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Abstract

The New Zealand royal honours system, as a colonial reproduction of an elite British system with a white male norm, has been largely overlooked in all fields of scholarship. Yet, as a state expression of what is valued in society, honours provide a window into shifts in society. This study of dames and knights is undertaken in the context of the changes in the lives of New Zealand women in the twentieth century. Situated in a changing and shifting environment, the honours system has itself changed, influenced by the ebb and flow of the feminist movement, the decline of imperial and aristocratic forces, and New Zealand's evolving independence and identity. At the same time, the system has been in some respects static, slow to respond to charges of being an imperial anachronism, and, despite some change in what areas of service titles were granted for, remaining a gendered space focused on the traditionally male-dominated fields of politics, law and commerce. Studied from a feminist perspective, honours also reveal much about gender identities and roles in twentieth-century New Zealand, both the feminine and, because of the historically constructed dualism, the masculine. Both the patterns evident in the honouring of women at the highest level and the representations of those women found in popular culture display a constant disjunction between discourses of exceptionalism and of conformity to traditional images of the feminine. Women's personal experiences of being honoured with a title for their achievements add a further dimension of complexity to understandings of the significant changes and underlying continuities in the honours system as a gendered space.
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Introduction

Knights and dames, the titled men and women ‘trailing clouds of aristocratic glory’ of one writer’s imagination, are no longer created in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{1} In New Zealand, titular honours, those bestowing a title from the monarch on the recipient, ceased in 2000 to be a constituent element of the royal honours system. That system, as in the United Kingdom (UK), has encompassed a range of levels, from hereditary peerages and non-hereditary titles to non-titular awards and decorations for gallantry. The many varieties of honour, some now obsolete and some still in use, and the rituals and regulations surrounding these honours, were woven together to form a complex and shifting honours system, as different strands were discarded or created over time. In turn, the honours system itself has historically formed part of an elaborate web of social precedence. In New Zealand, like its parent system in the UK, the honours system has been the target of some criticism and controversy. There have been accusations of racial and gender inequality, of political patronage and party connections determining appointments, of class bias, and even of a bias in favour of the North Island over the South.\textsuperscript{2} Yet, according to a 1995 investigation into the system that culminated in recommendations for considerable change, including the removal of titles, there remained ‘overwhelming support’ for the existence of an honours system as a means of recognising those who have served the world, New Zealand, and their communities.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{2} The suggestion that a larger number of honours went to the North Island than to the South was made in a 1959 article examining the honours system. Investigator, ‘Whom the Queen delighteth to honour: Awards for services in New Zealand’, The Weekly News, 11 November 1959, p. 3. For a further example of such criticisms, including that titles were given to ‘famous men’ for ‘services to the conservative ethic’, and not to Maori or women, see John Robson, ed., Craccum, vol. 50, No. 14, June 21, 1976, p. 5, quoted in C. H. Townsend, ‘Political Patronage in New Zealand: An Exploratory Study’ (MA, University of Canterbury, 1977), p. 55.
\textsuperscript{3} Prime Minister’s Honours Advisory Committee, The New Zealand Royal Honours System/Te Punaha Tuku Honore A Te Kuini Mo Aotearoa (Wellington, 1995), p. 4.
Knighthood and honours: an introduction

This thesis considers the creation of dames in New Zealand, examining the changes and continuities in women’s position in relation to honours at this high level, and exploring the connections between honours and gender identities and roles in twentieth-century New Zealand. Through a consideration of the types of service for which honours were awarded, patterns in the experiences of dames and the ways in which dames were represented in the popular media, I argue that the honours system in New Zealand between 1917 and 2000 was a gendered space. However, because ‘Dame’ is the title given to a woman when she is granted an award that would cause a man to become a knight, it is necessary to outline the place of knighthood within the royal honours system before examining these issues in more depth. The creation of knights and dames in New Zealand, as a way to honour those who achieved highly, advanced their nation or served humanity, had its roots, through the British honours system, in medieval systems of knighthood. As in the UK, the sovereign is theoretically the ‘fount of all honour’, a principle that developed through the gradual shift, particularly under Henry VIII, to reserving the creation of a knight to the sovereign’s prerogative, and knighthood almost always being ‘personally’ bestowed by the sovereign.4 Throughout New Zealand’s association with royal honours, the sovereign has been the source of all honours, and this remains the case despite New Zealand having replaced the British honours system with its own. It is still a royal honours system.5 Similarly, the ritual of ‘dubbing’ a knight, and the traditional use of ‘the accolade’ (a touch on the shoulder with a sword) to create a knight, can be traced to medieval rituals.6 The medieval system of knighthood was a

5 Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, pp. 4, 30.
masculine one, linked to war and dominated by men. The Old English *cnicht*, variously said to mean ‘boy’, ‘attendant’ or ‘military follower’, is believed to be the source of the title of knight in England. The title also has links with the Roman knight, *eques*, a term that referred to a mounted man; corresponding European terms, such as the French *chevalier* or the Spanish *caballero*, also indicated that the holder of the title was a military horseman.

The title of knight is the oldest title of honour in England, older than titles in the peerage, with the modern honour of Knight Bachelor having arisen out of these medieval antecedents. Knights were also created within the orders of chivalry which then developed, and which continued into the honours system of the twentieth century. However, the medieval concept of knighthood was more than simply a mounted soldier. It became imbued with chivalric notions as the Christian Church adopted and altered pagan customs. Knights were to have the attributes of ‘courtesy, gentleness towards the weak, piety and charity towards all’. Exclusivity was an important aspect of knighthood as well, just as a guild was exclusive, and this element was the crucial difference between the existence of mounted soldiers and the existence of a concept of knighthood.

During their long existence, honours in the UK, particularly knighthood, changed significantly, and the honours used in nineteenth- and twentieth-century New Zealand were significantly different from medieval systems of knighthood. Colonial honours were a ‘modification of a more generalised English nineteenth-century practice’, a practice that was the result of an ‘eighteenth-century “revival” and transformation of selected rituals of chivalry ... loosely drawn from the late medieval and early modern

---

9 Duke, ed., pp. 151, 166.
10 Pine, p. 117.
In this transformation, titles such as Knights of the Bath were revived and reordered to provide for the imperial state's need to reward state service. By World War One, it was recognised that honours were largely given for public service, and no longer merely to the aristocracy. As well, with new awards being created, titles were bestowed in much greater numbers by 1914. Particularly orders of chivalry applicable in New Zealand, and their development, are treated in more detail in Chapter One. In these very different later incarnations, however, knighthood as an honour retained exclusivity as a vital element, and the elitism suggested by the position of cavalry as a military elite also had modern echoes, if in a very different setting. The British honours system also continued to be a male-dominated institution, and the sex inequalities produced in it were reproduced in the New Zealand honours system.

From the nineteenth century, some orders of chivalry also provided for membership at a non-titular level by including different classes of award, further increasing the number and range of recipients of honours. These lower classes of the orders of chivalry, as with knighthood and damehood, are only one constituent part of the royal honours system. In the UK, the higher honour of elevation to the peerage was also awarded, and this practice continues to exist in the award of life peerages. The peerage has several levels: duke, marquess, earl, viscount and baron, which rank in that order. As well, the hereditary 'Order of Baronets in England' was begun by James I in 1611, ranking between the peerage above and knighthood below. The title of baronet suggests a lesser baron, and baronets are not peers, but 'commoners'. Honours within the peerage and baronetage have occasionally, but rarely, been bestowed in New Zealand. Ranking below knighthood and lower awards in the orders of chivalry in the order in

---

14 Duke, ed., p. 151. The title had, however, been bestowed in earlier years and originally referred to those who 'had lost the right of individual summons to Parliament'. Ibid.
which awards are to be worn, honours are also given at the level of decorations. These are given, for example, to reward gallantry, bravery or devotion to duty, and were an important part of the honours system of the twentieth century.

All honours are ranked in terms of precedence, or the order of wearing, from highest to lowest, and there are regulations for the wearing of insignia and medals. This order of wear has changed over time as the honours available have altered. As well, some honours bestow social precedence, which is 'officially accorded priority of place or superiority of rank'. This type of precedence is different to that relating to the order in which honours are to be worn. Knights and dames receive social precedence in accordance with which particular honour they have received, and members of the lower classes of orders of chivalry also receive social precedence further down the scale; social precedence is not bestowed on the recipients of other honours outside of orders, or of decorations. Although New Zealand has its own order of precedence and order of wear, it was largely the same as that of England in respect of orders of chivalry, at least until 1996.

As well as knighthood, damehood and awards within the lower classes of the orders of chivalry, some non-titular honours also fit between the peerage and decorations. Most important of these are the Order of Merit and the Order of the Companions of Honour, and the distinctive New Zealand honour, the Order of New Zealand. The Order of Merit, begun in 1902 by Edward VII, was intended to recognise members of the Empire 'who had rendered distinguished military service or who had made outstanding contributions to the fields of science, literature and the arts'. Excluding honorary members, ordinary membership was limited to twenty-four, making the honour highly

---

16 Pamm, Honours and Rewards, p. 218.
17 Ibid., p. 211.
18 Ibid., p. 218.
exclusive. The order ranks highly in the order of wear, but bestows no title and carries no social precedence. By 1972, it had been granted to a mere three women Commonwealth-wide, and by 1996, to three New Zealanders. The Order of the Companions of Honour, begun in 1917 as a ‘lower form of the Order of Merit’, allows the recipient to use the post-nominal CH. It is restricted to the Sovereign and sixty-five members and given to those for whom it is ‘deemed the most appropriate form of recognition’ since it is non-titular and has no social precedence. The Order of New Zealand is a similar non-titular award, unique to New Zealand, and restricted to twenty living persons as well as the Sovereign, although additional and honorary members may be created to mark special occasions and to recognise citizens of countries in which the Queen is not head of state.

