of the horror that she has caused France and Belgium to suffer.⁵

In 1914, fears of German attack on the British Empire reached fever pitch throughout the United Kingdom and the Dominions. In response, Great Britain and the Dominions reorganised their defence forces, beginning in 1907. Central to this reorganisation was the creation of Territorial armies. Great Britain's Territorial army was based on voluntary service, but the Dominions introduced conscription. New Zealand's conscript army was created by the Defence Acts passed from 1909 to 1911. The forces created by the Dominion Governments were distinctly Imperial forces, intended by each government to serve throughout the British Empire and to protect it if attacked. As each army was created, it was standardised along Imperial, and thus British, lines. Each force was to be trained in British methods, to have British instructors, and organised similarly to the British regular army.

New Zealand's aims in creating its Territorial Army were two fold: protecting New Zealand from attack and invasion, and for service throughout the Empire if needed. The Imperial intentions of the N.Z.T.A. were indicated clearly in its creation, in its training, and through its employment during the Great War. Its destination had already been decided at least a year before the war, and the Main Body of New Zealand's army was duly sent there. While serving in Sinai-Palestine, the N.Z.M.R. took part in the most Imperial of all the campaigns of the Great War. Here, they interacted with soldiers from almost every part of the British Empire. When the battles involving the N.Z.M.R. are examined, it becomes evident that they were fighting with the same methods and along the same lines as each of the other mounted units.

² Telegram Drill to Defence Palmerston North, 5/8/1916, NA AD series 1 Box 954 File 29/26.
³ Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), 9 August 1916, p 5.
⁴ Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), 6 July 1916, p 6.
⁵ H. Judge, diary, 15/12/1916, MS Papers 4312, Alexander Turnbull Library (hereinafter ATL).
This is especially the case when the classic mounted actions are examined. The war in Sinai-Palestine was very similar to the South Africa War, and the tactics and types of soldiers used were almost exactly the same.

The war fought by the E.E.F. was very different to that fought in France, both in terms of the mounted forces and the infantry. The cavalry used in France was only properly employed during the Great War’s opening and closing weeks. During the interval it lay dormant and was only used in times of great crisis. The comparison between the two fronts demonstrates that the Sinai-Palestine campaign was unique in an era of total war. The war fought by the infantry in France was considerably more intense and extreme, eliciting different responses from the soldiers involved in their respective campaigns.

The British Empire feared attack primarily from Germany, although Australia and New Zealand were also worried about Japan. In response each Dominion created a small peace-time regular army supported by a large territorial force. New Zealand went further than Great Britain in creating its territorial army, introducing compulsory military training applicable to all males from an early age. The armies created by the Dominions were based upon British models, both regular and territorial, and at successive Imperial Conferences Dominion representatives agreed to standardise their training and equipment on the British model. Lord Kitchener’s voyage around the Empire in 1910 helped in standardising the Dominions’ armies, as each Government asked him to examine and make comments on their armed forces. Kitchener’s comments were usually acted upon, and soon each Dominion’s army became very similar to the other, and to that of Great Britain.

In 1909, it became evident to New Zealand’s Government that the armed forces were in no shape to repel any serious attack. The Defence Forces were organised on a volunteer system. Any male who wished to join was accepted. Training was ad hoc, with those who turned up to drill nights and annual camps being a distinct minority of the total enrolled. Turnover was high, with as many as half of them being replaced each year, and the professionalism and ability of those who did take part in drill was low. In 1909, the New Zealand Defence Act was passed by Parliament, introducing compulsory military training into New Zealand society. The Act was further amended in 1910 and 1911, when it reached its final form. There was little

---

8 The Defence Acts provided for the eventual formation of a peacetime army of 20,000 and a wartime establishment of 30,848. The Act compelled all males between 12 and 30 to undertake some form of military service. This service was divided onto four stages: Junior Cadets, Senior Cadets, General Training Scheme, and the Reserve. A Permanent Force was also established to train and co-ordinate the territorials. Each male between 18 and 25 was expected to serve 14 full days in camp and 12 half days drilling each year. Those males outside this group also had set numbers of days they were expected to drill. The country was divided into 4 military districts: Auckland, Wellington, Canterbury, and Otago. Each district was subdivided into 16 area groups, and each area group into four groups. Each military district was expected to furnish three mounted rifle regiments, four infantry battalions, and two artillery batteries, as well as coastal defence soldiers to man the local batteries. In war, these forces would furnish two infantry divisions and two mounted rifle brigades.
opposition to the act within Parliament or New Zealand society in general. When Lord Kitchener toured the Empire in 1909/10, New Zealand's Government took the opportunity to obtain his thoughts on the Defence Act. Kitchener advised modifying the Territorial Army slightly so that it would be similar to what he had recommended for the Australian Commonwealth. Kitchener's advice was followed slavishly, with it being declared in Parliament that "the object of the bill is to give effect to Lord Kitchener's proposals". By 1911, New Zealand's armed forces were very similar to Australia's, which in turn had been based upon that of Great Britain.

Integral to the N.Z.T.A. were twelve Mounted Infantry regiments, three for each district. The incorporation of Mounted Infantry into the territorial army owed much to New Zealand's participation in the South African War of 1899-1903, where New Zealanders had fought exclusively as Mounted Infantry. Upon return many soldiers joined the volunteer forces, which consequently contained many mounted units. General Godley, the commander of New Zealand's armed forces, was a firm believer in Mounted Infantry. They could act as cavalry when none was available, or as infantry during battle. They were extremely useful in areas of sparse population. Because of this, mounted units could operate throughout the country with little danger of being observed, providing intelligence for the infantry, and attacking any invaders using guerrilla warfare, similar to that employed by the Afrikaners in the South African war. New Zealand's Mounted Infantry had a distinctly Imperial nature. General Godley was appointed direct from Great Britain to command New Zealand's armed forces. He had commanded one of the main mounted infantry training camps in Great Britain, Longmoor. He had also served in the South African War, seeing and approving of the employment of Mounted Infantry against the Afrikaners. The establishment and equipment of a mounted infantry regiment was also based upon British models. This uniformity was at the insistence of Lord Kitchener. Naturally, officials complied with him as it enabled the easy incorporation of New Zealand units into an Imperial army.

From the N.Z.T.A.'s very beginning the Government intended the citizen army to undertake more than just the defence of New Zealand. The debates held in Parliament on the
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9 Only a small number of men objected to enrolling in the Territorial forces, and of those who did enrol, 82% paraded for the 1911/12 camp. McGibbon, p 202.
10 Kitchener to J. Ward, 2/3/1910, NA AD series 10 file 16/1.
11 NZPD, vol 151 (22 September 1910), p 760.
12 NZPD, vol 151 (4 October 1910), p 190.
13 An important distinction has to be made here regarding the differences between mounted infantry and cavalry. Cavalry were trained with lances, swords and rifles, were not intended to act independently of infantry, and were expected to fight mounted on their horse. Mounted infantry were armed primarily with rifles and trained to fight as infantry. It was intended that they would use their horse to get to the battle, but would fight dismounted. Their superior speed could also be used to harry and attack a retreating army, but always they would fight on the ground, not on a horse. They were thus the pre-cursor of mechanised, and highly mobile, infantry.
15 Godley, p 102.
16 Kitchener to J. Ward 2/3/1910, NA AD series 10 file 16/1.
geographical obligations made this very clear. In 1909, the Premier and Minister of Defence Sir Joseph Ward declared that he wanted New Zealand to have a defence force which could be offered to Great Britain if it was needed.\textsuperscript{17} James Allen, then in opposition, said that "in defence of the Empire, we ought to be prepared to send a force away from our shores should necessity call it for it" and in September 1910 he said that New Zealand should be ready to send away a fully equipped force to fight with British troops if requested.\textsuperscript{18} Ward agreed, declaring "Should at any time a proportion of them [New Zealand's territorial army] be required as an expeditionary force to another part of the Empire, they will be ready and prepared to take a share in preserving the interests of the Old Land there".\textsuperscript{19} Clearly, politicians intended the New Zealand armed forces to have an Imperial role, to be able to serve wherever was needed in the interests of the Empire. This attitude is reinforced when the nature of the army is examined. The army itself had been created on the model of the British Territorial Army, and supervised by Lord Kitchener. The Commanders of both the Australia and New Zealand armies were British born. Equipment and training was standardised as far as possible throughout the Dominions and Great Britain, as per the agreements reached at the 1909 Military Conference.\textsuperscript{20} Ward announced that he did not want New Zealand to have a different system to Great Britain's, and that even the methods used to transfer Volunteers to the Territorials would be the same as Great Britain's.\textsuperscript{21} The intention was to create national Dominion forces which could, if needed, be mobilised rapidly and absorbed into an homogenous Imperial Army.

The New Zealand Defence Forces reflected their Imperial connections strongly, both before and after the 1909-11 Defence Acts. From 1908, officers of each Dominions' permanent staffs had been trained in Great Britain, and in 1911 this system was formalised.\textsuperscript{22} Henceforth, places at the Camberley Staff College would be reserved for Dominion officers. Under this system, New Zealand had two places reserved for its officers.\textsuperscript{23} New Zealand had close connections with the Australian Commonwealth's army, with up to ten officers being sent to Australia's main training institution, Duntroon, each year. Four years of training at this college would be followed by a further year with a regiment of Britain's Indian Army.\textsuperscript{24} Imperial ties are once more clearly evident, with Dominion officers seemingly being trained so that they could take command of any unit within the British Empire. The movement of officers and men was not one way, with New Zealand receiving men from the British Army. In 1914, New Zealand had 36 British officers and non-commissioned officers serving in the coastal

\begin{footnotes}
\item[22] Memo from War Office, 9/7/1921, NA AD series 1 box 1295 file 52/38
\item[23] Letter from L. Harcourt 19/9/1913, NA Ad series 1 box 1295 file 52/38
\end{footnotes}
The essential fact to note here is that the officers and men were being trained to a similar standard throughout the British Dominions. New Zealand's Army was thus an Imperial formation, and this was to have important and far reaching consequences once war began in 1914.

In July 1914, the crisis which the world had long feared broke out. Serbian nationalists assassinated Arch Duke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary. Believing the assassins to be connected to Serbia's Government, Austria-Hungary took this opportunity to punish Serbia. A diplomatic note was delivered to Serbia encompassing several demands, one of which Serbia refused to grant. Austria used this as its pretext for declaring war. While the diplomatic manoeuvring between Austria-Hungary and Serbia were taking place, the other Great Powers of Europe took sides, Germany backing Austria-Hungary, Russia backing Serbia. France remained uncommitted, but would be drawn in by any action from Germany against Russia, its only treaty ally. Great Britain remained officially aloof, its cabinet divided as to whether or not to go to war. A unifying pretext was found when Germany invaded the neutral countries of Belgium and Luxembourg, this invasion being an integral part of its war plan to attack France. On 4 August 1914 Great Britain, and thus the British Empire and its Dominions, declared war on Germany and Austria, fighting for the defence of neutral rights.

As the crisis of late July-early August 1914 unfolded, the Governments of the British Dominions pledged their support for Great Britain if war broke out. Statements of this support were published in newspapers in New Zealand, with the Otago Daily Times publishing messages from the Canadian Minister of Defence and the Australian Prime Minister. New Zealand's Government quickly indicated their support for Great Britain and the country's willingness to contribute an expeditionary force for service during hostilities. The machinery for creating an expeditionary force had been in existence since the Defence Acts were passed, and the necessary preparations had been completed by 1913. New Zealand Government's had always believed that the N.Z.T.A. might be needed outside New Zealand, and had planned

26 France and Russia were allied by the Dual Alliance of 1889.
27 The diplomatic situation in Europe vis a vis the various military alliances was at once simple and complex. All alliances were defensive, with their activation only being allowed if a country was actually invaded. France and Russia had such an alliance, as did Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. Britain did not have a formal alliance with any of the Great Powers in Europe. Instead, it had informal diplomatic agreements with Russia and with France. However, these agreements did not obligate Great Britain to take any action in the event of any country in Europe being attacked. In theory, Britain had complete freedom of action. The German alliance was known as the Triple Alliance, whereas the French alliance was known as the dual Entente. When Austria attacked Serbia, it had already gained German support. Russia mobilised its army against first Austria and then Germany. Because of its war plans, Germany was then forced to attack France, for the Schlieffen plan stipulated that France had to be knocked out before Russia finished mobilising. In order to attack and beat France, Germany had marched through the neutral nations of Belgium and Luxembourg. It was the invasion of these neutral countries, which all great powers of Europe had pledged to uphold, that caused Britain to declare war on August 4 1914.
29 For examples see Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), 3/8/1914, p 4.
accordingly. This was vividly demonstrated by Waitemata's Member of Parliament, Alexander Harris, who stated in early July "provision was made in the Defence Act passed by Sir Joseph Ward's government to provide for the raising of an expeditionary force if the need arose for service outside New Zealand".30 Once war had been declared by Great Britain, there was little or no debate as to New Zealand's involvement. The Empire was at war, and therefore so was New Zealand. New Zealand's Parliament seems to have been unified when it entered the war. Very few politicians disagreed with the declaration of war, and Sir Joseph Ward declared that "our [New Zealand's] sole purpose is to be of real service to the Empire".31 The question was now whether an expeditionary force from New Zealand was wanted. The government offered such a force, but at first it was declined by Great Britain. However, on 5 August, the British Government telegraphed its approval of a New Zealand Expeditionary Force, and its creation became official.32 From the start of New Zealand's involvement in the Great War, there was no debate as to the identity of the soldiers sent abroad. Soldiers from New Zealand would fight as British soldiers, using their training methods, uniforms, and laws. This was made plain by New Zealand's Prime Minister on 10 August in Parliament, when he stated "what I am saying now applies generally, because it must be understood that directly the force leaves New Zealand they are Imperial [British] troops in every sense of the word and under Imperial [British] authority".33

Mobilisation of New Zealand's armed forces began 5 days before the outbreak of war in Europe. On 30 July, the headquarters of each military district received a telegram ordering them to prepare for mobilising their armed forces as unostentatiously as possible.34 On 2 August, a force was established to inspect ships entering New Zealand to guard against the possibility of a surprise invasion, and by 4 August New Zealand's coastal forts were being manned continuously.35 On 5 August the formation of an Expeditionary Force was ordered, and formal mobilisation of the New Zealand forces began.36 Within a week, 14,000 men had volunteered for service abroad. General Godley was appointed as commander in chief of the N.Z.E.F., which at first comprised four battalions of infantry and four mounted rifle regiments. These forces were to form two brigades, one infantry and one mounted rifle, as well as one regiment of divisional cavalry. This last duty was performed by the Otago Mounted Rifles, despite them not being cavalry.37

The mobilisation of the mounted rifle regiments followed the broad dates outlined above. It began on 5 August, when the concentration of volunteers and territorials was ordered

30 NZPD, vol 168 (1/7/1914), p 158.
34 McGibbon, p 245.
35 McGibbon, p 245.
36 McGibbon, p 245.
37 The place of Divisional cavalry was normally fulfilled by a specialist cavalry unit. New Zealand did not have one of these, so it is likely that the commanders used the next best option available, Mounted Rifles regiment.
at Dunedin, Christchurch, Palmerston North, and Auckland. Lots were drawn each day, and those men selected were forwarded by train to the concentration centres. Men were accepted into the force only if they agreed to volunteer for service abroad, a necessary legal formality. The N.Z.M.R.'s mobilisation did not go as smoothly as had been expected. Many of the volunteers and territorials did not bring a horse with them. In the case of the O.M.R., a special appeal to the public had to be made on 17 August for more horses by Colonel Robin, the regiment's commander.

By October 1914, the Main Body of the N.Z.E.F, comprising 8,454 men on ten transports, was ready to sail. After a delayed start, the Main Body set out from Wellington on 16 October, escorted by ships of the Royal Navy and Japanese Imperial Navy. In Western Australia, the convoy met up with twenty seven Australian ships, and continued to Egypt, calling at ports in Australia, Ceylon, Aden, and Egypt, reaching Alexandria on 3 December 1914. Egypt had been chosen by Godley several years earlier for several reasons. He believed that Turkey would join Germany in the event of a general war. The Suez canal was the most important waterway in the world, and the capture of it by German or German allied forces would cut the sea routes between Great Britain and India, Australia, and New Zealand. New Zealand soldiers could provide an essential Imperial duty through protecting the canal. If Turkey did not enter the war, the New Zealand Forces could easily be sent through the Mediterranean for service with the British Expeditionary Force in France. In Egypt, the N.Z.E.F. were drilled and reinforced with regularity until they were sent to take part in the ill-fated Dardanelles Campaign. The Mounted Rifles were dismounted, their horses left in Egypt, and fought alongside the infantry. Here, they were joined with tens of thousands of Australians, Indians, French, English, and Scottish soldiers, living and dying alongside them. In December 1915, the Dardanelles was evacuated, and the New Zealand Forces were divided. The New Zealand Division was formed, and was later sent to France, while the N.Z.M.R. were reconstituted. The Sinai-Palestine campaign was about to begin.

The formation and dispatch of the N.Z.E.F. demonstrated a considerable Imperial mentality and thinking, both on the part of the Government and the military authorities. The soldiers were intended to fight as Imperial soldiers, and were placed under British military law. The task of the N.Z.E.F. was to protect the Empire and it could be used throughout the Empire.
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38 Telegram 5/8/1914, NA AD series 1 box 954 file 29/29.
Lots were selected in an attempt to cause as little dislocation to the railway system as possible.
39 The mobilised forces and volunteers to be concentrated "on understanding that they are in first instance for home defence but may later be required for service abroad and must be volunteers for that purpose". Telegram from Drill to Defence Palmerston North 5/8/1914, NA AD series 1 box 954 file 29/26.
40 Telegram from Colonel Robin to Defence Dunedin 17/8/1914, NA AD box 1 series 954 file 29/26.
41 McGibbon, p 252.
42 The sailing of the Main Body was cancelled due to the cruise of the German Asiatic Squadron from Tsingtao. Once adequate escort forces had been made available, the Main Body left Wellington. For details of these forces see Appendix 3.
43 McGibbon, p 254.
44 McGibbon, p 240.
This aim seems to have been in the minds of Ward and Allen when the very first Defence Acts were passed in 1909. There was little or no debate about New Zealand’s involvement in the war, and very little dissension in society. The military had already decided where New Zealand’s army was to be sent. Godley intended it to defend the Suez canal against Turkish attack, and this is where it was sent. Again, these plans show an Imperial mentality, for Godley committed the New Zealand army to the defence of the Imperial waterway, upon which the communications of Britain to the Indian and Pacific Ocean depended.

The N.Z.M.R.’s Imperial nature is clearly demonstrated when its war record is examined. Such battles as Romani, Magdhaba, and the two raids across the river Jordan provide considerable evidence for an Imperial war, Imperial forces, and an Imperial army. The tactics at each battle show how the development of each part of the constituent force had been pre-planned in an effort to ease the creation of a truly Imperial army. It also demonstrates how the dream of the Imperial Conference of 1909; standardisation of Dominion forces and the eventual creation of an Imperial army, came to fruition in Sinai and Palestine.

On 20 December 1915, 62 officers and 1,329 men of the N.Z.M.R. were evacuated from the Dardanelles, arriving at Zeitoun camp a week later. Here, the brigade rested and re-equipped, with over 500 new men from New Zealand joining the brigade. The brigade was comprised of the Auckland, Wellington, and Canterbury Mounted Rifles, the O.M.R. being reassigned the role of Divisional Cavalry. The N.Z.M.R. was joined to three Australian Light Horse brigades to form the Anzac Mounted Division. Colonel Edward Chaytor commanded the brigade at this point, and the Australian General Harry Chauvel commanded the division. General Murray, the commander of the Imperial forces in Egypt, had been charged with the protection of the Suez Canal from Turkish attack. Under his command, he had a number of British and British Empire formations. Murray planned an aggressive defence of the canal, to deny the Sinai Peninsular to the Turkish forces. In accordance with this plan, his mounted troops would undertake extensive patrols through the desert, destroying wells, and reporting back any and all Turkish movements. Prior to this occurring, however, the mounted men of his army would have to be retrained and prepared for desert conditions.

Soon after being reconstituted, the training schedule of the N.Z.M.R. began anew. The men had been without their horses for many months now, and horsemanship had to be

47 The three Australian Light Horse brigades were the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd. The 3rd Light Horse brigade was removed from the Anzac Mounted Division and transferred to the Imperial Mounted Division after the battle of Rafa, Jan 9, 1917.
48 For information about the forces under Murray’s command, see Appendix Four. General Murray was responsible for a vast geographical area of war operations, stretching from the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan to Salonika and the Egyptian-Lybian frontier to Sinai. Within this area he had to put down uprisings from the Senussi and Sudanese, supply and equip the Allied forces in Salonika, and protect the Suez canal from the Turks.
retaught. Many of the reinforcements came from the infantry and thus had little or no knowledge of horsemanship. This became the task for the instructors in Egypt. Desert training was undertaken, for it was obvious that conditions in the Sinai would be very different to those in the Dardanelles. Training consisted of patrolling, reconnaissance, attacking and defending against mock Turkish troops, and advanced guards. Most of this training was undertaken at regimental and squadron levels, and continued for three weeks before the men were allowed near the primary defence area, the Suez Canal Zone. One of the most important parts of this training regime was acclimatising the soldiers to desert conditions. To achieve this goal, a limited amount of water was provided to the men, and no more would be issued. While these rules seemed draconian to the men, they undoubtedly saved many lives once the campaign began. The training schedule for the New Zealanders was common throughout the mounted forces, with the Light Horse and the Yeomanry undergoing the same forms of instruction. These training efforts were intended to create a cohesive and effective fighting force.

The routine of the N.Z.M.R. was depressingly similar during the first eight months of 1916. Each day or two, detachments of the brigade, varying in size from four men to the entire brigade, would set out from their camp and patrol the sands for up to three days for any sign of the Turks. If the patrol was a large force, four or more men would advance in front, to the sides, and behind the larger force to report on any Turkish activity. If this was detected, heliographs would be used to report back to the larger force. If outnumbered, the New Zealanders would hide or retreat, but if the Turkish force was small enough to be attacked, a skirmish would result. If possible, the Turks would be taken prisoner and sent to the base camp for interrogation. A prohibited zone was established where the Bedouin were not allowed to enter. Any and all Bedouin in this zone were arrested and deported behind the front line to camps where they were held for an indefinite period. This was because the Bedouin were suspected of being Turkish spies. Bedouin who were known to be sympathetic to the British were issued with passes, rendering them immune to arrest, but these cases were few. These aggressive patrols were undertaken by all mounted units, but it soon became obvious that the Yeomanry units had not been adequately trained for this task. Murray himself realised this, declaring that "any work entrusted to these [Anzac Mounted Division] excellent troops is invariably well executed" and "it is unnecessary to reiterate the praises of the Australian and New Zealand Mounteds, who always come up to their high reputation". As a consequence, disasters such as the attack on Kantara by the Turks in April 1916 befell the Yeomanry.

50 see H. Judge, diary, December 1915-January 1916, MS Papers 4312, ATL; J. Evans, diary, 1/1/1916-22/1/1916, 31/1/1916, MSX 2936-2938, ATL; W.H. Owers, OH AB 506, ATL.
52 Wilkie, p 89; Powles, New Zealanders in Sinai and Palestine, pp 11, 18, 21.
53 A heliograph was a means of signalling through reflecting the sun's rays off a mirrored surface back to the main force.
regiments, whereas the Australians and New Zealanders soon imbued considerable respect in both the Turks and the British.\textsuperscript{56}

This monotonous state of affairs continued until August 1916, when the first major battle of the Sinai campaign began, the Battle of Romani. The Turks had long been planning an assault on the British forces with the aim of cutting the Suez Canal. 16,000 soldiers, heavy artillery, and considerable supplies had been making their way through the Sinai Peninsular. This task proved extraordinarily difficult, as the heavy guns had to be transported through soft sand, and the entire force had been supplied through camel trains stretching the length of Sinai. The Turkish force remained undiscovered until a flight by a British reconnaissance aeroplane, with General Chaytor on board, sighted them. Upon returning to the air-strip, mounted patrols were sent out to discover the Turks. Contact was duly made, and from then until the official start of the battle, 4 August, patrols kept the Turks under constant surveillance.\textsuperscript{57} They maintained contact with the Turkish advance guard, with running fights taking place each day. The mounted men would gallop up to the Turkish lines, dismount, fire, and then retreat when the Turks charged them.\textsuperscript{58}

On 4 August the Battle of Romani began. A weak defence line had been prepared, held by infantry of the 52nd Division and the 1st A.L.H. brigade. The Australians took the full force of the Turkish attack, but held on as long as they could, being pressed back slowly. While the Australians held, the British sent reinforcements and it is here that the New Zealanders played their part. The C.M.R. charged Mount Royston, taken by the Turks from the Australians, and by late afternoon the hill was in New Zealand hands.\textsuperscript{59} The success of the attack was even more surprising given that the hill lacked cover for the attacking New Zealanders and was occupied by many thousands of Turks. The C.M.R. took hundreds of prisoners, and by dominating the high ground, were able to turn the tables on the Turks. By the end of the day, four thousand Turks were dead or wounded, while another four thousand had been taken prisoner. On the night of the 4/5 August, the Turks began to retreat, and infantry from the 42nd division took over the defence lines.

The attack continued the next day, the New Zealanders, Australians, and Yeomanry pursuing the Turks. Running battles were fought over the succeeding days, with a series of towns and villages falling to the pursuing mounted forces. These towns included Katia, Oghratina, and Bir el Abd. The battles were hard fought, with the Imperial soldiers being greatly outnumbered. At Katia, the mounted men from six brigades attacked, charging over the flat ground on horseback before dismounting and fighting as infantry.\textsuperscript{60} The Turks had built

\textsuperscript{56} M.A. Eccles, diary, 23-30/4/1916, MSX 4963, ATL.
\textsuperscript{57} Idreiss, pp 83, 84.
\textsuperscript{58} J.H. Luxford, \textit{With the Machine Gunners in France and Palestine}, Auckland, 1923, p 181.
\textsuperscript{60} A.E.T. Rhodes, diary, 5/8/1916, Reference 76-123, ATL.
strong defences around deep trenches, and the battle took all day. By nightfall, the Imperial soldiers withdrew, having failed to take the oasis. The next day, they returned to the fight, but the Turks had withdrawn. On 7 August the Turks were driven back to Negilat, and on the 8th they were pushed back to Bir el Abd. During the pursuit of the Turks all of the mounted men suffered from severe lack of sleep and dehydration. This was also true of their horses, which went many hours, in some cases over forty, without a drink. R. Wilson, a Yeomanry soldier, declared in his autobiography that the pursuit necessitated at least three days without sleep. During these attacks, the mounted men fought as infantry, using their horses to keep in contact the Turks as they retreated. Romani was the first serious battle of the desert war, and as such the victory gained by the British proved even more important for morale. The pride the soldiers took in their victory was evident in William Owers' interview, when he said "it was a fierce fight, but we knocked them back".

Criticisms of the Battle of Romani and the pursuit of the Turks have been levelled against the British administration by Captain A.E.T. Rhodes, A.H. Wilkie, and modern historians such as the Marquess of Angelsey. One of the most damming criticisms was that the infantry had not been pushed far enough forward during the battle. As a consequence, the main brunt of the fighting fell on the mobile and fast moving, but outnumbered, mounted infantry. The long months of desert training and constant warfare were rewarded, as man for man, the Australian and New Zealand mounted infantrymen proved themselves far superior to the Turks. The lack of infantry, however, prevented the encircling and total destruction of the Turkish force, for the mounted men simply did not have the numbers. In the pursuit of the Turks after Romani, the Australians were criticised for their lack of will to fight. At the battle of Katia, A.E.T. Rhodes, Chaytor's aide de campe, wrote "the Australians let us down they were too slow and when they did come they only attacked in a half-hearted way". Rhodes also accused the 3rd Light Horse brigade of withdrawing without informing the other soldiers, thus giving the Turks the opportunity to attack. Nevertheless, these are amongst the rare criticisms found of the Australians. Other criticisms of the battle included the divided commands. Two commands existed, and both had to approve action. One was local whereas the other was in Cairo, too far away to act decisively. The distribution of honours and awards for the battle was
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also criticised. The honours largely went to men in Cairo who had no part in the fighting. Very few went to the soldiers who had actually won the battle, annoying the soldiers considerably. 68

Following the battle of Romani and the pursuit of the Turks, the familiar pattern of patrolling and running battles continued. On 20 December 1916 a night march followed by an attack on the town of El Arish, believed to be held strongly by the Turks, took place. 69 The attacking force comprised the A.M.D., the Imperial Mounted Division, and the I.C.C. The mounted men charged across the plain in front of the town, dismounted and rushed the Turkish lines. However, the town was found to be abandoned by the Turks. This was just as well, for the defences were found to be formidable, and had the Turks remained to fight, it would have been problematic for the mounted men to have taken the position. 70 Chauvel, in charge of the operation, resolved to continue his pursuit of the Turks, and the Imperial soldiers mounted their horses, completed another night march, and made contact with the Turks at the town of Magdhaba on December 23, 1916. This battle was fought as a classic mounted infantry action, with the mounted men surrounding the town, cutting off the retreat of the Turks, and then fighting as infantry. The Turks were in strong and well concealed trenches and were well supplied with food and water. 71 The N.Z.M.R. and the 3rd Light Horse brigade were sent to cut of the town from the north and north-east. The battle began at dawn, with the New Zealanders galloping to 2,000 yards from the Turkish positions before dismounting. By midday, the New Zealanders had advanced to just 200 yards from the Turkish lines. 72 Here, the New Zealanders had to stop, as the Turkish fire proved too strong. The fighting was very difficult, but slowly the New Zealanders advanced. At about 2pm, Chaytor ordered the 1st N.Z.M.G.S. to advance and provide covering fire, preparatory to a bayonet charge. 73 When the machine gunners began, the New Zealanders, joined by the Australians of the 3rd A.L.H. brigade, charging the Turkish lines from the north east. They reached the lines with few casualties, and soon the Turks began to surrender. 74 By 4:00pm all the Turks had surrendered and 1,282 prisoners were taken, as well as large amounts of equipment and ammunition. The cost to the Anzac Mounted Division of this battle was twelve killed and 134 wounded. Nine of the dead and 36 of the wounded were New Zealanders. Heat and hunger made this victory even more impressive. At midday, Chauvel had given serious thought to withdrawing due to the lack of water for both horses and men. 75 He had been close to ordering a retreat when the N.Z.M.R. and 3rd A.L.H. made their successful charge on the Turks.
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The attack on Magdhaba, and its outcome, was surprising, given that the British forces engaged were heavily outnumbered and outgunned. They had fewer machine guns, artillery, and soldiers engaged. Furthermore, the Imperial soldiers had been without sleep since the march of 20/21 December, and without water since the 22nd. The Turks were well entrenched, well provisioned, and rested. Despite this, the Imperial force managed to defeat them. It is likely that the final charge of the New Zealanders, coupled with the reputation the Imperial soldiers had gained through their advance over the previous few months, destroyed the morale of the Turks and panicked them, inducing them to surrender. The action had demonstrated a classic use of mounted infantrymen. They had used their superior speed and mobility to advance around the town, besiege it, and then fight as infantrymen against the Turks.

The brigade took part in a series of battles over the next fifteen months, all very similar to those outlined above. The N.Z.M.R. were involved in the capture of Rafa, which ended the Sinai campaign, the three battles of Gaza, the pursuit of the Turks from Beersheba to Jerusalem, the capture of Jaffa, and the occupation of Jericho. The New Zealanders played an important part in defeating the Turks in each of these battles, actions, and raids. The tactics used, and the means by which victory was secured, were broadly similar to those battles already described. The two raids on Es Salt-Amman provide an interesting contrast to the battles outlined above, not the least because the Imperial forces were defeated for the first time in over twelve months.

Controversy surrounds the two raids which were made on Es Salt. The first raid made it as far as Amman, and a pitched battle broke out in the hills and streets of Amman. The primary point for controversy revolved around the raids' necessity and planning. They were undertaken in the worst weather, with forces probably unequal to their task. Some historians have maintained that they were intended by General Allenby to fool the Turks and Germans into thinking that the next Imperial attack was going to follow this route. Others maintain that this interpretation was placed on the raids after their failure in an effort to preserve the reputation of Allenby. Whatever the reasons for the raids, the perseverance, tenacity, and fighting ability of the Imperial soldiers is evident.

The first raid on Es Salt began on 22 March 1918 conducted by Shea's Force. The river Jordan was bridged under heavy Turkish fire on the night of 22/23 March and the A.M.R. was one of the first units to cross, moving into the hills and clearing the Turkish defenders from
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76 The title of raid is misleading. In the context of the Palestine Campaign it was a battle, and the German commanders attached the names First and Second Battles of the Jordan to the raids. For reference sake, the British title of raid has been kept, but the forces used were considerably more than raid strength.
78 Shea's force comprised the Anzac Mounted Division, The Imperial Camel Corps, two battalions of West Indian infantry, the 60th Infantry Division, artillery, and bridging trains. It was known as Shea's Force after its commander, General Shea.
This was achieved on the 24th and for the next three days, the advance continued. Amman was reached on 27 March, Shea's force passing through Es Salt and capturing many Turks on 26 March. The Battle of Amman was fought over several days almost entirely by the mounted infantry, as the infantry were held up in Es Salt by feuds between Christian and Muslim Arabs. Only light artillery was available to the Imperial force, and it soon began to run out of ammunition. In Amman, the A.M.R., W.M.R., and the I.C.C. found it difficult to hold their positions on Hill 3039 after determined Turkish counterattacks. While the battle was in progress, the cameliers blew up sections of the Hejaz railway to the south of Amman, five miles being destroyed by the I.C.C.'s 4th battalion. By March 29, the Turks had received considerable reinforcements and General Shea ordered a retreat. That night, the Imperial troops retreated along the roads they had advanced over just a few days before. At Es Salt, all military equipment that could not be carried away was destroyed, and sympathetic refugees were taken back to Jericho.

At 4 am on 30 April 1918 a second raid took place across the river Jordan. It was intended by Allenby that the Imperial force would meet up with the Arab Beni Sakr tribe, who promised 20,000 irregulars to help in the attack. He ordered four A.L.H. and one Yeomanry mounted brigades to advance and capture Es Salt through the mountain tracks, while the remainder of the force attacked the Turks along the main route. On 30 April the C.M.R. and infantry from the 60th division began their attack on the Turks at Shunet Nimrin, and on 1 May the W.M.R. relieved the C.M.R. Neither of these positions were taken, and at noon on 1 May, Chaytor was ordered to relieve the 4th A.L.H. brigade which was holding the river crossing at Ed Damieh, under heavy attack from the Turks. If the Turks captured this river crossing the five mounted brigades en route to Es Salt would be cut off. A Yeomanry regiment joined the New Zealanders, and together managed to push the Turks back and hold the bridge. It soon became evident that this attempt to take Es Salt would not succeed. The expected help from the
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Beni Sakr tribe had not eventuated, the Turkish positions were still intact, and the weather was again deteriorating. In addition the Turks were being reinforced via the Es Sir road, and it became evident that retreat would be necessary. On 3 May the Imperial forces began their retreat and by 6 May they were, once more, encamped in Jericho. This second raid netted the Imperial forces 942 Turkish prisoners, but cost them over 1,600 casualties, and achieved very little. Certainly, the main objective, Es Salt, was not gained.

