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Abstract

*Home from War* is an account of which factors strengthen and aid coping with the impact of war, combat experiences and military service post-war for New Zealand veterans. While there is extensive and valuable research into combat-related stress reactions, and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, little attention has been given to what might support veterans’ abilities to cope with war experiences across the life span. Oral histories of 25 First World War veterans, 25 Second World War veterans, and 20 Vietnam War veterans were analysed to build themes from patterns in the men’s talk about coping with war and life afterwards. Thematic analysis was used to identify, analyse, interpret and summarise themes or patterns in the qualitative data. Three themes were identified. ‘*Personal growth and development*’ is a discussion of the psychological and emotional growth which occurred from benefits of military service. Such growth included emotional and intellectual maturity, independence and tolerance which developed from experiences of travel, general positive effects of military service and Posttraumatic Growth. ‘*Social regard and status*’ was found to be important to facilitate veterans’ return from war, especially genuine positive acknowledgement expressed at social and political levels through rehabilitation assistance, social respect and sites of remembrance. Social care, respect and compassion provided a sense of social connectedness necessary for psychological recovery from war. ‘*Dealing with the war*’ was about making sense of war. War experiences were either actively incorporated into the life story through identity practices, moral validation and processes of normalisation, or suppressed using
repressive coping strategies and silence. Processes of dealing with the war were mediated by social support. Coping with war was strengthened by the social support veterans received from wives and partners, other veterans and organisations such as the RSA. Coping with war is a complex process and the effects of war are expressed across the veteran’s lifespan. Experiences of trauma and well-being were embedded through wartime service and incorporated into how veterans dealt with life post-war.
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Overview

This research is about what strengthens and aids coping with war experiences for New Zealand men who went to the First World War, Second World War and the Vietnam War. It was decided to focus on those who had served in the New Zealand Army as this remains the nation’s largest service. The New Zealand Army has an extensive history of close-range warfighting, and as such, was the ideal service to look at how coping with combat and war was enabled across time and within particular historical contexts. This work is an interpretation drawn from the oral histories of 70 war veterans who talked about the impact of war on their lives.

Chapter One looks at war and military service as well as stress and coping. Without question, war is an environment of extreme stress and trauma. But going to war can also be an experience of self-awareness, camaraderie and growth. As such there are both positive and negative consequences of military service and war experiences. These negative and positive effects of war are implicated in the coping processes used to deal with stresses of war and everyday life. Theories of stress and coping are discussed in terms of coping with war experiences across the lifespan. This chapter further looks at conceptions of both social and personal identity and how these identities are played out in the shift from war to peace and vice versa.

Chapter Two is the New Zealand Context. This chapter is a historical account of New Zealand men at war and post-war for the First World War, Second World War and the Vietnam War. It is important to locate these men in the historical contexts of their wartime service to understand the impact these environments had in the
development of their lives. The experiences of New Zealand at war over the last
century are also experiences of race relations, social suffering, national identity,
economic hardship and political change. Historical, social and geographical contexts
are critical to understanding the impact of war on these men’s’ lives. Geopolitical
landscapes influence the different war experiences and post-war experiences which
in turn shape coping processes and psychological well-being after war. This doctoral
research is a psychological presentation of men returning from war that seeks to
bring the historical context firmly into view and produce a psycho-historical account
of coping with war, for these New Zealand men who fought in 20th Century wars and
conflicts.

Chapter Three is Methodology. This chapter outlines the sampling processes, the
theoretical framework and methodological approach taken for analyses of the oral
histories.

The following three chapters comprise the findings of the research. This is a
combined results and discussion section which is presented under three themes.

Chapter Four is the first theme of ‘Personal Growth and Development’ which
discusses the positive changes which occur for individuals as a result of military
service and going to war. This chapter looks at the psychological growth which
occurred from benefits of military service, which included emotional and intellectual
maturity developed from experiences of travel, general positive effects of military
service and posttraumatic growth.
**Chapter Five** is the second theme of ‘Social Regard and Status’ which was found to be important to facilitate veterans’ return from war. This social regard and status was genuine positive acknowledgement expressed at social and political levels, which included rehabilitation assistance, social respect and sites of remembrance. Social care, respect and compassion provided a sense of social connectedness necessary for psychological recovery from war.

**Chapter Six** is the third theme of ‘Dealing with the War’ and talks about processes of recovery from war and how the experiences of war are managed across time. War experiences were either actively incorporated into the life story through identity practices, moral validation, and processes of normalisation, or suppressed using repressive coping strategies and silence. Processes of dealing with the war were mediated by social support. This chapter ends with discussion of the social support veterans received from wives and partners, other veterans, and organisations such as the RSA.

**Chapter Seven** is the Conclusion. This chapter presents a summary of findings, strengths and limitations, directions for future research and the implications of findings in relation to coping with war across the lifespan.
Chapter 1 – War and Military Service, Stress and Coping

The things men carry

War and Military Service

War is an extremely traumatic experience. It is an experience which foregrounds acts of killing and threats of being killed. The individual is witness to wounding and deaths of comrades and civilians whilst immersed in a foreign world in which there are often scenes of utter destruction. Wars have been fought in harsh and punishing physical environments where climate and geography are also significant sources of stress. Soldiers deal with intense physical and psychological pressures such as chaos, loss, pain, grief, wounding, fear, sickness and deafening noise (Kahana, Kahana, Harel & Rosner 1988).

Identity

Contrary to other stressful life experiences which occur within a psychosocial fabric of normal life, war takes place in an unfamiliar reality or a “surrealistic existence” (p. 59). The worlds of war and peace are completely different from each other and operate on different rules, laws, expectations, values and obligations. Individuals need to rework themselves to fit their new psychological milieu and move from holding a civilian to a military identity. Identity or self-concept is a set of ideas about who one is, which is both stable and dynamic (Oyserman, 2004). There can be stability across time in a person’s values, beliefs, characteristics, thinking and self-
expression. There can also be change, growth and reconstruction. In a psychological sense, going from a civilian to a soldier identity, requires movement in understandings of self as soldiers move to become people different from who they were before. Soldiers are forced to separate from the societies they belonged to and become immersed in a new way of being. Individuals become part of this new world through shedding old presentations of embodiment. The soldier assumes a new haircut, wears uniform, badges of rank and functions as part of a collective group in which individuality is subsumed (Keegan & Holmes, 1985).

As such the subjective experience of self or ‘who I am’ must change in order for the veteran to be able to make sense of where they are, and what they are doing. Oyserman (2004) talks about the self being “…mutually constructed by developmental shifts in cognitive abilities and the requirements of particular life tasks embedded in particular times and spaces” (p. 7). Thus, there is a temporal nature to this incomplete process of identity construction, in that people have a “perception of who they were, who they are, and who they will be” (Ross & Buehler, 2004, p. 25).

These fundamental changes to identity are undertaken in the new and unfamiliar context of war, which is hostile, demanding and threatening. Individuals can remain in states of relatively constant stress in order to maintain the safety of themselves and others. This vigilance may be maintained for months or even years as any opportunities to control or remove themselves from the stressful environment of war are highly constrained. Apart from periods away on leave, the individual is forced to deal with the stresses of war on an ongoing daily basis that may or may not
have an endpoint. For example, for the men of the First World War and Second
World War, there was no end date to their lived deployments other than cessation of
war. As such, war can be understood as an environment that is universally stressful,
“circumstances [that] are so disruptive of normal life that they are perceived as
extremely stressful by all who experience them” (Kahana et al, 1988, p. 60).

**Psychological Injury**

The extraordinary stresses of war can be heavy burdens for veterans to carry and
cope with for a lifetime. For some men, these burdens may result in pathological
outcomes such as depression, anxiety and posttraumatic stress disorder (formerly
known as shellshock and war neurosis). Many of New Zealand’s war veterans
suffered psychological injury as a result of their war service in the three wars
examined in this research. By 1939, over 2,500 First World War veterans had
received some form of treatment in psychiatric institutions for war related stress
reactions (Clarke, 1991). Second World War veterans were similarly affected, and by
1985, there were just over 10,000 of these veterans in receipt of a war pension for
psychiatric disability (Parr, 1985). Research undertaken with Vietnam veterans in the
early 1990’s, showed PTSD rates at around 10-12 percent (Vincent, Chamberlain &
Long, 1994).

It is impossible to know the true extent to which New Zealand veterans have been
negatively affected by war as official figures do not reflect those who have not come
to the attention of government agencies or researchers. Nevertheless, these official
figures give some indication that experiences of war have resulted in psychological
suffering for substantial numbers of New Zealand men. While there is extensive and
valuable research into combat related stress reactions and PTSD, little attention has been given to what might strengthen a veteran’s ability to cope with war across time.

**Benefits of Military Service**

Experiences of war can also bring about positive effects such as personal growth, resilience and the ability to maintain psychological well-being (Aldwin, Levenson, & Spiro, 1994; Elder & Clipp, 1988; Sasson-Levy, 2002). Veterans often recall “military service as a process of acquiring self-consciousness, self-awareness and self-confidence and as a period of personal growth and empowerment” (Sasson-Levy, 2002, p. 370). Through experiences of travel, veterans are often exposed to different cultures and lifestyles and can develop greater awareness and tolerance of others. Personal growth can arise from meeting challenges, having new experiences and developing independence, all of which can build emotional and intellectual maturity (Gmelch, 1997; Inkson & Myers, 2003; Lindgren, 1959; White, 1987; Ziino, 2006).

Military service is a genuine commitment to one’s country, comrades and the military organisation (Elder, 1986). Service in the military engenders a sense of “… belonging and loyalty to the state” (Sasson-Levy, 2002, p. 360). For some men, going to war may have been the first time they consciously and positively identified as a New Zealander. Novelist and playwright, Maurice Shadbolt (1988) quoted one Gallipoli veteran who said

*Gallipoli made me proud of being a New Zealander. The shaping of the New Zealand character has been going on for a long time but you could say that Gallipoli, terrible though it was, consolidated the character of the New Zealander (p. 87).*
The Māori Pioneer Battalion of the First World War and the 28th Māori Battalion of the Second World War were also statements of citizenship, formed so that Māori could represent themselves and demonstrate they were equal to their Paheka comrades. The demonstration of equality by Māori worked ultimately, to “… earn the full benefits and privileges of New Zealand citizenship” (Soutar, 2003, p. 204). For Māori iwi or tribes who served in the Māori Battalion, service was seen as an honour and duty to culture and country. One 28th Māori Battalion soldier speaking at his farewell function outlined

"we are all a little uncertain as to what the future holds for us but there is no uncertainty in our minds as to the obligations we have taken up, these are to maintain the credit of the Māori race, to do our duty at the side of our European comrades and to keep green the memory of our homes and loved ones. (Soutar, 2003, p. 204)"

Representation of one’s country usually engenders a sense of pride, achievement and responsibility. According to Social Identity Theory, membership in certain groups, such as those defined by gender, occupation and ethnicity, for example, engenders emotional attachment and a sense of belonging. In turn this belonging and attachment informs personal identity or how and what people think and feel about themselves (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The sense of self is developed from the dominant beliefs, values and schemas that organise understandings of the world which are held by the social groups individuals belong to (Markus & Wurf, 1987).

Individuals further strive to have a self-concept which is affirming and creates feelings of worth and competence. In his explanation of Identity Theory, Stryker
(1980) takes this relationship between social and personal identity a step further, and argues that people are emotionally connected to, and define themselves by the salient roles they hold in life. Therefore, positive associations with salient roles such as soldiering aids in building self-esteem.

**Masculinity**

Military service also gives men the possibilities of being masculine and enjoying masculinity in ways civilian life cannot always offer. It is argued, that the military is second to none in its close association with ideas and practices of masculinity. Smith (2004, p. 174) asserts that “since the earliest days of western civilization soldiering has represented the ultimate in manliness”. Military organisations strengthen the importance of traditional masculine qualities such as honour, loyalty, courage, independence, duty and discipline and these qualities are played out in physical and psychological ways (Shefer & Mankayi, 2007).

In the military context, men’s’ bodies are assumed as tough, masculine and proud. Bourke cites the physical masculinity of a soldier’s body as a “signifier of military prowess” (1999, p. 110). The months of military training mean that for many men this is a time in their lives when their bodies are fit, strong and healthy. In order to reach this optimum level of fitness veterans needed to achieve good levels of mental and physical toughness, alertness and discipline (Bourke, 1999). The practices of army life and war service further instil discipline, endurance and perseverance within soldiers through achieving objectives, exceeding limits and taking care of self and others.
Comradeship or mateship is the most dominant theme in the literature on war (Phillips, 1996). This comradeship often begins before the war and many men went to war because their mates were going. During the First and Second World War, New Zealand men served in battalions, which broadly reflected their regional areas of origin (McGibbon, 2007). This meant that men from the same town or cities who served together often had previous family and friendship bonds. These men became part of an army which further provides a sense of community built on values of cohesion, togetherness, and commitment. This camaraderie was for one American Vietnam War veteran “…devotion, simple and selfless, the sentiment of belonging to each other was the one decent thing we found in a conflict otherwise notable for its monstrosities” (Kindsvatter, 2003, p.18).

However, experiences of masculinity, comradeship and citizenship both during and after war are not always positive experiences. Constructions of masculinity formed in wartime can lead to potentially destructive practices of emotional repression in peacetime. Parr (1995) argued that

the same message about manliness and courage that prevented soldiers disclosing their fears in war echoed in their mind when they got home.

Talking about feelings was not considered appropriate. If the silence was broken and the dark events that caused so much pain began emerging, returned men could become tense and uncomfortable, even tearful. Family and friends seeing the distress and not wanting to cause further suffering changed the subject and avoided it in the future, over time the war became unmentionable. (p. 197)
Not speaking about what had happened during wartime meant that many veterans experienced suffering that was lonely, painful and borne in silence.

Therefore, going to war is enormously complex as there are both negative and positive consequences of military service which “… reflects the capacity to experience pain and growth from the same event” (Elder & Clipp, 1989, p. 336). Following deployment to East Timor, Australian troops reported that although 44% were disturbed by the experience, 61% felt that deployment had an overall positive effect (Kearney, Cramer, Marshall, & Goyne, 2001). War service can be seen as embedding experiences of trauma and well-being which are then taken into how the individual perceives and copes with the world around them. These negative and positive aspects of military service are integrated into coping processes needed to deal with both the stresses of war and subsequent stressful life experiences.

Stress

Stress is “the condition that results when the person-environment transactions lead the individual to perceive a discrepancy—whether real or not between the demands of a situation and the resources of a person’s biological, psychological or social systems” (Caltabiano & Sarafino, 2002, p. 87). These biological, psychological and social systems are interrelated and always in flux. Biological systems encompass genetic characteristics and physiology which include the nervous, immune, digestive, respiratory and cardiovascular systems. Psychological systems are an individual’s cognitions or thoughts and feelings. Emotions shape physiological reactivity as well as thoughts and perception while thoughts in turn shape experiences of emotion and
physiology. How individuals think and feel is further influenced by their interactions with others and the social world (Caltabiano & Sarafino, 2002). Thus, emotional experiences, thoughts and physical responses are affected and influenced by one another. The overwhelming demands of a situation encountered at war can impact on soldiers’ and veterans’ biological, psychological and social systems, and on their overall functioning.

From a psychological standpoint, stress has traditionally been understood in two main ways. First, stress has long been seen as a negative response which produces negative effects. Second, it has been seen as a negative event which produces positive effects.

Following the Second World War and the Vietnam War, the predominant view of stress was negative (Elder & Clipp, 1989; Solomon, 1993). Ideas such as the stress evaporation hypothesis, the residual stress hypothesis (Solomon, 1993), the stress intensification perspective (Elder & Clipp, 1989), and the resurfacing of stress perspective (Elder & Clipp, 1989) were all based on assumptions of vulnerability and focused on either short term or long term harm from war. For example, the stress evaporation hypothesis proposed that intense stressors give rise to instant, far reaching and harmful effects, which are superficial for the most part and only persist for a minority of veterans (Solomon, 1993).

In contrast, the residual or stress intensification hypothesis suggests that detrimental effects of wartime stress are extensive, profound and long term and endure in some form across the veteran’s lifespan (Solomon, 1993). A third view, the resurfacing perspective, focuses on the notion that current stressors can trigger unresolved war
traumas. All of these approaches assume negative outcomes from wartime experiences of stress, and make contradictory predictions regarding the effects on veterans.

Alternatively, stress has also been understood as a negative event which produces positive effects, such as resilience or transformational personal growth, often known as Posttraumatic Growth (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). Resilience is “the ability to maintain a state of normal equilibrium in the face of extremely unfavourable circumstances” (Bonanno, 2004, p. 370), while posttraumatic growth is understood as “the experience of positive change that occurs as a result of the struggle with highly challenging life crises” (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004, p. 1). Posttraumatic growth comprises cognitive, psychological and emotional development that goes beyond what existed pre-trauma, while resilience is the ability to successfully endure adversity and can ultimately give rise to posttraumatic growth. Posttraumatic growth is thought to result from the shattering of the individual’s fundamental world assumptions, and the subsequent restructuring of how the world is now to be seen. This type of growth often occurs when the individual faces major life crises or has near death experiences (Wren-Lewis, 2004).

One process considered to enable positive effects, such as resilience or posttraumatic growth from experiences of stress, is the stress immunizing or inoculation perspective (Epstein, 1982; Meichenbaum, 1985). This is the idea that experiencing stress and developing successful adaptive and responsive coping strategies makes future stress less problematic. Earlier experiences of coping with
stress can somewhat immunize a veteran against the detrimental and overwhelming aspects of any future stress.

Research has supported both vulnerability and growth perspectives (Solomon, 1993; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). While some contradictory findings might arise from methodological shortcomings such as inadequate control groups or small sample sizes (Solomon, 1993), it is clear that there are complex patterns of adaptation arising from experiences of stress. Taking a simplistic, uni-directional perspective on stress and its effects can mean failing to consider that positive and negative outcomes can result from the same experience (Aldwin et al, 1994).

More recent developments in understandings of stress have examined the psychological, physical, emotional and behavioural processes that mediate between stressful experiences and positive or negative outcomes. These outcomes can exist alongside each other, meaning that a veteran can experience ongoing distress and psychological suffering as well as increased psychological resources such as stamina and perseverance associated with military service (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). Current conceptualisations of stress place considerable emphasis on perceptions of stresses and on the coping processes that are engaged to deal with them.

Once such conceptualisation is the transactional model proposed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). The model allows for cognitive, emotional and behavioural inputs and responses to stressful demands and allows for both positive and negative outcomes. This involves a fluid, ongoing process of interactions between the person and their environment, and these interactions are dependent on situational factors and individual resources.
According to the transactional model, stress is experienced as a process of negotiating the demands experienced by a person and the person’s ability to deal with them (Sulsky & Smith, 2005). Stress arises when individuals perceive that demands exceed their ability to cope (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Appraisal of demands is a two-step process: an initial appraisal is made as to whether a demand is seen as a challenge (a positive opportunity) or a threat (a negative source of potential harm). Secondary appraisal is an evaluation of which coping options are available to deal with the demand and which would be the most effective (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Demands faced by soldiers during war can be extreme, such as the need to manage situations of death, chaos, loss, grief, pain, fear, sickness, wounding, noise and disconnection from family and friends, as well as meeting the challenges of difficult physical environments. Following return from war, the veteran faces a myriad of immediate and practical changes such as returning to work, leaving army buddies behind, reassuming army life or leaving the army, starting or re-commencing family life and managing different living conditions. Maintaining a balance between these demands and an ability to marshal resources is the key to perceiving demands as threats or challenges, and to the ability to identify and engage the resources required for effective coping.

**Coping**

Coping is defined as psychological, emotional and physical efforts that an individual uses to manage the demands and stresses that are placed upon him or her (Lazarus...
Coping is an iterative process in which coping responses are influenced by the individual’s assessment of the stressor, their social environment and their own abilities to manage the stressful event (Shewchuk, Elliot, MacNair-Semands & Harkins, 1999).

Coping strategies are extremely diverse, but one widely used categorisation identifies coping as either problem-focused or emotion-focused. Problem-focused coping strategies are approach-oriented and address stressors through information seeking, planning and action. Emotion-focused coping strategies are aimed at managing distress, for example by avoiding or repressing emotional reactions, seeking emotional support or suppressing emotion. Emotion-focused strategies can often provide successful distraction temporarily but the stressor still remains (Blake, Cook & Keane, 1992).

Coping is a complex process contingent upon a multitude of factors that depend on the person, stressor and situation. As such, there are dynamic and changing appraisals and reappraisals of a stressful situation with individuals engaging in multiple strategies, which in some way seek to change the environment or transform the meaning of a stressful event. Adaptive coping processes are those which are protective for the individual in that they eliminate or change the conditions that cause problems, diminish the harmful effects of stress and keep emotional and psychological consequences within manageable bounds (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; Solomon, Avitzur & Milkulincer, 1990). Less adaptive coping involves cognitive, emotional or behaviour strategies which do not reduce stress. Strategies such as self-blame or denial can increase distress and other strategies such as procrastination or
avoidance can seem to provide short-term relief but will have negative long-term consequences (Blake et al, 1992).

The major findings of coping research generally indicate that problem-focused coping is adaptive whilst emotion-focused coping tends to be less adaptive (Blake et al, 1992). However, problem-focused coping strategies may be most effective when the stressful situation is in some way controllable. When individuals can do little to control a situation, emotion-focused coping may be the most constructive strategy to employ (Folkman, Lazarus, Dunkel-Schetter, DeLongis & Gruens 1986: Folkman & Moskowitz, 2004).

**Coping and Personal Resources**

Surviving extreme adversity of war is seen by some veterans as building self-discipline, confidence, maturity, perseverance and as enabling them to really value life (Aldwin, Levenson & Spiro, 1994; Elder & Clipp, 1989;). Confidence and maturity are linked to feelings of mastery, competence and self-efficacy. People who have good self-efficacy and a sense of mastery usually believe that they can overcome adversity and resolve stressful episodes in their lives (Bandura, 1997). The personal growth and development that can manifest from experiences of war can equip the veteran with psychological resources which can be drawn upon to engage in problem solving and approach oriented coping when necessary.

**Coping and Social Resources**

As well as personal resources, interpersonal relationships are key to successful coping. The social support gained through these interpersonal relationships can include the comfort and care of family, friends, colleagues and organisations. Social
support can have a direct effect on well-being in that people with good support feel
connected and have higher self-esteem. People who feel needed and valued are
often more able to cope with stressful events by drawing on emotional,
informational and material help of others in their social networks (Sarafino & Smith,
2011).

Camaraderie in wartime provides social support which is valuable in coping processes
(Kindsvatter, 2003). Relationships formed in war often continue into civilian life and
this continuation of camaraderie offers possibilities for genuine social support in
coping with the psychological and emotional aftermath of war. It is commonly
reported that the only people truly able to understand experiences of war are other
veterans (Parr, 1995; Shadbolt, 1988). Being with other veterans may provide a sense
of belonging, which facilitates help and support to process the trauma of war and
share the stresses and demands of current life.

**Coping and Societal Resources**

Wider societal support is crucial for allaying or reducing the manifestation of
psychological disorders for war veterans (Bolton, Litz, Glenn, Orsillo & Roemer, 2002;
Fontana & Rosenheck, 1994; Fontana, Rosenheck & Horvath, 1997; Grayson et al,
1996; Johnson, Lubin, Rosenheck, Orsillo, 1996; Umbrasas, 2009). This support not
only holds in place positive attributions and purpose for war related trauma but is
also thought to discourage veterans from employing detrimental psychological
defences such as withdrawal, avoidance and emotional numbing to cope with war
experiences (Umbrasas, 2009).
Continued social acceptance and ongoing recognition of their wartime experiences has been linked to the low PTSD rate amongst Second World War Finnish war veterans. Interviews with these veterans indicated that war experiences had been incorporated into their life stories within a cohesive framework of social solidarity (Hautamaki & Coleman, 2001). Similarly, British Falklands War veterans reported the importance of support from the British public in homecoming receptions in their efforts to make sense of going to war (Burnell, Coleman & Hunt, 2006).

In contrast, societal rejection of war service had negative implications for psychological well-being, as social connection and validation are important in facilitating adaptive coping processes (Fontana & Rosenheck, 1994; Grayson et al, 1996; Johnson et al, 1997). In part, war service is an expression of patriotism or citizenship and veterans usually expect that society will acknowledge and respect their wartime sacrifices (Franke, 2000; McCranie & Hyer, 2000; Shay, 2009). When this expectation is perceived to be violated it has negative impacts on psychological well-being (Umbrasas, 2009). The development of psychological outcomes such as Posttraumatic Stress Disorder was in part attributed to negative homecoming for American Vietnam veterans (Fontana & Rosenheck, 1994; Johnson et al, 1997;) and Australian Vietnam veterans (Grayson et al, 1996).

It took 37 years for an apology to be made to New Zealand’s Vietnam veterans for the inadequate support given upon return and for the manner in which the veterans had been treated since the end of the Vietnam War. During these decades, it is probable that many of New Zealand’s Vietnam veterans experience challenge to their identities as war veterans and as a consequence to their psychological well-being. It
is argued that social denigration, protest or censure over wartime service leads to "sense of rejection, humiliation and eventually alienation" (Umbrasas, 2009, p. 50), or psychological isolation (Johnson et al, 1997; Wilson & Krauss, 1985). A loss of social recognition impacts on identity, self-esteem and social status as well as opportunities to access emotional, practical and informational social support.

**Coping and Identity**

In order for a veteran to successfully cope in post-war life, it may also be necessary for some integration or sense-making of the military identity with the new civilian self. Men who go to war are “figuratively stripped of their civilian identities and rebuilt into soldiers” (Kindsvatter, 2003, p. xix). This fundamental alteration of the life trajectory means veterans often feel they had inhabited the worlds of war and peace as two different people (Leed, 1979).

From a life course perspective or developmental standpoint, psychological well-being is connected to successful progression through the stages and events of an individual’s life (Erikson, 1997). In this way, coping processes are linked to the sequence of interconnected transitions and trajectories that individuals experience in the various roles, identities, relationships and contexts which occur over the life span. As such “the lifespan perspective views development as lifelong, multidimensional, multidirectional, plastic ... and contextual and as a process which involves growth, maintenance and regulation of loss” (Santrock, 2008, p. 7). Future development is always linked to past and present events, contexts and conditions of life (Caltabiano & Sarafino, 2007).
Without doubt “wartime experiences acquire an element of immortality through their imprint on survivors. Wars eventually come to an end but their consequences in life continue” (Elder, 1987, p. 449). Coping with experiences of war across the lifespan is an ongoing process which occurs within changing social, psychological and biological conditions within the veteran’s life.

This research examines the accounts of life during and after war for 70 New Zealand men who served in the Army during the First World War One, Second World War and the Vietnam War. The exclusion of the veterans from the Korean War, Malayan Emergency and the Confrontation in Borneo was unavoidable and will be discussed in the methodology section. Qualitative analysis about coping is made of these accounts of life and war, which are oral histories collected from New Zealand men of the two World Wars aged in their 80’s and 90’s and Vietnam veterans aged in their 50’s, 60’s and 70’s.

These New Zealanders talk about their war experiences and about what happened when they came home. Three themes were identified from the men’s talk which provided a representation of what life was like following return from war across and within the different veteran sample groups. Thematic analysis was employed as a methodology of organising the predominant patterns and ideas in these interviews and will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 3.

It is important to understand the historical context of these men’s experiences and how socio-political conditions of war and peace shape a veteran’s ability to cope with the trauma of war and everyday life across time. In order to provide a context for the development of the themes identified from the interviewees experiences, as
discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, the following chapter provide a historical overview of a New Zealand context of war and post-war life and society.

Chapter 2 – The New Zealand Context

_The experience of war is neither the prerogative nor the exclusive fate of fighting soldiers. It engulfs entire peoples. Its nature too, is not specifically or wholly military. Warfare alters, sometimes transforms societies and leaves no one who has been exposed to its turmoil unchanged. But it is the soldier for whom the experience of war is most vivid._

(Keegan & Holmes, 1985, p.259)

Experiences of war over the 20th Century have shaped and defined New Zealand’s sense of nationhood, race relations, public policy and international arrangements (Belich, 2001). These experiences are also the personal stories and lived realities of the men who fought them and of the families and communities they belonged to. War then, was an entity that transformed the public life of the nation, and the private lives of New Zealand’s people. This transformation developed within, and through three major western world conflicts: the Great War or First World War (1914-1918), Second World War (1939-1945), and the Vietnam War (1964 -1975).

At the turn of the 20th Century, New Zealand was a young colonial nation and part of the British Empire. The Treaty of Waitangi was sixty years old, and the New Zealand Land Wars had concluded at Parihaka, some nineteen years earlier (McGibbon, 2000). The Boer War had just ended, and New Zealand had sent ten contingents totalling 6,500 men to fight in this war which lasted from 1899-1902 (McGibbon, 2000). By 1914, New Zealand’s population numbered just over a million. Of these
63,000 were of Māori descent and the remainder were predominately European of British descent (Soutar, 2007).

There were communities of German, Scandinavian, Indian, Chinese, French and Lebanese people but these communities were small and in the latter part of the 19th Century New Zealand’s European population was definitely British in essence. Following the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, all British immigrants were legally recognized as New Zealand citizens and further migration of thousands from British homelands was encouraged by free or assisted passage, (Phillips, 2008). As a result by the 1870s, and throughout the 1880s, nearly all immigrants to New Zealand were born in Britain. Of these British immigrants 70% were English, 10% were Irish and the remaining 20% were Scots (Phillips, 2008).

The shaping of New Zealand as an Anglo nation was further realised through the Chinese Immigrants Act 1881. This Act imposed a poll tax on Chinese immigrants which acted to halve Chinese immigration. Similarly, the Immigration Restriction Act of 1899 permitted entry only to those of British or Irish descent who could complete the application form in any European language. As such, this Act imposed what was effectively an English language restriction on immigrants (Phillips, 2008). These restrictions were so successful that between 1901 and 1916, only 63 immigrants out of a net population gain of around 120,000 were born outside the British Empire (Phillips, 2008).

This Anglicization ensured that New Zealand citizens proudly saw their nation as a daughter of Mother England. This strong tie with Britain almost certainly guaranteed
that New Zealand would take up arms on behalf of the Empire. As King (2003) argued, that implicit

\[
\text{in all this was the conviction that the Empire would never put a foot wrong in matters of principle and foreign affairs, and that anyone who crossed Mother Britain was likely to be wrong and did so at his peril.} \ (pp. 100-101)
\]

New Zealand was not only bound to Britain through social and cultural ties but also politically and economically. Ultimately, it was the British Navy that protected New Zealand’s trade routes and trade was fundamental to national prosperity (Harper, 2008). It was necessary for New Zealand to be seen as important to the British Empire to ensure the protection of a powerful ally.

The defence of the British Empire was a foremost consideration for Britain and her dominions. Following the end of the Boer War in 1902, world superpowers jostled for supremacy and Germany was seen as the major contender to usurp British dominance (Rabel, 2009). In such a climate of international competition and instability the prospect of war was seen as “virtually pre-ordained” (Rabel, 2009, p. 250).

Preparations to send a New Zealand Expeditionary Force to support the Empire resulted from meetings in 1907 and 1909, which New Zealand representatives attended in London. An Imperial General Staff was established to create military co-operation and standardisation of the forces of the Crown Dominions, including
Australia and New Zealand. Defence of the Empire would mean dominion forces being combined into “one homogeneous Imperial Army” (McGibbon, 2007, p.57).

New Zealand undertook preparation for war in several ways. The government focused on building the New Zealand Army which did not require huge capital expenditure. Using a territorial (volunteer reserve force) model, the nation produced a citizen army constructed through part-time service with limited numbers of regular soldiers in key positions (McGibbon, 2007). Training of this citizen army was made possible with the passing of the 1909 Defence Act. This Act required that every man underwent part-time compulsory military training following his eighteenth birthday. From ages eighteen to twenty-five men were required to complete a week long camp, drill parades and a musketry qualification course each year (Pugsley, 2004).

The First World War

By the British declaration of war on Germany of 4 August 1914, New Zealand was relatively well prepared for war. The target goal for territorial force numbers had been set by the government at 30,000, and at war’s outbreak there were around 29,000 territorial soldiers. The country was divided into four military districts: Auckland, Wellington, Canterbury, and Otago. Each district was responsible for raising the required infantry, artillery, mounted rifles, engineer and ambulance manpower (McGibbon, 2007). From these districts, the nation compiled an approximately 8000-strong expeditionary force known as the ‘Main Body’ which was “74 % New Zealand born, 94% single, 63% under 25 years of age, 94% Protestant and 82% with previous military training” (Stowers, 2005, p.20).
Māori Participation

Māori involvement in the Imperial war machine occurred directly following the British declaration of war. On the following day, 5 August 1914, New Zealand became the first Dominion of the Empire to pledge support to Britain (Capie, 2009). On 6 August telegrams were received by the government from the Māori iwi (tribes) of Te Arawa, Ngati Kahungunu, and Ngati Porou and from North Auckland iwi offering assistance (Cowan, 1926; Gardiner, 1992; Pugsley, 1996). Other iwi soon followed suit.

Not all Māori pledged support to the government, however. The New Zealand Land Wars left a bitter legacy and the wholesale confiscation of Māori lands in Taranaki, Waikato and from Ngati Maniapoto in the 1860’s was a long standing grievance. As such there was considerable resistance from some iwi against service in the Māori contingent. Some Taranaki and Waikato iwi as well as many Māori from Ngati Maniapoto refused to be part of any Māori contingent and Tuhoe prophet Rua Kenana actively discouraged Tuhoe men from joining any Māori war effort (Ministry of Culture and Heritage, 2010).

The Māori contingent was organised along iwi lines and under iwi leadership as decreed by Māori Members of Parliament who formed the Native Contingent Committee (Soutar, 2007). Although, Māori did fight in other units, the creation of a Māori contingent held Māori soldiers together as a group rather than dispersing Māori throughout Imperial forces, allowing for the preservation of “tribal cohesiveness and … the delicate balance of intertribal relations” (Gardiner, 1992, p.16).
The Māori contingent known as the Native Contingent or Te Hokowhitu a Tu consisted of A and B Company, and each company comprised four platoons. The men in A Company originated from Auckland, Northland, North Taranaki, Tauranga, Taupo, Whanganui, Taihape, Manawatu, Horowhenua down to Wellington and the South Island. The men of B Company came from Rotorua and Matata through to the East Coast, Gisborne, the Mahia Peninsula, Napier and aiarapa (Gardiner, 1992). *Te Hokowhitu a Tu* was led by Māori officers with the two most senior appointments of the contingent held by Paheka (New Zealand European) commanders (Gardiner, 1992).

Originally, Māori were intended to be garrison forces and not combat troops for two main reasons. First, Imperial policy in 1914 excluded indigenous troops from participating in wars between Europeans or so called ‘white people’ (Gardiner, 1992). However, this objection was soon set aside when it appeared necessary to send Indian troops to protect the Suez Canal in mid-1914. Second, there was a somewhat paternalistic concern by New Zealand authorities that a “race that had been facing extinction and was now making a brave struggle to survive should not face depletion of its numbers on the battlefront” (Soutar, 2007, p. 97). However, due to the strong desire of Māori to be deployed on active service this was finally agreed to by the Imperial Government in early 1915.

Going to war on active service was an opportunity for Māori to demonstrate military prowess. Gardiner (1992) argues “that every society has a war memory” and for Māori this memory was long and spanning over 1000 years since arrival in New Zealand (p. 8). Conflict between Māori iwi in pre-European New Zealand had led to
rich oral histories of famous chiefs, and battles, which exemplified the mana or prestige of Māori military heritage. Contemporary warriors were seen as bound to their ancestors and thus responsible for continuation of tribal prestige (Gardiner, 1992)

Supporting New Zealand’s war efforts was seen by Māori politicians and leaders as a way of enhancing, “…the profile of the Māori and to prove that he was the equal of his Paheka comrades” (Gardiner, 1992, p.14). Military service was seen as both an expression of Māori bravery and a response to the call to arms for all races within the British Empire. Going to war was “…motivated by ideals of patriotic service and the obligations of citizenship inherent in the commitment signed by their ancestors to the Treaty of Waitangi” (Soutar, 2007, p.100).

**Enlistment**

Patriotism was an important reason why New Zealanders both Māori, and Paheka went to war. There was a strong notion of service for King and country (King, 2012). However, there were multiple other reasons why New Zealanders entered the First World War and the subsequent wars of the 20th Century.

Notwithstanding a patriotic loyalty, there was a strong underlying moral current that joining up was the “correct and proper thing to do” (Shadbolt, 1988, p. 68). There was a strong sense of “moral outrage... against the ‘Central Powers’ [Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria] aggression towards smaller nations and it’s willingness to violate international law” (Harper, 2008, p. 21). Specifically, German aggression was demonised, and there was seen to be a moral imperative to restore
correct law and order, and thwart any challenge to Britain and her Empire (Harper, 2008).

Men also joined up from a spirit of adventure, and military service was perceived as a way to see the world and strange faraway places (Pugsley, 1996). Military service was a means of experiencing the “old world of Europe” and for most of these men, this was a world only previously heard about (Ziino, 2006 p.41). Sometimes enlistment meant an escape from economic deprivation and unhappy home lives. Certainly, and most importantly, men went to war because their mates, brothers, cousins and compatriots were going (Pugsley, 1996).

Men volunteering for war service helped hold intact a male community shared in civilian life. To be left behind was an exclusion from what would be an experience of shared adventure, masculinity and honour. Fighting in war was seen as courageous, noble as well as a marker of masculinity. As Phillips (1996), stated

*People continued to regard their soldiers as heroes whose triumphant manhood was seen as proving New Zealand’s very nationhood. Instead of undermining the role of war in defining male achievement, the Great War established the soldier as the shining personification of the New Zealand male and indeed of New Zealand itself. (p. 163)*

**Gallipoli**

The New Zealand ‘Main Body’ was intended to join the British Expeditionary force in Europe. However, due to political tensions in the Eastern Mediterranean, Britain decided it was necessary to station troops there rather than in Europe (McGibbon,
2007). As a result, the New Zealanders disembarked in Egypt in December 1914, and from there went on to serve in the Gallipoli campaign in the first Australian and New Zealand (ANZAC) Division (McGibbon, 2007)

The experiences of war on the Gallipoli Peninsula were without question a baptism of fire for New Zealand soldiers. For Māori, this was seen as passing into te mura o te ahi (the fires of hell) (Gardiner, 1992). New Zealand’s soldiers not only coped with the daily realities of trench warfare but also fought through the carnage of three major battles on Turkish ground. The first of these battles famously occurred at Anzac Cove on 25 April 1915. Of the 3,100 New Zealand troops who landed that day, it was estimated that there were 600 casualties (McGibbon, 2000). Similarly horrific was the ill-fated charge across what was known as the ‘Daisy Patch’ towards the Krithia village at Cape Helles on 8 May 1915. For a gain of 500 yards, the cost was 835 casualties with the loss of 170 New Zealand lives. Finally, at the battle for Chunuk Bair in August 1915, the New Zealanders endured their greatest tragedy of the Gallipoli campaign. The failure at Chunuk Bair cost 2500 casualties with over 800 dead. The attacking Wellington Infantry Battalion was reduced from strength of 805 to less than 80 men who had not been wounded or whose wounds were slight (Stowers, 2005).