**Titular honours: parameters of the thesis**

Non-titular awards, and the peerage and the decorations that are included in the honours system, are not included in this study, which focuses on the award of titular honours in New Zealand. Similarly, this thesis does not discuss honours that have had no application in New Zealand, such as the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India or the Imperial Order of the Crown of India, although they are part of the UK honours system. Recipients of the Orders of the Thistle and of St Patrick, for instance, are generally Scottish and Irish peers respectively, and there have been no New Zealanders appointed to either of these. Awards of the semi-independent Order of St John of Jerusalem are likewise not included in this thesis. It is the group of people in New Zealand who have

---

21 Ibid., p. 63.
been honoured with awards falling between the hereditary and the non-titular that are the focus of this study, the dames and the knights, and in particular, the dames. Some knights did, of course, later also receive hereditary honours, and many recipients of titular honours also held non-titular awards. Similarly, titles conferred outside the British honours system, in other states' systems or by the papacy, are not included in this study.

Although knighthood came to be used in New Zealand when the country was a British colony in the nineteenth century, this study commences in the twentieth century, in 1917. 1917 is an important date in the history of honours in New Zealand, as it was in that year that the Order of the British Empire was established. This order was the first to include titular honours open to women in their own right. As well, before the institution of the Order of the British Empire, the UK, and thus New Zealand, had no general honour with which to reward contributions to art, literature or science. Honours were limited to a small number of people, largely associated with 'public services to the State'. Many New Zealanders received honours in this order over the years that followed, as awards in the order formed the vast majority of all royal honours given in New Zealand before 1996. Although there were changes to the honours system in New Zealand in 1996, the major change occurred in 2000, with the cessation of titular honours; this study therefore ends in 2000, as dames and knights, with a few exceptions, can no longer be created in this country. Publicly, there has been a rather mixed reaction to the cessation of titular honours, ranging from warm approbation to great disappointment. Some among the public have welcomed the change, glad to see the removal of an institution they considered anachronistic and overly preoccupied with

---

27 Other honours open to women before 1917 had been non-titular, as with the Order of Merit and the exclusively female Imperial Order of the Crown of India and Royal Order of Victoria and Albert. Pam, Honours and Rewards, pp. 173, 190-191; Duke, ed., p. 161. Women had also received limited admission into the Order of the Garter prior to the sixteenth century. However, dames wear a smaller star, collar and sash than knights, and women wear the insignia of the lower classes suspended from a bow rather than a ribbon, unless they are in uniform. E. C. Joslin, Spink's Catalogue of British and Associated Orders, Decorations and Medals, with valuations (Exeter, 1983), p. 50.

class. Others have regretted the loss of links to New Zealand’s British heritage and the visible recognition of services performed that is given by a title. Whatever one’s view of the removal of titles in New Zealand, it is now timely to examine the grant of titular honours in New Zealand, its operation and implications.

Although this thesis covers a relatively long period of time, many of the patterns apparent in the granting of titles remained evident over most of the period, at least in the case of male recipients, the majority of dames not being created until after 1970. While the focus of this thesis is on New Zealand, there is evidence to suggest that these patterns and trends occurred in the UK as well; indeed, such patterns and trends were likely reproduced in New Zealand along with the honours system itself. Some comparisons with Australia and Canada, also former colonies of the UK, have also been made where possible. In a similarly colonial way, the honours system has also functioned in states constitutionally linked to New Zealand, such as the Cook Islands and Niue. Recipients from those states whose awards were announced on separate lists in the New Zealand Gazette have not been included in the statistics for this study. Recipients of additional and honorary titular awards have also not been included in the statistics. Honorary awards are those given to people in countries where the Queen is not the head of state, and additional awards are those created at ‘special events’ like coronations, or in ‘times of war’ when a larger number of awards than normal is temporarily necessary. All other dames and knights whose award was published in the New Zealand Gazette between 1917 and 2000 have been included in the statistics for this study. Conviction of a criminal offence may lead to the forfeiture of a titular honour. Of all titular honours announced in the New Zealand Gazette between 1917 and 2000, only one has been

---

29 Pamm, Honours and Rewards, p. 179. Although they have at times been included in New Zealand honours lists published in the New Zealand Gazette, one reason for not including honorary awards in the statistics, besides their extraordinary nature, is that honorary awards are generally ‘not gazetted’. Ibid., p. 1568.

30 The population of this study is defined as those gazetted because ‘[u]ntil 1931 the simultaneous gazetting of awards in the New Zealand Gazette did not always take place’. Pamm, Honours and Rewards, p. 1568.
forfeited, that awarded to Albert Royle Henry in 1974. Henry's KBE was forfeited and his name removed from the register after his conviction for conspiring to defraud the Crown.\textsuperscript{31} Finally, it is important to note that this thesis is a study of those who have accepted titles in the New Zealand honours system, rather than of those who have refused. Most nominees accept honours, and reasons are not required from those who decline.\textsuperscript{32} Reasons for declining that have been mentioned in the UK, however, range from a simple desire not to receive a title if offered an award of that level, to a dislike of the perceived imperial implications of an honour such as an award within the Order of the British Empire.\textsuperscript{33} It is possible, therefore, that those who appear to have been overlooked for honours have in fact declined an honour.

**Methodology**

The methodology used in this thesis encompasses statistical analysis, biographical research, discourse analysis of articles in the popular media and oral history. A list of men and women announced to have received titles was compiled from the honours lists published in the *New Zealand Gazette* between 1917 and 2000. As well, the numbers of men and women to have received lower awards in those lists were collated. Tables were created to allow analysis of the award of honours at various levels to men and women, in numerical terms, over the years since 1917. Further research was then undertaken into the achievements or service of those who had been made dames and knights in New Zealand. In order to examine the work most often done by those who were honoured, recipients of titular honours between 1917 and 2000 were categorised according to the services they were honoured for. From 1975, this categorisation was easily achieved, as citations were published with names. Prior to that, it was possible to assign categories through citations where they did occur, government records and biographical

\textsuperscript{31} 'Database of titular honours, 1917-2000', see Appendix Two; 'Will Maori leader lose knighthood?' *National Business Review*, 10 March 1995, accessed from Factiva.
\textsuperscript{32} Baguley, David, interview with the author, 11 May 2004, Wellington.
information. Where appropriate, recipients' services were classified as fitting into more than one category, a practice followed in the published citations themselves. The categories themselves emerged from the citations given after 1975 (see Figure One below, for notes on the categories).

**Figure One:**
**Categories of Service:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public*</td>
<td>Includes international, national and local services to the state and government, or related bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Includes voluntary work (defined as unpaid), work with charities and community organisations, or generous donations to various causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Includes services to the judiciary, or to the legal profession and related bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Includes commercial and industrial services (perhaps including technological development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Includes services to tertiary education and research, or to an academic field, and other services to education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Includes services to farming, agricultural research, and industries related to farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Includes services to health, medical research and education, to particular fields of medicine, or medical organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>Includes services to Maori-oriented organisations, or to the Maori people in any field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Includes services to, or success in, any branch of the arts, from literature and painting to music and drama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Includes services to, or success in, any sport, such as rugby, cricket, yachting and squash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War/patriotic work</td>
<td>Includes services to patriotic organisations, to soldiers' welfare, or to the NZRSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Includes all awards in the military divisions of any order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Includes services to women's affairs in any field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal to Sovereign</td>
<td>Includes any award in the Royal Victorian Order, as these are given for personal service to the Sovereign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>Includes services to any profession other than those covered in other categories (such as medicine or law).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Includes services to the church, of any denomination, or in a particular religious office, such as Archbishop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td>Includes services to the trade union movement, and particular unions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The term 'public service' has been preferred over 'state service' in this thesis, following the citations for awards published in the *New Zealand Gazette*.

As exceptions, dames were then studied in terms of portrayals of them in the popular media. Articles from magazines and newspapers were gathered for each dame, with at least one article per year being collected for each year following their receipt of a
title, where such articles were available. Data on knights was used for statistical comparison only, and although outside the scope of this thesis, further research into the representation of knights in the popular media would be a valuable contribution to understandings of male gender roles and masculinity in New Zealand. Finally, oral histories provided further depth to the understanding of women's position in, and experience of, titles in New Zealand, by revealing personal experiences of being honoured, and of living as a titled woman in one's own right. Interviews were sought with dames resident in Christchurch, whose awards represented a variety of those services for which dames were created in New Zealand. This view of the lived experience of dames added depth to the understanding of the complexity of the grant of titles in New Zealand.

**Awarding honours: an introduction to the process**

Before considering the grant of titles to women and men in New Zealand further, an introduction to the process by which honours were distributed in New Zealand, and the issues surrounding that process, is necessary. When New Zealand first received British royal honours in the nineteenth century, the dispensation of honours operated in a much more personal fashion than it currently does. While there was increasingly a requirement that appointments be able to be defended through reference to precedent, honours were often sought through patronage, usually personally but sometimes in writing, and usually through an intermediary. Patronage is a term often used as equivalent to the term clientelism, referring to a system where a patron, who has higher status in society, acts as a broker between the central power and the client, so that the client receives certain benefits and the patron receives the client's services. Well chosen and tended personal relationships, through patronage, could lead to one receiving

---

the honour one desired.\textsuperscript{36} For example, Alfred Domett, who was a civil servant and parliamentarian in nineteenth-century New Zealand, wrote to George Grey, former Governor and then current New Zealand premier, and previously Domett's patron, asking for verification of the services he had given New Zealand. He went so far as to discuss which particular honour and level he considered himself eligible for, comparing his services to the colony to those of others who had been honoured.\textsuperscript{37}

Even in 1929, two telegrams sent by the High Commissioner in London, James Parr, to Joseph Ward, indicated Parr's desire for a higher honour than the KCMG he already held. In the first, on 18 November, Parr sent: 'I shall be greatly obliged if you will recommend me for G.C.M.G New Year's Honours List'.\textsuperscript{38} On the 21\textsuperscript{st}, he sent:

\begin{quote}
I hope you agree I am entitled to G.C.M.G by virtue of my services to both Governments. Leaving excellent record here. Respectfully I suggest if Allen and Mackenzie received Honour as recognition their work here I should be entitled at least to same privilege coming New Year [sic].\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

In reply to the second telegram, Ward sent that, in respect of the GCMG, '[I] regret cannot submit New Years [sic] Honours but will discuss matter with you on your return'.\textsuperscript{40} Eventually, in 1935, Parr received the GCMG, as he neared the end of his second stint as High Commissioner for New Zealand in London.\textsuperscript{41} Whether or not the award was connected to the earlier solicitation, these telegrams indicate continuing attempts to secure honours through personal communication in the early twentieth century.