The survivor's accounts of the first raid concentrated on the appalling conditions in which the attempt on Amman was made. The spring rains were falling, the Jordan river was in flood, and the hills, being so high, ensured that the soldiers were never warm. During the raid, Trooper W. Daubin wrote in his diary "spent night on roadside, rain pouring, bitterly cold". Ben Gainfort described the conditions as very wet throughout the raid. In a letter to Greta, Alex McNeur said "the weather was as wet and cold as ever you have seen it in New Zealand ... there wasn't a dry spot to be found". The perceived treachery of the Circassians was also commented upon, McNeur describing them as "armed and treacherous", Gainfort regretting that the New Zealanders never got even with them, and Daubin also mentioned the affair. The weather problems were compounded by the lack of adequate roads. Reconnaissance of the route had not taken place, and roads turned out to be little more then goat tracks. Wheeled transport had to be left at Es Salt, and this led to a lack of artillery and ammunition when they reached Amman. The plight of the wounded was dreadful. No wheeled transport meant that they had to carried in camel cacelots. These were stretchers carried on camels, one each side. These would swing and rock with the movement of the camel, leading to agony for the wounded soldier, and contributing to the death of many. McNeur remarked on the wounded, writing "It was terrible for our wounded men who had to be carried I suppose 50 miles before they reached shelter and many died on the way". D. M. Horner, the editor of a book on Australian military commanders, believed that the first raid failed because the Turks were alerted through operations in the area before the attack, inadequate intelligence before the raid took place, failure of the Arabs to join up with the British force, and not enough men taking part. Trooper Daubin seems to have summed up both raids, when he wrote "it was a badly managed affair".

If Allenby's objective had been the diverting of Turkish attention away from his planned battles on the plain of Megiddo, he certainly succeeded. The Turks and Germans were

---
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convinced that this was where the next attack was going to be, and increased their defences there and weakened those along the coast. It was a very expensive way of achieving this outcome, both in terms of men and the Palestine campaign. Several thousand casualties from some of his best soldiers, as well as the blows to morale that the defeats must have caused, were heavy prices to pay for deceiving the Turks in this way. It seems more likely that Allenby hoped that Amman would be captured, but secondary to this was his plan to use the raids as disinformation for the Turks. This theory is backed up by examples of Allenby's disinformation from earlier in the campaign. Usually, they were subtle and did not risk many lives in their execution.96 The raids on Es Salt stand in marked contrast to this.

There were many aspects to the war in the desert which indicated that this war was an Imperial war, fought by and for all parts of the British Empire. One of the strongest and most evident indicators of this is its similarity to earlier Imperial wars, especially the South African War, sometimes known as the first war of the British Empire. Direct comparisons can be made between the Sinai-Palestine campaign, and the South African war. Both wars were mobile, involving mounted soldiers on raids across large areas for several days. The fighting was mostly small scale, involving just tens of thousands, and not the hundreds of thousands usually found in modern warfare. Patrols by mounted men were constant and usually uneventful, involving detachments of mounted infantry ranging from four men to several thousand. The enemy in the desert was similar. Like the Afrikaners, the Turks proved to be elusive enemies, running and fighting, but usually being defeated in battle. The practise of stopping and arresting civilians in the war zone was also common to both wars, as was interning those civilians found without a pass in large camps. The soldiers used in Sinai-Palestine were also reminiscent of the South African War. Mounted men, whether mounted rifles, light horse, or yeomanry, featured strongly in both wars, and were in the forefront of the fighting for much of the conflicts. Running fights, reconnaissance, and dismounted infantry fights featured strongly in both campaigns.

These similarities were not lost on the soldiers involved. Frank Twistleton, an officer posted to Palestine from France, had served in the South African War. In his letters, he wrote that he was looking forward to Palestine as it would be very similar to South Africa, and later "It was quite an interesting day, have seen nothing like it since the South African war".97 As well as this, many of the officers and some of the men who were in the N.Z.M.R. had also

---

96 There are many examples of Allenby using disinformation to trick the Turks and Germans. One of the most famous was that used prior to the Third Battle of Gaza. Here, Allenby's chief intelligence officer, R. Meinertzhagen, rode alone into a patrol of Turkish cavalry. He was seen, pursued, and in the action of galloping away, dropped a pouch containing faked plans of the next offensive, along with letters, money, and other personal documents. These had been added to add authenticity to the ruse. The documents were forwarded to the German intelligence officers, who declared the documents genuine, and preparations were made to defend against the coming offensive. These were in the wrong place, greatly aiding Allenby's breakthrough at Beersheba.

97 F.M. Twistleton, letter, 25/10/1917 and 27/10/1917, MS Papers 1705, ATL.
served in South Africa. The Imperial Army's commander, General Allenby, had also participated in the South African War. Here he had learnt many of the tactics which were repeated on a larger scale in Palestine. These points could well indicate why the two campaigns were so similar. Similar conditions and similar troops would necessitate similar tactics. As well as this, a proportion of the men had experience in fighting this type of war. They had been through it all fifteen years before. All of these similarities indicate a common approach to these wars, an approach which was distinctly Imperial.

As well as this similar approach to the fighting, there was also the very composition of the E.E.F. From its creation, the army in Sinai was a composite force. It involved soldiers from every Dominion except Canada, from each country in the United Kingdom, from many Indian states, and from Hong Kong and Singapore. The Imperial nature of the army expanded as the war progressed, until it also contained West Indians, Egyptians, Ceylonese, Rarotongans, and Palestinian Jews. This cosmopolitan nature was immediately apparent to the soldiers from New Zealand as they lived, fought, and died in Sinai-Palestine. Briscoe Moore summed up the composition of the army, in a passage in his book on the campaign.

Through the mixed crowd [of Jerusalem] move the soldiers of the British Empire - the Tommy as unconcerned as ever - the swarthy Indians, obviously interested in all around them, and soldiers of the Jewish battalions, easily discernible by their features. An Australian Light horseman moves with a jaunty air matching the fluttering plume of feathers in his hat, stopping to exchange a greeting with two New Zealand Mounted Riflemen ... a party of natives in the Egyptian Labour Corps struggle by in the charge of a lance corporal ... these are followed by two black soldiers of the British West Indies battalion, one carrying a cane and both well turned out with shining buttons, evidently alive to their dignity as soldiers of the Empire to which they are proud to belong.

This Imperial nature was also evident when the various Australian sources are consulted. Oliver Hogue, Frank Reid, and Ion Idreiss all make mention of the plethora of different communities and ethnicities which were present in Palestine. Each soldier was nominally ruled by the British monarch, resided in the British Empire, and had been sent to Palestine at the behest of that Empire. For each soldier, the size, scope, and power of the Empire became immediately evident through a task as simple as walking down the street. The Empire became a reality for

---

98 From the First contingent of New Zealanders sent to the South African War, 5 officers and 2 NCO's served in the Wellington Mounted Rifles, 2 officers, 2 NCO's and one trooper in the Auckland Mounted Rifles, and 3 officers in the Canterbury Mounted Rifles.
100 Moore, Mounted riflemen of Sinai and Palestine, p 139. See also Powles, New Zealanders in Sinai and Palestine, p 68.
101 For example, see Idreiss, p 100; F. Reid, The fighting Cameliers, Sydney, 1934, p 103; O. Hogue, The Cameliers, London, 1919, p 143.
them, not an abstract thought or colours on the map, and the soldiers who left a record seem to have realised it.

Another indication that the fighting in Palestine was a uniquely Imperial fight was the ability for soldiers, officers, and units to interchange with each other. Each division and its constituent parts mirrored the British model. Therefore, the establishment of a regiment from Great Britain was the same as one from any part of the Empire. This greatly aided the ability for officers, men, and units to be moved from one division to another. Sources abound with instances where regiments from New Zealand, Australia, or England were joined to each other, where officers from one Dominion were commanding regiments from another, and where a British commander wielded the force as a whole. The Anzac Mounted Division contained men from Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain. At the Battle of Romani, the W.M.R. was joined to the 2nd A.L.H. brigade, and 5th Light Horse regiment replaced them.102 Due to the casualties inflicted on the 2nd Light Horse brigade, for a time its entire senior staff was furnished by New Zealand officers from the W.M.R.103 Throughout the entire campaign, British officers made up the bulk of the senior staff officers. This did not, however, mean that men from the rest of the Empire could not rise to these positions. Harry Chauvel, an Australian, started the Sinai-Palestine campaign as commander of the A.M.D. By its end, he was responsible for the Desert Mounted Corps, commanding the largest mounted force in recorded history.104 Edward Chaytor began as the commander of the N.Z.M.R., but by the war’s end he commanded the Anzac Mounted Division. This was due to the ties of Empire which held these areas to Britain. The Empire introduced a common language, English, to the Dominions, to India, to the West Indies, to anywhere where the Union Jack flew. Because of the common language, officers from New Zealand could command men from Australia, from India, from Great Britain, and from the West Indies. The Empire led to common training methods, common uniform, and a common disciplinary code.105 This enabled the military formations produced throughout the British Empire to work with each other with a cohesiveness seldom seen in such a large army. Given the commitments of every Great Power in World War One, no one country could have created the E.E.F. Only the British Empire could have created an homogenous whole out of so many geographically disparate parts, and this was only due to the policy of the Empire before the war. Without the British Empire, the Sinai-Palestine campaign would have been a much harder proposition.

104 In March 1918, the Desert Mounted Corps had 36 regiments organised into four divisions and a number of brigades. The 36 regiments were made up of 14 Australian, 13 Indian, 5 British, 3 New Zealand, and 1 French regiments.
105 Some differences did exist between the military discipline code of the Dominions and Great Britain, but these were usually minor. The only major difference discovered was that Australian soldiers were not allowed to be executed. This was not the case in New Zealand, where the British military discipline code was imported wholesale and applied without modification.
The N.Z.M.R. did not have a distinctive method of fighting while in Palestine. This can easily be demonstrated when its methods are matched to Australian and English sources. According to the New Zealand sources, the Mounted Rifles would be sent on long patrols through the desert. The formation of the soldiers would depend on the numbers involved, but if large, would entail a screen of men to the front, sides, and rear of the main force. These screens would keep in contact with the main force, warning them of any contact or sightings of the Turks or Bedouin. At night, the patrol would bivouac for rest, with screen guards being sent out to protect the resting soldiers.\textsuperscript{106} When compared to the patrolling pattern of the Australians, it is easily seen that the two were virtually identical. Idreiss explained how, when patrolling, small patrols would move off from the bivouac site to search for the Turks or Bedouin. If contact was made, the patrols would heliograph back to the main force, and then retire if the enemy seemed too strong.\textsuperscript{107} When fighting, the mounted men usually fought as infantry, galloping up to the battle site, and then dismounting and fighting as foot soldiers. A glance at any description of how the mounted men fought at Romani, Katia, El Arish, 1st and 2nd Gaza, Beersheba, the capture of Jerichoe, the raids on Es Salt, and the final battle Megiddo will demonstrate this.\textsuperscript{108} There were few exceptions to this rule, most notably at Huj and at Beersheba, where the Yeomanry and Light Horse charged the Turks in cavalry fashion.\textsuperscript{109} The New Zealanders did not perform any cavalry type charges. Cavalry charges were extremely rare in Palestine until the final battle of at Megiddo in September 1918, when the Turks were too demoralised to resist. The New Zealanders' lack of cavalry charges was therefore not distinctive. There was nothing distinctive at all about the way the New Zealanders fought in Palestine. They were part of the army as a whole, and fought that way, frequently with assistance from English, Scottish, or Australian units.

The use of mounted men in Sinai and Palestine differed greatly from how they were used in France and Belgium. The combination of lack of space to manoeuvre, large concentrations of enemies, and of course, the overwhelming defensive fire provided by machine guns and artillery, meant that the use of cavalry would be unlikely to bring success, and indeed often proved to be suicidal.

\textsuperscript{106} Moore, pp 34, 49.
\textsuperscript{107} Idreiss, p 61.
\textsuperscript{108} For examples of how the soldiers' fought at these battles, see any of the campaign histories listed in my bibliography.
\textsuperscript{109} The charge by the Warwickshire and Worcestershire Yeomanry cavalry at Huj took place during the breakthrough of the Imperial armies along the Beersheba - Gaza line in October/November 1917. The 60th infantry Division was being heavily shelled by artillery, manned by Austrian and German gunners and protected by Turkish soldiers. Two of these Yeomanry regiments resolved to charge the Turks in true cavalry style. Drawing swords, B squadron and two troops of the Warwickshire regiment charged the Turkish trenches. The Turks were so demoralised by the charge that they threw down their guns and either ran away or surrendered. Once the Turkish trenches had been cleared, a squad of the Worcestershire's and two troops of the Warwickshire's charged the artillery. The Austrian and German gunners remained to fight, the Turks running away. The charging cavalry were shelled and machine gunned, but they continued their charge. They reached the artillery and sabred the gunners who were not dead or running away. The charge cost the two regiments 32 dead and 58 wounded out of the 120 soldiers who took part. Eleven guns, four machine guns, and 70 prisoners were taken in the action. Angelsey, vol 5, pp 178 - 182
The main difference between the mounted men of the Western Front and those of the Middle East was the professionalism of the two. All of the mounted units sent to Palestine were territorial or conscript in origin. No professional cavalry ever served in Palestine. This is in contrast to the units sent to France, which were all initially regular cavalry formations. They were long servicemen, many of whom had served in South Africa. The majority of them were excellent shots, and the Marquess of Angelsey reprints Wavell’s belief that they were the best shooters out of all cavalry in Europe, and most of the infantry. They were armed with swords or lances, and all had rifles. The regular cavalry were all mobilised in less than a week and transported to France over a five day period. By 20 August 1914 all of the cavalry brigades had reached the front in Belgium.

On 22 August 1914, the British cavalry forces made their first contact with the Germans at Peronne. This action was fought as a classic British cavalry action. Once the Germans had been beaten off by rifle fire, the regiment charged the Germans with lances, spearing many. Small actions like this were fought throughout August and September. Cavalry were used in small scale raids and as screening units in front of the infantry. The role of cavalry temporarily changed at the Battle of the River Aisne, where it was used as mobile infantry, galloping from one section of the British front to another and fighting as infantry. This role was periodically forced onto cavalry in France throughout the Great War, most notably at the First and Second Battle of Ypres. However, the static nature of the war in France precluded cavalry being used as planned throughout all of 1916 and most of 1917. The cavalry force was expanded to a peak of five divisions, but this was later reduced to three. During the last few weeks of the war, cavalry was again able to be used as a mounted force with some hope of success. The war had once more become fluid, and consequently cavalry had a role. Cavalry screens would advance in front of the infantry, ranging as much as fifteen miles in front. They would fight and charge the Germans, but only if the ground was level. Cavalry was unable to press against determined German resistance, and was unable to turn the German retreat into a rout. Often it had to wait for the infantry, tanks, or armoured cars to catch up and attack.

The use of cavalry on the Western Front was very different to how mounted men were used in the Middle East. In France, the army used cavalry as cavalry, and when this role was

111 The cavalry regiments were grouped into brigades, and five were ear-marked for service in France. The brigades departed from the United Kingdom from Southampton and Dublin and entered France through the ports of Le Havre, Rouen, and Boulogne. Angelsey, vol 7, pp 61-62.
113 These months saw the advance to and retreat from Mons, and the Battle of the river Aisne.
114 Angelsey, vol 7, p 199.
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untenable the cavalrymen were withdrawn to behind the lines where they stayed unless in dire emergency. Despite the cavalry being trained to fight dismounted, this role was never universally adopted by the cavalry corps, and cavalry formations were therefore held for most of the war in reserve. This stands in contrast to the mounted men in the Middle East where the exact opposite occurred. Here, the mounted rifles fought predominantly as dismounted infantry, using their mobility to attack and pressure the Turks. Such a role would have been suicidal for the cavalry in France, for trench warfare was totally unsuited to cavalry operations. Horses were easy targets for machine guns and artillery, and cavalry would have been unable to operate in the shell torn landscape which modern warfare created. The sheer density of the opposing forces in France prevented any attempt to out-flank the enemy, and cavalry were as unsuited to frontal attacks as men were. This was not the case in the Middle East, where the battle front was relatively unpopulated and modern weapons less frequent. The mounted men could get away from the static lines of defence, make their way through the defence lines, and attack the enemy from all sides. Mounted men in Sinai-Palestine did not face the sheer number of machine guns, barbed wire, and artillery that made operations in France suicidal. Finally, the terrain in the Middle East was more conducive to mounted operations. Flat desert and rolling sand dunes, while difficult to ride in, could support mounted patrols, pursuits, and attacks. This was not the case in France.

The war fought by the New Zealanders and the other Imperial troops in Sinai and Palestine was very different to that fought by the majority of soldiers from the British Empire. The overwhelming majority of British Empire soldiers served in France and Belgium, and it is here that the great carnage of the Western Front took place. Millions of men lived, fought, and died amidst the mud and desolation that was the Western Front. It was here that the main thrust of New Zealand's war effort, the New Zealand Division, was located.

The soldiers of the New Zealand Division experienced a very different war to those of the N.Z.M.R. In France, the progress of the war was measured in terms of tens and hundreds of yards captured, in numbers of trenches held, and in the casualty returns each week which listed the newly dead and wounded. This contrasted greatly with Palestine, where trenches were few and far between, and no real front line existed. The N.Z.M.R.'s patrols ranged for over fifty miles, and an advance was often measured in tens or hundreds of miles, and it was usually immediately evident who had won and who had lost. Even Palestine's largest battles, such as those in September 1918, involved less then two hundred thousand men. In France, battles would involve many hundreds of thousands, if not millions. The casualty lists were correspondingly enormous, and it became a matter of degree in determining who had won and who had lost. The fighting in Palestine was fluid, and the chances of survival relatively good, especially when compared to the static and often suicidal fighting experienced on the Western Front.
These contrasts were apparent to the men of the Mounted Rifles, and several of them made comments about the differences. They recorded both the difference in conditions and the difference in the fighting. In his diary H. Judge wrote "Of course it's no hardship campaigning here during the winter but the poor devils in the trenches in France, how they must dread it". Frank Jamieson, of the A.M.R., said in his interview that the shelling in Palestine was "not nearly as bad as in France". The best comparison of all were made by Frank Twistleton, a soldier transferred from France to Palestine in 1917. In his letters to New Zealand he made many comparison between the two theatres. Twistleton was surprised at Palestine's smaller scale of fighting, lack of shell fire, trenches and barbed wire when compared with France. In fact, Twistleton was amazed at how two separate campaigns in the same war could be so different. In one of his letters he wrote

From intelligence we learned that the previous day's fighting had resulted in seventy casualties to some Yeomanry ... Everyone seemed to think the losses very heavy. I said nothing but after France they scarcely seemed worthy mentioning and I could only infer that the fighting they were accustomed to was of a very mild nature.

In a later letter he wrote "The fighting is very little in comparison to the French front". Most scathing of all, he wrote "To hear the officers discussing their fights here, it is easy to see they have no idea of what a modern battle is like. They would get a shock if they found themselves in one". Twistleton was clearly not impressed with the fighting which he saw in Palestine. There was not as much fighting and shelling in Palestine, and the sheer intensity of the war was much lower in Palestine. This is not to suggest that Palestine was not dangerous, but that the scale of the war in the Middle East was smaller. Battles were widely separated, and it was unlikely that a soldier would get killed if he was not involved in them. This luxury did not exist in France, where death was random and ever present.

It is perhaps this lack of intensity of war which made the soldiers in Sinai and Palestine generally more optimistic than their counterparts in France. Though the soldiers in the Middle East wished for an end to the war, they did not become as fatalistic and as anti-war as the soldiers in France did. This is easily demonstrated when the two are compared. H. Judge wrote in his diary "I'm sick enough of this life goodness knows, but I'd rather stay here another year than think that there should be peace till Germany has been made to suffer at least for some of the horror that she has caused France and Belgium to suffer". Alex McNeur, of the 1st N.Z.M.G.S., possessed a similar line of thought. In a letter he wrote that the "only way to end this war is to fight on and kill Germans". These comments stand in contrast to those of the

119 H. Judge, diary, 11/8/1916, MS Papers 4312, ATL.
120 F. Jamieson, OH AB 484, ATL.
121 F.M. Twistleton, letter, 27/10/1917, MS Papers 1705, ATL.
122 F.M. Twistleton, letter, 5/11/1917, MS Papers 1705, ATL.
123 F.M. Twistleton, letter, 8/11/1917, MS Papers 1705, ATL.
124 H. Judge, diary 15/12/1916, MS Papers 4312, ATL.
125 A. McNeur to Dave, letter, 6/8/1918, MS Papers 4103, ATL.
New Zealanders on the Western Front. Randolph Grey, a soldier in the New Zealand Division wrote "A shell had burst, and he had been too close - that was it. The awfulness of such scenes is mercifully tempered to us who have seen so much. There is no time for the dying. Cheers for the living and on with the ghastly business". Robin Hamley, a soldier in the Auckland Battalion, wrote "Going over the bags in the morning. I am in the hands of God. So are we all. Preserve us Lord". Leonard Hart provided an excellent example of the casualty rate experienced by units in France. "My company [roughly 250 men] has come out with no officers, only one sergeant, one corporal and thirty men. Even then we are not the worst off". The contrast between the two could not be more evident. In Palestine there was optimism and a chance of survival, in France there seemed to be only death and slaughter without reason.

When actually engaged in fighting, there was nothing distinctive in the way the N.Z.M.R. operated. They fought the Turks in much the same way as the Light Horse and the Yeomanry units did. At Romani, Katia, El Arish, Magdhaba, Rafa, Gaza, Beersheba, Jaffa, Jericho, Es Salt, and Amman their task, while important, was undistinctive in terms of their methods of carrying it out. This is easily seen when the ways the New Zealanders fought are compared to Australian and English sources. No major differences were found, certainly nothing large enough to indicate a distinctive New Zealand method of fighting. The probable reason why this was so, given that the majority of soldiers were civilians not regular soldiers, was the training that the New Zealanders, Australians, and English had. The soldiers were trained in accordance to Imperial forms, as set down at the Imperial conference in 1909 and were standardised as much as possible throughout the Empire, as were uniforms and equipment. British regular soldiers were sent throughout the Empire to train the Dominion forces, and in turn Dominion soldiers were sent to Great Britain to train at the officer colleges. Such was the extent of the standardisation of the Imperial forces that during the war soldiers, officers, regiments, and brigades could all be switched between units which originated thousands of miles from each other. The constituent parts of the British Empire each contributed soldiers which formed, during the war, an Imperial Army. Without the British Empire and the resolution to standardise the Empire's armed forces on British lines, this would not have been possible.

The army which fought in Sinai and Palestine was the most representative of the British Empire during the Great War. Soldiers from New Zealand could personally witness people from every continent. Men from Africa, Australasia, Asia, Europe, and the Americas were all present in the E.E.F. The New Zealanders were conscious of this fact, and remarked upon it in their letters, diaries, and books. For them, the Empire had become a reality and not an abstract

128 J. Phillips et al, p 146.
thought. The New Zealanders were not alone, for the Australian soldiers also recorded similar thoughts in their letters and books. This indicates that the Mounted Rifles were conscious of their belonging to an Imperial whole, and not exclusively to New Zealand. It also suggests that the Australians felt the same.

The way in which the N.Z.M.R. fought in Sinai and Palestine provides more evidence for them being Imperial soldiers. They were fighting in an army made up of soldiers from all over the Empire. Many of the mounted men from New Zealand, Great Britain, and Australia had served in South Africa and were thus veterans of this earlier Imperial war. The tactics and methods used by the mounted men were similar to those used in South Africa. In terms of the fighting done, the New Zealanders performed exactly the same tasks as the mounted units from other countries. An examination of how these tasks were carried out indicates a common approach throughout the Desert Mounted Corps, no matter what the origin of the force. This indicates not only a common approach to the war, but provides tangible evidence of the common training which each unit had in the years before and during the war. Without this common training the approach would almost certainly have been different.

There were great contradictions in the experience of war between France and Palestine. The experience of the war which the New Zealand soldiers had in Palestine was very different to that of the men in the New Zealand Division. France's appalling casualties and horrific conditions soon bred antipathy and hopelessness. In Palestine, the knowledge that the Imperial Forces were winning, and acceptable casualty rate, enabled many of the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. to remain optimistic and in favour of prosecuting the war until Germany's defeat. The employment of mounted units in Palestine was very different to how they were employed in France. This indicates, not something distinctive to the N.Z.M.R., but something distinctive to the Palestine campaign as a whole.

The soldiers of New Zealand who fought in the Middle East were fighting an Imperial war and were part of an Imperial army. Of this there can be little doubt. From the very inception of the N.Z.T.A., they had been trained to be an army for service throughout the Empire. This aim had been standardised at the Imperial Conference of 1909. What followed in Sinai and Palestine merely brought this aim to fruition.
The brigade at war

Figure 1 Note the similarity between the uniforms of the New Zealand General Edward Chaytor, the Australian General Harry Chauvel, and the English General Chetwode.

Figure 2. Note the similarity of equipment and uniforms between this section of the A.M.R. and the A.L.H. watering their horses (overleaf).

Figure 3 Australian Light Horsemen watering their horses.

Chapter Two

The Arab camel men are all spies as far as I can see. They have been caught signalling to the enemy by lighting big fires. They all want rounding up and shot.¹

We had had about enough of the Arabs with their thieving cut throat tendencies and took pleasure in hastening their departure with a few shots.²

I'm afraid we are not a very good example of Christianity and mission work among them will be pretty difficult after the war.³

These dirty black natives who yabber and argue and protest as you load up what you reckon is a good return for your money.⁴

The more we see of them [the Sikhs] the better we like them. They bear their illness with great stoicism and without a murmur.⁵

Ghurkhas were fine chaps ... as happy and as jolly as a lot of schoolboys.⁶

The Middle East has long been the crossroads of the Old World, joining the continents of Europe and Africa to Asia. It is accredited with being the starting point of Western Civilisation, with written records dating back over five thousand years. Its unique geographical position in the world, astride three continents, results in the Middle East containing a vast number of different ethnicities and cultures.

The soldiers of the E.E.F. had many new experiences while on active service in the Middle East. Perhaps the strangest of all was their interaction with the people who lived in the region. Drawn from around the globe, most of the soldiers of the British Empire had never experienced the conglomeration of different peoples which existed in Egypt and Palestine. To this conglomeration was added the soldiers of the Empire itself, comprising men from Europe, Australasia, Asia, and the Caribbean. The New Zealand soldiers had similar responses to the many different groups with whom they interacted in the Middle East, regardless of whether the subjects were Arabs, Jews, or Indians. Moreover, when the reactions of the New Zealanders are compared with the Australian, English, Scottish, and, in some cases, West Indian, soldiers, a distinct commonality of views is easily detected. This commonality is most transparently demonstrated by examining the raid by soldiers of the Anzac Mounted Division on the Arab village of Surafend.

¹ A.E.T. Rhodes, diary, 29/5/1916, Reference Number 76-123, Tapuhi IRN: 14486, Alexander Turnbull Library [hereinafter ATL].
² A.B. Moore, From Forest to Farm, London, 1969, p 29.
³ A. McNeur to Greta, 24/2/1918, MS Papers 4103, ATL.
⁴ A. McNeur to Greta, 20/7/1918, MS Papers 4103, ATL.
⁵ S. Brailsford, 30/11/1915, Accession Number 1990.2491, Waipouru Army Museum [hereinafter WAM].
The underlying reason for why soldiers from different parts of the Empire held such similar views is more than just the soldiers "being in the same place at the same time". All of these attitudes, opinions, and views have, as their underlying cause, Imperial ideology. Imperial ideology governed interactions between Englishmen and Arabs. It governed the status of each group encountered in the Middle East vis a vis the soldiers. It influenced what the soldiers thought of the Middle East, even before they reached the region, as well as their attitude towards its inhabitants. It governed what the soldiers from Great Britain and its Dominions thought about their counterparts from British India. In this case, Imperial ideology was part of the India's Martial Races mythology. Imperial ties and Imperial ideology also helped to shape what the soldiers thought about the different Jewish communities in the Middle East.

A comparison with the soldiers from New Zealand during the Second World War will also be made. Men from the 2nd New Zealand Division were stationed in the Middle East on garrison duty from 1939-1943, and their racial attitudes have been examined. Their views and opinions were similar to those of the N.Z.M.R. The same disdain, hostility, and derogatory comments were made towards the Arabs and Jewish traders, while the view of the Indian soldiers was very similar. At its root seems to have been the same Imperial ideology and Imperial mentality that influenced the opinions of the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R.

The soldiers of the British Empire encountered a plethora of different ethnic and racial groups while fighting in the Middle East. The most despised of these groups was its Arab inhabitants. The soldiers employed the name Arab loosely, and as a category it contained a multiplicity of different members. For the soldiers in Egypt and Palestine, Arabs ranged geographically from the Egypt-Cyrenaica border, to the mountainous plateau in the land of Moab, and to the port of Aden in the desert wastes of the Yemen. Within this vast geographical region lived many disparate groups, each classified by the soldiers as Arab, including groups described as Senussi, Egyptians, Palestinians, Circassians, Levantines, Natives, and the catch all grouping of Bedouin, the wandering desert nomad. No distinction was made by the soldiers between the Arabs of different regions and towns regarding their supposed "qualities". With minor exceptions, all of these people were intensely disliked by the Imperial soldiers. This dislike of Arabs was not confined to the New Zealanders, but was just as prevalent in units from the United Kingdom and Australia.

Virtually every letter, book, and diary contained some reference to the Arabs reflecting the New Zealanders' racial views. Because the majority of these media were intended for others to view, it is surprising that they contained such explicit reference to the soldiers' dislike of the Arabs. Letters were intended to be posted back to friends and family in New Zealand, while books were expected to be read by the general public. When on active service letters were censored, and publishers and editors also exercised the same right over post-war books.
Because of the censorship, it is likely that the attitudes and opinions expressed by the soldiers were more muted than they would have been in reality. It can, therefore, be surmised that the dislike of the Arabs was even more intense than the opinions expressed in the books and letters imply.

The New Zealand soldiers in the Middle East were very forthcoming in their views on its various Arabic inhabitants. While campaigning in the Western Desert against the Senussi, Stanley Brailsford recorded his views of the region in his diary, describing a Senussi village as a "God forsaken place, and only fit for niggers to live in". C.L. Malore, a camelier, kept a diary containing a section entitled "A discussion on Palestine". In this section, he described an Arab village, writing "natives live in the usual crowded, filthy, mud walled villages that make up the East ... normal size of a village is 4-500 living in most unsanitary conditions". Earlier in the diary, Malore recorded that the village of Yebna had excreta on the streets. Descriptions of the Arabs focus on their perceived lack of honour and integrity, their dirtiness, and their decadence. In his book, Kiwi Trooper, Ted Andrews included a letter from J. Elmslie: "...the Egyptian race is a decadent one and I don't think even we British can save them or ever make men out of them". Briscoe Moore wrote that the inhabitants of Jericho were "very degenerate" and that the Bedouin tents "would make a sanitary inspector's hair stand on end". A writer in the Kia Ora Coo-ee described the Arabs who inhabited the hills of Judea as "having no law beyond the dictates of animal instinct". Alec McNeur, of the 1st N.Z.M.G.S., wrote in a letter "we are becoming used to the Eastern ways but they are very devious", and making reference to Palestine's Biblical past, "no wonder the old inhabitants of Palestine had to be destroyed ... many a chap is disgusted with the people". Moore wrote that the Arabs were "intent on thieving or other nefarious schemes", and when interviewed by Nicholas Boyack, Beethoven Algar, a camelier, said that the Arabs "could not be trusted" and "were on anybody's side". The attitude of the New Zealanders towards the Arabs was contempt mixed with indifference over whether the Arab lived or died. In his autobiography, Moore wrote that the soldiers all laughed when the Arab spectators were shelled during the Battle of Amman, while Captain A.E.T. Rhodes, General Chaytor's Aide de Camp, recorded "They [the Arab camel drivers] all want rounding up and shot".

---

7 S. Brailsford, 25/11/1915, Accession Number 1990.241, WAM.
Beginning in late 1915, a rebellion of the Senussi tribe, located in the area of desert between modern day Libya and Egypt, took place. Loyal to the Turks and supplied through German submarines, the Senussi maintained their revolt until defeated by a mixed force comprising troops from throughout the Empire. The bodies of the dead Senussi Arabs were left unburied as a permanent reminder to other Arabs of the danger of rebelling.

8 C.L. Malore, Discussion on Palestine, Diary, WAM.

9 C.L. Malore, 14/11/1917, Diary, WAM.


12 Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 4, p 20.

13 A McNeur, Letter 14/3/1918 and Letter 20/7/1918, MS Papers 4103, ATL.

14 Moore, The mounted riflemen of Sinai and Palestine, p 64 and B Algar, OH AB 443, ATL.

15 Moore, From Forest to farm, p 28 and A.E.T. Rhodes, diary, 1/5/1916, Ref 76-123, ATL.
New Zealand soldiers in the sources consulted of the Arab rebellion under the leadership of Colonel T.E. Lawrence and Prince Faysal.

The New Zealanders were not alone in their opinions of the Arabs. The Australians maintained a more violent contempt and hatred for the Middle East's inhabitants. This contempt can easily be seen in *The Desert Column* by Ion Idriess, a Light Horseman. Based on his war time diary, Idriess recorded these comments on the Bedouin: "Last night Turkish raiders swooped down on Khan Yunis and drove away the flocks of sheep and cattle ... Good luck to the raiders. Pity they didn't cut all the Bedouin throats". These comments are similar to those of Frank Reid, a camelier and author of *The Fighting Cameliers*, when he wrote: "These nomads of the desert, clad in filthy garments, showed their contempt for the cameliers by refusing to answer questions ... There were men in these patrols who would not have hesitated to put a bullet through them". Reid's comments echoed those of Moore and Rhodes, as well as reiterating the common idea of Arabs being "filthy and dirty". Sir Harry Gullett commented on this, writing that the war taught the Arabs the benefit of being clean. Like the New Zealanders, Gullett, Reid, and Idriess all saw the Arabs as thieves and cheats.

Soldiers from Great Britain and the British West Indies also held a widespread contempt for Arabs, indicating that the above views were not confined to Australasia. In his book on the Worcestershire Yeomanry Regiment, Lord Cobham makes reference to both the perceived treachery of the Arabs and their habit of killing the wounded and looting after a battle. His comments are not as violent as those of the Australians and New Zealanders, but nevertheless, a deriding and derogatory tone towards the Arabs is immediately noticeable. In the *Desert Mounted Corps*, the Honourable R.M.P. Preston's comments on the Palestinian Arabs' sloth and lack of resource.