Māori troops were stationed at Gallipoli from July, 1915, following the brutal losses New Zealand sustained at Gallipoli in April and May 1915, the Māori contingent was despatched from Malta to Gallipoli (Soutar, 2007). Māori fought alongside Europeans in the August offensive. The Māori contingent comprising 477 men took part in the night attack to capture the foothills of Sari Bair ridge and “... the battle cries of the
sons and warriors of Tumatauenga [God of War] were for the first time heard on foreign soil” (Gardiner, 1992, p.12). Throughout the darkness, the Māori war cry, *ka mate, ka mate, ka ora, ka ora* (tis death tis death, tis life, tis life) was chanted. The official war correspondent Captain Malcolm Ross wrote on 26 August, that

> the Māoris entered upon the charge with great dash, making the darkness hideous with their wild war cries and striking terror into the Turks. With the awful vigour of their onslaught, using bayonets and rifle butts with equal effect, the Māoris forged another link in the chain of the Empire. (Cowan, 1926, p. 55)

Seventeen Māori soldiers were killed and 89 wounded from a contingent of 477 (Cowan, 1926). During the eight month long Gallipoli campaign, from April until December 1915, it is estimated that approximately 13,000 New Zealanders served (Stowers, 2005), with causalities numbering 2,721 dead and 4,779 wounded (McGibbon, 2000). Of the 16 Māori officers and 461 rank and file who went ashore on July 16, only two officers and 132 men remained by the time of evacuation, some five months later (Soutar, 2007). Overall, 57 per cent of New Zealand men, Māori and Paheka, who served at Gallipoli were either wounded or killed.

The costly failures and unnecessary waste of life at Gallipoli have been attributed to a combination of factors. Foremost, inexperienced and detached British and New Zealand commanders consistently demonstrated a lack of understanding of the capabilities of men in combat. Overall, there was poor and inept planning at the operational and tactical levels which repeatedly resulted in failed attacks (Pugsley, 2008). There were also issues of military experience, and different motivations which
were brought to the battlefield. At this emergent stage of the First World War, the New Zealand citizen soldier faced professional Turkish forces that were ultimately fighting for survival as a nation (Pugsley, 2004). Lastly, there was inadequate sanitation, medical treatment and resources, which are required in a theatre of war. New Zealand soldiers not only battled the enemy but the constant heat, flies, and stench of unburied and decomposing bodies. Over the June and July period of 1915 alone, over 1,000 men reported as sick (Stowers, 2005).

The experiences at Gallipoli are often understood to have led to a ‘coming of age’ for New Zealand as the aftermath of this campaign brought about a distinct sense of national identity (King, 1981; Pugsley, 1996). Certainly, it was at this point that determination of a New Zealand identity and protection of the nation’s interests in allied policy making was strengthened. New Zealand’s disillusionment with British ways was emerging (Shadbolt, 1988).

Following the battle for Chunuk Bair, Stowers (2005) argues, that

*the Kiwis on Gallipoli from that day forward saw New Zealand as a nation rather than a ‘not quite grown-up child of Britain’ They came to see themselves as a distinct people through the comradeship and shared agony of the ruinous campaign. Undeniably, New Zealand’s emergent nationhood had [begun] to be forged in the crucible of Gallipoli. The men who fought at Gallipoli and on the Western Front ... never forgot the British staff that sent them into battle, their mates that were killed and the British New Army Divisions that failed so often on their flanks... their*
constant criticism of the First World War was always ‘British staff, British
methods and British bungling. (p. 11)

The events of Gallipoli also impacted on race relations between Māori and Paheka
both at war and at home. Serious questions had been raised about the capabilities of
two Māori company commanders and two Māori officers (Gardiner, 1992). Of these
four men, one was medically discharged and three returned to New Zealand in
disgrace. Major-General Sir Alexander Godley, commander of the New Zealand
Expeditionary Force (NZEF), decided to split the contingent up and attached half a
company to each infantry battalion (Gardiner, 1992). The Māori contingent remained
separated and fought with infantry battalions until Māori were evacuated from
Gallipoli on 3 October 1915.

Godley’s move to separate elements of Te Hokowhitu a Tu and the return of the
disgraced officers was met with enormous resistance both at Gallipoli and in New
Zealand. Māori leaders determined that there would be no further reinforcements
sent to the war effort and demanded the return to duty of the three officers.
Eventually, Godley agreed to the officers’ return to service and posted all Māori to a
Pioneer Battalion after the Gallipoli campaign (Cowan, 1926).

Following Gallipoli, the mostly elated mood of New Zealand seen in 1914 was also
changing. By and large, the nation in 1914 had celebrated going to war in the streets,
with cheering crowds waving the Union Jack (King, 2012). But by the end of 1915,
New Zealand was becoming war-weary and the casualty lists and returning wounded
were bringing home the realities of war (Shadbolt, 1988). The grouping of men from
the same towns and districts meant that not only families, but communities suffered
the sicknesses, wounding and deaths of New Zealand soldiers. Public opinion of the growing cost of New Zealand’s commitment was evidenced by political commentary. When called upon by Britain to provide an infantry division for the Western Front at the beginning of 1916, Defence Minister James Allen replied, that he was

... very glad that New Zealand has been able to provide a Division and reinforcements thereon...it is a very large task for us and I do hope that you will not without the gravest consideration suggest that more be done by New Zealand. We have supplied considerably more than our share of soldiers as compared with the Commonwealth or with Canada and the willing horse cannot be worked till it drops. (Pugsley, 2004, p. 66-67)

The formation of a New Zealand Division in February 1916 helped to strengthen this emergent national identity. Troop numbers bolstered through reinforcements made a New Zealand Division, which was separate from the ANZAC division possible (Stewart, 1921). New Zealander, Major General Andrew Russell was given command of the division which was a welcome shift from the previous direct British command. (Pugsley, 1996). Although still subject to British Army rules, regulations and decision making, the New Zealand Division became a “national army in miniature, fiercely proud of its identity and as determined as Russell, its commander, to be the best... on the Western Front the New Zealanders did not see themselves as ‘Anzacs’ but ‘En Zeds” (Pugsley, 1996, p. 127).

Despite these beginnings of national identity, an independent New Zealand voice in allied military arrangements was still a long way off. British authority was supreme and any objections from New Zealand commanders about troop deployment or
planned attacks could be overruled by British command. Pugsley (2004, p.68) argues that “...even during the worst years on the Western Front ... there was little or no questioning on New Zealand’s part on how its expeditionary force was used”. And these years on the Western Front were among the worst years in the nation’s history in terms of loss of life.

**The Western Front**

Following the withdrawal from Gallipoli in December 1915, the New Zealand Division was sent to the Western Front arriving in France in May 1916 (Wolfe, 2004). The Māori Pioneer Battalion had arrived in France in April 1916 and from then to the war’s end was present for each battle the nation was involved in. Initially, there were equal numbers of Paheka with Māori in the Pioneer Battalion but by September 1917 the battalion was exclusively Māori (Gardiner, 1992).

Alongside Māori, 458 Pacific Island men from Rarotonga, Niue, Gilbert and Ellice Islands also served in the Māori Pioneer Battalion. Often under heavy fire and shelling, the Pioneer Battalion was responsible for constructing trenches, providing and repairing roads as well as laying wooden “duck walks” so soldiers could move forward. These men also laid tram lines, buried cable and built dug outs, gun pits and shelters (Cowan, 1926).

Following a rest period after Gallipoli, the New Zealand Division was despatched to defend the trenches at Armentières in Northern France from May 1916, through to August of the same year. Life in the trenches was an appalling daily struggle with lice, mud, sewage and the constant “…threat of shell, bullet, mortar or gas” (Wright, 2005, p. 45). In the three months that the New Zealanders were stationed at
Armentières, the Division suffered 2500 casualties, including 400 dead (McGibbon, 2000).

**The Somme**

In September 1916, the New Zealand Division undertook its first offensive action on the Western Front, at the Battle of Flers-Courcelette, in the third phase of the First Battle of the Somme (McDonald, 2007). It was “amid the grisly First Battle of the Somme in 1916 [that] the New Zealand Division seeded its reputation as one of the finest on the Western Front” (Macdonald, 2007, p. 227). The New Zealanders achieved all their objectives and surpassed the performance of the British Divisions, which were situated on either side (Macdonald, 2007). This success and further successes in the Somme in 1916 worked to consolidate the New Zealand Division’s highly regarded reputation.

This reputation was “built on what have become recognized as characteristic traits of New Zealanders: a strong sense of individual initiative, an unassuming ability to get on with different nationalities, a willingness to conform and an almost dour determination to win” (Pugsley, 1996, p. 127). However, such success was not without grave cost. At the First Battle of the Somme the New Zealanders fought continuously for 23 days with 5,848 wounded and 2,111 dead. For New Zealand, it was the highest ever casualty figure for a battle (Macdonald, 2007).

The New Zealanders then defended the line north of the Somme until February 1917 when they were moved north into Belgium (McGibbon, 2000). In March, the New Zealand Division was once again sent into battle at Messines on 7 June 1917. Control of the Messines ridge was crucial for the planned advance towards Passchendaele…
and the New Zealanders’ involvement in this attack has been considered one of the Division’s most spectacular successes (McGibbon, 2001). The New Zealanders met their objectives and the Messines attack was considered a “model of planning, preparation and artillery/infantry co-ordination” (McGibbon, 2001, p.27). Success however was at a price. By 9 June, 3,700 men had become casualties and 700 were dead (McGibbon, 2001). However, the worst was yet to come through the terrible slaughter that was the battle of Passchendaele.

*Passchendaele*

The Battle of Passchendaele or the Third Battle of Ypres was a series of eight offensives, which lasted from July to November 1917 (Harper, 2000). The New Zealand Division was committed to two offensives on the Flanders battlefield which were launched on 4 October and 12 October 1917. The first battle, known as the battle of Broodseinde, was extremely successful. The New Zealand Division secured its objectives and made a gain of over 1,900 yards (Harper, 2000). This was vital ground and the enemy had been driven from some of the most significant positions of the western front (Harper, 2000). Although casualties numbered 1,853, and which included 522 men dead or missing, the losses were less than at Gallipoli, the Somme or Messines (Harper, 2000).

The next offensive carried out on October 12 was a disaster and can only be termed the ‘massacre at Passchendaele’ (Harper, 2007). In the attack that commenced at 5.25 am, and was halted around 8.00 am, New Zealand suffered casualties of 117 officers and 3,179 men. In two and a half hours, 846 New Zealand men were dead
with a further 138 dying of wounds within the week. The gains made for this terrible loss of life was a total of 700 yards (Harper, 2007).

This attack should never have taken place. There was a lack of planning and little time to prepare for objectives that were tactically impossible (Harper, 2007). The weather was atrocious and the terrain was a sea of mud. Artillery support was weak and the enemy had been forewarned. The soldiers were exhausted and had endured an arduous five mile march through pouring rain. Most importantly, there were masses of unbroken barbed wire some 30 yards wide and heavily protected by German pillboxes and machine gun fire. The Division had been given an impossible task and the men of New Zealand never stood a chance of success against such odds (Harper, 2007).

The New Zealand Division was devastated. “Passchendaele was the Division’s first and greatest failure of the war, when combined with the heavy winter of 1917, almost destroyed it” (Harper, 2000, p. 97). The Division was bitter at the futility of the attack and the tragic losses, it had been pushed to the limits of endurance and the troops were exhausted.

Back home, the whole country was affected. “This catastrophe at Passchendaele affected more New Zealand families and shattered more lives on a single day than any other event in the nation’s history” (Harper, 2000, p. 103). New Zealand would never again celebrate the declaration of war in the streets. As Harper (2000) solemnly reflects
Life for all New Zealanders could not turn back to 1914. Too much blood had been shed and too much pain, often borne in silence, endured. The shadow of death had fallen across the land and it would remain for some time to come. And Passchendaele lies at the heart of this experience.

(p. 114)

After Passchendaele, the Division was rested at Lumbers and all fit men returned to trenches south of Passchendaele by 16 November 1917. The New Zealanders next saw action at Polygon Wood in an attempt to capture the German held Polderhoek Spur. At the top of the spur was a ruined chateau, which had been fought over several times already. Heavy artillery shelling on German pillboxes was supposed to have driven the Germans underground. Unfortunately it did not, and the pill boxes were fully manned. Although the New Zealanders gained control of this position following an attack on 3 December, the Germans subsequently attacked, and regained possession ten days later (McGibbon, 2000).

In mid-January 1918, the weary New Zealand Division was moved to defend the line at Broodseinde Ridge. During the cold winter months from January until the German Spring offensive launched on 21 March 1918, the Division suffered a further 3,000 casualties including nearly 500 deaths (McGibbon, 2000).

Following a period of rest and training, the New Zealanders participated in the allied response to Operation MICHAEL, the first battle of the German Spring offensive also known as Kaiserschlacht (Kaiser’s Battle) in April (Wright, 2005). The Division played a significant role in “... stemming the German advance in the Somme sector... against
massive odds, without much equipment, and often without much sleep” (Wright, 2005, p. 138).

The Division’s success continued through the ‘hundred’ days of action, which brought the war to a close launched by the British attack on Amiens on August 8, 1918 (McGibbon, 2000). The New Zealanders were in almost continuous action in the final three months of the war. In the closing stages, the New Zealand Division undertook the capture of the ancient walled town of Le Quesnoy, on 4 November 1918. This was to be the Division’s final and most spectacular action (McGibbon, 2001).

Rather than use artillery bombardment to destroy the walls of this town, which originated from a 12th Century castle, the New Zealanders re-enacted a medieval type attack and scaled the outer ramparts with ladders. It was an unparalleled success; the Division captured sixty field guns and the German garrison of around 2000 surrendered. The people of Le Quesnoy had been under German occupation since August 1914 and were overjoyed at their liberation (McGibbon, 2001).

Seven days later, on the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, the ‘war to end all wars’ concluded in armistice. The fighting was over and the guns were silent (Pugsley, 1996). However, war never really ends with the laying down of arms. Its legacy lives on in the minds and bodies of the men who went, and always touches the families left behind, especially, the families of men who never returned. The two and a half years on the western front cost 12,483 New Zealand lives (McGibbon, 2000) and 35,000 were wounded (King, 2003).
**Sinai and Palestine Campaign**

As well as serving on the Western Front, New Zealand forces had also fought against the Turks from April 1916 to October 1918, as the Mounted Rifle Brigade at Gallipoli and in the Egyptian Expeditionary Force (EEF) across Sinai and Palestine (Powles, 1922). During this campaign, the New Zealanders, who numbered around 2000 men fought 14 major battles through Syria, Gaza, Beersheba, Jerusalem, Jericho, Amman and Jordan (Kinloch, 2007). The Mounted Rifles not only battled the Turkish enemy but also the desert environment which contained scorpions, tarantula spiders and poisonous centipedes and snakes, as well as malaria and influenza. In total 522 men were killed or died of wounds. Sadly, only four horses from the 10,000 that departed for the First World War were ever returned to New Zealand (Ministry of Culture and Heritage, 2014).

In all, between 5 August 1914 and 12 November 1918 New Zealand sent 100,444 soldiers to serve in the First World War. In total, 18,166 men were killed and 41,315 wounded (McGibbon, 2000). Of the 2,227 Māori who went, 336 were dead and 734 wounded a casualty rate of 50 per cent. In all, “the killed or wounded amounted to a quarter of the male population of military age” (Belich, 2001, p. 116). From a population of less than one million, New Zealand’s contribution was massive (Belich, 2001).

The loss to a young developing nation was unsurpassed. Instead of being named as fathers on the birth certificates of a generation of New Zealand children, the names of men who were lost are inscribed on stone cenotaphs throughout the country. Others who returned spent years in and out of hospitals, sanatoriums and mental
asylums. By 1939, around 2,500 soldiers had received institutional treatment for psychological injury. Of these men, 1,134 had been treated between 1919 and 1921 (Clarke, 1991). These numbers do not reflect those who suffered and never sought help. Suffering was deep and sometimes life-long, often repressed into inward haunting and trauma. The roar of the guns could be heard years later for many and the fallen were never forgotten (Boyack & Tolerton, 1990)

The First World War had become “...in the public mind, the epitome of military futility, a battlefield on which men struggled to survive in a hellish landscape of muddy shell holes and flooded trenches and were sacrificed at regular intervals in pointless attacks...” (McGibbon, 2000, p. 609). From the personal sacrifices and societal experiences of the First World War a sense of nationhood had begun to emerge and the New Zealander was now longer a devoted colonial child of Mother Britain. The experiences of the First World War directly led to autonomy of command for New Zealand’s forces in the Second World War. The willingness to blindly follow Britain was “tempered by the knowledge of 60,000 causalities in the First World War and reinforced by the determination to ensure New Zealand’s national interests were never forgotten” (Pugsley, 1996, p. 167). Painful lessons had been learnt.

The Inter-war Years

We consider that it is the duty of the State to assist the returned soldier to escape as soon as possible from his military environment, and to find a suitable niche in the general social life of the community for him. We recognise that the sooner that can be brought the better it will be for the soldier and the better it will be
Preparations for the repatriation or process of returning soldiers to the community began soon after the Gallipoli campaign in 1915. Below in Table 1 is a list of legislation, government and other aid offered to veterans.

**Table 1**

*Legislation, Government, and Other Aid in Favour of First World War Veterans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Legislation and Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>National Patriotic Fund Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Discharged Soldiers Information Department established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>War Pensions Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Repatriation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Repatriation Department established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Repatriation Department closed down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Ex-Soldiers Rehabilitation Commission established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Disabled Soldiers Civil Reestablishment League established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>War Veterans Allowance Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Mortgagors and Lessees Rehabilitation Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 82,278 men who survived the war and 41,315 of these had been wounded (McGibbon, 2000). By 1939, there were 24,257 men in receipt of a war pension, and around 95% of these pensions were for physical disability following war service (Clarke, 1991). These physical problems included neurasthenia, respiratory
diseases, eyesight problems, deafness, rheumatism, heart trouble, nerve damage, sciatica, lumbago and so on (Thomson, 1983). There was also considerable psychological injury from war and by 1939, more than 2,500 First World War soldiers had received some form of treatment in New Zealand’s mental hospitals. Sadly, five of these men spent the full twenty years from the end of one war to the beginning of another as committed patients.

The obligation to care for these sick men and men discharged as fit from war service “… became an article of faith for many politicians and those involved in community interest groups such as patriotic societies” (Gould, 1992, p. 42). The Crown moved quickly in support of war veterans with the passing of the War Pensions Act of 1915. This act stated that all men who had suffered disease or injury as a result of war service were entitled to a universal pension (Boston, 1993). However pension payments were limited and eligibility was denied to those who had been discharged as fit.

These eligibility criteria proved to be problematic as delayed effects of war experiences led to deterioration of veterans’ health. There were issues with previous wounds on ageing bodies, diseases, especially respiratory from gassing and psychological issues (Hodgetts, 1997). Public recognition of long term effects of war coupled with extensive lobbying from The New Zealand Returned Soldiers Association (NZRSA formed in 1916) brought about the passing of the War Veterans Allowance Bill of 1935 (Thomson, 1983). Under this Bill, pensions could be granted to soldiers who had been discharged as fit following the First World War but whose health had subsequently broken down (Thomson, 1983).
Other measures were taken to repatriate apparently fit veterans into everyday civilian society through the workings of the Repatriation Department. Between 1919 and 1922, this department helped 17,000 returned soldiers find work and a further 7,000 had received governmental subsides for work training or apprenticeships. A further 6,000 men received loans for business ventures, tools, equipment and furniture (Thomson, 1983). Employment was seen as the top priority in the reintegration of soldiers into civilian society and was identified as a crucial contributing factor to the health and well-being of veterans (Hodgetts, 1997). Even the disabled veteran was expected to work “…in the hope that work would find a curative for the loss of self-respect, sense of purpose and self-expression that advocates perceived as the sources of his ills” (Hodgetts, 1997, p. 14).

**Land Settlement**

Perhaps the most well-known demonstration of gratitude to veterans for their service was through the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act of 1915. This Act was in keeping with the tradition of offering land grants to settle soldiers on farms and had originated following the New Zealand Land Wars of the 1860’s (Gould, 1992). Farming was seen as therapeutic and used in rehabilitation programmes in many hospitals (Hodgetts, 1997). By 1920, 7,000 soldiers had been settled on farms and of this number 6,701 farms were still occupied by ex-soldiers in 1934 (Gould, 1992).

Historically, there has been controversy as to the success of soldier land settlement. It is commonly thought that the scheme was a failure, mostly due to processes during 1915-1921 (Gould 1992; Thomson, 1983). During this time some unproductive land was sold to the Crown at inflated prices and then re-sold to soldiers regardless
of their farming abilities or skills (Thomson, 1983). However, as the numbers above demonstrate, 95% of those settled on farms after the war still retained possession in the mid-1930s.

**The Depression**

The inter-war years of 1920-1939 were largely characterised by economic depression, and the soldiers of the First World War not only had to cope with effects of their war service but also debilitating economic conditions. Kennard (1972) asserts that

> the depression had a profound effect not only on the politics and economy of New Zealand but also on the psychological outlook of her people. The suffering of those years is not easily forgotten. Many people still remember the unemployment, the relief agencies, the work camps, the bad housing, the under nourished children and the despair that struck many New Zealand homes. (p. iii)

For returned men, the Great Depression had several implications. The job market became extremely competitive with healthy men favoured over disabled veterans although healthy veterans fared little better than their disabled counterparts (Hodgetts, 1997). Many veterans had taken up casual work after returning from the war rather than undergo training. This was mostly due to family responsibilities and the need to make some financial headway. Unfortunately, casual work opportunities are usually threatened early in a market downturn, and many veterans were forced to take up inadequate relief work. Relief work generally consisted of three days a
week for two weeks, out of every three weeks, doing hard physical labour such as land clearance, road construction and other pick and shovel work (Simpson, 1997).

It was a significant struggle for some men to cope with the physical demands of this work. For some veterans, the effects of war service, including PTSD re-surfaced in times of stress, so faced with economic uncertainty, their health further suffered (Hodgetts, 1997). Government workers also took massive wage cuts and disability pensions were reduced (Oliver, 1960).

In response to the effects of the economic depression on veteran’s lives several measures were taken. The creation of the Disabled Soldiers Civil Re-establishment League in 1931 was an attempt to revive the Repatriation Department closed in 1922. Unfortunately, the League had limited effectiveness due to the economic conditions and lack of government funding. Men who had obtained rehabilitation farms also began to have problems with mortgage repayments due to lack of work or wage cuts. In reaction to these difficulties, a board was established to value and adjust the capital worth of farm properties. In turn, this led to re-assessment of mortgage repayments as legislated through The Mortgagors and Lessees Act 1936.

The NZRSA was instrumental in subsidising work schemes for returned men funded from sales of silk poppies on Anzac Day. The manufacture of the poppies was undertaken by veterans whose need for work was prioritised by their financial responsibilities. There were also patriotic war funds and other private charities that offered assistance to returned servicemen in difficulty. In all, as Boston (1993) argues
there was a complex framework against which the needs of returned servicemen were to be met. There was a clear social commitment to rewarding such men for their service to the country, but this was a partial commitment cobbled together from voluntary and public sources and was always harassed by financial constraints. (p. 9)

Māori Rehabilitation Assistance

For Māori veterans, the situation was quite different. There were around 2,227 Māori who participated in the First World War and about 1,800 Māori were returned servicemen. For Māori, fighting for New Zealand had several important consequences. Veterans were accorded a position of great respect in Māori communities that lasted across their lifetimes. Participating in war led to increased access to education, which increased employment and economic growth through participation in industry, and land use. Through sharing battlefield experiences, men of different iwi created relationships and partnerships that formerly did not exist (Soutar, 2007).

Participation in the First World War was among the first steps to full citizenship, although it would take decades for social and legal equality (Gardiner, 1992). The Crown policy for First World War veterans at war’s end was outlined, in the information booklet called ‘The Soldiers’ Guide’. This guide stated that Māori and Paheka soldiers would receive the same opportunities and treatment in terms of repatriation processes. However well-intentioned the government may have been, Māori did not receive the same benefits as Paheka veterans (Gould, 1992).
In terms of land settlement, two percent of Māori veterans received rehabilitation farms as compared with ten percent of their Paheka counterparts. This may have been due in part to lack of desire on the part of Māori to move outside of iwi boundaries but evidence also suggests that Māori were not well informed about the opportunities available (Gould, 1992). There seems to have been widespread perceptions by some Paheka communities, various politicians and at least in one instance the NZRSA, that Māori were rich in land assets and therefore undeserving of Crown assistance. Alongside land settlement, Māori veterans also failed to receive other reparation help such as vocational training and/or loans for business endeavours, tools or furniture (Gould, 1992).

The deprivations and struggles endured by and Māori and Paheka veterans of the First World War in the inter-war years were located in a landscape of hardship and economic depression. The country made a genuine commitment in public and private sectors to repatriate and rehabilitate the men who had served the nation’s interests. Important understandings and lessons were gained which ultimately benefited the returned men of the Second World War. These benefits were delivered through the interventions of the First World War veterans who through their own experiences became important advocates for returned men. Thomson (1983) highlighted, that

*By 1939, the angry young men of 1918 had achieved a dignified middle age. However, they knew and remembered and they formed a sort of outer group giving strength and succour to the new generation of soldiers. Their existence guaranteed a sympathetic hearing for the men of*
the new war. More than this, ex-servicemen permeated the echelons of the public and private sectors where policy is made. Veterans of the Great War graduated from outside critics to decision makers and World War Two servicemen benefited. (p. 28)

Second World War

I am satisfied that nowhere will the issue be more clearly understood than in New Zealand - where, for almost a century, behind the sure shield of Britain, we have enjoyed and cherished freedom and self-government. Both with gratitude for the past and confidence in the future, we range ourselves without fear beside Britain. Where she goes, we go. Where she stands, we stand. We are only a small and young nation, but we are one and all a band of brothers and we march forward with union of hearts and wills to a common destiny.

Prime Minister Michael Joseph Savage 5 September 1939

Officially, the decision to go to war with Germany was made simultaneously with Britain on the 3 September 1939 following the Luftwaffe attacks on Poland, and German refusal to withdraw from Polish territory. On the 4th of September, the New Zealand Governor-General confirmed this decision by sending a telegram to London recognising that a state of war existed between New Zealand and Germany (McClymont, 1959). In 1939, New Zealand’s decision to go to war was based on similar political and economic conditions that had informed the nation’s participation in the First World War.

New Zealand was still firmly committed to allied support of Britain and a genuine desire to assist the ‘mother country’. There was still a need to protect and secure the
nation’s trade routes to ensure economic stability and, as in 1914, the New Zealand economy was dependent on sales of primary produce to the British market. Like many other Western countries, the nation was repelled by fascism and saw a need to take action against Adolph Hitler and his highly aggressive stance. Going to war was a decision made from allegiance to Britain, political ideology and for reasons of national self-interest (McGibbon, 2000).

However, the painful legacy of 60,000 casualties of the First World War shadowed the declaration of war, and there was firm determination that New Zealand’s voice would be heard. This time national interests would foreground any participation in allied military arrangements. Major General Bernard ‘Tiny’ Freyberg, the British-born but New Zealand-raised commander of the New Zealand Division was given a Charter which determined that his primary responsibility was to the New Zealand government. Through his Charter of authority, Freyberg was empowered to communicate directly with the New Zealand government if he thought a course of action directed from British command might unnecessarily endanger the safety of New Zealand troops (Barber & Tonkin-Covell, 1989).

On 12 September 1939, the recruiting offices opened and 5,419 men enlisted on that first day. By 5 October, a total of 14,983 New Zealand men had joined up for what would become the Second New Zealand Expeditionary Force or 2 NZEF (McClymont, 1959). Initially recruits were restricted to single men aged between 21 and 35 but by April 1940, this age limit was extended to age 40. For officers, the age limit was up to 45 (McClymont, 1959). Initially enlistment was voluntary until conscription was introduced in September 1940 (Thomson, 1983).
It was decided that New Zealand would raise a division known as the ‘Div’ through amassing three echelons at two month intervals, entering military camps in October, December and February of 1940 (McClymont, 1959). Each echelon numbered around 6000 men, bringing the Division up to a strength of approximately 18,000 and comprised primarily of three infantry brigades numbered 4, 5 and 6 (Pugsley, 1996). Unlike the First World War, where the battalions were named after the originating regions, Auckland, Wellington, Otago and Canterbury, the infantry brigades and battalions of the Second World War were numbered with battalions starting at 18. Hence Battalions 18, 21, and 24 were from the Auckland region; 19, 22, and 25 from the Wellington region and 20, 23 and 26 from the South Island (Pugsley, 1996). Attached to each infantry brigade was an artillery regiment, battery of anti-tank guns, anti-aircraft guns, a machine gun company, engineers, transport, ordnance and other equipment and personnel which contributed to the successful performance of an infantry brigade (Pugsley, 1996).

Two days after New Zealand’s declaration of war, Māori members of parliament proposed that Māori should have their own unit and that this should be an infantry battalion rather than the pioneer or labour force of the First World War. The 28th (Māori) Infantry Battalion was made up of four companies which were organised on an iwi or tribal basis. A company encompassed iwi from North Auckland and consisted of men from Ngapuhi and Aupouri. B Company covered the Bay of Plenty, Thames-Coromandel and Taupo areas, with the majority of men coming from Te Arawa. C Company incorporated the East Coast of the North Island and were mainly
Ngati Porou, and D Company was a compilation company comprised of other remaining areas and the South Island (Gardiner, 1992).

The 28th Māori Battalion became a highly decorated unit which served with distinction in the New Zealand Division (Soutar, 2007) Māori enlistment in the 28th Battalion (attached to the 5th Infantry Brigade) was entirely voluntary, and Māori were given the choice to either stay with their enlistment units or transfer to the 28th (Māori) Battalion. In total, 3,600 Māori served with the Battalion, and of these 649 were killed and 1,712 were wounded (McGibbon, 2000). The Battalion left for overseas as part of the Second Echelon on 1 May 1940 (Gardiner, 1992; McClymont, 1959).

Meanwhile, the First Echelon of 6,600 troops had departed on 5 January 1940, for Maadi camp in Egypt. This training camp was located at the base of the desert slopes of the Wadi Degla and Tel al-Maadi in close proximity to the training grounds for the First World War, also known as Maadi camp. Maadi was the main overseas base for New Zealand troops, although there was a smaller camp at Helwan nearby. From 1940-1946, over 76,000 New Zealanders would be based at these training grounds. The camp was separated from the Great Pyramids of Egypt by the Nile, and like their fathers and uncles before them New Zealand troops got to know Cairo located some eight miles south (Hutching, 2005).

**Greece**

After training in the Egyptian deserts for just over a year, New Zealand’s first theatre of war was in the defence of Greece. The Allies had expected a German invasion to follow the failed Italian attempt in late October 1940. Under the command of British
General Henry Maitland Wilson, the British, Australian and New Zealand units of W Force began to arrive in support the small Greek army in March 1940. All three infantry brigades and supporting units of the New Zealand Division would participate in the Campaign for Greece which began with the German panzer-led invasion on 6 April 1941 (McClymont, 1959).

The German invasion was successful and by late April, following the collapse of the Greek army, the decision was made to withdraw W force. This withdrawal began on the night of 24 and early morning of 25 April 1941, and was completed on 29 April. Unable to transport more than the men, instructions were given to the New Zealanders to destroy artillery guns, equipment and transportation. These orders were given to avoid Allied equipment falling into the hands of the advancing German army. Due to the concerted efforts of the Luftwaffe, the evacuation of Allied forces using British Navy warships was highly dangerous, and around 2,000 New Zealanders were left behind on the beaches of Greece. These men were either taken prisoner or managed to escape the Germans, and make their own way to Crete or further afield. The brief Greek campaign of 55 days had cost 291 New Zealand lives, 387 men seriously wounded, and 1,826 taken prisoner of war (McClymont, 1959).

**Crete**

Rather than returning to Egypt as expected, the 4th and 5th Infantry Brigades were landed on Crete following evacuation from Greece. The New Zealanders were woefully ill-equipped, lacking vehicles, heavy guns, radios and other equipment they had been forced to leave behind in their rushed exit from Greece (Hutching, 2001). The 35,000 strong garrison force known as Creforce comprised British, Australian and
7,000 New Zealanders were now commanded by Major General Freyberg (Davin, 1953). After securing Greece, the Germans turned their attention to Crete and the anticipated German attack came on the morning of 20 May 1941.

The German attack on Crete in May was to become one of the greatest airborne assaults in history (Davin, 1953). In the first wave of the invasion, German gliders swept towards Maleme and Canea. The skies over Maleme and Galatas filled with different coloured parachutes each carrying a German paratrooper complete with stock of weapons and supplies (Davin, 1953). The New Zealanders were, as Hutching (2001) describes “… spellbound and many were momentarily frightened, by the heart-stopping spectacle of an airborne invasion on a scale far beyond anything ever seen before” (p, 29). Eventually, the paratroopers were able to gain advantage and secure the landing areas for their planes. The New Zealand battalion commander at Maleme, Colonel Andrew, made a fateful decision to withdraw on the evening of the 20th May, and from that moment, the battle for Crete was effectively lost (Davin, 1953).

Fierce fighting raged at Maleme, Heraklion, Galatas, Canea and Suda. The New Zealand soldiers distinguished themselves in challenging conditions. There had been fierce hand to hand combat in places and it was on Crete that the bayonet was first employed by New Zealanders. Heralded by shouts of ‘surrender be fucked’ Māori charged on that first day of battle killing 32 Germans (Gardiner, 1992). The valour of New Zealanders both Māori and Paheka was recognised and it was in Crete that Charles Upham won the first of his two Victoria crosses (Pugsley, 1996).

But it was also at the end of May 1941, that
newspapers in New Zealand started publishing casualty lists – name after name, column after column, of New Zealanders killed, wounded or missing. It was the first time in the war that one generation of New Zealanders were confronted with the type of grim reading that was depressingly familiar to an earlier generation; the toll of one war looked much the same as the toll of another. (Palenski, 2009, p. 137)

The battle for Crete was effectively over in a week and New Zealand forces made their way to the coast for what was for many their second evacuation following defeat within a month (Davin, 1959). The men had to make their way to the evacuation beaches of Sfakia over the formidable White Mountains on a road that reaches a height of 1,000 metres at one point. The passage along this mountainous road was made even more arduous by the lack of sufficient food and water (Hutching, 2001). It was an exhausting journey and “…those who struggled along on foot gradually divested themselves of anything disposable, leaving the trail littered with the debris of a defeated army. Many fell out and collapsed at the side of the road” (Hutching, 2001, p. 40). Over 11,000 troops began evacuating from Crete on the 29th May but more than 6,000 were left behind, and of this number 2,217 were New Zealand men. Similar to the situation in Greece, British warships came under heavy German bombardment, making complete evacuation too dangerous (Hutching, 2001).

Crete had cost 671 New Zealand lives, 967 men were wounded and 2,180 captured (Pugsley, 1996). It is contended by Pugsley (1996), that “Crete was also the graveyard of a number of New Zealand reputations and doubts were raised about Freyberg’s
performance” (p. 193). These doubts are now seen as somewhat unfair, given that his subordinate commanders failed to hold the airfield at Maleme despite orders to the contrary. One enduring legacy of Crete was the relationships, still existing, formed with the Cretan people under German occupation, who risked their lives to shelter and assist nearly three hundred New Zealanders to escape to Egypt (Pugsley, 1996). The New Zealand troops were battered and bruised, and between the campaigns on Greece and Crete more than 950 young New Zealand men were killed, over 2,500 wounded, and 4,000 became prisoners of war (Parr, 1995).

**North Africa**

Following the evacuation from Crete, the New Zealand Division was rested and given the recuperation they badly needed and then put into operations on November 1941. This time it was to face General Erwin Rommel and his Afrika Korps in the North African desert. The 2 NZEF were some 20,000 strong and equipped with around 2,800 vehicles. The men mainly moved at night chiefly by three-tonne trucks and “… the journeys were a nightmare of jolting and twisting as the drivers tried to avoid patches of soft sand or, alternatively, piles of rock” (Gardiner, 1992, p. 78). The New Zealanders first undertook a key role in Operation **Crusader** as part of the recently formed Eighth Army (Murphy, 1961). The objective of Operation **Crusader** was to smash Rommel’s Afrika Korps and to relieve the garrison at Tobruk in Libya (Murphy, 1961).

The allied-held garrison at Tobruk had been under siege for seven months from 11 April 1941, following attack by a combination of Italian and German forces. The town and harbour of Tobruk were a key strategic stronghold vital to supply lines, and Allied
defence of the Suez Canal and Egypt (Murphy, 1961). Allied loss of Tobruk would have significantly reduced the long and vulnerable German supply lines and enabled Rommel to attack across the Egyptian border and advance towards Cairo and Alexandria (Murphy, 1961).

Operation *Crusader* was launched 18 November 1941 in the attempt to break the seven month long siege. Early on, the majority of British tanks were destroyed. The desert fighting at Sidi Rezegh and Belhamed near Tobruk was some of the hardest fighting of the war for the New Zealand Division. In trying to capture Point 175 at Sidi Rezegh, the 25th Battalion lost over 100 men, which were the greatest losses suffered by a New Zealand battalion in a single day. This was a day that would become known as ‘Sunday of the Dead’, named after Totensonntag, a date in the German Lutheran calendar (Murphy, 1961). One New Zealand soldier talked about one of the first deaths in 25 Battalion at Point 175, saying

> he was like a platoon mascot, a little bloke, not a youngster, 30 years old probably. Absolute favourite with everyone, just a nice little bloke, never be a soldier in the whole of his life. Everybody liked him. And they shot him. Right through the head. That was the first dead guy I saw. (Hutching, 2005, p. 51)

Operation *Crusader* was finally won following Rommel’s withdrawal but it was at heavy cost. There were 879 dead, 1,700 wounded and 1939 taken prisoner (Hutching, 2005). For the third time that year, thousands of New Zealanders went into captivity (Hutching, 2005). At the end of Operation *Crusader* “… more New Zealanders died and more were taken prisoner in CRUSADER than in any other
campaign of the Second World War. This was a heavy loss indeed and there were few communities in New Zealand untouched by it” (Murphy, 1961, p. 521). The New Zealand Division was sent to Syria to recover.

On 20 June 1942, the Germans broke through allied lines and captured Tobruk on their advance to Egypt in what would become known as the First Battle of El Alamein (Scoullar, 1955). Recalled from Syria and eventually positioned at Minqar Quaim some 450km west of Cairo, the New Zealanders were cut off from Allied forces in the East after becoming encircled by the advancing German Army. The New Zealand Division managed to successfully break out and escape through a gap to the south through fierce and brutal hand to hand fighting by 4 Brigade, and the 28th Māori Battalion (Scoullar, 1955).

Retreating from Minqar Quaim, the New Zealand Division fell back to the Alamein line. It was at this First Battle for El Alamein that the New Zealanders successfully captured Ruweisat Ridge and the El Mreir Depression a week later in July 1942. However both of these successful night assaults were undone by the lack of support from British amour and these positions were lost at great cost. There were 1,405 causalities, mostly killed or captured at Ruweisat Ridge with two battalions effectively destroyed. There had been 290 wounded and 1,115 either killed or taken prisoner (Scoullar, 1955). Pugsley (1996) argues that “by the time the battles of the Alamein line were over in June and July of 1942 the Commonwealth soldiers of the 8th Army had lost faith in their commanders, hated British armour and held Rommel in high regard” (p. 198).
Three months later, the battle for El Alamein (also known as the Second battle of El Alamein) was launched by the newly appointed commander of the Eighth Army Lieutenant General Bernard Montgomery (Monty) on 23 October 1942. The New Zealand Division played a pivotal role in this battle which turned the tide of the war in North Africa in favour of the allies. Engineers cleared paths through the minefields for British tanks and the New Zealanders captured their objectives at Miteiriya Ridge. However, the battle failed to develop due to congestion, lack of coordination and cautious command decisions which prevented British armour capitalising on infantry gains (Walker, 1967).

Montgomery then launched a second attack called Operation Supercharge south of these battle lines on 2 November. The New Zealanders led the initial thrust of this attack and Montgomery is quoted as describing this attack as “a real killing match as the Company stabbed, grenaded and tommy gunned its way through an area thick with machine gun and anti-tank guns” (Gardiner, 1992, p. 104). By 4 November, the German lines had been breached and, facing complete defeat of the Afrika Korps, Rommel withdrew his forces (Walker, 1967).