\textsuperscript{36} Peacocke, pp. 335-336.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., pp. 248-257. In the event, instead of the KCMG he desired, he was given the CMG, which it appears he was not unequivocally pleased with. Ibid., pp. 249-257, 265-268.
\textsuperscript{38} Archives New Zealand, PM9/85, cablegram, Sir James Parr to Sir Joseph Ward, 18 November 1929.
\textsuperscript{39} Archives New Zealand, PM9/85, cablegram, Sir James Parr to Sir Joseph Ward, 21 November 1929.
\textsuperscript{40} Archives New Zealand, PM9/85, telegraph, Sir Joseph Ward to Sir James Parr, 29 November 1929.
Significant change in the process by which honours are awarded has occurred since, and as in the UK, Canada and Australia, New Zealand now accepts nominations from any member of the community. Nominations are acknowledged in a brief letter to the sender, and a short précis of the nominated person’s work and achievements prepared by the Honours Secretariat, who based on past experience also suggest the level of award the nomination might be suitable for. All nominations are discussed by a Cabinet Committee of Ministers, chaired by the Prime Minister, and the original 600-700 nominations whittled down to 200-250. Before the decisions are made, additional information can be gathered. At the final meeting, the list is reduced to within the statutory quotas for each honour, and is sent for the Governor-General’s informal approval, after which nominees are given the choice of accepting or declining an honour. The list is then prepared for formal approval, is signed by the Prime Minister, and sent to the Queen through the Governor-General.  

In a successful nomination, the form and level of honour is chosen according to the kind of services the nominee has given, the period of time in which these have occurred, whether the service was performed locally, nationally or internationally, and the impact on New Zealand society overall. Jean Herbison, for instance, was made a dame for her services to education in 1985, having contributed locally, nationally and internationally. Among other roles, she was a member and chairperson of the Canterbury branch of the New Zealand Educational Administration Society (NZEAS) from 1976 to 1989, national president of the society between 1978 and 1984, and vice president of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration from 1982 until 1986. Nominations remain ‘alive’ for more than one list, and thus may be reconsidered.
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44 Herbison, Dame Jean, interview with the author, 18 November 2004, Christchurch. Note that for ease of reading, the titles of recipients of titular honours have generally not been used in this thesis.
Baguley, the Director of the Honours Secretariat in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) in 2004, claimed that a nomination has a greater chance of success in New Zealand than in Britain. It should be noted that any system of nominations contains an element of inequality, simply because it relies on a person being nominated, and therefore, some people deemed deserving may remain without an honour. Once this process has been followed, the resulting awards are announced, and published in the *New Zealand Gazette* twice a year, at the New Year and at Queen’s Birthday, as well as occasionally at special occasions. Those honoured receive their award at an investiture, usually from the Governor-General, by which time the process has already begun again for the next list.

**Controversy and the process of distributing honours**

A major issue surrounding the honours system is that of control of this process of the distribution of awards, and the attendant potential for corruption. Corruption has certainly been a feature of the distribution of honours in the UK at various times, and was viewed as bringing honours into dishonour. Awards were at times sold, given to those who had made significant donations to the funding of a political party, or granted in exchange for political party services or support. Scandal relating to the granting of honours peaked in the time of Lloyd George, when ‘touts sold baronetcies and knighthoods in London clubs’, gathering considerable sums of money for Lloyd George’s ‘private political fund’. Maundy Gregory, an notorious honours tout, was the first and only person convicted under the Honours (Prevention of Abuses) Act of 1925 that was
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45 Baguley, interview with the author, 11 May 2004.  
48 Hanham, p. 289.
passed in the UK in response to the abuses of the system under Lloyd George.\textsuperscript{49} As well as legislation, the Political Honours Scrutiny Committee was set up in the UK in 1924.\textsuperscript{50} Yet even in the 1980s, John Walker suggested that honours were being given in the UK in exchange for contributions to party funds, largely by industrialists, or were given for long political service and to reward long-serving backbenchers.\textsuperscript{51}

The current UK system for the distribution of honours is a complicated one, where nominations come both directly from the public and from government departments, which may have received them from 'public or private sources'. Nominations are considered then by one of a number of sub-committees connected to the Ceremonial Secretariat, these committees having responsibility for particular areas of service, before going to an overall committee, and then to the Queen, via the Cabinet Secretary and the Prime Minister.\textsuperscript{52} Moreover, there are three distinct honours lists created independently: the Prime Minister's list, the Diplomatic Service and Overseas List and the Defence Services List.\textsuperscript{53} The Political Honours Scrutiny Committee still operates, but merely searches for 'any evidence of unsuitability' regarding those recipients receiving their award for 'political services', who 'may have made political donations' or who are added to the list by the Prime Minister, rather than having any 'active role in assessing suitable people'.\textsuperscript{54} In its 2004 report on the honours system, the Public Administration Select Committee claimed not to have discovered 'pervasive' corruption in the UK honours system at that time, as there had been in the 1920s, but acknowledged that habitually granting knighthoods to MPs is seen by some 'as a mere

\textsuperscript{50} Hanham, p. 289.
\textsuperscript{51} J. Walker, \textit{The Queen has been pleased: the British honours system at work} (London, 1986), pp. 4, 164-167, 194-195.
tool of political party management'. However, public nominations, which were only begun in 1993, still play a minority role in the selection of honours recipients in the UK: only 45% of honours 'over recent lists' have been recommended after being nominated by a member of the public.

In both Australia and Canada, changes have been made to the process of awarding honours in an effort to remove the institution from the control of politicians, and ensure honours are dispensed on the basis of merit alone. In Canada, awards are made by the Governor-General, on the recommendation of an Advisory Council that includes people connected with the arts, the universities, the state, and members of the order itself. Since the very first appointments to the Order of Canada in 1967, politicians and judges, both federal and provincial, cannot be ‘considered’ for an honour during their period of office. The website of the Governor-General of Canada also states that politicians are not on the Advisory Council. Similarly, Alister Taylor noted that Australian honours are no longer distributed by politicians, ‘but through public participation and a filtering process supervised by the Honours Secretariat attached to the Governor-General’s office’. Nominations in Australia are subject to research by the Honours Secretariat, which then passes them on to the Council for the Order of Australia, up to two years after they have been received. The Council considers the nominations, and then advises which should receive honours and at what level. The council has nineteen members, including eight who are ‘appointed by the Governor-General on the recommendation of the Prime Minister’. The government website claims that the consideration by the Council is
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55 Public Administration Select Committee, paragraphs 127-128.
59 Ibid.
removed from political patronage', as the council simply decides 'whether the service of the person put forward is over and above what would reasonably be expected'.

In contrast, Taylor criticised the process of distributing honours in New Zealand as recently as 1998. He argued that politicians retained control, and that honours were often still given to politicians 'almost automatically' after 'a few years' of service in Parliament. Connal Townsend, on the other hand, concluded in his 1977 thesis on political patronage that New Zealand did not use the honours system as in the UK to reward MPs' loyalty, though possibly as a reward for timely retirements. Charges of corruption in the honours system are less evident in New Zealand than in the UK, although former Prime Minister David Lange was reported in one newspaper as claiming that one could gain an honour by donating large sums of money if not by buying one directly.

However, a Prime Minister's Advisory Committee reporting on honours in New Zealand in 1995, while agreeing that the process of awarding honours should be 'as fair and free of prejudice or patronage as humanly possible', was sceptical of changing the process at that time. The committee felt that the honours system should be viewed in the light of the many 'deserving' New Zealanders who had been honoured, rather than the few cases where patronage had been influential. Rather than change the process, the committee advised increased publicity for the honours system, as well as providing a nomination form and attempting to raise awareness of the system among 'all language and ethnic groups'. Baguley acknowledged in 2004 a need for the public to better understand the honours system, including the structure of the New Zealand Order of
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63 Townsend, p. 51.
64 S. Raea, 'Going ... going ... gong', The New Zealand Herald, 4 November 1995, section 8, p. 1.
65 Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, pp. 76-77.
66 Ibid., pp. 76-77.
Merit. At the same time, he stressed that the vast majority of nominations in New Zealand are now made by the public, and that the few nominations from politicians are not viewed with particular favour.\textsuperscript{67} This is different to the situation when Townsend wrote his thesis in the late 1970s, when he wrote that ‘most’ nominations were from politicians, local bodies and ‘other official organisations’.\textsuperscript{68}