In his unpublished book, "Forty Thousand Horsemen", J. McMillan records the feelings of the West Indian regiments towards the Arabs. Upon their arrival, the West Indians were frequently confused for Arabs. The soldiers of the West Indian regiment took

---

19 Reid, p 63; Idriess, p 172; Gullett, *The Australian Imperial Force in Sinai and Palestine*, pp 87, 570, 787.
20 The British West Indian soldiers came primarily from Jamaica. However, men were also drawn from the various other small islands ruled by Great Britain in the Caribbean, and the territories of British Honduras (Belize) and British Guiana (Guyana).
21 "...these desert jackals are only dangerous to wounded or stragglers unable to resist".
22 "Its [Gaza's] inhabitants have neither the energy of the people of Europe, nor the incentive of a better climate, and they are never likely to rebuild it".
23 J McMillan, "Forty thousand horsemen", p 157, Accession Number 1997.503, WAM.
affront to this confusion, and entered into long arguments with those who mistook them. This
continued until it became known within the E.E.F. that the West Indians were not Arabs.

In the short term, the opinions possessed by the Imperial soldiers regarding the Arabs
were the result of the soldiers' own actions. In the front line, the sensibilities of the Arabs
usually took second place to survival. Crops and livestock were commandeered when needed,
usually with the threat of force, and sometimes without consultation with their Arab owners.24
When fighting and dying, most soldiers held Arab ownership to be an unimportant concept. In
their pursuit of the Turks, the mounted divisions would ride through the crops of farmers,
destroying them under their horse's hooves.25 This destruction of the Arabs' livelihoods,
usually at mere subsistence level, naturally led to antagonism. While in the desert, orders were
issued that all Arabs found within the front line area were to be arrested and interned in
camps.26 Such action was undoubtedly resented by the wandering Bedouin, while the Imperial
patrols sent out were often overly zealous in their attempts to apprehend the Arabs.27 When the
soldiers realised that they were being cheated in the bazaars, they would often take matters into
their own hands. Assaults were common, as was the practice of merely taking what you
believed to be a fair exchange for your money while the owner looked on helplessly.28 These
practices naturally led to both urban and rural resentment towards the Imperial soldier and bred
antagonism between the two groups.

The Arabs were not completely without blame in creating these opinions of themselves
during the war. The use of Arabs as spies by the Turks was well known and common, and was
soon adopted by the British Armies. The Arabs were faced with two rival armies, each willing
to pay for information which, by virtue of their nomadic lifestyle, they could obtain relatively
easily. They availed themselves of as many opportunities for selling the information as they
were willing to risk. This was condemned by the Imperial soldiers, who soon came to believe
that all Arabs were spies.29 Looting the battlefields and graves of the dead certainly did take
place. Any and all Arabs which lived near a battle site would appear soon after, or even during,

24 B. Algar, OH AB 443, ATL.
25 A.D. Dibly, OH AB 464, ATL.
26 A.D. Fabian, Diary, 22/12/1916, WAM.
27 Cases exist whereby Bedouin were arrested by patrols only to have their camels, sheep, food etc confiscated
for the use of the soldiers. Bedouin near the front line were arrested, rounded up, and placed into camps behind
the British lines for fear that they may be spies. Patrols were also sent out to apprehend suspected spies. J.E.
Fowler's book Looking Backward contains an example of what happened when a suspected spy was caught. In
order to prove whether or not they were a spy, stones were put in their mouths, pins stuck into them, and
sometimes they were dragged behind a horse.
J.E. Fowler, Looking Backward, Canberra, 1979, p 19.
See A.D. Fabian, Diary, 22/3/1918, WAM; C.L. Malore, Diary, 1/2/1917 and 21/1/1917, WAM; E.C.
McKay, Diary, p 98, Accession Number 1998-31, ID Number 39636, WAM.
28 McNeil provides an excellent example in his letter of 20/7/1918: "These dirty black natives who yabber and
argue and protest as you load up what you reckon is a good return for your money", MS Papers 4103, ATL.
29 Virtually every source comments on Arabs being spies. For examples, see A.E.T. Rhodes, diary 2/5/1916,
Reference 76-123, ATL; Moore, Mounted Riflemen of Sinai and Palestine, p 156; J McMillan, p 70, Accession
Number 1997.503, WAM; Idriess, p 172; E.C. McKay, diary, p 98, ID Number 39636, WAM; and C, p 47.
the fighting and carry away everything they could.\footnote{Gullett, Australian Imperial Force in Sinai and Palestine, p 708.} While this was condemned, the inhabitants of the Middle East must have seen it as a heaven-sent opportunity for enriching their possessions at little or no cost, and for recouping their losses caused by the war. The poverty of the Arabs in Palestine is immediately apparent in the descriptions of the Arabic villages outlined above.

Incidents such as Arabs firing at Imperial soldiers did occur. There were several occasions when this took place, the most famous involving New Zealand soldiers being during the retreat from Amman in 1918.\footnote{Moore, Mounted Riflemen of Sinai and Palestine, p 115.} Arabs who had welcomed the Imperial soldiers just days before were now hastening their retreat with bullets. The New Zealanders, Australians, and Englishmen were incensed by the Arabs’ disloyalty to the British cause. From the Arab’s point of view it was necessary now that the Turks would be returning. Faced with being caught between two powerful rival armies, the inhabitants had to practise realpolitik of the most dangerous type in order to survive. It is also possible that the Arabs were fearful of what would happen to their country once the war was over, and intended to show their resistance to possible annexation or foreign control. The Arab traders did cheat the foreign soldiers on many occasions, of this there can be no doubt. Experiencing a huge influx of soldiers from throughout the world, prices were trebled and fake goods substituted for real ones. Arab traders were resented and condemned for this and accusations and clashes between the two parties occurred frequently.\footnote{In part, this was the cause of the July 1919 riots at Ismailia.}

It is interesting to note that the attitudes of the British, Australian, and New Zealanders, while being similar in their general dislike of the Arabs, were nevertheless different in the degree. The dislike for Arabs expressed by the Australian soldiers in Palestine was more intense then that of the New Zealanders or the British. A reason for this could be the history of race relations within New Zealand and Australia. New Zealanders tended to have had better relations with the Maori than those between Australian and Australian Aboriginal. The New Zealand soldiers, indeed New Zealand society, seems to have had a much higher regard for the Maori as a soldier and a person then what would be expected for non-whites, given the racial views of the time. This attitude was immediately apparent soon after the Great War began. Through their chiefs Maori expressed their desire to participate in the war. New Zealand’s Government petitioned Great Britain twice on their behalf, their second attempt being successful in mid-September, 1914. Sir Joseph Ward supported Maori participation in the Great War, making a speech to that effect in early September 1914.\footnote{C. Pugsley, The Maori Pioneer Battalion in the First World War, Auckland, 1995, p 20.} James Allen, the Minister of Defence, gave a speech to the Maori soldiers of the Pioneer Battalion before they left New Zealand. Allen described the Maori soldiers as "the chief of the dark races living under the sun."\footnote{Pugsley, The Maori Pioneer Battalion in the First World War, p 29.} Australians
seem to have accepted the distinction made with regards to Maori for when T. Ryan, of South Australia, visited New Zealand he described the first Maori contingent as being equal to the best that England, Scotland, and Ireland had to offer. These statements suggest that little distinction was officially made between the Maori and the European New Zealander. When the New Zealanders landed in Egypt, they were specifically told not to treat the Egyptians as they would normally have treated non-whites, ie. Maori. Indeed, the New Zealanders had to be reminded that the "The natives in Egypt have nothing in common with the Maoris. They belong to races lower in the human scale, and cannot be treated the same way". This suggests that the New Zealanders were more used to happier relations and interaction with non-whites than their Australian peers. With respect to the Australian soldiers, the treatment of the Australian Aboriginal and the history of conflict between the two groups seems very similar to that between the Light Horsemen and the Arab. The harsh treatment and hatred of the Arab by the Australian soldiers could well be a consequence of the history of race relations in Australia.

In the long term, the opinions of the Imperial soldiers can be traced back to the ties of Empire which bound the United Kingdom to its colonies, its Dominions, and its Indian Empire. The majority of New Zealand, Australian, and United Kingdom soldiers believed themselves to be superior in every way to the Arab. This superiority seems to have been based upon what the soldiers believed to be their respective levels of civilisation vis a vis the Middle East. For the soldiers of the Empire, the cities of the Middle East were invariably described as filthy, dirty, and blots on the landscape. Those who inhabited the cities seem to have taken on these, and other, negative characteristics by virtue of their residency. The wandering Bedouin were ranked even lower than the sedentary townsfolk and farmers, and were more despised than the urbanised Arabs. In his book, Orientalism, Edward Said suggested several explanations as to why this process occurred, and offered several reasons for why the soldiers thought the way they did. Orientalism has been criticised for being too monolithic, but in this case, the critics provided additional support to Said's theories. Said's explanations revolved around the idea of how an Englishman was supposed to act and be treated in the Middle East, as well as the concept of the White Man's Burden. The ties of Empire were integral to explaining why it was constructed.

Great Britain's involvement in Egypt dated back over a century before the Great War but was sporadic until Britain's invasion and pseudo-annexation of the region in 1882. From Pugsley, The Maori Pioneer Battalion in the First World War, p 27.
37 For examples of these and other descriptions see the footnotes above and Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 4, p 13.
38 Britain's involvement in Egypt in the modern era began when Napoleon I invaded the region in 1798 with a French army and fleet. Britain sent an army and the Mediterranean Fleet to defeat the French. The French fleet was destroyed by Admiral Horatio Nelson in 1798 at the Battle of the Nile, and an English army helped in defeating the French outside Acre in 1799. The French were finally defeated in 1801, and the English left Egypt in 1802 under the terms of the Treaty of Amiens. British involvement waned until 1824, when international loans were raised in London, guaranteeing a continued interest in the stability of Egypt. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 increased the British involvement in the area, climaxing in 1882 when Egypt's impending financial collapse caused the British invasion and assumption of power.
then until 1914, English scholars had the opportunity of studying Egypt and the Middle East in depth and on site. Scholars synthesised ideas about the Orient, gleaned from their experiences in India and the Persian Gulf, with what they encountered and experienced in Egypt, until they had developed what were believed to be expert opinions on the Oriental. John MacKenzie alleged in his criticism of orientalism that these earlier philosophies, developed in England about Indians, were arrogant and destructive of inter-racial harmony. The post-1882 opinions included such ideas as "the Oriental is irrational, depraved (fallen), childlike, and different", and "if not patently inferior, then in need of corrective study by the West". The Oriental was seen as an "inveterate liar", and "gullible, devoid of energy and initiative, given to flattery, cunning, intrigue, and unkindness towards animals". Once formed, these ideas quickly entered the literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The great upsurge of books and articles written along Orientalist themes during this period spread these stereotypes. The outpouring of books also corresponded to the great increase in literacy which took place during this period, making the literature's audience even larger. Authors during this period were well-versed in Imperial ideology, and Imperialism soon merged with the "expert opinions" on the Oriental, presenting a distorted view of interactions between the Oriental and the Englishmen. Once these views became integrated en masse into the literature of the time, it was unlikely that the readers would question the opinions put forward.

At school, the boys who were to become the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. were taught from stories and books which contained significant elements of the "expert opinions" on the Oriental. This can easily be seen when the two main school journals, Schoolmates and New Zealand Schools Journal, are examined. The stories, articles, and editorials focused on the Orient's perceived "other worldliness" and backwardness, and described its inhabitants in distinctly derogatory terms. In 1910, the School Journal contained an article about the history and geography of Asia. This article said "Yet, while other continents have advanced in knowledge, skill, and wealth, until recently Asia has stood still or fell back. Most of its older kingdoms have fallen into decay or under the influence of other nations". When the journals described

39 The Orient was originally the term given to just the Levant. However, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it expanded to include everything between the Ottoman Empire and China. An Oriental thus became any person living in this enormous region.
43 Said, p 42.
44 "in the first place, nearly every Nineteenth century writer ... was extraordinarily well aware of the fact of Empire: this is a subject not well studied, but it will not take a modern Victorian specialist long to admit that liberal cultural heroes ... had definite views on race and imperialism, which are quite easily to be found at work in their writing". Said, p 14.
45 These two journals were used to teach the boys and girls of state run schools history, geography, reading, writing, arithmetic, and morals. For more information, see E.P. Malone, "The New Zealand journal and the Imperial Ideology", New Zealand Journal of History, 7 (1973) and R. Openshaw, "Patriotism in the primary school curriculum 1910-1930", Delta, 24 (1979).
46 Schools Journal, (Feb 1910), p 11.
specific countries, a definite correlation with the expert opinions can be detected. The Chinese are portrayed in *Schoolmates* as treacherous and cowardly, and the editor believed that the Boxer Rebellion was part of a general struggle between the white and yellow races. He expressed pleasure that China's "punishment" for the Rebellion had come sooner, rather than later.\(^{47}\) The inhabitants of the Middle East were described in a similar derogatory manner. The general term of Arab is used, with the majority being described as bandits of little or no morality.\(^{48}\) Egyptians villages are described as looking "like a rubbish heap alive with human insects", and the people themselves as "swarthy".\(^{49}\) The only fictional story set in the Middle East published in the journal is a serialised version of John Haklyt's "Escape from the Turks", written in the sixteenth century. The Turks were portrayed as brutal and sadistic, delighting in inflicting pain upon their Christian captives.\(^{50}\) These stories showed a distinct similarity with the "expert opinions", and indicate that the New Zealand soldiers had been exposed to these opinions from an early age.

The soldiers in Egypt during the Great War were unlikely to think differently. They arrived in the Middle East with preconceived notions gained through the literature of the period. They expected to find dirty, cunning, dishonourable, and inferior people, and this is just what they found and commented upon. The similarity of the expert opinions to the observations and opinions of the English, Australian, and New Zealand soldiers suggests that these ideas were linked to the ties of Empire between these regions. The ideas were formed by scholars in England and dissipated through popular fiction and school texts to the Colonies and Dominions of the British Empire. Once in these regions, the texts would be read and studied until they became accepted by many of their readers as the truth. When they arrived in Egypt, many of the soldiers began to look for examples of what they had been taught was the truth and quickly found them. Without the Imperial connections between the United Kingdom and the Dominions, it is unlikely that the New Zealanders' views of the Arabs would have been so similar to those of the Australians and English. The similarity of opinions indicates the New Zealanders' Imperial bonds, their Imperial ties, and the soldiers' Imperial mindset.

Part of the Orientalist theme present in the literature of the time was the idea of the "White Man's Burden". According to Said, the "White Man's Burden" was a very real concept for many people travelling through the Orient from European and European-modelled states. In *Orientalism*, Said gave a definition of what he believed the "White Man's Burden" was:

> it meant - in the colonies - speaking in a certain way, behaving to a code of regulations, and even feeling certain things and not others. It meant specific

\(^{47}\) Editor, "Editorial", *Schoolmates*, (August 10, 1900), pp 9-10  
\(^{48}\) *Schoolmates* (May 10, 1901), p 15  
\(^{49}\) Sir Edwin Arnold, "Wandering Words", *Schoolmates* (April 10, 1901), p 8  
\(^{50}\) J. Hakylt, "Escape from the Turks", *Schoolmates* (October 10, 1901), pp 1, 3
judgements, evaluations, gestures. It was a form of authority before which non-whites, and even whites, were expected to bend.\textsuperscript{51}

In much of the Middle East, including Egypt, it was Great Britain which had taken up the "White Man's Burden".\textsuperscript{52} Britain could only continue in this role if it maintained its belief in its cultural, political, and social superiority.\textsuperscript{53} If this belief faltered, then Britain's legitimacy for its presence in the Middle East would be undermined. Consequently, Englishmen in the Orient were expected to act in a certain way in order to uphold their superiority.\textsuperscript{54} This expectation applied directly to all Englishmen in Egypt. The soldiers of the Empire seem to have been well aware of this "White Man's Burden" and usually acted in ways which would uphold their Imperial duty. The many references to the unhygienic and unhealthy cities, the continual deriding of the people who inhabited them, their physical treatment of Arabs, and the soldiers' perceived superiority over the Arabs are examples of how soldiers acknowledged the "White Man's Burden". Indeed, when the New Zealand soldiers first arrived in Egypt, they were issued with a General Order "warning" them about Egypt and urging them to act as Britons were "supposed" to, featuring many of the aspects of the "White Man's Burden":

The natives in Egypt ... belong to races lower in the human scale ... The slightest familiarity with them will breed contempt which is certain to have far-reaching and harmful consequences. Every member of the Force in Egypt is charged with the enormous responsibility of maintaining the prestige of the British.\textsuperscript{55}

It is unlikely that the New Zealand soldiers would have acted so clearly in accordance with the "White Man's Burden" if New Zealand had not have been part of the British Empire. Certainly, it is probable that they would not have acted the same as the Australian and English soldiers. All three groups adopted a similar attitude and similar opinions towards the Arabs, suggesting that all three groups were acting in accordance with the theory of the "White Man's Burden". This indicates once more that the New Zealand soldiers in the E.E.F. did have an Imperial mindset, and acted in accordance with this mindset.

The raid made by members of the Anzac Mounted Division on the village of Surafend is an excellent case study for many of the ideas raised above. In the short term, this attack was in retaliation for the murder of a New Zealand soldier by an Arab, thought to be from Surafend. There are other reasons which helped to motivate this raid including the hatred of the Arabs felt by the soldiers, the common frustration felt by the soldiers towards the military authorities, and

\textsuperscript{51} Said, p 227.
\textsuperscript{52} By 1914, British Administrators were in control of almost all of the Middle East outside the Ottoman Empire. All of the Coastal Arabian Sheikdoms had a British Resident in charge of their foreign affairs enabling Britain to exercise unofficial control. Egypt, Southern Persia, the Sudan, and Aden were all under formal British control. As well as this, subsidies were paid to many of the tribes in inland Arabia to keep them from attacking British possessions and to keep their rulers sympathetic to British policy.
\textsuperscript{53} Said, p 34.
\textsuperscript{54} Said, p 108.
\textsuperscript{55} N. Boyack, \textit{Behind the Lines}, Wellington, 1989, p 15.
the concept of the "White Man's Burden", including how a British soldier should act and how he should be treated while in the Middle East. Overarching these reasons were the British Government's contradictory declarations with regards to the fate of the Middle East after the Great War, and its policies towards the Jews and the Arabs in the immediate post-war period. The raid has also been used as an example of emerging nationalism in Dominion units. This explanation is both false and incorrect.

On the night of 10 December 1918, the A.M.D. was in camp on the plain of Richon le Zion, between the Jewish village of the same name and the Arab village of Surafend. That night a thief stole the kitbag of Trooper L. Lowry of the 1st N.Z.M.G.S. Lowry awoke while the theft was taking place, rose, shouted, and gave chase to the thief. Drawing a gun, the thief fired one shot at Lowry, fatally hitting him in the chest. The thief then ran from the camp. Lowry's shout, and the subsequent gunshot, roused the camp, and his body was soon discovered by Corporal C.H. Carr, who called for a doctor. The doctor arrived too late to save Lowry, pronouncing him dead around 1:40am. At the Court of Inquiry that morning, officers gathered evidence in an attempt to discover the location of the murderer. The evidence presented implicated an Arab culprit, and suggested that the thief had run off to the village of Surafend. Lieutenant E.E. Lord said "from where the struggle took place, bare footprints led down towards the Native Village of Surafend". Lord's suggestion of Surafend as the residence of the murderer was supported by Sergeant G.S. Bruce, who stated that the Arabs of Surafend were leaving the village, heading west, away from the soldier's camp and further into the desert. Because the Arabs did not usually travel in this direction it is possible to surmise that they knew that trouble would be caused by Lowry's murder and were attempting to escape retaliation.

A picket from the division was sent out and the village surrounded to prevent more people leaving. British Military Policemen arrived later that morning to conduct the investigation. They entered the village, but by nightfall had found no evidence to link the murder to Surafend. The Military Policemen retired for the night, leaving the guarding of the village to men from the division. That night, the soldiers, frustrated by what they believed to be a lack of will on the part of the Military Police to find the murderer, resolved to take matters into their own hands. The division elected a "deputation" which went to the village seeking "justice". It is unlikely that only New Zealanders were part of this deputation. The sources all suggest that members from many different units in the Anzac Mounted Division participated in the raid. Trooper W. Daubin wrote in his diary "Last night a united force from various units raided and burnt a village and Bedouin camp", while in his interview, W.H. Owers specifically

---
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referred to seeing men from the Ayrshire Battery making their way towards Surafend. In their interviews Ben Gainfort remarked that the soldiers of an English infantry division nearby refused to parade and apprehend those taking part, and H. Porter specifically mentioned the Australians taking part in the raid. The number of men involved in the raid is contentious. W.H. Owers believed that about fifty men took part, while in their books, A.H. Wilkie and T. Andrews gave a figure of around two hundred. There is no evidence specifically noting how big Surafend was to act as a guide as to how many men would be needed in the raid. However, C.L. Malore recorded in his diary that the "normal size of [a] village [was] 400-500". If this were the case with Surafend, it is likely that Owers could be the more accurate, and almost certain that the estimated totals in Wilkie's and Andrews' books were too high. The soldiers surrounded the village to prevent the Arabs from leaving. The raiders then entered and demanded the headman. When he appeared, the soldiers ordered him to hand over the murderer. This he refused to do. Surafend's inhabitants were divided according to age and gender, all women, children, and old men being placed outside the village under guard. The soldiers within the village then began to beat the Arab men with clubs and gun traces in punishment for Lowry's death, killing some and wounding many more. No shots were heard, suggesting that firearms were not used. In Behind the Lines, Nicholas Boyack alleges that the Arabs were mutilated by the soldiers, some of them being castrated before they were murdered. This allegation is only supported by one source, Ted Andrews in his book Kiwi Trooper. It is a surprising allegation given that all of the men interviewed by Boyack denied that the Arabs were castrated. When asked by Boyack if any of the Arabs were castrated, Ben Gainfort replied "no, they were not that callous. I would not think that was right". The lack of evidence suggests that the Arabs were not castrated. Once the soldiers had completed their physical punishment of the Arabs, the soldiers set the village alight before returning to their camp.

A Court of Inquiry was convened the next day in order to investigate the sacking of the village and murder of its inhabitants. It ascertained almost nothing. A number of men appeared before it, but they were either unable or unwilling to give evidence as to who had, and had not, taken part in the raid. The entire division was placed under arrest, with those who broke bounds liable to be shot. All leave was stopped, all awards yet to be presented were postponed
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indefinitely, and Arabs were forbidden to enter the camp. On 16 December the division was ordered to parade on the plain of Richon le Zion. Field Marshall Allenby, General Chaytor, and their respective Aides de Camps, rode through the Division and into the bare ground in the middle. Allenby then proceeded to address the Division, calling its members cowards and murderers. He concluded by saying: "Officers, Non Commissioned Officers, and men of the Anzac Mounted Division I was proud of you once. I am proud of you no longer!" Allenby and Chaytor then turned their horses and rode out of the parade ground, followed by their Aide de Camps.

A very different version of this parade claimed that Allenby and Chaytor were "counted out" and forced to flee for their own safety. This story is presented by both Boyack and Andrews in their books, and by Porter and Owers in their interviews. It is an appealing story as it demonstrates the "typical" Colonial disregard for discipline, their commanders, and the British, indicating the New Zealanders' and the Australians' emerging nationalism and their independence. However, it is unlikely to have happened. There is a decided lack of evidence to support Boyack's claims. Only two out of the nine interviews conducted by Boyack support Allenby being "counted out". The remaining seven deny the event ever occurred. Only two books examined mention the event taking place, Boyack's seemingly being based upon Andrews'. The only diary entry discovered that records the parade does not mention Allenby being "counted out". Instead, Daubin wrote "11am parade and got a big lecture from General Allenby about village". Such an event as counting out Allenby would almost certainly have been recorded. The characters of Allenby and Chaytor must also be considered. Allenby was known as "The Bull" and Chaytor as "Fiery Ted". Neither were the type to back down from a confrontation, especially an event as serious as wholesale murder and mass indiscipline. It is unlikely that they would have during the parade. It is also unlikely that the officers of the Division would have sanctioned and supported Allenby and Chaytor being "counted out" by the men. Chris Pugsley made the point that such support by the officers would have destroyed discipline and respect within the brigade and the division. It is certain that the soldiers of the A.M.D. resented Allenby's words, but it seems equally certain that the "counting out" event did not take place. Because it is unlikely that this event ever took place, it would be irresponsible to try and use it to indicate any form of nationalism and independence within the Dominion units.
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From the evidence contained within the sources it is possible to discern several of the motivating factors for the raid. Dislike of the Arabs was almost certainly one of these factors. This dislike must be examined in conjunction with Said's theories and the common frustration experienced by the soldiers at the antipathy of the Military authorities. The Imperial soldiers maintained a vehement dislike towards all Arabs in the Middle East, and believed themselves to be superior to the Arabs. They took every opportunity to express this belief. Arabs had been portrayed in literature as fit only to be ruled, and this literature had circulated throughout the British Empire. Because of the official British policy towards the Arabs, many soldiers believed that crimes suspected to have been committed by Arabs were often not investigated, or that the culprits were not punished sufficiently. Indeed, Moore goes so far as blame the raid on Surafend on the British Authorities for not installing enough respect for the Briton into the Arabs. These crimes included such actions as the desecrating of soldiers' graves, shooting at soldiers, looting of battlefields, and the theft of soldiers' equipment. Most soldiers took the perceived lack of attention paid to these "crimes" by the authorities as an affront to their superiority, and by 1918 many of the soldiers had become intensely disgruntled. This disgruntlement, remarked upon in so many of the sources, contributed a major factor to the raid. Through violence, the soldiers could vent their anger at the Arabs, avenge Lowry's death, revenge themselves upon the Arabs for their past "crimes", and reaffirm the soldiers' superiority and position in society.

As well as these local factors, the raid on Surafend was partly caused by Imperial policies towards the Arab and Jewish inhabitants of the Middle East. During the war, the Allied Powers, and Britain in particular, had made several contradictory declarations with regards to the future of the Middle East after the war. In some of the declarations, such as the Balfour Declaration of 2 November 1917, the British Government under D. Lloyd George seemingly gave its support to an independent Jewish state. In others, such as the Hogarth Message of 4 January 1918, and the Anglo-French Declaration of November 1918, the British Government seemed to favour the establishment of an independent Arab state. The publication of the secret treaties by the Bolshevik Government in Moscow in late 1917 further confused the situation. By these treaties, Anatolia and the Middle East were to be partitioned into spheres of
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influence, controlled and governed by Great Britain, France, Imperial Russia, and Italy once the war had ended. These treaties had been made in 1916, and were known as the Sykes-Picot Agreement. By 1918 the Arabs knew of these proposals, counter proposals, and declarations. At the conclusion of the Great War, a delegation of Arabs travelled to Paris to take part in the Peace Conference with the aim of securing an independent Arab state. They were to be largely disappointed, as Great Britain and France partitioned the Middle East under the League of Nation's Mandate system, indicating that Britain had not abandoned its attempts to gain control of the area.

While these diplomatic manoeuvring's were taking place, Arab nationalism grew throughout the Middle East. Faysal, the son of the King of the Hejaz, led the movement in Syria, Mustapha Kemel in Turkey, Reza Khan in Persia, and Saad Zaghlul Pasha in Egypt. Britain, as the principal contributor to the Army of Occupation in the Middle East, was given the task of keeping order in the region, and preventing this nationalism from bubbling over into open rebellion.

It is against this back drop that the murder of Lowry took place. The apprehension of Lowry's murderer, or even an over-zealous investigation of the case, could have been used by the Arabs as a pretext for rebellion against British authority. Certainly, the potential for rebellion increased exponentially because of the raid on Surafend and the murder of its inhabitants, helping to explain Allenby's harsh words on 16 December 1918. This helps to explain the British policy. It may well be true that the authorities were lethargic in their investigation of Lowry's death. Placed in the broader context, the murder of one man was small compared to the acquisition of Iraq, Palestine, and Trans Jordan by Great Britain, the continued occupation of its pre-1914 Middle Eastern territory, and preventing a widespread rebellion. Britain was in
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85 By these agreements, Britain was to gain control over Mesopotamia, Jordan, and the ports of Haifa and Acre. France was to gain control over Syria and South Eastern Anatolia. Russia was to gain Constantinople, control of the Bosporus and Dardanelles, and Armenia. Italy was to gain South Western Anatolia. Palestine was to left under international control. By this plan, Turkey would end up truncated to only the North Western part of Anatolia. Fisher and Ochsenwald, p 385.

86 The mandate system was a means by which a country could gain control over a region without outright annexation. The mandatory power, that is the one in control of the region, was required to submit a report each year on the state of the territory it controlled to the League of Nations. Mandates were classified A, B, or C. Category A Mandates were those most likely to gain self-government and independence, while category C were those unlikely to gain independence. The mandated territory of the Middle East comprised the modern states of Israel, Iraq, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. Great Britain received Palestine (Israel), Trans Jordan (Jordan), and Iraq. France gained Syria and Lebanon. All were category A, though only Trans Jordan and Iraq were to gain independence in the inter-war period.

87 The King of the Hejaz, Sherif Husayn, had been instrumental in the Arab Rebellion during the Great War against the Ottoman Empire, and all the Arab irregulars who fought alongside Lawrence were nominally under Husayn. Faysal, his son, was Husayn's deputy, and had travelled with the Arab army. Soon after capturing Damascus, Faysal was elected by the Syrians (comprising people from the modern states of Syria, Israel, Palestine, and Lebanon) as their King. This caused considerable tension with first the British and then the French. The situation was resolved when Faysal's administration went bankrupt and French soldiers dispersed his followers by force.

88 In this, Britain was unsuccessful; for rebellion broke out in Egypt in 1919, and Iraq in 1920. Unrest also prevailed in Palestine, beginning in 1920.
no position, financially, militarily, or psychologically, to fight another war for the purpose of gaining control of the Middle East. The larger diplomatic context helps to explain both Allenby's reaction to the raid and his treatment of the Division. Allenby's task was to keep the peace in the Middle East when faced with simmering resentment and possible widespread rebellion. A massacre of those he was attempting to rule by those he was using to keep the peace meant that he was unlikely to let the matter pass by.

One of the motivating factors for the attack on Surafend was the New Zealanders' opinions of Palestine's Jewish inhabitants. The Jews encountered by the Imperial soldiers in Palestine fell into three main groups. The first were those who had lived in Palestine for centuries. The second group were those who fought in the two Jewish regiments of the E.E.F. The third group were those who had settled in Palestine relatively recently as part of the Zionist Programme of Model Settlements.

The attitude of the New Zealanders towards the first group of Jews can be summed up easily. The New Zealanders had only contempt for the Jewish community which had been in Palestine for centuries. This contempt was especially evident when the soldiers visited Jerusalem. Comments about these Jews describe them invariably as having a bad physique, as being money grasping, and as living in unsanitary conditions. Jewish traders in Jerusalem were believed to have greatly inflated their prices as soon as the town was liberated by the British Army, and this belief led to contempt of the Jewish traders on par with that of the Arab traders. These Jews were also seen as dirty and thieving. The opinions held of the Jewish traders predisposed the soldiers to view them in the same light as they viewed the Arabs. The reasons for this are similar to why the Arabs were treated so badly: the "White Man's Burden" and the generally held feeling of superiority towards the Middle East's inhabitants.

Contempt is easily recognisable with respect to the soldiers of the two Jewish regiments. Jews residing in the British Empire were encouraged to volunteer and join these units, and eventually two regiments were formed. These regiments were nicknamed the Jordan Highlanders, and they took part in several actions and raids with the A.M.D. The fighting value of these regiments was believed to be low, and the New Zealanders soon had contempt for them. In his interview, Francis Jamieson of the A.M.R., said that the Jews "were not very good soldiers. A lot of them would crack up or go off sick". Edwin McKay, of the same regiment, wrote that the New Zealanders belittled Jewish soldiers, and as a consequence the New Zealanders were nicknamed by the Jews as "the lessor breeds without the law".

89 Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 6, p 15.
91 E.C. McKay, Diary, p 157, Accession Number 1998-31, ID Number 38291, WAM. The three most famous of these actions were the First Raid on Amman, the Raid on Es Salt, and the Second Raid, and subsequent capture, of Amman.
92 F.R. Jamieson, OH AB 484, ATL.
93 This is, of course, a direct quotation from one of Rudyard Kipling's poems. E.C. McKay, diary, p 157, Accession Number 1998-3, ID Number 38291, WAM.
Jewish Regiments were viewed negatively because of their perceived lack of fighting ability. As part of Chaytor's force, the New Zealanders and the Jewish regiments had to fight and rely on each other. The Jewish soldiers proved unreliable several times, and this fact alone would have strained the relationship between the two groups.94

The New Zealanders had a completely different attitude towards the Jews of the New Model Settlements. New Model Settlements were established by the Zionist Congress under the sponsorship of prominent Jews as a means of repopulating Palestine with Jews. The process was adopted by the First World Zionist Congress in 1897 at Basle. This Congress aimed "to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law".95 Jews from all over the world came to Palestine and resettled, living together in communities. These communities were based on agriculture, with wine production and orange cultivation being the common economic base.96 The New Zealanders encountered several of the Model Settlements during their advance through Palestine, including Ras die Ran and other villages around Ayun Kara, but Richon le Zion was the most important. New Zealanders first encountered the Jews of Richon le Zion when they liberated the town from the Turks in their advance towards Jaffa. The N.Z.M.R. were greeted with joy and friendship by the town's inhabitants. Rachel Gordon, a young girl living in Richon le Zion, wrote an essay to express the relief of the inhabitants at having been freed from Turkish rule. She wrote:

I watch all the present life, thinking we must hope now, because these British men bring such hope into our homes and cheer us up ... it is seven months since we were freed from the Turkish masters, and all this time the new dawn is approaching ... one can hardly realise the freedom we enjoy when comparing it with those years of slavery.97

Alex McNeur, in a letter, wrote "Jews here in Richon le Zion have been very decent to us and appear to be a good class of working people".98 In his interview, William Porter was very impressed with the Jews of Richon le Zion, and said that "we had a very pleasant stay there".99 McNeur aptly summed up the affinity which the New Zealanders felt towards the Jews of Richon le Zion in a letter. On 1 March 1918 he wrote that after seeing a Jewish ceremony at Richon le Zion, he believed that the New Zealand soldiers had died for good cause, indicating that he believed the sacrifice of lives and money for freeing Palestine from Turkish rule was worthwhile.100 During November and December 1918, the New Zealanders were again
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camped outside Richon le Zion, waiting for their demobilisation and shipping back to New Zealand. While there, they reaffirmed and renewed the earlier ties with the inhabitants of Richon le Zion.