The New Zealanders fought through Libya to Tunisia in a series of small attacks before taking part in preventing a German counter attack at Medenine in Tunisia on 6 March 1943. The New Zealand Division then pushed south to Tebaga Gap, tasked with encircling the German-Italian forces across the Mareth Line on 20 March. Operation Supercharge II launched on 26 March shattered enemy defences at Tebaga Gap. It was for bravery in action amidst the savage fighting just south of
Tebaga Gap that 2nd Lieutenant Moananui-a-Kiwa Ngarimu won a posthumous Victoria Cross and became the first Māori to do so (Gardiner, 1992).

The German and Italian forces retreated, taking a defensive position around Enfidaville and Takrouna. Over a two day period the New Zealanders pushed forward and successfully took Enfidaville and Takrouna on 21 April 1943. This was the end of the fighting in North Africa for the New Zealanders with the surrender of 238,000 German and Italian forces on the 13 May 1943.

The North African campaign had been fought in highly challenging physical conditions. During the day temperatures soared and nights in the desert could be extremely cold. There were regular sandstorms and the sand dust created by shell fire and moving vehicles went through everything (Hutching, 2005). There was a lack of drinking water let alone having sufficient resources to shave and wash. The flies were insidious and attracted to moisture on the mens’ bodies as well as their food and drink. Dysentery was rife and desert sores quickly festered (Hutching, 2005). A New Zealand surgeon who worked with the wounded, said

*there was everything - head wounds, chest wounds. They were awkward the chest wounds because they were sucking wounds and if you have a hole in your chest and you breathe, the air comes through that hole ... and that collapses your lung ... abdominal wounds were always unpleasant, especially when the bowel was involved and hanging out of the hole* (Hutching, 2005, p. 235).
In all, 2,989 New Zealanders died, 7,000 were wounded, and 4,041 taken prisoner in the North African Campaign, which spanned November 1941 to May 1943 (McGibbon, 2000).

The New Zealand Division then made the 3,000 km journey, reaching Maadi and Helwan camp near Cairo on the 1st June. The men were rested in Cairo and a furlough draft of 6,000 came home to New Zealand in 1943. These men were determined not to return to war until all able-bodied New Zealand men had done their share as well (Pugsley, 1996). There were over 40,000 men in essential industries in New Zealand during the Second World War and around 13,000 of these men were single. There was considerable tension about sharing the burdens and costs of war in a socially just way. In January 1944, preparations began to send veterans back to the Middle East. Exempt from return were married men with children, and men over 41. Some were medically downgraded, leaving many eligible but mostly unwilling to return to war (Pugsley, 1996).

A number of those determined to disobey orders and refuse further service staged a social rebellion which occurred over several stages. After an initial meeting in Hamilton, over 100 men met the train carrying veterans back to camp with banners and pamphlets. By the time the trains reached the military camps, they were practically empty. This rebellion spread with public marches and protests and the government somewhat drastically imposed “...censorship on matters that were destructive of civilian morale on our own country or disruptive of unity of our forces at home or abroad” (Pugsley, 1996, p. 211-212). In the end 800 men returned to war but an estimated 430 who refused to serve were arrested. These men were court-
martialled but the court-martial sentences were subsequently overturned upon appeal and pay entitlements as well as rehabilitation allowances were restored after the war (Palenski, 2009).

War had broken out in the Pacific and South East Asia with the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbour on 7 December 1941, and the collapse of Singapore in 1942 (King, 2012). The Australians relocated their North African divisions to the Pacific theatre and debate ensued as to whether to boost New Zealand’s numbers in the Pacific by withdrawing troops from Europe. Prime Minister Peter Fraser was convinced by Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt to leave New Zealand troops in North Africa and instead American troops would be sent to the Pacific region (Gillespie, 1951). As a result New Zealanders fought in the North African and Italian campaigns or in the Pacific and some men served in both.

**Italy**

After the North African campaign, the Division withdrew to Maadi camp to regroup and rest. During this time, 4 Infantry Brigade was reconfigured into an armoured brigade comprising three armoured regiments: 18, 19, and 20, each with Sherman tanks (Pugsley, 1996). The Division was on the move again and arrived at Taranto in Southern Italy in October 1943.

The campaign for Italy was very different from the desert conditions the Division had left behind. It was mountainous terrain which was ideal for the German defenders but unsuitable for tanks and mobile warfare. The weather conditions were challenging as it was cold and the Division cracked on through snow, mud and slush.
Ultimately it wasn’t until the end of the war that the New Zealanders were able to enjoy the Italian summer (Hutching, 2004).

The New Zealanders went into action in November 1943 around the Sangro River in an attempt to breach the Gustav Line and initiate an advance on Rome. On 2 December they secured the village of Castelfrentano and attempted to take the town of Orsogna (Phillips, 1957). The Germans maintained control and despite repeated attacks the situation turned into a stalemate. When the New Zealanders were eventually withdrawn in January 1944 there had been approximately 1,600 casualties in the first two months of combat in Italy (Phillips, 1957).

The New Zealanders then marched across Italy to join preparations for an allied attack on Cassino. Gaining control of Cassino and the Liri Valley was strategically important for the allied advance to Rome. Monte Cassino, the monastery established in 529 A.D by St Benedict, sat some 500 metres above sea level and overlooked the ten kilometre entrance into the Liri Valley. The four battles for Monte Cassino spanned January to May 1944, and New Zealand played a part in two. The battles of Monte Cassino were amongst the most demanding of the Second World War (Harper, & Tonkin-Covell, 2013). Not only was the fighting hard and at close range, there was also the difficulty of dealing with the dead and dying in such close proximity. One soldier recounted, that “the stench of rotting bodies is something I can still smell in my nostrils” (Hutching, 2004, p. 36).

In the second battle for Cassino, the ancient monastery was laid waste on 15 February 1944 by massive aerial bombardment. The New Zealanders moved forward toward the town of Cassino with the 28th (Māori) Battalion positioned for attack on
the town’s highly defended railway station. On 17 February the Māori Battalion attacked through mine-laden fields and under heavy German mortar and machine gun fire at great cost. Although Māori were able to seize key positions, they were forced to withdraw after much needed support failed to materialise and Māori lost 128 killed or wounded (Gardiner, 1992). A month later, the third battle for Cassino began on 15 March and the New Zealanders fought their way into the town by ferocious hand to hand combat amidst the rubble and destruction.

One New Zealander described Cassino saying

> everything in the town is smashed to bits, in most cases not even walls standing, just a chaos of rubble, steel reinforcing bars, shattered timbers, rubbish of all sorts. Among this were dud shells, fragments of bombs, ammunition used and otherwise, boxes of all types used by both sides, battered tin hats, torn clothing, broken rifles, all the refuse of war among the ruins of a town that was a battlefield. (Pugsley, 1996, p. 237)

After eight days of fighting Freyberg deemed the costs were too high and withdrew the New Zealand Division. In all Cassino had cost 343 dead and 1,253 wounded (Kay, 1967). Following Cassino the New Zealand Division pushed forward across the Senio, Gaiana, Idice and Po rivers to take Padua on Anzac Day 1945. Crossing the Izonso River on the 1st of May the New Zealand Division led the Eighth Army to victory in Trieste, arriving the day before the German forces in Italy unconditionally surrendered. The New Zealanders’ war in Europe was over. The eighteen months the Division had been at war in Italy cost 2,003 killed, 6,705 wounded and 220 captured (McGibbon, 2000).
By May 1945, the New Zealanders were the longest serving division on the Eighth Army and by the time they were disbanded in February 1946 had lost 6068 dead, 29,584 wounded and 8348 captured in nearly six years of war (McGibbon, 2000).

**Pacific**

Following victory in Italy, New Zealand was still at war in the Pacific. In 1940, the plans for a New Zealand presence in the Pacific began. Fiji was viewed as New Zealand’s most immediate Pacific outpost and members of 8 Infantry Brigade numbering approximately 3,000 departed for Fiji in November 1940, primarily intended as a garrison force (Gillespie, 1951). The New Zealanders landing on Fiji made history as this “… was the first time a defence force from a self-governing dominion had been sent to garrison a Crown Colony of the Empire” (Gillespie, 1951, p. 26). By the end of June 1942 there were 10,000 New Zealanders in Fiji (Gillespie, 1951).

Following on from Fiji it was decided to raise a third division for defence closer to home and to better contribute to the US and Australian presence in the Pacific. Major General Harold Barrowclough was appointed to command this third division, known as 3 NZEF on 12 August 1942. The Division was to consist of infantry brigades, anti-tank battery, field regiment, anti-craft regiment, battery of heavy guns, engineers, signals, supplies and medics (Gillespie, 1951). New Zealand’s third division would never become full strength as intended as the country simply didn’t have enough men. By March 1942, 61,368 men had gone overseas; the Army had absorbed 52,712 with the rest serving in the Navy or Air Force (Gillespie, 1951).
Unable to raise a full strength division, the 3 NZEF for the most part consisted of two infantry brigades (8 and 14) with supporting armour and could only play a small but important support role in the Pacific (Pugsley, 1996). Intensive training for a jungle environment began in the Hunua Ranges in Auckland, and in November 1942, a contingent of 13,383 men of 3 NZEF began arriving in New Caledonia (Gillespie, 1951). The New Zealanders undertook nine months of garrison duty and made preparations for the three battles of the Solomons Campaign (Gillespie, 1951).

The first operation began in late September 1943 when approximately 3,700 men of 14 brigade landed on Vella Lavella with the objective of clearing the island of Japanese. Jungle warfare proved highly demanding. Guns had to be brought ashore and moved over tree roots and coral to their positions with the moisture, continuous rain and electrical storms interfering with the signals equipment (Gillespie, 1951). Despite the adverse conditions, it was a successful attack and somewhere between two to three hundred Japanese were killed before they evacuated. New Zealand had secured the island with the loss of 32 killed and 32 wounded (Gillespie, 1951).

At the same time as the attack on Vella Lavella, 8 Brigade landed on Mono and Stirling Islands. This amphibious attack was the first since Gallipoli and precise planning was needed to ensure that troops, guns, ammunition, vehicles were landed in the correct order. On 27 of October 1943, New Zealand attacked and successfully secured ground around Falamai which had been identified as a suitable airfield, taking the islands from Japanese defenders. As tasked, the New Zealanders were able to set up a radar station the day before the Australian invasion of Bougainville.
on 31 October 1943. Japanese resistance finally ceased on 12 November with the cost to New Zealand of 21 killed and 70 wounded (Gillespie, 1951).

The third and final operation of the Solomons Campaign was situated on Nissan or Green Island. Nissan Island had been determined as a strategic location for an airfield and motor torpedo base. This was the first time the 3 NZEF had operated at Divisional level. The attack on Japanese garrison forces commenced on 30 of January 1944, in thick jungle with range of sight between five to ten metres. Difficult fighting took place when a large number of the Japanese garrison were encountered near the village of Tanaheran. For the first time New Zealand tanks were used in the Pacific theatre successfully overcoming the Japanese with infantry and tank firepower at the end of February 1944 (Pugsley, 1996). To secure Nissan Island had cost New Zealand 10 killed and 21 wounded (Gillespie, 1951).

The shortage of manpower in New Zealand heralded the demise of 3 NZEF, which was withdrawn from active service by October 1944 (Gillespie, 1951). Fighting in the jungle had been exhausting mentally and physically, undertaken in humid and hot environments in often relentless rain and mud (Hutching, 2006). New Zealand troops had faced venomous snakes, scorpions, centipedes, spiders, mosquitoes and leeches. Sickness was rife with men experiencing prickly heat, malaria, tinea, festering sores, Dengue fever, hepatitis, elephantiasis and hookworm infestation (Hutching, 2006).

In total 17, 134 men returned from the demanding conditions of the Pacific theatre. Of this number there were 12, 069 men subsumed into essential industries and 3,229 joined 2 NZEF in Europe.
By the end of the Second World War around 105,000 men had served overseas, and 11,625 had been killed (McGibbon, 2000). The New Zealand Army lost 6793 killed, 15,324 wounded and 7863 taken prisoner (Pugsley, 1996). In all, there had been just under 30,000 casualties of the Second World War. More than 3,600 Māori served in the 28th Battalion which accounted for around ten percent of the Māori population (Soutar, 2008). Of these Māori men, around 70 per cent were killed, wounded or captured. Māori had lost many potential leaders and had certainly paid the ‘price of citizenship’ (Soutar, 2008). In all New Zealand had lost 11% of the men sent overseas and thousands more were damaged physically and psychologically. As reported by Prime Minister Peter Fraser at the end of the Second World War:

*the country had taken its share of the responsibility: The New Zealand division had taken part in more major actions than any Commonwealth force; and the casualties on a per capita basis were the highest of any allied country except Russia* (King, 2003, p. 231).

**Post- Second World War**

*For all ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen the opportunity of returning to civil life on terms at least as favourable as those which would have probably applied, as a result of their own efforts, if they had not been required to serve in the Armed Forces*

*Rehabilitation Board 1944*

Preparations for rehabilitation of the Second World War veterans began in 1940. Following, in Table 2, is a list of legislation and government and other aid offered to veterans.
As after the First World War, the government and society were keen to assist the veterans of the Second World War back into civilian life. Plans for the rehabilitation of Second World War soldiers began within months of the outbreak of war. In 1940, a parliamentary committee began to inquire into ways of providing state assistance to resettle discharged men. The 1941 Rehabilitation Act made provision for the Rehabilitation Board which organised the establishment of veterans in civilian life.

Table 2

*Legislation, Government and Other Aid in Favour of Second World War Veterans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Legislation and Aid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Amendment to Small Farms Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>New Zealand War Amputees Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Approval given for 50% of state houses to be reserved for veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Māori Rehabilitation Committee established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Māori Rehabilitation Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Servicemen’s Settlement and Land Sales Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>War Pensions Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Servicemen to Civilian Booklets produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Intermediate Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Disabled Servicemen’s Re-establishment League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Blinded Servicemen’s Trust Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Land Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Servicemen’s Settlement Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>War Pensions Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
post war. Unlike the situation following the First World War, rehabilitation of Second
World War veterans was accomplished during a time of economic prosperity and
political stability. There was full employment, New Zealand’s exports were in high
demand and the Korean War boosted wool prices (Thomson, 1983).

The primary focus for rehabilitation was on providing employment and second to this
was financial assistance, land settlement, vocational training and provision for
disabled men (Thomson, 1983). Politicians, officials and veteran organisations,
principally the NZRSA, all contributed to the reformation of rehabilitation policy
following the war. Underlying the resettlement philosophy was the fairly traditional
socialist ideology of the then Labour Party Government in the 1940’s and 1950’s.

Both Peter Fraser (Prime Minister 1940-1949) and Walter Nash (Leader of the
Opposition 1951-1956 and Prime Minister 1957-1960) shared a philosophy focused
on economic recovery from war which benefitted veterans in a socially just way.
Fraser outlined this sentiment when he “… referred to social reconstruction in the
post-war world, and to hopes for a better order with greater equality of opportunity
and no extremes of wealth and poverty” (Thomson, 1983, p.37). Thus to some
extent, the “… rehabilitation scheme was an experiment in social welfare on a large
scale” (Thomson, 1983, p. 10).

Work, Skills Training and Education
The first consideration for the Rehabilitation Board was returning veterans to work.
Trade training was set up as a mechanism to return veterans to work through skills
based training and to bolster the national pool of tradesmen, which had been
decimated by mobilisation for war. Carpentry trade schools were established on
state housing development sites and trade school trainees built a total of 4,474 state rental houses. The establishment of other training centres was approved in mid-1945 to supplement the building industry and included painters, paperhangers, plasterers, joiners and bricklayers. By 1954, 15,000 or 6% of the men who had enlisted for war had successfully completed some form of trade training. Of these men, just over 25% had trained under an employer subsided scheme, just short of 25% had resumed apprenticeships and around 50% had gained a new trade. These trades not only included those in the building industry but also grocers, printers, boot makers, law clerks, accountants, surveyors and architects (Thomson, 1983).

There was other help available for veterans in the form of education and vocational training. The guiding principle of the education policy towards returned men was to “… help men recover lost time or lost opportunity, in preparing for a career for which it is considered that they are suitable, and to provide sufficient money for them to do so with reasonable prospect of success” (Thomson, 1983, p. 106). Free places in technical schools were made available, as were bursaries for some men to take up university education alongside subsistence student allowances and overseas postgraduate scholarships. By 1951, 8.8% of Second World War veterans had received help to study (Thomson, 1983). Refresher courses were run by universities (and other professional groups) such as the three week course for dentists run by the Otago Dental School in 1945, 1946 and 1947. All of these educational opportunities made an important contribution to the re-employment of veterans (Thomson, 1983).
Land Settlement

Continuing historical tradition, another important focus of veteran rehabilitation was in land settlement. The notion of land in return for war service took on an emotional and figurative meaning beyond simple gratitude. Thomson (1983) argues, that “... land in the popular cliché is our life’s blood and what more fitting gift could be made to men who risked their own life’s blood for their countrymen” (p. 218). Several key pieces of legislation (see table 2) were concerned with either acquisition of land for purposes of settlement by soldiers or settlement processes.

Following the experiences of some First World War soldiers who had predictably failed to farm unproductive and expensive land, the Labour government made sure that suitable land at controlled prices was bought for resettlement purposes (Thomson, 1983). The lessons of land settlement after the First World War around stewardship of farms had also been learnt. Men with little farming experience were given training and assistance through mentorship, experience on training farms and more formal instruction at either Lincoln or Massey Agricultural Colleges. Men entered into a ballot system to receive farms and were able to access rehabilitation loans at 3% interest for 100% value of the farm (Thomson, 1983).

The land settlement schemes made a valuable contribution to the New Zealand economy by increasing expertise levels through training in farming communities, education for farmers, land development and more intensive farming (Thomson, 1983). By 1951, around 3.5% of the Second World War veterans had been assisted into their own farms and of this number 59% had been settled by 1950 with the last of these men settled in the 1960s (Thomson, 1983).
Housing was also another important consideration for men returning from war and the government allocated 50% of state rental housing to veterans. Veterans who wished to buy houses were given lower interest rates and loans up to 100% value. A further interest free loan was made available to bridge differences between pre-war and post-war housing prices. Business loans were also offered for individual or small business ventures and returned men could access reduced interest loans for stock and chattels as well as interest free loans for tools and furniture. By 1954, there had been 10,963 loans given to war veterans who were in business as builders, grocers, fisherman, transport carriers, bakers, butchers and manufacturers (Thomson, 1983).

All veterans were paid a gratuity of two and sixpence for each day of overseas service and bonuses were paid annually if left untouched. Men with more than six months overseas service were given between one and three months leave allowance and free railway passes for two people for the length of any leave period (Thomson, 1983).

**Assistance for Disabled Veterans**

It was further recognised that disabled veterans would require special assistance. The Disabled Servicemen’s Re-establishment League and the Blinded Servicemen’s Trust Board were formed in 1944, and these welfare groups were given the same standing as executive committees of the Rehabilitation Board (Thomson, 1983). In 1947, the number of veterans receiving permanent war pensions for disability numbered some 26,000, in 1954 this number was reported at 21,687, and in 1970 there were 20,000 on pensions (Thomson, 1983). There were a higher proportion of leg amputations and eye injuries in the Second World War as compared to the First
World War, which resulted from the greater use of anti-personnel mines. However, the most common medical problem both during and after the war was ‘anxiety neurosis’, affecting around 10% of the New Zealand Army (Thomson, 1983). By the 1980s, more than 10,000 New Zealanders had been officially recognised as suffering some sort of psychological injury as a result of the Second World War (Parr, 1995).

For men who still required intensive medical care following war service, there were two convalescent hospitals built in Rotorua in the North Island, and Hanmer in the South Island. The hospital at Rotorua specialised in general treatment facilities alongside occupational therapy and the other at Hanmer focused on psychiatric cases. There was a strong emphasis on returning disabled men to work where feasible. Two main initiatives were undertaken to achieve this. First, the Public Service was expected to endeavour to provide employment for veterans, and disabled men with special preference given to those who had lost limbs. Second, in 1945, employment in several industries including basket ware, book binding, fancy leatherwork, picture framing and boot making were restricted to disabled veterans.

In 1944, the Intermediate Scheme was established for veterans who were partly disabled or had psychological injury, which provided men with light work, as it was seen that such work would “… benefit them mentally, morally and physically and thus prevent degeneration of these qualities” (Thomson, 1983, p. 134).

There were also significant changes made to war pensions, which were available for men unable or only partly able, to return to work. The War Pensions Act of 1943 raised the basic pension by 50%, and unlike the previous legislation, this new Act gave the claimant the benefit of the doubt that disability was due to war service
(Thomson, 1983). In 1954, a new consolidating War Pensions Act was passed, which set the pension at contemporary benefit rates, and still remains as the legislative framework for veterans today.

**Māori Rehabilitation Assistance**

Rehabilitation processes specifically aimed at Māori veterans came about through the workings of the Māori Rehabilitation Committee and the Māori Rehabilitation Finance Committee, established, in 1942 and 1943 respectively. There had been very little help for Māori veterans following the First World War, and it was intended that matters would be very different for Māori veterans of the Second World War. As one Rehabilitation board member stated, “Māori and Paheka are living under the same sky together. They are eating the same food ... and the bullets that are coming from the enemy are not choosing who they hit” (Thomson, 1983, p. 137).

New trade schools were built in Māori districts and Māori had equal rights to tertiary educations possibilities, business concessions, interest rates and loans. Māori veterans were also eligible for state housing allocations. However, there was definitely a disparity in the rehabilitation opportunities and possibilities between Māori and Paheka. Apart from the building of trade schools in Māori areas, there was no other specific education or training designed for Māori, failing to address the pre-war differences between Māori and Paheka in educational achievement. Only 243 business loans went to Māori from a total of around 10,000. Around 6% of Pakeha received assistance to settle on farms as compared to 4.6% of Māori, and about 5% of Māori received farm training, as compared to 16.4% of Paheka veterans (Thomson, 1983).
Māori participation in the public service increased but they never reached senior positions, in part due to social attitudes of the day and also because many Māori wanted to be with one another. Among some Paheka, there was a paternalistic attitude, which premised the idea that Māori lacked capacity in some ways to manage their own affairs. So, although Māori veterans benefited from rehabilitation processes, it was not to the extent as for Paheka veterans of the Second World War.

However, all of these rehabilitation processes for Māori and Paheka were an attempt to meet the objective of successfully settling New Zealand men home from war. It was far from a perfect system but ideas of equality and opportunity underpinned the workings of the Rehabilitation Board and its various committees. By 1950, the demand for rehabilitation assistance had largely been met as Second World War veterans readjusted to civilian life (Thomson, 1983).

**Vietnam War**

*The Crown extends to New Zealand Viet Nam Veterans and their families an apology for the manner in which their loyal service in the name of New Zealand was not recognised as it should have been, when it should have been, and for inadequate support extended to them and their families after their return home from the conflict.*

*Prime Minister Helen Clark, 28 May 2008*

Following the Second World War, the security arrangements and military alliances that New Zealand had formed over the last century dramatically changed. It was clear that Britain would no longer be a key player in political and military arrangements in the Asia-Pacific region (Rabel, 2005). American forces had secured
victory against the Japanese in the Pacific, and looked to significantly contribute
towards political stability in the region. Decolonisation was also changing the
geopolitical environment in the Asia-Pacific region and the Cold War had begun. The
Cold War evolved on the clashing ideologies of Socialism/Communism versus
Capitalism, and employed the threat of nuclear weapons to enforce or protect each
side’s political systems and worldviews. The Cold War became a competition
between the East and West, led by Russia and America respectively, to dominate
world order through expansion of their particular political ideologies (Rabel, 2005).

Negotiating this Cold War landscape, New Zealand “... attempted to both remain
within a British-centre universe, and with Australia, to stretch the boundaries of that
universe and incorporate a security guarantee from the U.S” (Rabel, 2005, p. 4).
Traditionally, New Zealand played the part of the junior partner in wider alliance
structures, and did so again, making a significant shift towards American protection.
New Zealand’s defence policy now focused on a strategy of forward defence, which
focuses on the surrounding geographical region. The objective of forward defence is
to prevent a threat or attack before it gains momentum (Mearsheimer, 1982), and at
this point in history, communism was regarded as the threat to regional stability.

New Zealand had signed the ANZUS treaty in 1951, formalising a military alliance
with Australia and the U.S. These three countries agreed to co-operate on defence
matters in the Pacific and it was New Zealand’s first alliance without Britain (Rabel,
2005). Three years later, New Zealand joined the South East Asia Treaty Organisation
(SEATO) an organisation of collective defence with Australia, France, Pakistan,
Philippines, Thailand, Britain and the U.S formed with the goal of containing communism within Southeast-Asia (Rabel, 2005).

As a result of commitment to these new defence alliances, New Zealand participated in the Korean War (1950-1953), the Malayan Emergency (1955-1960), and the Confrontation in Borneo (1964-1966), and finally in Vietnam (Pugsley, 1996). New Zealand had sent a SAS squadron to Malaya in 1955, which was replaced by 1st Battalion, an infantry battalion some 740 strong, which was based at Terendak Military Camp in Malaya from 1957 onwards. Sending the SAS abroad was the beginning of 44 years’ service in South East Asia for the New Zealand Army, culminating with the withdrawal of 1 Battalion from Singapore in 1989. During these 44 years, the most well-known and controversial period was the New Zealand Army’s commitment to operations in Vietnam (McGibbon, 2010).

Between 1963 and 1975, around 3200 New Zealanders were involved in a civil war between the government of the Republic of South Vietnam and its Army called the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN) forces, against the communist forces of the Viet Cong, combined with the regular troops of the North Vietnamese Army (NVA). In February 1965, just over 3000 U.S men landed in South Vietnam and the Australians quickly declared commitment of an infantry battalion. In response to growing U.S pressure, the New Zealand government reluctantly announced their intention to send a combat unit to Vietnam in May 1965. As New Zealand’s infantry battalion was committed to operations in Borneo in 1965, the artillery 16 Field Regiment known as the 161 battery was sent to Vietnam as a 4 gun unit. The battery would be joined by two infantry companies V (Victor) and W (Whiskey) in 1967. Previous to this, New
Zealand had assisted her allies in Vietnam with medical support and reconstruction teams (McGibbon, 2010).

New Zealand’s V Force initially worked under US command but later came under Australian command, as part of the ‘Free World Military Forces’. The supreme command of the ‘Free World Military Forces’ rested with American generals, first General William Westmoreland and later General Creighton Abrams. The Australasian taskforce was made up of 3 artillery batteries and 13 infantry companies, and re-established ANZAC military arrangements between New Zealand and Australia (McGibbon, 2010).

In 1965, the New Zealand Army was a composition of regular and territorial force personnel. The men of V Force were regular soldiers as opposed to the citizen soldiers of the First World War and Second World War. Men who were part of the regular force were given the choice to serve in Vietnam, and when recruitment started there were short service engagements for as few as three years (later reduced to two years) offered to single men aged between 21 and 40. The tours of duty in Vietnam were differentiated due to marital status. Married men served between 7 and 10 months, and single men served between 18-21 months which, was later reduced to 12 months (McGibbon, 2010).

Although most of the men who served in Vietnam were Paheka (European), Māori participation in the armed forces had been steadily increasing since the 1950s. By 1965, about a third of the regular force was Māori. Of this number, Māori comprised 30-50% of the infantry, 57% of the SAS, and 36.5% of the artillery battery. Although there was a significant Māori presence in the army at the time, they were
underrepresented in higher ranks and no Māori ever commanded combat units beyond platoon level in Vietnam (McGibbon, 2010). Relationships between Māori and Paheka were good as they had fought together prior to Vietnam in the jungles of Malaya (McGibbon, 2010).

In Vietnam, the tempo was quite different as the New Zealanders spent a greater amount of time in operations than the men of the First World War, and Second World War, with the exception of the Gallipoli campaign. For example, from July until September 1967, Victor Company spent 68 out of 92 days on operations. Likewise in 1968, the battery spent 49 weeks in total in the field. In all, both infantry companies and the battery spent more than 80% of their time away from their base camp in the first six months of 1968 (McGibbon, 2010). To help cope with the stresses of war, the New Zealanders had two leave periods. One was in-country in Saigon and then Vung Tau, and the second leave granted after 6 months service could be taken in Hong Kong, Bangkok, Toyoko, Singapore, Taiwan or Manila. By 1970, the New Zealanders could also go to Sydney or Brisbane, which many did and came home during their leave periods (McGibbon, 2010).

For the first time in the nation’s history, combat troops were deploying to a theatre of war to which a large section of society was opposed. Protests in New Zealand originated from interest groups and left wing political organisations such as the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and the New Peace Council. This was the first time that so many groups had come together to express criticism of New Zealand’s support for US policy. Protests grew louder across time, leading to bitter debate, especially between 1969 and 1972, when protests were buoyed by the
emergence of other political and social groups such as the Womens’ Movement (Rabel, 2005).

Amid growing opposition to the Vietnam War, members of the 161 Battery left New Zealand on 15 July 1965. The Battery was the first of New Zealand’s combat troops to leave the country by air and did so on the newly purchased C130 Hercules transport aircraft. The departures were made on a night flight without any public farewell. The New Zealanders landed at Bien Hoa airbase some 25km north-east of Saigon in what was formerly a rubber plantation. The battery was tasked with protection of the airbases at Bien Hoa and then at Vung Tau in the Phuoc Tuy province, and attached to the infantry 1st Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment or 1 RAR. Over time 1RAR was replaced by infantry battalions, 2RAR through to 9RAR (McGibbon, 2010).

The climate was extreme and for months there would be no rain and red dust settled on everything. The dry season was followed by monsoons, which brought humidity and mildew. The New Zealanders not only contended with the enemy but also with snakes, scorpions, leeches, mosquitos, ants, spiders, crocodiles, tigers, elephants and water buffalo. It was close range combat with an objective to search and destroy an elusive enemy and unlike previous wars where the goal had been to seize and hold territory. Moving through the jungle was laborious as the men carried 50 kilogram packs while silently patrolling on average around 400 to 500 metres an hour. Combat was usually engaged within 50 metres of each other, and involved not only small arms fire but also mortars, RPGs, booby traps and mines (McGibbon, 2010).

Following arrival in Vietnam from September 1965 to April 1966, the 161 battery deployed on exercises and operations with the Australians and the Americans, and at
the end of November were part of Operation *New Life*. This operation was a major
effort to deny the enemy access to the rice harvest, and as such, to the food supply
and funds that the rice harvests realised each year. The battery went on to take part
in Operation *Marauder* and Operation *Crimp*, in what would prove to be somewhat
typical of the battery’s efforts in Vietnam. These efforts included harassment fire and
interdiction missions as well as protection of allied forces, and loading zones. The
New Zealanders moved their guns by road or air, and become skilled at transporting
guns using a combination of slings and pallets suspended under a Chinook helicopter.
After some practice it was found that four trips moved one gun, its detachment and
25 rounds of ammunition (McGibbon, 2010).

It was during September in 1965 that the battery suffered its first deaths. Two New
Zealanders were killed when the Viet Cong detonated a mine, destroying the Land
Rover the men were travelling in. The mines were embedded throughout South
Vietnam jungles and roads. The M26 ‘Jumping Jack’ mine was especially lethal. One
infantryman from Victor Company recounted the death of a fellow soldier saying, “…
the mine blew the lower half of his body to pieces. His legs were separated from the
rest of him and his balls were blown up on his webbing… he was an excellent soldier
and I looked up to him. To see him blown to pieces in front of my eyes was hell”
(Subritzky, 1995, p. 205).

The battery went into action in January 1966, positioned about a kilometre away
from American forces in response to a build-up of Viet Cong forces, estimated at
around 1,800 men. The anticipated attack came at on 24 January, and both American
and New Zealand artillery and armour successfully repelled the enemy but at heavy
cost, with 11 US soldiers killed and 70 wounded. The New Zealanders experienced mortar fire, small arms and rifle fire. Feeling vulnerable, one gunner said “flares were dropping into our area and in the harsh white glare I felt like a sitting duck” (McGibbon, 2010, p. 128). By the time the battery returned to the air base at Bien Hoa in late February 1966, they had fired nearly 700 shells in support of taskforce operations. (McGibbon, 2010).

In 1966, the 161 battery, now increased from a 4 gun to a 6 gun battery was shifted to the Phuoc Tuy province to protect the port of Vung Tau, and it was at this point the New Zealanders came under the command of the Australians. Although the Viet Cong were less invested in Phuoc Tuy, most of the province still came under Viet Cong dominance, and it was an important evacuation route. In a province largely covered in jungle, there were around 100,000 people living as farmers, fishermen and labourers. The Vietnamese mainly lived in the south, and the south west in 30 villages (the closest being Long Tan and Long Phuoc), and around 100 hamlets. Rice cultivation was extensive, and there were also two large rubber plantations (Binh Ra and Courtenay) in the north, which also contributed to the province’s economic stability. The allied force’s main opponent in Phuoc Tuy was the Viet Cong D445 Provincial Mobile Battalion, formed in 1965, and numbering around 500 locally recruited troops (McGibbon, 2010).

The New Zealander’s and Australians began construction of the Nui Dat Camp about 30 kilometres away from Vung Tau in May 1966. The battery’s foremost objective was to consolidate its position and search and clear the exclusion or no fire zone around Nui Dat. The battery then began its usual support operations by moving to
designated areas for firebases and discharging harassment and support fire for the Australian infantry’s security sweeps. Alongside support for routine patrolling, the gunners participated in specific operations to destroy the enemy (McGibbon, 2010).

**Battle of Long Tan**

The New Zealanders next major action was at the Battle of Long Tan in August 1966. The Viet Cong 275 Regiment and D445 Battalion attacked at 2.45 am on 17 August, wounding 24 Australians. The guns were brought into action and the attack was halted. It was expected that the Viet Cong would withdraw and move towards the east as normal, and accordingly they were pursued by Australian 11 platoon eastward. Late in the afternoon of the following day of 18 August, the left flank of the platoon’s lead section was cut down by machine gun fire. Several men were instantly killed, and others mortally wounded leaving 11 platoon fighting for survival, and in threat of being overrun (McGibbon, 2010).

Captain Morrie Stanley from 161 battery was a part of a forward observation party, which was located close to 11 platoon and was able to bring the battery’s guns (alongside fire from the American 155mm battery) into action from Nui Dat. The 161 gunners fought furiously for two and half hours, firing around 1,100 rounds and the whole battery took part. There had been unsuccessful attempts by 10 and 12 platoon to move forward, which were beaten back by enemy machine gun fire. Eventually 11 platoon were left in a desperate situation with only 12 men available, and the ability to only hold the enemy back for another 10 to 15 minutes. Stanley was urged to bring artillery fire down on 11 platoon’s position. Conscious of the possibility of friendly fire casualties, Stanley refused but was able to bring artillery fire within 50 to
100 metres of 11 platoon’s position. Under artillery bombardment, the enemy fire reduced and under cover of coloured smoke, 11 platoon was able to reach 12 platoon (McGibbon, 2010). At this stage, the weather deteriorated, and “the rain started late in the day as usual but soon developed into a tremendous storm. Rain, and the intense gunfire caused the area to be shrouded in smoke, steam and fog” (Subritzky, 1995, p. 148).

By 6.15pm, the Viet Cong had regrouped and the Australians counterattacked from the east, north-east and south. With all the Australian infantry together, Stanley was able to bring artillery fire in much closer to the infantry and shells were falling 25 to 30 metres in front of them. Finally, relief was sent from Nui Dat in armoured personnel carriers (APCs) forcing the Viet Cong to retreat. Firing ceased at 7.15 pm (McGibbon, 2010). Surveying the battleground the following day, one New Zealander commented on the destruction, saying “no tree was unmarked; most of it looked as if someone had hit them with a giant flail, and there were no leaves, no twigs, shattered stumps, fallen branches and whole trees toppled over” (McGibbon, 2010, p. 157).

The artillery support had been vital to the survival of the Australian infantrymen and Captain Morrie Stanley was made a Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire. The Australians were awarded a US presidential unit citation and General Westmoreland hailed the victory as ‘one of the most spectacular in Vietnam to date’ (McGibbon, 2010, p. 157). The battle for Long Tan would be the taskforce’s most important action in the Phuoc Tuy province (McGibbon, 2010).
The New Zealander's continued to support the Australian infantry in the sweep and clear missions, becoming involved in a series of small contacts from August through until December 1966. During the early part of 1967, the battery also became involved in ‘winning hearts and minds’ through offering medical assistance, repairing and reroofing the local hospital and other civic aid. Protecting Nui Dat base became of paramount concern as there was a shortage of troops, and the Viet Cong were well aware of the base’s vulnerabilities, attacking the camp several times. It was decided to construct two fences with a minefield in-between, stretching some 16 kilometres from an extinct volcano nicknamed the ‘Horseshoe’. The ‘Horseshoe’ was located about 8 kilometres south west of Nui Dat, and became the forward fire support base for the 161 battery. From this fire support base, the battery could achieve greater range than firing from Nui Dat (McGibbon, 2010).

It was in February 1967, that the worst case of friendly fire occurred for the 161 Battery. Questionable orders to correct firing were carried out, killing four Australians and wounding 13. A court of inquiry found that an inexperienced officer had not carried out the correct procedure and a faulty piece of plotting equipment was to blame. The battery was further shaken with the death eight days later of one of their officers involved in a search operation (McGibbon, 2010).

Two months later the Battery shifted to the fire support base at the ‘Horseshoe’, where a permanent firebase was established. It was the same year that New Zealand infantry entered the Vietnam War as a result of growing pressure from the U.S and Australia. New Zealand sent an infantry company from 1st Battalion (1 RNZIR) at Terendak Camp in Malaysia. These men were all volunteers and formed V (Victor)
Company. There was pressure on for New Zealand to provide more infantry troops and W (Whiskey) Company began training in Burnham Military Camp near Christchurch. On average infantry troops had a year’s training and preparation for service in Vietnam. Over 200 men did two tours of Vietnam and around 40 completed a third tour (McGibbon, 2010)

Within six days of arrival, the New Zealand infantry had their first contact with the Viet Cong, and by the middle of the year both the battery and infantry were based at the ‘Horseshoe’, making it an exclusively New Zealand position. However, also during this year, the battery and infantry companies returned to Nui Dat for periods of training interspersed with patrol and ambush missions. On 31 August 1967, the infantry had their first fatality whilst out on a search and destroy operation when Corporal Manton was killed by a jumping jack mine. He was the first New Zealand soldier who died at war to be returned to New Zealand. This was a significant departure from burial in-theatre or in camp at Terendak (McGibbon, 2010).

The next major shift for the New Zealanders occurred during the Tet offensive of 1968, when the Australians and New Zealanders were sent east of Long Binh in the Bien Hoa province, in order to assist with preventing the approach of enemy units. Victor Company went forward with 2RAR from Nui Dat and attacked a Viet Cong camp with one New Zealander killed. Four days later, enemy fire killed one of 161 battery’s forward observer party. On 7 February 1968, the infantry would become involved in the fiercest fighting that they would encounter in South Vietnam (McGibbon, 2010). The Vietcong attacked the New Zealand position just before 7am. There was an intense firefight, and artillery support was given from the Australian
battery with helicopter gunships brought in to secure Viet Cong withdrawal. There were 3 seriously wounded and 3 lightly wounded but the “... intensity of the three quarters of an hour of living hell they had endured left the Company in a state of shock” (McGibbon, 2010, p. 206).