**Knights and dames: the historiography**

The royal honours system has been neglected in academic study to a surprising degree. Very little has been written concerning honours in New Zealand, Australia or Canada, and even in the UK there has been little academic study of honours. Most of what has been written on the honours system, either academic or popular, has focused on patronage and politics, or has simply been reference material on the development and functioning of the constituent elements of the system. In terms of academic study, some work has been concerned with honours in the UK. In one article, H. J. Hanham dealt with honours in Victorian England, and in particular, with the sale of honours for political purposes; T. A. Jenkins similarly focused on the connections between honours and the financial support of the Liberal Unionist Party.\textsuperscript{69} Some work has been done examining the prestigious Order of the Garter in medieval and Tudor times, including a chapter on the Order’s early history in D’Arcy Boulton’s *The Knights of the Crown: the Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520*.\textsuperscript{70} Official or semi-official histories have also been written for particular orders of chivalry, covering the historical development and changing nature of the composition, functioning and

\textsuperscript{67} Baguley, interview with the author, 11 May 2004.
\textsuperscript{68} Townsend, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{69} Hanham, op cit.; Jenkins, op cit.
dispensation of these orders, and touching on controversies surrounding them.\textsuperscript{71} Brigadier Sir Ivan De la Bere, the Secretary of the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood for fifteen years, also authored a book on the orders of chivalry.\textsuperscript{72} It was carefully researched, and has value as an introduction to the history of the orders and their use. As well, Anthony M. Pamm produced a two volume reference work covering honours and decorations in the UK and the Commonwealth nations, and the rules and conventions associated with them.\textsuperscript{73} Pamm's work provides a useful introduction and reference to the complexities of the system and the way it has been adapted by different Commonwealth nations, but little analysis. A number of catalogues of decorations have also been published, detailing the insignia for the various honours in both the British honours system and in other states' systems, of particular relevance to collectors.\textsuperscript{74}

Popular works have also appeared on the royal honours system in the UK, with a highly critical tone.\textsuperscript{75} These works have focused on the scandals in the honours system, devoting a chapter or two to the notorious honours tout Maundy Gregory, or providing statistics to show that honours are given to certain sectors of the population disproportionately. By far the most polemical is the work of John Walker, who adopted in his book an unreservedly critical and cynical approach. He saw his treatment of the honours system in the UK as 'a story of patronage, privilege and politics, with a common thread: power'.\textsuperscript{76} He appears to have set himself the task of exposing the system as riddled with hypocrisy, corruption, snobbery and a complete lack of honour. As the book is substantially without reference to his sources, it is of limited value, except as an example of the negative views that are sometimes taken of honours.

\textsuperscript{71} For example, J. C. Risk, \textit{The History of the Order of the Bath and its insignia} (London, 1972); F. Hood, \textit{The Chapel of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire} (Oxford, 1979); Galloway, op cit.
\textsuperscript{72} I. De la Bere, \textit{The Queen's Orders of Chivalry} (London, 1961).
\textsuperscript{73} Pamm, \textit{Honours and Rewards}, op cit., vols. 1 and 2.
\textsuperscript{74} For instance, Joslin, op cit.; R. Werlich, \textit{Orders and Decorations of All Nations: Ancient and Modern, Civil and Military} (Washington DC, 1965).
\textsuperscript{76} Walker, p. 1.
In New Zealand, work on the honours system is in even shorter supply. Besides the short chapter in Pamm’s *Honours and Rewards in the British Commonwealth*, basic introductions to the honours system and the awards given in New Zealand before 1996 are provided in a handful of biographical reference dictionaries on the recipients of honours. Information on the history and current functioning of the honours system is also given in brief form officially, on the website for the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Academic study related to the honours system in New Zealand has largely focused on the colonial period, and publications can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Bruce Knox has written an article covering colonial honours in Australia and New Zealand, examining the intersections of democracy and aristocracy through the lens provided by existing and proposed honours. Jon Peacocke wrote a thesis on honours in the colonial period, focused on issues of patronage, gentility, and social rituals and conventions. As mentioned, one thesis has also been produced in political science, by Connal Townsend in 1977, examining political patronage in New Zealand, with one chapter using awards made within the honours system since 1960 as a case study. Popular comment on the honours system in New Zealand has been restricted to articles, editorials and letters published in magazines and newspapers, particularly on the changes to the system in 1996 and 2000.
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82 For example, Raea, p. 1; R. Laugesen, 'Knights and Dames face the knife', *Sunday Star Times*, 13 February 2000, accessed from Factiva; S. Upton, 'Titles are irrational but at least they honour top performers', *National Business Review*, 7 April 2000, accessed from Factiva; D. Fleming, 'Doing the Honours', *New Zealand Women's Weekly*, 10 April 2000, pp. 22-23; 'Discarding Titles', *The Christchurch..."
Consideration of women’s involvement in royal honours, in New Zealand or the UK, has been almost totally neglected. A number of the works on honours, academic or otherwise, mention women’s participation, but cover this complex topic in a few sentences.83 Peter Galloway’s official history of the Order of the British Empire is an exception, having given the issue of female participation in the Order rather more space, and included a discussion of proposals to provide women with an equivalent decoration to the relatively common Knight Bachelor.84 As well, popular articles in the media have occasionally touched upon women’s participation in honours.85 However, there has been no detailed study of women’s participation in honours, and no collective study of the recipients of titles in New Zealand, although individual dames and knights or the organisations they were connected with have sometimes been written on.86 This lack of consideration of women and honours may at first seem surprising, given the celebratory trend in early women’s history, a trend which has continued to exist alongside later developments in New Zealand historiography. The field of women’s history, which
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84 Galloway, pp. 3, 6, 15-17, 53-58, for example.
developed in the 1970s, had as a central aim the recovery of women’s experiences in the past. Work at that time was often celebratory, linked to second wave feminism. Frequently, studies were grounded in women’s biology and emphasised women’s values and culture. Carroll Smith-Rosenberg’s ‘The Female World of Love and Ritual’, focusing on the intense love and friendship between middle class women in nineteenth-century America, epitomises this approach. The framework of public and private spheres ran through much of the early work, often re-valuing the separate female world of nurturing as positive and strengthening for women. Work in New Zealand that has recovered the history of women and their place in New Zealand society provides the context for this thesis.

The absence of honoured women in women’s history is not so difficult to understand, however. Women who received royal honours at the titular level were honoured by the establishment and became part of a masculine system. These women are traditional heroines, and, through their entry into a system that presumed a male norm, ‘honorary knights’. This thesis thus moves away from the celebration of feminist heroines to reveal gendering of honours, considering a minority of women who succeeded in a male-dominated structure, only some of whom considered themselves feminist, as well as the men who were the majority of those honoured. Many of these women have not been considered in counter-culture work that aimed to make previously neglected female subjects visible, or have reached the peak of their achievements and been honoured only in recent years. I have drawn from Katie Pickles’ work on the first women to enter the traditionally male areas of academia and politics, for the honours

88 S. Coney, ed., *Standing in the Sunshine: a history of New Zealand women since they won the vote* (Auckland, 1993); Else, op cit.; A. Rogers and M. Simpson, eds., *Early Stories from Founding Members of the Maori Women’s Welfare League/Te Timatanga Tatau Tatau, Te Ropu Wahine Maori Toku i te Ora*, as told to Dame Mira Szaszy (Wellington, 1993).
system is also a long-standing one, and only opened to women in the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{89} Like female political leaders, dames were ‘exceptions to the rule’.\textsuperscript{90} In examining women in the honours system and depictions of dames in the media, this study also builds on work by Antonia Fraser that has addressed the mythology surrounding women in traditionally male spaces of power, and work by Pickles that examines the construction of New Zealand’s national icons.\textsuperscript{91} Fraser has argued that the ‘warrior queen’, a female leader in wartime, is a ‘singular exception’ who stands out in the male-dominated public spaces of power.\textsuperscript{92} The ‘aura’ of exceptionalism that clings to the female leader also lingered in some sense around women who were honoured by being created dames.\textsuperscript{93} Many women granted the title of dame have been referred to as a ‘grand dame’ or a ‘great dame’, and while some have been relatively unknown, others have been celebrity figures to whom the title has added a further lustre.\textsuperscript{94} This aura is intensified by the ‘aura of mystery and romance’ that has been perceived as clinging to the honours system and the lists that appear twice yearly.\textsuperscript{95} The crucial difference is that, although some dames were successful in traditionally masculine activities, other dames, far from being leaders in wartime as the ‘warrior queen’ was, served their communities in ways that recall traditional ideas of naturally ‘feminine’ activity. Women who have been visible in


\textsuperscript{90} The phrase is from Pickles, ‘Exceptions to the Rule’, op cit.


\textsuperscript{92} Fraser, pp. 9-10.

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., pp. 9-10.


\textsuperscript{95} Riddell, p. 9.
traditional history, or who have been female 'kiwi icons', were either 'super-womanly' or 'honorary men'. In a similar way, the threads of exceptionalism in the lives and portrayals of dames can be contrasted with threads of continuing conformity to traditional images of the feminine.