Grateful and joyous welcoming of the N.Z.M.R. was not confined to Richon le Zion. In other areas the Jews welcomed the New Zealanders. In his diary, C.L. Malore wrote that he was very impressed with the village of Ras die Ran, and described it in great detail, mentioning the settlement's huge vineyards, stone houses, running water, church, shops, and orchards.\footnote{C.L. Malore, 18/11/1917, diary, WAM.}

When Jaffa was liberated, James McMillan wrote that the Jews there "greeted the New Zealanders with great enthusiasm."\footnote{J. McMillan, "Forty Thousand Horsemen", p 188, Accession Number 1997.503, WAM.} The overall tone of the New Zealand and Australian soldiers when they describe these Jewish settlements is very complementary. The \textit{Kia Ora Coo-ee} published several articles praising the Jewish system of colony settlement, and the way their villages were set out.\footnote{\textit{Kia Ora Coo-ee}, issue 4, p 13; issue 5, p 3; issue 6, p 2.}

C.L. Malore stated that the "houses and pretty gardens of Jewish colonies form a very pleasant contrast with Eastern villages".\footnote{C.L. Malore, "Discussion on Palestine", diary, WAM.}

The reasons for these attitudes towards the Jews of the New Model Settlements are easy to discover. Almost all the settlers in these villages had come from Europe.\footnote{P.T. Enright, "New Zealand's involvement in the partitioning of Palestine and the creation of Israel, M.A., Otago, 1982, p 69.} Their villages were constructed along Western lines and made from Western materials. The soldiers of the A.M.D. recognised the villages and felt a strong affinity with their inhabitants. The houses, gardens, and amenities of the villages presented the soldiers from New Zealand, Australia, and the United Kingdom with a familiar set of surroundings. This view was strengthened when the villages of the Jewish settlements were compared to those of the Arabs, where the prevailing pattern of village layout, construction, and amenities had not changed for centuries, and appeared alien to many of the soldiers. The economic base of the villages, being agricultural, also appealed to the soldiers. Those from Australasia came from countries with a predominantly agricultural base, adding to the familiarity which they soldiers experienced when they rode through the Model Settlements and interacted with their inhabitants. The people who lived in these villages must also be remembered. There would have been more European language speakers in the N.Z.M.R. than Arabic speakers, leading to an ease of communication unavailable to the soldiers with regards to the Arabs. The fact that the Jewish settlers were predominantly of European descent must also have contributed to the affinity the soldiers felt with the inhabitants. Both groups were strangers in a strange land, leading to a camaraderie developing, a manifestation unlikely under other circumstances. The attitude of the settlers towards the soldiers also contributed to the good relationship. The feeling of relief which the settlers possessed at being liberated from the Ottoman Empire, and the role played by the
Imperial soldiers as liberators, led to a warm relationship based on gratitude quickly developing.

These settlements provided an all important comparison between the Jews and Arabs, revolving around what the soldiers believed to be good and bad in Palestine. This is most aptly indicated by C.L. Malore in his diary. New Zealanders saw Richon le Zion's inhabitants as industrious, hard working, clean, but above all civilised. This civilisation factor is easily seen when the descriptions of the Jewish villages are examined. Contrast these descriptions with those of the Arabs, focussing on the filth, dirt, and the profoundly "uncivilised" nature of the Arab villages, and the importance of the Jews of Richon le Zion become immediately apparent. The positioning of the A.M.D.'s camp between the Arab and Jewish villages enabled the soldiers to reaffirm this contrast every day, intensifying their dislike of the Arabs. For the soldiers, the Jews had only recently arrived in Palestine, had started with few possessions, yet they had built modern and prosperous settlements. This was in direct contrast to the Arabs, who had been in Palestine for centuries, had achieved little, and had remained poor. The contrast between the two groups, and the intensifying of the hatred of the Arabs which it caused, had important consequences when Lowry was murdered. The intensification of feelings against the Arabs helped in convincing the soldiers that the raid on Surafend was justified, for the soldiers were merely killing uncivilised men. The Arabs had "proven" this to the soldiers in the long term by their way of life, and in the short term by their conduct during the war and their murder of Lowry.

The E.E.F. contained a number of units from British India, most of which were recruited from Nepal, the Punjab, and Northern India. Following the German Spring Offensive in 1918, the number of British Indian units in Palestine expanded considerably as English units were withdrawn for service on the Western Front. The attitude of the New Zealanders towards these Indian soldiers provides further evidence of their Imperial mindset and attitude. It suggests that the soldiers had been exposed to, and had absorbed, a considerable amount of Imperial racial ideology.

Without question, the many fighting units of British India in the Middle East were well regarded by the New Zealanders. The New Zealanders had nothing but praise for the Sikhs of the Punjab. New Zealand soldiers encountered the Sikhs first in Gallipoli, then in the Western Desert, as infantry in Palestine, and again as cavalry while on duty in the Jordan Valley. Stanley Brailsford, R.G. Greive, and Edwin McKay indicated their opinions of the Sikhs in letters and letters and...
diaries. While campaigning against the Senussi in the Western Desert, Brailsford wrote in his diary "the more we see of them [Sikhs] the better we like them. They bare their illness with great stoicism and without a murmur". In a letter published in the *Otago Daily Times*, Greive described the Sikhs as brave fighters and very good company. McKay, a Lance Corporal in the A.M.R., believed the Sikhs to be "splendid types" and "good company". The admiration of the Sikhs was mirrored in the New Zealanders attitude towards the Ghurkha regiments of Nepal. Brailsford believed them to be "little" and "great", and very good fighters. In his unpublished biography, T.M. Holden praised the Ghurkhas' prowess in war. He wrote "their whole bearing shows love of war and their keenness for the job at hand". A letter from F.R. Teague, written during the Gallipoli campaign, described the Ghurkhas as "fine chaps ... as happy and as jolly as a lot of schoolboys".

There was only one New Zealand source which did not favourably describe the Indian units. This is A.B. Moore's book *The Mounted Riflemen of Sinai and Palestine*. Moore described the bombing of a transport, and hence non-combatant, unit. During an air-raid, the transport men panicked and ran from the scene of the bombing, leaving their camels tethered and a prime target for the German aircraft. A New Zealand officer had to control the camel transport men by riding around them on his horse, whipping them. Moore condemned the cowardice of these Indians in his book.

Sir Harry Gullett and Frank Reid provided examples of how the British Indian units were viewed by the Australians in the Middle East. Reid especially praised the relationship between the Cameliers and the Hong Kong and Singapore Mountain Battery, known affectionately by the Cameliers as the "Bing Boys". Reid described the relationship between the two groups, writing

There was a remarkable bond of friendship between the Indians in the battery and the men in the camel battalions. These sturdy and well trained Sikhs and Mohammedans were mostly ex-Indian Army regulars and on many occasions they displayed such reckless bravery under enemy shell fire that they soon earned the admiration of the Cameliers.

Gullett wrote in similar glowing terms when he described the relationship between the Australians and Indians in *Australia in Palestine*. In this book Gullett wrote "The strong bond which sprang up so quickly between the Light horsemen and the Indians was perhaps the
strangest of all his new friendships. They were divided by colour, the language barrier was absolute, and most unpromising of all, there was the barrier of caste... But the barriers, though they seemed insurmountable, were miraculously surpassed." \textsuperscript{118} The Australian admiration for the Indians seems to easily match that of the New Zealanders.

The opinion of the English soldiers is very similar to that of both the Australians and the New Zealanders: admiration mixed with warm friendship. In his autobiography, \textit{Palestine 1917}, Richard Wilson described his impressions of the Indian cavalry. "Already there is a minimum of white cavalry here, and we are mixed up with Indians - really good soldiers who fight like tigers." \textsuperscript{119} Vivien Gilbert, in \textit{The Romance of the Last Crusade}, also included a reference to the Indians, focussing on their prowess in war. "I must say our new recruits [Indians] turned out keen soldiers, quick and eager to learn." \textsuperscript{120}

Within these opinions expressed by the New Zealand, Australian, and English soldiers, there is considerable evidence supporting the view that there was a common Imperial mindset, beliefs, and ties. This evidence revolves around the idea of India's Martial Races, and many examples can be found of remarks being made by the soldiers that correspond directly to the Martial Race mythology.

The belief that India possessed "Martial Races" was first officially mooted in the Eden Commission of 1879 which stated that: "The Punjab is the home of the most martial races of India and is the nursery of our best soldiers." \textsuperscript{121} It was adopted as a recruiting strategy in 1885 when Lord Roberts transformed the four armies of British India into the one unified Indian Army. \textsuperscript{122} The Martial Race mythology maintained that the various communities of British India were separate races, some of which were predisposed to fighting than others. \textsuperscript{123} Roberts wished to recruit from only those communities which he believed produced the best soldier material. Like the British Indian authorities, Roberts believed that those communities which inhabited the south of India made poor soldiers, while the best soldiers came from the north, especially around the Punjab, Nepal, and North West Frontier Province. The communities of the north were divided and subdivided by region and by caste in order to discover which part of a particular region possessed the best soldiers. A process was began whereby the Indian Army was quickly restructured to reflect the Martial Races idea, with Bengali, Tamil, Mahratta, and Telagus regiments being replaced by those comprised of men from the North and North West of India.

\textsuperscript{118} Gullett and Barrett (eds), \textit{Australia in Palestine}, Sydney, 1919, p 21
\textsuperscript{119} R. Wilson, \textit{Palestine 1917}, Tunbridge Wells, 1987, p 119
\textsuperscript{120} V. Gilbert, \textit{The Romance of the Last Crusade}, London, 1936, p 219
\textsuperscript{122} Omissi, p 12.

The Indian Army came into being during the tenure of Lord Roberts in 1885. Before that, India had possessed four armies, based in Madras, Bombay, Bengal, and the North West Frontier. This policy had been adopted so that if one army mutinied, the other three would be available to reassert British Control. Roberts removed this outdated structure, believing that the primary purpose of the army in India was not to keep the Indians loyal to their Queen-Empress, but to protect the Indian Empire from the Russian Army.

By 1914 the Indian Army was almost entirely composed of Sikhs, Ghurkhas, and men from the North West Frontier Province.

In order to recruit the right type of men from the right areas, a number of handbooks were written by the Government of India intended to inform the Indian Army and its recruiters of the Martial Races of India. In his *Handbook on the Sikhs*, Falcon made a number of comments about the Sikhs:

The Sikh is a fighting man and his fine qualities are best shown in the army which is his natural profession. Hardy, brave and of intelligence; too slow to understand when he is beaten; obedient to discipline; attached to his officers and careless of caste prohibitions, he is unsurpassed as a soldier in the East ... The Sikh is always the same, ever genial, good tempered and uncomplaining, as steady under fire as he is eager for the charge.

George MacMunn, the author of *The Martial Races of India*, wrote this description of the Ghurkha: "As a fighting man, his slow wit and dogged courage give him many of the characteristics of the British soldier at his best." The Martial Races were believed to be childlike and possessed of a great simplicity, devoted to their British officers and unquestioning in their obedience to their orders.

The process of how the Martial Race mythology was adopted by the public was very similar to how the public adopted the "expert opinions" about the Oriental. Popular fiction writers and populist military novels and histories, as well as boys magazines adopted the opinions held on India's Martial Races. Through reading such literature the Martial Races mythology permeated to the general public, until they were accepted by many as the truth. A general view of the Martial Races is given in Stephen Cohen's book *The Indian Army, its contribution to the development of a nation*. Dogras were shy and proud, Sikhs were prone to plotting and scheming but tenacious in defence, and Ghurkhas were playful and comical but crazed and bloodthirsty in battle.

Evidence that the Martial Race mythology was adopted by the soldiers of the British Empire can easily be found when the above remarks of the soldiers about the Sikhs and the Ghurkhas are matched with the Martial Race mythology. These comments were not confined to the New Zealanders, but can also be found in the opinions of English and Australians. With respect to the Ghurkhas, the comments correspond almost directly to the mythology. Teague
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and Holden described them as happy, jolly, schoolboyish, and brilliant fighters.\footnote{F.R. Teague, letter, 14/3/1915, NA WA Series 255 Item W1445 and T.M. Holden, chapter 4, p 4, MS 2223, ATL.} These comments are very similar to the mythology, where praise of their fighting prowess was invariably expressed, as was their childlike devotion to their officers and to life when away from the firing line.\footnote{Cohen, p 51 and Omissi, pp 26-7.} A similar correlation is immediately apparent when the Sikhs are examined. New Zealanders admired the Sikhs for their soldierly bearing, their ability at fighting, and their uncomplaining nature.\footnote{Otago Daily Times (Dunedin) 24 February 1916, p 6 and S. Brailsford, 30/11/1915, Accession Number 1990.2491, WAM.} The Australians commented on the Sikhs' reckless abandon during battle and their warm friendship towards the Light Horsemen.\footnote{Reid, p 28 and Gullett, The Australian Imperial Force in Sinai and Palestine, p 596.} The English soldier Wilson did not mention a specific group of Indians, but did describe them as good soldiers and praised their prowess in battle. Again, according to the mythology, the Sikhs were supposed to be brave to the point of foolhardiness, fighting to the last man, and were cheerful and uncomplaining when not in battle.\footnote{Cohen, p 51.} The similarity of the New Zealand, Australian, and English views to the Martial Race mythology indicates once more that many of the New Zealanders accepted the mythology and its attendant Imperial ideology.

Perhaps the best piece of evidence to support the idea that the New Zealanders accepted and believed the Martial Races mythology is the incident between the New Zealand officer and the Indian Transport Cameliers described in Moore's book.\footnote{Moore, The Mounted Riflemen of Sinai and Palestine, p 43.} The contempt shown by the New Zealand officer for the Indians is understandable when viewed in relation to the Martial Races mythology. The Indians in question came from the Bikanir Camel Corps, and their task was carrying supplies and provisions from the supply depots to the soldiers and horsemen in the front line.\footnote{Government Press and Survey of Egypt, A brief record of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force under the command of General Sir H.H. Allenby, Cairo, 1919, p 74.} Bikanir is a region of Southern India, an area where, according to the mythology, Martial Races would not be found. Roberts clearly stated this when he wrote "The men of Southern India fell far short, as a race, in possessing the courage and military instincts of the men of North India". It is not surprising that the men from Bikanir were therefore placed into non-combatant units, such as supply trains. The idea that men from the South of India could not and should not fight had been in existence for over thirty years before the incident in Moore's book. As southerners, the men from Bikanir were believed to be tentative, cowardly, and even more dull witted than those from the north. The Bikanirs' obvious concern for their own safety, and not the safety of their camels, provided "evidence" for these stereotypes. The New Zealand officer would have known of these "characteristics" of the Bikanirs before the incident occurred. The air-raid merely confirmed the Martial Races mythology and the officer's own opinion of the Bikanirs.
An interesting comparison of racial attitudes can be made between the N.Z.M.R. and the New Zealand soldier of the Second World War, using Bryan Dunne's thesis on the New Zealand soldiers as tourists in World War Two.\textsuperscript{138} The New Zealand soldiers of the Second World War seem to have been every bit as prejudiced as those of the First, voicing their dislike and hostility towards the Arab inhabitant of the Middle East. Dunne's thesis abounded with derogatory comments regarding the Egyptians, including "Wogs on every hand ready to cheat us for our last acker. Egypt can keep its ancient traditions and everything it owns. I will be happy to say goodbye to it and forget I have ever seen it or its black bastards." and that the New Zealanders' views of the Egyptian was "one of contempt".\textsuperscript{139} Just as in the First World War, the soldiers of the Second believed that the Arabs were cheating them in the bazaars, and their reaction was remarkably similar. "Justice" was dispensed for alleged wrongs, and punishments were awarded to the Arabs, with the soldier frequently recovering more than what he believed he had lost.\textsuperscript{140} This is almost exactly the same as what the N.Z.M.R. did, as described in McNeur's letters. The New Zealanders of the 2nd Division also believed the Arabs to be thieves. When a tent was stolen from their camp in Syria, the official historian wrote that it was "a reminder that we were still in Arab territory and thus among thieves".\textsuperscript{141} The was only one significant difference found between the views on the Arabs in the First and Second World Wars. No distinction seems to have been made by the N.Z.M.R. regarding Arabs from different areas. They were all universally disliked. However, the soldiers of the 2nd New Zealand Division did divide up Arabs into geographical groupings, and believed that they had different qualities depending on their area of residence.

Like the soldiers of the Great War, the New Zealanders of the 2nd Division had a good opinion of the British Indian soldiers they encountered. John Kennedy, of the 4th Field Regiment, described the Indians as "magnificent specimens of manhood and as is fairly well known [they] are regarded as the Empire's crack troops of this war".\textsuperscript{142} Once more the New Zealanders concentrated upon the militaristic qualities of the Indians, indicating that the mythology of India's martial races continued to be widely believed. The 2nd Division viewed the Jewish traders in much the same way as the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. The traders were viewed as being unscrupulous and money grasping, with a soldier writing "they [the Jews] were making money in a safe refuge under the guarding hand of Britain ... I have found that the Jew is not keen to assist in any way, unless there is some profit in it for them".\textsuperscript{143} The opinions of the soldiers from the 2nd New Zealand Division were very similar to those voiced by the Mounted Rifles about the Jews who had lived in Palestine for centuries, recorded above.

\textsuperscript{139} Dunne, pp 61 and 66.
\textsuperscript{140} Dunne, p 66.
\textsuperscript{141} Dunne, p 109.
\textsuperscript{142} Dunne, p 64.
\textsuperscript{143} Dunne, p 109.
The meeting of so many different cultures in the Middle East gave the New Zealanders first hand experience of a very diverse group of people. Many of the soldiers were ignorant of the cultures of the Middle East, instead relying upon the information provided for them in popular texts and school books. These texts were often influenced by Imperial ideology, resulting in the New Zealanders having a definite Imperial attitude towards the Middle East. The New Zealanders were quick to form opinions of those cultures they encountered in the Middle East, and these were often derogatory and reflected their Imperial mindset. The New Zealanders felt a great dislike for the Arabs. They had a mixed response towards the Jews, enjoying the friendship of those that were Westernised, but disliking those who were "Oriental". In relation to the Indians, the New Zealanders felt a great camaraderie with those who fought and an antipathy towards those who did not. These views can generally all be traced back to the Imperial mentality and Imperial ties with Britain which New Zealand possessed as part of the British Empire.

The New Zealanders attitude towards the Arabs seems to have been based on what they had been taught about the Middle East long before the Great War. They had been taught to expect a certain type of people, living a certain life, and acting in a certain way. The soldiers had been taught to act in a certain way towards the Arabs. The New Zealanders followed these teachings, of this there can be little doubt. Their comments in diaries, books, letters, and their actions while in the Middle East all confirm this. The commonality of their views with regards to the Australians and the English further strengthen this view. Without the bonds and ties of Empire, it is unlikely that the attitudes of men living in England, Australia, and New Zealand would have been so similar. The raid on Surafend in December 1918 shows how the attitude of the soldiers had boiled over into rage, and how this rage too can be traced to Imperial factors. These factors included the way the soldiers had been treated as opposed to how they believed they should have been treated vis a vis the Arabs, their beliefs about the Arabs, and Britain's Imperialistic foreign policy to the Middle East. The attitude of the soldiers with regards to the Jews show some aspects of their Imperialistic mentality. Their support of the Jews in the Model Settlements indicates a direct correlation with the Balfour Declaration, while their treatment of the old Jews, those who had been in Palestine for centuries, indicates again the belief that Englishmen should be treated differently and with respect while in the Orient. With regards to the Indians, the New Zealanders again maintained Imperial opinions. Their obvious compliance with the Martial Race mythology indicates that the soldiers were again showing their Imperial upbringing. This is strengthened by the commonality between the views of Australians, New Zealanders, and Englishmen. It is unlikely that the New Zealanders would have exhibited so blatantly the Martial Race mythology if they had not been part of the British Empire, and under its ideological dominance. Certainly, their opinions would not have been as similar as those of the Australian and English soldiers without New Zealand's Imperial ties. The evidence
presented in the sources with regards to Arabs, Jews, and Indians all indicates that the New Zealand soldiers were Imperial soldiers, thinking and acting as Imperial soldiers ought.
Images of the Arabs

Figure 4 Photographs and sketches of Arabs encountered by Australian and New Zealand soldiers in Palestine. Note how the Arabs have been portrayed as dirty, poor, uncivilised, and backward.

H.S. Gullett and C. Barrett (eds), *Australia in Palestine*, Sydney, 1919, p 120.
Figure 5 Rural scenes of Arab Palestine.

Figure 6 Rural and urban Arabs.

Bedouins captured at Hassaniyer

Street market, Jerusalem

H.S. Gullett and C. Barrett (eds), *Australia in Palestine*, Sydney, 1919, p 133.
Figure 7 Arab children begging for money of an Australian Light Horse man.

"BAKSHISH"

H.S. Gullett and C. Barrett (eds), *Australia in Palestine*, Sydney, 1919, p 42.
Every person born in H.M. Dominions or on board a British ship, whatever the nationality of his parents may be, is a natural-born British subject.\(^1\)

Of course, if Great Britain should become involved, necessarily every portion of the Empire is at war.\(^2\)

There is every indication that this land is ours for keeps, and so it ought to be after all the fighting.\(^3\)

She [New Zealand] was to show the world that Britons of the most distant Dominion were the bone and flesh of the Motherland. Britain's menace was her menace.\(^4\)

This chapter is an investigation of what opinion the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. had of Britain and the British Empire. Three areas have been chosen for direct examination; the opinions the soldiers expressed about the British Empire, whether or not the soldiers supported Britain annexing Palestine, and if the soldiers viewed the campaign as a crusade. The soldiers' views are based upon their letters and diaries, and fall into two main groups. The first group was those who mentioned the British Empire, its annexation of Palestine, and crusading. These men all seem to have had a favourable opinion of the Empire, supported Britain's annexation of Palestine, and viewed the campaign as a crusade. The second group of soldiers did not mention these three areas at all. When the views of the soldiers who expressed an opinion are combined, a picture emerges of a proportion of the N.Z.M.R. supporting crusading, annexation, and the British Empire. This suggests that, for these soldiers with an opinion, imperialism was not wrong and believed themselves to be citizens of the British Empire, and not exclusively New Zealand citizens.

The press and politicians of New Zealand presented a similar view of the British Empire as the soldiers, though considerably more intense. They supported the concept of crusading in Palestine, annexation of the region, and the British Empire, their declarations on the topic being more jingoistic than the soldiers', who tended to be more muted in their opinions. This was also true for the campaign histories and books produced after the Great War.

The *Kia Ora Coo-ee*, produced as a magazine of the A.M.D., provided an interesting middle ground between the two. Its items were not as jingoistic in their opinions as the public

---

\(^1\) Army Council Instructions, 18/8/1916, NA AD 1 24/216.
\(^2\) *Otago Daily Times* (Dunedin), 1/8/1914, p 8.
\(^3\) A. McNeur to Archie, no date, MS Papers 4103, Alexander Turnbull Library (Hereinafter ATL).
media were, but they were more positive and supportive than those views apparent in the soldiers' diaries. Due to its official nature, the magazine must be viewed more circumspectly than the diaries and letters, but was probably more accurate in its views and opinions than the campaign histories, and was certainly more accurate than the press and politicians.

When Australian views on these topics are matched to the New Zealanders, it becomes evident that they were similar. The Australians do seem to have supported crusading, annexation, and the British Empire. This commonality suggests more than just a common response to the war. This argument is supported when the underlying set of values possessed by the soldiers are examined. Both groups had been exposed to similar propaganda, in schools and society at large, resulting in the majority of New Zealanders and Australians arriving in the Middle East with the same beliefs and opinions on the Empire. The similarity of views between the New Zealanders and the Australians suggests that the opinions held by them were common throughout the British Empire, and suggests they had been instructed by a common educational philosophy. The opinions expressed by the New Zealanders, and their similarity with the Australians indicates an Imperial mind set on the part of the N.Z.M.R.

The boys who were to become the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. were exposed to considerable imperial propaganda while growing up. This can be considered the root of the imperial opinions expressed by the soldiers in their letters, diaries, and books. The exposure to these media took many forms, some overt, but most of them subtle and easily absorbed. Songs and music were one of the more subtle methods of installing imperialism into society, and others included commemorative plates and tobacco. Others, such as school texts, were more overt and were intended to educate children into an imperialist mindset. This combination of overt and subtle was common throughout the Empire. New Zealand possessed a similar curriculum to Australia and Great Britain, and children were therefore inoculated with similar imperial views. When the New Zealanders went to Palestine, they already possessed an imperial mindset and focus.

Subtle forms of Imperial propaganda were common throughout the British Empire, and included mundane items such as music and tobacco. In the 1870's, sheet music became very popular, and thousands of cards, songs, ballads, and hymns were produced and distributed throughout the Empire. The songs revolved around Britain's military adventures in the late nineteenth century, and were written to appeal to the Empire's middle class, regardless of their residence. Bandstands were built throughout the Empire, and military and civil bands produced shows, usually with military and patriotic undertones. Large audiences attended these productions, exposing them to imperialist propaganda. Commemorative plates were very

---

popular, especially during the South African War, and featured maps and statistics of the Empire, pictures of the Royal Family, and the Royal Navy. Even such mundane items as tobacco tins and company names were used as vehicles of imperial propaganda. Cigarette card series featured naval ships, military uniforms, pictures of the Empire, and famous imperialists. The very names of the tobacco companies also expressed pride in the Empire and helped to dissimulate propaganda to the colonies and Dominions.

The more overt methods usually involved the printed word. Books involving travel, exploration, missionaries, and the military enshrined the imperial ethos and established hero worship for their subjects, these became the staple award at school and church prize givings, and Christmas presents. It is possible that these books were only partially, or never read, but it is impossible that the owners missed the exciting and dramatic cover illustrations, depicting an heroic and expanding age of Empire. At school, children in New Zealand were taught imperial history. Their heroes were Clive of India and Lord Nelson. School texts such as School Journal and Schoolmates contained articles about imperial adventures, and published improving articles concerning duty, honour, and valour. Above all, the children were taught about the Empire, and how it was their duty to be worthy citizens.

Schoolmates contained a large number of imperialistic articles through which the children were taught to read and write, history, geography, and mathematics. Poems published included Lord Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade", W. Henley's "England my England", and the Honourable Joseph Howe's "The flag of old England". Deeds that won the Empire was serialised and published over many issues. Songs featured themes of imperial unity and imperial battles. The Editor was a firm imperialist, and urged the readers to think of themselves as British citizens, writing "think what a privilege it is to be a British subject". He urged the boys and girls to establish branches of the Empire and Navy Leagues at their schools. School Journal was just as imperialistic as Schoolmates. Militaristic and imperialistic stories were in almost all issues, and events such as Lord Kitchener's visit and the
death of King Edward VII were given extensive coverage. Imperialistic songs were also featured.

Australia's school curriculum was very similar to New Zealand. Schools aimed to educate their children to become worthy of the British Empire. Teachers taught patriotism, national unity, duty to the Empire, and imperial unity. Songs, poems, and stories in schools were similar to those published in schoolmates. In the wider context, Australia was subjected to as much imperial propaganda as New Zealand and Great Britain. Juvenile literature featuring British ideals deluged the bookshops. The Australian press reprinted British articles and incorporated them into their own newspapers. Through this exposure, British ideals and modes of life were incorporated into Australian life just as they were in New Zealand.

These media are important as they subjected the population of Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, indeed the entire British Empire to a constant stream of Imperialistic propaganda. Children were educated and encouraged to become citizens worthy of the Empire, and the common articles around them in every day life reminded them constantly of their country's membership within that Empire. Their schooling seems to have been similar in both Australia and New Zealand, suggesting an Empire-wide set of values and of morals being taught to children. This suggests that the New Zealanders did not begin their active service with a unique set of opinions on the British Empire, but that their opinions were common to all other Dominions of the British Empire. The opinions which were contained in such school texts as Schoolmates and Schools Journal provide a means by which the views expressed by the soldiers during the war can be traced back to their root. The New Zealand soldiers entered their service in Palestine having been taught a particular set of values about the British Empire, values which were articulated in their diaries and letters.

The outbreak of war in 1914 saw an enormous wave of Imperial patriotism and jingoism sweep through many sectors of New Zealand society. Newspapers and politicians pledged New Zealand's loyalty to the Empire's cause, and throughout the war these people continued to pledge themselves to the war effort. Due to their position in society their opinions received considerable exposure through the press. The publication of books and campaign histories after the war provided another medium for writers to indicate their opinions on Empire. Almost all of these media praised the Empire and preached the justness of the war. When matched to the diaries and letters of the soldiers in the N.Z.M.R., it appears that the soldiers were more muted in their opinions of the Empire than the public media indicated. Those

18 School Journal, April 1910, p 67; June 1910, p 129.
19 For example see "Our glorious British Empire", School Journal, May 1910, p 110.
21 Andrews, p 32.
22 Andrews, p 10.
23 Andrews, p 11.
who left a record believed in the Empire, but it was not the jingoistic praising of the newspapers and politicians.

The crisis of July 1914 saw considerable speculation as to the likelihood of British involvement in a general European war. Offers of support for Great Britain began to arrive from all parts of the British Empire and New Zealand was no different from the other Dominions.24 Central to New Zealand's declarations was the idea that if Great Britain was at war, then so was the rest of the Empire. New Zealand as a Dominion of that Empire would also be at war.

Between 1 August and 4 August 1914, the Otago Daily Times printed declarations made by politicians and editors from New Zealand and the other Dominions pledging their loyalty to the Empire. On 1 August the Editor of the Otago Daily Times reiterated New Zealand's commitment to Britain if war became necessary, remarking

the Dominion of New Zealand is also ready, if need be, to take her part. The requisite machinery of the organisation of an expeditionary force from this part of the British Dominions was arranged by the early part of the year by the Ministry of Defence.25

The Editor justified New Zealand's involvement as loyalty to the Empire and to Great Britain., writing:

of course, if Great Britain should become involved, necessarily every portion of the Empire is at war with the forces that are opposed to the Mother Country. Of the solidarity of the Empire in such a contingency ample proofs are already being offered.26

Canada and Australia professed the same Imperial loyalty and issued statements of support and offered military expeditions to Great Britain. The Otago Daily Times printed these sentiments on 3 and 4 August. On 3 August, Australia's Prime Minister said "When the Empire is at war, so is Australia, and all the resources in Australia and the Empire are for the preservation and security of that Empire".27 Canada's declaration offered the immediate transfer of 20,000 soldiers to Great Britain if war was declared.28 New Zealand's Parliament left no ambiguity as to who would control the New Zealand army and naval units in wartime. On 10 August 1914, Prime Minister Massey said to Parliament "it must be understood that directly the force leaves New Zealand they are Imperial troops in every sense of the word and under Imperial

---

24 In 1914, the British Empire had four Dominions, each self governing with a Governor - General as the monarch's representative. These four Dominions were New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and South Africa. A semi Dominion also existed. This was Newfoundland. Though self governing, it had not acquired full Dominion status.
26 Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), 1/8/1914, p 8.
28 "Colonel Hughes [The Canadian Minister of Defence] announced that a force of 20,000 Canadians was ready to sail for Great Britain within a fortnight". Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), 3/8/1914, p 4.
authority". They were to fight as soldiers of the British Empire, and were to be under the direct control of Great Britain.

The statements printed in the *Otago Daily Times* indicate that one of the immediate reasons for New Zealand's direct involvement in the Great War was Imperial unity and loyalty to Great Britain. The idea of Great Britain fighting, but New Zealand not, seems not have been considered by New Zealand's press and Parliament. These Imperial ties were equally apparent in Canada and Australia, where Imperial loyalty and unity seem to have been equally large motivating factors in influencing their involvement in the Great War. It was not merely a case of legal and constitutional obligation, but a popular decision in each Dominion. For these countries, the preservation of the Empire and loyalty to Great Britain were important reasons for entering the war. Clearly New Zealand was not acting alone in its devotion to the British and Imperial cause, but was part of an Empire-wide movement. Once war was declared, Imperial ties seemed to have been reinforced in New Zealand. New Zealand's soldiers were placed by Parliament under the direct control of Great Britain. No consultation or approval was required by Westminster before they could be moved or sent into battle by Great Britain. This met little resistance.

During the Great War, the newspapers of New Zealand published many patriotic and Imperialistic items. Natalie Wright's thesis on the portrayal of the Central Powers in the Otago/Southland press indicated that this patriotism fluctuated over the years in its intensity, but it was always evident. The *Otago Daily Times* published articles and items of this type virtually every day. Imperial unity, the justness of the British cause, the evil of Britain's enemies, and the glory of fighting and dying for the Empire were large components of each issue. For the Editor, the soldiers who had died or been wounded during the Great War "have been faithful to the splendid tradition of the British Empire. They have proved themselves worthy of a great race". Following the Third Battle of Gaza, the Editor remarked "the British, with their character for honour and justice, will find many useful welcomes as they advance into this strange land". Accolades for the Empire and its soldiers flowed from the press and politicians at the war's end, and were published in the *Otago Daily Times*. Mr Malcolm, Clutha's Member of Parliament, said "Honour to our boys in France, in Palestine, in Mesopotamia, honour to the British Army, honour to the navy. long live the British Empire!". New Zealand's Prime Minister reiterated this praise, saying "proud as we are of America, her part has been as nothing in comparison with that of the Motherland".

---

29 *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, vol. 169 (10 August 1914), hereinafter *NZPD*, p 468
31 *Otago Daily Times* (Dunedin), 29/10/1917, p 4.
33 The third battle of Gaza took place in November 1917.
patriotism of the Editors and Members of Parliament could not questioned, as well as their views on citizenship and identity. The press and politicians believed New Zealanders to be British.

The campaign histories and personal experiences of ex-soldiers published after the Great War provided many examples of patriotism and loyalty to the Empire. This loyalty was expressed in the most elaborate and glowing way possible, sometimes outstripping the sentiments expressed by newspaper editors during the Great War. In his book on the A.M.R., C.G. Nicol wrote one of the most patriotic statements of loyalty discovered. Contained within this statement are declarations of loyalty, of patriotism, and, for Nicol, the reasons for New Zealand's involvement in the Great War.

The day had come she [New Zealand] was to prove her loyalty to King and Empire, when she was to assume the burden of a free nation within the Empire, when she was to show the world that Britons of the most distant Dominion were the bone and flesh of the Motherland. Britain's menace was her menace. Her sons were Britain's sons. Her offer of help to the limit of her power was as inevitable and as certain as the rising of the sun.35

Nicol's was not the only the book to contain statements of this type. A.H. Wilkie wrote in his book that the Main Body men were "New Zealand's first contribution to assist the Motherland in the fight for freedom".36 Colonel Powles, in the official history, reprinted General Maxwell's declaration that the first men to leave New Zealand were "volunteers who gave up everything, prepared to give up their lives for King and country".37 The British Empire is remembered fondly, and for the writers, the New Zealand soldiers were just as British as those born in Great Britain.