**Battle of Coral**

In April of 1968, the 161 battery was located at the Fire Support Base named Coral in the province of Bien Hoa in support of the Australians. The area around the base was known as “real Cong country” (McGibbon, 2010, p. 374) and throughout April there had been a number of contacts with the enemy, which had led to the destruction of a major Viet Cong stronghold. Upon arrival at Coral, there had been some initial confusion, and instead of being positioned together, the Australian 102 battery, and the New Zealand 161 battery were located 1,500 metres apart. As a result of these separated positions, 3 RAR were sent along with their mortar platoon to protect the New Zealanders. On 12 May, the Australian 102 battery was attacked at 1.45 am and “all bloody hell let loose at Coral” (McGibbon, 2010). It was a devastating attack and one Australian gun was overrun as was the mortar platoon. The 161 battery went quickly into action, firing in defence of 102 battery’s position, some 1,500 metres away. The Douglas AC-47 ‘Spooky’ airplane circled the battle zone and “… hosed the ground with fire that ‘looked like a great long tongue of flame along with a real roar” and helicopter gunships were brought into the fray (McGibbon, 2010, p. 379). The battle continued for hours through the night and into the next morning. Incredibly, there were no New Zealand casualties. In all, 25 Australians died and nearly 100 were wounded (www.vietnamwar.govt.nz).
The New Zealanders continued to be involved in search and ambush patrols for the rest of 1968, and the beginning of 1969. These months were strenuous, and six New Zealanders were wounded in the close fighting, which was typical of the contacts in Vietnam. In February 1969, the focus changed from pursuing enemy forces to improvement of security of the Phuoc Tuy province, and denial of Viet Cong access to the people of Phuoc Tuy. Despite the pacification approach, the level of danger remained and contacts with the enemy continued. Nui Dat based was attacked four times in May and June alone, and twelve more New Zealanders died in 1969 (McGibbon, 2010).

In July 1969 Whiskey Company, ... “suffered the bloodiest moment of the whole Vietnam campaign” (McGibbon, 2010, p. 421). On 23 July, a ten man patrol was on the outskirts of Lo Gum Village when a soldier triggered a jumping jack mine. The explosion killed one, mortally wounded two and another three men were injured but survived. Just over a fortnight later, a mine fatally injured two more New Zealand men (McGibbon, 2010).

In the beginning of 1970, the security situation in Phuoc Tuy improved. Viet Cong numbers and presence reduced and the province started to economically flourish. There were still sporadic contacts throughout 1970 but by November of that year Whiskey Company departed without replacement. By 1971, the need for the gunners had fallen away and on 22 May, the 161 battery was withdrawn. The battery had seen six years and ten months of continuous service in Vietnam, and had suffered four fatalities. Victor Company remained in the field until December 1971 when they left for Singapore. The New Zealander’s war in Vietnam was over. In all, 3,000 New

The infantry companies returned to Terendak camp in Malaya, and the 161 battery returned to New Zealand. The day after their return from Vietnam on 12 May 1971, the 161 battery marched down Queen Street in Auckland, accompanied by the SAS, before a mayoral reception at the town hall. Most bystanders applauded the troops but a small group of protestors approached the army personnel on parade shouting ‘baby killers’ and lay on the road, covered in tomato sauce representing blood. As a result of this parade, the battery commander Major John Masters was the subject of a private prosecution brought about by two anti-war protestors. The prosecution rested on charges of offensive and obscene behaviour for leading the parade down Queen Street. The charges were quickly dismissed and court costs awarded to the defence. New Zealand’s Vietnam veterans were officially welcomed home twenty seven years later accompanied by applause and support as they marched through the streets of Wellington in June 1998 (McGibbon, 2010).

Veterans returned home from war at the Whenuapai air base in Auckland in the dead of night, and immediately went on leave after being instructed to wear civilian clothes, instead of their uniforms. Rehabilitation processes were somewhat different than for those of earlier conflicts because, as regular servicemen, they all held jobs and those on short term engagements (two or three years) were all offered the choice of reenlistment. Men who had served in Vietnam for longer than six months
(whether they left the army or not) were eligible for cheap loans towards housing, furniture or courses. Subsidised training and education assistance were also made available. Although the land settlement scheme ended after the Second World War, Vietnam veterans, were entitled to enter the farm ballot administered by the Department of Lands and Survey (McGibbon, 2010). Around 40% of veterans left the army soon after return to New Zealand with others remaining as career soldiers. In 1980, around a third (1,019) of the Vietnam veterans were still in military service, and as late as 2008, there were still 10 Vietnam veterans serving in the New Zealand Army (McGibbon, 2010).

Many Vietnam veterans experienced a great sense of alienation and bitterness, which was related to how they were received by New Zealand society following the war. One soldier said he had been overwhelmed, by “the disappointment, the lack of acknowledgment of the contribution that we had made for what we believed was the defence of our nation” (McGibbon, 2010, p. 526). There were indifferent or sometimes hostile receptions at some but not all of the RSAs for these returned men. Veterans returned to a limited employment market with unemployment on the rise. Many were only able to find menial work, which increased their sense of disenfranchisement, and many went to Australia (McGibbon, 2010). Like veterans from previous wars, there were some with mental health problems, and it was a result of the Vietnam War, that Posttraumatic Stress Disorder was officially recognised as a psychiatric disorder in 1998 (McGibbon, 2010). Studies undertaken in the 1990’s indicated that New Zealand’s Vietnam veterans’ PTSD rates were somewhere between 10 to 12% (Vincent, Chamberlain & Long, 1994).
The biggest issue that faced Vietnam veterans was the impact of Agent Orange on their own health and their children’s. Between 1961 and 1971, an estimated 72 million litres of Agent Orange (a toxic compound of chemicals 24D, 245T and TCDD) was used as a defoliant in clearing jungle in Vietnam for enemy detection (Ka Rongo Te Pakanga Nei, n.d). Since the 1970’s, American veterans had been concerned about the potential adverse health effects of Agent Orange, and likewise concern grew among Australian and New Zealand veterans (Challinor & Lancaster, 2000). Arising from this concern, a class action lawsuit was brought against chemical companies who manufactured Agent Orange by a consortium of international veterans. Rather than face a protracted legal battle, these companies settled out of court and New Zealand and Australian veterans received around two percent of the US $180 million dollars won for disbursement (Challinor & Lancaster, 2000).

Despite this settlement, pressure mounted upon the US government for recognition of what veterans considered was serious damage to their own health, and the health of their children. As a result, a comprehensive study by the U.S Institute of Medicine was undertaken in 1991, to investigate health effects of Agent Orange on Vietnam veterans. The study found evidence of an association between exposure to this compound and three cancers, soft tissue sarcoma, Hodgkin’s disease and non – Hodgkin’s lymphoma. The study also found limited but suggestive evidence for associations between Agent Orange and respiratory and prostate cancers as well as multiple myeloma (Institute of Medicine, 1994).

However, the investigating committee found that there was insufficient evidence to determine whether there was an association between Agent Orange exposure and
other forms of cancer, motor dysfunction, cognitive and neuropsychiatric disorders, nervous system problems as well as metabolic, immune, digestive, circulatory and respiratory disorders. However, there was insufficient evidence to conclusively determine any relationship between herbicide exposure and reproductive effects and birth defects in veterans’ children (Institute of Medicine, 1994).

Despite these American findings, many New Zealand veterans put previous illness as well as current health problems down to a direct result of their exposure to Agent Orange. Veterans not only felt hurt, aggrieved and angry about what they perceived as damage to their own health but also damage to their children’s health. Compounding this anger and hurt was the continuing denial by the government and New Zealand Defence Force, that Vietnam veterans had been directly exposed to Agent Orange. Concerns about the health of their children, and themselves remains a major and contentious issue for American, Australian and New Zealand Vietnam veterans. New Zealand followed both the US and Australian governments’ position in arguing, that there was insufficient evidence of a link between direct or indirect exposure to Agent Orange and reproductive or birth defects, and accordingly there were no grounds for compensation (Challinor & Lancaster, 2000).

As a result of pressure brought about by New Zealand Vietnam veterans, there were two inquires commissioned to investigate links between exposure to Agent Orange and the health problems of children born subsequently. Both the Reeves Report in 1999, and the McLeod Report of 2001 found no scientific evidence to suggest exposure to chemicals had damaged the health of Vietnam veterans’ children, except for a small but non-significant association with spina bifida. However, both these
reports were erroneously based on the premise that New Zealand troops were never directly exposed to Agent Orange spraying despite veterans assertion that they had been (Challinor & Lancaster, 2000)

As a result of the operational map showing areas of defoliation subsequently produced by the former 161 battery commander John Masters, significant political pressure was brought to bear on re-examining the Agent Orange issue. In 2003, a Health Select Committee inquiry into the ‘exposure of New Zealand defence personnel to Agent Orange and other defoliants chemical during the Vietnam War, and any health effects of that exposure was undertaken (Ka Rongo te Pakanga Nei, n.d). This inquiry led to a subsequent review of all Vietnam veterans’ grievances.

This Health Select Committee enquiry finally, and officially accepted that New Zealand veterans had been exposed to Agent Orange. The inquiry found that

* veterans’ attitudes were consistent. They began with a very real anger that neither their service, nor its particularly hazardous nature, has received any acknowledgement from the Government which committed them to the operational environment in which they had been deployed. There was even greater resentment amongst veterans that no recognition had been given to the potential linkage between their service and their children’s medical conditions. (Challinor & Lancaster, 2000, p. 168)*

As a result of this inquiry, several compensatory conditions were linked with exposure. These were chronic lymphocytic leukaemia, ischaemic heart disease, Parkinson’s disease, soft tissue sarcoma, Hodgkin’s disease, non-Hodgkin’s
lymphoma and chloracne (McGibbon, 2010). Cover was also extended to veterans’ children who suffered from certain conditions, including acute myeloid leukaemia, cleft palate and spina bifida. It was further recommended that veterans’ children be recompensed for any medical costs associated with conditions pertaining to Agent Orange exposure (Challinor & Lancaster, 2000).

There were a number of measures agreed between Vietnam veterans, the RSA, and the government. These measures included compensation for conditions attributable to service, a formal apology, and an oral history project paid for by the Crown to collect veterans’ stories. These oral histories are to be held for perpetuity in the Alexander Turnbull, National Library of New Zealand. The formal apology was made by Prime Minister Helen Clark in parliament on 28 May 2008 (see Appendix A) for the inadequate support veterans had received from the government since Vietnam. A month later at Tribute 08, a gathering of Vietnam veterans in Wellington, Lieutenant General Jerry Mateparae, the Chief of the New Zealand Defence Force, also apologised to veterans for the treatment they had received from the Defence Force since returning from war (see Appendix B). The oral history programme, undertaken by the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, commenced in 2008 and completed in 2012, collected over 150 interviews now lodged at the Alexander Turnbull Library. Some of these interviews are used in this research.

The aim of the present research is to examine the oral histories of the Army veterans of the First World War, Second World War and the Vietnam War, to see what strengthens and aids coping with war experiences. Going to war is a complex experience, which has both negative and positive effects that are expressed across a
veteran’s life-span. Looking across time with three sample groups of First World War, Second World War and Vietnam War veterans, this research seeks to show the impacts of both universal and specific experiences of war, and homecoming on veterans’ psychological well-being. The next chapter outlines the methodology of this study.
Chapter 3 – Methodology

Oral histories of veterans from three major conflicts of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, the First World War, the Second World War, and the Vietnam War, were analysed to answer the research question ‘what strengthens and aids coping with war’. The exclusion of veterans from Malayan Emergency (1955-1960) and the Confrontation in Borneo (1964-1966) and the Korean War (1950-1953) occurred for several reasons which will be discussed later in this chapter. Using thematic analysis, the oral histories were examined to identify patterns or themes that related to coping with war. By looking within and across veteran groups, historical, social and cultural factors could be identified that might be related to coping processes.

**Oral history**

Oral histories are the spoken, personal and subjective memories about life experiences collected for posterity and scholarship (Harrison, 1989). In the early 1800s, French historian Jules Michelet, “… described the memories of ordinary people as living documents” (Green & Hutching, 2004 p. 1). Today, Michelet’s notion of memories as living documents has been enriched and elaborated by historians, such as Michael Frisch (1990), who suggests oral history is

\begin{quote}
   a powerful tool for discovering, exploring, and evaluating the nature of the process of historical memory - how people make sense of their past, how they connect individual experience and its social context, how the past becomes part of the present, and how people use it to interpret their lives and the world around them. (p. 188)
\end{quote}
The collection and use of oral histories has moved beyond the discipline of history and has been taken up by scholars from anthropology, sociology and psychology. Oral histories have been used to collect, document and preserve academic knowledge, histories and legacies (Baker, 2007; Cameron & Hagan, 2005; Frisch, 2007). They have been used to give voice to marginalized and often repressed groups including, women, lesbian, gay, transgender and indigenous peoples (Basso, 1989; Drescher & Merlino, 2007) Oral histories have been further utilised to understand historical trauma, and resilience as well as used to encourage healing and foster well-being (Blugass, 2007; Ramsay, 2007; Smith, 2003).

Oral histories were chosen as the primary source of material in this research for several reasons. It was seen as important to ‘give voice’ to veterans now deceased. The last New Zealand-born First World War veteran died in 2003. Without drawing on oral histories already collected, the perspectives and accounts of these First World War men would be lost. Currently, veterans of the Second World War are in their 80s and 90s, and it is highly probable that some veterans who gave oral histories in the last decade may have since died. Using the oral histories already collected allows for these men’s accounts to be included.

Oral histories were further chosen to avoid the need for unnecessarily repetitive and potentially intrusive interviews. This may especially be the case for Vietnam veterans who have suffered a lack of government acknowledgment, and experiences of societal condemnation. Oral histories were also chosen to access a rich and in-depth source of information. These histories are collected for posterity and for use in future research, and should be utilised as the rich and valuable research resource that they
are. By doing so, wider knowledge of New Zealand and her people is strengthened and supported.

Using oral histories already collected has also kept the research manageable. A greater number of histories can be listened to in the research time frame than would be possible if new interviews were needed. There are always limitations when using research that has been collected for other research purposes. Conducting one’s own interviews means that specific research questions can be explored in depth, and in an evolving way. However, it was felt that the benefits of using existing interviews was greater than the limitations.

In New Zealand there are two main government institutions concerned with the collection and storage of oral histories. These are the Manatu Taonga Ministry for Culture and Heritage, and the Alexander Turnbull Library. Other oral histories are stored in army museums, by private organisations or in researchers’ private collections. Manatu Taonga Ministry for Culture and Heritage is concerned with researching and providing resources about New Zealand, the care of the nation’s treasures and supporting individuals and organisations, which work to sustain and promote the country’s culture (Manatu Taonga Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2011). The Ministry funds certain projects, which meet its aims and criteria, and this includes the collection of oral histories. Once collected, the Ministry deposits oral histories at the Turnbull Library.

The Alexander Turnbull Library is part of the National Library of New Zealand Te Puna Matauranga O Aotearoa of New Zealand. The role of the Turnbull Library is to
As part of this collection and preservation process, the Turnbull Library has an oral history centre which comprises over 10,000 recordings.

**Participants**

For this research, it was originally intended to include veterans from the Malayan Emergency and Korean War but at the time of data review the only oral histories available were from the Malayan Emergency SAS veterans. It was decided to exclude these, as Special Force soldiers are unique in that they are an elite group, and their role in combat operations may not necessarily reflect a more ordinary soldier’s experience. It was also not possible to include Korean War as the oral history project for the Korean War veterans was a new project and interviews had not yet been conducted. Therefore, this research looks at oral histories from veterans of the First World War, Second World War and Vietnam. Details of the oral histories available to researchers are outlined below.

**First World War**

There were 84 records for First World War veterans held at the Turnbull Library. Each record includes a synopsis which details the name of the veteran, the interviewer, date of interview, access and restriction details, and copyright status. These
interviews were conducted by Jane Tolerton and Nicholas Boyack in 1988 and 1989. At the time of the interviews, the youngest veteran was 87 and the oldest was 99. One veteran was Māori. Veterans were interviewed across the country. Access to all 84 interviews is unrestricted, and public use of the material is possible with permission of the copyright holder (the Turnbull Library).

These oral histories were collected in a semi structured ‘life history’ format. This involved questions and discussion about parents, childhood, adolescence, events leading up to and experience in the First World War, and details of life since the war. The veterans were asked about the effects of the war on them, how they saw the war, and how they felt society saw the nation’s involvement in the First World War. (Appendix C provides examples of interview questions).

**Second World War**

There are nine separate oral history projects and one website which comprise approximately 233 oral histories of Second World War veterans. These are the Second World War Oral History Project- From Memory, which has five sub oral histories comprising North Africa, Greece/Crete, Prisoners of War, Italy and the Pacific. There is also C-Company oral history project, Kiwi Soldier Oral History Project, After the War, New Zealand Defence Force Military Oral History Project, New Zealand Sapper Contribution to World War II project, Pacific War Stories Oral History Project, 20th Battalion Oral History Project, 21st Infantry Battalion Association Oral History Project and the 28th Maori Battalion website (see Appendix D for details). Of these, 53 oral histories had unrestricted public access and public use with permission from the copyright holder, the Ministry of Culture and Heritage. These oral histories
were from men who had served in Greece, Crete, North Africa and Italy. Unfortunately the 22 interviews from two separate oral history projects for veterans of the Pacific campaign could not be accessed either because no listening copies were available or there were restrictions in regards to access and copyright.

The Second World War veterans were in their 80s and 90s at the time of the oral history interview, and three of these veterans were Māori. The oral histories were collected in semi structured ‘life history’ format, involving questioning and discussion about parents, childhood, adolescence, events leading up to and experiences in the Second World War, and details of life since the war. The veterans were asked about the effects of the war on them and how they saw the war (See Appendix C for example of interview questions).

**Vietnam War**

**Vietnam War Oral History Project**

This project spanned 2008 to 2012 and collected a total of 150 interviews. This project was a result of the Memorandum of Understanding signed between the Crown and Vietnam veteran representatives in 2006. From the initial data collection process in 2010, there were 46 oral histories held. Of these interviews, only 20 had unrestricted public access and use with permission of copyright holder, the Ministry for Culture and Heritage. Staff at the Ministry kindly agreed to make copies of the twenty oral histories with unrestricted public access; without this gracious act no listening copies would have been available until after the data review period for this research.
At the time of interview, the veterans were aged in their 50s, 60s and 70s, five of these were Māori and one was Rarotongan. The Vietnam oral histories were collected in a semi structured ‘life history’ format. The interviews involved questioning and discussion of parents, childhood, adolescence, events leading up to and experience in Vietnam and details of their lives since the war. The veterans were asked about the effects of the war on them, how they saw the war and how they felt society saw the nation’s involvement in Vietnam (See Appendix C for interview questions).

**Interview Selection Strategy**

Interview selection was limited to oral histories that had unrestricted public access, and where public use was possible with the written permission of copyright holders (the Turnbull Library and the Ministry of Culture and Heritage). As both of these institutions are research oriented and supportive of research endeavours, this selection strategy helped ensure smooth data collection processes. There was one exception to this selection strategy, when permission was sought from the Ministry of Trade and Foreign Affairs to include the interview with Sir Charles Mohi Bennett, the commander of the 28th Māori Battalion. It was felt that this interview was too important to be excluded. The researcher also reviewed three (about 10%) of the interviews with restricted public access to determine whether there was any qualitative difference between the restricted and non-restricted oral histories. Little difference was found between these interviews.

There is no rule of thumb as to how many interviews constitute ‘enough’ in qualitative research and little research to date addresses sample sizes (Guest, Bunce
& Johnson, 2006; Jones, 2002; Kuzel, 1992; Marshall, 1996; Sandelowski, 1995; Sandelowski, 1999). However, there is some indication that data saturation occurs within the first twelve interviews (Guest et al, 2006), fifteen interviews (Marshall, 1996), and between twelve and twenty interviews (Kuzel, 1992).

Saturation is the point at which additional data yields no new themes or patterns (Bunce & Johnson, 2006, p. 59). It was decided that 25 interviews per group would be sufficient to achieve saturation, such that no new information about coping with war would be likely to be gained if additional interviews were included. Saturation also includes a temporal dimension for capturing an individual’s thoughts, feelings and experiences (Onwuegbuzier & Leech, 2007). This study focuses mostly on retrospective data or on what has happened to the individual since the war experience. To consider one’s life retrospectively there needs to be time in the interview for reflection, thought and articulation. There are few guidelines on how long interviews should be to achieve saturation (Onwuegbuzier & Leech, 2007). Therefore it was decided that the minimum interview time would be one hour and that longer interviews would be given preference in sample selection.

The scope and contents of all unrestricted interviews of the First World War and Second World War veterans were examined and interviews were chosen where there was clear information about the effects of war on the veteran’s life after war. From this selection of interviews, every second interview was chosen to reach the target number of 25 interviews. Although only 20 Vietnam histories were available, slightly unequal sample numbers are unlikely to affect the overall analysis.
All four interviews with Māori veterans of the First and Second World Wars were chosen. In addition, the Second World War interviews of the highly decorated veterans Charles Upham and Jack Hinton were chosen, to see if a wider perspective on coping and war might be obtained through hearing from these citizen soldiers who excelled at warfare. Prisoners of war, however, were excluded as on reviewing the interviews it became apparent that these histories were qualitatively different from other Second World War veterans’ experiences of war and life afterwards. Men who have been prisoners of war often suffered unique conditions, which other combat soldiers do not endure, such as starvation, torture, and use as slave labour. Men who endure such deprivation and maltreatment are widely acknowledged as being at high risk for long lasting PTSD (Parr, 1995). For these reasons, interviews which had been collected for the purpose of documenting experiences of prisoners of war were excluded.

The following tables provide details of veteran’s oral history interviews.

**Table 3**

*Brief overview of Oral Histories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of WWI histories</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of WWII histories</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Vietnam histories</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of histories</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of veterans wounded/injured</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of interview hours</td>
<td>220 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of interview</td>
<td>3 hours and 10 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

**Summary of First World War Veterans**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of veterans</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time spent away from New Zealand</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of years spent overseas</td>
<td>2 - 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age at time of interview</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. wounded</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total not wounded but injured/ hospitalized</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours of interviews</td>
<td>69 and a half hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of interview</td>
<td>3 hours and 18 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

**Characteristics of First World War Veterans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Age at interview</th>
<th>Year left NZ</th>
<th>Year returned to NZ</th>
<th>Where served</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
<th>Interview Length</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>WF(^1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>WF(^1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCB</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Gallipoli</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>WF(^1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Māori Pioneer Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEB</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>WF(^1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESB</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>WF(^1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Pneumonia 3 weeks in hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTB</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Egypt/WF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOB</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>WF(^1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Medically boarded following diphtheria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>WF(^1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>WF(^1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td>Burst appendicitis and peritonitis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Service Years</td>
<td>WF/No</td>
<td>Date Returned</td>
<td>Reason for Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>91 1917 1919</td>
<td>WF No</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Hospitalised for influenza in 1918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARE</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>93 1916 1919</td>
<td>Egypt/WF No</td>
<td>2:45</td>
<td>Medically boarded following wounding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFH</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>93 1916 1917</td>
<td>WF Yes</td>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Gassed, and shellshock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNH</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>90 1917 1918</td>
<td>WF No</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Gassed, and shellshock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>92 1917 1919</td>
<td>WF No</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Gassed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>95 1915 1918</td>
<td>Gallipoli/WF Yes</td>
<td>1:55</td>
<td>Wounded at Chunuk Bair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>90 1916 1919</td>
<td>WF No</td>
<td>1:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCM</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>93 1915 1919</td>
<td>Egypt/WF No</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>POW (1 of 464 NZ POWs) suffered starvation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKN</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>92 1917 1921</td>
<td>WF No</td>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>POW (1 of 464 NZ POWs) suffered starvation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>93 1915 1919</td>
<td>Gallipoli Yes</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Wounded Chunuk Bair, then aboard sunken Marquette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHP</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>94 1916 1919</td>
<td>Egypt/ Sinai/ Palestine Yes</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Malaria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>94 1914 1919</td>
<td>Samoa Gallipoli/WF Yes</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Enteric fever in Gallipoli. Wounded WF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGS</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>88 1916 1919</td>
<td>WF Yes</td>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Went to war aged 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>92 1916 1919</td>
<td>WF No</td>
<td>4:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post war occupations: Draper, Secondary school teacher, Farmer, Clerk, Carpenter, Clothing cutter, Grocer, Printer, Cabinet maker, Electrical engineer, Telegraph operator, Timber worker, Agricultural college lecturer, Optometrist, Mechanic, Labourer, Manager

WF = Western Front

Table 6 and Table 7 below summarise the details of the Second World War veterans.

**Table 6**
**Summary of Second World War veterans**

- No of veterans: 25
- Average time spent away from NZ: 4 years
- Range of years spent overseas: 2-6 years
- Average age at time of interview: 83 years
- Total number wounded: 11
- Total not wounded but injured/hospitalized: 11
- Total hours of interviews: 80 hours and 40 minutes
- Average length of interview: 3 hours and 10 minutes

**Table 7**

*Characteristics of Second World War Veterans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Age at interview</th>
<th>Year left NZ</th>
<th>Year returned to NZ</th>
<th>Where served</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
<th>Length of interview</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VDH</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Awarded M.C, DSO, American Legion of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKP</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>Yes. Lost leg</td>
<td>5:40</td>
<td>Spent 2 years in hospital upon return to NZ. Served 28th Māori Battalion. Aged 17 when in combat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDC</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Hospitalized in Alexandria with pneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Hospitalized on ship with pleurisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Served in 28th Māori Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Service Year</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>War Service</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Medical Condition</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1940, 1945</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1940, 1946</td>
<td>Greece Crete</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1940, 1944</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malaria, lung congestion, burst eardrums. Medically boarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1941, 1945</td>
<td>North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contracted jaundice, 11 weeks in hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHB</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1940, 1943</td>
<td>Greece, North Africa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Damaged pelvis. Medically boarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1941, 1944</td>
<td>Crete, North Africa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medically boarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TG</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1942, 1945</td>
<td>North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Māori Battalion Wounded 3 times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1941, 1943</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medically boarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1942, 1945</td>
<td>North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suffers PTSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAT</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1940, 1945</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing damage from war service 2 hernia operations in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REM</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1943, 1946</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enlisted in regular army 1951 for 12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELG</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1942, 1945</td>
<td>North Africa, Italy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Back problems following the war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLW</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1942, 1945</td>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLC</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1940, 1944</td>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suffered burns and hearing loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDH</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1939, 1945</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awarded VC POW 4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHU</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1939, 1945</td>
<td>Greece, Crete, North</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wounded 3 times. Awarded VC twice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8

**Summary of Vietnam Veterans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of veterans</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average time away from NZ</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of years spent overseas</td>
<td>1 – 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age at time of interview</td>
<td>63 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no wounded</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no injured/hospitalized</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours of interviews</td>
<td>70 hours and 10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of interview</td>
<td>3 and a half hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9

**Characteristics of Vietnam Veterans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Age at Interview</th>
<th>Year left NZ</th>
<th>Year returned to NZ</th>
<th>Where served</th>
<th>Wounded</th>
<th>Length of interview</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Post war occupations. Accountant, Clerk, Member of Parliament, Business manager, Baker, Bus driver, Farmer, Railway serviceman, Dentist, Stock agent, Freezing Works worker, Electroplater, Professor of Gynaecology, Hotelier, Auctioneer, Journalist, High Commissioner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1:45 Problems with eyes, heart and kidneys. Has a pacemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6:05 PTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGW</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:10 Hearing loss, tinnitus, PTSD, hypertension, eyesight problems, osteoarthritis, side effects of malaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Borneo</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>3:20 Arthritis, PTSD, bronchitis, deafness, skin rashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>4:35 Depression. PTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3:05 Side effects from malaria. Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3:10 Back issues. Wife miscarried 3 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6:00 Hearing loss. Daughter has hole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post War Occupation: Orchardist, Railway worker, Farmhand, Freezing Works worker, Truck driver, Career Soldier, Policeman, Military Policeman, Construction worker, Car salesman, Civil servant

### Qualitative Approach

The oral history interviews were interpreted within a post-positivist paradigm using thematic analysis, which involves looking for patterns or themes in the veterans’ talk about war, and life after war. A post-positivist approach seeks to understand how and why people function in the ways they do. To do this, researchers need to explore the perceptions and worldviews of individuals (Crowley 1994-1995; McGregor & Murnane, 2010). This approach contends that people make meaning of their lives through their experiences, their ideas and beliefs about the world, which are shaped by culture and society (McGregor & Murnane, 2010). The goal of qualitative research within this paradigm is, to “… provide a rich contextualized understanding of some aspect of human experience” (Polit & Beck, 2010 p, 1451) as it is located in a historical and cultural world.

Qualitative research undertaken from this stance is not expected to be objective or unbiased but instead reflective of the subjective values and voices of both participant...

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic liver problems. Depression. Daughters have multiple health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Indonesia Borneo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knees replaced. PTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing loss. Joint problems. PTSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and researcher. In this way, research is created in the space between the researcher and researchee. Positivist conceptions of academic integrity, that results are generalizable or universal are re-worked in a post-positivist framework (McGregor & Murnane, 2010). While positivism uses reliability and validity as tests of rigour, research in a post-positivistic paradigm strives for trustworthiness. It endeavours to achieve credibility (instead of internal validity), transferability (instead of external validity), dependability (instead of reliability) and confirmability (instead of objectivity) (McGregor & Murnane, 2010, p. 422).

In order to achieve credible, transferable and dependable research findings, it is crucial to ensure authenticity or trustworthy findings. (Crowley, 1994-1995). This means that the findings described and inferences made are firmly grounded in the data and are convincing to the reader (McGregor & Murnane, 2010). In the present study, the aim is to build convincing findings through identification of credible themes or patterns within the oral histories.

**Thematic Analysis**

To build themes requires identifying which experiences are common to many veterans as compared to those which are unique (Ayres, Kavanagh & Knafl, 2003). Thematic analysis is widely used for interpreting, identifying, analysing and summarising themes or patterns across qualitative data or material (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006). As outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), a theme is constituted when something significant in the data is related to the research question in some sort of patterned way. Themes can be semantic or latent. Semantic themes are presented in an explicit and descriptive manner, while latent themes are
deeper and richer, in that theoretical meanings and assumptions are connected to each theme. These themes can be either induced and grounded in the data or deduced from the data as informed by pre-determined theoretical framing. This research took an inductive approach in which latent themes were identified and grounded in the oral histories, and then theorised after theme identification was made (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The first step in thematic analysis is for the researcher to familiarise themselves with the data, through readings and re-readings of the material. The second step is to generate codes or features, which describe what is happening in the data. In this stage, the data is organised into groups that share some common meaning. For example, all instances of talk about nightmares are coded and grouped together. The third step is sorting the coded information into themes or general patterns in the data. Using the previous example of nightmares, it may be that this code fits into a wider theme of psychological injury. The fourth step is about reviewing the themes to ensure that there is coherence within, and distinction between the themes. This step may involve discarding themes which lack coherence or merging similar themes if there is significant overlap. The fifth step is about naming and defining the themes. This step is about capturing the crux of the theme, and organising the data into a coherent and consistent account. It is at this step, that sub-themes may be developed. Sub-themes are smaller themes within a theme and are useful for organising complex themes or indicating some hierarchy in meanings. The final step is about writing the themes up, and providing an explanatory and coherent theme. This step provides an interpretation of the data with supporting evidence in the form
of quotes or extracts. This step is about moving past description to interpretation, and making an argued analysis in relation to the initial research question (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

**Reflexivity**

Reflexivity is a vital component of qualitative research. This is the idea that I as a researcher needed to be cognisant of who I am, what assumptions and preconceptions I bring to the research, and how all of these things affect data gathering and the analytical process (Etherington, 2006; Finlay, 2002; Mauthner & Doucet, 2003; Pillow, 2003; Smith, 1994; Underwood, Satterthwait & Barlett, 2010).

Employing reflexivity enables the researcher to be aware of how their gender, class, ethnicity, age and epistemological positioning shape the research process (Underwood et al, 2010). Self-awareness allows for honest evaluation of how the researcher themselves impact on the research findings. Engaging reflexive practices throughout the research process, highlights obligations around the analysis, interpretation and representation of the data collected from the oral histories.

At the analytical stage, I was stepping far beyond simply listening and reacting to the data collected by others into an interpretive sense-making process. Being reflexive from this point onwards meant understanding, that a reading of veterans’ narratives is always done through the researcher’s subjective lens (Pillow, 2003). Engaging a reflexive stance permitted consideration of how I the researcher was changed as a result of the research process, of the emotions which can be aroused, and of how the researcher’s positioning and outlook can be dramatically altered. Finlay (2003) warns that “being preoccupied by one’s emotions and experiences, however, can skew
findings in undesirable directions as the researcher’s position can become unduly privileged blocking out the participant’s voice” (p. 541).

I have never experienced war or combat and I can never know what it means to be pushed to the limits of physical and psychological endurance. I will never experience the bonds of camaraderie and what it is like to return to the civilian world. I cannot know what any of these things are truly like, but I can hear and identify them in the men’s talk. I can put my ignorance aside, and present as faithfully as possible what they say and feel about the worlds of war, and peace. I can never really get inside their feelings or knowledge but I can keep my interpretations completely grounded in their testimonies. I can provide a sound theoretical framework gained by a wide reading of research in this field and against which, I can explore and negotiate what these men say.

The vast majority of these men were working and/or middle class. I felt we shared the same social location and I could easily follow their talk, cadence and language used. The First World War men were my grandfather’s generation and his brother had served in this war. My grandmother’s uncles had also served in the First World War, with one killed at the Battle of Passchendaele, and the other badly wounded. The mens’ turn of phrase and expressions used were all very familiar and comfortable for me. I was born 22 years after the Second World War ended, and my great uncle had served in the army. Many of my generation had grandfathers or other family members who were Second World War veterans. Again these men, and listening to them was familiar and comfortable for me. At the time of data gathering, my partner of some years was a Vietnam veteran. As a result of this relationship, I
was aware of the issues facing Vietnam veterans and was able to relate to what was said as they discussed their situations and experiences.

Being reflexive is being aware of how the researcher is affected by the research process, and what impacts this may have on how the data is reported. Listening to these interviews and hearing the men’s voices invoked and unexpected tenderness in me for them. I have heard some truly terrible things, some very funny stories and ‘ordinary’ recounting of extraordinary events. I have heard older men without warning break down and cry, and their sorrow has touched me in ways I never anticipated. At times, I had to let ‘bad’ interviews overwhelm me in ways that felt like grief so that I could, however painfully, stay engaged with the research process. I sometimes needed days between interviews to let these words sit with me till they became a story in my head I could recall without crying. I also found myself consumed with anger at the injustices so many had received at the hands of fellow countrymen and government institutions.

But most of all, I felt so privileged and proud that I had the luxury of being able to listen to so many oral histories of veterans. To me, these men are bloody heroes every last one of them. Each one of these men accepted the possibility of losing their lives in the political service of our country. Every single one of these veterans sacrificed something - career, family, health or psychological well-being to be New Zealand’s soldier. The price was very high for many, and few had any regrets.

Being aware of the emotions that are aroused during data collection and analysis can help to keep an academic perspective, and locate the conclusions firmly in the data.
Feelings of sadness, anger and pride can be developed as motivation to present a faithful and scholarly rendition of the veterans’ talk about coping with war.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Listening to the interviews at the Turnbull Library commenced in early August 2010, and was completed in February 2012. Each tape or CD disk was accompanied by an ‘abstract’. This is a booklet which gives brief details on what is said at which time point on the tapes, and sometimes there were selected pieces of the interviews, which had been transcribed and attached to the abstract booklet. It was also common to have photographs, correspondence to the interviewer and other notes, which were often recollections of particular events as part of the abstract. The initial part of the research process involved reviewing the abstracts and getting a feel for what was said in each interview. Details from the abstract, such as date of birth, date of interview, occupation, whether wounded, date embarked for overseas, name of ship that veterans embarked and returned to New Zealand on, duration of service, where served, any comments on life after the war and the effect of the war service were noted.

The Turnbull library does not allow transcription of oral history interviews, although copying verbatim quotes is permissible, in order to encourage listening to the men’s narratives. Due to this restriction, analysis had to be undertaken in a way that is not routine when using thematic analysis in psychological research. It is usual practice to transcribe each interview in full, and then analyse the document line by line in order
to code and identify themes. However, in this case a different approach was required.

Each interview was listened to in full. Interviews generally followed a chronological order starting with early life, reasons for enlisting, war experiences and life after war. Extensive notes were made about this personal information, plus accounts of leave, travel, reactions to different places and peoples as well as equipment, battlefield operations, troop movements and other logistical information. Funny stories, accounts of camaraderie, and how veterans felt about fellow soldiers and officers were also recorded. Special attention was given to accounts of psychological or emotional feelings, and the effects of war on the veteran’s life. This was a lengthy process involving going backwards and forwards on the tapes, until the desired information was copied accurately.

Initially, data gathered from the oral histories were recorded by pen and paper and subsequently typed up. The re-processing of material from paper and pen to an electronic version allowed for greater depth, and for the analysis process to begin early in the data collection phase. This procedure was used for both the First World War and Second World War oral histories. By the time of data analysis for the Vietnam sample, notes were directly taken in electronic form as there was greater experience in identifying important and relevant material. The interview notes were then typed up and stored electronically, and in paper copy.

Each interview was coded line-by-line for the meaning of what was said, and similarities and differences, within and across the groups were noted. Reading and re-reading of the data took several months in order to highlight the patterns or
themes, which constituted the similarities and differences in the data. Three themes were identified. These were ‘Personal growth and development’; ‘Social regard and status’; and ‘Dealing with the war’. Once these three themes had been identified, the data was reviewed again for both the evidence and absence of these themes in each interview. This review was undertaken to be sure that identification of these themes had not obscured other aspects of the text.

A widely used perspective within psychological research is Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1996). Central to this perspective, is the idea that we understand ourselves and others, through interactions with sociocultural systems operating in particular historical contexts (Bandura, 1986). The social cognitive approach focuses on two important and interrelated aspects of human functioning. The first is thoughts and beliefs. These include attributions, attitudes, and other cognitive structures that veterans use to make sense of who they are, and of the world around them. The second is social competence, which is seen as an individual’s ability to effectively function in their social environment, and on the social, political and economic contexts which shapes this functioning. Also of interest are ways in which individuals adapt to changing social circumstances, and the impact on adaptive functioning. A social cognitive perspective has a strong focus on understanding how social worlds and knowledge are determined in a particular time and place, and the real life consequences for individuals relying on this knowledge for understanding who they are (Fiske & Taylor, 1991).

A social-cognitive theoretical framework was utilised to interpret the three themes of, ‘Personal growth and development’, ‘Social regard and status’ and ‘Dealing with
the war’. Results of the thematic analysis and discussion of the findings are presented in the following chapters.
Chapter 4 – Theme 1
Personal Growth and Development

“That which does not kill us makes us stronger” - Friedrich Nietzsche

Personal growth and development was a strong theme that was evident from analyses of the oral histories. Personal growth is about the “positive psychological changes experienced as a result of struggling with demanding circumstances that require adaptive resources, and challenge the way people understand the world and their place in it” (Taubman-Ben Ari, 2012, p. 165). In this case, these growth enhancing changes occurred for individuals as a result of going to war, and can be seen to arise from experiences of travel and tourism, general positive effects of military service and posttraumatic growth.

The outcomes of personal growth such as emotional maturity, independence, tolerance and self-discipline undoubtedly strengthened coping with war experiences, for veterans in all three samples. The sub themes that constituted personal growth and development, which are implicated in coping processes will be discussed as follows.

Tourism and Travel

There is growing recognition in the academic literature of the ‘soldier as tourist’ (Curran, 2009; White, 1987; Ziino, 2006). The month-long sea journey that the soldiers of the First World War and the Second World War made was reminiscent of
the leisurely sea voyages, which the tourists of the day undertook for their European sojourn (White, 1987). En route to the camps in Egypt or Europe, the ships usually docked at Hobart, Albany, Colombo, Durban and Capetown. Unlike the British who returned home, the leave periods of New Zealand soldiers were taken near to the theatres of war and included Paris, England and Cairo. Similarly, Vietnam veterans did not return home and spent leave periods in places such as Singapore and Japan. Hence, going to war was also a chance to travel and explore foreign places. RJ WWI said it was an “opportunity to travel that was one of the main things about it”.