This thesis also contributes to an understanding of female and male gender roles in twentieth-century New Zealand by examining the patterns in the granting of titular honours in New Zealand, and the representations of dames in popular culture. Gender history developed from challenges that arose to the framework of public and private, and to the celebration of women's culture, based on a recognition of the inherent risk of reasserting a biological determinism. Gender history aimed to understand gender roles and relations, and the ways in which gender has been socially constructed and has operated in society. From within the field of feminist history, work on masculinity developed through the 1990s, moving on from the gender identity history that had continued to be concerned only with women, to consider the gender identity of men. In New Zealand, however, the celebratory trend was reinforced by the celebration of the centenary of women's suffrage in 1993, when a number of books were published on women in the history of New Zealand, and this trend continues today. Caroline Daley's study on the local community in Taradale remains one of few works in New Zealand using a gender history framework. Feminist scholarship has also developed in the
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100 C. Daley, Girls and Women, Men and Boys: Gender in Taradale 1886-1930 (Auckland, 1999). There is also, for instance, C. Daley and D. Montgomerie, eds., The Gendered Kiwi (Auckland, 1999).
direction of recognising women’s difference, in particular in terms of race and class, and these differences are acknowledged in this thesis.\(^{101}\)

As Jock Phillips has shown in *A Man’s Country?*, gender identity can be crucially linked to the issue of national identity, what it is perceived to be and how it is represented.\(^{102}\) Indeed, national identity has been an important aspect of popular discussion on honours in New Zealand. The honours system has been a space where issues of nationalism and independence have been raised, in the context of colonial ties to Britain, and it has not been uncommon for commentators to see the honours system as inappropriately imperial, particularly at the times when it has been reviewed. Moreover, the honours system has been discussed within a discourse of independence relating to New Zealand’s constitutional arrangements, and it is therefore necessary to view it in the light of the continuing academic debate as to the level of independence evident in New Zealand’s stance in the world and in its foreign policy.\(^{103}\) As well, this thesis intersects with literature considering the elite and the wealthy in New Zealand, shedding light on the myth of egalitarianism as an element of national identity in New Zealand history.\(^{104}\) Yet although the honours system has been a space in which these issues of national identity could be considered, and although issues of gender identity have been implicated in the royal honours system, questions of gender identity in relation to honours have not
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been discussed. Given the role of honours in acknowledging the value of people’s contributions to society, such discussion is long overdue.

**The structure of the thesis**

In this thesis, examination of the connections between royal honours and gender identities and roles in twentieth-century New Zealand is begun. Approaching the honours system from a feminist perspective has allowed much about both feminine gender identity and, through the historically constructed dualism, masculine gender identity, to be visited. In the first chapter, the system itself is introduced, as a reproduction of a British institution in the setting of a settler society. Excepting the process of distributing honours, which has already been covered, the changes honours have undergone since 1917 are considered, and it is suggested that the class exclusivity and male norm existent in the British system continued to be present, to differing degrees, in the honours system in New Zealand over the twentieth century. The second chapter is focused more specifically on women’s association with royal honours, particularly at the level of titles, and in New Zealand. The changes in women’s relationship with honours are considered in the context of the shifts in women’s circumstances and status over the period, and the ebb and flow of the feminist movement. These strands of change are contrasted with underlying continuities in women’s relationship with honours and in perceived female gender roles.

Chapter Three centres around an examination of the services performed by dames, and knights, in New Zealand. The focus is on the ways in which honoured women, though exceptional, have remained linked to the traditionally feminine, in their work and in portrayals of them in the popular media. Continuing this focus on the services given by those honoured with a title in New Zealand, Chapter Four covers the other side of the paradox, the doubly exceptional women whose work has been non-traditional, yet who have been represented in the media in contradictory ways and who were honoured for work that was traditionally honoured work. That is, they worked in areas that were
common in the careers of honoured men, and which in that sense did not contradict the system's male norm. Throughout the thesis, the tensions between these contradictory themes are further deconstructed through an examination of the ways in which they have applied in the lived experiences of women granted a title in New Zealand, drawing particularly from interviews with such women. The paradoxes, ironies and tensions that have inhabited the honours system in relation to gender roles and identities are re-visited in the conclusion, and the importance of revealing these tensions in the ways we value the work of women and men is explicated. If the honours system is to continue to provide recognition for those who strove and succeeded in various areas in New Zealand, with or without titles, dualisms of masculine and feminine must be surpassed.
Chapter One

An elite male institution: reproducing British honours in New Zealand

Like a number of states that were historically part of the British Empire, New Zealand has had, for much of its history, an honours system closely linked to that of Britain. In an attempt to move from the British model of honours that was reproduced in the colony to a national system with a more distinctly New Zealand flavour, significant changes have been made to the New Zealand honours system. These changes have occurred relatively recently, making New Zealand considerably slower to abandon its ties to the British honours system than many other former colonies. Charges that the honours system was anachronistic can be seen as part of a wider debate about New Zealand’s place in the world relative to that of other Commonwealth countries, and should be viewed in the light of discussion regarding New Zealand’s shift to independence. As the current New Zealand honours system developed from the British model, the elite and exclusive nature of the British system interacted with a national identity that placed importance on the supposed egalitarianism of settler societies, opening possibilities for an honours system that was not dominated by an elite, or a male norm.

Knighthood and damehood in New Zealand: the British awards

British royal honours were distributed throughout the British Empire during the nineteenth century, a practice that began New Zealand’s association with royal honours. From 1858, the honours system operating in New Zealand was essentially the British honours system, supplemented by a small number of uniquely New Zealand awards.105 The New Zealand system at the beginning of the twenty-first century, it is true, bears little resemblance to that operating in the nineteenth century, having undergone a number of important revisions in the intervening years. However, until 1975, New Zealanders were mostly simply eligible for British honours. Until 1996, New Zealand continued to
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105 Pam, Honours and Rewards, p. 1568.
use British honours to reward its citizens, alongside the new indigenous awards created after 1975, while all titular honours available in New Zealand continued to come from the British honours system.

Of those titular honours, Knight Bachelor is the oldest, dating to the reign of Henry III (1216-1252). Unlike the other titles bestowing knighthood that were dispensed in New Zealand prior to 1996, Knights Bachelor do not belong to a Royal Order. Rather, the title is directly linked to the ‘fighting knights of the middle ages’ from which the orders of chivalry have come. In the nineteenth century, the Colonial Office bestowed the honour of Knight Bachelor in New Zealand, as it did throughout the British Empire. By 1996, the honour was an important element in the New Zealand royal honours system, with Knights Bachelor forming by far the largest group of knights created in New Zealand, totalling 250 between 1917 and 1996. In Australia too, awards of Knight Bachelor formed the majority of knighthoods given during the period when British honours were used, 936 being created since 1901. New Zealand’s first Knight Bachelor was Charles Clifford, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in 1858. The first Knight Bachelor to have been born in New Zealand was James Mills, who was knighted in 1907 and who then received the KCMG in 1909, while Clifford had been made a Baronet in 1887. The first Maori knight was also a Knight Bachelor, James Carroll, in 1911, fifty-three years after Clifford received his honour. No women have yet been given this honour, either in New Zealand or in the UK, as the very title by definition excludes women.

107 Peacocke, p. 77.
108 'Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000', see Appendix One.
110 New Zealand Honours: History, http://www.dpmc.govt.nz/honours/overview/history.html. Captain George Grey was the ‘first person resident in New Zealand’ to be made a knight, receiving a knighthood in the Order of the Bath (a KCB) in 1848. Ibid.
Much rarer in New Zealand have been awards to the Most Noble Order of the Garter. A mere two New Zealand recipients of this award appear in the *New Zealand Gazette* since 1917, Keith Holyoake in 1980 and Edmund Hillary in 1995.\footnote{Database of titular honours, 1917-2000, see Appendix Two.} A single class order limited to twenty-four Knights Companion since 1831, the Garter has usually been given to ‘British and foreign royalty’, ‘English peers’ and, after 1918, ‘distinguished commoners’ such as Prime Ministers.\footnote{Parrm, Honours and Rewards, p. 192.} The Order is officially recognised as having been founded in 1348 by Edward III, and has been considered one of the most valued orders in Europe, and in the world.\footnote{De la Bere, pp. 49, 52-55; Taylor, ed., *New Zealand Who's Who Aotearoa*, 1998, p. 21; Orders (Ceremonial Secretariat), available from http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/ceremonial/index/orders.htm, accessed 20 June 2004.} An oft-quoted tradition holds that the order was created after the King picked up a garter dropped by a lady at his court, and in response to criticism proclaimed that he would make the garter much honoured; hence the motto of the order is ‘*Honi soit qui mal y pense*’ (Shame on him who thinks evil of it).\footnote{For instance: Taylor, *The Australian Roll of Honour*, p. 14; De la Bere, pp. 55-58; Boulton, pp. 155-157; *The Queen's Role in the Modern State: Sovereign as Fountain of Honour: Orders of Chivalry: Order of the Garter* (The Royal Household), available from http://www.royal.gov.uk/textonly/Page490.asp, accessed 26 October 2004.} However, although it has been suggested that the story could contain some truth, because fourteenth-century knights did wear pieces of a lady’s clothing to show ‘devotion’, the origin of the symbol of the garter is in much doubt.\footnote{Boulton, pp. 155-157; De la Bere, pp. 55-58.}

Medieval echoes are also clearly evident in the Most Honourable Order of the Bath. This order was constituted in 1725, but the creation of Knights of the Bath can be traced as far back as the fourteenth century. The custom from which the order takes its name, a ritual whereby new knights had to bathe before being dubbed, symbolically ‘washing away any impurities’, can be traced further still, to at least the twelfth century.\footnote{Risk, pp. 1-10; De la Bere, p. 100; Joslin, p. 30; *The Queen's Role in the Modern State: Sovereign as Fountain of Honour: Orders of Chivalry: Order of the Bath* (The Royal Household), available from http://www.royal.gov.uk/textonly/Page495.asp, accessed 26 October 2004.} This honour was available throughout the British Empire, having been
gradually expanded from a single class honour to have, by 1847, a civil and a military division, both with three classes: Knights and Dames Grand Cross (GCB), Knights and Dames Commander (KCB/DCB) and Companions (CB). One appointment as a GCB appears in the *New Zealand Gazette* between 1917 and 1996, that of Sidney Holland in 1957, upon leaving the office of Prime Minister of New Zealand. There are also four appointments as KCB recorded in that period, two in the military division, and two in the civil division. Appointments to the third class have been more numerous, with sixty-four CBs announced, fifty-seven of those in the military division. None of the appointments to the Bath have been of women, just as there have been no female appointments to the Order of the Garter in New Zealand.