The view outlined in the campaign histories was also contained in A. Briscose Moore's book. Moore wrote in favourable terms about the British administrators and officials which governed Palestine in the wake of the E.E.F.'s advance. More was "pleased" when he saw how Gaza had revived as a centre of commerce under British control, and was impressed at how Jerusalem was rapidly becoming a thriving community following the Turks' expulsion.38 He praised the British administration throughout the region, and wrote that "everything was done to give the oppressed people confidence in the British administration".39

These views were echoed in books published by ex-Australian soldiers and their campaign histories. Praise of the Empire and its ability to govern the inhabitants of Palestine featured strongly in Oliver Hogue's book The Cameliers, Ioa Idriess' book The Desert

35 Nicol, p 1.
Columns. and W. Massey's book Allenby's Final Triumph. Hogue mentioned several times the benevolent British administration in Palestine, and wrote that "British colonial statesmanship is constructive, in striking contrast to the destructive incidence of Turkish misrule."\(^{40}\) Hogue went on to provide examples of how this rule was constructive.

One Armenian priest with tears in his eyes exclaimed 'The Turks held Jerusalem for hundreds of years and gave us nothing; the English have been here for a few months and have given us a permanent water supply. Long live England!' Somehow, I think that prayer finds an echo in the hearts of all the peoples of Palestine.\(^{41}\)

These statements present images of a benign and just rule, accepted by Palestine's inhabitants, as well as Hogue's own pride in the Empire and concurrence with British rule in Palestine. Idreiss recorded how impressed he was with the size and power of the British Army in Palestine, and was agreeably impressed with the British administration of the region.\(^{42}\) Massey, an Australian official war correspondent, wrote that the entire credit for the victory was Britain's. The glory was shared by no other nation. We incurred the responsibilities and paid the hundreds of millions the campaign cost us ... The work from start to finish was ours. The strategy was a British General's, and his plan was carried out to complete success by the courage and endurance of the British Empire's soldiers.\(^{43}\)

For Massey, there was no doubt as to the identity of the soldiers, or for whom the soldiers had been fighting. He praised the Empire, and was noticeably proud of its achievement against the Ottoman Empire in Palestine.

The views expressed in the Kia Ora Coo-ee were almost exclusively in support of the war and Great Britain, and praised the Empire and its individual components. Britain is often referred to as "the Motherland" and in "The Great Adventure", the soldiers who had died during the war had died so that "the Grand Old Flag which carries freedom and civilisation to every corner of the world shall still fly above those they have left behind".\(^{44}\) In the references to the Dardanelles campaign, the writers indicated that those who had died had died for the Empire. A poem on this theme contained the lines "Scarlet and glowing, emblems of youth's blood; Shed for the Empire, careless of price".\(^{45}\) Like the examples in books outlined above, the magazine carried articles, stories, and letters praising the work of British Engineers and administrators throughout the Middle East.\(^{46}\) Articles were written praising the war effort of the Empire. The A.M.R.'s commanding officer, Colonel Mackesey, wrote a series of articles entitled "Through
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\(^{41}\) Hogue, p 205.
\(^{42}\) I. Idreiss, The Desert Column, Sydney, 1951, pp 186 and 284.
\(^{43}\) W.T. Massey, Allenby's Final Triumph, London, 1920, p 20
\(^{44}\) Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 2, p 1.
\(^{45}\) Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 4, p 6.
\(^{46}\) For example see the letter from F.L. McFarlane, NZEF, about the port of Basra. Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 4, p 1.
the way of the Philistines". These were among the most patriotic and imperialistic articles contained in the magazine. Mackesey linked the Empire's prosecution of the war with Christianity, creating a blend of Imperialism heavily influenced by religion. He paid tribute to the British Empire during the war. According to Mackesey, by 1916, Britain had 

out organised the German's, raised and equipped an army in every way superior to the theirs, swept the seas clean of the German boasters and man for man beaten them all along the line. No other nation under heaven could have accomplished what Britain has done. Think of it. Believe in it. Preach it. Take pride in it. It is a guarantee for the future, and give God the glory.47

Mackesey's article showed graphically the pride which he had in the Empire, praised the efforts made by the Empire, and portrayed his belief in its association with God. Historical comparisons were used in order to show how powerful and important the Empire was, and how impressive its military conquests had been. Britain was portrayed as more successful than Napoleonic France, for Napoleon Bonaparte had tried and failed to conquer Palestine, whereas Britain had succeeded.48

The soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. who gave their opinion of the British Empire seem to have had a relatively muted view when compared to the public sources. There are no declarations of unending loyalty and patriotism such as Nicol's or Colonel Mackesey's. In the soldiers' diaries and letters, Britain and the British Empire seem to have been remembered fondly and without hostility. The tone is one of pride and nostalgia, but without the arrogance contained in the published sources. James McMillan, a Corporal in the C.M.R., described Great Britain as "Home" and the "Old Country", and referred to himself as British, indicating he thought himself British and not exclusively as a New Zealander.49 Trooper C. Pocock, of the C.M.R., wrote in his diary that he was "intensely proud" of the fact that Britain had established a protectorate over Egypt in December 1914.50 He was proud that he was able to take part in the march through Cairo, intended to proclaim Britain's might to the Egyptians. E.C. McKay, a Lance Corporal in the A.M.R., referred in his diary to Britain as the "Old Land", and remarked fondly upon Britain's "historic richness".51 While serving as the Assistant Adjutant General, Colonel Chaytor, later the commander of the N.Z.M.R. and then the Anzac Mounted division, issued a general order. This order presented Chaytor's views on the nationality and identity of the New Zealand soldiers, as well as his opinions of the British Empire. The order was published in November 1914, and included the lines "every member of the Force in Egypt is charged with the enormous responsibility of maintaining the prestige of the British race".52

47 Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 1, p 8.
48 Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 9, p 1.
50 C. Pocock, 19/12/1914, Diary, Accession Number 1998.310, WAM.
51 E.C. McKay, p 105, Diary, Accession Number 1998.31, WAM.
52 C. Pugsley, On the fringe of hell, Auckland, 1991, p 20
The views expressed in the public media, both during and after the war, were very different in intensity to those of the soldiers. Where the public media preached jingoistic unending loyalty and willing sacrifice, the soldiers' opinions were more muted. Many seem not to have left a record of their feelings for the Empire. For those that did, their respect and belief in the Empire was evident, but it was stripped of the rhetoric which was prevalent on the home front and the campaign histories. The commonality of the New Zealand soldiers' views with the Australian Light Horsemen is immediately apparent. Idreiss and Hogue both indicated their opinions of the British Empire, and they were similar to those of the New Zealanders. The commonality of these views indicates a common outlook on the Empire, as well as suggesting a common ideological upbringing during the years preceding the war as its root. Without this common ideological upbringing, it would be unlikely for the New Zealanders and the Australians to have had such similar views. For those soldiers who gave their opinions, such as Chaytor, McMillan, and McKay, they seem to have been citizens of the Empire, classifying themselves as British.

Soon after its entry into Palestine the press and public of the British Empire began to attach a new meaning to the E.E.F.'s advance. No longer were the Imperial soldiers merely fighting the Turks. Instead it had become engaged in a continuation of the Medieval Crusades. The E.E.F.'s aim became, not only the defeat of the Turkish army, but the deliverance of the Holy City of Jerusalem into Christianity. The press soon mixed this aim with Imperialism, and the E.E.F. was now conquering the Holy Land for Britain and Christianity. Several soldiers provided their opinions on this issue, giving their support to a crusade against the Turks by the British Army. This suggests that some of the N.Z.M.R. favoured the idea of conquering Palestine for Great Britain, for it is hard to have a crusade without occupying territory.

The Editor of the Otago Daily Times believed in the comparisons between the Imperial Army and the crusaders of old. On 22 November 1917 the newspaper contained a long editorial where these comparison were made. The Editor wrote that the British forces were engaged "in an endeavour to rid the Holy Land of the curse of Turkish domination", and made a direct correlation between the crusades and the British Army, writing:

recognisable analogies are suggested by the mention of the crusades ... and the resemblance is not inaccurate; but truth to say, the story of the medieval crusades carries a tint of fancifulness and impracticality ... whereas the crusade of the present

53 The Medieval Crusades began in response to the capture of Jerusalem by the Seljuk Turks in 1077. There were 8 crusades, of which the First was the most successful. The First Crusade of 1096-99 saw the capture of the main cities of Palestine and the re-introduction of Christian rule in Jerusalem. Four Crusader states were established: The Kingdom of Jerusalem, the County of Edessa, the County of Tripolis, and the Principality of Antioch. These states were progressively destroyed by the Muslim armies. Jerusalem was captured by Egyptian armies under Saladin in 1187, and the last Crusader city, Acre, was captured by Mameluks from Egypt in 1291.
hour is controlled by the spirit of reasoned justice and substantial humanitarianism.  

Soon after the capture of all Palestine these comparison multiplied. On 4 November 1918, the Editor wrote "The Holy Land had been liberated from the bondage of the unspeakable Turk, and now the Union Jack flew over the Holy City". Many churches in New Zealand echoed the Editor. The Reverend W.A. Hay wrote "The Turkish Empire was splashed with blood and every page of her history drenched in blood", while the Arch Bishop of Canterbury ordered a thanksgiving service to be held when Jerusalem was captured from the Turks.

In the books published after the war written about the N.Z.M.R., the idea of the New Zealanders being modern crusaders remained. Moore used this exact phrase, describing the soldiers as "modern crusaders", and Wilkie described them as "crusaders of the southern cross". Powles and Robertson linked the crusading ideal and Imperialism into one entity. Powles wrote "and now with their faces towards the Holy Land came out glorious youth of the southern cross, beginning the modern crusade that was to wrest once more the Holy City from the hands of the Turks". Powles also described the First Battle of Gaza as the beginning of the Tenth Crusade. Moore entitled his history of the campaign as "the story of New Zealand's crusaders". In his book, Robertson wrote:

The bodies of the men of the B.E.F., from Great Britain, South Africa, India, Australia, and New Zealand - the modern crusaders who gave up their lives in helping to free the Holy Land from the rule of the Turks - are laid to rest in a spot which overlooks the Holy City and its hallowed surroundings.

These views were repeated and echoed in the Australian published sources, suggesting that the Australian soldiers too were seen as modern crusaders by their public, or wished to be portrayed that way. Oliver Hogue described the graves of three New Zealanders as those of "three gallant Irish-Colonial crusaders". Sir Harry Gullett mentioned the crusading ideal in connection with the E.E.F., tying together the route and sites occupied by the Imperial Armies with those places associated with the crusaders and Christ.

---
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The Kia Ora Coo-ee also mentioned the crusading ties. Poetry contained within the magazine often described the soldiers as crusaders, with lines such as "Oh the new crusading Anzacs" and "the last crusade in Palestine". A poem published was entitled "The conquering pilgrimage", drawing a parallel between the entire campaign and the crusades. When the campaign was over, the magazine published a series of articles written by W.T. Massey which drew a more blatant comparison: "The most impressionable of us must have been thrilled at the prospect of liberating [Palestine] ... from tyranny and oppression". An excerpt from the acting Australian Prime Minister was published making the crusading parallel. He said "nothing has brought more joy to the English speaking world than the cleaning up of Palestine".

There are more comments and opinions recorded in the diaries and letters of the New Zealand soldiers about being modern-day crusaders than there were about the British Empire. Edwin McKay described the actions of Colonel Mackesey when he reached the border of Palestine and Egypt. Mackesey took off his hat, knelt to the ground, and gave praise to God for the honour of reaching the Holy Land. In his interview with N. Boyack, Harry Porter said that the more religious members of the A.M.R. were "overcome" at being in Palestine, and believed that the fields of barley signified "that they had reached the Holy Land". In a letter to James Allen, R. McCullum, a member of New Zealand's Parliament, wrote "I know, however, of one of our Brigadier Generals who would love nothing better than to take part in an expedition to Palestine and drive them [the Turks] out of the Holy Land forever". A letter published in the Otago Daily Times from a "New Zealand officer" offered a similar view of the entry into Palestine. He wrote:

I had set my heart on taking part in the capture of Jerusalem and had hoped to be in at the triumphant entry to that city on the occasion of its being once more in the hands of Christians ... It is good to be alive these days, and to have the honour of taking part in the restoration of the Holy Land from the grip of the infidel.

G. Butchers had his letter published remarking on "how the Heavenly Father had used the great Roman Empire to spread Christianity, and now was using the British Empire for the same purpose".

A greater similarity existed between the views expressed in the public and the private sources for the crusading ideal, then with the views and opinions of the Empire. The media
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seem to have favoured viewing the advance of the E.E.F. as a Crusade, portraying it as such in newspapers and books. This comparison of the E.E.F. with the Medieval crusades was, perhaps, inevitable. Nearly all the soldiers from Great Britain and the British Dominions were from a Christian background. The soldiers were fighting in Palestine, among the old battlefields of the crusaders, and the enemy were once more Turks. When this is matched to what the soldiers themselves actually thought, it is evident that the public media had exaggerated the view prevalent in the army. A selection of the soldiers viewed the advance of the E.E.F. as a crusade. Indeed, it shared many characteristics of the crusades. The number of soldiers who commented on the crusading parallel suggests that only some felt the parallel strongly enough to record it. It is possible that this parallel would only have been apparent to the more religious members of the N.Z.M.R. Given the relative secularity of New Zealand society, some soldiers may not have been aware of the parallel at all. It is possible that the New Zealanders did not mention the parallel for fear of feeling unmanly. There was also the belief that to brag about what they were doing was wrong. These factors may account for the lack of substantial evidence for the soldiers believing in a crusade. It is interesting to note that, for those who commented on it, the New Zealanders had a similar reaction to the Australian Light Horsemen. Hogue, Idreiss, and Gullett all made the comparison between the crusaders and the E.E.F., yet these comparison were, like the New Zealand soldiers', more muted than those in the public media.

On 24 July 1922, the British mandate over Palestine began, giving Britain control over the region. The imposition of prolonged British control had been looming for many years. A British Army had conquered the region, and British administrators had governed its inhabitants since 1918. Furthermore, the British Government had been interested in gaining control of this territory for a number of years, and had been guaranteed it by the other European Great Powers through secret agreements in 1915 and 1916.72 Several members of the N.Z.M.R. indicated their thoughts on the possibility of annexation in their letters and diaries, all supporting annexation.

When the E.E.F. liberated Jerusalem in December 1917, the future of Palestine became a topic for public discussion throughout the British Empire. In New Zealand priests, press, and Prime Ministers speculated on the future of the region. Most of the comments made favoured the assumption of British rule, both in the immediate and long term. The Otago Daily Times greeted the fall of Jerusalem with joy. The vicar of Dunedin's All Saints Anglican Church called for British rule to continue in Palestine.73 His justification was religious, believing that Palestine needed a Christian ruler in order to spread Christianity among its inhabitants. The Reverend Hav wished for a peace loving people to rule Palestine.74 New Zealand's Prime Minister, William Massey, believed in direct British rule of Palestine's Christian sites, implying

---

72 These secret treaties and agreements became formalised into one agreement, the Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916.
73 Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), 17 December 1917, p 2.
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that Britain should rule the entire region.\textsuperscript{75} The editor of the \textit{Otago Daily Times} agreed with these statements, writing that he hoped that the new Government of Palestine would be the one best able to provide welfare for its inhabitants.\textsuperscript{76} It seems that official New Zealand wished for the imposition of direct British Christian rule in Palestine.

Australian and New Zealand campaign histories supported the possible annexation of Palestine. John Robertson gave his support to the proposition interpreting the campaign as one to "decide who was to have the possession of the land of the Bible".\textsuperscript{77} Walter Massey wrote that "no honest man can deny us the glory of delivering the Holy Land from the corrupting, blighting influence of the Turk".\textsuperscript{78}

Colonel Mackesey provided the best example of support for the annexation, linking Imperialism and religion to justify Britain's rule presenting this view in the articles "Through the way of the Philistines", published in the \textit{Kia Ora Coo-ee}. Mackesey believed that Palestine had been given to Britain by God, and that it would be defying God to ever relinquish control of the area. "Palestine is the gift of Providence to us. De-jure it has always been ours - Defacto the Edomite has been in possession but his time is now up and in spite of the aspirations of any other nation we cannot afford to part with it. It is ours for keeps this time".\textsuperscript{79} His comment "this time" can be interpreted as a reference to the medieval crusades, indicating that he also believed in this interpretation of the campaign. In the \textit{Kia Ora Coo-ee}, numerous articles were written implying that Palestine should be made part of the Empire after the Great War.\textsuperscript{80}

The soldiers were more muted with regards to the future of Palestine. Few opinions were expressed on the matter, but all of those who did supported Britain's annexation of the region. Alex McNeur, a Machine Gunner of the 1st N.Z.M.G.S., wrote in several of his letters back to Dunedin of the possibility of Britain annexing Palestine. He gave his support to that possibility in these letters, describing Palestine as "the latest addition to the Empire".\textsuperscript{81} To his brother Archie, McNeur wrote "There is every indication that this land is ours for keeps, and so it ought to be after all the fighting".\textsuperscript{82} The letters published by the New Zealand soldiers G. Butchers and "A New Zealand Officer" in the \textit{Otago Daily Times} also indicated support for British rule in Palestine.

\begin{footnotesize}
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Once more, soldiers expressed a distinctly muted view when compared to the opinions in the public sources. Authors, politicians, and newspapers all seem to have accepted and promoted the concept. Only a few soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. provided their opinions on the matter of Great Britain annexing the region. The Kia Ora Coo-ee provides a few more opinions, all generally supportive of annexation, but in general, the soldiers doing the fighting seem to have had little or no opinion, either in support or in opposition to the idea.

It is necessary to examine why they were so different to those in the public media. Modern historians have, with little deviation, proclaimed New Zealand's endeavours in the First World War as one of the founding moments of New Zealand's journey towards nationhood. Nevertheless the ongoing debate about New Zealanders' attitudes towards the British Empire before and during the Great War provide a confusing picture. Claims and counter claims are made, with several opinions seemingly emerging.

Some historians have argued that the majority of New Zealanders were indifferent to the ties of Empire and were not concerned with Imperial ideals or issues, both before and during the Great War. They argued that the British Empire was an abstraction, and appealed only to those people in a privileged position in society and high culture. It had little or no attraction to the vast bulk of New Zealand's population. Perhaps the best example of this argument is contained in Sir Keith Sinclair's book A Destiny Apart, where he clearly stated that New Zealanders were not concerned with their membership of the British Empire. He wrote:

> most New Zealanders were indifferent to Imperial federation, to Imperialism. The Empire belonged to an official rhetoric, to Newspaper editors, to school teachers, to politicians, to Governors and Governor Generals. The Empire was for most people no more than an abstraction ... the mass of the people were unmoved by Imperial questions.83

This theory suggests that New Zealanders would have been indifferent to the South African War, the Imperial security debate, and the outbreak of war in 1914. This can be demonstrated to be clearly not the case. Even if Sinclair was correct, all citizens of New Zealand were exposed to Imperial propaganda through school, the press, and many of the mundane items of life indicating that it did not belong exclusively to the preserve of High Society. All people were exposed to it and interacted with it, suggesting that Sinclair's opinion is, in part, erroneous.

Another group of historians argued that the majority of New Zealanders were not indifferent to the British Empire, and this argument seems to be supported between 1900 to 1914. The New Zealand public enthusiastically supported Great Britain in the South African War and sent ten contingents to fight in South Africa with the British Army, totalling 6,495 men. During the years between the South African and the Great War, New Zealand introduced conscription to create its own Territorial Army. Conscription was not effectively opposed,

either in Parliament or in society. This army was intended both for the defence of New Zealand and for service outside New Zealand under Imperial control. New Zealand's offer of a Battle Cruiser for the Royal Navy was not opposed by Parliament or society, and neither was the offer of this ship to the Royal Navy for service in the North Sea, as opposed to service in the Pacific, which had been its intended function. There were also the constant calls by New Zealand's Prime Minister's during this period for greater Imperial unity and interaction within the Empire. Finally, there is New Zealand's enthusiasm at the outbreak of war, and the numbers of men joining the army. These factors indicate that large sectors New Zealand society were not indifferent to Imperial matters or to their membership of the British Empire.

This view is put most strongly, perhaps too strongly, by Nicholas Boyack in his book *Behind the Lines*. Boyack argued that the New Zealand soldiers became very bitter towards Britain, Britain's Parliament, and entire notion of the British Empire. He alleged that the New Zealand soldiers were originally proud of their British citizenship, and looked upon themselves as superior to other groupings of "Britons", such as the Australians. This view changed quickly when they first saw action in 1915. He argued that they now possessed considerable bitterness towards Great Britain, had come to accept groups such as the Australians as their equals, and had promoted themselves above the position formerly "held" by the British. Boyack argued that this bitterness came as a result of the failure of the Dardanelles campaign in general, and the Gallipoli landings in particular. He further alleged that the soldiers could only express their bitterness towards the Empire and Great Britain in their diaries, as the public in New Zealand would not have accepted or supported their opinions.

This view is partly supported by E.M. Andrews in his work on Anglo-Australian relations during the Great War. However, Andrews' opinion of the evolution of the Australian soldiers' belief in Great Britain is less forceful and dramatic as Boyack's. Andrews' book, *The Anzac Illusion*, argued that the Australians possessed a similar naive faith in the British Empire and Great Britain as Boyack alleged New Zealand soldiers possessed at the start of the war, but their exposure to reality caused these views to be modified. The Australians had been educated into accepting and believing in the British Empire, and the British. Andrews wrote "As for Australian allegiance to Britain, the idealistic upsurge of loyalty and enthusiasm in the early days could not survive the rigours of a long mechanistic war" and "The early euphoria and idealism - not to say naivety - had therefore passed. The soldiers had now seen the British close
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84 NZPD, vol 148 (13/12/1909), p 1009
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up and the illusions of the pre-war days were ended... The soldiers had lost their simple awe of
the British Empire". Andrews was not as overstated as Boyack, and nowhere did he allege
that the Australian soldiers no longer maintained a belief or pride in the British Empire. Rather,
Andrews argued that the opinions of the soldiers were now based upon a more realistic
foundation, and had been tempered by exposure to the British people. The pride was now
mixed with realism rather than naivety.

Boyack's argument seem to be false when matched against the opinions expressed by
the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. In the diaries and letters of these soldiers, there seems to have
been little correlation between the time spent in the Middle East and the views the soldiers had
about the British Empire. McKay, McMillan, and Pocock all seem to have been proud of their
association with the Empire, and believed themselves to be British. Mackesey did not modify
his views on the Empire at all. He was just as supportive of it in 1917 as he was in 1918 when
he wrote his articles for the Kia Ora Coo-ee. These men were proud of the Empire. Some
soldiers, different to those listed above, supported the idea of annexing Palestine to Great
Britain. These men must be classed with those who supported the Empire, for it would be
unlikely that men would be against the British Empire, but supportive of its expansion. Alec
McNeur, G. Butchers, and "A New Zealand officer", as well as Mackesey all expressed their
approval of Britain gaining possession of Palestine following the war's end. Because it is
difficult to have a crusade, in this context, without the aim of acquiring territory, those men
who supported describing the campaign as a crusade should be added to the grouping of Empire
supporting men. When this information is collated, it becomes evident that a considerable
proportion of men in the N.Z.M.R. supported Britain's eventual annexation. Several letters in
the Otago Daily Times, Mackesey, McNeur, and the more religious members of the A.M.R. all
indicated their support of the crusade. If members of the Auckland regiment supported
crusading, it is likely that members of the other two regiments also viewed crusading in the
same light. This evidence all suggests that a proportion of the soldiers, far from being anti-
imperialist and anti-Empire, were supportive of the British Empire and supported the idea of
extending the Empire into the Holy Land. If this is correct, and it seems to be, it would indicate
that Boyack's conclusions regarding the imperial outlook of the soldiers was incorrect when
applied to the New Zealanders in Sinai and Palestine.

It is probable that the New Zealanders experienced a similar process as outline by Erik
Andrews. It is likely that the naive belief which the N.Z.M.R. possessed at the start of the war
did disappear once the soldiers began fighting. There are few statements like Pocock's after the
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brigade's first battles. However, faith in the Empire and support for increasing its boundaries remained, suggesting that the process had not gone as far as Boyack believed. The conclusion that the faith soldiers' in the British Empire remained is inescapable.

At a superficial level, it is surprising that the New Zealand soldiers mentioned the Empire so infrequently. It was because of the Empire that they were serving in the Middle East, and the symbols and ties of Empire had surrounded them for most of their lives daily whilst in New Zealand. Under further examination, it becomes surprising that the soldiers mentioned the Empire at all. The control group which the New Zealanders are measured against in this respect are the soldiers and sources from Great Britain. These soldiers were surrounded by a greater number of items in their every day lives which reflected the British Empire then the New Zealanders. John MacKenzie entered into a close examination of these items in his book *Propaganda and Empire*. Even the most mundane items of their lives reflected the British control of a quarter of the world. Despite this near constant exposure, none of the British unit campaign histories, nor the biographies of British soldiers in Palestine examined, mentioned the British Empire, the idea of a crusade against the Turks, or the possibility of annexing Palestine after the Great War. The Australian and New Zealand sources are unique in dedicating their involvement in the war to Britain and the Empire. This suggests that the New Zealanders and the Australians who served in Palestine were similar in their attitudes to the Empire. Many of the soldiers from these Dominions did support the British Empire, did believe in it, and were proud of their membership of the Empire. It could also be interpreted as suggesting that the soldiers who did not mention the Empire, far from being anti-imperialist, were indeed supporters of the Empire, viewed imperialism with favour, and supported the idea of an Imperial crusade against the Turks. They were merely following the unconscious act of the majority in not recording their views in their letters and diaries.

When the views of the New Zealanders in Palestine are compared to those of the New Zealanders in France, an interesting divergence of opinions emerges. The men of the New Zealand division seem to have had a more antagonistic view of Britain and the British Empire when compared to the N.Z.M.R.. In her Long Essay, Mindy Chen examined the lives of men from the Otago and Southland region during the Great War.94 Chen's essay contained statements from men of the Otago-Southland region attacking the Empire and the English. According to the Otago men, the New Zealanders came to realise that the Empire was not all that it had been made out to be.95 For them, England was no longer the source of an all pervading greatness, wisdom, and power.96 This had been destroyed by their perceived bungling of the war effort. Lieutenant Black, of the O.M.R., summed up these opinions by writing that Britain was a "shattered idol", and that "this war, instead of drawing the Empire together, will drive it apart as the Colonials will no longer worship the fetish of English troops or English
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institutions". These views are very different to what the New Zealand soldiers believed Britain to be in the Second World War. Bryan Dunne's thesis on New Zealand soldiers of the 2nd Division covered the billeting of some New Zealanders in Britain. These men seem to have had an idealistic and patriotic view of Britain, describing it as a dream and beyond words. Dunne suggests that for the soldiers, England was the centre of their imaginary world and that arriving in England was a magical experience.

These opposing views are interesting as the majority of the N.Z.M.R. never managed to visit Great Britain as part of their war service. Their beliefs and opinions of England were therefore never called into question as those who visited England were. For the New Zealand Division, their experience of England seems to have been a disillusioning experience. For the soldiers of the 2nd New Zealand division a quarter of a century later, their experience was the fulfilment of dreams, the culmination of all they had been taught at school. Like the New Zealanders of the earlier generation, they had been brought up with many patriotic media in their world. The reasons for the disparity between the soldiers of the New Zealand Division and those of the N.Z.M.R. and the 2nd New Zealand Division could well have been due to the nature of the war each group experienced. The war in France was very different from that in Palestine or World War Two. The grinding battles, tremendous slaughter, and sheer lack of hope could well have contributed to their lack of belief in the British Empire. Grinding battles and extreme wastage of men did not occur for the N.Z.M.R. or the 2nd Division.

The New Zealand soldiers who fought in Palestine and provided records of their opinions were imperialists and did believe themselves to be members of the British Empire, classifying themselves as British, as well as New Zealanders. This experience seems to have been common to that of Australia, for several Light Horse sources support the views of the New Zealanders. It is also true that the opinions of the New Zealanders in Palestine were not nearly as rabid or jingoistic as those of either New Zealand's press or campaign histories. The soldiers believed in the Empire, believed in themselves being British, believed in themselves as some form of crusaders, and believed in Great Britain annexing the region after the end of the war. However, they were not the rabid imperialists which the public sources suggest them to be.

All of these conclusions point to Sinclair's theory of New Zealanders not bothering with the Empire being, in part, wrong. It is true that as the war progressed, some of the New Zealanders' opinions of the Empire became less jingoistic. Boyack attempted to answer why this was the case, but his conclusions were too general, too forceful, and do not match the
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opinions held by the N.Z.M.R. Andrews provided an adequate explanation as to why this change took place, believing that it was the result of the soldiers' experience of the British. The opinions expressed early on in the war by the soldiers were merely naive recounting of what they had been taught at school. Once the soldiers had interacted with the British, the naive belief was replaced with a more realistic one. The soldiers still believed in Britain, the British Empire and their continued membership of that Empire, but it was now a belief based on realism and experience.

This experience was common to both the New Zealanders and the Australians, for soldiers from both Dominions fought and died together in the many battles for control of Palestine. The soldiers had a common ideological upbringing. Both countries taught their children to have pride and belief in the Empire. The soldiers were exposed to the same forms of Imperial propaganda throughout their early years, through school, literature, and music. This suggests a reason why the opinions were so similar. The soldiers from both countries began the war with similar opinions, went through a common experience during the war, and left with a similar set of opinions. Without the common experience and ideological upbringing, the opinions of the two would not have been so similar. These opinions indicate that the soldiers from New Zealand and Australia had a belief in the British Empire, and identified themselves as British citizens of that Empire. Certainly, without their membership of the British Empire they would not have classified themselves as British.
Chapter Four

In France cameras are barred and to be in possession of one is a court martial offence. Here anyone carries one who wishes to.\textsuperscript{1}

Parties from the regiment visited Jerusalem to view the innumerable historic sites ... inside and outside the walls, the padres acting as guides.\textsuperscript{2}

Today has been a busy time as we had a whole day of sports and a horse show. It was as good as any show I have seen in New Zealand and the horses looked splendid. We had some of the yanks looking on and I wonder what they thought of it. We had a proper show ring, a band and everything went well, while the YMCA 'shouted' afternoon tea. It was quite a lively, happy, peaceful day.\textsuperscript{3}

Venereal Disease in the NZEF in Egypt is on the increase and the number of men out of action through this disease is in excess of what experts consider to the normal percentage.\textsuperscript{4}

While fighting the war was the primary purpose for the New Zealanders being in Sinai and Palestine, the N.Z.M.R. spent considerable time not fighting. Training camps and rest camps were all located away from the front line, and even while at the front there were long periods of time when the soldiers were not required to do anything. As a result, the soldiers quickly developed an appreciation for their leisure time, and a number of official and unofficial pastimes developed. 'Official pastimes' were those organised by the High Command and included sporting matches, sporting show days, and guided tours. 'Unofficial pastimes', were those organised by the soldiers without the sanction of the High Command, and included gambling, amateur archaeology, sight seeing, some sporting events, and visiting prostitutes. The New Zealanders seem to have enjoyed taking part in all of these pastimes, participating enthusiastically in leisure activities.

When compared with the leisure activities of the other British Empire soldiers in the Middle East, it is evident that there was little distinctive about their leisure activities. New Zealanders seem to have played the same sports as the English, Australians, Scots, and, in some cases, the Sikhs. There seems to be little difference in the approach of these groups to playing the sports. All groups participated in amateur archaeology; digging, scraping, and collecting artefacts as and where they found them. As well as these activities, all groups visited prostitutes and participated in sight seeing. The similarity of the various national groups' pastimes in the Middle East indicates that there was little distinctive in the New Zealanders approach to leisure activity.

\textsuperscript{1} F.M. Twistleton, letter, 27/10/17, MS Papers 1705, Alexander Turnbull Library (hereinafter ATL).
\textsuperscript{3} A. McNeur to Greta, letter, 11/8/1918, MS Papers 4103, ATL.
\textsuperscript{4} Memo to all NZ units, 11/7/1918, NA WA series 1/3 box 4 file 712.
The sporting activity of the New Zealanders, indeed the entire E.E.F., indicates more than just a commonality of leisure pursuits. It indicates Imperial ties and connections, and a shared culture throughout the British Empire. Cricket, rugby football, polo, and tent pegging were all sports associated with the British Empire. The fact that the majority of the soldiers could play them, not only those from Great Britain and the Dominions but also Sikhs from the Punjab, indicates that the sports were true Imperial sports. New Zealanders' knowledge of them, and their ability at playing them, indicates that the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. were also Imperial soldiers.

The final area to be examined, while not part of their pastimes, was integral to their popular culture. This is the language of the soldiers, particularly the slang words which they adopted. Many of these terms came from Arabic and were adopted into the speech of the New Zealand soldiers. When these terms are compared to the slang words of the Australian and English soldiers, it again becomes evident that the New Zealanders were not easily distinguished from their compatriots in the E.E.F.

Sight seeing was a very important pastime of the New Zealanders while in Egypt and Palestine. Given the nature of the surroundings, the splattering of history, "knowledge" gained from popular fiction, and natural curiosity which the soldiers must have possessed, it was unremarkable that the soldiers tried to see as much as possible during their rest and leave periods. Sight seeing began almost immediately after their arrival in Egypt, with the soldiers being greeted by crowds of Egyptians anxious to take them to the sights of Cairo. This anxiety was prevalent throughout the campaign, with Arabs willing to show the soldiers around Jerusalem, Sinai, Jaffa, and Jericho. Arab willingness to conduct the soldiers was matched by the willingness of the soldiers to be shown these sights, and by the time the soldiers reached Jerusalem organised touring parties had been established by the High Command to aid their sight seeing.

Egypt was the first country which the New Zealand soldiers were able to experience for more than a few hours with many of the soldiers spending all the money they possessed sight seeing.\(^5\) They also spent much of the time recuperating from wounds in Egypt leading to considerable amount of sight seeing taking place. The major sights visited included the pyramids, the sphinx, the bazaars, the tomb of Mohammed Ali and the Citadel. Great numbers of Egyptians would wait outside the New Zealand camp at Moascar and would sell their services as tour guides, taking the soldiers around the popular sights and explaining their history to them.\(^6\) Many of the tour guides knew as little about the sights' history as the soldiers,

---

\(^5\) On the voyage from New Zealand, the soldiers had been given the opportunity to see ports in Australia, British India, Ceylon and Aden, but these opportunities lasted for only an hour or two.

\(^6\) S. Brailsford, diary, 19/11/1915 and 12/2/1916, Accession Number 1990.2491, Waiouru Army Museum (hereinafter WAM) and F.L. Sapsford, letter, 31/12/1914, MS Number 5349-3, ATL.
but this did not stop them passing themselves off as experts. Sight seeing's popularity in Egypt was demonstrated by the number of entries made in diaries, and comments made in letters, written by the New Zealand soldiers. M.A. Eccles spent two weeks in Cairo in 1916 where he visited the Bazaar, the Blue Mosque and the zoo. Alec McNeur, in one of his letters, wrote about the places he visited.