Likewise ELG WWII recounted “we were keen to see the world, this was one chance to get out there and see something of the world”.

Many soldiers spoke of the sights that they had seen. WHB WWII talked of the Great Pyramids of Egypt, saying

>I went to the pyramids right up to the centre of it and onto the top ... terrific you can’t imagine till you see it, how big they are, and that was one of the first impressions when we arrived at Maadi.

Another WHP WWI said

>the Esbekia gardens were very beautiful ... we used to have races around the pyramids. I won one or two races myself riding a camel among the pyramids. Then adjacent to the pyramids of Giza was the Sphinx, down below the Sphinx was a sort of temple, and we used to go down there

When talking about leave in France, RJ WWI stated that, he “went to Versailles and all those important places, it’s a beautiful city Paris”. SFH WWI commented that he
went all over London when I was on leave, went and saw the tower of London, the Crown jewels and things like that. I went to the big museum in London that was interesting.” Another NEW WWII stated “we spent our leave exploring every corner of fascinating regions of the ancient part of the world, such as Petra Palmyra, the Holy Land, and Luxor.

Not only did these men experience extraordinary sights, they were also part of and witness to important moments in history. First World War veteran VN talked about Armistice Day in Paris in 1918, saying

we were on leave in Paris at the time... and it was rather terrific, just went mad. But they did it well because the country had been dark during the war, five years of it that country had been in total darkness. And they arranged it evidently, the Paris governors decided to leave switching on of all the lights till 7 o’clock in the evening. And you can imagine when the lights from five years of darkness just came on. All the lights came on and it was just a mad world.

Travel is touted as broadening one’s horizons and mind, and is thought to provoke personal growth and change through several mechanisms. These mechanisms involve growth in independence, increased self-confidence, maturity, self-awareness and a greater appreciation of difference (Gmelch, 1997; Inkson & Myers, 2003; Kauffmann, Martin & Weaver 1992; White, 1987; Ziino, 2006). These elements of personal growth are courses of change that occur for individuals, through the interaction with other people, cultures and experiences. Through these interactions,
the individual becomes more independent and confident, and these qualities are seen as marking maturity and adulthood (Erikson, 1995; Piaget, 1932).

It is thought that the developmental change and maturity signalling adulthood frequently, “...occurs in periods of discontinuity, displacement and disjunction” (Brueggemann, 1987, p. 9). Experiences of travel caught up in going to war are such periods, and several veterans talked about the self-growth and maturity gained from leaving New Zealand. AB WWI, said “I suppose the average man felt a bit more mature you know having seen a bit of the world”. Similarly REM WWII, said “I personally achieved a lot. I grew up quickly...”. Another, said “I think the experience has opened up my life tremendously” RW VW.

The personal growth that arises from travel, comes in part, from coping with the demands of everyday life in new surroundings. Individuals develop greater independence through new problem solving, and organisational skills needed to deal with the challenges of life in an unfamiliar environment (Curran, 2009; Gmelch, 1997; Inkson & Myers, 2003). During leave periods, soldiers had to organise the practical realities of day-to-day living, such as their own transportation, food, and accommodation. These arrangements often meant negotiating challenging language and cultural barriers. Several veterans talked about a shift towards greater independence through successful navigation of these new sociocultural systems, during their time overseas. BE WWI, said it “helped me, I was so terribly quiet I learnt to fend for myself a bit I really continually changed”. Likewise EK VW, stated “I think you learnt to look after yourself”.
Personal growth was further developed through greater self-awareness brought about by immersion in the cultural and social worlds of others (Alexander, Bakir & Wickens, 2010; Gmelch, 1997; Inkson & Myers, 2003; Kauffmann et al, 1992; Ziino, 2006). Maslow (1987), claimed that the self is not an isolated being but exists in constant interaction with others, and grows through processes of personal awareness and self-reflection. This growth is developed as the individual is opened up to experiencing ‘the other’, through coming to know their different values, ideas, sociocultural practices and worldviews. Several veterans talked about the experience of encountering other cultures, and how shocking it was in some cases. ESB WWI talked about Africans jostling for scraps thrown from the ship’s mess in Capetown, saying

*I had no idea that in an inner city they could be so hungry, that they would eat what most farm animals wouldn’t have touched because it was all mucked up with dirt, a pig might have, but they were prepared to scrape it off cold, it covered their backs, they scraped it off each other and ate it*

VN WWI, talked about

*finding ourselves in Colombo, Ceylon. Ceylon it was in those days ... very very interesting as you can imagine coming from the back blocks in the native forests and then suddenly finding yourself in Ceylon or someplace like that, it was rather shocking.*
Adler (1975), discusses culture shock as a “… important aspect of cultural learning, self-development and personal growth [through] the attempt to comprehend, survive and grow through immersion in a second culture” (p.14).

Through this immersion in the world of the ‘other’, the individual comes to know themselves through examination of their own values, systems and worldview (Asperger, 1986). These values and outlooks shape how the world is understood and acted upon, and for some people experiences of travel are a time when understandings of the world and humanity change (Kauffman et al, 1992). Several veterans spoke of this change. WB WWI, said “it opened my views to humanity; you give everybody a fair go”. Similarly GKN WWI, stated “I suppose it changed a lot of my ideas and attitudes towards customs and so on”. BLC WWII, also said “It gave me a perspective and stance I wouldn’t have otherwise had”. These men talked about the openness and broad-mindedness they had developed as a function of accepting the diversity of others. These capacities for acceptance of others arise not just from tolerance of another’s beliefs or values but from truly appreciating the differences in other people and their cultures (Kauffman et al, 1992).

From an appreciation of difference, some veterans came to the realisation that no single culture is inherently superior to another. Every culture has unique belief systems to deal with the questions and meanings of existence, and social practices are shaped from these cultural epistemologies (Adler, 1975). NM VW, explained

we have different cultures and different standards and this is purely an observation from me. The countries whose laws have been based on the Ten Commandments have a natural compassion and the compassion is
built into their laws, it’s probably less today than it was back in the old days but that’s the foundation, and we have this compassion. In Asia, their laws were never based on the Ten Commandments, and it was based on karma, and if anything bad happened to a person their philosophy was that they had bad karma anyway ... and it’s something culturally difficult for us to understand.

Veterans who developed awareness of diversity of other cultures took on a more multicultural worldview through the assimilation of new viewpoints, into previously held values and beliefs. A multicultural worldview is constructed on tolerance, understanding and insightfulness. Tolerance and insight indicate emotional and intellectual maturity, and are resources the individual can use to cope with successes and failures in everyday living (Lindgren, 1959). People who are tolerant and insightful have greater self-awareness, which aids learning, adjustment to new situations and understanding the behaviour of others (Lindgren, 1959). These new worldviews could be drawn upon to successfully negotiate not only the veteran’s own social world but also new cultures encountered after wartime experiences. EK VW, shared his thoughts on experiences in Vietnam, saying

I think it exposed you to another culture which allowed you to compare, and I think it broadened your horizons entirely and having travelled since ... it allowed me to understand people, and people from a third world background, so when I went to third world countries I wasn’t moved or aghast. I could understand what village life was like, what the dynamics were, you were a lot more aware, and you could read a
situation a lot more quickly and clearly than perhaps someone who hadn’t been exposed to that environment.

As well as gaining self-awareness, several veterans talked about a greater appreciation of the world which is gained from experiences of travel. Part of this appreciation came from intellectual growth, which came from travel as a form of education. REM WWII, said

*Italy’s an old country and the villages were very old to us, it was quite great to see these old places. It was quite educating for us young guys seeing these old places. Actually, we didn’t realise at the time just how significant it was*

Similarly CMB WWII, said “*it was a great experience, especially on our first visit to London having a look at Westminster Abbey, Parliament buildings, the things that Charles Dickens wrote about it was a fantastic experience for all of us*”. Travel is experiential education as individuals are exposed to different forms of architecture, literature, art, music, and their knowledge of the world is expanded and enriched. First World War veteran BE, talked about Beethoven being “*a wonderful man no doubt about that*” after he had visited his house in Bonn and viewed the famous musician’s piano. Similarly, REM WWII, said of the opera “*I enjoyed the Madam Butterfly, it was really good. I would have liked to have gone into the Milan Opera House*”. As well as the intellectual growth gained, some veterans expressed awe about experiencing the beauty of nature in the unique environments of foreign places. BLC WWII, discussed the desert of North Africa, saying how
after the rains it would bloom and scents were fantastic, flowers what they were I don’t know of course, but it did smelt beautiful, very subtle smells. Also the colours, the colours were quite good ... just before sunset period; you might get an hour of it. And first thing in the morning too, sunrise in the morning but within an hour of that the great golden bowl of heat would be over you, and it would it would lose its beauty then.

Experiences of travel for veterans in this research led to personal growth and development, through the independence, maturity and self-awareness that travelling can engender. Veterans became more self-reliant by taking care of themselves in foreign and often very novel places. Many of these men came to know themselves more profoundly through exploring and accepting the differences in others, and their worlds. The appreciation for the world of others led many veterans to grow in emotional and cultural maturity, which aided coping processes generally, and allowed veterans to review going to war partly as a positive experience.

**General Positive Effects of Military Service**

Personal growth and development was not only gained through experiences of travel with war, but also through some general positive effects of military service. This subtheme was about the general positive effects of military service, which also facilitated personal growth and development for First World War, Second World War and the Vietnam War veterans. Many of the veterans across all three samples reflected positively about their army experiences. TE WWI, said “on the whole it was a good life. I don’t see anything wrong with a soldier’s life...In the army it is a good
experience if it wasn’t for the war part of it but you’ve got to take that with it”.

Similarly ELG WWII, said “I appreciated being there, great to be there. I was glad I was in the army”. For some veterans, the army experience was career changing. AR WWII, said “I enjoyed my life in the army so much that after I came out of the army and I was working I thought this is no future for me and I applied to join the permanent army, the Regular Army”. The veterans in this research talked about certain aspects of military life, which facilitated personal development. These aspects include the benefits of physical fitness, growth in self-efficacy, increased self-confidence and gaining a sense of personal direction in life.

TE WWI talked about the physical fitness aspects of his military service, saying

I was never fitter in my life than when I was in training... I have got to admit that I think meself that it stands you in pretty good stead. If you do a certain amount of that when you are younger, and can put up with it I think it helps you later on.

Physical fitness related to good health is produced from a combination of aerobic or cardio-respiratory stamina, muscle strength and bodily composition. Having a healthy heart, strong muscles and a desirable fat-to-muscle weight ratio is strongly connected to disease prevention and optimal well-being (Ensel & Lin, 2004; Fox, 2000). It may well be, that early physical fitness has protective effects across the life span, and that veterans who enjoyed high levels of fitness as young men continued to participate in exercise and healthy behaviours as they aged (Wilmoth, London & Parker, 2010). Good health is beneficial as it leads to both physical well-being and psychological wellness. Research indicates, that physically fit people are much less
likely to suffer from debilitating psychological disorders, such as anxiety and depression (Ensel & Lin, 2004).

Psychology’s explanations and hypotheses regarding the relationship between mental wellness, and good levels of fitness have been significantly influenced by well validated constructs of self-efficacy, self-esteem, and mastery (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997). It is argued, that when people successfully achieve or master an activity like exercise, then feelings of self-worth or self-esteem increase (Carmack, de Moor, Bourdeaux, Amaral-Melendez, & Brantley 1999). Building self-esteem through mastery necessitates the individual first believing, that they are capable of achievement or having what is termed as self-efficacy. These self-efficacious beliefs impact on motivation, thinking, decision making, and the overall quality of emotional processes (Benight & Bandura, 2004). Individuals who develop strong levels of self-efficacy are confident they possess skills to achieve goals, solve problems, and are more likely to view new and potentially stressful situations as challenges rather than threats (Bandura, 1997).

Several veterans talked about the self-efficacy and confidence that they gained as a result of their military service. SGW VW, said

*when I came out of the forces I came out with a very good confident attitude… and I was prepared to have a go at anything, I had the upmost confidence that whatever I ever tried to do I could carry out to a good standard.*

Similarly BP VW, said
I went into the army a very quiet lad and it gave me self-confidence. I got that out of the military and it helped later in my job selling cars, skills that I picked up in the military.

The self-efficacy and confidence that veterans expressed may have been largely enabled through the self-discipline, which is instilled through practices of military life. When discussing self-discipline, VN WWII talked about the soldier in third person saying

it was the most definitive thing and in fact it was, it did from the very beginning from the very first time he accepted it, until he went out of existence through his military career, and his civilian career, it never left him. It was something that stuck there and whether he knew it or not, whether he appreciated it or not, he was working by it all the way.

Discipline is both imposed through institutional army structures, and through the discipline of self that forms the rhythm of army life. EK VW talked about being, in “an environment where there was group discipline but you had self-discipline as well”. Within these practices of discipline, both in-training and in-theatre, soldiers find they are capable of reaching and surpassing limits, taking on greater responsibility, achieving objectives and taking care of themselves and others. This competence and mastery develops personal growth from successful achievements by building esteem and confidence.

The self-confidence and self-efficacy that veterans talk about above, may further result from increased levels of tolerance and perseverance developed from the
experiences of military life. CC WWII said “most of us got on alright with the army... some things that we didn’t like, some things like that, we just put up with it”. GM WWII recounted that it “taught us a lot of things, we learnt from the experience travelling around camps even if conditions were hard”. The personal growth enabled through tolerance of both discomfort, and difficulty shapes how individuals cope with or master new situations (Skinner & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2011). Individuals with high tolerance levels are more likely to perceive that they have some control over events, and therefore usually plan constructive problem-solving outcomes. Thereby, perceived control becomes a potent resource as it leads to a growth in mastery when dealing with stressful events (Skinner & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2011).

Undoubtedly, ways of coping with stress are influenced by a myriad of other personal, social, environmental and physiological factors. Many of the veterans in this research indicated that the personal growth, which developed from military service was relatively stable across their life-spans. But these men had also been largely fortunate to have had stable employment, good physical and psychological health and strong levels of social support through marriage, families and friends. Increases in self-efficacy, perceived control and mastery may well influence how veterans cope with stressors in their life post-military service but these psychological resources are also impacted by wider factors in people’s lives. However, in saying this, it is important to recognise that military service enabled growth in personal qualities, which were both beneficial and enduring for many veterans.

Military service is also what has been termed as a “turning point” in life as it “knifes off” disadvantaged backgrounds and previous negative influences in life (Wilmoth et
al, 2010 p.745). Several veterans talked about military service as a turning point in their lives, and how they gained a sense of personal direction as a result. BP VW, said

*I was a no hoper at the time I joined the army. I never had much in life or no objectives, sort of thing. I did when I came out. I could do anything at that stage ... I think it did that for a lot of people ... straightened my life out, sorted my life out.*

NM VW said when talking of his life and friends prior to joining the army

*I purposely didn’t want to make contact with them because I didn’t want to go back to that old way of life... that was the one positive thing that came, it gave me a totally fresh start because I realised a soldier could be accepted in a dive or accepted in polite company, as well done, my lad. So it was a foundation to build on where I hadn’t had a foundation before that, and so I made a conscious decision to build on that foundation.*

In some cases, joining the armed forces physically removes an individual from environments, which may encourage anti-social or criminal behaviours (Aldwin & Levenson, 2005). The army provided structure, support and skills and allowed some veterans in this research to walk away from disadvantaged backgrounds and negative life circumstances, and move confidently into new lives. American research suggests, that the military can be seen as place where young men and women can gain greater educational and career opportunities, financial stability as well as a sense of belonging and connectedness (Elder, Wang, Spence, Adkins & Brown, 2010).
Aldwin and Levenson (2005) argue, that individuals grow in emotional maturity as a result of their military service experiences, and are likely to become more thoughtful and considered in their reactions to adversity. As a result, individuals are more able to regulate their emotions and most importantly any negative and impulsive behaviours. Through military service and practices of discipline, individuals come to accept responsibility for their actions and leave behind emotionally immature behaviour, such as blaming others when things go wrong. Military service further provides an environment for soldiers to be positively influenced by good mentors, and to build self-beliefs that they are valuable and worthy human beings. In this way, military service may well provide a pathway to greater personal growth and advancement through encouraging the individual to value themselves and their actions.

Personal growth and development was enabled through the general positive effects of military service. Levels of physical fitness soldiers achieved during military service may well be protective as the individual ages, and can encourage life-long engagement in healthy behaviours. Feelings of well-being produced from being healthy and fit are probably implicated in increased feelings of self-efficacy, self-esteem and mastery.

Military service can also provide an individual with opportunities to set and meet objectives, and to form long term goals with the confidence to achieve them. Being confident in one’s ability to constructively meet goals and objectives builds good coping resources, such as resilience, motivation, perseverance and emotional stability. Personal growth and development were also indicated for veterans in this
research through experiences of what is commonly understood as posttraumatic growth.

**Posttraumatic Growth.**

Posttraumatic growth is defined by Tedeschi & Calhoun (2004, p. 1) “as the positive psychological change experienced as a result of the struggle with highly challenging life circumstances”. Posttraumatic growth is thought to come about through several beneficial dimensions of change for individuals. These dimensions are: an increased appreciation for life, more meaningful interpersonal relationships, changed priorities of what is important in life, a greater sense of personal strength, and recognition of new possibilities for one’s life, which may include a spiritual aspect (Janoff-Bulman, 2004; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004).

The aspect of posttraumatic growth that was most evident in the veterans’ testimonies was an appreciation of life. This appreciation was formed as a direct result of experiencing the trauma of combat. IJ VW, said

> You are not experiencing through somebody else’s eyes, somebody else’s experience, you are experiencing it yourself, the blood and the smell, the cordite, the shockingness of it. It’s so real and after that everything is even more real, the trees, the leaves, the wind, the rain, everything just so real ... people have often said to me ‘how come no matter what day we come into work, no matter what day it is you are always happy, full of life and that’s because when you get close to death, so close to destruction the bad things, ... then everything is easy from then on in.
In a somewhat similar vein, SGS WWI, said

*I believe I’ve had such a full life ... a very full life and a very happy life ... and you’ll find that when you reach your ripest old age you’ll look back and you’ll find the hard knocks are just about as important as the good times. They do something to you. They help mould you, the way you look at things the way you accept things.*

BE WWI talked about how much he appreciated living in New Zealand as a result of his war experiences saying “oh gosh it let me see what a lovely country this is”.

This appreciation of life may well stem from feelings of gratefulness. There is growing research into gratitude and its positive correlation with well-being (McCullough, Kilpatrick, Emmons & Larson, 2001; Nelson, 2009; Wood, Joseph & Linley, 2007; Wood, Joseph & Maltby, 2009). Grateful people are more likely to have good physical health and less likely to be depressed or anxious. Grateful people are also reported to be more vital, more satisfied with life and happier than people who rarely express gratitude (McCullough et al, 2001). Several veterans expressed enduring gratitude in terms of survival from their war experiences. JLW WWI, said he was “one of the lucky ones, having survived it”. Similarly, BOS WWI talked about, the “thankfulness that that [he] had been spared to return home after all the horrific times we had”. CV WWII said going to war was “well worth the experience, lucky not be hurt bad when wounded”. Gratitude is seen as a positive emotion that enables the individual to build good cognitive, social and emotional resources to deal with adversity. Grateful people actively seek social support, engage in positive reinterpretations of negative
life events, develop in terms of personal growth, and employ constructive coping strategies (Nelson, 2009; Wood et al., 2007).

An appreciation for life and a sense of gratitude may also come from comparisons with others and their environmental conditions. As a result of these comparisons, there is often a changed sense of what it is actually important and meaningful, which usually leads to a change of priorities (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). EK VW, talked about returning to New Zealand, and finding

    people were very spoilt, very indulgent. I thought they didn’t know how good they had it. I couldn’t relate to them. To them what was important, to me meant nothing. What you bought for your groceries wasn’t a big worry especially seeing how some of those people lived in the Third World … even now people will say things to me and I will think you’ve got no idea.

CC VW talked about how going to war changed his life and priorities, saying “I recognise it has been one of the most formative experiences of my life for better or worse it shaped an awful lot of what I did”. Thus, an ability to appreciate life can lead to a prioritizing of how life should be approached, and a more grateful viewing of how life actually is. Individuals who are able to appreciate life have greater life satisfaction and better psychological well-being (Fagley, 2012). For many of the veterans in this research, this appreciation for life was enduring and sustained across their lifespan. The First World War and Second World War veterans were interviewed when in their 80s and 90s, and Vietnam veterans were men in their 50s
and 60s, yet this appreciation for life and its positive effects was still very much in evidence.

However, it is also well recognised that posttraumatic stress and posttraumatic growth can go hand in hand (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 2004). This research was focused on what aids and strengthens coping with war experiences but it was clear along the way that going to war is an immensely complex experience. Veterans in this research talked about positive effects of military service alongside their distress, and in some cases were still grappling with PTSD. Individuals can be scarred by their experiences but still find some benefit or growth from what has happened to them (Schok, Kieber & Boeije, 2010). AB WWI, talked about being

one of the lucky ones having survived it. It was an experience never to be forgotten. But I am anti-war and killing. I am glad I was part of it but would not wish to have any of my sons in a war.

Similarly TG WWII, said

in all it was a good experience I wouldn’t have missed it, a lot of sadness in it, a lot of good times. You think about the good times. I’ve been really lucky in my life. I’ve had a good life.

JEB WWI, said

I made some good friends over there and that you know with me I generally see the funny side of everything. I’ve got a good sense of
humour. I think it gives you a better outlook on life. And I came through it
and lived to this age, well I’m doing well.

It may well be that the dimensions of posttraumatic growth, such as an appreciation
for life and a changed sense of what is important helps to mitigate the distress and
suffering that many veterans experience post-war. Changed priorities and
gratefulness for life can serve as a blueprint of how life should be valued and lived.
Mitigation of distress may be further enabled through the self-development which
can evolve from veterans’ experiences of other positive dimensions of military
service. Experiences of travel not only expanded intellectual and cultural maturity
but also produced greater independence, self-awareness and self-confidence. The
general positive effects of military service including physical fitness, self-discipline
and self-efficacy also matured and grew an individual’s sense of self.

The personal growth and development that occurred for many veterans may be a
cornerstone for how veterans cope with their war experiences. Growing emotionally,
and psychologically as a person gives a veteran some tools to make sense of their
war experiences, and to manage the changes in oneself that going to war brings. PS
VW argued, that “there’s nobody that has gone to Vietnam who has come back the
same person that left. Nobody, everybody is affected by it in some way as was
everyone who went to World War One, World War Two, any conflict, it’s not just
synonymous to Vietnam. Active service is a stage of your life that changes you,
changes everybody”. The next theme looks at the importance of social processes in
coping with the changes war brings about.
Chapter 5 – Theme 2
Social Regard and Status

‘We acknowledge you fought in our name’

Social regard and status was an important theme that played out in the material collected from the oral histories. Giving social regard and status to veterans is genuine positive acknowledgement for service these men have given to their country. This acknowledgement is made at social and political levels through policy and practices. These practices include homecoming receptions, rehabilitation assistance, medical help and pensions as well as according a level of social standing to veterans. Without doubt, social regard and status shapes the everyday worlds of returned servicemen and has implications for well-being across the life span (Coleman & Pololskij, 2007; Grayson et al, 1996; Johnson, Lubin, Rosenheck, Fontana, Southwick & Charney, 1997).

There were two main ways in which the theme of social regard and status was discussed. These were ‘social rejection’ and ‘social care’. Each of these sub themes highlighted the importance of social regard and status in order to facilitate veterans re-immersion into society. The first sub theme of ‘social rejection’ explores the consequences of not according social regard and status in the everyday lives of returned men. This was the only theme or sub theme in which one veteran group, Vietnam veterans, were uniquely positioned. Vietnam veterans were the only sample
who reported social rejection and as such demonstrate the impact of historical, political and social contexts on veterans’ psychological well-being.

**Social Rejection**

The failure of society to welcome veterans back and rejection of their service for socio-political reasons can be highly destructive for psychological well-being. Social rejection is implicated in the development and/or maintenance of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and social anxiety for American Vietnam veterans (Fontana & Rosenheck, 1994; Fontana, Rosenheck & Horvath, 1997; Johnson et al, 1997; Orsillo, 1996), for Australian Vietnam veterans (Grayson et al, 1996), and for US peacekeepers in Somalia (Bolton et al, 2002). Social rejection was something that featured in a single First World War interview, was absent from the Second World War narratives but featured heavily in the Vietnam veterans’ oral histories.

The only First World War veteran to discuss social rejection recounted “we were a lot of diseased left overs, people didn’t want to know you, no very cold shoulder, took no notice of us, like you’d never been away or what you had been through” FW. This veteran may well have felt this way due to ill-health following the First World War as he talks about being part of a “lot of diseased left overs”. On examining the notes from this interview, this veteran was badly wounded by a machine gun bullet and shell which burst in his left shoulder and hand, contracted measles and suffered severe weight loss during his service on the Western Front. When the interview was conducted he was bedridden and had serious ongoing health issues related to
gassing during his war service. His chest had to be massaged daily to move accumulated fluid and to ease his breathing.

Although, there was a national commitment to the welfare and rehabilitation of veterans following the First World War, government policy was such, that all veterans except for those most severely disabled were expected to be self-sufficient and to take responsibility for their own economic well-being (Boston, 1993). Many veterans experienced ongoing ill health, regular hospitalisations, and unemployment due to the limitations of medical treatment, and constrained state provisions. New Zealand experienced nearly two decades of harsh economic times following the First World War (Kennard, 1972), and during this time it is almost certain that the suffering of disabled veterans was greater than able bodied veterans. It is conceivable during these hard economic times, that other debilitated First World War veterans may have had perceptions about society similar to the veteran in this sample. However, it would appear that the social rejection experienced was likely a function of environmental conditions as opposed to any social disapproval about their service.

There was no evidence of social rejection in post-war experiences for Second World War veterans, and only one Second World War veteran touched on social rejection at all. When asked about how he was treated upon return, JLW WWII, said

*I think they just accepted us. It was a bit upsetting a few years ago when they seemed to denigrate the RSA, and RSA members were ashamed, well not ashamed but a bit embarrassed about wearing an RSA badge in
public because all the young people went out shouting about Vietnam
and places like that.

A lack of comment about social rejection from the Second World War veterans may have occurred for several reasons. This war had uncontested military objectives and the morality of opposing the Axis forces, especially Germany and Japan, remains unchallenged even today (McCranie & Hyer, 2000). The Second World War was seen as a ‘just’ war whereby allied forces defeated an ‘evil enemy’, and widespread social acceptance was likely to be the norm for these veterans.

This was not the case for Vietnam veterans as social rejection was a predominant theme within their testimonies. This rejection was seen as coming from the army, the government, the RSA, and fellow New Zealanders. PS VW, stated

when we came home, it was all this nonsense that was going on and we were discriminated against. We were baby killers; we were murderers, mercenaries and all these sorts of things. I believe the government of the day regardless of political parties, politics should have stepped in and put a stop to it, and a lot of it originated from the universities to the media, and we were hated by the schools. By the teachers, absolutely hated by them. There was some bad things said ... the ones that failed miserably was first the Government, then the Defence Force, which were our direct employers, and to a certain degree the RSAs.

In a similar vein, IJ VW recounts, how “in this country for 35 years we were literally spat on by our own government, that’s a hard thing, it’s not the issues of Vietnam
that worry me” Another said “I was rejected, spat on arrival in Auckland” RE VW.

Likewise, TH VW recalled a speech by the Minister of Defence at the time

he said something about the Vietnam War. He said ‘our side didn’t go to a real war’. I thought to myself. I remember ‘where the hell do you think we bloody went and that hurt me and I think that would have hurt a lot of guys

It is clear from these extracts that experiences of social rejection were extremely painful and traumatic for many New Zealand Vietnam veterans. Many returned to an unsupportive, unwelcoming and on occasion openly hostile environment. For the first time in New Zealand, a specific veteran group had their status or identity devalued. This devaluing would have been highly disturbing as social rejection of military service was completely outside of these veterans’ experiences.

Vietnam veterans may be quite unique in the sense that they grew up in an environment where going to war was relatively normalized. Many of their grandfathers, fathers or uncles had served in the First World War and Second World War, and military service was regarded as a usual, meaningful and worthwhile act of patriotism. WC VW, recalled: “I came from a generation I guess where you traded war comics as boys, and war was seen as something, as heroic and something you still did”.

The Vietnam War commenced some twenty years after the end of the Second World War, and as such, these veterans were familiar with the way that war veterans had
been treated positively upon homecoming. CC VW talked about this treatment, saying

*the experience of the contingents who had been away to all the wars before was quite different and the men coming back from the Second World War were all feted as heroes and they were, we looked after our chaps, the people who came back marched through the streets.*

He went on to say Vietnam veterans would “*have wanted to be regarded as highly as their father’s generation was for doing exactly the same thing*”. This expected social regard was far from what happened for many Vietnam veterans who were held individually responsible, and socially censured for the Crown decision to participate in the Vietnam War. For many Vietnam veterans, this social rejection detrimentally impacted on recovery from war.

A sense of connectedness is crucial for post-war adjustments in two important ways. First, a sense of belonging and connection offers veterans a respected position within society through validation of their social identity. Validation of social identity creates care and protection of veterans through positive social relations, and allows individuals to construct a positive and healthy sense of self (Cast & Burke, 2002). Second, social connectedness provides a supportive environment in which the veteran is able to legitimise and make sense of wartime trauma. This legitimisation enables healthy psychological and emotional integration of war experience into understandings of self (Barron, Davies & Wiggins, 2008; Umbrasas, 2009). Each of these issues around connectedness to society and post-war adjustments will be discussed in turn.
Individuals make sense of who they are by drawing on their social identities. An individual’s social identity is “… that part of self-concept which derives from his knowledge and membership of a social group (or groups) together with an emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel & Turner 1986, p. 255).

Membership in a group engenders belonging, which Maslow (1987), argues is a fundamental human need. Through a sense of belonging, this group membership becomes an important component of personal identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Therefore “… social identity and group belongingness are inextricably linked in the sense [of who one is]... identification with a social group is a psychological state ... it is phenomenologically real and has important self-evaluative consequence” (Hogg & Abrams, 1988, p. 7)

In terms of social identity and self-evaluation, Vietnam veterans are members of veteran groups and the wider national group understood as New Zealanders. As members of these two groups, many veterans served with a deep sense of patriotic loyalty to the nation. Patriotism is the love and devotion for one’s country which arises from a deep sense of belonging and attachment. It is “… unconditional - irrespective of the ruling regime, ... directed towards the people as an ethnographic group and towards the geographical place, based on historical heritage, as well as a cultural and social ethos” (Bar-Tal, 1993, p. 49).

To have this patriotic service and loyalty rejected struck deep for many veterans. DS VW, recounted

... it didn’t matter what the stupid politicians had agreed to with the Americans. At the time it seemed like an absolutely crash hot idea, it
didn’t matter why we had gone, the reason the government sent us over there but the fact is that we had bloody well gone. We had gone and we had risked everything for our country, and in return they treated us like a bucket of shit, a bucket of shit. That’s what mattered, we didn’t give a fuck about anything. We just wanted our country to love us as much as we loved our fucking country, and they couldn’t do it.

Similarly, IJ VW explained that he was “defending my country, looking after it ... I didn’t make the bad decisions and I acquitted myself with honour and respect both for the people of Vietnam, myself and my country”.

To be treated almost like an enemy of society or the nation impacted on veteran’s self-evaluation, and the sense of whom they actually were. Within processes of self-construction, most individuals seek to create an affirming self-image which is in part based on positive evaluations of social identity (Korostelina, 2007). Therefore, when ostracism or social rejection occurs, a healthy self-image is also threatened. This threat occurs because ostracism thwarts four fundamental needs required for a positive and stable sense of self. These needs are: belonging, self-esteem, sense of control, and meaningful existence (Williams & Nida, 2011; Williams, 2007; Young Bernstein & Claypool, 2009).

A sense of belonging to the rest of society was shattered for many New Zealand Vietnam veterans as rejection of their veteran identity resulted in pain, sadness and anger that ostracism creates (Williams & Nida, 2011). WC VW expressed deep shock at the unexpected ostracism he experienced. He said
you didn’t expect bells or whistles. You didn’t expect medals or glory or anything like that. I didn’t. I just wanted to get on with my life but what I didn’t expect was to be ostracised … and I carry a lot of anger because of that I think will never be fixed no matter what.

Similarly NM VW, said that veterans had

a sense of belonging to society by being in the army, it was their place … they were doing something for the country and that in later years we have found to be trodden on, misunderstood or just discarded and that’s a large hurt.

NM went on to say that a large part of veterans’ pain was from “not being recognised by the country”.

The loss of belonging through ostracism is implicated in levels of individuals’ self-esteem. Self-esteem is seen as an individual’s general positive appraisal of themselves and consists of two major dimensions (Cast & Burke 2002). These dimensions are worth and competence. Worth relates to feelings of value about oneself and competence to feelings of efficacy and capability. It is argued, that “verification of identity produces feelings of competency and worth, increasing self-esteem” (Cast & Burke, 2002, p. 1043). Hence, any challenges to social identity and by default selfhood impacts on self-esteem with detrimental psychological outcomes. One veteran recounted what happened when he agreed to talk to a scout group on Anzac Day. PS VW, said
I was quite happy to [talk to the scouts] because remember I was a member of an ANZAC unit on active service in Vietnam, which was the most stupid thing I could possibly have said, because man alive, all hell broke loose. Oh you are a baby killer, one of those mercenaries and they were going to take their kids out of Scouts not to have them anywhere near a mongrel like me So I quit right there on the spot ... and that was very very hurtful ... they were the sort of things that struck you everywhere, you had to be constantly on your guard, constantly on your guard.

In this extract, PS talked about how hurtful it was to have his pride in being an ANZAC soldier challenged by the parents of the children in the scout group. He called himself a mongrel and felt the need to guard his identity as a veteran in order to protect against further defamation of his character.

There is also evidence in these testimonies that a sense of control and meaningful existence was threatened through processes of ostracism for some Vietnam veterans. The everyday and meaningful anchors in individuals lives such as going to work, and participating in community activities, which are taken for granted by most people become sites of challenge and struggle. DS VW, talked about the disruption on employment when co-workers discovered he was a veteran. He said: “we couldn’t hold our jobs it wasn’t so much the bosses as the bloody workers, they just tormented us, and it was really shit you know”. In response to this torment, DS VW, said “you can put up with it for a while [then] I stood a couple of them up against the wall and give them a smack in the head”. An aggressive response is a bid to restore some
control over the social environment, and is quite common when control and meaningful existence needs are frustrated (Williams & Nida, 2011). Unfortunately, these aggressive responses increase in magnitude when social or group rejection is unanticipated, and this certainly would have been the case, at least initially, with returning Vietnam veterans. These antisocial responses can lead to physical injuries to self and others, legal troubles and psychological difficulties.

It is apparent that many Vietnam veterans suffered psychological injury through experiences of ostracism or social rejection. Veterans reported loss of self-worth and belonging to society as well as certain threats to a sense of control and meaningfulness in life through devaluing of their veteran identity. Through a lack of belonging, individuals can become isolated and disenfranchised from society.

Becoming socially isolated is linked to increased use of avoidant coping strategies and self-defeating behaviours, which can contribute to psychological and emotional distress (Cacioppo & Hawkley, 2005). The cognitive and emotional impacts of ostracism can deplete coping resources, resulting in feelings of helplessness and worthlessness. These feelings can often lead to psychological fragility manifesting in outcomes such as depression, sadness and anger (Cast & Burke, 2002; Kernis, 1993; Williams & Nida, 2011).

Social alienation denies the veteran support necessary to process wartime experiences, creating psychological isolation and encouraging detrimental psychological defences, such as withdrawal, avoidance and numbing in processes of coping (Johnson et al, 1997; Umbrasas, 2009). BP VW, talked about the lack of
societal support, and consequential ongoing stress for some Vietnam veterans. He said, there is a

lot of stress amongst the veterans ... I think it’s probably got a lot to do with the way we were treated when we got home, treated by the military and by governments, didn’t really get it off our chest in the first place.

Perhaps if we had psychiatrists that talked to us before we got out of the military

When talking about the failure of the Government, Defence Force, and RSAs to offer support to veterans PS VW, stated

now had those people gone the other way and backed us up, and recognised what we had done, and let us get over it and get back into normal civilian life, a lot of these things that are existing today would never ever have come about. The most injuries that exist today from soldiers returning from Vietnam are all in the head, and they will never go away.

Another said, “when we came back we had absolutely no support from anyone” IJ VW. The psychological isolation that some veterans experienced and a lack of place and space to make sense of wartime experiences was further pointed out by TH VW, when talking about his local RSA. He stated, “nobody wanted to talk to me, they didn’t want to know Vietnam vets so I pulled out and I didn’t go back”. BP VW admitted that he “kept quiet about my service in Vietnam. Embarrassed by the way
the government and military treated us after, embarrassed to tell locals that you were a Vietnam veteran”.

Drawing on narrative ideas in Psychology, veterans need to process their experiences and understand the role that military service has played in shaping who they are (Adler, Zamorski & Britt, 2011). The war experience needs to be legitimized and valued by society in order for the veteran to successfully and coherently assimilate it into their life story (Adler et al, 2011). Through this assimilation, the veteran can construct meaning and purpose from their military service, and achieve what McAdams (2001, p. 101), terms “psychosocial unity”. This is the idea that “... life stories are psychosocial constructions, co-authored by the person himself ... and the cultural context within which that person’s life is embedded and given meaning” (McAdams, 2001, p. 101). Establishing socially validated meanings for war experiences aids healthy psychological and emotional adjustment after war.

Validation of the soldier’s wartime contributions and positive post-war adjustment can be shown through testimony of men who stayed in the military after Vietnam. CC VW, explained

*I was lucky I went back into the military immediately after coming home, stayed in the military, my input was valued, my contribution, my knowledge, my information was valued but I was lucky it was because I was still serving. How many other people were choked off from wanting to talk about it?*
It appears that the military environment not only valued service but provided a safe and supportive environment for veterans to process their experiences. PS VW, said

*I was fortunate staying in the army, you were within that umbrella if you like and I didn’t get subjected to anywhere near as much as what a lot of other guys did what came back and got out and went into civilian life and had that aggro around them all the time.*

Staying in the army seemed to hold in place positive attributions and legitimation of wartime service. CC VW, stated “probably because I have spent all my life in the army. I have never felt one of the disadvantaged few. I have always been proud to be a Vietnam veteran”.

Social acceptance and validation are necessary requisites for healing from traumatic war experiences as they allow veterans to belong and be connected to society. A connectedness to society discourages psychological alienation and subsequent outcomes of depression, stress and anger. These detrimental outcomes are ameliorated by offering a supportive environment, which encourages veterans to attribute positive meaning, purpose and legitimation to their wartime experiences. It is through a sense of belonging, that veterans are able to find positive congruency between social and personal identities, and in doing so work towards successful reintegration into civilian life.

Alongside the sub theme of ‘social rejection’, the other way this bigger theme of social regard and status was discussed, was in terms of ‘social care’.
Social Care

The social care of veterans affected their re-immersion into life after war. Discussion of this is divided in two parts. First, there was the rehabilitation assistance given to veterans in the form of pensions, gratuities, reduced interest mortgages, and compensation for injury or illness. Second, social care was demonstrated for veterans through social institutions and sites of remembrance, including days of commemoration, cenotaphs, memorials, monuments and museums.