Another order of chivalry became available to New Zealanders in 1868, the Most Distinguished Order of St Michael and St George. Those involved in administering honours had found it difficult to accommodate the ‘numerous claimants’ of honours in the colonies, given the statutory limits on already available honours. Earlier proposals for a solely colonial order of chivalry had been discarded, and the idea of hereditary colonial honours was also rejected. The Order of St Michael and St George had originally been a reward for services relating to the Ionian Islands and Malta, but it was ‘re-invented’ in 1868 to cover colonial service throughout the empire, and placed below the Bath in the official order of wear. The order was in particular to be a reward for ‘extraordinary and important civil service’, and for ‘high and confidential office’. The statutes also allowed the honour to be given to those who had ‘become eminently Distinguished [in the colonies] by their Talents, Merits, Virtues, Loyalty, or Services’.

---

118 Peacocke, p. 80; De la Bere, pp. 102-120.
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121 Peacocke, pp. 81-82.
124 Draft statutes approved by the Queen, 30 November 1868, CO. 447/9, fos 151-65, quoted in Knox, p. 247.
As with the Order of the Bath, there are three classes: Knights and Dames Grand Cross (GCMG), Knights and Dames Commander (KCMG/DCMG) and Companions (CMG). All classes were awarded in New Zealand between 1917 and 1996, particularly the CMG, of which there were 266 male recipients and seven female recipients. In the same period there were eleven Knights Grand Cross created, one Dame Grand Cross, thirty-three Knights Commander and two Dames Commander. Catherine Tizard received the GCMG, while Lady Norma Holyoake and Ann Hercus both received DCMGs. Before Lady Holyoake received the DCMG in 1980, no dames had been created within this order in New Zealand. As these statistics show, female participation in the order was low throughout its use in New Zealand, at just over 3% across all levels of the honour.  

Another order of chivalry that has been occasionally awarded in New Zealand is the Royal Victorian Order, established in 1896 by Queen Victoria. In the personal gift of the sovereign, this order was intended to escape the mounting ‘influence’ of prime ministers and governments over the awarding of honours. It is given to those who have given ‘extraordinary, or important, or personal service to the Sovereign’ or ‘merit Royal favour’. Five classes are included in the order: Knights and Dames Grand Cross (GCVO), Knights and Dames Commander (KCVO/DCVO), Commanders (CVO), Lieutenants (LVO) and Members (MVO). The fourth class was originally known as ‘Members of the fourth class’. A medal is associated with the order, the Royal Victorian Medal (RVM). Most awards of the Royal Victorian Order in New Zealand have been made on the occasion of a royal tour, with a total of seven New Zealanders awarded the GCVO, nine the KCVO, and none the DCVO. Despite the different character of this honour, only one award of the GCVO was to a woman, to Catherine Tizard in 1995, and,

125 'Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000', see Appendix One.
126 Joslin, p. 44.
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of the 112 awards made in the lower classes, a mere ten have been female (a little under 9\%).\footnote{Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000', see Appendix One.}

Finally, the British order of chivalry that has been most commonly awarded in New Zealand is the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire. This order provided the major instrument for honouring New Zealanders between 1917 and 1975, and remained a central part of the honours system until 1996. It was instituted in 1917 on a significantly larger scale than the previously existing orders, for the purpose of providing a sufficient instrument to honour the large numbers of people, including women, who had been mobilised for war between 1914 and 1918, particularly in non-combatant work.\footnote{Galloway, pp. 1-2, 19-20; A. W. Thorpe, ed., \textit{Burke's Handbook to the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire}, containing biographies, a full list of persons appointed to the order, showing their relative precedence, and coloured plates of the insignia (London, 1921), pp. 9-10.}

Despite some suggestions that the order cease to be awarded after World War One, it was reorganised for peacetime, and from December 1918 had both a military and a civil division, governed by its statutes.\footnote{Galloway, pp. 45-52.} The statutes reissued in 1970 required the recipient to give ‘important services’ to the United Kingdom, Commonwealth states where Elizabeth II was Queen, or other territories administered by the Crown.\footnote{‘Statutes of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire’ (1970), ATL, p. 3.} There are five classes in the order, as well as an associated British Empire Medal (BEM): Knights and Dames Grand Cross (GBE), Knights and Dames Commander (KBE/DBE), Commanders (CBE), Officers (OBE) and Members (MBE).

The inclusion of women among the recipients of the Order of the British Empire since its inception in 1917 is considered in one official history to be the ‘greatest innovation of all’ in the new honour.\footnote{Hood, p. 1.} Prior to the creation of the Order of the British Empire, other than a handful of awards exclusively for women and the honouring of Royal women, Indian princesses and those given private Royal honours, only one woman had been appointed to an official order: Florence Nightingale, given the non-titular Order
of Merit in 1907. Yet between 1917 and 1996, women made up only 20.5% of appointments across all levels of honours bestowed in this order, excluding the BEM, published in the *New Zealand Gazette* between 1917 and 1996. Of these appointments, the majority given at the level of OBE or higher were bestowed after 1970. Interestingly, at the time of the creation of the Order of the British Empire, the concern was also expressed that there was no decoration for men that was equivalent to the Royal Red Cross (RRC), which was for women only, and that male doctors, surgeons, volunteer ambulance drivers, stretcher bearers, orderlies and other men in similar positions would be unrewarded after the war.

Honours lists published in the *New Zealand Gazette* show a very clear pattern in relation to which types of titular honour were most often granted. These lists name 163 men and women appointed to the first and second classes of the Order of the British Empire, making this order the only one to give titular honours in numbers that came anywhere close to those of Knights Bachelor. Nearly 80% of the knights in New Zealand were granted either a KBE or the honour of Knight Bachelor, and a similar majority of dames in New Zealand (just over 70%) were granted the DBE. Among the lower three classes of the Order of the British Empire, the lists between 1917 and 1996 show 734 CBEs of both divisions awarded, 1826 OBEs and 3150 MBEs, as well as many recipients of the associated BEM.

**Reviewing honours: the changing New Zealand honours system from 1975**

After a review of the system, major changes to New Zealand's royal honours system were introduced in 1975. At this time, the Queen's Service Order (QSO) was

---

134 'Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000', see Appendix One. Awards of the MBE to women do not show a clear trend of increasing or decreasing numbers of award over the period. In fact, such awards steadily decreased as a percentage of the total number of MBEs awarded between 1950 and 1990. Ibid.
135 Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood, OBE Institution Letters Box, Memorandum by Sir Frederick Ponsonby, November 1915, quoted in Galloway, p. 3.
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created, and incorporated into the honours system as a ‘distinctive New Zealand honour’. The QSO is divided into community service and public service awards, as is the medal associated with it, the Queen’s Service Medal (QSM). Officially, it is to recognise ‘Valuable Voluntary Service and Meritorious and Faithful Services to the Crown or similar services within the public sector in elected or appointed office’. Quickly assimilated into the honours system, the award has been used extensively in New Zealand honours lists since 1975, and continues to be used so today. From the first awards made in 1975 until the New Year’s list in 2000 (inclusive), 726 QSOs and 2821 QSMs were distributed, with approximately 45% of those going to women, a far larger proportion than in any order created earlier. Further specifically New Zealand elements were introduced into the honours system in 1987, with the creation of the single class, non-titular Order of New Zealand (ONZ). That honour, despite being non-titular, was placed above most titular honours in the order of wear.

1995 saw the next significant review of the system. The Prime Minister’s Advisory Committee set up in January 1995 was instructed to consider various aspects of the honours system in New Zealand, including the ‘purpose and coverage’ of the system, the ‘appropriateness’ of the mix of British and New Zealand honours, and the possibility of establishing new honours or altering the indigenous ones. Modification of the British honours then in use was not a possibility, as they were ‘not ours to change’. Following a process of investigation and gathering submissions, the Committee produced a report, the major recommendations of which were a move to an honours system composed entirely of ‘distinctive New Zealand-based honours’, the cessation of recommendations for British imperial honours, the establishment of a New Zealand Order

139 Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000, see Appendix One. In the Queen’s Birthday list for 2004, fifteen QSOs and seventy-one QSMs were announced, along with one additional and one honorary QSM. ‘Queen’s Birthday Honours’, The Press, 7 June 2004, section A, p. 9.
140 Prime Minister’s Honours Advisory Committee, p.1.
141 Ibid., p. 5.
of Merit to replace the British orders of chivalry, and the discontinuation of titular honours.\textsuperscript{142}

The report stressed the desirability of giving the system a greater New Zealand flavour, incorporating Maori culture into the system, increasing the participation of women, and raising the importance of merit rather than rank or office in making awards.\textsuperscript{143} Although the recommendation to dispense with titular honours was not immediately taken up, the report did signal a major change in the honours system. Recommendations for appointments to the British orders of chivalry ceased, being replaced in 1996 by appointment to the New Zealand Order of Merit. The new order was constituted by five levels, with the first two classes being titular. The levels were familiar, based on the pattern of the British orders: Knights and Dames Grand Companion (GNZM), Knights and Dames Companion (KNZM), Companions (CNZM), Officers (ONZM) and Members (MNZM). Appointments to the New Zealand Order of Merit require ‘meritorious service to the Crown and the nation’ in any area of activity, or that the nominee is ‘distinguished by their eminence, talents, contributions or other merits’.\textsuperscript{144} As had been urged in the 1995 report, the design of the new insignia incorporated more New Zealand elements, including Maori designs.\textsuperscript{145}

The New Zealand Order of Merit currently remains the chief order to which those honoured in New Zealand are appointed, although the order itself has undergone one particularly significant change in the cessation of titular awards in May 2000. Those appointed to the first and second levels of the order, previously GNZM and KNZM or DNZM, are now known as Principal Companions (PCNZM) and Distinguished Companions (DCNZM). The Prime Minister’s Advisory Committee had argued that

\textsuperscript{142} Ibid., p. 6.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., pp. 4, 6-8, 30-32, 45, 50-57.
\textsuperscript{145} Prime Minister’s Honours Advisory Committee, pp. 7, 51-52; ‘NZ Herald of Arms celebrates 25 years in the job’, New Zealand Press Association, 5 February 2003, accessed from Factiva.
titles had 'a lustre that dims' other honours, including the higher ONZ, and Prime Minister Helen Clark was quoted as arguing that titles were eclipsing and 'devaluing our top honour'. On the other hand, some have argued that titles bestow more recognition on worthy recipients. As recently as January 2004, Richard Prebble, then leader of the centre-right ACT party, called for the return of titular honours, on the grounds that titles gave greater world recognition to the recipient. He reportedly complained that with letters after people’s names but no titles, ‘I don’t know whether they’ve received an order from the Queen or whether they’re a member of the New Zealand society of optometrists’. The higher visibility of awards with titles was also seen as a positive in a letter written to The Press, in which the writer claimed that titles before names were easily remembered, and that without them, such awards would ‘be seldom referred to’. As a woman who has received a title, Malvina Major also regards the cessation of the award of titles as 'a shame', because a title is a more visible recognition of someone’s work than letters behind their name, which people may not know are there. Major suggested in an interview that New Zealand should rather have created its own 'method of saying someone has an honour' if not referring to recipients as 'Sir'.