Yesterday four of us got off in the forenoon, had dinner in the city and spent the afternoon at the pyramids. It was a beautiful day and we enjoyed tram ride out through the country. We walked all about the pyramids, Sphinx and temples. I couldn't climb so just had a quiet wonder around.

A week later, McNeur visited Egypt's Holy Well and the Roman Catholic church established there. T.M. Holden managed a tour of Cairo and its surrounding area prior to the Gallipoli campaign, visiting the pyramids, the Sphinx, the tombs of the Bulls, the Mokattam Hills, Napoleon's Fort, the Citadel, the Mosque of Mohammed Ali, the Mosque of the Sultan Hussein, and Mouski. The areas visited were very similar in all cases, and similar reports can be found in the diaries of H. Judge, E.J.F. Kennedy, J. Wilson, and W. Daubin. The various campaign histories contained many descriptions of Egypt, particularly Cairo, which read like a tourist guide book. C.G. Powles, in his history of the C.M.R., wrote:

Visits to the many surrounding places of interest filled in the spare time. The Citadel with its glorious view of the surrounding city and country, Museum and Gardens, drew the men frequently, while the pyramids and sphinx were a never ending source of interest.

A.H. Wilkie's and C.G. Nicol's descriptions of Cairo were equally picturesque, and specifically mentioned that the soldiers were regarded as tourists, both by themselves and by the Egyptians.

The enthusiasm for touring did not end when the soldiers moved away from Egypt. Indeed, it increased as the New Zealanders came across sights which they had only read or heard about. Palestine's sights featured strongly in the diaries and letters of the soldiers, with many of them visiting the Biblical sights which they had heard and read about since they were children, especially in Jerusalem. C.G. Powles matched together the history of Palestine with a

---

7 S. Brailsford, diary, 12/2/1916, Accession Number 1990.2491, WAM.
8 M.A. Eccles, diary, 7/1/1916 and 21/1/1916, MSX 4963, ATL.
9 A. McNeur to Greta, letter, 16/1/1918, MS Papers 4103, ATL.
10 T.M. Holden, chapter 3, p 9, MS 2223, ATL.
11 For examples see H. Judge, diary, 27/9/1915, Accession Number 1998.311, WAM; J. Wilson, diary, 8/8/1915 and 20/2/1916, MS Papers 1639, ATL; W. Daubin, diary, 3/8/1918, 4/9/1918, 10/9/1918, 14/9/1918, and 23/9/1918, Micro MS 4, ATL.
near perfect guide book description of it. "The great blue wall of this plateau of Judea is the most characteristic sight from the plain and from it the Israelites of old looked down upon the country that was filled with corn and wine and olives". In his interview, W.H. Owers, said that he visited all the sights he could in Jerusalem, including the Garden of Gethsemane. He was conducted around the city by a padre in an organised tour. M.A. Eccles visited the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Mosque of Oman, and W. Daubin visited Mount of Olives and the Virgin Mary's Tomb. Alec McNeur described his tour of Jerusalem in great detail in a letter to New Zealand. Powles wrote in his books that the padres were enthusiastic guides for tour parties which wished to see the city, and many of the diaries mentioned this fact. Wilkie provided a lengthy description of Jericho in his campaign history, detailing its history and position of the ruins. His description, like others in the campaign histories, reads like a tourist guide book, and it seems more than likely that the New Zealanders availed themselves of the opportunity of touring the ruins.

The soldiers from other parts of the British Empire were just as enthusiastic at searching for sites to visit in the Middle East. English soldiers spent their free time looking at Egypt's monuments, and a typical story is one contained in Vivien Gilbert's book *The romance of the last crusade*. Gilbert wrote "I was photographed on a camel with the pyramids as a background, and sent home an assorted collection of guaranteed genuine antiquities brought in their native bazaars and probably manufactured in Birmingham or Chicago. In fact, I behaved like a typical Cook's tourist". J.E. Fowler, a Light Horse man, described how all the soldiers visited sights in Cairo, including the Citadel, the palace, and the gardens. When the E.E.F. reached Palestine, touring continued. Frank Reid described the Palestinian campaign as "touring the Holy Land", and for many soldiers, this seems to have been what they did. Idreiss, Reid, and Fowler all included stories of sight seeing in Palestine. As with the New Zealanders, Biblical sites featured prominently with soldiers from Australia and Great Britain. So

---

16 W.H. Owers, OH AB 506, ATL.
17 "I managed to get leave again. This time got inside the Old City. Visited Church of the Holy Sepulchre and Mosque of Oman etc most interesting". M.A. Eccles, diary, 12/10/1918, MSX 4963, ATL.
18 A. McNeur to Greta, letter, 10/6/1918, MS Papers 4103, ATL.
20 "The ruins of two ancient cities of Jericho are still to be seen close to the modern town. The Canaanite city of Joshua's time lay about a mile to the NW of the site of the modern town, and the ruins of its walls, which the Bible records as having fallen before the blasts of Joshua's trumpets, still remain. Close by is Elisha's spring ... Jericho of the time of Christ stood at the entrance to the hills of Judea and commanded the old main road which still connects Jericho with Jerusalem. Blocks of masonry and ruins of aqueducts abound in the vicinity of the site of this city, and give indication of its former greatness". Wilkie, p 185.
24 For examples see I. Idreiss, *The Desert Column*, Sydney, 1951, pp 279 and 287; Fowler, pp 37 and 41.
intertwined were the Biblical sites with the soldier-tourist trade in Palestine, that Gilbert recorded how a large number of Bibles were bought to act as guide books for the soldiers while looking at Jerusalem. Like the New Zealand campaign histories, Lord Cobham's history of the Worcestershire Yeomanry regiment contains many tourist descriptions which read very much like guide books.

Photography, a pastime still novel during the Great War, was essential to the soldier-tourists of World War One. Indeed, the camera company Kodac marketed a small camera entirely for the soldiers, known as a soldier's Kodac. Many soldiers carried cameras to provide permanent reminders of the places they had visited, and sent the photographs back to New Zealand to show relatives what they had seen. Photography was mentioned in the diaries of the New Zealanders, indicating that it was taken seriously by the soldiers. H. Judge seems to have taken photographs of any and all sights that he visited, and W.H. Owers admitted to taking lots of photographs with his box camera. Frank Twistleton indicated the large number of cameras in Palestine when he wrote "In France cameras are barred and to be in possession of one is a court martial offence. Here anyone carries one." Cameras were just as important for the Australians, and many possessed one. Richard White, in his study of the Australian Imperial Force as tourists, wrote that cameras had become an essential part of touring, and that "cameras were everywhere in Egypt". Oliver Hogue and Ion Idreiss both mentioned soldiers taking photographs to act as permanent reminders of their campaign in their books.

When the touring experiences of the N.Z.M.R. are compared with those of the 2nd New Zealand Division during World War Two, a similarity between the two is easily discerned. Bryan Dunne's thesis on the New Zealand soldiers as tourists demonstrates this in great detail. Many soldiers of the 2nd Division were fascinated by Egypt's past, availing themselves of as many opportunities to sight see as they could. Very few differences seem to have existed with regards to the sights visited. The sphinx, the pyramids, the Mosque of Mohammed Ali, Christian churches and Muslim Mosques, all featured prominently on the list of sights seen by

25 "We used the Bibles as guide books to Palestine, and remarkably fine ones they turned out to be! It was wonderfully interesting to read the history of all the places we were visiting daily, and men in the ranks were as keen as the officers". Gilbert, p 180.

26 "Turning off short of the Jaffa road and skirting the old walls, the regiment passed the mounds known as Gordon's cavalry, the Damascus Gate, and the Gardens of Gethsemane. From here the road takes a turn up the steep Western slope of the Mount of Olives, above Siloam and the Valley of the Kedron. From this point the great walls which guard the temple area frowned black against the moonlight, while from higher up could be seen the bold outline of the Dome of the Rock, which is said to stand over the site of the temple". C, The Yeomanry cavalry of Worcestershire 1914-1922, Stourbridge, 1926, p 160.

27 Kodac's marketing slogan ran "every soldier needs a soldier's Kodac". Dunne, No ordinary tourists: The Second New Zealand Division in the Middle East 1939-43, MA, Otago, 1997, p 89.

28 For examples see H. Judge, diary, 10/7/1916, 12/7/1916, and 25/9/1916, MS Papers 4312, ATL and W.H. Owers, OH AB 506, ATL.

29 F.M. Twistleton, letter, 27/10/1917, MS Papers 1705, ATL.


the New Zealanders of the Second World War.\textsuperscript{32} Little seemed to have changed about the guides as well. The soldiers were again met by a head-long rush of Egyptians, all intent on showing them around.\textsuperscript{33} As in the Great War, the quality of information from the guides of the Second was extremely variable.\textsuperscript{34} Amongst these similarities, there were several important distinctions which divided the experience of the New Zealanders in World Wars One and Two. In World War Two, tours were organised by the High Command from the outset, with the intention of informing the soldiers as much as possible about their surroundings.\textsuperscript{35} This stands in contrast to the ad hoc touring of individual soldiers in the Great War. Organised tours do not seem to have started until the capture of Jerusalem in December 1917. Soldiers in World War Two were also issued with Arabic phrase books, and of lists of sights they may want to visit. Again, this did not take place in the Great War. These differences indicate that touring, or more importantly, the soldiers' free time, was not a high priority to the High Command in the First World War, but was taken more seriously by the officers of the Second.

Touring must be reckoned as one of the most important of the New Zealanders' pastimes while fighting in the Middle East. From the first day they arrived in Egypt, the soldiers were faced with the region's ancient past and monuments. The soldiers took advantage of any and every opportunity to see the sights of the region, visiting as much as they could, even breaking the rules to see just one more sight. In this, the N.Z.M.R. were no different from other Imperial soldiers. English and Australians were just as keen on seeing the sites of Sinai and Palestine, and availed themselves of as many opportunities as the New Zealanders did. The New Zealanders of the Great War were acting in much the same way as those of the second. They all, no matter what the generation, used any opportunity to see the sights of the Middle East. Technologically, the New Zealanders were not unique. From the comments of the Australians, and Twistleton's letters, it seems that cameras were just as prevalent in the units of Australia as they were in those from New Zealand. This indicates that the New Zealanders were not unique in their touring pastime of the Middle East, but were, once again, acting similarly to soldiers from the other Dominions and Great Britain.

The Middle East has the longest recorded history in the world. Records for its lost civilisations reach back almost 5,000 years, and their monuments and remains dot the region. Artefacts were easily acquired at the turn of the century, and the records of the N.Z.M.R. contained many references to foraging for pieces of these lost civilisations. Amateur archaeology must be counted as one of the New Zealanders' pastimes, and a popular one too. It must also be counted as a popular pastime of the E.E.F. as a whole, indicating that the New Zealanders were similar to soldiers from England and Australia.

\textsuperscript{32} Dunne, pp 77, 78, 79.
\textsuperscript{33} Dunne, pp 58-60.
\textsuperscript{34} Dunne, p 82.
\textsuperscript{35} Dunne, Frontispiece, p i.
The New Zealanders first seem to have engaged in amateur archaeology during the Senussi campaign of 1915. Here, many artefacts and remains of lost civilisations were discovered in the sand and desert wastes of the Egyptian-Lybian frontier. At Mersa Matruh New Zealand soldiers discovered a ruined Roman palace, and found coins and swords were nearby.36 Between this palace and Sidi Bareni a burial tomb was discovered.37 This site netted the searchers metal rings, spear points, and chain mail. At the Battle of Sollum, a sword believed to be that of a Crusader was discovered, only to be broken and used as fire tools.38 While it is almost certain that most of the artefacts found were subsequently lost, the fact remains that a considerable amount of time was spent by the soldiers in looking for artefacts when not fighting.

When the N.Z.M.R. were in Sinai and Palestine, amateur archaeology seems to have been an important pastime. Many of their diaries and oral interviews contained examples of artefacts gathered during the three years of the campaigns. The ease at which these artefacts could be unearthed, or in some cases merely picked up, is immediately evident. Alec McNeur wrote in a letter that "under the sand our troops are finding the ruins of great cities", and later in that letter

[the] road is strewn with all the relics of great armies, Roman and Greek coins, even Roman gladiatorial swords as good as the new after 2,000 years lying in the road. Our men have discovered many buried cities, Roman stables etc. Many of the oldest inscriptions in the old arrowhead writing. In fact, new light in being thrown on the old, old lands.39

At the ruins of Gercha and Mahamdiyr, Captain Rhodes and General Chaytor found pieces of glass and coins while riding along the beach front.40 E.C. McKay wrote in his diary that he and some friends found several empty stone sarcophagi, charnel pits, and old stone walls, and believed that it was the site of an old town.41 In a letter to New Zealand, George Ranstead wrote that the area along the route to El Arish was strewn with broken pottery, tombs, and ruins.42 The extent of the interest in archaeology by the New Zealanders was summed up by Ranstead when he wrote "fellows are fossilling [sic] about all over the place looking for

---

36 Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 1, p 14. The soldiers believed that this palace was the summer residence of the Egyptian Queen Cleopatra and the Roman General Mark Antony, but this is debatable.
37 Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 1, p 14.
38 Kia Ora Coo-ee, issue 1, p 14.
39 A. McNeur to Dave, letter, 4/9/1917, MS Papers 4103, ATL.
The reference to 'arrowhead' writing in McNeur's letter is interesting. Several different civilisations used cuneiform writing. It was first developed by the Sumerians and Babylonians, and was used by 15 different language groups over the next 3,000 years. The last known use of it was in AD 75. Among the language groups were Eblaite (Syria), Elamite (Iran), Hittite (Turkey), Hurrian (Syria), Urartian (North Mesopotamia), Ugaritic (Syria), Old Persian (Iran).
40 A.E.T. Rhodes, diary, 30/4/1916, Reference 76-123, ATL.
41 E.C. McKay, Diary, p 145, Accession Number 1997.255 ID Number 37991, WAM.
42 Ranstead Letters, 15/3/1917, MS Number 4139, ATL.
While many of the artefacts discovered by the New Zealanders were just shards of original items, several had important historical connections and shed light onto the knowledge of the Middle East's history. At Serapeum, a large granite stone with an inscription on it was discovered. The stone was sent to the Cairo Museum and the inscription deciphered. The inscription stated that a canal to connect the Nile to the Red Sea had been started by the Egyptian Pharaoh Necho. When over 100,000 people had died in the attempt to build the canal, Necho was compelled to stop work on it. The canal was eventually finished by the Persian Emperor Darius I following his conquest of Egypt, and the stone found was that erected by Darius to commemorate the canal's completion. Another major find by the N.Z.M.R. was the Shellal mosaic. This mosaic floor was discovered on a hillock on 17 April 1917 during the Second Battle of Gaza. Although largely intact, two trench lines had been dug diagonally through it. The mosaic was the floor of a Christian church built in A.D. 561, and was on the road between Jerusalem and Egypt. It featured a number of animals in many bright colours, and a grape vine, and a Greek inscription. The mosaic was carefully unearthed by soldiers under the supervision of the Australian Chaplain Maitland-Woods and sent away from the front line to Cairo for storage. Many New Zealanders took part in the excavation, indicating again that archaeology was an interesting pastime for them.

British and Australian soldiers were also interested in amateur archaeology. The many articles on the topic in the Kia Ora Coo-ee indicate that the Light Horse men were also active archaeologists. These articles mentioned mosaic floors at Bir el Shanaur and near the Aqueduct of Ain Duk, as well as giving hints on where to dig. A. Barker, in his diary, tells of...
English and New Zealand soldiers all digging around a town he believed to be the Biblical city of On. Here, they unearthed beads, bones, and images. Two Australians uncovered a tomb containing an intact mummy. Ion Idreiss wrote how Yeomanry at Bir el Dueidar uncovered a well and some Roman coins. Idreiss also gave the best explanation found with regards the popularity with all soldiers of the pastime.

Chaplain Maitland-Woods is a decent old sort ... Whenever the padre gets the chance, he climbs one of those big old mounds and a crowd congregates, Aussies and En Zeds, Tommies and Cameleers Artillerists [sic] and heaven knows what not.

Later on, Idreiss wrote "The padre has got numbers of the men archaeology mad. In their precious spare time they are digging all along the wadi and finding queer old stone houses, and buried tombs and things so musty with centuries that even the padre does not know what they are".

The sources outlined above indicate several facts. Amateur archaeology was an important pastime of the New Zealanders in Sinai and Palestine. Doubtlessly fuelled by their knowledge of the region's history, the Bible, and by word of mouth, the soldiers realised that the region they were passing through had seen the rise and fall of many civilisations. Artefacts were so easily acquired that many of the soldiers found the pastime an interesting and fruitful one. While some may view their actions as theft and desecration, to the soldiers it was a profitable and enjoyable way of passing the time. The New Zealanders were no different in their approach to archaeology than the other British Empire soldiers. English and Australians all participated in the scramble for artefacts, and were all active participants, often working together, as in the uncovering of the Shellal mosaic. The New Zealanders therefore acted similarly as soldiers from other units in the E.E.F.

The visiting of prostitutes within Cairo seems to have also been a popular pastime for the New Zealand soldiers. Cairo possessed an enormous red light area, known as the Wazzir, where sex could be purchased cheaply, quickly, and frequently. The evidence for this came from tremendous debate about venereal disease which prevailed in New Zealand during the Great War. The prostitutes in the Wazzir district were not licensed, and no attempt was made to remove those who were known to possess venereal diseases. Diseases were therefore able to be transmitted easily by the prostitutes. Compounding this problem was New Zealand's

---

52 A.C.M. Barker, diary, 14/3/1915, Accession Number 1998.309, WAM.
53 Idreiss, p 158.
54 Idreiss, p 223.
55 Idreiss, p 224.
56 It is surprising, given the popularity of the past time, that so few of the artefacts are present in New Zealand today. This could have been due to a number of factors. The soldiers, faced with having to carry what they dug up, could well have thrown the artefacts away when forced to move on. Those artefacts that did make their way back to New Zealand could well have been thrown away by the relatives of the soldiers when they died, or by the soldiers themselves when the novelty of the artefacts died off. It is also possible that many of them were sent to the proposed War Museum in Wellington during the 1920's and were never returned to their owners.
Government refusal to issue its soldiers with condoms for much of the war, exposing the soldiers to venereal diseases whenever they visited an infected prostitute. Consequently the N.Z.E.F. had one of the highest rates of venereal diseases, irrespective of whether the soldier was in the Middle East or in Europe. Those soldiers who became infected with a venereal disease were immediately hospitalised. The wound was treated by the authorities as self inflicted, for it necessitated a patient bed being taken by someone not hurt in battle. Pay for the soldier was stopped, the hospital compound for those with venereal diseases was patrolled and wired in, and he was often charged. 57

There was considerable debate about venereal disease in New Zealand during the Great War period. Prominent New Zealanders wished for New Zealand to set an example to the rest of the world by ridding itself of venereal diseases. 58 These diseases were seen as a threat to motherhood, children, and national vitality. 59 This was due to their ability to infect the next generation, their effects on children's mental stability, and their ability to cause miscarriages. It was also seen as a threat to the British Empire. 60 In an era of Social Darwinism and eugenics, breeding "unfit" children was seen as integral to racial decline. Given New Zealand's position as the "reserve gene pool" of the British Empire, venereal diseases were threatening the very base of the "most fit" Anglo-Saxons. The easiest method of preventing venereal diseases spreading, condoms, were not issued to the soldiers due to two main reasons. The first was moral. The catching of a venereal disease was attributed to a lack of self control on the part of the man. 61 He should have refused to have intercourse. Because he did have intercourse, he must face the consequences. The second was the belief that fear of infection was a means of preventing men having sex with infected prostitutes. 62

From the venereal disease returns for the N.Z.M.R. it is evident that visiting prostitutes was a common pastime. From September to December 1916, 57 New Zealanders were admitted to hospital for venereal disease, being an average of 55 per 1000. 63 This is compared to Australia's average of 31 per 1000. 64 The number of New Zealanders infected had declined by 1917, to 56 for an eight month period, but by June 1918 it had increased to 33 for that month. 65 R. McCullum, a Member of Parliament, wrote to Sir James Allen about the venereal disease problem, stating that the Dermatological Hospital in Egypt had treated 8,800 cases between the outbreak of war and April 1916, and had over twice the number of cases then

59 Fleming, p 58.
60 Fleming, p 59.
61 Fleming, p 61.
62 Fleming, p 63.
63 Venereal Disease returns September-December 1916, NA WA series 1/3 box 4 file 712.
64 Venereal Disease returns September-December 1916, NA WA series 1/3 box 4 file 712.
65 Venereal Disease returns, 1/1/1917-7/8/1917 and for June 1918, NA WA series 1/3 box 4 file 712.
beds. A memo circulated in 1918 warned that "VD in the NZEF in Egypt is on the increase and the number of men out of action through this disease is in excess of what experts consider to be the normal percentage". New Zealand's Government and the Armed Forces initiated a number of measures to keep venereal disease to within reasonable limits. Sir James Allen summed up these measures in a letter in 1919: "Lectures are given, booklets are issued, officers are continually pointing out the lifelong misery possible entailed by the contraction of these diseases, and men are encouraged to report to the medical officer as early as possible when infected". More extreme measures were advocated for the prevention of spreading venereal diseases, but they were never carried out. The New Zealand military authorities in Cairo urged the British Government to close down the Wazzir district and to evict all the prostitutes living there. The YMCA with the New Zealand armed forces believed that only through burning down the Wazzir could venereal disease be removed from Cairo.

Visiting prostitutes was just as prevalent among Australian and British soldiers in Egypt and Palestine during the Great War. The Australian Hospital treated over 8,000 cases of venereal disease by March 1916, with the Wazzir district labelled as the main culprit. The hospital, built to hold 1,040 venereal disease patients, frequently had over twice that amount. When compared to the British Army, the rates of New Zealand and Australia are very high. Yet, the British Army also experienced venereal disease, indicating that their soldiers, too, visited the prostitutes of the Wazzir. From August 1914 to June 1917, the venereal disease return for the British Army in Egypt averaged 32 per 1000.

The New Zealanders, indeed all of the British Empire soldiers, in Egypt were no different there to those who were fighting in France and Belgium. These soldiers all visited prostitutes, and sex for them seems to have been just as much of a pastime as it was for their countrymen in Egypt. Indeed, for the Australians, and New Zealanders, venereal disease seems to have been more prevalent in France and Belgium than it was in Egypt, although this could have been due to the difference in numbers serving in each theatre. The returns for British soldiers serving in France were 24 per 1000, this being the average from August 1914 until June 1917. For January-June 1917 the Canadians averaged 49 per 1000, for the Australians, 144 per 1000, and for the New Zealanders 134 per 1000. These figures indicate that visiting prostitutes was just as prevalent in Western Europe as it was in Egypt.
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67 Memo to all NZ units, 11/7/1918, NA WA series 1/3 box 4 file 712.
68 Letter from Sir J Allen, 4/7/1919, NA AD series 1 box 864 file 24/46/1.
69 Cable, 11/3/1916, NA AD series 1 box 864 file 24/46.
72 Colonial Office to New Zealand Government, letter, 19/10/1917, NA AD series 1 box 873 file 24/260.
73 Colonial Office to New Zealand Government, letter, 19/10/1917, NA AD series 1 box 873 file 24/260.
74 Colonial Office to New Zealand Government, letter, 19/10/1917, NA AD series 1 box 873 file 24/260.
For New Zealand soldiers, sex was a pastime while on leave in Cairo. The venereal disease returns prove that this was so, as do the comments by various political and private parties as to how to reduce these rates. The New Zealanders were not alone in visiting the Wazzir while on leave. The returns for both the Australian and British armies demonstrates that these armies also visited the Wazzir, indicating that the New Zealanders did not act differently when it came to sex. The New Zealanders in Egypt were also similar to those in France and Belgium. The soldiers of the New Zealand Division visited prostitutes, and their venereal disease rates were just as high, when compared to soldiers from other Empire units, as they were in Egypt. The New Zealanders seem to have been more careless or reckless in their attitude towards the dangers of sex with the Wazzir prostitutes than the other Imperial soldiers. However, the Australians had a similarly high rate, indicating that they too were careless towards the prostitutes. Once again a similarity with other British Empire units is demonstrated.

Sports were another important pastime of the New Zealand soldiers in the Middle East, featuring strongly in their letters, diaries, and campaign histories. The sports ranged from the conventional, such as rugby and soccer, to the unconventional, such as improvised polo and gazelle shooting. These sports were common to all the soldiers of the E.E.F. Inter unit competitions were encouraged, and it was common for teams of one part of the British Empire to play another.

New Zealand's campaign histories tended to mention the more conventional sports. Colonel Powles mentioned boxing competitions, rugby football, and association football, as well as horse racing in his two campaign histories. A.H. Wilkie described cricket matches and swimming races. C.G. Nicol described the horse races which took place after the war had ended, and also the rifle competitions. J. Robertson mentioned a few of the more unconventional which seem to have been peculiar to the soldiers of the I.C.C. The strangest of these were camel galloping races, and wrestling matches on camel back. N. Annabell, in the history of the New Zealand Engineers, described how the dispatch riders would ride after gazelles and shoot them, mounting their heads as trophies in the style of the big game hunters. Fun competitions were held but taken just as seriously. Races included egg and spoon and tugs of war. The strangest of all the sports was an improvised form of polo. This was played while riding donkeys, instead of polo ponies, using walking sticks for polo.

---


76 There were many horse races held in Middle East during the Sinai-Palestine campaign. These races included the Promised Land stakes, Victory Cup, Palestine Plate, Birthday Plate, Farewell Plate, and the Allenby Cup.

77 Wilkie, pp 12, 131.

78 Nicol, p 258.


80 "These graceful animals [gazelles] were much sought after on account of their beautiful heads, which made handsome ornaments when mounted". N. Annabell, *Official history of the New Zealand Engineers during the Great War*, Wanganui, 1927, p 249.

81 Robertson, pp 195, 196.
mallists. The soldiers seem to have enjoyed this improvisation, but only one reference has been found to the match.

The N.Z.M.R.'s soldiers described these sporting events in their diaries frequently, indicating that the sports were both popular and enjoyed. In a letter back to New Zealand, Alec McNeur recorded one of these sporting events in great detail.

Today has been a busy time as we had a whole day of sports and a horse show. It was as good as any show I have seen in New Zealand and the horses looked splendid. We had some yanks looking on and I wonder what they thought of it. We had a proper show ring, a band and everything went well, while the YMCA "shouted" afternoon tea. It was quite a lively, happy, peaceful day.

W. Nicholls, an amateur poet, wrote a poem about a rugby match. It was entitled "Der Tag", and featured a description of the final match for the Moascar Cup between the 2nd and 9th Squadrons of the W.M.R.. J. Wilson and M. Eccles both recorded pleasant comments about football matches between the New Zealanders and teams from Australia and the Punjab.

Inter-unit sport was encouraged in the E.E.F. It was quite common for teams from New Zealand to play teams from England, Scotland, Australia, and the Punjab. These sports seem to have led to a greater feeling of camaraderie between the soldiers. Many of the sporting contests involving New Zealanders took place between them and the Australians. Football was an exception, and was played against any and all opposition, the Scots and Australians featuring strongly. Colonel Powles stated that the sporting contacts between the Scots and the New Zealanders set the two countries' soldiers on good terms quickly. It was also played against the English, most notably a team from the 52nd division, and surprisingly against teams from the Punjab. The proficiency of the Sikhs was demonstrated by J. Wilson's comments in his diary when he wrote "In the afternoon we played football with the Punjabis and had some great sport with them". Robertson also mentioned the Sikhs, writing that they beat the New Zealanders in the egg and spoon races and were the only team to beat the 16th (New Zealand) company at the tug of war. The Kia Ora Coo-ee provided considerable evidence for the popularity of the sporting events and for inter unit competitions. In February 1918, a large competition was held at Moascar camp. Sports here involved hunting, tent pegging, wrestling, high jump, long jump, tug of war, 100 yards race, half mile race, relays, bombing contests, boxing, association football, tennis, and cricket. Such events as these were not unusual, with
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Competitors from any unit of the E.E.F. could take part, and a representation from many territories of the British Empire was often seen.

The New Zealanders do not seem to have had any distinctive sports. They seem to have played a selection of all the sports which the units from other parts of the British Empire played. The only distinctive quality of the New Zealanders seems to have been the frequency of rugby matches. Like today, rugby football seems to have been a passion for them. The English soldiers, or more particularly their officers, seem to have been the only group to have a distinctive sport. This was hunting by the officers of the Yeomanry regiments. Jackals and Syrian foxes were hunted in the manner of English fox hunting by the Worcestershire yeomanry while at Deir El Belah rest camp. This sport soon ended when the regiment moved into Palestine. This version of hunting stands in contrast to that practiced by the dispatch riders, who stalked and shot gazelles like game hunters.

The sports played by the British Empire soldiers indicate a number of points. The first is that the New Zealanders were not distinctive with respect to their sporting pastimes. They seem to have played and participated in any and all sports which were on offer, from rugby football to egg and spoon races, and everything in between. No sport was played only by them, and inter- and intra-unit competitions were common. The second point is that many of the sports played reflected their membership of the British Empire and their Imperial connections. Sports such as polo, tent pegging, rugby football, rugby league, and cricket were all attributed to being English. These sports had spread throughout the world in tandem with the expansion and inter-connections of the British Empire, and the fact that all of the units played them is testament to the flow of sports which accompanied the expansion of the Empire. Cricket was used by Imperial administrators as a means of "civilising" and assimilating both the native elites and the wider naïve populations throughout the Empire. Polo was a distinctively imperial sport, and was played passionately by British Indian Army regiments and Indian princes. Rugby football was very popular in the Dominions, Great Britain, and in army units. These sports were all played by members of the British Empire and reflected their common culture and imperial heritage. During the pre-war period, representative teams toured the Empire to play sports against each other, and these contacts were used to reaffirm their inter connection and demonstrate imperial loyalty. The fact that Sikhs were knowledgable of rugby football, New Zealanders were knowledgable of polo, and all knew how to play cricket is attributable to a
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common culture within the British Empire which helped to bind it together. The Empire's degree of sporting integration is demonstrated by the ability of soldiers from four continents to play the same sports, despite their different ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

Sports, and the many sporting events, played an important part in the leisure time of the New Zealand soldiers. They played it whenever they could, and took part in almost all of the competitions held in the Middle East. They were joined by soldiers from other parts of the Empire, including Australians, English, Scots, Welsh, South Africans, and Sikhs. Apart from their methods of hunting, the sports played by the New Zealanders were not distinctive to them, indicating that they were similar to other Imperial soldiers. The ability of the majority of the soldiers from the British Empire to play the same sports indicates that the New Zealanders were part of the British Empire and shared a common culture, as well as their Imperial ties and upbringing.

The existence of gambling and gambling schools was also common throughout Palestine and the Middle East, and New Zealanders seem to have participated in gambling frequently and enthusiastically. Gambling was expressly forbidden, both in peace and in wartime. The 2nd Mounted Rifles' standing orders read "gambling, that is playing any game for money, is strictly forbidden", and the standing orders for the army forbade gambling. Its prevention was almost impossible. The most common form of gambling seems to have been the games of Two Up and Crown and Anchor, but almost any activity was bet on. The Main Body opened a book on their destination soon after sailing from Wellington, while inter-unit sports days created a host of book makers. The New Zealanders seem to have been relatively reluctant about recording their experiences with gambling. Nicholls, the N.Z.M.R.'s amateur poet, provided one of the few pieces of evidence concerning gambling within the brigade. One of his rhymes described gambling, where he wrote: "Sing a song of Two Up, a pocket full of loot, 5 and 20 troopers, looking for a coot, when the game is finished, the troopers start to sing, because they found the coot had rung, a double header in". The Australians were not as reluctant. J.E. Fowler, an Australian Light Horseman, described the camp at Tell el Kebir as the biggest gambling site he had ever seen, with 120,000 possible participants. He claimed to have witnessed bets of £1,200 being laid on a game of Two Up. The rhyme by Nicholls suggests that the New Zealanders took an active part in the gambling schools, especially when it is linked to the evidence of the Australians. Given the close proximity of the two Dominion forces, it would be unlikely for gambling to be so prevalent among one group and non-existent in the other. These comments, and the frequency with which gambling occurred, suggest that
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gambling was a common pastime for the soldiers of the E.E.F., and the New Zealanders were no different from the other soldiers in taking part.

The language of the New Zealanders within the N.Z.M.R. demonstrates how much the New Zealanders were integrated with soldiers from Australia and Great Britain. There seems to be very little evidence to distinguish the three groups of soldiers. The sources show that, with regards to their new experiences, the soldiers applied common terms and names to them.

Arabic was the biggest influence on the speech of the soldiers in the Middle East. At its height, the E.E.F. was only 500,000 strong, and a proportion of these were Arabic speaking non-combatants. The number of native English speakers was only in slight majority when compared to the soldiers from British India. Surprisingly, no Hindi terms have been discovered in the sources, suggesting limited interaction between New Zealanders and the Indians. The native inhabitants of the Middle East were overwhelmingly Arabic speakers, and their interaction with English speaking soldiers was considerable. Because of this, many Arabic terms were imported into the language of the British Empire armies. These Arabic words included magnun, mungaree, imshi, malesh, bucksheesh, misquoise, and saida. These terms meant, respectively, mad or crazed, food, fast or quickly, never mind, bribery or "gift" money, all that displeases, and good night/good morning. According to the Kia Ora Coo-ee, these words were all common to the Australians and the New Zealanders, and those words which applied to the Cameliers were common to all nationalities within the I.C.C. This indicates that the English Cameliers shared some of the same slang words as the New Zealanders and the Australians.

English slang terms were also introduced to the common language for military operations. According to Paul Fussell in his book The Great War and Modern Memory, these words had, as their root, English music halls and theatres. The most common of these slang terms were shows and/or stunts for a raid or patrol out from the front line. These words seem to have been common to British Empire soldiers throughout the Great War, regardless of where the soldiers were actually fighting.

The New Zealanders do not seem to have had any distinctive words or phrases to distinguish them from other parts of the E.E.F. It is likely that some of the New Zealanders were distinctive with regards to their accent. These men would have been those born and raised
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in New Zealand. However, many men who had immigrated to New Zealand from Great Britain recently would still have retained their original accent. This would have added to their similarity vis-à-vis the other English units in the region. Those common slang terms which they used were common to them and the Australians, and many of the words were also used by the English soldiers in the Middle East. With respect to speech, the soldiers were not distinctive or unique.