Rehabilitation Assistance

Throughout the 20th Century, material help and assistance (pensions, compensation etc.) were developed for veterans of the First World War, Second World War and Vietnam and other conflicts/wars which saw New Zealand involvement. This assistance was to recompense veterans for losses incurred from wartime service which included normal social development, career progression and damage to physical and psychological well-being.

Several First World War and Second World War veterans spoke about losses and disruption to their lives as a cost of military service. RDC WWII, recounted

you take six years out of your life at that time you miss a lot, of course,
you miss the social side of life, you miss the sport that you probably had
at that time. I would have married earlier, probably my family would have
been younger and I would have had more time with my wife, of course. So
you lose those things I might have been possibly able to do the things I
wanted to. I had ideas when I got back that perhaps I would get one of
these bursaries or something and take up medicine [but] I thought to myself I’ve been away from my family for virtually six years and it’s hard on them, they had to put up with it all those years.

BOS WWI, also explained

while I was away you know I felt that the war was interfering with my future life because between the age of 18 and 23 is the time you should be established in some sort of way of life that you intend to carry on with.

Perhaps as expected, the Vietnam veterans didn’t talk about the disruption to their lives in terms of loss of career or social development. This may be due to these men having been regular professional soldiers as opposed to the voluntary or conscripted citizen soldiers of the two World Wars. Vietnam veterans’ terms of engagement were relatively short and for those career soldiers going to war may have even been a positive factor for career development.

Many veterans from all groups talked about the physical and psychological damage incurred from their war service. For some men, the legacy of war in everyday life was experienced on a regular but manageable basis, while for others it was extremely serious and disabling. JTB WWI, talked about the ongoing issues he had from being wounded in his left arm. He explained, the bullet had “split the shoulder blade and come out the back of me shoulder underneath the shoulder blade in two different places so the bullet got split as well as my arm” The aftermath of this wounding meant his “arm is half an inch shorter than the other one... occasionally I feel an ache, the weather affects it a bit”. Likewise SGS WWI, who went to war as a boy of 15
talked about the physical effects of his service 73 years later. He stated, “I’m still on a
40 per cent disability pension for wounds incurred in the First War. I’ve had two x-
rays in recent years and they’ve both disclosed shrapnel in my hips and groin”

Other veterans talked about specific damage as a result of carrying heavy loads,
patrolling and regular disembarking from aircraft, combined with normal
deprivations of being in the field. TH VW stated: “my knees have gone. I have had
four knee replacements and spent 18 months in hospital. I was lucky to come out
alive” AP, also from the Vietnam War, explained: “my lower spine was compacted
from carrying so much weight [and] my teeth paid a price, couldn’t use toothpaste
just a bit of salt on my finger because of the smell to the enemy”.

Many veterans talked about the ongoing psychological damage that resulted from
their service. For some veterans, it was an ongoing process of coping with
nightmares, fits of crying and anxiety, while for others it was a constant struggle
battling PTSD and depression. At age 97, FA WWI talked about disorienting episodes
he experienced fairly regularly. He said, “I get a bit queer at times myself. I think it’s
the war. I can’t quite realise where I am. Quite recently I had one of them”. He went
on to talk about nightmares, and his inability to cope with loud noises, saying he
finds himself

ducking and diving and pulling the clothes over your head thinking you
were covering up from the shells. Tell you what does make me get a bit
funny is being indoors and anything that suddenly makes a row, that’s
really I can’t stand a row, if the television is too high I can’t take it
SGS WWI explained, that “I find that if I allow myself to go too far, to become too realistic. I’ll begin to weep. Well that’s the shadow isn’t it? That’s what I mean; the shadow [of war] has left something, somewhere or other”. CC WWII, talked about how it “took a long time, a long time to get right... sometimes I woke up in the night and I was crawling through bones and [my] arms were going”. Similarly, GM WWII, explained “these things just happen out of the blue. I might think I am as good as gold then all of a sudden ... you will find me shaking like a leaf, some nights it takes me ages to go off to sleep”.

Other veterans talked about their ongoing struggles with PTSD and depression. NB VW said “I am on medication for depression and they said it’s delayed PTSD. Certain things would come up on TV and I’d be a disaster for the next two days. It was only the remembering”.

It was evident that wartime service had come at some cost to most if not all veterans. The level and nature of these costs varied from man to man, and from war to war. Some men had spent years away from home and had foregone wives, families, jobs and social development. Other men had sustained terrible damage to their bodies and minds from which there was almost never a total recovery. These men had simply learned to live and cope with their painful injuries.

In return for shouldering these painful injuries, New Zealand societies have offered some form of social reward and compensation for the costs of military service from the First World War onwards. This government help and assistance given to returned soldiers is a formalization of a social contract or exchange (Levy & Mizrahi, 2008). According to Social Exchange Theory, a generalized exchange of contribution and
reward based on principles of reciprocity and distributive justice is common in social practices (Bell, 2009; Berger & Webster, 2006; Hegtvedt, 2006; Homans, 1958; Molm, 2010; Molm., Peterson., & Takahasi, 1999; Polk, 2011; Sabbagh, 2005).

Drawing on these ideas of reciprocity and distributive justice, military service can be understood as operating within what Levy and Mizrahi (2008) term the ‘republican contract’. This contract is defined by these authors as

\[
\text{the exchange between the willingness of citizens to sacrifice their lives and wealth by bearing the costs of war and the preparations for it in return for civil, social and political rights as well as other rewards granted to them by the state (p. 26).}
\]

Thus

\[
\text{by virtue of their oath of allegiance, members of the Armed Forces enter into a unilateral undertaking to serve the Crown and the State. Inherent in this understanding is an unspoken contract that the Crown will look after them and their families. (Challinor & Lancaster, 2000, p.170).}
\]

There was an expectation of some level of social obligation and reward throughout the oral histories. This expectation reflected ideas of reciprocity and distributive justice in the form of economic, career and medical assistance in return for the costs of military service. RW VW, said

\[
\text{I have the right to have a chance to become eligible for those things and then if I get them, yes that’s my entitlement but I don’t like using the}
\]
word entitlement initially. I like to say this is my story; this is how I physically feel. This is the damage the army had done to me whether it be a disorder or whether it be my joints, whether it be my hearing and I do get a pension for my hearing. That all happened because you can’t wear earmuffs in battle otherwise you can’t hear the orders being given out. You have to be real so when you are in an infantry unit, and you are firing live rounds not just in Vietnam but in your whole peacetime career your hearing will be affected.

The reciprocal nature of social exchange for the costs of military service creates a sense of psychological justice and satisfaction in what is perceived as fair treatment (Hegtvedt, 2006). Justice as a concept invokes a sense of what is morally right and good, and some veterans felt that the government had treated them justly. LOB WWI, stated: “I don’t think that it was too bad at the time they gave a lot of the fellas opportunity of getting onto farms”. GCB WWI, asserted “I think most returned men got a good deal of attention and whatever help one way or another”. Another veteran appreciated the subsidised interest on mortgages offered, saying “from the government at the time when we got a housing loan at 3% which was great to us in those days” WHJ WWII.

The just and fair treatment demonstrated to veterans through government assistance is a signifier of the value accorded to veterans as a special group within New Zealand society. According to Social Identity Theory, most people desire to feel connected with and well regarded others in the groups they belong to (Lind & Tyler, 1988). This connection and regard helps to maintain or increase an individual’s self-
esteem. Simply put, people feel good about themselves if they perceive they have been treated justly in return for the sacrifices they have made. BLC WWII, talked about the considerate and respectful way he was treated by the government department Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ), which administered his pension. He recounted

> I’ve never had to ask them and WINZ handle my war pension. They sent out a circular to all returned men wearing hearing aids or with hearing defects. I had to fill in a questionnaire and also they wanted us to know they weren’t going to reduce our pensions.

Similarly, ESC WWI discussed the help, which he and his brother received. He said

> In 1920, 21, 22, New Zealand suffered a devil of a recession. We went into the farm with mortgages up to here. Didn’t take much of a recession to make us sink did it? So for years we didn’t know whether we had a farm or didn’t have a farm fortunately Rehab was administered by the Lands and Survey Department. They stuck to us, rearranged our mortgages and put us on our feet and started us off again.

It is clear, that at least some veterans were treated with a measure of care and status. The help given to them was often unsolicited and a sincere demonstration of the state as a party to the ‘republican contract’. In return for the personal contribution, and costs (financial disadvantage, challenges to mental health, loss of hearing etc.) of wartime service, veterans were rewarded with certain benefits administered by the state. These benefits were clearly appreciated by the veterans.
Through state help and commitment, these veterans were able to feel satisfied and move forward with their lives as personal costs associated with disruptions of war been acknowledged and recompensed.

However, within the oral histories there were also veterans who felt government assistance was inadequate or even absent. There was considerable sentiment around the ‘republican contract’ as either unfulfilled or actually dishonoured from the testimonies of the First World War soldiers onwards. Many veterans talked about a lack of ongoing help or assistance for medical conditions they believed resulted from wartime service. For example, TE WWI protested about being denied a pension for his deafness. He said, “the buggers won’t give me one. I blame the war for it but they don’t”. Another veteran was initially told there was nothing wrong with his ears but disagreed, saying “I’m actually positive my hearing [problems] was from the war when I came back from Crete it was pretty rowdy there for a start” ELG WWII. He eventually went on to have three operations on his ears but hearing was only restored to one ear.

Other rehabilitation assistance such as the land scheme offering farms to veterans after the First World War was seen as a disaster by some. These veterans felt that in some cases the government had charged exorbitant prices for land that was unproductive for farming. JCM WWI said, “they [government] bought up huge estates and split them into farms and built houses on them and put such a mortgage on them, on the place that the man never had a hope” Similarly HP WWI commented

quite a few of them were allotted farms and they had no capital and it’s impossible to run an unimproved farm without any capital and to create
those improvements, absolutely impossible. And quite a few of them went
to the wall, most of them did.

There was an underlying feeling that veterans had been defrauded by the state to
some extent and that damage sustained during the war was not justly compensated.
Many veterans felt there was a real failure to redress economic, physical and
psychological losses due to war service.

The state failure to recognize the damage and losses of wartime service was
particularly salient for Vietnam veterans, who consistently expressed that the
‘republican contract’ had been dishonoured by the government. Foremost in these
grievances was the three decade long denial of their exposure to Agent Orange,
which meant little or no assistance, was made available to veterans or their children
for the outcomes of this exposure. WC VW, explained

what you had was fit young warriors coming back from overseas with
their minds clear, and probably with the objective of putting that year
behind them, and getting on with life. They married, some of them
became very rich, some became business men, self-employed business
men or high up in companies or stuff like that. And these conditions didn’t
really manifest themselves for probably 20 years on average. And all of a
sudden their lives started to fall apart. Yeah there were drunks, there
were wife beaters, there were guys who were messed up right from the
inception but the majority got on with their lives. Twenty years down the
track there has been guys who have lost their properties, their families,
they have pretty much lost everything. And if they were on ACC and got
chemical poisoning, which would be an accident, they would get 80 percent of their salary, what do they do they get $300 a week if they are lucky on their pension, $363 a week I think it is, if they are lucky, it’s not much justice there really.

The violation of social exchange processes can lead to an inability to trust others. Loss of trust in the government and New Zealand Defence Force led to feelings of anger, alienation, humiliation and hurt for Vietnam veterans (Cast & Burke, 2002; Hegtvedt, 2006; Johnson et al, 1997).

Schneider, Konijn, Righetti and Rusbult (2010) argue, that although there are many definitions of trust, the underlying assumption of all definitions is that “trust constitutes perceived benevolence” (p. 669). The trust that Vietnam veterans initially had in the government was based on reciprocity, fairness and compassion. In return for the sacrifices soldiers were willing to make including loss of life itself, there was trust that the government would respond appropriately. ET VW highlighted this expectation of trust by saying, “the government should not have the audacity to send anybody to war if they are going to return to this crap”. A loss of trust led WC VW to explain, that he had

been hit with depression from time to time … this is a situation that affects a lot of veterans with kids it’s got very little to do with being shot at or seeing dead bodies. It’s to do with your children and the fact that up to three years ago who could take responsibility for their condition … and that’s what we talk about at these reunions, it’s just trying to get over that and how it affected those guys with their kids.
A loss of trust in the government was still evident when Agent Orange exposure was finally acknowledged in 2008 and a compensation package was unveiled. The compensation package was deemed inadequate and AP VW angrily vented, “the compensation is crap... since then I have had no faith in politics, politicians they are all a bloody bunch of liars as far as I am concerned and a lot of guys think along the same lines”. Similarly, NM VW, stated

    the government said that they had given us a 30 million dollar package, so out of the existing vets and see as there is less than 2000 of us there has been 30 that have benefited and this is why we are so angry about the rubbish that has come out.

The stringent claim criteria were viewed as an obstructive barrier to eligibility, as AP VW explained, “… the whole thing is too narrow, the criteria of that they will pay out on is very narrow, they haven’t looked at the big picture”.

Overall, the compensation package was deemed insincere and a token gesture that failed to accord respect and value to these men’s status as veterans. NM VW felt,

    it would have been fairer to have said to all of us instead of having a nanny state ‘listen you went through it, we accept it ... here is 60 odd thousand. This is your compensation and we will cover you we will cover your family’s medical bills and we will adequately cover your children’s medical bills’, and we would have been happy little chappies but instead they made all these criteria to us and that’s quite gutting to us.
Many veterans had carried these feelings of loss of trust, disillusionment, hurt, anger and alienation for over 30 years until a reconciliation process was made possible with acknowledgment of Agent Orange exposure. As shown above, the compensation package offered did not necessarily redress injustices that had been experienced. The formal apologies delivered to the Vietnam veterans in 2008 by the Prime Minister and head of the NZDF were much more important than financial recompense, and began a healing process. These apologies articulated social care and respect, and were recognition of damage suffered through exposure to Agent Orange and wider social rejection that veterans had experienced. Although these apologies were made some 30 or so years after the end of the Vietnam War, they still invoked deep emotional reactions and were meaningful in veterans’ lives. IJ VW talked about the intense reaction he had to the apology given by the head of the NZDF, Lieutenant General Jerry Mateparae. He explained, “I broke down and cried several times… and I cried and cried and cried till I was sick”.

For the majority of veterans in this research, the formal apologies were key occurrences which helped them resolve anger and hurt following the Vietnam War. Apologies are important and powerful as they work to repair breaches of trust. The restorative process of apology meant that painful and long-term breaches of trust could be repaired, with veterans able to become more connected to society through being accorded social care and respect. Repair of trust, social connectedness and social care and respect are brought about through the specific mechanisms of apology, by means of a restoration to dignity; an establishment of truth; an
acceptance of responsibility; creation of a sense of justice and a pledge of future safety (Kirchhoff, Wagner & Strack, 2012; Lazare, 2004; Tylim, 2005).

Dignity was restored through an acknowledgment that Vietnam veterans were good soldiers who had discharged their duties loyally and professionally. The Crown apology delivered by the Prime Minister, read

*The Crown formally acknowledges the dedicated service of the New Zealand Regular Force personnel ... the Crown records that those armed forces personnel loyally served at the direction of the New Zealand Government [and] is placing on record its respect for the service of the nearly 3,400 New Zealanders who served in that conflict should now be honoured, alongside that of other brave service personnel deployed to other conflicts in the service of our country. (Ministerial Statement to Parliament - Crown Apology to Vietnam veterans, Prime Minister Helen Clark, 2008. See Appendix A)*

The restoration of dignity was reiterated by Lieutenant General Mateparae who, said

*you had volunteered to serve in the New Zealand’s Armed Forces and you went to do your duty to the best of your abilities when and where required ... you served loyally, you served with honour ... those currently serving in our armed forces and veterans alike, are a family bound together by the ethic of service to our country, a common set of values, and a professional military culture that reflects our national heritage and character, a heritage and character you helped created.*
He went on to say

*your records show that you were at least as good as the best troops New Zealand has ever deployed [and] you can be proud of the legacy you provided for the generations of Service men and women who followed you. (Address by Lieutenant General J. Mateparae, 2008. See Appendix B)*

Restoration of dignity being aided by the apologies was evident in the extracts. For example FD VW, said

*we were just a bunch of bloody good soldiers doing a job and the circumstances might not have been good but 7/8th of them are right like me to be very happy about the apology and the things that have gone on.*

The apologies were a vindication of the veterans’ professionalism as well as legitimation of their identity and status as soldiers. FD VW talks about this, as

*“vindication of who were and what we were actually doing and that vindication is still going on today”.*

Nordenfelt (2004) argues that most people have a fundamental respect for their own identity but that this self-respect can be easily fractured, leading to feelings of humiliation and unworthiness. The denial of Agent Orange exposure and specific social rejection on the basis of their service in Vietnam was a violation of veterans’ dignity and an exclusion from communities they belonged to. The apologies given by the Crown and the NZDF repositioned the social status of veterans through according them social status and dignity. Through respectful treatment, a space was opened up for veterans to be publicly proud of who they were, and what they stood for.
Nordenfelt (2004, p. 75) calls this “the dignity of identity”, which is “.... attached to the person’s integrity and identity as a human being” and through these apologies ‘dignity of identity’ was restored to veterans.

Apologies further lead to an establishment of truth, and acceptance of responsibility. The Crown apology acknowledges these in regards to both social rejection, and exposure to Agent Orange. The Crown extended

\[
\text{to New Zealand Vietnam veterans and their families an apology for the manner in which their loyal service in the name of New Zealand was not recognised as it should have been, when it should have been, and for the inadequate support extended to them and their families after their return home (Ministerial Statement to Parliament - Crown Apology to Vietnam veterans, Prime Minister Helen Clark, 2008).}
\]

The Prime Minister went on to say “the failure of successive governments and their agencies to acknowledge the exposure of veterans to dioxin contaminated herbicides and other chemical is itself acknowledged”. Similarly Lieutenant General Mateparae took responsibility for the failings of the Defence Force. He stated that: “unreservedly I say that the Defence Force did not do enough to assist you, our returning veterans... there can be little doubt that you were let down after you returned from the war and across subsequent decades” (Address by Lieutenant General J. Mateparae, 2008). He went on to say that “in sharp contrast to other veterans of earlier conflicts, our returning Vietnam veterans in effect became casualties in our own country”. He too reflected that “the issue of your exposure to the defoliant Agent Orange has been a
long and open wound. It is difficult to understand how the critical information about chemical spraying in the areas where you operated lay dormant ... until 2003”.

Establishing truth and taking responsibility for wrongful actions demonstrated social care and respect, and was acknowledged by veterans as sincere. FD VW, stated

the words were not hollow and whatever had been spoken before, very little was said but this time these were things that had well and truly been given a good airing. They represented a country saying we were wrong, we did you wrong, we treated you badly on public record.

IJ VW explained, that he wept when “Major General Mateparae said we let you down, your country let you down and on behalf of the army I would like to apologize”.

In order for an apology to be accepted and therefore effective, there has to be demonstration of “true sorribness” (Kirchhoff et al, 2012, p. 111) or genuine conveyance of remorse by the apologist. The offering of sincere remorse and admitting fault means that an apology can be seen as a just response to unfair treatment (Kirchhoff et al, 2012). This expression of sincere remorse for transgressions committed against veterans was recognised by FD VW, who stated that there were: “things a country was responsible and a government was and it abandoned its soldiers and its military and it’s taken a long time for an apology to come [but], an apology finally arrived in public”.

The taking of responsibility for wrongful treatment means that a pledge of safety can arise and this holds in place a sense of justice and commitment to rightful treatment. Veterans’ distress is validated and protection is offered to current and future
veterans. In the apology read by Lieutenant General Mateparae, it was stated that:

“the NZDF will ensure that no other group of New Zealand veterans is treated the way you were. And one important way we can honour you, is to act upon the lessons you have helped us learn” IJ VW talked about his belief in the sincerity of Lieutenant General Mateparae’s words. He said

it’s not to say it [social rejection] won’t happen again. But it won’t happen again when he’s in charge. Never again for New Zealand soldiers to face what we had to face when we came back, and face what we did when we came back, with absolutely no support from anyone.

Through pledging future safety, creating a sense of justice, establishing truth and accepting responsibility, an apology can lead to forgiveness. Tylim (2005) argues that the aim of an apology is to obtain forgiveness through a restoration of procedural justice. People can become consumed with anger, shame and guilt through experiences in their lives and forgiveness is understood as a mechanism to change and reduce these negative emotional states (Kirchhoff et al, 2012). Acts of forgiveness offer the victim a way to move towards the future rather than looking back to the past (Avruch, 2010).

IJ VW explained the importance of the Crown apology for being able to deal with his anger and move forward

so Tribute 08 was important to us but at the end of the day no matter what the circumstances are I have got to put that behind me and get on with my life and that’s a very hard thing to do. I have got to put the anger
behind me and I have got to say to myself, ok, they mean that apology, they actually mean what they are going to say.

EK VW echoed these sentiments to some degree, saying

*I’m comfortable now that all those issues are being addressed and it’s really a process, really a series of events that have to be ticked off ... I suppose the key one was the apology which was holistic in many ways. For some it was too late, some will never accept it, for the remainder they probably accepted the apology, so that was the final acknowledgment.*

Social care was demonstrated to Vietnam veterans through the apologies made by the Crown and the NZDF. Although the compensation package was deemed as inadequate by many veterans, it was an important signifier of redress. Apologies acted to rework the public record regarding the contributions of Vietnam veterans, and in doing so forged a new social memory around their military service and aftermath. The ‘republican contract’ previously viewed by many veterans as dishonoured was reconfigured, and imbued with validity and meaning. Restoration of trust in the government and wider social recognition allowed many veterans to move past a psychological limbo of hurt, alienation and anger.

The other way ‘social care’ was constituted was through sites of remembrance, which included social institutions and practices, such as commemoration days as well as memorials and monuments.
Sites of Remembrance

Sites of remembrance are social institutions, practices and memorials, which are created and maintained to show social respect for war veterans. Sites of remembrance can be a fixed location, and the most common of these are the cenotaphs placed in most New Zealand towns and cities. There are at least 452 war memorials in New Zealand, which over time have included community halls, hospitals, returned veterans’ homes, gateways, public swimming baths, memorial windows and libraries (Maclean & Phillips, 1990).

These fixed symbols memorialize and preserve a collective memory of the sacrifices and losses of New Zealand men at war. The National Army Museum and the Auckland War Memorial Museum are also places of memory, which honour veterans and hold in place wider social narratives of war through displays, exhibitions, documents, newspapers and images.

Remembrance practices can also be acts of commemoration, social institutions, defence policies, education curricula, and national holidays. The 25th of April, known as Anzac Day since 1916, is a national day of commemoration for those New Zealanders killed at war, and for those who returned (Pugsley, 2004). On Anzac Day there are parades, church services and other ceremonies that commemorate dead and living veterans.

Initially, sites of remembrance were created in order to honour and remember the war dead, and to serve as places for mourning (Winter, 1995). One veteran said that he attended the Anzac day parade “...in memory of my brother, the one that was killed and a lot of my own mates that never returned” ARE WWI. Historians Jock...
Phillips and Chris Maclean (1990), talk about war memorials in New Zealand symbolizing both sorrow and pride. These memorials are recognition of the sorrow for the incomplete lives of men who fall in war, and in the words of the Mayor of Christchurch in 1920, a tribute to “our fallen soldiers who had displayed the finest characteristics of which the human race is capable – courage and self-sacrifice” (Maclean & Phillips, 1990, p.72). As these memorials were erected to symbolize the nation’s sorrow and pride in respect of its war dead, grief was also a major force behind the construction of war memorials in New Zealand and elsewhere (Maclean & Phillips, 1990; Winter, 1995).

For many veterans, sites of remembrance were important locations for expression of grief of individuals, families, communities and the nation as well as acknowledgment of the brutal reality of death and loss in war (Winter 1995). One veteran wept as he talked about visiting the Vietnam memorial in Washington saying, “that big black wall, fifty-eight thousand names line after line” CC VW. Bachelor (2007) argues that “bereavement is well recognised as the most psychologically and socially significant life event most people ever experience” (p. 405). Research indicates that having a focal point such as a memorial, grave or day for reflection can be an important component of working through the loss and grief that bereavement entails (Bachelor, 2007).

However, it wasn’t until the Vietnam War, that the bodies of veterans were repatriated back to New Zealand, so for the fallen men of the First World War and the Second World War there were no graves to visit and mourn over (Maclean & Phillips, 1990). War memorials become a “surrogate tomb and focal point thought to
provide a way to help manage and work through the pain of grief” (Maclean & Phillips, 1990, p. 71).

Sites of remembrance may offer a place of solace and comfort to the bereaved. Rowlands (1998) talks about people who visit the American Vietnam memorial to “... touch and caress the names carved on the wall. They trace the names onto pieces of paper to take away” (p. 61). In New Zealand, the text written in 1934 by Kemal Ataturk (who commanded the Turkish forces who opposed the ANZACs in 1915), is inscribed on a monument in Gallipoli and replicated on the Ataturk monument in Wellington. These words say

\[
\text{those heroes who shed their blood and lost their lives, you are now lying in the soil of a friendly country. Therefore rest in peace. There is no difference between the Johnnies and the Mehmets to us where they lie side by side in this country of ours. You, the mothers who sent their sons from far away countries wipe away your tears; your sons are now lying in our bosom and are in peace. After having lost their lives on this land they become our sons as well.}
\]

The memorialisation of the war dead provides consolation in that the fallen are remembered and kept alive across time in the nation’s memory (Ben-Amos, 2003).

Part of the grieving process includes, making sense of the loss within an individual’s set of assumptions or understandings of the world (Parks, 1996). Having national days of commemoration allows sense-making around the deaths of those who die in war. A New Zealand local county chairman, when talking about war memorials,
hoped that “these memorials would serve to show what a terrible sacrifice war meant to a country…” (Maclean & Phillips, 1990, p.74) This sentiment was echoed by First World War veteran LOB, who when talking about Anzac day, stated: “well it just brings back to me the chaps I knew in my particular company who sacrificed themselves ... they gave their lives during that period”.

Sites of remembrance signify society’s moral responsibility towards men and women who go to war, and as such become sites of indebtedness. The rolls of honour engraved on cenotaphs or walls of museums are lists of those lost who are precious to society (Clarke, 2008). Several veterans talked about the importance of respecting those who had fallen, and the sense of moral responsibility, which underpinned this respect. When talking about Anzac Day, FA WWI stated, it “should never be dropped, all the men’s’ good lives that were lost especially in our war they should never be forgotten”. Similarly, EK VW, said “it’s the only day of the year where I sit down and reflect on those guys who have gone, killed in conflict”. Likewise ELG WWII, when talking about Anzac Day, said “it’s a day in the records of New Zealand, it’s the day of record for all the deaths that have occurred on behalf of our country. All the people that died on behalf of that ... we remember them”.

The sacrifices these men made were central to the moral responsibility to honour the fallen (Winter, 1995). This is the idea that ‘they died so that we can be free’ and that the sacrifice was meaningful and important. Remembering war dead is also an act of recognising the continuity of society and nationhood. The act of war is supposed to secure or maintain some sort of freedom: political, ideological, territorial or a
combination of these. Social reverence is society’s respect and remembrance for what these men’s deaths meant for society.

This process of collective remembrance across time also contributes to what Ben-Amos (2003, p. 172) calls a “sense of the continuous life of a community”. An attachment to society is formed through a togetherness forged from a shared past. Sites of remembrance then, create a place for members of society to experience solidarity, and to feel connected with each other. This connection is often demonstrated during ceremonies at war memorials because, as Arthur (2009) claims, “…war memorials have great unifying power because they are so well integrated into the established narrative of national identity and pride. They generate a sense of community and belonging” (p. 66). Commemorative acts are social practices which can foster a sense of integration and belonging (Barron et al 2008; Berkman, Glass, Brissette & Seeman, 2000). Consequently, when people are integrated into society they become cognisant of their social and moral unity with others (Durkheim 1915/1976).

Through practices of social unity, veterans can gain affirmation and support from the public who gather together to pay their respects and without doubt, “… information that one is valued, and esteemed is most effectively proclaimed in public” (Cobb, 1976, p. 300). One veteran, PS VW, talked about his reaction to the tribute parade held in 2008 for Vietnam veterans. He said

it was one of the most emotional things I have ever experienced was that big parade we did along Lambton Quay in Wellington. And when all those Wellingtonians turned out and they applauded us from one end of the
street to the other and ... they brought their little kids out ... and we had never seen that before, and they were running out and shaking our hands, and you stop and give them a cuddle. That was a very very difficult parade emotionally it really was but I thoroughly enjoyed it and I would do it again. They turned out, and that was bloody marvellous, it really was.

From acts of public affirmation veterans are able to verify their sense of moral identity and self-worth (Barron et al, 2008). The experience of being valued and respected by society for wartime sacrifice and losses, provides veterans with a sense of care, affiliation, recognition and status. Providing this social regard to veterans supports the ability to create or maintain a healthy sense of self, and therefore psychological well-being. This social regard may be especially important for older veterans who often face increasing social isolation and marginalization as a function of their age (Barron et al, 2008).

Social regard and care and the genuine positive acknowledgement for service are necessary for re-immersion into civilian life following wartime. At the most basic level, social acceptance provides veterans with a sense of social belonging necessary for psychological recovery from combat experiences. When a veteran identity is valued, this supports creation and maintenance of a positive and healthy sense of self. Social connectedness further provides a supportive environment within which veterans can process their wartime trauma, and combat experiences can be legitimised, enabling healthy integration of these experiences into understandings of
one's self. The experience of social rejection for Vietnam veterans clearly highlights the importance of social care and regard for coping with war.

Social regard and care demonstrated through rehabilitation assistance provides not only material help or compensation but also a sense of procedural justice and fairness, which is helpful for moving forward from war. Through sites of remembrance, veterans are accorded respect, status and public affirmation for their participation in war, which further acts to support coping processes, and psychological well-being. Sites of remembrance reflect a moral responsibility to honour sacrifices veterans make for their country. The importance of never forgetting the fallen means that living veterans will be remembered by society, and can be treated with the respect and compassion necessary for recovery from war (Winter, 1995). Remembrance then becomes an act concerned with the past, present and future welfare of veterans and may well be the foundation from which, social care and regard for veterans are created, re-iterated and immortalized.
Chapter 6 – Theme 3
Dealing with the War

“No man is an island” - John Donne

This final theme is focused on how veterans in this research dealt with the psychological aftermath of war. War changes people in some way, at some level. For many men in this research the change was profound, for others it was reported as less life changing. Without doubt, war is a traumatic landscape where individuals are exposed to acts of killing, threats of being killed, death, destruction and loss of comrades. This trauma often occurs within new and difficult physical environments, which further take a toll on psychological and physical well-being. The men in this research fought in the steep valleys of Gallipoli, the trenches of the Western Front, African and Middle Eastern deserts and the jungles of Vietnam.

Leed (1979) argues, that “war is ... the binary opposite to social life and the counterpole to normal existence in modern industrialised society” (p. 41). Therefore combat experiences take place in a psychological and physical space, which is at polar opposites to the workings of civil society. Coming home meant, that these men made an abrupt shift from a world of war into a civil world of peace and order.

Coming back meant moving from embodiment as a soldier to assumption of a civilian life, and this transition was difficult for many veterans. There was a constellation of immediate and practical changes for the veteran, such as gaining employment, leaving comrades behind, reassuming army life in peacetime New Zealand or leaving...
the army, resuming family life and managing different living conditions, new clothing, food and transport. Many veterans suffered permanent damage to their bodies as a result of wounds, sickness, and hard physical conditions as well as from the psychological and emotional damage from war. Veterans in this research often went through processes of recovery in order to heal from physical and psychological injuries. It is fair to say, that there is always some imprint of war on body and mind, and for some veterans this imprint was harder to deal with than it was for others. There are many reasons why veterans found it easier or harder to deal with the effects of war. People are different from each other and cope in different ways, soldiers are exposed to different aspects of war, and veterans come home to different levels of support and stability. Such differences result in a wide range of experiences.

Dealing with the war in psychological terms is presented within three sub themes. First there is ‘coming back’ which looks at the transition from soldier to civilian and the initial readjustment into civilian life. The second sub theme is about ‘incorporating war service’, which focuses on active sense-making of what going to war had meant for veterans. The final way many veterans dealt with the war was by ‘suppressing the war’ through deliberate avoidance of thinking or talking about the war. These three main ways of dealing with war are mediated by processes of social support which includes camaraderie with other veterans, organisations, such as the RSA and relationships with wives. Thus ‘social support’ will be discussed as the final sub theme about coping with war experiences.
Coming Back

The majority of men across all three samples talked about the initial difficulties of settling back into civil society following their return to New Zealand. SGS WWI, said

I was very confused when I landed back it took me quite some time to get things in any sort of perspective at all ... when I came back I found it hard to relate to the environment that I had to take part in or be part of you see.

Likewise BOS WWI, said

when I came back ... everything seemed to have changed. You know well my friends had been killed and there seemed to be a bunch of young people doing the things I was doing before I went away ... I felt I was on the outer ... I was just a soldier who’d come back from war and they were carrying on what I was doing before I went to war.

Similarly, Second World War veteran BLC, said

when I got back home I wasn’t at peace at home. At my parent’s home I wasn’t happy and I spent as little time at home as I possibly could ... unfortunately I don’t think my parents came to terms with the change that can happen to a fella in exposure to that sort of thing. I had a different perspective; conversation at home didn’t hold me. I didn’t feel as though I was a participant any more, isolated in my own home.
Likewise RE VW, recounted “I came back a better person mentally although it took me a long time to get back to normality”. Another Vietnam veteran AP, said that he “just couldn’t settle down, mentally and emotionally”.

This destabilising period experienced by many veterans, which follows return from war is a state of what Victor Turner terms, “betwixt and between”, in his theory of liminality (1967, p. 93). Originally developed to make sense about rites of passage this theory outlines three stages in important transition processes. These stages are before, between, and after. The veteran enters the between stage, or period of liminality, as he makes the transition from soldier to civilian, starting with demobilisation. This liminal period is about separating from a previous way of being, and starting to transform the self in order to occupy another social position or state (Cook-Sather, 2006). This place “… within, which the transition unfolds is an ‘in-between’ place, which bridges ‘what is’ and ‘what can or will be’ (Cook-Sather, 2006, p. 110). There is no specific time period attached to liminality but it probably ends when the veteran feels mostly comfortable with civilian life.

For some men, the initial settling in period was reported to last for months. ARE WWI, said “when I first came back I didn’t do anything for about three months”. Some veterans took longer periods. LL WWI, said “after a year or two I applied for a year’s leave without pay and I wandered around the world in that year and then I went back to work”. Some veterans talked about this settling in period as resulting from restlessness. BL WWI, said he

\[
\text{just didn’t feel like settling down for some reason for another. When you are at the war you were shifting around all the time and never more than}
\]
three weeks in the one place in all the time you were away ... that seemed to have some effect I think.

For others there was simply a need to recover from changes brought about by war.

SGS WWI, said

the fighting on the Western Front, and the life on the Western Front was the most terrific tension you lived under all the time you see. Terrific tension, that’s the thing I feel, was the biggest factor eroding the nervous systems of people... apart from the physical hardship. It was more of an emotional thing, than anything else.

CC VW, stated

people had been away to war before, people in my own family, they came back and ... they let off a certain amount of tension and steam by a number of ways. Mine was getting away into the hills, and I suppose resting my spirit a bit with my dad, and resting with my family, all of which helped me recover. The young body and mind is a resilient thing.

This liminal period can be fraught with difficulty as the veteran struggles with transitioning from soldier to civilian. It is a time of moving from life structured in army- terms of self-sacrifice, subordination and discipline to civic life, which is largely constructed on ideas of individualism and independence (Demers, 2011). ARE WWI, talked about how
in the army you get up in the morning at the right time, you go to bed at the right time, everything is regimental, well when you come home you get rid of all of that... I felt damn relieved and free because when you are in the army, you don’t get any freedom, you are just there to do what you are told, and you get by through being told what to do, and what not to do.

Leaving the army meant regaining independence and VN WWI, talked about having

*a little elated feeling ... that you could do it yourself without being told how to do it and what to do and the rest of it. I think it was nice, a very nice feeling to be in charge of yourself again.*

Similarly, WB WWI, explained “*in the army you got everything done for you, you see, but once you got out of the army you had to make a decision yourself and I don’t think we could do it*”.

Learning to be independent and autonomous may have required significant adjustment for some, as the majority of veterans in this research had gone to war as young and single men. In the first half of 20th Century New Zealand, it was usual for young men and women to remain living at home until marriage, with the exception of boarding elsewhere for education or employment reasons (Phillips, 2008).

Returning from war meant reassuming the path of adult maturation, which included development of independent thinking, future goals, social lives and romantic relationships. The development from adolescence to adulthood was arrested by war service so while these returning veterans were mature in some aspects, especially in
terms of personal growth from experiences of war, in other ways they were young men whose normal adult social development had been delayed to some extent (Baum et al, 2013). Hence, leaving the military also meant a return to the normal trajectory of life development.

Leaving the military environment also meant losing the emotional comfort of being surrounded and supported by processes existing in large groups. SFH WWI, talked about the “thousands of soldiers that you mixed with all the time and wherever you went, you went about in big mobs for two and a half years”. According to Identity Theory (Stryker, 1980), people are emotionally attached to, and defined by the roles they inhabit in life. These roles become more ingrained and salient in constructions of identity, especially when the individual’s social and personal networks are bound up with these roles. As such, “social ties to role-based others serve as social and emotional investments that ‘bind’ them to their role-based group, and in turn the self-meanings that are attached to that group” (Walker & Lynn, 2013, p. 156).

**Work**

Many of the veterans reported going to war and soldiering as a job. EK VW, stated “you were there to do a job, you did it”. TE WWI, recounted that

*Captain Moncrieff … pulled up in front of us and he had a grin on his face, ‘well boys I’ve got a bit of news for you’. He waited a while, nobody said anything. ‘You know the war finishes at 11 o’clock this morning’. We all looked at one another and someone says ‘hell what are we going to do tomorrow, we’re out of work’.*
Being in the army was far more than just a job, it was a role that was lived for all these veterans, and for many encompassed two, three or more years of their lives. Shedding this soldier role also meant disengaging from life as it had been, and from the people who had intimately shared that life. Some veterans were able to make that transition from soldier to civilian relatively quickly, and move through this liminal period by returning to employment in the civilian world. GCB WWI, said “I was very fortunate striking a job like that right away, many didn’t, and I know many chaps didn’t, found it hard to find a job that suited them”. JT WWII, recounted how he “drove Dunedin taxis for about six months to settle me down a bit”. Likewise BS WWII, said “the fact I had a job to return to helped immensely”. Similarly, NEW WWII, stated “it wasn’t too difficult, I had a profession to come back to, and JH WWII, said “I went practically straight to work when I came home and that was a great help”. BOS WWI, remembered “the only thing was that I had my job. And my job was open for me when I went back which was you know some sort of foundation”.