Neither the 1996 reforms nor the removal of titular honours affected New Zealanders’ availability for honours bestowed personally by the sovereign. The committee concluded that as they were rare, part of New Zealand’s heritage and 'of so distinct a character', they should remain available. These honours are termed 'dynastic honours', and those of relevance in the New Zealand context are the Order of the Garter,
the Royal Victorian Order, and the non-titular Order of Merit.\textsuperscript{152} As well, appointments to the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem continue, as it is a ‘semi-independent’ order, not granted on the recommendation of Cabinet ministers.\textsuperscript{153} It consists of six classes, none of which give the holder the right to use the title of ‘Sir’ or ‘Dame’.\textsuperscript{154} In this limited way, imperial ties to Britain have been preserved in honours in New Zealand. The changing availability of honours in New Zealand is summarised in the table in Figure Two below.

**Figure Two:**
Royal honours applicable in New Zealand between 1917 and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynastic Honours</th>
<th>British State Honours</th>
<th>New Zealand Royal Honours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Order of the Garter</td>
<td>The Order of the Bath</td>
<td>The New Zealand Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• KG 1348-1896</td>
<td>• GCB, KCB/DCB, CB 1725-1996</td>
<td>• GNZM, KNZM/DNZM, CNZM, ONZM, MNZM 1996- (titles removed 2000, replaced with PCNZM, DCNZM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Victorian Order</td>
<td>The Order of St Michael and St George</td>
<td>The New Zealand Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GCVO, KCVO/DCVO, CVO, LVO, MVO, RVM 1896-</td>
<td>• GCMG, KCMG/DCMG, CMG 1818-1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Order of Merit</td>
<td>The Order of the British Empire</td>
<td>Queen’s Service Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OM 1902-</td>
<td>• GBE, KBE/DBE, CBE, OBE, MBE, BEM 1917-1996</td>
<td>• QSO, QSM 1975-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight Bachelor (not an order) c. ninth century-1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Order of the Companions of Honour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CH 1917-1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
Table excludes the semi-independent Order of St John, and honours at the level of decorations. Honours in italics are non-titular.
Dates given show the years during which the honour has existed as an order. Note that the Order of St Michael and St George was re-ordered as a general colonial honour in 1868.
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Exclusivity and elitism in British honours

Central to the issue of whether or not to continue awarding titles in New Zealand was a perceived conflict between the traditionally exclusive, elite nature of the British honours system and the myth of egalitarianism in settler societies. In one sense, exclusivity has always been crucial to honours, at all levels. A recurring concern of those involved in instituting and administering royal honours has been that the awards be sufficiently exclusive as to be valued in the eyes of the public and of the recipients; as marks of royal favour, honours are intended to be select. Sir Ivan De La Bere, the Secretary of the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood between 1945 and 1960, wrote that if honours were given 'too lavishly', there would be 'little pleasure in gaining them and little pride in holding them'.155 The statutory limitations on membership that exist in most orders, usually in the titled first and second, and sometimes the third, classes of award, are a means of ensuring this exclusivity. Limits have been altered over time to accommodate the increasing numbers of people 'eligible' for awards.156

The history of the Order of the British Empire clearly displays the interplay between concerns to retain the exclusivity, and hence the value, of honours, and to have sufficient awards available to reward the deserving. Sir Frederick Ponsonby, who was the Keeper of the Privy Purse and the person who led and organised the discussions leading to the creation of the Order, raised the concern in 1917 that if it were awarded too generously, it would 'be considered of no value at all, and nobody will take it'.157 As it was, with the new order being dispensed in much greater numbers than any earlier British order of chivalry, some of those offered honours in it declined them, or expressed displeasure at not receiving a higher award or an award in a more prestigious order.158 Jokes were made about the new honour, including references to it as a 'mushroom order',
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157 Galloway, pp. 1-2, 18-19.
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as the ‘Order of the Bad Egg’ and as the ‘Order for Britain’s Everybody’.159 After initial generous use of the Order of the British Empire to reward services in World War One, awards in the order were restricted in 1922, with, for example, a total of thirty GBEs in the civil division to be created in the UK, and thirty in the Dominions.160 When the statutes were re-issued in 1970, a limit was set of forty GBEs in the civil division for the UK, and thirty-nine for the Commonwealth or in relation to foreign affairs.161

However, the exclusive nature of the British honours system was not merely based on a concern that numbers of honours given not be so high as to lower the value of the awards. The system was also an elite institution in relation to class. Until the early nineteenth century in the UK, the award of honours within the orders of chivalry was confined to those of noble birth or with high military rank.162 As the range of honours was gradually expanded, with the extension of the Order of the Bath and the creation of the Orders of St Michael and St George and the British Empire, honours did become available to a wider range of people. The Order of the British Empire has been described, on the official website of the British monarchy, as ‘the order of chivalry of the British democracy’, as it is awarded for a extensive variety of services and ‘[v]aluable service is the only criterion’.163

There remained a degree of bias on the grounds of class, however, especially in the UK. During the discussion of how many levels to include in the proposed Order of the British Empire (as it would become), and how to organise it, a remark by Ponsonby displayed the impact of class on royal honours in the early twentieth century:

159 Galloway, pp. 42-43; De la Bere, p. 146.
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If an Admiral of the Fleet jumps overboard and saves the King’s life, he gets the Grand Cross; if a Midshipman rescues the Monarch from the deep, he receives the lowest class.\textsuperscript{164}

Clearly, the issue of who received which decoration and for what, was not simply a matter of the value of the services to the country or to humanity. Anthony M. Pamm, in his 1995 reference work on honours and awards, acknowledged that class and position affected the level of honour one might receive in the UK, and even provided a table giving the usual military ranks or civil positions to whom different honours were awarded.\textsuperscript{165} Honours in the UK continue to be perceived in 2004 as ‘part of a class system, where the MBEs go to the common people and the KBEs to civil servants’.\textsuperscript{166} David Baguley agreed that class and rank had been relevant in the past to which honour or level of honour one might receive, as with gallantry decorations that had been reserved for officers. For instance, he suggested that under the British system, if a man had deserved a knighthood, class status could determine what type of knighthood was awarded, with members of distinguished families receiving more prestigious awards like the KCMG and working class men receiving the lower award of Knight Bachelor. However, he also noted that a man was often not working as a diplomat or holding high office unless he was from a particular background in any case; one’s situation in society affected one’s opportunities.\textsuperscript{167}

The elite flavour of the royal honours system in the UK was also evident in the criticism that was made of the first grants of honours to those involved in industry and commerce. From the late nineteenth century, related to the ‘social changes’ that saw the influence of the landed aristocracy decline in relation to the influence of the ‘nouveaux riches’, those made wealthy through commerce and industry, honours were increasingly

\textsuperscript{164} Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood, OBE Letters, Box 1, Sir Frederick Ponsonby to Sir Edward Troup, 20 May 1916, quoted in Galloway, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{165} Pamm, \textit{Honours and Rewards}, pp. 188-195.
\textsuperscript{167} Baguley, interview with the author, 11 May 2004.
awarded to successful commercial figures in the UK.\textsuperscript{168} The rise of self-made men in society through commerce and industry appears to have been thus paralleled by their entering the honours system and receiving titular honours. Some disapproval of these honours was expressed in the UK, focused on an elite dislike of granting royal honours, particularly at the level of the peerage, to those earning money from trade and speculation on the stock exchange, rather than to those involved in politics.\textsuperscript{169}

**Exclusivity and elitism in New Zealand?**

When the British model of honours was reproduced in the settler society of New Zealand, it might be expected that its elite nature was also reproduced. Baguley draws a distinction between practices in the UK, where he feels that an ‘unwritten’ class structure exists even now in the honours system, and in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{170} Yet, while a thorough class analysis of the New Zealand honours system’s functioning and recipients is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is suggested that there were still ways in which the honours system remained an elite institution in twentieth-century New Zealand, and this deserves further study. A number of knights engaged in commercial activity, for instance, were wealthy.\textsuperscript{171} As well, distinctions were made on the grounds of occupational status, for instance, if not by birth. A former Prime Minister did not receive the lower award of Knight Bachelor if the quotas of GCMGs and GBEs were full.\textsuperscript{172} While it was possible to come from a poor background to reach an important position, the elite nature of the honours system still existed in the predominance of awards given for medical, academic, legal, political and diplomatic services. Similarly, community service work, an important area of work for many dames, has traditionally been the preserve of elite women, who were able to give their time to it. A 1959 piece in *The Weekly News* also suggested an
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\textsuperscript{171} For example, knights appear throughout Graeme Hunt’s *The Rich List*, including Michael Fay, Patrick Goodman, Ronald Brierley, Jack Butland, Henry Kelliher, William Goodfellow, William Stevenson and many more. Hunt, pp. 194, 242, 266.
\textsuperscript{172} Townsend, p. 29.
elite strand to titular honours in New Zealand, in terms of occupation, the writer noting that in the ten years of honours lists he or she had studied, twenty-two of fifty-six knights carried a title of a sort already, such as ‘Mr Justice, or Q.C., doctor (both medical and scientific) [sic] professor or honourable’. The importance of the legal, academic and medical professions, and public service, in the careers of those given titular honours in twentieth-century New Zealand, which is further discussed in Chapters Three and Four, reflects the rise of professional society since the nineteenth century. Society remained hierarchical, albeit in a somewhat altered form, and the increased prestige attaching to the professions may thus be seen as reflected in honours granted to those involved in the professions.