An examination of the pastimes and language of the New Zealand soldiers leads to several conclusions. The N.Z.M.R.'s soldiers were not distinctive with regards to what they did in their spare time. The sources indicate that the New Zealanders went on sightseeing expeditions, engaged in amateur archaeology, visited prostitutes, gambled, and played sports, all in their time away from the fighting. In this they were similar to Light Horse-men, Yeomanry, English and Scottish infantry, and even Sikhs. All of these groups seem to have visited prostitutes, searched for artefacts, played sports against each other, gambled, and toured each region's sights as they passed through it. The approach of the British Empire's soldiers to these pastimes was similar, and the enjoyment which they got out them seems also to have been common throughout. This evidence all indicates that there was little to distinguish the leisure time of the New Zealanders from that of the rest of the E.E.F. Some differences did exist, but these tended to be minor. These differences included the New Zealanders' methods of hunting and their persistence at visiting prostitutes despite the harsh penalties for doing so. These differences were, however, small when compared to the enormous similarities which they had to the other Imperial soldiers in Egypt and Palestine. There also seems to have been no difference in the New Zealanders' attitude towards sightseeing in World War One and World War Two. All soldiers took advantage of the opportunity to visit as much as possible of Egypt, Sinai, and Palestine.

A similar conclusion is evident when the language of the soldiers is examined. This has necessarily focussed upon the slang terms which the soldier used. The sources indicate that while a considerable slang vocabulary existed, there was little to differentiate the New Zealanders from the rest of the British Empire soldiers. All seem to have used the same slang terms and words, with little distinctive use being made of them. While there was probably some difference in accent, there would also have been many English accents in the New Zealand units helping to limit their distinctiveness.

The sports played by the soldiers of the E.E.F. indicate that they were products of the British Empire. Cricket, rugby football, polo, and tent pegging were all distinctly associated with the England, and had spread through the world through the British Empire. The main point to note is that the knowledge of the New Zealanders of these games would have been limited if they had not have been part of the Empire. Certainly they would not have been able to play sports against the Sikhs without the common imperial heritage, ties, and culture. By playing
these games, and playing them competently, they were indicating their membership of the British Empire, their imperial culture, and their own, individual, connections to that empire.
Figure 8 Sporting pastimes of the brigade while on active service.

THE ATHLETIC SIDE.

1. Boxing on the desert. 2. A.M.R. football team, which never had its line crossed; winners of the Anzac Cup.

Figure 9 Typical sights visited by members of the brigade while in Palestine. Place where Jesus Christ was believed to be baptised and the Garden of Gethsemane.

Figure 10 Scenes of Jerusalem.


The modern Jaffa Gate, Jerusalem.

On the top of the Mount of Olives.
Figure 11 (Lower) A soldier shopping in Jericho.

New Zealanders, like Australians, have a distinct bearing and a graceful walk peculiar to themselves.¹

They [New Zealand soldiers] ... were the flower of New Zealand, the cream of her manhood. They have proved themselves equal to the best soldiers in the world.²

To them [New Zealanders] nothing was impossible.³

I don't mind having an odd drink with anyone but I can't stand this systematic boozing.⁴

Sing a song of "Two Up", a pocket full of "loot", 5 and 20 troopers, looking for a "coot", when the game is finished, the troopers start to sing, Because they found the coot had rung, a "double header" in.⁵

In 1914 there was a widely held belief in New Zealand society that the New Zealand male, by virtue of his rural upbringing, was perfectly adapted for soldiering. He was fearless, ingenious, able, and compassionate. These beliefs had been created through a combination of eugenics and mythology, and seem to have been quickly absorbed by most levels of New Zealand's society, especially after their mass publication following the South African War of 1899-1902. In the many media which publicised New Zealand's war effort, the mythology featured strongly. The campaign histories of units which served in both the South African War and the Great War implied that the mythology applied exclusively to New Zealand and New Zealand men. This was not the case, for many aspects of the soldier myth can be found to have applied to Light Horse and Yeomanry regiments which served in Sinai and Palestine. Their legend can be easily discovered through an examination of their campaign histories. The similarity between the soldier legends of Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia suggests a likely connection between them. The soldier legend seems to have been directly related to the mythology of the English Yeoman farmer. The qualities which the Yeoman farmer possessed; including morals, standards, humanity, loyalty, and aptitude at fighting, were all very similar to those of the soldier legend, suggesting a high degree of inter-relation. The fact that some statesmen in both New Zealand and Australia pledged their support for the creation of a Yeoman society further suggests that the soldier legend was developed from the Yeoman mythology.

¹ Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), March 24 1917, p 8.
⁴ H. Judge, diary, 25/9/1916, MS Papers 4312, Alexander Turnbull Library (hereinafter ATL).
⁵ W. Nicholls, "Nursery Rhymes", MS Papers 5727, ATL.
The facts concerning the New Zealand armed forces, and the society which it came from, do seem to provide some loose basis for the soldier legends. The rural economic base to New Zealand, the large numbers of agriculturalists in society, and the better diet and environment when compared to industrial Britain, all provided a provable base upon which the legend could build itself. Those slight differences which existed between the soldiers of Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain, seem to have been the only real difference between the soldiers and their legends. The qualities which the all New Zealand soldiers were believed to possess in general were not widespread in reality. This can clearly be demonstrated when the mythology and reality are compared. The New Zealanders did not make perfect soldiers, and many of their actions were in direct confrontation with the legend. They acted in much the same way as soldiers from Australia and Great Britain with the three groups drinking and rioting together. New Zealand was not as rural as the mythology implied. It also seems probable that the civilian background of the New Zealanders and the Australians was similar in contradiction of the soldier legend. These contradictions to the mythology, and similarities to each other, all suggest that the New Zealanders were not overly distinctive within the Egyptian Expeditionary Force.

The New Zealand soldier legend, based upon service in Imperial Wars in the short term and an English myth in the long term, underlies the strength of New Zealand's Imperial connections. It demonstrated their close Imperial ties, not their independence, and showed that the New Zealanders were Imperial soldiers.

In the long term, the presence of such similar soldier myths as those that existed in Australia, New Zealand, and England can be traced directly to the ties of Empire, particularly immigration, which existed between these countries. Their origins can be found in the many rural myths and legends which existed in England, an area extensively researched by Raymond Williams in his book *The country and the city*. His book suggested that the myths, far from being peculiar to each individual country, stemmed from a common, English, root. Williams discussed the origins of these myths, tracing them back through English literary history. The common root to these myths was English, and when the works of Marilyn Lake, J. Pocock and R. Arnold are examined, a means by which these legends were dissimilated through the British Empire is suggested. Tom Brooking and Miles Fairburn provide evidence of the Yeoman mythology's existence and application in New Zealand.

Williams reviewed English literature ranging from the thirteenth to the twentieth century. Throughout these seven centuries of literary history, a number of common themes were present, regardless of the work's time period or whether the work was an epic, novel, or poem.

---

Urban lifestyles were constantly derided and abused, no matter what the time period. Conversely, the rural lifestyle was praised and upheld as being noble and virtuous, again irrespective of the time period.

Examples of these views are readily available throughout Williams' book. City dwellers' loose morals and dishonesty is an immediately apparent theme in most of the literature from the thirteenth to the eighteenth centuries, and is transparent in such disparate works as William Langland's *Piers Plowman* and Fielding's *Tom Jones*. Both these works, and others, mentioned the benefits of rural lifestyle. It was believed to be natural, in tune with nature and God, leading people to being peaceful, innocent, and virtuous. It embodied all that was good in a person. Rural people were believed to have had the perfect upbringing, and possessed morals and standards. Sixteenth century poetry lauded the shepherd, believing them to be innocent and without intrigue, this in direct comparison to the city dwelling courtiers who were forever conspiring. Because the shepherds acted as gentlemen should, within poetry they soon took on the persona of gentlemen at court. Humanity and family need were intertwined, and the industriousness of the farmer was an important element in the eighteenth century.

Eighteenth century humanitarianism praised the farmer's plain and virtuous life and believed them to be socially responsible, while nineteenth century writers concentrated on the physical qualities of the agriculturalists. By the middle of the nineteenth century, literature, in addition to the above qualities, seems to have conveyed elemental energy upon the farmers, giving their efforts and achievements a superhuman facet. The egalitarian nature of the countryside was also stressed throughout the literature, with all of the farmers living and working together for their common good, without the presence of large landowners.

Rural myth and legend were placed into an imperial context soon after the colonisation of North America by England. English Renaissance and Enlightenment philosophers fixed upon the idea of the English Yeoman farmer as the perfect settler for the American colonies, and extolled the virtues they believed the Yeomen possessed. Philosophers such as Sir Francis Bacon believed Yeoman made tough and resilient fighters. Yeoman were believed to possess courage, civic spirit, and were good producers. The Yeoman farmer's appeal grew in the period around the American Revolutionary War. Thomas Jefferson wrote that Yeomen were the chosen of God, and that their independence would lead to the creation of a large group of virtuous men living an the land. The appeal of Yeomen grew after the revolutionary war, as the new Government opened up areas previously closed to settlement. Yeomen farmers were
seen as the perfect settler as their fighting spirit, way of life, and farming ability would enable them to defend themselves against the American Indians, while their sense of civic pride and duty would protect the fledgling republic.19 Yeomen farmers was now an American republican figure, yet their roots were firmly set in English literature and philosophy.

In the nineteenth century, the appeal of Yeomen farmers was transparently obvious in both Australia and New Zealand. In Australia, as demonstrated by Marilyn Lake, it seems that the intention of some statesmen was the establishment of a Yeoman society, with all the benefits such a society was believed to bestow. The colony of Victoria was actively promoting the creation of a large number of small farming blocks, each independent of large land owners.20 The aim was to create a "sturdy producing class", upon which the colony, and later the Commonwealth, could base its wealth.21 Lake examined the reasons why the colony was attempting this task, and is evident that each reason was directly linked to England, and thus the ties of Empire, writing that the original model of the Australian farmer was English, and that it had sprung out of an "idealised memory of England".22 In Victoria, people believed Yeoman farmers to be independent and egalitarian, but also capitalist, freeing the colony from the threat of socialism.23 Yeomen were honest, sober, hard working, and family men. Some statesmen claimed that Yeomen had been the "backbone of England in every time of stress".24 The establishment of a Yeoman society would thus provide security for the colony. Eugenics and social Darwinism were mixed, and Yeomen farmers became the survivor of the race, untainted by industrialisation and urbanisation and all the evils which they caused.25 Australian statesmen did not intend to create a new race, rather they wished to reinvigorate the Anglo Saxon, British, race. A direct link is again indicated to the British Empire and its ties.

Like the Australian colonies, New Zealand seems to have been attempting to establish a Yeoman society in the late nineteenth century. Certainly many aspects of its society, and the mythology surrounding that society, corresponded to the Yeoman legend. In The ideal society and its enemies, Miles Fairburn examined publications designed to attract settlers to New Zealand. Almost all of these publications corresponded to the Yeoman ideal. New Zealand was described as a land without compare, enormously productive, possessed of the most wonderful climate, and with opportunities for any colonist willing to work.26 Society was egalitarian, almost crime free, and peaceful.27 The ideal migrant was a man willing to work on the land, and his rewards would be directly related to the effort he put in.28 Tom Brooking, in his article
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"Use it or loose it, unravelling the land debate in late nineteenth century New Zealand", demonstrated how ruralist ideas very similar to the Yeoman ideal were ever present in New Zealand. Many in society wanted lots of small farmers, each working their own land and independent of large landowners. Farmers were to be central to New Zealand's society, and society was to be fundamentally egalitarian. Both works suggested that urban lifestyles were derided by many in society. Brooking stated that many settlers thought that country life was superior and morally preferable to urban living, while Fairburn noted that New Zealand advertisements often advised against the city worker migrating to New Zealand. Many of the settlers during the 1870's were agriculturalists, intent on establishing small farms in New Zealand. This they did, clearing and cultivating the land and laying the fundamental building blocks of a Yeoman society. Many of these new migrants were Methodists and ex-union members. They tended to be more democratic and independent, and, given their experience in England, wished for a more egalitarian society. These factors all added some basis in fact for claims that New Zealand was a Yeoman society, as well as indicating a base upon which the soldier myth was able to develop.

A correlation can be noted between the qualities possessed by the Yeoman farmer and those possessed by Australian, New Zealand, and English farmers. The legend of the New Zealand soldier, and the attributes which he was supposed to possess had its roots in the mythology of the Yeoman farmer. This myth was English in origin, suggesting that the myth prevalent in Australia and New Zealand came from their English immigrants. Lake has indicated that the myth prevalent in Australia came from England and its ideas of Yeoman farmers. Brooking, Arnold, and Fairburn all indicate that a ruralist philosophy existed in New Zealand during the late nineteenth century, and that this philosophy was very similar to the Yeoman mythology. Because New Zealand's society was so similar to the Yeomen farmers', the country took on that attribute, as did the people living there. The fact that the mythology was so similar in both New Zealand and Australia suggests that its means of importation was similar. It suggests that, like Australia, the origins of New Zealand's soldier legend can be traced directly to the English Yeoman mythology, indicating once more New Zealand's Imperial ties. The legend was spread through Imperial ties. Without these ties, it would be unlikely that the legend would be so similar in these countries.

29 Brooking, p 149.
30 Brooking, pp 145-146. Fairburn, p 55.
32 Arnold, p 41.
33 Many of the settlers had been locked out of their tenanted farms in England for membership or support of the unions, and had been forced to emigrate in order to survive.
The immediate origins of the New Zealand soldier legend can be found in the media of the early twentieth century. These media, particularly newspapers, published articles and stories about the New Zealand soldiers during both the South African and the Great Wars containing significant elements of the soldier myth. New Zealand possessed a highly literate society, and this, combine with the large circulation of newspapers, ensured that it would be circulated through the mass of the reading public.

In 1899, the Second Anglo-Boer War broke out in Southern Africa. The war was enthusiastically supported by all of the self-governing colonies and Dominions of the British Empire, with all of them bar Newfoundland dispatching contingents to fight alongside the Imperial army. New Zealand sent over six thousand soldiers to fight in Southern Africa, and it is in the reports published by the print media that the immediate origins of the New Zealand soldier legend can be found. The various campaign histories and newspaper articles published both during and directly after the South African War contained many aspects of the soldier legend. The aptitude of New Zealanders for fighting and warfare was praised by many authors. L.S. Amery, the editor of *The Times History of the War in South Africa*, wrote

> Of the services of the New Zealanders in the field it is unnecessary to speak at this point, but it would be hardly an exaggeration to say that after they had a little experience they were by general consent regarded on average the best mounted troops in South Africa.34

When Amery described the actions of New Zealanders during the war, they seemed invariably prefaced with the words "dashing charge", "hard riding", or "sterling qualities".35 "A New Zealand*, the pen-name of Mrs Harden and the author of *New Zealand and the Boer War*, wrote that a British officer was heard to say "I would go to the Devil to command a body of men like that", referring to one of the New Zealand contingents, and later quoted Lord Roberts saying that the New Zealanders "had borne themselves with even more conspicuous gallantry than was their custom".36 Egalitarianism, and the supposed egalitarian nature of the New Zealand contingent was remarked upon by Harden, as was their supposed ingenuity and resourcefulness.37 Indeed, Harden indicated that this was common throughout the campaign, writing "it is to be feared that some of the young men had their heads a little turned by the praises of their resourcefulness and power of initiative", and again "however they showed colonial resourcefulness in rigging up a shelter of sacks etc" when the New Zealanders were without tents.38 *The Otago Daily Times* praised the military quality of the soldiers from the New Zealand and Australian colonies.39

---
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Featuring strongly in the descriptions of the New Zealanders, and just as strongly in the soldier mythology, was the idea that all New Zealand soldiers were farmers or agriculturalists. This point is integral to the soldier mythology, and relates directly to the colonial myth, the Yeoman farmer myth, and the belief that urbanisation led to a decline in the vitality of the race. The Otago Witness made this point when Major Kennedy, author of "Notes on the War", wrote:

The recruiting of rough riders in Canada, bushmen in Australia, and a contingent of hardy light musters, rabbiters etc in New Zealand are all steps in the right direction. This class of men will prove as far greater value for hard service in South Africa then four or five times that number recruited from the ranks from our volunteer forces that are all, or nearly all, residents of towns, unused to the saddle and unacquainted with the care and management of a horse. 40

Harden wrote in a similar style, praising rural over country life, and tying this into why the New Zealanders were good soldiers. She wrote:

The English soldier is the finest in the world, but he is recruited from the streets, and never has had to think for himself. He has always been within hail of a policeman who can tell him the time. Our men, from their earliest years, have had to think for themselves, and have had duties and responsibilities which have made them self reliant. 41

She also wrote that the Seventh Mounted Rifle contingent

have little or no fear under fire. They can shoot straight, and, though hard riders, know how to take care of their horses. In the latter respect they have a considerable advantage over the Imperial troops, as they have a thorough knowledge of horses, and can get more out of their mounts. Our lads also have another advantage over regulars, and that is they can always be depended upon to sight their rifles at the first two or three shots. 42

Harden directly related the farmers of New Zealand to the Yeomanry mythology of Great Britain, repeating the words of the South African League Congress that the New Zealand Mounted Rifle contingents "were of the description known in England as yeoman farmers". 43 Amery wrote that the New Zealanders of the 4th and 5th "Rough Riders" contingents were bushmen. 44 Amery had described what a bushman was earlier from the Australian context, but it seems likely, given that he applied the same term to the New Zealanders, that the description could also be applied to the Rough Riders. These men were "accustomed to the rough and tumble life of the 'back block' districts of Australia, men who would easily find themselves at home on the South African veld, and provide a match for the Boer at his own tactics". 45
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Aspects of the soldier myth seem to have been loosely based on fact but were peculiar, not to New Zealand on its own, but to the men and women who lived in all the Self-Governing Colonies of the British Empire. During the Edwardian period in Great Britain, considerable research was carried out as to the physical condition of the population. The rapid industrialisation of the nineteenth century had led to the creation of large slum districts in most British manufacturing towns and cities. The people who lived in these districts had poor diets, terrible living conditions, and very low life expectancies. The true extent of the situation of these people was revealed during the South African War when soldiers from these industrial centres, both regular and volunteer, came up against soldiers from the British colonies and Dominions. Most Colonials were bigger, stronger, and taller than their British counterparts. This was a direct benefit of their better diet and living conditions. The Self-Governing Colonies and Dominions simply did not have slum districts on the size and scale of Great Britain. The aptitude at fighting which the New Zealanders were supposed to possess, so greatly lauded by the press and authors, was another environmental factor. New Zealand’s Government actively encouraged widespread rifle shooting as a form of pest control. People who brought in dead pests were paid by the government and this encouraged proficiency in shooting. There was also the sheer numbers of people who volunteered in the colonies. New Zealand’s fourth contingent had over 500 men volunteer from the Otago-Southland region. As there were only 100 places available, the authorities could afford to pick and choose those who they wanted to send selecting only the best available. The soldiers which the British saw in South Africa were therefore the best out of a population which tended to be healthier and more proficient with a rifle than their own.

There was also a certain truth to be found in the assertion that the soldiers all came from farming backgrounds. Roughly two thirds of New Zealand’s population came from rural areas in 1901. The stipulation that the soldiers had to be mounted infantry, combined with the fact that so many volunteered for service, resulted in a preponderance of rural people being in the New Zealand contingents, simply because those from the countryside tended to be better at horse riding than those from the town. When these units, containing a majority of men from rural areas, were contrasted with those from industrialised and urbanised Great Britain, the authors could be forgiven for assuming all New Zealanders were farmers. As well as the better diet of the New Zealanders, which tended to make them larger, there was also the fact that they...
were mounted on horses. This would have made even the shorter ones appear tall, when viewed by the infantry on the ground.

The many points made about the New Zealand contingents in the South African War show many similarities with the soldier legend as it existed in the Great War. Such characteristics as their resourcefulness, their egalitarianism, and their aptitude at fighting featured prominently in the media. The most important point to note is that commentators drew a direct correlation between the farming/rural lifestyle and the Yeoman mythology. The soldiers were believed to possess those characteristics which the rural lifestyle bestowed on those who were brought up in it, and these characteristics were believed to essential in creating a soldier. The New Zealanders correlated to the yeoman ideal of rural farmers, intent on making a living but prepared to fight for their country if need be. This soldier legend also seems to have a loose factual basis. The New Zealanders did tend to be taller, stronger, healthier, and better shots than the British, but these were due to environmental differences between the colony and Great Britain. These aspects were greatly exaggerated in order to form the soldier legend which was portrayed so widely in the Great War.

When the South African War finished in 1902, the legend of the New Zealand soldier continued, being magnified until it seemed to be official Government policy. Politicians lauded the egalitarian Volunteers, C.A.C. Hardy, Selwyn's Member of Parliament, saying "both classes of men [working and rich] were prepared to fit themselves to fight for their hearths and their homes".\(^{51}\) E. Newman, the Member for Rangitikei, argued that training for soldiers was good, implying that some politicians believed New Zealanders did not need to be trained to be soldiers.\(^{52}\) This indicates the support of a section of society for the idea of New Zealanders being the perfect soldier, without ever having been trained to be one. Colonel Baillie said in Parliament that the New Zealand soldiers who fought in South Africa were the best in the world and consequently needed little training. Mr Anstey, a Legislative Council member, said that the New Zealanders in South Africa "possessed a great deal of native wit and ability, or else we would never have seen a single one return to New Zealand alive".\(^{53}\) The Volunteer units of the New Zealand Defence Forces were allowed to elect their own officers, encouraging ad hoc and inconsistent training.\(^{54}\) The soldier legend was even integrated into the new territorial army. Lord Kitchener wrote to Sir Joseph Ward about the men from Australia and New Zealand, writing

> the young men of Australia and New Zealand ... are, in both countries, splendid material for creating a first rate fighting machine, for the conditions of their country life are very similar, producing successful pioneers accustomed to make the land supply their wants.\(^{55}\)

\(^{51}\) *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates* (hereinafter *NZPD*), vol 152 (October 4 1910), p 223.
\(^{52}\) *NZPD*, vol 152 (October 4 1910), p 203.
\(^{53}\) *NZPD*, vol 152 (October 12 1910), p 366 and vol 152 (October 14 1910), p 366.
\(^{55}\) Kitchener to Sir J. Ward, letter, March 2 1910, NA AD series 10 file 16/1.
Clearly, Kitchener believed in the idea of an intertwined soldier, rural and colonial legend.

The Great War saw a continuation of the soldier legend, both in New Zealand and in Australia. Again, this legend was published through the media, particularly the newspapers, and it is easy to see that Imperial ties were integral to both the creation and the publicising of the legend. The Dardanelles campaign, and the landings of the Australians and New Zealanders, marked a definite point in the literature of the New Zealand soldier. The Anzacs were described by reporters as "a race of athletes" and comparisons were made between them and gods in respect to their physical fitness.56 Writers such as Rudyard Kipling, Ashmead Bartlett, and John Masefield all extolled the virtues of the Anzacs.57 In their works, the soldiers were all brave, courageous, gallant, democratic, modest, and capable of self sacrifice, showing a definite correlation to the soldier legend.58 Because it was these men who were writing the press releases, and their releases were so complimentary, it was only these ideas which were given to the public in New Zealand, and they were absorbed quickly. The legend then became self supporting. Most citizens wanted to believe that their soldiers were like this, and as a result those items which contradicted this idealised view were disdained or condemned.59 The Anzac Book, published by C.E.W. Bean, did more than any other text to bring forward these ideas to the world.60 Bean had been born in Bathurst, New South Wales, and received his tertiary education at Oxford University. He was a fervent believer in the idea of rural Colonial life being the perfect upbringing for soldiers, combining this with his ideas on the racial decline brought about by industrialisation and urbanisation. These ideas were very similar to those present in the "moral panic" of the Edwardian period in Great Britain. This panic stipulated that industrialisation was leading to a weakening of the race, especially with respect to the working class. It called for more open air dwelling, a reduction in the size of cities, and a return to a more rurally based society. It seems likely that Bean gained these beliefs while studying in Great Britain, given that they were so similar. Bean's beliefs were integral to the Anzac Book, and his descriptions of the soldiers, be they Australian or New Zealander, were heavily influenced by his ideas.61 Bean excluded any and all items from The Anzac Book which did not fit into his mythology.62 The Anzac Book achieved record sales in New Zealand and

58 Partly, their press releases and comments contained in them were influenced by the positioning of the landings, being so close to the ancient city of Troy. Comparisons were made between the landings of the British Armies and the landings of the Greeks during the Trojan War.
62 Kent, pp 379-382.
Australia, and was found in many homes throughout the rest of the British Empire, bringing the legend of the Australasian soldier to a much wider audience than ever before.63

The press, both New Zealand and British, contributed to publicising the legend. The Otago Daily Times published many descriptions of the New Zealand soldiers, all heavily influenced by the soldier legend. Lord Northcliffe, a British Newspaper magnate, said that the New Zealanders "have a wonderful physique due to their agricultural heritage", that they "have a distinct bearing and graceful walk peculiar to themselves", that they were largely open air men, and that "the average size is more than equal to that of the average Highlander".64 The Manchester Guardian carried a large article soon after the war had ended discussing the qualities of the New Zealand and Australian soldiers.

All ranks of the Australian and New Zealand troops have extraordinary military qualities ... we should acknowledge that the Australasian troops are superior to the British on average. This is due to the Australasian social, economic, and political way of life, which is more favourable to the production of high military self reliance and resource than our obsolete village feudalism and crude factory system.65

It is evident that the author of this article was heavily influenced by the ideas of a rural society, where every person's upbringing bestowed benefits not found in those people brought up in cities.

Imperial ties were vital in terms of the soldier and Anzac legends, both in creating it and in spreading it. The New Zealanders would not have been present in South Africa, the Dardanelles, France, or the Middle East if they had not been members of the British Empire. The publicising of the legend was dependant upon the British. The journalists who wrote about the New Zealanders in South Africa came from Great Britain. It was also journalists from Great Britain who created the mass of epithets which accompanied the descriptions of the landings at Gallipoli, the best being Bartlett's "race of athletes". British poets, such as Kipling, eulogised the landings. Bean, who already possessed ideas on what he thought the "typical" Anzac was, introduced these ideas into The Anzac Book. These ideas had been created in response to what he believed to be a decline in the Anglo Saxon, meaning British, race. Bean was thus creating what he believed to be the perfect Britisher, integral to which was a colonial myth, again dependent upon the British Empire. The success of The Anzac Book seems to have been due to the British Empire. It was distributed throughout the Empire, with even King George V having a copy. This worldwide distribution could not have taken place without the British Empire. It is important to note that the soldier legend in New Zealand was never peculiar to New Zealand. New Zealanders were generally grouped together with Australians, and an Australasian legend was thus created. This legend could not have been created but for the membership in the British

63 Kent, pp 388-390.
64 Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), March 24 1917, p 8.
65 reprinted in Otago Daily Times (Dunedin), April 29 1919, p 5.
Empire by these two Dominions. The way these two Dominions were grouped together also suggests that the soldier legend was part of a wider, colonial, legend that could have been applied to all of the British settlements within the Empire outside Great Britain. It seems certain from examining the immediate origins of the soldier legend, that it was not peculiar to New Zealand, and owed much to Great Britain and British writers.

The legend of the New Zealand soldier rested upon several key concepts outlined in a variety of recent historiographical works. The authors include J. Phillips, Sir Keith Sinclair, James Belich, and Ian McGibbon. Each of the key concepts outlined by these, and other, authors, are supposed to have applied to all the New Zealand soldiers who served in the Great War.

One of the most important of these concepts was that the New Zealand male was perfectly adapted to warfare because of his upbringing.66 This upbringing was believed to be rurally based, and supposedly conferred great benefits onto the males. It forced the men to be self reliant and ingenious, as problems had to be solved when they occurred, and frequently there was little or no help available. This in turn made the man tough, as well as physically stronger then his counterparts in the cities. New Zealand's rural base resulted in all New Zealanders being adept at horsemanship and riding, again qualities believed to be essential in soldiering.67 One of the most important aspect of the legend was the excellence with which New Zealand men were supposed to fight.68 New Zealand men, by virtue of their upbringing, were natural soldiers, and good soldiers. New Zealand's climate and geography conferred benefits onto its people which made them better soldiers then the rest of the world. New Zealand possessed a pristine climate, undamaged by industrialisation. It did not have the sprawling industrial slums, air pollution, and ease of transportation which, it was believed, contributed to the general "softness" of contemporary Europeans.69 The clean air helped in creating physically superior humans, and it was popularly believed that the New Zealanders were considerably taller then their contemporaries around the world.70 The nature of society was also part of the soldier legend. New Zealand society seemed to be egalitarian when compared with Europe.71 This egalitarianism was transferred to the armed forces. It was maintained that officers had to earn the respect of their men, and were not merely entitled to expect it from them. Therefore, such formalities as saluting and the distinctions between officers and men were anathema.72 The egalitarian society and armed services led to a dislike of unnecessary discipline, partly because most citizens believed that New Zealanders were

---

67 McGibbon, p 155.
68 Belich, p 130.
69 Phillips, A man's country, 152.
70 Phillips, A man's country?, p 144.
72 Phillips, A man's country, pp 147, 175-76.
naturally disciplined. All of the attributes outlined above were those expected in a gentleman. Therefore, as they were all found in most New Zealanders, most New Zealand men were "naturally" gentlemen. Other aspects included the family atmosphere of the New Zealand armed services, the soldiers' non sexual nature, and mateship.

There were many examples of this myth to be found in the published sources of the N.Z.M.R. Much was made of the physical quality of the soldiers who volunteered for the war. A.H. Wilkie, in his history of the W.M.R., stated that the men were "stalwart and keen soldiers, whose physique, acumen, and powers of endurance would compare favourably with any other body of men", and later said that the "splendid physical fitness of men enabled them to withstand the conditions prevailing". In W. Lawson's book about Wellington's Trentham military camp, the new recruits are invariably described as "giants". The benefits which colonial life supposedly bestowed were extolled constantly. C.G. Nicol, in the history of the A.M.R. provided explicit evidence of this when he wrote "from the colonial mode of life they inherited the initiative and resource which make for high military talent". In Lawson's book, rural life is acclaimed as the reason why New Zealanders could shoot straight.. C.G. Powles described the Mounted Riflemen as hunters and farmers.

New Zealanders were often described as natural soldiers. Wilkie believed that they had a natural ability for war, and had a martial spirit, while Nicol wrote that the New Zealanders did not believe in retreating once committed to action. The initiative and resource of the New Zealand soldier also made its way into most of the histories, Usually being directly linked to the colonial upbringing of the men. J. Robertson, in his book on the I.C.C., linked this, and the colonial aspect of the legend, when he wrote "Difficulties are made to be overcome, and colonials frequently seem to have the faculty of overcoming them". C.G. Powles made comments along this line, writing that the New Zealand soldier had "natural aptitude ... to fall in with the existing circumstances". A.B. Moore wrote that the New Zealanders excelled in patrol work due to their initiative and their familiarity with wide open spaces, again an explicit reference to their colonial and rural life.

---

73 Phillips, A man's country?, p 147.
75 For examples see Belich, p 125/6; N. Boyack, Behind the lines: the lives of New Zealand soldiers in the First World War, Wellington, 1989, p 131; and Phillips, A man's country?, p 149.
76 A.H. Wilkie, Official War history of the Wellington Mounted Rifles regiment, Auckland, 1924, pp 4 and 89.
77 Lawson, pp 49 and 55.
79 "There were some town bred men in the squads who found their eyes not in focus for seeing long distances - they were so accustomed to having their horizons bounded in by bricks and mortar or wood and point". Lawson, p 97.
81 Wilkie, pp 2 and 5; Nicol, p 166.
82 J. Robertson, With the Camelliers in Palestine, Dunedin, 1938, p 54.
83 Powles, The New Zealanders in Sinai and Palestine, p 47.
Engineers, wrote that "the quality of the communications of the New Zealand brigade was a constant cause of envy among the other mounted brigades, both Australian and Imperial".85 Examples of this initiative were given, such as the invention of the spear point pump and the creation of hangers and panniers from bits of wire so that ammunition boxes could hang of the saddles of the machine gunners.86

The concept of "mateship" is also mentioned in the campaign histories. Moore wrote that new recruits were quickly adopted into the brigade through this institution, and Robertson stated that every camelier would share his fire and food with those less fortunate then him.87 Descriptions also exist of the gentlemanliness of the New Zealand soldiers. Nicol wrote that the A.M.R. prided itself on not showing emotion, but were kind to Arab women and children.88 Moore included an example of the mercy and compassion which the New Zealanders extended towards the civilians living in Sinai and Palestine.89 The Mayor of Albany, Australia, also commented on this, paying tribute to the "gentlemanly and soldierly conduct of the New Zealand troops who called there [Albany] on their way to France and Sinai".90

The Y.M.C.A. in Egypt made several comments about the sexual activities of the New Zealanders, which also tied into several of the concepts outlined above. This letter stated "that only under compulsion would parents allow their sons to face such risks - not of bullets - they are not afraid of these - but of physical and moral contagion worse than death to which, under present conditions, they are needlessly exposed".91 The letter is referring to the perceived gentlemanliness of the soldiers, the family atmosphere of the New Zealand army, their fearlessness, and the non-sexual nature of the soldiers.

Soldiers from other countries also provided evidence for the existence of the legend. Australians Ion Idreiss, Oliver Hogue, and Frank Reid all mentioned aspects of the New Zealand soldier legend. Idreiss continually referred to the New Zealanders as "big", and described one group as "muffled giants in their great coats".92 Idreiss also praised their fighting qualities, writing "the En Zeds are first class fighting men".93 Hogue gave great credit to the New Zealanders by writing that he believed that the battle of Romani would have been lost

86 Spear point pumps replaced the older Deep Well pumps. A deep well pump was inadequate as it took over 50 hours to water a brigade of horses, being only able to raise 600 gallons of water per hour. As well as this, there was also the time spent in digging the well. The spear point well could be assembled in 20 minutes, was easily transported, and could raise over 4,500 gallons of water. New Zealanders claimed that they invented this well. Annabell, pp 275-279; J.H. Luxford, *With the machine gunners in France and Palestine*, Auckland, 1923, p 179.
87 Moore, *The mounted riflemen in Sinai and Palestine*, pp 78-79; Robertson, p 113.
88 Nicol, pp 10, 121-122.
89 A patrol which Moore was part of captured an old Bedouin man. He was half starved, so the patrol fed him before sending him to an internment camp. Moore, p 24.
90 *Otago Daily Times* (Dunedin), July 11 1916, p 7.
93 Idreiss, p 126.
without them. He later wrote "English staff officers, competent critics, have declared that the New Zealanders were the pick of the whole Egyptian Expeditionary Force, and I've heard Australians gladly endorse that verdict." Reid also praised the fighting qualities of the New Zealanders, stating that

ask any Australian who fought in the Great War what is his opinion of the New Zealanders and he will most certainly declare that as fighting men they were superior to the men of the Australian Imperial Force ... The Camel Corps were fortunate in having in their ranks many heroic fighting men from New Zealand.