Research indicates that work is important to maintaining psychological well-being for veterans as it is for most people (Adler et al, 2011; Anderson & Mitchell, 1992; Burnett-Zeigler, 2011; Iversen et al, 2005; MacLean, 2010). The advantages to psychological well-being come from both the manifest and latent benefits of work (Jahoda, 1981). Employment provides the manifest benefits of a wage, which enables people to live, provide housing for themselves, support families and go about the business of everyday living. Work also has latent benefits in providing structure, social contact, personal status and identity, collective purpose, and activity (Jahoda, 1988). Primarily, employment enforces a time structure on the day as it regulates
how the day is managed, which provides order and routine. BOS WWI, said “my work occupied my time, and I got back into that alright”. This structure extends past daily routine to months and years, creating a rhythm for life over time. Going to work also provides social contact with others outside family and friends. Individuals share experiences with colleagues and others, which often creates social networks and friendships both within, and outside of work relationships (Jahoda, 1988). WNH WWI, talked about how he used to go around the farms to buy produce for his job as a grocer, saying

\[
\text{at the time the country was what cured me, the trips that the firm sent me on were from farm to farm, and in those days the farmers were a much happier lot than they are today, in that you either had to have a meal or you had to have a cup of tea before they'd talk business.}
\]

Having a job can also sustain well-being through endowment of personal identity, and status as individuals operate as something in the world, which is recognisable and meaningful to others. Maslow (1987) argued, that human beings have basic needs to be socially accepted, respected and acknowledged for their accomplishments. Accordingly, the relationships forged with others through employment can fulfil this need for esteem from one’s peers. Work further compels individuals to be focused on collective goals, and there is satisfaction and pleasure when a shared goal is achieved. One Second World War veteran talked about his service as a railway engineer before, during and after the war. BLC, said

\[
\text{you had a common background, the railway blokes did, and you knew the social standing of pretty well everybody in the outfit from civilian life. The}
\]
job was quite responsible. You had to maintain a certain standard of order; safety was a feature that was always imprinted on railway men, always. I mean the very first thing they taught us was the most important duty was to provide for the safety of the public.

Working towards a common purpose entails attention and focus that can divert introspection, worry and anxiety into outward directed thinking and motivation, which in turn can bring about self-respect and self-valuing (Jahoda, 1981).

As well as entering employment, another way of moving forward from this liminal period was to make sense of the war, and to process the trauma of combat in psychological and emotional terms. Many veterans did this by actively incorporating the war experience into their life story, so that war was integrated, and seen as part of life.

**Incorporation of War Service**

Articulating war service as part of the story of life or life narrative is a way of dealing with experiences of war. Sarbin (1986) claims, that the concept of narrative explains the organisation or structure human beings seek to impose on experience. Creating narratives becomes more important when life is disrupted by traumatic experience, as the individual “… seeks to ‘reconfigure’ a sense of order, meaningfulness and coherent identity” (Crossley, 2000. 528). When people talk about a “biographical disruption” (Bury, 1982, p. 167), such as the experience of going to war, there is often reference to an “unmaking of the world insofar as it shakes peoples’ taken-for-granted sense of identity at its very roots … they often characterise themselves as
becoming a totally different person and... life was totally transformed as [they] entered another world” (Crossley, 2000, p. 540). This rupture of life was experienced by veterans leaving their previous civilian lives and entering military service, and again, as they returned to New Zealand, and left behind the world of war and their soldier identity. GM WWII, said

\[\text{we had been away and things had changed. People had grown up and got older. We ourselves had changed in many ways, after all what we had been through, thus to settle was not easy... we did not know what we wanted to do, as it had affected our lives.}\]

Likewise, BOS WWI talked about how his family thought the war had changed him, saying

\[\text{I think a lot of them felt the war had changed me. It wasn’t so much the war changing but the circumstances I met when I came home... you know; I felt life wasn’t going to be the same for me.}\]

Demers (2011) talks about a ‘crisis of identity’, that many veterans experience when they return home, in that they are caught between military and civilian cultures in a place of alienation and distress. Through such alienation and distress, veterans often experience a loss of self-worth and self-esteem as they try to articulate a personal identity, which provides a coherent sense of self.

**Identity**

In order to initially bridge the gap between a soldier and civilian identity, several Vietnam veterans joined the Territorial Force. Belonging to the army reserve or
Territorial Force entails part time military service while remaining in the civilian world. Territorial soldiers deploy to operations overseas with no difference from Regular Force soldiers, and operate as army personnel in civil emergencies and disasters (New Zealand Defence Force, 2014). Several veterans talked about bridging from full time to part time soldiering as part of the process of moving through the liminal period, from army life to the civilian world. BP VW, said “we couldn’t get what we called the green machine out of our system; it took years for me to settle down probably. I joined the Territorials and did about five years in two different stints to try and get it out of my system and calm down and settle down”. Another veteran said, “I joined up with the Territorial Force to wean myself of it, like being weaned off the bottle, so I did it that way” AP VW.

Joining the Territorial Force following wartime service may well be a way of actively incorporating war service into selfhood by partially retaining a soldier identity. To some degree, retaining this soldier identity holds war service as a more accessible and visible part of identity across time. Drawing on Identity Theory, it may well be that veterans who became Territorials were able to maintain some coherence and unity of self, as well as to preserve the emotional attachment they had invested in being a soldier. These veterans also remained connected to social networks structured around army life. Remaining connected to a soldier identity can be seen as a process of active coping with the instability, and upheavals of returning home from war. Rather than a total disruption of self when moving from war to peace, these men were able to ease or moderate their feelings of dislocation and loss by continuing to inhabit the roles, which had previously defined who they were. Holding
onto this part of themselves allowed for a configuration of purpose and integrity about what it meant to be a soldier or officer.

Veterans in this research narrated their sense of their war service around constructs such as patriotism, pride and morality. Many veterans talked about ethical and moral dimensions underlying their decisions to go to war. TE WWI, said “I think New Zealand is a country worth defending, a country worth fighting for”. Likewise, GM WWII, stated “I went for King and country, flag and adventure. I would do the same today”. Similarly, RW VW, said “I joined the army to serve my country”. Many of the veterans in this research saw their war service as a contribution to world order and international political stability. RDC WWII, further stated

> from my early teens I had been concerned with the rise of militarism; in particular Nazism and Fascism ... had not the slightest doubt that when Hitler said today Germany, tomorrow the world he meant it. I believed that unless he was stopped that this was what would happen ... I felt so strongly on the subject there was no option for me but to enlist.

Similarly, ELG WWII, said “you felt you were fighting the good fight for the dreadful things Germany had imposed upon other human beings in their country, and this was something you didn’t want for the world at large”.

Reiterating this sentiment, VDH WWII, said “I certainly did not want to be subjected to Nazi rule and obviously the Germans were very powerful, and something had to be done, really the only reason I joined up was a patriotic one”. Talking about his participation in the Vietnam War, CC said
the other fear was the communist domination which was also a very real thing ... I certainly believed it and it was quite obvious what the communists wanted to do ... the actual politics of how we came to be there I didn’t think too much except I knew it was an alliance arrangement.

Likewise ET VW, said “…New Zealand did our duty under the ANZUS treaty fronting up with the Americans and the Australians”.

As well as patriotism, there was enormous pride expressed about going to war. ELG WWII, said “… it was good to feel that you were doing something about it, as part of it”. Likewise ET VW said “I was proud of doing my bit, personally I wouldn’t have missed it for the world and BP VW, talked about how he was “very proud to be a Vietnam veteran and serve in the army...I’ve no regrets of joining the military and have no regrets about Vietnam”. Often coupled with feelings of pride and patriotism, there was appreciation of the experience of war. JLW WWII, said

\[
\text{personally I think perhaps, I shouldn’t say this with all the chaps killed but for me it was one of the most outstanding periods of my life I think, and I’m glad I was there I wouldn’t have missed it but I realise that’s the personal view of someone who was a bit lucky and was never involved in the hard fighting.}
\]

Talking about going to war as an experience, CC VW, said, it was “right up at the top. I recognise it has been one of the greatest formative experiences of my life”. JEB WWI, said “taken all round it was a great experience”. NT VW, also said “it’s a time in
my life I have never regretted ... it was an experience that I found very valuable to me”. By no account was there any romantic idealisation of war articulated by these veterans. There was no ‘gung ho’ attitude about war in these oral histories and most veterans expressed complex feelings and ideas about going to war. For example, EMS WWII, said “my feelings are still anti-war but although that opinion would say otherwise, I would not have missed it for anything”. Likewise NW WWII, said “it was an experience never to be forgotten but I would not wish it on anyone. I am anti-war and killing”.

There were very few men in this research who regretted going to war and the sense that they had served their country was enough to hold in place feelings of value around their war experiences. The incorporation of experience within understandings of self is linked to psychological well-being (Pasupathi, Mansouri & Brubaker, 2007). When significant events are connected and included into the life story in a positive and functional form, there are opportunities for personal growth and constructive accounting for changes. Attaching beneficial meanings to important events in life leads to psychological maturity, emotional stability, and greater happiness (Pasupathi et al, 2007; Schok et al, 2010; Schok, Kleber, Lensvelt & Mulders, 2010). Crossley (2000) further argues, that individuals often construct themselves in in relation to a moral order in life. This is the idea that individuals will interpret their experiences according to beliefs in fairness, justice and value (Park & Ai, 2006). Hence, detrimental effects of war on psychological well-being may well be mitigated for veterans who believed their wartime service was morally justified, and of value to the societies they returned to (Burnell, Boyce & Hunt, 2011).
However, other veterans in this research incorporated war service into their life story as just another experience, which had little or no negative effect on their well-being. WB WWI, said “It was just another item of experience I delved into so many different things I performed my duties and that was all there was to it”. RJ WWI looked upon going to war, as “an interesting experience that was all”. Looking back, LLWWI, said “I don’t think it had much effect really if I go back. I went back to my old life and I don’t think I’d be any different if I hadn’t gone to war”. Similarly NW WWII, said ‘it was just a period of life that you went through” Likewise EK VW, stated “...it's was just part of your life and from there you move on upon reflection I didn’t dwell on. I didn’t get caught in a time warp ... It’s just an experience that I’ve had”. Men who normalised their service as simply part of their lives did not report any major disruptions to their lives or ongoing psychological or emotional struggles, at the time of the oral history interviews.

It seems that for some, war experiences were smoothly integrated into the life story with little friction or question. McAdams (2001) talks about, how “people select and interpret certain memories as self-defining providing them with privileged status in life [while] other potential candidates for such status are downgraded” (p. 14). It may well be, that war service occurred at a period in their lives when they possessed an “a portfolio of skills and resources that facilitated their transition to civilian life and subsequent integration into educational, work and family roles” (Settersten, Day, Elder & Waldingon, 2012). Therefore, war was not necessarily a disruptive event in some men’s lives. It seemed that events after war such as career, marriage, family,
hobbies, and travel impacted much more on these men’s definitions of themselves, and in review of their lives rather than their war experiences.

It is also feasible that as a function of New Zealand’s history, that these veterans conceptualised “war as a taken-for-granted phenomenon and [perceived]..... war as an ordinary experience” (Lomsky-Feder, 2004, p. 97). From the Land Wars, Boer War, First World War through to the Second World War, and Vietnam War, there had been a relatively routine presence of war within New Zealand social life. Kimmerling (1993) labels this constant memory, and presence of war in society as ‘cognitive militarism’, and through social normalisation it is likely that these veterans simply viewed going to war as a natural part of life.

**Talking about the War**

Another way a few veterans incorporated war service into their understandings of self was by talking about the war. There is a significant body of research demonstrating empirical support for talking about trauma as a way of healing from painful life events (Esterling, L’Ablae, Murray & Pennebaker, 1993; Horowitz, 1993; Lutgendorf & Antoni, 1999; Pennebaker, 1992; Pennebaker, Mayne & Francis, 1997; Stephens, 2002). Today, it is *de rigueur* to view psychological care, especially talking therapies, as the optimum way to approach dealing with trauma, and there is little question that such therapies are highly effective. Several men openly discussed war trauma, and how confusing talking about the war was at times. Vietnam veteran CC, said

_I think there is a bit of emotional crippling that goes on with these sorts of things ... this business of being able to show your emotions. Young men_
are hobbled I suppose is a better word than crippled, they hobble
themselves by not letting their feelings go, and that’s why I think old men
find it easier to cry about things than young men do, because young men
don’t know how. And over the time of your life, the emotional healing
takes place. And if you are lucky you can heal yourself and analyse
yourself, and if you are even luckier you have someone to help you heal.
But, however, it happens you heal, and you become emotionally more
whole, repaired I suppose and I have no doubt that I was as emotionally
hobbled, and inhibited as anyone else. And so you can see the way
soldiers take it on, they talk callously about things, they affect not to be
moved about things, they don’t care about things and they are coarse and
rough about it. All to hide the fact that they are deeply, not even
disturbed but concerned. They want to know what it’s about, they just
don’t know how, and they never delve into it. There is no mechanism for
them to delve into it. They don’t know how to approach other people to
do it, and sometimes it takes many many years before it comes right.

Some people it never does, some people need help to do it.

There were men in this research who reported diagnoses of PTSD, and other men
without formal diagnoses who talked about the terrible psychological suffering, and
struggle they had experienced as a result of war, especially the nightmares. Some
men still heard the guns as much as seventy years later. SFH WWI, discussed his
nightmares, saying
I might go 12 months but then some night if I have had a big day ... I might have a flash of it then, and I can even hear the guns going, the big artillery guns ... and when I wake up I think it might have been two hours but it might be five minutes, two minutes.

Similarly CHU WWII, said “I had these nightmares after the war and strangely enough I just started to get them back since I’ve been ill, nightmares, not as badly”. PS VW, said “I still get nightmares today, mainly if I have been dwelling on something and I have these nightmares”. RW VW talked about, how his

**nightmares were about certain things, certain contacts we had in Vietnam, and it was amazing because it was exactly how it took place, but the location was Taupo ... how am I dreaming about ... a battle that took place in Vietnam, and yet the dream is about it being in Taupo.**

It is very common for veterans to have dreams or nightmares that reference war trauma and these dreams can be recurring or experienced years later (Coalson, 1995). It is thought that some veterans may deliberately suppress traumatic memories by distraction or avoidance, but that during sleep these conscious defences are relaxed, so that suppressed trauma is brought once more into consciousness (Brockway, 1987). For some veterans who have suffered stress reactions to combat, including PTSD, these traumatic memories can intrude into consciousness while awake, and are known as flashbacks. These flashbacks can be a replay of the original trauma or fragments of sounds, smells and images, and are accompanied by high levels of physiological arousal, which usually causes distress
Cognitive theories around PTSD propose, that individuals face trauma with certain pre-existing ideas or schemas about the world, which are subsequently shattered (Brewin et al, 1996; Janoff-Bulman, 1992). This shattering of worldviews prevents assimilation of trauma as it cannot be made sense of. Therefore, a reworking of beliefs about the world is necessary in order to successfully process, and reconcile the traumatic memories within the individual’s re-ordered understandings of the world. This successful reconciliation addresses, and alters the physiological and emotional reactions to traumatic memories, so that associated distress and suffering is diminished or excised (Horowitz, 1979; Horowitz & Reidbord, 1992).

BP VW, talked about how he had sought professional help with his PTSD, and said “it was good to get it off your chest”. It is argued, that expressing rather than inhibiting emotion is necessary for both physical and psychological health (Esterling et al, 1999). Expressing this emotion through talking allows the individual to construct a story or explain the event in a coherent way, that allows for emotions to be labelled and understood (Pennebaker et al, 1997). This process of reappraisal and making sense of trauma in a way, which explains and structures experience enables adaptive coping strategies (Esterling et al, 1999). Although some veterans did talk about the value of professional help, there was some discussion of stigma around help-seeking, which may well have prevented other veterans coming forward. For example, PS VW, said “anyone who did go for that sort of thing was considered a nutcase, they were just due for the funny farm and you don’t want to go there”.
Talking about the war was also at times constrained to particular environments, and some veterans repeated that talking about the war was best done with other veterans, as they were the only people who could understand what going to war meant. TE WWI, said “we had to live in those trenches in the mud, you can’t realise that till you try it, you can’t realise it”. Similarly RJ WWI, said “you can’t understand a thing like that unless you’ve been in it. I suppose you see pictures and get some glimmering of what is happening but you can’t really feel what is happening”. LL WWI reiterated “without actually being there and seeing it you couldn’t appreciate the gruesomeness and the horrors of it, it was horrible”. Likewise, EK VW, said they asked me what it was like but then you realise that they wouldn’t understand what you were telling them anyway. They had no idea, what they visualised, and what their concept of what you were doing, and what you telling them was two totally different things. They had no idea at all, no ideas of the conditions, of the environment, the country.

For these veterans, war became a phenomenological experience that can only be known by those who were there. Talking with other veterans may have been the only way some of these men were able to process the trauma of their combat experiences. EK VW, said “that experience was ours and nobody else’s. I don’t tend to relate those [experiences] except when we are in company again and having a yarn”. Likewise, RW VW, stated “yes in my civilian life I have my friends and they are still there but the connection is different. It’s only something you can talk about [with other veterans]”. Likewise, JLW WWII, said “... you can only discuss the war with people who have been there, the atmosphere and the whole experience you have got
to be there to appreciate it”. Talking with other veterans provided a supportive environment whereby these men could safely relate their combat experiences. Through relating war experiences some veterans may have had the opportunity to make sense of their wartime actions, so that painful memories could be reconciled cognitively and emotionally.

However, talking about the war with other veterans was a precarious business at times. There was a suggestion that talking about the war somehow implied conceit or arrogance on the part of the speaker. HB VW, said “there was a lot of bloodshed and basically I thought it was wrong to talk about it. It sounds as if I was boasting about it, and I didn’t like that”. First World War veteran BL, said “they think if a fella starts talking about the war you would think he was skiting or something or like he hadn’t been there”. Likewise, BE WWI, said “a few gasbags would talk” and NB VW, reflected “I have often listened to soldiers telling warry stories with my tongue in my cheek”. Talking about the war also risked potential ostracism. JCM WWI, said

if you hear them discussing it, it’s somebody who doesn’t even know what they’re talking about because they weren’t in the war. We got one man down there [in the rest home] and he is the most hated man here, nobody will talk to him, nobody will sit and listen to him or anything else. When we investigated, we found out that he went over to Germany in the First World War or was it the Second World War and he got taken prisoner. He never heard a shot fired the whole war, and went and worked on a German farm. Now those are the people you hear talk about wars. The
other sort that saw so much of it, they just want to forget, they don’t want to be talking about it.

It may well be, that issues of authenticity around talking about the war with other veterans raised concerns about violations of expected behaviour. There is a certain ethos for how soldiers should act. Going to war presents conditions and demands that forestall individual self-interest as a soldier is part of a community in, which individuals are bound together, and act in collective unity (Leed, 1979). Upon induction into the military world, civilian identity is stripped away, and the individual is transformed by haircut, uniform and training, so that “at some level the soldier... surrenders[s] his individuality, notably his individual agency to the collectivity of his comrades” (Smith, 2007, p. 61). Survival and victory are a group endeavour and individual achievement is seen as action undertaken for others. GN WWII, said we’re all one, no matter what you are ... that’s what the army is all about. In war we had to all be one, if we hadn’t of been one, we wouldn’t have survived. Everyone had to stick together, had to be a body of men.

Therefore, being seen to boast about exploits in war could be viewed as violating codes of conduct for soldiers, as bringing the individual into view obscures the synchronicity of collective unity. As such, contravention of norms and values of the soldier identity resulted in social censure and ostracism, which some men talked about in these oral histories. This disapproval potentially precludes veterans from talking about the war, and could have been one of the reasons some men rarely talked about the war to anyone. Most of the veterans in this research said they
seldom talked about the war or that they had made a deliberate decision to forget the war.

**Suppressing the War**

Many veterans said they rarely discussed the war with anyone, including other veterans. SGH WWI, said “I never talk war when we get together. We talk about those soldiers that came home”. Likewise AB WWI, said “I didn’t discuss it to any great extent unless you were referring to anyone you might have known but otherwise didn’t”. Similarly PT VW, said “I don’t talk about Vietnam, no there’s no reason to talk about it. I’ve been in the war, what is there to talk about”. The details given to others about the war were often brief and incomplete. HB VW, said “if they asked I’d talk about it but I wouldn’t go into details, just to answer the question, yes or no, that was the answer that would be the answer, a rough gloss over the incident that would be it”.

There may be several reasons why veterans don’t discuss the war with each other or with others who have never been to war. Some veterans may see little need to discuss an experience, which they saw as mostly beneficial, or that had made moderate impact on how they understood their lives. There may also have been adherence to a prescription of proper conduct for returned men in issues around talking about the war. It may also be, that veterans remain silent about their combat experiences to avoid burdening others with their painful and often horrific war experiences. AB WWI, said “A lot of people didn’t want to bring it home to them I don’t think... they wouldn’t have liked to think they were upsetting their people too much”. Similarly NT VW, said “I didn’t want to impose it on people”. Remaining silent
may well have been a response to the “psycho-social cultural damage”, that communities suffer from experiences of war (Tankink, 2004, p. 13). The First and Second World Wars engulfed the nation with many civilian lives shattered, and most if not all, members of society affected in some way. During the Vietnam War, sections of society splintered through their support or opposition to Vietnam, and in some ways akin to the 1981 Springbok tour, the nation suffered some civil division. Veterans’ silence may have been a reaction to social distress and suffering in New Zealand, and an attempt to facilitate societal healing and recovery from war. Tankink (2004) argues, that individuals are usually more concerned about what is going on in their social environments and relationships with others, rather than in their own internal worlds. Veterans talked about getting on and rebuilding their lives, and creating new futures for themselves. BL WWI, recounted about people at home

*they were fed up with the war and didn’t want to talk about it in those days. The war was over and that’s what you would likely say if they asked some questions about it, you’d tell them it’s all over.*

Forgetting the war or putting it behind them was articulated by many veterans as the main strategy they employed in order to cope with their combat experiences. JCM WWI, talked about veterans who had seen “so much of it [war] they just want to forget, they don’t want to be talking about the war”. He went on to say, that he hadn’t really wanted to participate in the oral history interview as it “sort of brings up old memories you want to let them lie I think”. Veterans talked about the war being finished, and about leaving it in the past and putting it behind them. ELG WWII, said “I was glad to be home, the job done”. Likewise LOB WWI, said upon his return
home “I said war was finished as far as I am concerned recollections might as well be dispensed with I might as well get on with my life and make something of it”.

Similarly CC VW, said “I was very pleased to be back and my life had now entered a completely different phase”. WC VW said “I didn’t think too much about Vietnam. I got on with my life”.

It is possible that many of these veterans employed a repressive coping style in order to deal with the emotional and psychological aftermath of war. Such a coping style defends against anxiety, and other adverse emotions through the veteran’s deliberate avoidance of thinking or talking about wartime trauma (Weinberger, 1990). When talking to the oral history interviewers, GN WWI, said “I’ve not been one to discuss the war very much and any time, any time. I’ve talked more in the last two days about war that I have in all the time since I’ve left the army with you”. Similarly, BL WWI, said “we don’t really ever talk about the war at all. I suppose it’s not a very pleasant subject” When talking about the information that the oral history interviewers recorded, BE WWI said “I wanted to forget it I’ve had to go and rake up everything to get these notes you know”. Individuals who employ this type of coping strategy attempt to forget painful events, and as such report poorer recall of both negative emotions, and details of events in autobiographical memories (Boden & Baumeister, 1997; Furnham & Traynar 1999; Raes, Hermans, Williams & Eelen, 2006). It is thought that some individuals learn to retrieve memories in a non-specific or general way, so that the associated emotions are more diffused, reduced in focus, and therefore less painful (Weinberger, 1990).
Employing a repressive coping style can act to maintain emotional equilibrium by avoiding distressing triggers through focusing on happy memories or positive aspects of traumatic experiences (Boden & Baumeister, 1997). BE WWI, said “you see going through a thing like that you eliminate the unpleasantness and remember the pleasant side and then you came through it”. TG WWII, said “a lot of sadness in it, a lot of good times. You think about the good times”. Likewise PS VW, talked about getting together with other veterans, saying

Vietnam always comes up but it’s the antics that you got up to on the booze and things like this and the stupid things we did. The actual combat side of it is never discuss. We never go there and we do have a laugh about the silly things that we did … and it’s a bit of hilarity, that’s all.

Echoing this sentiment, WC VW, said “you talk about the funny things not about the bad things”. It is thought that when individuals employ this coping strategy they are recalling aspects of the experience that replace or distract the veteran from the distress, which recalling traumatic memories would bring. In this way, the veteran psychologically defends himself “ … against emotionally distressing material by generating pleasant thoughts and memories [albeit] mood incongruent cognition (Boden & Baumeister, 1997, p. 47). Employing such a coping strategy can be psychologically adaptive in the aftermath of trauma (Pauls, 1998). A repressive coping strategy allows the individual to regulate their emotional expression, control anxiety and moderate reactions to grief (Solomon et al, 2007). Individuals are less likely to become prone to sadness, fear and anger, and more likely to report good levels of self-esteem and optimism.
However, some ways of defending against anxiety and distress can have negative consequences for an individual’s well-being. One of the methods of avoiding confronting and threatening memories is through activities such as substance abuse. Some veterans in these oral histories indicated periods of alcohol abuse in their lives. SGS WWI, said “we all drank ... we did nothing but drink, drink, drink, drank ourselves into oblivion I suppose”. NM VW, talked about his heavy drinking, saying he had been “unable to express or talk about any experience, aware that it was not wise to discuss where you’d been and lots of alcohol”. There can be physical, psychological and legal repercussions for abusing alcohol, as well as interpersonal costs in terms of impact on marriages and social relationships. One veteran said, “I was a quarrelsome young man, drinking and fighting around the place” SGH WWI. Another veteran talked about drinking to cope, and said he had sustained “a lot of damage from the drink” PT VW. A wife who was one of a few wives present during these oral histories said,

\[
\text{And it was that bad at that stage, where I used to got to the pub and pull him out because I thought if I'm going to get a belting, I better get it over and done with, because I never knew what he was going to come home like.}
\]

Engaging in repressive coping strategies that utilise distraction activities, such as alcohol use means that individuals may avoid using problem solving techniques to resolve trauma. Solomon et al, (2007) suggests that processing trauma is essential to incorporating these experiences into understandings of self, which are necessary for recovery and healing. These authors argue that unprocessed memories of trauma remain in original form, almost detached from the life history. Through suppressing
traumatic experience, the individual is unable to bring the painful emotional content of these memories into consciousness, so that cognitive and affective elements of trauma can be reconciled. This lack of reconciliation is thought to be implicated in the development of depression and PTSD (Schwartz & Kline, 1995). As such, repression initially serving as an adaptive function against distress and anxiety may in effect become counterproductive, in terms of mental health (Raes et al, 2006).

There is also evidence that repressive coping is detrimental for physical health. Evidence indicates that people who employ a repressive coping style have marked physiological reactivity to negative events and stimuli (Boden & Baumeister, 1997). Repressing negative thoughts and memories can lead to increased autonomic reactivity, which can result in poor health, including heart disease and cancer (Myers, 2010). Although repressive coping styles can lead to negative impacts on physical health, there is also evidence to suggest that repressors can be skilled at maintaining health behaviours around controllable illnesses, like diabetes and asthma. Accordingly, there is debate as to whether a repressive coping style is maladaptive or adaptive for psychological well-being. While there may be long term negative effects on physical and psychological well-being, there is also evidence to suggest that individuals who repress distressing memories, and focus on positive rather than negative aspects of experience cope well in the aftermath of trauma, and with subsequent stressors (Pauls, 1998).
Social Support

Another important mechanism which enables veterans to successfully cope with combat experiences is the social support they receive from their wives or partners, other veterans, and organisations, such as the RSA.

Social support can be defined as the informational (advice); material (tangible or practical); and emotional (empathy and caring) help, that an individual draws upon from family, friends, colleagues, communities, organisations and institutions in order to manage psychological well-being (Gurung, 2006). The most significant form of social support for most veterans in this research was the camaraderie experienced with other veterans both during, and after war. BOS WWI, said

> now 70 years on what do I remember of my experience of war? Certainly I still have vivid recollections of the terrible conditions we endured, and the many pals who were killed, and many more wounded, and some maimed for life. Above all, what I look back on now, and what I remember and treasure is the comradeship and fellowship that existed among the men.

The relationships formed with each other were often deep, secure, enduring and solidly based on care and respect.

Camaraderie

Without doubt, these bonds formed with other men during wartime are protective for psychological well-being, and for coping with war experiences. Initially, the psychological cohesion or camaraderie formed in a combat unit serves to provide collective safety, survival and performance and to develop being ‘part of a whole’,
which is a fundamental dimension of a soldier (Persson, 2012). Camaraderie grows as a commitment to each other through humour, shared experience, loss, growth, loyalty, death and life. Through this camaraderie, veterans are able to provide and receive social support and through such support feel cared for, valued and connected.

Many veterans talked about this deep friendship or camaraderie RM VW, said

the tight knit group started our basic training together ... you shared a tent with, you had absolute confidence in him. We were so mentally attuned to each other ... you knew what they were going to do in the jungle, you knew exactly what their reactions were going to be ... and that is training and closeness in the way people were. When someone dies you lose all emotion ... you are beyond close that you feel sad, you go to the next level and you shut all that out.

Similarly, TE WWI, said

you could never find better cobbers than the jokers you were in the line with, you know, go over the top with them and in the line, living with them, sharing with them and doing all that, and never let your mates down.

GKN WWI, talked about choosing to go back to his unit rather than remain hospitalised. He told the doctor
Oh no, I want to go back, you get very attached to your mates, they’ve been through things with you. You’re very fond of them. It tells you that in some ways, war does something to you in your ability to rise above the immediate difficulties.

Another veteran SGS WWI, talked about how he would have gone to fight in the Second World War if possible, in order to re-experience the camaraderie of wartime, saying

the atmosphere that’s generated with huge groups of men together. You form comradeships and friendships, groups of friends that you would have no opportunity of forming under any circumstances you see other than wartime. That stays with you too ... you’re one of a huge group you see and therefore there’s an atmosphere attached to that you couldn’t get in any other part of life and that’s a bit heady. It’s is heady that sort of thing you see, you would be bolstered up, buoyed by that sort of thing you see, otherwise you wouldn’t put up with it. If you had to put up with the same sort of thing as one single individual you’d think to hell with it, I’m not having any more of this. But with a big group of men, you see, it makes things bearable, and that’s why men go back ... to get inside that thing again, which is an army of men together, soldiers.

For soldiers of the Māori Battalion, the camaraderie was strengthened by blood ties. TG WWII, said “blood is thicker than water and that’s why we [Māori Battalion] were so good because we fought in blood lots. I do think you’d go along and help and I
always had a mate there who was a relation of mine”. Likewise, CMB WWII, said when talking about the companies formed to comprise the Māori Battalion that,

these companies were more or less whanau [family] groups so every NCO belonged to the tribe, and where possible the officer was a member of the tribe. Both when they were out of war, and when they went into war they fought as a group, each one more or less conscious of the fact that the chap next to him was a relation of his, a cousin or a brother or something like that ... And there were many cases where chaps were back in base for instance ... and you know because their brother or cousin was way out in the desert about 1000 miles away, these chaps would find transport and get up to their battalion, leave their safe headquarters and re-join the company, because their relations were in battle, and they wanted to be alongside them.

The mutual supportiveness and connection formed between men at war is the bedrock on which social support operates between veterans, and within veterans’ organisations, such as the RSA. Camaraderie was the most talked about dimension of their war experiences for veterans in this research, and a defining factor for psychological well-being both during, and after military service. Talking and remembering the camaraderie meant that afterwards, veterans could recall positive memories of war. Many veterans chose to frame their war narratives in terms of camaraderie, and in doing so may have found a way to make traumatic memories more emotionally manageable. It is also possible that at times veterans did talk to each other about war experiences. Hence, the social support gained from other
veterans may have facilitated active recollection of war, and the potential for processing of trauma. There are implicit unspoken understandings, which exist from sharing experience that enable feelings of belonging and connection. Through the comfortableness of belonging, veterans could make sense of their experiences among men they trusted and with whom their communications were safe and valued.

There were also veterans in this research who said they rarely talked to one another about the war. It is likely the friendship and social interaction between men who have shared combat and army experiences is generally, and directly beneficial for psychological well-being. Having a shared social identity may provide connectedness with each other, which in turn buffers against loneliness and isolation enabling, the individual to feel supported and cared for. GM WWII, said

"we came to protect one another, now if I was out front he would protect my back and this went right through the war, and we came to be real comrades, look after one another. If one was in trouble, the other would help out, this is where the comrades that remains with you for life."

Likewise, ET VW, said “we are the only ones that we can relate to and speak the language, you keep that strong bond with them because you’ve all got something in common”. Similarly, BOS WWI, talked about the “fellowship and comradeship of the chaps who were there under those conditions, we all wore the same clothes, you ate the same food … we all lived together and actually you know lived more or less as a big family".
A life-long connectedness formed through deep bonds of camaraderie was expressed across all the veteran samples. One veteran living in a war veterans’ rest home talked about having “three good mates in the home, all went over the top on the same day on the Somme and all stick together” JCM WWI. DS VW, talked about meeting up with fellow veterans saying, “Christ in an hour we were all back to how we’d been in the army, it was unbelievable as if we hadn’t been apart”. Another said “I enjoy the company of the fellows who came back from Crete now because we are a special gang” AR WWII. These bonds meant that veterans could offer emotional support to one another to deal with everyday life, and at times with the impact war had on their present lives. PS VW, talked about getting together with other veterans, and how “we discuss the things that are going on with VANZ, we discuss, update on how everyone is getting on. I’m not the only one getting bogged down, everybody is, we are all exactly in the same boat”.

These strong bonds formed in war meant that some veterans continued to offer practical support, and friendship to one another years after war ended. One Vietnam veteran talked about driving two of his wartime mates around. RE, said “one of them hasn’t worked for over 30 years, he has cancer, a brain tumour, he is in a bad way, the other guy had a stroke at 40 and barely gets around with a stick”. Without this ongoing practical support, these relatively incapacitated veterans may be more socially isolated and less able to participate in everyday living.

**The Returned Services’ Association**

Social support was also offered through the RSA which helped individuals to deal with the effects of war. The Returned Services’ Association in New Zealand was
formed in 1916 by wounded soldiers who wanted to create an organisation which provided care for returned men, and to remember those who had fallen (History of the RSA, 2013). The RSA was described by one veteran LOB WWI, as

very active, very concerned about the disabled and wounded... They were active as far as promoting the welfare of the returned association boys to get better pensions for them, better facilities, better accommodation, better medical care, and they have been a very active organisation for the welfare of their own people

The RSA can be seen in terms of a soldiers union. One veteran said “you had to be a soldier that served overseas to get in, you see to join. It was a very exclusive club and we had a certain conceit of ourselves, and of course naturally as being RSA, returned soldiers” SGS WWI. Many veterans talked about joining the RSA as soon as they arrived home. JEB WWI, said “I joined the RSA it was the first thing you did when you got back, we built our own club”. Another First World War veteran said, “I joined the RSA in Whanganui in 1918 and I’m still a member today. I joined to be associated with those who had been through the mill although I never attended a meeting or very much” JTB WWI. Similarly, CCWWII, talked about joining the RSA, saying “most of the people who came back did it was the thing to do, so everybody did”.

The RSA operates at a political level, lobbying for veterans’ interests, and at a social level providing physical spaces where veterans can come together, and where war-related rituals like Anzac Day parades can take place. The RSA also offers informational and material social support to individuals. One veteran FA WWI, said
“the RSA got to work and saw that I got a pension when I was ill”. Another HP WWI, said

for any show, they come and get me and take me to it. Having no car or any ability to drive a car they come and pick me up on important occasions. For instance on Anzac Day I go down, and put in an appearance, they find a seat for me and that’s it

Some men received emotional support and a place to be connected with other people at the RSA. ESC WWI, talked about how he “used to go along and play billiards and fraternise with the chaps that were there, jolly good mates”. Another veteran talked about going with his Second World War veteran son-in-law to the RSA, saying “we find its quite nice, it’s quite good up there, we like it, we go up occasionally or periodically and have a game of snooker and probably a couple of pints and while away an afternoon” TE WWI.

Not all veterans utilised the support offered by the RSA for various reasons. Some men hadn’t liked the drinking aspect. One said, “... I pulled out of it and quite a lot of others did too because that time just after the war it was just boozeroos” BL WWI. Another said, “... in the end all those old birds sitting there all day drinking and one thing and another. I thought I’m not going to mix with that” VDH WWII. Other men found that other veterans associations, such as the Crete Association or particular battalion or company association groups better suited their needs for support and affiliation. Some veterans re-joined sports clubs or found other interests, which in turn may have offered the social support that was needed. But the overwhelming majority of veterans supported the RSA in principle, and many made consistent
financial contributions across their lifespans despite having little involvement. Most veterans saw the RSA, as a mechanism advocating on their behalf as well as offering practical and emotional support. TE WWI summed up the support for the RSA, saying “I think the RSA is a good thing. I would hate like hell to see the RSA go”.

However, gaining access to the RSA and its social support had been problematic for some veterans. Vietnam veterans talked about the rejection they had received from the RSA, and the resulting emotional costs. DS VW, said

I went to join the RSA, was told ‘no you can’t join the RSA’, and when we did eventually get into the RSA, we got hounded from the time we walked into the place until the time we walked out of it, by the old fellas. ‘You weren’t fighting a war’. ‘You bastard’... here’s these bastards that reckon they’ve been to a war, by Jesus it hurt, it bloody hurt.

He went on to talk about a past occasion, where there had been about eight of us from the Balclutha area went to the RSA ... there was the president of the New Zealand RSA, he was visiting and we thought we will go and do our thing. Towards the end of his bloody spout, he got up and said ‘he didn’t class Vietnam as war’, and immediate reaction was to stand up. And the words I said to him were, ‘so we were murderers’, and he says ‘no’, so I said ‘so were we mercenaries then’, ‘no’, and I said ‘if it wasn’t a war why our mates were killed up there’. Eight of us threw our badges and cards at him, gave it to him and walked out, and I never went back to the RSA for years.
Many Vietnam veterans have most likely lost significant social support by the initial stance of some RSAs.

Despite some initial marginalisation, the RSA was now seen by many Vietnam veterans as an important site of social support and political action. One veteran EK VW, said

> the whole change and survivability changed when there was a change of leadership ... the coming together of ex Vietnam service association and the RSA getting together, doing the interviews and getting the MOU underway, and getting all those things in place.

The tensions around particular veteran groups’ inclusion were viewed pragmatically by some veterans. BP VW, said

> if you look back through the history of the RSAs ... you had a pecking order. The First World War guys didn’t want the Second World War guys there, and then later on they didn’t want the Merchant Navy. The Korean guys, that go there were given a hard time, payments, saying ‘you are not really members or returned soldiers’, then they gave the Malaya Borneo guys a hard time. Vietnam guys were no different. We called it the old pecking order ... the old fellas think only they had the real war

Overall, the RSA was well supported by veterans in this research, with some drawing more heavily on it than others for help with benefits, social company and welfare assistance. The RSA contributes to veterans’ well-being through connections to a
wider social network, which provides informational help and advice, practical assistance and emotional support through social contact and friendship.

**Partner or Intimate Support**

The last and very important form of social support talked about by these veterans, was the support they received from their wives. All of these men were married or had been previously. These men received informational, material and emotional support from their wives, and many veterans recognised the impact this had made in terms of strengthening their coping abilities, with the trauma of war. SFH WWI, said his wife was

> just the best. She made me. Mum told me if you hadn’t got Beet to marry you, you would have been a hobo because I was a hobo. I had learnt too many bad things too young ... that’s why I am here today, because I had a good person to live with ... she pulled me together ... I realised what a good woman meant.

Likewise, BLC WWII, talked about writing to his wife during the war, saying he

> established a sustained pattern that of correspondence which lifted me out of the drab khaki world for the duration, and allowed me to dare hope for the partnership that eventually followed ... [she] is still on the pedestal or plane she is. It’s just special, very very special, and still there.

These intimate relationships provided a sense that these men were loved, valued and cared about, and can be seen to “... considerably reduce the negative impact of combat, and greatly aid in the recovery and healing processes” Shehan, (1987, p, 55).
This marital support enabled some veterans to move forward from the trauma of wartime experiences, and one veteran talked about how his marriage was, “the starting point of my recovery really” BLC WWII. Feeling loved may have provided an anchor, which moderated the emotional aftermath of war trauma (Hunt & Robbins, 2001). It may be that wives or partners offered some sort of civilian substitute for the deep friendships, men made with close comrades in war. These women may have provided a sense of connectedness, which enables the individual to have greater coping skills through the knowledge, that they were not alone.