The soldier legend did not only apply to the New Zealanders. When the texts of other books and articles are examined, it becomes very clear that most other countries shared similar legends. The Territorial and conscript units of Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand all seem to have shared many aspects of the soldier legend, as outlined above.97

Great Britain's Territorial Yeomanry Cavalry units were very similar to the N.Z.M.R. and this commonality makes them a very useful contrast. They were both initially peace-time civilian units acting as soldiers, and its members expected life to be more relaxed than in the regular army. Several aspects of New Zealand's soldier legend are immediately apparent in the sources. The Yeomanry seem to have had an egalitarian outlook similar to the N.Z.M.R. This is evident in J.M. Brereton's article "Cold Steel at Huj", published in Blackwood's Magazine. Brereton described the process of calling a parade of the Worcestershire regiment prior to the Great War: "the squadron leader eyed the Commanding Officer. 'My dear Charles, do be reasonable! What is the point of ordering a parade for 7am when only you want it at that hour and 300 of us prefer it at 9am?'" Egalitarianism and a dislike of discipline is evident in this, and another, excerpt from Brereton's article where he wrote that Yeomanry had a "healthy contempt for irksome rules, regulations, and military bull." The Yeomanry were not adverse to breaking military regulations. Lord Cobham, in his history of the Worcestershire regiment, recounted an example of this in his book.100 The Yeomanry seemed to have prided themselves on their ingenuity. When mobilised in 1914, the regiment did not have enough carts and wagons to transport its equipment. This was done with or without the permission of their

---

94 The battle of Romani took place on August 4 and 5, 1916.
96 Hogue, p 61.
97 It is important to note here that the legends examined are those with regards to the Territorial and conscript units. The British regular units had their own traditions and customs, which were very different to the "hostilities only" units.
99 Brereton, p 179.
100 Lord Cobham retells a story where the men of the regiment, while in Sinai, proceeded to destroy several oases of date palms, both to justify the position of a demolition's man and to provide much needed firewood. C, The Yeomanry Cavalry of Worcestershire 1914-1922, Stourbridge, 1922, p 70.
owners, and the regiment was ready ahead of schedule. Lord Cobham also retold the story of how the regiment temporarily ended its lice infestation while camped at El Arish. Like the New Zealanders, the Yeomanry seem to have been perceived as big and strong. Frank Reid described the British cameliers as "big sturdy men who could not fail to give a good account of themselves". Reid also mentioned the English soldiers' aptitude in warfare and fearlessness in battle, and his comments are reminiscent of the New Zealand legend.

The New Zealand soldier legend also shared considerable similarities with that of Australia. Russell Ward provided an excellent description of what the Australian myth was in his book The Australian legend. He identifies all of the key areas, including the Australian's ability to improvise, distaste of authority and status, stoicism, independence, and commitment to his mates, as well as the typical Australian being a "Bushman". His definition is very similar to that provided for the New Zealanders above, differing only in small degree. Australians were believed to be fearless in battle and good soldiers. Idreiss wrote "The Bedouins are big men and wiry, but without boasting I feel certain that our regiment could wipe out any three thousand of them, and meet them on their own country too". Reid also commented on this. The idea that the colonial upbringing bred the perfect soldier was integral to the Australian legend. Life in the Australian countryside was supposed to train men for warfare, teaching them to track, shoot, survive on their own, and to be self reliant. Ward commented on this in his book when he discussed the "noble bushman". The Honourable Preston's history of the Desert Mounted Corps also made this point when he wrote

Trained from the cradle in the art of finding their way in uncharted country, they have the bushman's almost uncanny sense of direction. Tireless as the wiry horses

---

101 Brereton, p 183.
102 While camped at El Arish, one of the Yeomen recognised the ants present as the same type used by the soldiers in the South African War to kill lice. The ants were let loose in the uniforms of the Yeomanry, and the regiment was soon, temporarily, lice-free, as well as the envy of the E.E.F. C, p 82.
103 Reid, p 77.
104 "Fine men were these Tommies. Not one of them faltered as their long khaki lines advanced over the uneven ground. They worthily upheld the traditions of England's fighting men in other wars". Reid, p 152.
105 "According to the myth, the 'typical Australian' is a practical man, rough and ready in his manners and quick to decry any appearance of affectation in others. He is a great improviser, ever willing 'to have a go' at anything, but willing too to be content with a task done in a way that is 'near enough'. Though capable of great exertion in an emergency, he normally feels no compulsion to work hard without good cause. He swears hard and consistently, gambles heavily and often, and drinks deeply on occasion. ... He believes Jack is not only as good as his master but, at least in principle, probably a good deal better, and so he is a great 'knocker' of eminent people ... He is a fiercely independent person who hates officiousness and authority, especially when these qualities are embodied in military officers and policemen. Yet he is very hospitable and, above all, will stick to his mates through thick and thin, even if he thinks they may be in the wrong." R, Ward, The Australian legend, Melbourne, 1958, pp 1-2.
106 An Australian Light Horse regiment had about 500 men, but this would, of course, fluctuate due to casualties, leave, and reinforcement availability. Idreiss, p 54-55.
107 "Anzacs were usually selected for tasks with an element of danger attached to them". Reid, p 88.
they breed and ride, possessed of a wonderful keenness of vision, alert, wary, and supremely self confident, they are the finest scouts in the world.\textsuperscript{109}

This upbringing supposedly led to the soldiers possessing tremendous stoicism. Oliver Hogue described the Australian cameliers as bushmen.\textsuperscript{110} An Australian was without emotion and did not boast of his achievements. Hogue wrote that the men of the Australian Flying Corps "never think they are doing anything heroic. To them it's all a gorgeous adventure".\textsuperscript{111} Hogue also described the demeanour of a wounded Australian soldier. He did not groan or complain, despite his obvious pain, indicating the Australian's lack of emotion.\textsuperscript{112} Egalitarianism and a dislike of unnecessary discipline both featured strongly in the Australian legend.

The similarities between the soldier legends of New Zealand and Australia and Great Britain are too marked to ignore. The three legends share many of the same characteristics. The pride in each country's soldiers' ability, their ingenuity, their physical size, their egalitarianism, and their dislike of what they believed to be "unreasonable" discipline are common to all three of the legends. The New Zealanders shared more characteristics with the Australians than with the English. The most important was the colonial legend; how life in the colonies, or in this case the Dominions, provided the perfect upbringing for a man who was to become a soldier. This indicates an Imperial and British root and connection to the legends. It also suggested a spreading of the legend through the ties of the British Empire, for if the three were not connected, it would be reasonable to assume that the legends would be markedly different.

When the soldier legend of New Zealand is matched against the actual activities of the N.Z.M.R., it becomes obvious that it was just a legend. While some of the soldiers may have possessed some of these mythological qualities, it is evident that few, if any, possessed all. Rioting, drunkenness, the need for training, and many non-farmers were all prevalent throughout the N.Z.M.R.. These less desirable elements, in terms of the soldier legend, were also easily found in the units from Australia and Great Britain.

The soldier legend stipulated that the New Zealanders who fought in the Great War were natural gentlemen. This claim is, however, easily discounted when the soldier riots which took place in Egypt are examined. Three main riots took place during the time in which the New Zealanders were present in Egypt; Easter 1915, December 1915, and July 1919. In each of these riots the New Zealanders were active participants, looting and burning in conjunction with other British Empire soldiers. These riots all tended to follow the same patterns of drunk soldiers breaking into alcohol outlets, looting shops, and destroying the property of merchants.\textsuperscript{113} The Easter 1915 riots took place in the red light district of Cairo, known as the

\textsuperscript{109} Hon R.M.P. Preston, \textit{The Desert Mounted Corps}, London, 1921, p 140.
\textsuperscript{110} Hogue, p 77-78.
\textsuperscript{111} Hogue, p 163.
\textsuperscript{112} Hogue, pp 15, 16, 81.
\textsuperscript{113} Boyack, p 167.
Wazzir, supposedly in revenge for soldiers catching venereal diseases off the many prostitutes resident there.\textsuperscript{114} This riot caused £1,759 5 0 of damages, of which New Zealand was assessed at having caused £586 0 0.\textsuperscript{115} The December 1918 riots cost New Zealand £3,947 0 0 in damages, and the July 1919 £2,529 0 0.\textsuperscript{116} It seems that these riots were caused as much by boredom as by ill discipline, with many other contributing factors, too numerous to list here. The important point to note, however, is that rioting was not the pastime of a gentleman, and in this instance, many of the soldiers, both New Zealand and from other parts of the Empire, failed to live up to the soldier legend.

Integral to the soldier was the idea that the soldiers from New Zealand were mainly farmers or men whose jobs placed them in a rural context. This was also important to both the colonial and Anzac legend, and was especially true for C.E.W. Bean, the editor of \textit{The Anzac book} and Australia's official history of the Great War. The legend extolled the virtues of country life and implied that the vast majority of the soldiers in the N.Z.M.R. were from the countryside. This does not, however, seem to have been the case, as the sources indicate that the soldiers came from all walks of life. C.G. Nicol, in his history of the A.M.R., provided the best evidence for contradicting the legend, writing:

No regiment of the force contained so many types and represented so many widely divergent walks in civil life. There were lawyers and school teachers and students; there were bushmen and farmers and stockmen; there were traders and labourers and clerks; one single tent in the Epsom camp included a schoolmaster, a barber, a coach driver, an accountant, a carpenter, a farm labourer, a commercial traveller, a farmer, and a lawyer.\textsuperscript{117}

This description has identified as incorrect the part of the legend which stipulated that the soldiers were all from rural backgrounds. It was also true for the Australian Imperial Force. In a study completed on the Australian Imperial Force by L.L. Robson, it has been proven that the bushman/farmer composition of the Australian army, so favoured by Bean, was certainly not true. Only 17% of Australia's main body worked in primary production, the other 83% being men from non-farming occupations.\textsuperscript{118} This indicates that Bean was wrong in his belief that the Australian army comprised mainly farmers.

\textsuperscript{114} Proceedings of Court of Inquiry, 3/4/1915, NA AD series 1 box 869 file 24/86.

This riot seems to have been started by drunk New Zealanders and Australians in the Wazzir district. Onlookers soon joined in the destruction, with at least two bonfires being started. The Military Police proved unable to stop the riots, and English soldiers were paraded to help them. The riot continued for several hours before it petered out, those soldiers who were involved returning to barracks. Blame was apportioned at one third New Zealand and two thirds Australian. Due to a lack of evidence, no-one was ever charged for these riots.


Both the December 1918 and July 1919 riots were located at Ismailia.

\textsuperscript{117} Nicol, p 3.

\textsuperscript{118} The composition of the entire force was: 5% clerks, 5% professionals, 9% transport workers, 10% unknown, 12% in commerce, 17% primary produce workers, 20% industry workers, 22% labourers.
An important aspect of the soldier legend for New Zealand, indeed for the colonial legend, was the idea that men brought up in the colonies were pre-trained for warfare through their upbringing. Colonial life had turned them into natural soldiers, and most, if not all, of the training a soldier required could be dispensed with. An examination of the N.Z.M.R. indicates that this was not true. Their campaign histories, letters, and diaries all abound with comments about the brigade training for fighting. Training began as soon as the individual regiments were mobilised, and continued until well after peace was declared. Even while in rest camps away from the front line, the soldiers were being trained for fighting. The training which they received again contradicts the soldier legend. Horse riding, grooming, rifle firing, and marching all featured strongly in the instruction the New Zealanders received. Desert acclimatisation and water discipline were crucial to the E.E.F., and the New Zealanders spent months preparing for fighting in the desert.

The level of training which the New Zealanders received in New Zealand was inadequate, even in the most basic elements of soldiering. Many of the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R., both Main Body and later reinforcements, were unable to ride when they arrived in Egypt, having already gone through basic training in New Zealand. W.H. Porter, in his interview with N. Boyack claimed that he had been trained as a stable hand and had not received any infantry training in New Zealand at all. Despite this, he found himself as part of the A.M.R. fighting in the front line. The wireless troop's commanding officer sent several telegrams back to New Zealand complaining about the state of his reinforcements. Not only could they not ride, but some of them could not even use a wireless machine. Clearly the New Zealanders needed to be trained for warfare, and they did not receive as much training as they needed in New Zealand.

The legend of the New Zealand soldier would have the reader believe that the majority of New Zealand soldiers did not drink alcohol, and that the few who did drank only in moderation. This does not seem to have been the case when the sources are examined. Sources from Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain all indicate that the soldiers drank and suggests that many did not drink only in moderation. H. Judge made this point very clear in his diary when he wrote "I don't mind having an odd drink with anyone but I can't stand this..."
systematic boozing". His use of the words "systematic boozing" suggests that it was common for the soldiers to visit the bars of Cairo and get drunk. This is backed up by the several riots which took place in Egypt, where alcohol seems to have played an important contributing factor. P.M. McCallum wrote to R. McCallum, a member of the House of Representatives, and commented upon the drunkenness in Egypt, writing that he thought it was diminishing. This suggests that the level of alcohol consumption must have been widespread to be with. William Daubin wrote in his diary that he was in favour of prohibition, but feared that it would never be passed in New Zealand. He implied in his diary entries that drinking was a serious problem in the armed forces. Lord Cobham, in his history of the Worcestershire regiment, wrote that many of the tea houses of Jaffa were closed down for selling alcohol, and Richard Wilson retells many instances of soldiers who drank alcohol in his autobiography. Oliver Hogue's book also contains many examples of Australian soldiers getting drunk, both while on leave and when fighting. If the Australian and British soldiers were getting drunk, coupled with the evidence from the two New Zealand soldiers' diary entries, it suggests that many of the New Zealand soldiers were too. This is further reinforced by the national prohibition vote returns, where New Zealand soldiers tipped the balance in favour of introducing prohibition. This is not to accuse all the soldiers in the E.E.F. of being drunkards. Rather it is to explain that the legend's claim of the New Zealand soldiers being moderate drinkers was incorrect.

The N.Z.M.R. did not live up to the soldier legend. This much is obvious from the examples given above. The soldiers participated in riots, drank and got drunk, all attributes of soldiers which the legend either censored out or expressly contradicted. The soldiers from the N.Z.M.R. were not all farmers. They came from any and all walks of life to fight. They needed to be trained. Colonial life had not turned them into natural soldiers. The examples given above indicate that the legend was just that, a legend, and bore little or no similarity to what the Mounted Rifles actually were. These examples also indicate that the soldiers of the N.Z.M.R. acted in much the same way as soldier from other British Empire units. English, Australians, and New Zealanders all participated in riots and disturbances, drinking, and gambling. There was little unique in the New Zealanders being part of this. They were similar to men from other units, countries, and Dominions.

Having demonstrated what the myth was, where it came from, and what was incorrect, it is necessary to investigate what basis it had in fact. While there seems to have been little

123 H. Judge, diary, 25/9/1916, MS Papers 4312, ATL.
125 "Got a book named 'Defeat or Victory' from our YM Sec. Very good too. It shows how drink has hindered the war and tells of some of the sadness and ruin. Hope we have prohibition everywhere soon but I expect they will soon be issuing rotten rum again".
W. Daubin, diary, 8/11/1918, Micro MS 4, ATL.
126 C, p 159 and R. Wilson, Palestine 1917, Tunbridge Wells, 1987, pp 130, 131, 135, 164.
127 Hogue, pp 27, 28.
difference between the New Zealanders and the soldiers from the other Dominions of the British Empire, and of course, those from Great Britain. However, it also seems to have been certain that the soldiers did believe that there were some differences between them and the Australians and English, and that these differences were integrated into each countries' soldier legends. It seems likely that this was, mainly, a matter of degree. In certain cases, the soldier legend was supported through these differences. The size and strength of the New Zealanders was, to a certain extent, probably accurate. New Zealand's and Australia's climate was more conducive to healthy living than the slums of Britain's industrial cities, resulting in healthier and bigger soldiers in the Dominions' armed forces.\(^{128}\) The difference would have been obvious when New Zealand and Australian soldiers were compared to those of Great Britain, especially those units from the cities. This helps to explain such epithets as Bartlett's "race of athletes", and the New Zealanders being consistently described as big. The rurally based society of the colonial legend is another area where, to a degree, the facts supported the legend. Compared to Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand did have a higher percentage of primary producers and people living outside of urban centres. New Zealand, in 1914, had 23 per cent of its male work force engaged in primary producing, a figure larger than Great Britain's.\(^{129}\) These figures probably corresponded to the make up of the armed forces, resulting in a larger percentage of primary producers being present New Zealand's armed forces than people from Great Britain would have been used too. For the 9th to 38th reinforcements, occupations of the soldiers were published in the embarkation rolls. 2,508 reinforcements of the N.Z.M.R. listed their occupations as farm related. This worked out as 55 per cent of the total, or well over twice the national average of society. This heavy preponderance of agriculturalists, even by New Zealand standards, would have made the brigade appear to comply with the soldier mythology.\(^{130}\)

There was also the fact that New Zealand, and to a lesser extent Australia, lacked cities of a comparable size to those of Great Britain. New Zealand's largest city, Auckland, had only 114,000 people in it, and just 32% of New Zealand's population lived in the four main cities.\(^{131}\) It seems likely then that, to people from Great Britain's highly urbanised society, New Zealand would have seemed overwhelmingly rural.\(^{132}\) The excellence at fighting which

\(^{128}\) Conscription in Great Britain was introduced in 1916. Medical examination of the working class revealed that 80% had bad teeth and could not eat properly and 2/3 were not of normal health and strength. This was almost certainly due to poor living conditions and poor diets.

Thompson, p 9.

\(^{129}\) New Zealand Year book for 1914, p 126.

\(^{130}\) 4,533 men were listed as being posted to Palestine in the 9th-38th reinforcements. 2,508 listed their occupation as farm related and 2,025 did not. Farm related jobs included those occupations listed as farmer, shearer, drover, farm labourer, station hand, etc. Non farm related occupations included teachers, lawyers, railway workers, general labourers, etc. While not exact, this comparison does indicate that well over the normal percentage of farm related workers were part of the Mounted Rifles.

\(^{131}\) The sizes were: Auckland 114,284, Wellington 75,143, Christchurch 86,410, Dunedin 69,057. This made a total of 344,894, out of New Zealand's population of 1,070,910, or roughly 32%.

New Zealand Year book for 1914, p 106.

\(^{132}\) In Great Britain, between 1841 and 1901, over four million people moved from rural to urban areas. By 1911, only 25% of the population lived in rural areas. When the 75% urbanisation rate is compared to the 32% for New Zealand, one can forgive the average Englishman believing that New Zealanders were all farmers and rural dwellers.

Read, p 24.
the soldiers were believed to possess possibly came from New Zealand's long recorded history of participation in conflict. From 1860-1872 there was conflict between Settlers and Maori. During the first few years of the twentieth century there was conflict between New Zealanders and enemies of Great Britain; Afrikaners during the South African war, and Germans, Austro-Hungarians, Turks, and Bedouin in World War One. Given the knowledge of this history, it is understandable that some authors believed New Zealanders were natural and adept soldiers. These points would have contributed to the creation of the legend. It was probably these points which created the main differences between the various units of the E.E.F. and helped to differentiate those men who served in New Zealand, Australian, or English units, as well as prompting and perpetuating the soldier mythology of New Zealand.

When New Zealand entered the Great War, a considerable mythology about its armed services, especially its soldiers, already existed. Soldiers from New Zealand were believed to possess certain qualities purely because they were from New Zealand, qualities which many believed were unique. These qualities were believed to have been derived from the upbringing which the men received in New Zealand. These ideas had begun to permeate through society during and immediately after the South African War of 1899-1902, and by the outbreak of the Great War they were firmly believed by much of society. The many campaign histories written after the Great War reinforced considerable elements of this legend, and the press seem to have reported events through the lens of this mythology.

The legend itself, while containing some elements found in some soldiers, seems to have been largely false. Some soldiers were brave and ingenious, some were farmers, some were non-drinkers, and some were exceptional fighters. However, it is also true that some were riotous, some were drinkers, roughly half were from urban areas, and a considerable number were not natural soldiers. The legend seems to have been just a legend, and had scant factual relevance to the N.Z.M.R.

When the New Zealand soldier legend is compared to others, in particular those of England and Australia, it becomes evident that it was not unique. Both England's and Australia's legends show marked similarities with that of New Zealand. This was especially true of the very similar Australian legend. The reasons for these similarities seem to have been the ties of Empire which existed between Great Britain and the Dominions. The similarities of the English, New Zealand, and Australian legends indicate a close connection between the three countries. The root of the legend seems to tie in directly with the myth of the English Yeoman farmer/soldier. The soldier legends of New Zealand and Australia showed many similarities with this mythical figure who was supposed to have existed throughout England's past. Australian statesmen made many public statements indicating their support for the creation of a Yeoman class in Australia in the nineteenth century on the English model. Indeed, the

133 Belich, p 121.
comments of the premier of Victoria suggest that he wanted to establish a society where Britons lived as they should. New Zealand seems to have marketed itself as a destination for settlement which directly corresponded to the Yeoman society of mythology. The ties of Empire were integral to spreading this myth to Australia and New Zealand, and the creation of the soldier legend indicates that the legend was accepted into the public's consciousness.

The legend does seem to have had some basis in fact, which probably helped to legitimate it in the eyes of the public. The New Zealand soldiers did tend to be larger than their English equivalents, both on account of their better diet and the fact that they were usually mounted. Their accuracy with a rifle was, probably, better than soldiers from Great Britain. The N.Z.M.R. probably did have a higher percentage of farmers than would normally be expected, and the lack of urban centres in New Zealand would have helped in perpetuating this myth. These factors would have helped in distinguishing the New Zealanders from other British Empire units, and probably the colonial/Dominion units from units from Great Britain. However, it is a matter of degree in which these facts support the legend, and it is certain that they do not support the wide ranging generalisations which the mythology stipulates.

The creation and distribution of the soldier legend during the Great War again owed itself to the ties of the British Empire. It was writers from England, be they journalists or poets, who initially created and publicised the myth of the Anzac soldier, and it was those people schooled in British methods, most notably C.E.W. Bean, who perpetuated the myth. The mythology seems to have been heavily influenced by the panic which swept through Great Britain's intellectuals and social theorists regarding the state of the working class. Indeed, it seems likely that the mythology was, in part, a reaction to this panic. The soldiers would not have been fighting in the Dardanelles without the ties of Empire, and the reports would not have been written by the English journalists without these ties. The Yeoman mythology was vital to both the creation of the soldier legend, and its distribution, both in Great Britain, and in the Dominions. The soldier legend of New Zealand, and possibly that of Australia too, seems to owe itself to their connections to each other and to Great Britain, and was created through the ties of Empire which existed between these countries.
The war which the 6,500 New Zealanders fought in the Middle East was very different to that of France. In Palestine there was no massed battalions, no deadlock, no mud, disillusionment and slaughter. Deaths occurred in the thousands, not the millions. Instead there was movement, victory, and hope. The war was fought, for the main part, at a small level. Tens of thousands fought against each other for hours at a time, with victory and defeat being apparent by the end of the day. There were no grinding battles involving millions of men that lasted for weeks and even months. These factors led to a very different mentality being present in the E.E.F. when compared with the Western Front. In the modern era of total war, the war in Palestine was unique.

This thesis has sought to demonstrate that the New Zealanders which fought in the N.Z.M.R. and experienced the Sinai-Palestine campaign were Imperial soldiers, citizens of the Empire, acting in accordance with this role, and conscious of this fact. In short, that they were characteristic of the British Empire, its ideals, fallacies, and institutions. The several areas examined suggest that this was so. It was not intended to make conclusions for the other New Zealand formations which fought in the Great War, for the experiences of the New Zealand Rifle brigade in Gallipoli, and the New Zealand Division in France were vastly different to that of the N.Z.M.R. in Palestine.

The New Zealand soldiers who fought in the Middle East were fighting an Imperial war and were part of an Imperial army. The brigade fought as an Imperial formation, linked to other units of the British Empire under the overall command of a British General. This had been the goal in the minds of New Zealand's politicians when they passed into law the Defence Acts between 1909-1911. From the N.Z.T.A.'s inception, New Zealand's soldiers had been trained to be an army for service throughout the Empire. What followed in Sinai and Palestine was merely a coming to fruition of this aim. The N.Z.M.R.'s tactics, equipment, and training were uniform with the rest of the Empire, a goal agreed too by the Dominions and Great Britain in 1909. They fought alongside men from five different continents, of different cultures and ethnicities, all nominally ruled by King George V. From their books, it seems that the New Zealanders were aware of the Empire's achievements in constructing this army from so many disparate parts, and were proud of it. The region they were fighting in was of Imperial importance, and this was why General Godley chose the destination. While fighting, the N.Z.M.R fought similarly to all the other Imperial mounted formations in Palestine, be they Australian, English, Scottish, or Indian, regular or conscript, the culmination of 1909's aims.
There was no distinctive New Zealand means of fighting, and soldiers from all parts of the Empire were very much aware of the Imperial nature of the E.E.F.

The racial attitudes of the New Zealand soldiers clearly indicate both an Imperial way of thinking and a common imperial attitude towards several communities. The New Zealanders' opinions of the Arabs indicated distinct Imperial attitudes. Their perceptions of the Arabs—dirty, untrustworthy, indifference over whether they lived or died, uncivilised, and backward—reflected what they had been taught before the Great War. When matched to Said's Orientalism, they showed a distinct commonality with the "expert opinions" used to justify British control of the region. The N.Z.M.R. seems to have been fully aware of the "White Man's Burden", and believed that it applied to them as equally as it did to men born in Great Britain. The "White Man's Burden" seems to have played no small part in motivating the attack on Surafend. The opinions on the Indian units in Palestine indicated distinct imperial values and opinions. The Martial Races philosophy was widely believed and upheld, and its creation can be directly linked to the British Empire. Ghurkhas and Sikhs were upheld as great fighting men, and the qualities praised in them; stoicism, fearlessness, bravery, and fighting ability, seem to have been drawn straight from the philosophy. The non-fighting units, such as the Bikanirs, were derided and abused as being cowardly and timid, qualities which seem to have been drawn straight from the Martial Race's philosophy.

The New Zealanders' views of the Empire indicate that the men of the N.Z.M.R. were not antagonistic towards the Empire and fighting for it, and favoured expanding its borders. Many of the New Zealanders viewed the campaign as a Christian crusade against Turkish control of the Holy Land, a modern attempt to gain what the Medieval Crusaders never permanently achieved. The soldiers of the brigade were not as fervent imperialists as many of the official campaign histories suggest, but a definite pride in the Empire, and belief in expanding it into Palestine, is evident and seemingly widespread.

The sports and pastimes of the New Zealanders in Sinai-Palestine indicate once more that the soldiers were from an Imperial background and were conscious of their Imperial connections. The sports played—rugby, cricket, soccer, and polo—all indicated their imperial connections. They suggest a common Imperial culture of sport throughout the Empire, regardless of whether the territory was in Asia, Australasia, the Americas, or Europe.

The conclusion that the New Zealanders of the N.Z.M.R. were Imperial soldiers gains more support when the views of soldiers from outside New Zealand are compared to those of the N.Z.M.R. In almost all of their opinions and attitudes, activities and pastimes, the New Zealanders were joined by the Australians, English, and Scots. Australians and English both disliked the Arabs and conformed to the Martial Race philosophy. They both fought in a similar manner to the New Zealanders, and their armies reflected the drive for standardisation and an
Imperial Army voiced in 1909. Australians seem to have supported the British Empire, its expansion, and the crusading parallel just as vociferously as the New Zealanders. The sports played by the New Zealanders were played by the Australians and English, as well as the Sikhs. The pastimes of the New Zealanders - sex, archaeology, gambling, and touring - were shared by the English and Australians. This commonality, running through so much of the campaign, indicates that the New Zealanders were Imperial soldiers. They expressed similar ideas, held similar ideals, acted similarly, and fought similarly to their compatriots throughout the Empire. This similarity indicates an Imperial culture spreading throughout the British Empire's Dominions, colonies, and Indian Empire. Without New Zealand's membership of the British Empire, assuming that the brigade fought in Sinai and Palestine, it is almost certain that the N.Z.M.R. would have acted differently from the Australians, English, Scots, and Sikhs. Certainly the training and tactics, racial attitudes, pastimes, sports, and views on the British Empire would not have been as similar to those from other parts of the Empire. This commonality indicates a distinctly Imperial mentality. attitude, culture, and framework to the New Zealanders of the N.Z.M.R.

As well as indicating these points in favour of the N.Z.M.R. being Imperial soldiers, this thesis has also suggested that some prevailing "New Zealand" myths are incorrect. The exclusive myth of the New Zealand soldier, a man who could fight without training, grounded in rural life, mild and reserved, courteous and gentlemanly but always ready to uphold that which he thought right has been shown to be incorrect. This myth existed, was very popular at the turn of the century and was incorporated into many of the campaign histories of the N.Z.M.R. The origins of the myth, however, suggest an English root in the long term, and an Imperial root in the short term. The myth came from English literature and was applied wholesale onto New Zealand by its English immigrants. It owed its popularity to New Zealand's participation in the most Imperial of wars, the South African War, where New Zealanders were fighting for the expansion of the British Empire. Moreover, it was not peculiar to New Zealand, but seems to have been part of a wider colonial mythology which applied equally to Australia and Canada, as well as New Zealand. Without New Zealand's membership of the British Empire, the mythology would not have been imported into the Dominion and would not have shown such similarity with Colonial Mythology. It is evident that the New Zealand Soldier Mythology was dependant upon the British Empire, indicating New Zealand's Imperial ties and connections.

The evidence presented in this thesis supports the view that the New Zealanders of the N.Z.M.R. were Imperial soldiers, conscious of the Empire, proud to belong to it, and acting in a way that was expected of all male members of this supra national organisation. In some cases the New Zealanders did act differently to the English, Scots, and Australians. However, these instances were rare and inconsequential. This Imperial mentality was both conscious and unconscious. Sometimes the soldiers were aware of its existence, such as when they wrote and
discussed the Empire. At other times, such as their expression of their thoughts about Arabs and how they should be treated, it seems to have been unconscious. The Imperial mentality was, however, always present. None of the New Zealanders in the N.Z.M.R. left any indication of contradicting the above conclusions. Many left evidence of their support. It seems certain that the members of the N.Z.M.R. were truly characteristic of the British Empire at its zenith of power and influence.
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Appendix I

Establishment of New Zealand Mounted Rifles Brigade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Horses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Quarters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.R.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.M.R.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M.R.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st M.G. Squadron</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Troop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Troop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 2 Mobile Vet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounted Field Ambulance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M.R. Band</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number 4 Coy A.S.C.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.H.A.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>2884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishment of Imperial Camel Corps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion (4 companies)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st Battalion
1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th companies all from Australian Light Horse.

2nd Battalion
5th, 6th, 7th 8th companies, all from British Yeomanry regiments.

3rd Battalion
9th, 10th, 11th, 12th companies, all from Australian Light Horse.

4th Battalion
13th, 14th companies from Australian Light Horse.
15th, 16th companies from New Zealand Mounted Rifles.

The Camel Corps also had a British Machine Gun Squadron and a Sikh mountain battery of artillery.
Appendix II

Composition of the Mounted Rifle Regiments

Auckland Mounted Rifles
3rd Auckland Mounted Rifles
4th Waikato Mounted Rifles
11th North Auckland Mounted Rifles

Wellington Mounted Rifles
2nd (Queen Alexandra's) Wellington-West Coast Mounted Rifles
6th Manawatu regiment Mounted Rifles
9th East Coast regiment Mounted Rifles

Canterbury Mounted Rifles
1st Canterbury Yeomanry Cavalry Mounted Rifles
8th South Canterbury Mounted Rifles
10th Nelson Mounted Rifles

Note: Each military district's regiment was made up of three squadrons. Each squadron had an official establishment of 6 officers, 152 men, and 169 horses.
Appendix III

Naval Forces in the Pacific October 1914

German Asiatic Squadron
Scharnhorst: 11,600 tons, 20.5 knots, 8 x 8.2 in, 6 x 6 in.
Gneisnau: 11,600 tons, 20.5 knots, 8 x 8.2 in, 6 x 6 in.
Emden: 3,600 tons, 24.5 knots, 10 x 4.1 in.
Nurnberg 3,450 tons, 23.5 knots, 10 x 4.1 in.
Leipzig: 3,250 tons, 25.5 knots, 12 x 4.1 in.
Dresden: 3,600 tons, 24.5 knots, 10 x 4.1 in.
8 colliers

New Zealand to Australia Convoy
Ibuki: 14,600 tons, 22 knots, 4 x 12 in, 8 x 8 in.
Minotaur: 14,600 tons, 23 knots, 4 x 9.2 in, 10 x 7.5 in.
Philomel: 2,725 tons, 19 knots, 8 x 4 in.
Psyche: 2,135 tons, 20 knots, 8 x 4 in.
10 Troop Ships

Australia to Egypt Convoy
Ibuki: 14,600 tons, 22 knots, 4 x 12 in, 8 x 8 in.
Minotaur: 14,600 tons, 23 knots, 4 x 9.2 in, 10 x 7.5 in.
Melbourne: 5,400 tons, 25 knots, 8 x 6 in.
Sydney: 5,400 tons, 25 knots, 8 x 6 in.
Philomel: 2,725 tons, 19 knots, 8 x 4 in.
38 Troop Ships
Appendix IV

Egyptian Expeditionary Force

April 1916

Anzac Mounted Division

Number One section, Suez Canal Zone
IX Corps: 8th Mounted brigade
42nd, 54th Infantry divisions
29th Indian Infantry brigade

Number Two section, Suez Canal Zone
II Anzac Corps: 4th, 5th Australian divisions, 11th division

Number Three section, Suez Canal Zone
5th Mounted brigade
52nd Infantry division
Western Frontier Force
6th, 22th Mounted brigades
53rd infantry division

April 1917

Eastern Force
Imperial Camel Corps
Imperial Service brigade
52nd, 53rd, 54th, 74th Infantry divisions

Desert Column
Anzac Mounted Division
Imperial Mounted Division

North Canal Force
20 Indian Infantry brigade
October 1917

Desert Mounted Corps
Anzac Mounted Division
Australian Mounted Division
Yeomanry Mounted Division
XX Corps
53rd, 60th, 74th, 10th Infantry divisions
XXI Corps
52nd, 54th, 75th Infantry divisions

September 1918

Desert Mounted Corps
4th, 5th Cavalry Divisions
Australian Mounted Division
Anzac Mounted Division
XX Corps
10th, 53rd Infantry divisions
XXI Corps
3rd, 7th, 54th, 60th, 75th Infantry Divisions

Yilderim

October 1917

7th Army
3rd Cavalry division
24th and 27th Infantry divisions
Two regiments of infantry

8th Army
16th, 26th, 54th Infantry divisions

October 1918

4th Army
48th + two un-named Infantry divisions
One Cavalry brigade

7th Army
1st, 11th, 24th, 26th, 53rd Infantry divisions

8th Army
7th, 20th, 16th, 19th Infantry divisions
References: Ain, Ayun, Beir, Bir, Spring, Gebel, Mountain, Ras, Bir, Cape, Tell, Mound, Wady, Watercourse, Tracks, Telegraph.