Many of these men talked about psychological struggles that they, and their wives had endured. One said, “she has put up with a huge amount just with my mood swings” NM VW. Another said, “[She] will tell you I was a proper bastard to live with… just couldn’t settle down and mentally and emotionally, it was hard on both of us” AP VW. The social support of these wives helped their husbands to cope with stresses in their everyday lives and provide hope, and some security for the future.

Some men may have talked to their wives about war experiences, and in doing so may have made sense of their memories in ways, which supported well-being. One veteran CC VW, said

And I suppose my greatest crutch, my greatest friend, certainly my best friend in the entire world is my wife. We have been married 36 years … and there is nothing I can’t tell her. There are some things I don’t tell her or haven’t told her about lots of parts of my life but there is nothing that I couldn’t or wouldn’t tell her. And if I need to talk to someone, I talk to her because she understands, she understands a lot of
things, she understands and I think our girls do much more than we give them credit for, or want to give them credit for, to share with them. I think we get too bound up in the business of headship and being in charge, and actually you have to march along with people. You can’t always pull people along with you, and so she is my friend, and I talk to her, and she does understand

Other veterans said they rarely talked about the war with their wives and families. Hunt and Robbins (2001) claim, that this silence around families can be “… an avoidant strategy, which ensures that if the family doesn’t know they can’t bring the subject up” (p. 180). As such, these veterans may have kept their home environment protected and free from any distress caused by wartime recollections (Hunt & Robbins, 2001). Wives also offered everyday practical support in household roles, which would have contributed to veterans’ health and well-being in quite gentle ways. FA WWI, talked about having “… wonderful wife, loved house life, loved cooking, nice house, and always there where went I went home”. At aged 94, JEB WWI, said “my wife won’t let me work in the garden for longer than two hours at a time”. Some wives helped veterans in practical ways such as milking cows or going to work to help with mortgage payments, which helped to mitigate stressful episodes, and aided coping processes over the veterans’ lifespan. Wives also helped veterans cope with ongoing effects of combat experiences both practically, and emotionally. One Vietnam veteran talked about how his wife helped him after war-related nightmares, saying “she wakes me up and calms me down and puts me in the shower,
changes the sheets, makes a cup of milo and puts honey in it, and puts me back to bed again. Without her I would be nothing” IJ VW.

Within the everyday business of family life, the veteran can be somewhat buffered against having to deal with stress alone, and coping with wartime trauma can be shared. Relationships with partners may offer the deep connectedness of camaraderie for some veterans allowing them to confide, and share their memories. Through the support offered in good marital relationships, veterans may well be able to relax their psychological defences, and work through unreconciled trauma in a place of warmth and security. Family life may also offer some veterans a refuge or sanctuary from memories of war. As such, the home may provide a place of distraction and avoidance of painful wartime memories.

Some veterans cope alone with these painful memories, but do so in a context where they can access other emotional and practical support, such as from comrades, and the RSA. These processes of social support offered both material help and camaraderie. Veterans who report good levels of social support suffer from fewer PTSD symptoms, and fewer physical complaints compared to those with lower levels of support (Barnett & Minzes, 1998; Pietrzak & Southwick, 2012; Tsai & Harpaz-Rotem,). The informational, material and emotional support of comrades, veterans’ organisations and partners provides interpersonal and organisational resources to aid with dealing with wartime trauma.
Chapter 7 – Conclusion

Experiences of war are highly complex with co-existing negative and positive outcomes. In this research, it was clear that alongside effects of war trauma there was personal growth and development that came with going to war. Even veterans with physical and psychological injuries often still found some benefit in their war service. These benefits became part of life after war, and were used as resources to strengthen and aid coping processes with both wartime trauma, and the demands of everyday life.

Three broad themes were identified from the data and each theme was discussed in the context of psychological theory and research, and data provided by oral histories. It was evident that there were certain factors, which strengthened or aided coping with war, and that these were both individual, and social processes.

The first theme focused largely on individual processes, and showed that the personal growth and development, which resulted from experiences of travel, physical fitness and health, and post-traumatic growth, which arose from dealing with severe stressors played a key part in veterans’ wellbeing. Wartime experiences stimulated the development of protective psychological resources, such as self-efficacy, self-awareness, tolerance and confidence. Dimensions of posttraumatic growth, such as an appreciation for life and changed priorities helped to mitigate distress, and to manage the changes, which going to war brought. Analysis of this theme identified ways in, which veterans’ personal growth and development can help to counterbalance the psychological and physical damage experienced by many
veterans, and showed that the benefits of military service can strengthen the ability to cope with demands of life after war.

The second theme highlighted the social processes and complexities of the social arrangements, obligations and expectations, and the impact of these on coping processes and psychological well-being. Life-long well-being requires that veterans must come back to a society that genuinely cares for them, and values their military service. The care and protection of positive social relations allowed the veteran to make sense of and recover from war. When social respect and care were not forthcoming, as was the case for Vietnam veterans, then processes for coping with war were detrimentally affected. These effects arose from veterans’ needs for financial, psychological and medical help, and from the importance of social acceptance for inter-personal relationships.

The third theme was the most complex. This theme showed the entwinement of individual and social resources in processes of coping with war. Individual psychological resources, such as efficacy and self-confidence were held in place by social support from partners, comrades, and veterans organisations. This theme highlighted that coping with war was a lifelong process, which began when veterans came home, and continued until old age. This theme discussed the different ways in, which veterans incorporated war into their life narratives. Discussion was also made of the difficulties of disclosing wartime trauma and the impact of this silence on psychological well-being. Relationships with others were central to how veterans made sense of going to war and how they dealt with war’s effects.
The data across all three themes indicated a diversity of coping strategies used by veterans, and the great importance of personal, interpersonal and societal resources. Personal resources included self-confidence, self-esteem, self-discipline, awareness, tolerance, perseverance and independence. These psychological resources, which were developed from the benefits of military service built emotional, intellectual and cultural maturity for many veterans. This maturity enabled veterans to adjust to new situations, understand others, achieve goals, solve problems and view demands more as challenges than threats. Viewing demands in this way encouraged constructive coping strategies, and more positive interpretations of negative life events.

Interpersonal resources were particularly important and social support gained from partners, comrades and organisations, such as the RSA, gave veterans access to informational (advice), emotional (empathy and caring), and practical (material) support.

Veterans received informational, material and social support from their wives and many recognised the impact this had made. Men who felt valued and cared about reported much greater recovery and healing. Being connected to loving and supportive relationships enabled veterans to have a greater capacity for coping, as these relationships buffered the veteran, and provided more resources to draw upon when meeting stressful demands.

Camaraderie was another important form of social support, which initially developed to provide collective safety and survival and as a way to cope with conditions of war. These men were bonded to each other through shared experience, loss, humour,
loyalty, life and death. For some veterans, the relationships with wartime mates endured, and proved to be highly supportive in many ways over a number of years after returning home.

Veterans’ organisations, such as the RSA also provided valuable social support through informational assistance and advocacy for veterans rights. Practical support was given to veterans in help with day to day living, and offering a physical space in, which veterans could connect with one another, and where war commemorations could take place. Commemorative acts are social practices, which build solidarity and belonging with other members of society. Through such social unity, veterans gained affirmation and public support, which were important resources to utilise in processes of coping with war.

Wider societal support through the development of sites of remembrance, provision of rehabilitation assistance, and workings of social institutions were vital for dealing with the effects of war. Sites of remembrance were important locations for the expression, and management of grief and loss from war. Rehabilitation assistance was shown to be necessary for veterans. In return for wartime sacrifices, there was trust that the government would behave appropriately, in other words it would act according to principles of reciprocity and distributive justice. Governmental help and assistance aided coping processes in terms of acknowledging and meeting the personal costs associated with the disruptions of war. The apology to the Vietnam veterans for the denial of their exposure to Agent Orange, and for the inadequate Crown, and NZDF support highlighted the importance of societal support, and showed that even decades later, it matters. Social institutions, such as work were
also necessary for effective processes of coping. Work helped veterans move through
the transitional or liminal period immediately following return from war. The
manifest and latent benefits of work enabled veterans to constructively cope with
adjustment from war and everyday living. Employment provided social contact and
networks, structure and meaning in life as well as income, personal status and
identity (Jahoda, 1988).

Veterans employed a variety of coping strategies to deal with the psychological
aftermath of war. Articulating war service as part of the life narrative was one way of
positively dealing with war. Narratives are created to instil a sense of order,
meaningfulness and coherent identity. One way in which veterans incorporated
coherence, and meaning into constructions of identity following war was by holding
a soldier identity visible. This visibility was most commonly achieved through
veterans joining the Territorial or Reserve Forces. Joining the Territorial Force
preserved the emotional attachment invested in being a soldier, and sustained
connections to social networks and supports structured around army life.

Expression of the ethical and moral dimensions underpinning war service helped
hold feelings of value in place, by attaching beneficial meanings to military service,
whereby distress and suffering were mitigated. Other veterans normalised war
experiences as part of life, and thus war was smoothly integrated into their life
stories, and required minimal coping endeavours. A few veterans found talking about
the war to be an effective coping mechanism, which enabled reappraisals and sense-
making of war trauma, whereby painful memories could be reconciled cognitively
and emotionally.
However, the most common coping strategy reported by veterans in this research was to suppress memories or discussions of their war experiences, in order to deal with negative emotional and psychological consequences of war. Such repressive coping defends against anxiety, and other adverse emotions through deliberate avoidance of thinking or talking about war. Emotional equilibrium is maintained through focusing on happy memories and positive aspects of military service, and by eschewing distressing triggers. Accordingly, veterans stayed silent about their wartime experiences to facilitate their own healing and recovery.

Employing a repressive coping style is usually considered problematic and maladaptive as individuals usually avoid threatening memories by engaging emotion-focused and avoidant coping activities. One such common activity is substance abuse. Attempts to self-medicate distress and anxiety primarily through alcohol abuse were, not surprisingly, found to have detrimental effects on veterans and their families. These avoidant activities mean that veterans failed to use problem-solving techniques essential for processing trauma, and incorporating these experiences into understandings of self, necessary for recovery, and healing.

However, utilising a repressive coping style is highly complex, and as well as being maladaptive, repressing distress and focusing on positive aspects of wartime experiences can be adaptive for psychological well-being. Veterans who employed this style were able to regulate their emotional expression, control anxiety and moderate reactions to grief. Repressors have been found to be able to successfully cope with subsequent stressful demands and further experiences of trauma (Pauls, 2007).
All of these different coping strategies which featured practices of repression, normalising war, attaching ethical and moral values to military service and incorporating war experiences into the life story were shown to have value for different respondents, and indicate that there is no one right way of dealing with the lifetime effects of war.

**Strengths and Limitations**

There were a number of strengths and limitations in this research. The oral histories were collected for other purposes, and the research question for this thesis was not the original focus for these interviews. Purpose-designed research would have meant that specific research questions could have been explored in-depth, and in an evolving and responsive way at the time of the interview, but this was not practicable, especially as regards veterans of the First and Second World Wars. As a result, some histories contained less relevant information than others.

Even so, the benefits of using existing interviews were found to outweigh any limitations posed. Using existing interviews meant that men who have died since data collection occurred could be given ‘voice’ and included in this research, especially the First World War veterans. It was also possible to avoid unnecessarily repetitive and potentially invasive interviews. The existing interviews provided a good body of data from which to choose from, and care was taken to ensure there was little qualitative difference between interviews, which had restricted and non-restricted public use. Perhaps the greatest strength of using this data was that these
interviews which had been collected for posterity were used for the purpose for which they had been collected.

There was little evidence of social stigma or any social desirability bias in the oral history interviews. Instead, these interviews appeared to be remarkably honest and open, and in many cases were admissions of painful and disturbing recollections of war. This honesty is almost certainly a reflection of the veterans’ ages, and disconnection from military organisations. These men had no need to engage in self-serving talk or protection of their careers, and many had waited years for someone to listen to their stories. The changes in social contexts across time, and the growing recognition of outcomes, such as PTSD have created environments where talking about an inability to cope has become more normalised and acceptable. The different experiences on homecoming of the Vietnam veterans as compared to the other veteran groups, highlighted the importance of social acceptance; and without this contrast, this theme would have been much less apparent.

The men who participated in the oral histories were a self-selected sample. As such, those most severely physically and psychologically affected may have been unwilling or, through early mortality, unable to take part. However, the aim of this study was to look at which factors strengthened and aided coping with war, so this group who did survive and were well enough to participate in the oral history interviews were those of the greatest interest. It is regrettable that interviews from veterans of the Korean War, the Malayan Emergency, and the Confrontation in Borneo as well as from men who served in the Pacific during the Second World War could not be accessed. As such, there are limitations in the extent to which it was possible to gain
a greater picture of coping for New Zealand men who went to war in the 20th Century.

Directions for Future Research

Several directions for future research have been highlighted by discussion of the strengths and limitations of this study. First, it would be useful to conduct longitudinal research to observe how coping strategies fluctuate across the lifespan, and the impact of changing and emerging health conditions, and changes to social support networks through major life events, such as divorce or death of a spouse and loss of wartime comrades. Longitudinal research would offer the advantage of being able to explore coping strategies and life circumstances at discrete points in time, and to look at current relationships rather than relying on retrospective data.

It would also be worthwhile to include those who have served in the Navy and Air Force, and those who have been Special Forces soldiers and Prisoners of War, in order to gain a wider sense and scope of war experiences and coping processes. It would also be useful to include those who have participated in wartime roles other than warfighting, such as nurses and support personnel. Identifying similarities and differences in coping from members of these other services, and from those who undertook various roles can help determine, which processes might be universal for more successful coping with war, and which might be specific to each group.

New Zealand has the highest female representation in the Regular Forces as compared to Australia, the U.K, the U.S and Canada. In 2013, women represented 15% of all Regular Force personnel. Women have been posted to ships since 1986;
have participated in all Air Force roles since 1988; and seen service in infantry, armour and artillery units since the early 2000’s (Ministry of Defence, 2014). Given the presence of women in the New Zealand Defence Force and deployments in peacekeeping, peace-making, and humanitarian operations, any future research should reflect the participation of both genders.

**Implications**

Given current defence policy and direction, it would seem highly improbable that New Zealand will have future involvement in wars or conflicts, which demand widespread mobilisation of the country’s men and women into citizen armies. The most likely scenario is that New Zealand will continue to participate in peacekeeping or peace support operations under the mandate of the United Nations, with the exception of Special Forces soldiers. Although peacekeepers are likely to face less risk of social neglect and stigma than was experienced by some veterans in the past, this remains an important issue, especially if there is public controversy about the places or nature of warfare New Zealand forces engage in.

Looking at military service and combat across time within different historical contexts can show the similarities of experiences, the common effects and benefits of wartime service, and to some extent the universality of trauma. Travel and new experiences, physical fitness and health as well as posttraumatic growth played an important part in veterans’ well-being. These factors are still part of the experience of New Zealand military personnel, so the ability to recognise the positive aspects of their work will continue to be important. Viewing wartime trauma as a universal and
demanding challenge means that coping processes can be seen less as contingent on individual traits or strategies, and more as being reliant on wider inter-personal relationships and social circumstances. As a result, any psychological or emotional breakdown from war can be normalised and socially accepted.

War is a societal issue and so is its aftermath, going beyond families and communities to society as a whole. Coping with war is an ongoing and fluid process, which is expressed across each veteran’s lifespan, and strengthening coping with war is a complex issue in, which societal, political, economic, interpersonal and individual factors come into play. Social acceptance, meaningful work, good health care and supportive relationships are as important as veterans’ abilities to adopt appropriate coping strategies. These findings are as important for New Zealand’s future veterans as they return from current and future peacekeeping roles, as they are for veterans of previous wars and conflicts. To conclude with the words, which opened the chapter of New Zealand at war, this thesis has shown that

*The experience of war is neither the prerogative nor the exclusive fate of fighting soldiers. It engulfs entire peoples. Its nature too, is not specifically or wholly military. Warfare alters, sometimes transforms societies and leaves no one who has been exposed to its turmoil unchanged. But it is the soldier for whom the experience of war is most vivid.* (Keegan & Holmes, 1985, p. 259)
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Appendices
Appendix A: Crown Apology to Vietnam Veterans

28 May, 2008

Ministerial Statement to Parliament - Crown apology to Viet Nam veterans

The Crown formally acknowledges the dedicated service of the New Zealand Regular Force personnel deployed during the Viet Nam War, and those many servicemen and women who supported them in their mission.

Further the Crown records that those armed forces personnel loyally served at the direction of the New Zealand Government of the day, having left their home shores against a background of unprecedented division and controversy over whether or not New Zealand should participate in the war.

The Crown extends to New Zealand Viet Nam Veterans and their families an apology for the manner in which their loyal service in the name of New Zealand was not recognised as it should have been, when it should have been, and for inadequate support extended to them and their families after their return home from the conflict.

The Viet Nam War was a defining event in New Zealand’s recent history, and one during which significant divisions and tensions emerged within our own society. Old allegiances and alliances were tested, and New Zealanders began to question the role their country was playing in global affairs.

On all sides, strong views were held with conviction. My own party, the New Zealand Labour Party opposed New Zealand involvement in the war, and acted immediately to withdraw the troops on election to office in 1972.

Many others also spoke out, often coming under attack from the government and other establishment voices of the time for doing so.

Viet Nam itself suffered huge damage from the war – to its people, its cities and ports, and its countryside. The consequences there have been long term and intergenerational. Today we count Viet Nam as an Asia Pacific partner, and welcome its leaders to our shores.

Today’s focus, however, is on those who served, regardless of what our personal views on the decision to send them were. It is time for reconciliation.

The Crown is placing on record its respect for the service of the nearly 3,400 New Zealanders who served in Viet Nam during the war between June 1964 and December 1972. We honour the 37 personnel who died on active duty, the 187 who were wounded, some very seriously, and all those who have suffered long-term
effects. The service of those who fell and all who served in that conflict should now be honoured, alongside that of other brave service personnel deployed to other conflicts in the service of our country.

For too long, successive governments ignored concerns being raised by Viet Nam veterans. It was the emergence of Agent Orange as a serious health and veterans’ issue in the United States which began to change the way in which issues surrounding Viet Nam veterans came to be perceived and then treated in New Zealand.

In 2003 the Health Select Committee undertook its own inquiry into the concerns raised by veterans. It investigated whether New Zealand defence personnel had been exposed to Agent Orange. It also assessed the health risks to defence personnel and their families, and the health services available to them. The Committee concluded that New Zealand personnel who had served in Viet Nam had indeed been exposed to Agent Orange, and that this exposure had had adverse health effects not only for the personnel themselves, but also for their children.

A Joint Working Group on the Concerns of Viet Nam veterans was established in July 2005, under the chairmanship of the former State Services Commissioner, Michael Wintringham. The Royal New Zealand Returned and Services Association, and the Ex-Viet Nam Services Association participated in the group.

In their report of April 2006, the Joint Working Group proposed that the Crown apologise formally to veterans and their families for the history of pain and suffering experienced by many of them. That recommendation was accepted as part of a wider package of measures proposed under the themes of "Acknowledging the Past", "Putting Things Right", and "Improving Services to Viet Nam Veterans". A range of steps under each of these headings was agreed.

Today the Crown has offered a formal apology to the New Zealand Veterans of the Viet Nam war and their families. The Crown places on record recognition of the service of those personnel; and acknowledges the many consequences of that service, including the physical and mental health effects. The failure of successive governments and their agencies to acknowledge the exposure of veterans to dioxin contaminated herbicides and other chemicals is itself acknowledged, as is the way in which that failure exacerbated the suffering of veterans and families.

The recommendation of the Joint Working Group report that the earlier Reeves and McLeod reports, should no longer form the basis for policies towards Viet Nam veterans and their families is accepted by the Crown.

Finally, there is the commitment to put things right, where government action is the appropriate means of achieving that resolution. The commitments the Crown has made to the treatment of Viet Nam veterans who were affected by toxic environments in Viet Nam and to their families are set out in the Memorandum of Understanding of 6 December 2006, and the Crown will adhere to them.
In concluding, the Crown thanks the members of the Joint Working Group who provided a way forward for dealing with these troubling issues of New Zealand’s relatively recent past. This has led to the opportunity for the Crown to put on record its thanks for, and its apology to, those brave service personnel who became the veterans of the Viet Nam war, and to pay tribute to those who never came home. We will remember them.

Helen Clark
Prime Minister

http://beehive.govt.nz. The official website of the New Zealand Government
Appendix B: New Zealand Defence Force Apology to Vietnam Veterans

Address by Lieutenant General J. Mateparae, ONZM
Chief of Defence Force
Tribute08.

1 June 2008

Governor-General, Vietnam veterans and your families – including Vietnam veterans of Australia and the United States, veterans of other conflicts and invited guests [Australian Minister of Veterans Affairs, US Ambassador, Australian High Commissioner], welcome to this commemoration and celebration paying Tribute to our Vietnam veterans and their families.

Our defence involvement in the Vietnam War spanned eight years. This was the longest commitment of our combat forces to a single conflict in New Zealand’s military history. Our involvement in the War has had an impact on our nation, those who served there, and their families, that continues to this day.

The controversy connected with the Vietnam war was corrosive; it was damning; and for many of the men and women of the New Zealand Defence Force who served there it became noxious.

Nearly 4000 New Zealanders served in Vietnam; 37 of them made the ultimate sacrifice, and nearly 200 personnel were wounded.

Since the War, others who served have died prematurely, and many Vietnam veterans and their families continue to suffer the after-effects of that service. And that is why we are here this weekend. Tribute 08 is an official and visible show of recognition for the considerable contribution and sacrifice of the men and women of New Zealand Defence Force who served in Vietnam.

But today it is the turn of the New Zealand Defence Force to acknowledge your service. I say that you served loyally, you served with honour, and I pledge my determination to correct the failings of the past.

Today, the Defence Force emphasizes the principle that ‘we’, those currently serving in our armed forces and veterans alike, are a family bound together by the ethic of service to our country, a common set of values, and a professional military culture that reflects our national heritage and character – a heritage and character you helped create.

It is clear that many Vietnam veterans believe that the NZDF has not lived up to these ideals. I want to start to make amends by personally welcoming all of our Vietnam veterans back into the New Zealand Defence Force family.
I would understand any hesitation on your part to accept such an embrace. There can be little doubt that you were let down after you returned from the war, and across subsequent decades.

Unreservedly I say that the Defence Force did not do enough to assist you, our returning veterans – especially those of you who left the Army, Navy or Air Force soon after returning to New Zealand. Having been placed in harms way, you arrived back to unwarranted derision. From the security of comradeship and service, you went out into an ungrateful and unwelcoming world. Most people cannot start to imagine how you must have felt.

The New Zealand Defence Force could, and should have done more to stand by you, to provide you and your families with refuge from the storm of negative public opinion you had to weather. NZDF should not have allowed public concerns about the war to shape how returning veterans were treated.

I have also heard you when you have talked about the other issues that have caused you and your loved ones deep hurt and pain.

I acknowledge here your concern about the maintenance of your personal and medical records. I believe your expectations around the integrity and completeness of your files were both fair and reasonable. NZDF let you down. Fortunately, your entitlements are protected under the ‘reverse onus of proof’ provisions of the War Pensions Act.

The issue of your exposure to the defoliant Agent Orange has been a long and open wound. It is difficult to understand how the critical information about chemical spraying in the areas where you operated lay dormant until the Health Select Committee Inquiry in 2003.

As a Defence Force we were too slow in readjusting our position in the face of growing scientific evidence, as well as statistical and anecdotal information.

It was probably inescapable that veterans would interpret this inertia as a deliberate rebuff – though certainly the Defence Force’s simple inability to grapple with such a complex issue deserves a good portion of the blame.

I believe that various provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding, and in particular the Expert Medical Panel which is about to be established, will help us address this more effectively, both for Vietnam veterans, and for veterans of future deployments as well.

I also want to note the hurt you have told me about the NZDF attitude that was evident around Parade ’98. From my point of view this was certainly a lost opportunity to rebuild the bonds between the Defence Force and veterans.

Here at Tribute08 I am sure you have noticed that the serving veterans gathered among us today are in uniform. You will note that they wear the uniform with pride, just as you did.
This is a pride founded on your earlier service and the service of all veterans past and present. Unlike the decades immediately following the Vietnam War, the NZDF of today has reclaimed its rightful place, standing proudly amongst the New Zealanders we serve, publicly wearing our uniforms wherever we go.

Vietnam veterans have made a valuable contribution to the nation building of New Zealand in many ways. In particular you can be proud of the legacy you provided for the generations of Service men and women who followed you. Your knowledge and fighting skills helped forge the next generation, and lifted considerably the abilities of the New Zealand Defence Force.

What has been missing from the balance is acknowledgement that what you left behind has ensured that the New Zealand Defence Force is a valued partner around the world, helping to build and keep the peace.

Today we have nearly 700 personnel actively serving in three major theatres around the globe. We are in countries such as Timor Leste, the Sinai, Afghanistan and the Solomon Islands. The contribution of our Defence Force people is helping maintain stable working and living conditions for thousands of people.

You helped build the foundation of today's New Zealand Defence Force capability. We thank you for that.

On a more personal note, I was a young soldier in the Army during the years immediately following the end of the Vietnam War. My first platoon commander was a Vietnam veteran: then WO2 Baldy Merito. In fact, every commander I have had up until my appointment as the CDF has been a Vietnam veteran. So from a personal perspective I have every respect for our Vietnam veterans.

Many veterans I have spoken to consider that they were inadequately equipped for the task they were given in Vietnam. Your record shows you were at least as good as the best troops New Zealand has ever deployed. You also made good advantage of New Zealand's earlier experience in the jungles of Malaya and Borneo.

But while our military doctrine and training were proper, some of our kit was not. In spite of this, and in keeping with tradition and with true Kiwi ingenuity, you exploited the military supermarkets of our Allies in-country!

At home, the protest and public debate that arose as a result of the unprecedented scale of media coverage of the war and a general belief that our involvement in the Vietnam War was wrong, helped fuel the anti-war sentiment and mass street protests.

There were no home-coming parades; you were told not to wear your uniform in public; and compared to other returning veterans there was inadequate support for rehabilitation.

In sharp contrast to other veterans of earlier conflicts, our returning Vietnam veterans in effect became casualties in our own country.
Perhaps most painfully of all, some sections of the New Zealand public made it clear that they did not approve of those who had served in Vietnam. But the decision to be involved in the war in Vietnam was not made by those who fought there, but by the Government of the day.

You had volunteered to serve in the New Zealand Armed Forces and you went to do your duty to the best of your abilities when and where required. You served alongside Australian troops in the best of ANZAC traditions in an even more integrated way than other ANZACs before you. This has forged a very special ANZAC bond between New Zealand and Australian Vietnam veterans. You also developed a similar rapport with those whom you served from the United States.

The Memorandum of Understanding signed with Vietnam veterans in 2006 goes some way towards addressing the wrongs of the past and provides a solid foundation for putting things right.

The Crown’s public statement in Parliament apologising for the harm done to Vietnam veterans and thanking you for your immense contribution to New Zealand is another tangible piece of the reconciliation process.

The Memorandum of Understanding package, although I acknowledge too late for some, will serve the current and following generations of the Vietnam veteran community. It will also serve other New Zealand veterans both current and future.

I would like to make special mention of the tenacious few Vietnam veterans who at various stages over decades have kept the issues alive. You must be applauded for your determination and perseverance against the odds to get the wrongs of the past put right. Your efforts culminated in a Parliamentary Select Committee which confirmed what you had been saying for so long – that New Zealand personnel were exposed to a toxic environment in Vietnam.

The NZDF will ensure that no other group of New Zealand veterans is treated the way you were. And one important way we can honour you, is to act upon the lessons you have helped us learn.

In conclusion, on behalf of the New Zealand Defence Force, I would simply ask for your forgiveness for our shortcomings in the past, and I apologise for the impact these shortcomings have had on you and on your families.

Thank you for your service.
Thank you for your sacrifices.
Thank you for your contribution to New Zealand.

I know it is long overdue, but to our New Zealand Vietnam veterans - welcome home, nau mai haere mai pike mai kake mai.
As another tangible demonstration of our intentions to put things right, the NZDF wishes to mount a special ceremony. A ceremony that we believe is unique in the history of not only the NZDF but of the Armed Forces of the Commonwealth.

The Regimental Colour of 1 RNZIR will be rededicated and re-presented.

This ceremony is necessary because the dates of the original Theatre Honour for South Vietnam did not include the operational service of all rifle companies that served in Vietnam.

Until now all of the tour by Victor 1, part of the tours of Victor 2 and Victor 5, and all of the tour of Victor 6 have not been acknowledged in the Theatre Honour.

Earlier this year, Her Majesty The Queen gave Royal Assent for the Theatre Honour to be amended to cover the period from May 1967 to December 1971 so as to include all of the service of these companies.

The embroidery on the Regimental Colour has since been amended accordingly and this change will now be publicly acknowledged.

Appendix C: Interview Questions

Questions for World War One veterans

Veterans were asked questions on their personal background, life in the army, in battle and under attack, and out of battle as well as details about what happened after war. Examples of these questions are as below.

- What was it like coming back to New Zealand?
- When you look back, do you feel that people in New Zealand understood what the soldiers had been through?
- What sort of work did you do on your return?
- How hard was the Depression for you?
- When you returned did you join the RSA?
- What sort of welfare did the RSA do in those years?
- Did you attend Anzac Day parades?
- Do you ever have nightmares about the war?
- What effect did Passchendaele have on morale?
- What happened after your return to New Zealand?
- Do you think the war changed your outlook on life?
- When World War Two broke out, what was your attitude?
- What does Anzac Day mean to you?
- Looking back on World War One from seventy years on, what do you think New Zealand school children should know about it?
- What was it like settling down in New Zealand?
- What was your reaction when you heard the outbreak of war?
- How did you feel when you first went into action?
- Do you feel that the government did enough to rehabilitate men after the war?
- What do you think of on Anzac Day? Do you think of fallen comrades?
• What about reunions. How important were those reunions?
• Was venereal disease a problem?
• Where were you when the Armistice was called?
• Were you aware there were five New Zealand soldiers executed?
• Do you think there was enough done to help men like you who came back suffering the effects of the war?
• Do you think the people of New Zealand had any idea what it was like for the soldiers in France?
• Looking back at the war now, how would you sum up your attitude to it?
• Did you have any physical or emotional repercussions from the war?
Questions for Second World War veterans

Veterans were asked questions on their personal background, life in the army, in battle and under attack, and out of battle as well as details about what happened after war. The questions that follow were asked as to life after the war:

- When did you go back to work? Describe how it felt to be back at work?
- Did you feel as though you had anything in common with people who had not been fighting?
- How was your health?
- Did you ever experience nightmares? If so, how long did they continue after the war? Do you ever have them now?
- Did you drink much alcohol after the war?
- Do you have a war pension? If so, on what grounds?
- Did you join the RSA on your return (Reasons?)
- What level of involvement did you have?
- Did you join any other veterans’ groups?
- What was your attitude towards conscientious objectors?
- What did taking part in (particular campaigns’) mean to you at the time?
- What does it mean to you now?
- Why do you think it is so well remembered by those who fought there?
- What did you do on Anzac Day? Has that changed over the years?
- What does Anzac Day mean to you?
- What are your feelings about war in general?
- What is the impact of your war experiences on your life?
Questions for Vietnam War Veterans

Veterans were asked about their background, schooling, military service, rank, decorations, service in Vietnam, impressions of New Zealand and other forces, best moment, worst moment. The questions about the Vietnam War and life afterwards as below.

- When did you leave Vietnam?
- How did you leave Vietnam?
- When did you return to NZ following your service in Vietnam?
- Describe your homecoming to NZ
- Did you have military service after Vietnam? If so, please give details and where possible include dates and corps
- Are you a member of any veteran’s organisations (for example RSA, EVSA, Australians associations, corps-related association)?
- Have you returned to any of the places where you have served?
- Did you attend Parade 98?
- What was your reaction to Parade 98?
- Did you participate in the Welcome Home March in Sydney in 1987?
- Did you participate in the dedication of the Australian Vietnam Forces National Memorial in Canberra in 1992?
- Did you attend Tribute 08?
- What was your reaction to Tribute 08?
- Please comment on the attitude of New Zealanders to your service in Vietnam both during and after the war
- How do you feel now about your involvement in Vietnam?
- What have been the effects of the Vietnam War on your life?
Appendix D: Oral History Projects

The oral history projects of the Second World War are detailed as follows.

Second World War Oral History Project

This project was undertaken as part of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage’s current ‘From Memory – war oral history project. The ‘From Memory’ project has been collecting oral histories from veterans involved in the 20th Century conflicts that New Zealand took part in. These conflicts are the Second World War, Korea, Malaya and Borneo. Vietnam War veterans are included in a separate project also currently undertaken by the Ministry. This project is called the Vietnam War Oral History Project. As the histories are collected they are deposited at Alexander Turnbull’s Oral History Centre.

The Second World War component of the ‘From Memory’ project has been completed and was overseen by New Zealand historian Megan Hutching, who with others conducted interviews with Second World War veterans which are all recorded on cassette tape. Typical questions asked of these veterans are attached in Appendix C. All of these interviews have been deposited at Turnbull’s Oral History Centre and copyright is held by the Ministry of Culture and Heritage.

From Memory

There are five sub oral histories undertaken that make up this project:

North Africa

There are 15 interviews recorded from May 2003-March 2004. There is unrestricted public access to all 15 North Africa campaign interviews with public use of interviews requiring permission of copyright holder and public use of 1 interview requires permission of the interviewee. Publication arising from this oral history project is ‘The Desert Road: New Zealanders remember the North African campaign’, edited by Megan Hutching with Ian McGibbon and published in 2005.
**Greece/Crete**

There are 17 interviews about the Greece/Crete campaign recorded from November 2000 to March 2001. Of these interviews 16 are New Zealand Army Veterans and one interview is with a woman. There is unrestricted public access to these histories but public use of the interviews requires permission of the copyright holder. Publication arising from this project is ‘A unique sort of battle: New Zealanders remember Crete’, edited by Megan Hutching with Ian McGibbon, Jock Phillips and David Filer and published in 2001.

**Prisoners of War**

Recorded from January to April 2000 there are 15 interviews with former Prisoners of War. There was unrestricted public access to POW histories but public use of all interviews requires permission of the copyright holder and four of the interviews also require permission of the interviewee. Publication arising from this project is ‘Inside stories: New Zealand Prisoners of War remember’ edited by Megan Hutching with Ian McGibbon and published in 2002.

**Italy**

There were seven interviews recorded from April to August 2003. There is unrestricted public access to interviews and public use requires permission of copyright holder. Publication arising from this project is ‘A fair sort of battering: New Zealanders remember the Italian campaign’, edited by Megan Hutching with Roberto Rabel and published in 2005.

**Pacific**

There are 14 interviews recorded with veterans of the Pacific campaign. Publication arising from this project is ‘Against the Rising Sun: New Zealanders remember the Pacific War’ edited by Megan Hutching with Ian McGibbon and Alison Parr and published in 2006. However there is no public access to the Pacific interviews as there are no listening copies available. Due to renovations currently undergoing at Turnbull Library, the library is temporarily rehoused in the National Archives Building.
As such certain interviews are in ‘lockdown’ and unavailable to any researchers until after the data collection period for this research.

After the war

This oral history project was undertaken by oral historian Alison Parr which looked at the psychological damage resulting from experiences of combat following the Second World War. There are 12 interviews with veterans and six interviews with female relatives of the male interviewees. Public access to and any subsequent public use of these interviews requires the written permission of Alison Parr. ‘Silent casualties’ was written and published by Alison Parr in 2004 as a result of this project.

C-Company oral history project

These tapes were an oral history project undertaken by Māori historian Dr Monty Soutar. Through the 1990’s, Dr Soutar led a team of researchers who interviewed over 100 Māori veterans and their widows about experiences of Second World War and connections with C Company of the 28th (Māori) Battalion. These interviews have not been catalogued into the Oral History Collection to date and as such are in “lockdown” and are unavailable to any researcher. It is not known when these interviews will have public access. Dr Soutar has produced a book as a result of these interviews – ‘Nga Tama Toa: The price of Citizenship C Company 28 (Māori) Battalion 1939- 1945’.

Kiwi Soldier Oral History Project

This project is part of the wider Massey University History Department Students Oral History Projects. The sub-project Kiwi Soldier Oral history Project consists of six interviews with one Air Force veteran, four army veterans and one female nurse of Second World War completed in 1989. There is unrestricted access to all interviews but public use of five of the interviews may require written permission of the interviewees. Copyright to be confirmed.
New Zealand Defence Force Military oral history project

This oral history project comprises of 26 interviews with Second World War veterans from the Royal New Zealand Air Force, Royal New Zealand Navy, New Zealand and some civilians undertaken by journalist and historian Paul Diamond. This project is mainly focused on operations and experiences during war time. Access to the interviews is mostly unrestricted but public use requires the written permission of individual interviewees and could require permission of the copyright holder. Copyright is held by New Zealand Defence Force.

New Zealand Sapper Contribution to World War II project.

This project consists of 11 interviews undertaken by Liz Catherall from May to July of 2003. These 11 interviews are with of New Zealand Army Engineers or Sappers of the Second World War. This project focuses on operations in North Africa and Italy and the role of engineers in laying and lifting minefields, building bridges and the maintenance of roads. There are no listening copies available for these oral histories although transcripts of the interviews are available for six of the participants. There may be restrictions on access to individual interviews and public use requires permission of the donor. Copyright is held by Liz Catherall.

Pacific War Stories oral history project

These eight interviews are with New Zealand Second World War veterans from the Pacific campaign undertaken by documentary producer and director Anna Cottrell. Access to the collection is unrestricted but public use requires written permission of the copyright holder. Copyright is held by Anna Cottrell. Interviews were conducted from December 1996 to November 2000. This oral history project was recorded on both cassette tape and videotape. Four of the eight interviews have videotape copies available.
**20th Battalion Oral History Project**

This project consists of three interviews completed by Peter Kingston in 1992. These interviews are with Brigadier General Denver Fountaine (commanding officer of several infantry battalions during the Second World War), Captain Charles Upham (twice awarded the Victoria Cross in the Second World War and cited as the most decorated soldier of the Commonwealth) and Sergeant Jack Hinton (Victoria Cross awarded in Second World War). Public access to all of these interviews requires written permission of the curator of the oral history centre and public use requires written permission of the copyright holder, the Alexander Turnbull Library.

**21st Infantry Battalion Association oral history project**

This project is focused on the memories of mateship and camaraderie formed during the Second World War with members of Auckland’s 21st Battalion recorded on cassette tapes from December 2006 to June 2007. The six interviews that comprise this oral history project also feature discussion of military training, the campaigns in Greece, Crete, North Africa and Italy, the death of comrades and battalion activities and reunions. Access to the collection is unrestricted but public use of the interviews requires written permission of the individual interviewees and may require permission of copyright holder. Copyright is held by Auckland institute and Museum.

**28th Māori Battalion website**

This website is a current project of the Ministry of Culture and Heritage and is “a place to record, remember, honour and maintain information and knowledge of the Māori Battalion and its outstanding contribution to Aotearoa” (Manatu Taonga Ministry of Culture and Heritage, 2011). As a current project the histories collected will be deposited as completed and added to the website as time progresses. To date Alexander Turnbull Library holds only five full interviews with Māori soldiers of the Second World War. Four interviews have unrestricted public access but public use of one of these interviews requires permission of the interviewee. At this point no researcher has been able to obtain permission for public use of this interview which
includes details of conditions of a German concentration camp. The oral historian curator at Turnbull indicates that this refusal is likely to remain the status quo. The fifth interview is with Sir Charles Bennett, Commanding Officer of the Māori Battalion and access to this interview requires written permission of the copyright holder which is the Ministry of Trade and Foreign Affairs.