Further, an elite aspect to the award of titular honours in New Zealand is suggested by an analysis of the education that knights and dames had received. Over a third of those made knights, 39.8% or 175, had obtained a university degree, or in some cases, more than one, as had at least twenty-seven (48.2%) of those made dames. As well, many knights and dames attended older or prestigious secondary schools. Among knights, thirty-seven, or 8.4%, attended the Auckland Grammar School and College; twenty-seven, or 6.1%, the Wellington College and Grammar School; twenty-three, or 5.2%, the Wanganui Collegiate School; and twenty each, or 4.5%, went to Christ’s College and Otago Boys’ High School. In comparison, schools such as New Plymouth

---

173 Investigator, p. 3. Similarly, in his study in 1977, Townsend argued that the honours system was ‘the preserve of the status conscious upper middle class’, with a majority of recipients involved in government, public service work, business and community service. Townsend, p. 94.


175 All editions of Who’s Who in New Zealand and New Zealand Who’s Who Aotearoa; Dictionary of New Zealand Biography; Taylor, The New Zealand Roll of Honour, op cit. These are conservative figures because education data was not easily available on a number of knights and dames, and because these figures do not include those who attended university but for whom no information was readily available as to whether, or with what degree, they graduated. Further research would therefore be valuable into this area, able to contribute to greater understanding of the interaction of myth and reality in terms of New Zealand’s supposedly classless identity.

176 These schools, excepting Wellington College and Grammar, were all singled out by Stevan Eldred-Grigg as prestigious schools attended by the sons of the elite and the wealthy, particularly in the nineteenth century. He also viewed King’s College, Nelson College and Waitaki Boys’ High as having a similar
Boys' High, Timaru Boys' High and Napier Boys' High all produced ten or fewer knights over the years since 1917. Among dames, patterns are much less evident, possibly due to the much smaller total number. However, a hint of a similar pattern is clear: four, or 7.1% of dames, attended Epsom Girls' Grammar School; three, or 5.4%, attended Auckland Girls' Grammar School and Otago Girls' High; and two each, or 3.6%, attended Diocesan High School for Girls in Auckland, St Mary's College in Auckland, Wellington Girls' High School or Girls' College, Solway College in Masterton and Wanganui Girls' College (see Figure Three below). Although much change did occur between 1917 and 2000, the predominance of tertiary education and of secondary education at older, prestigious schools does suggest that an elite aspect continued to exist in the award of titles in New Zealand, with old boys' and girls' networks in operation. Since those receiving this education may have more easily reached positions where honours were traditionally awarded, such as in government or the judiciary, the weighting of the honours system towards these people may be considered indirect rather than direct.

**Figure Three:**
**Schooling of knights and dames**

| Secondary schools attended by men who were knighted between 1917 and 2000 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| School                        | Number | Percent |
| Auckland Grammar and College   | 37     | 8.4    |
| Wellington College and Grammar | 27     | 6.1    |
| Wanganui Collegiate            | 23     | 5.2    |
| Christ's College               | 20     | 4.5    |
| Otago Boys' High School        | 20     | 4.5    |
| Christchurch Boys' High School | 15     | 3.4    |
| Waitaki Boys' High School      | 11     | 2.5    |
| Nelson College                 | 11     | 2.5    |
| Napier Boys' High School       | 10     | 2.3    |
| St Patrick's College           | 9      | 2.0    |
| King's College, Auckland       | 9      | 2.0    |
| Te Aute College                | 9      | 2.0    |
| Timaru Boys' High School       | 8      | 1.8    |
| Mt Albert Grammar              | 8      | 1.8    |
| Southland Boys' High School    | 7      | 1.6    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch West District High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Plymouth Boys’ High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston North Boys’ High School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough High School/College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bede’s College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutt Valley High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua District High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otahuhu College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s College, Christchurch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balclutha High School/District High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kuiti District High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimate High School/District High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore High School/District High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Grammar, Birmingham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangarei High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Technical College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Technical College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greymouth District High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburton High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrarapa College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secondary schools attended by women made dames between 1917 and 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom Girls Grammar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Girls Grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago Girls' High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan High School for Girls, Auckland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s College, Auckland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Girls’ High School/Girls College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanganui Girls College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solway College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

Percentages are rounded to one decimal place. The total of the numbers in the second column does not add to 440 or 56, as some knights and dames attended more than one school. The category of ‘other’ includes those who may not have attended high school at all and many of those who attended schools overseas, as well as those who attended other schools in New Zealand.

**Sources**

Egalitarianism, national identity and independence

Despite this strain of elitism in royal honours in New Zealand, the country’s history as a settler society without an hereditary aristocracy has led to its society being perceived as egalitarian. The recurring discourse of egalitarianism that made perceived classlessness a central aspect of national identity was crucial in the cessation of awards of titles. As early as the nineteenth century, there were some voices claiming that royal honours, particularly titles, were not appropriate to New Zealand as a ‘liberal’ and ‘democratic’ new colony that did not have the class structure of England.177 Jon Peacocke argued that the negative responses of British officials to suggestions for ‘a more formalised system of colonial honours’ before 1868 was linked to their perceiving ‘distinction and crown patronage to be almost incompatible with a manifestly egalitarian ideology in the colonies’.178 It was even suggested that titles were an ‘anachronism’ in 1881, though ironically by Robert Stout, who was later knighted himself.179

The major reason given for the cessation of titular honours in New Zealand was intimately connected to the theme of the egalitarian settler society. In the 1995 report on the honours system, the Prime Minister’s Advisory Committee reasoned that titles should be removed because they were unsuited to the ‘distinctive New Zealand character’ and did not match New Zealand’s ‘values and culture’ as they once might have.180 The Committee claimed in its report that it had recommended a system that ‘would be consistent with the egalitarian character of New Zealand society’ as well as providing recognition, while in 2004, David Baguley cited the New Zealand belief in an egalitarian society as an important reason in the removal of titles.181 Helen Clark’s comments at the time of the removal of titular honours, as presented in the media, both echoed New
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178 Peacocke, pp. 120-121, 372.
180 Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, pp. 72-73.
181 Ibid., p. 3; Baguley, interview with the author, 11 May 2004.
Zealand's settler past and referred to the present time. She argued that New Zealand was
not 'a country of inherited aristocracy', that titles were 'anachronistic', and that the issue
was a 'question of where New Zealand is today'. Clark was quoted in media reports as
saying, shortly before the changes in 2000, that 'we are not the class society of Britain',
and that awarding titles did not assist the development of a uniquely New Zealand
identity and national customs. The focus on egalitarianism in society was part of this
concern that the honours system reflect national identity. Baguley considered that,
particularly since the changes in 2000, the honours system does reflect New Zealand
identity.

On the other hand, the focus on egalitarianism was criticised in one newspaper
article as an imposed equality that cut all 'down to the same size': 'you can almost hear
the soft swish-swish of tall poppies being scythed'. This comment reflected a concern
with national identity, in that New Zealand is often said to treat harshly those who stand
out above the majority, the so-called 'tall poppy syndrome'. Simon Upton, an MP at the
time, considered that the removal of titles was an example of this syndrome in
operation. One writer connected the removal of titles to an imagined socialist tendency
on the part of the Labour Party that encouraged 'enforced egalitarianism'. In another
article, the author commented that Clark had 'decided the honours system is to be
nationalised, standardised and proletarianised in the drive to strengthen national identity
and re-establish equality'. Other aspects of New Zealand's perceived national identity
were also evoked to oppose the cessation of titular honours. New Zealand, it was
claimed, benefited from the tradition attached to British honours. In 1995, Doug
Graham, then Justice Minister, was quoted in the media arguing that British honours were

182 Laugesen, 'Knights and Dames face the knife', accessed from Factiva.
183 Brockett, 'Dames and Knights could go if review implemented', accessed from Factiva.
185 'A Labour legacy that belongs in the past', The Evening Post, 21 February 2000, accessed from Factiva.
186 Upton, accessed from Factiva.
187 'A Labour legacy', accessed from Factiva.
188 Dawe, accessed from Factiva.
'a form of tradition in a young country rather light on tradition', and that indigenous honours would not have the same 'impact'.

Not only have the changes made to New Zealand’s honours system been viewed in terms of class aspects of a perceived national character, but they have been discussed within a discourse of developing independence and nationhood. The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, on their website, contend that New Zealand’s honours system has ‘evolved along with’ the constitutional changes ‘from Crown Colony to Dominion, and from Dominion to a fully independent monarchy or realm’. Changes to the honours system were sometimes seen as steps in a process towards developing a fully New Zealand honours system that was itself a step in New Zealand’s developing nationhood. The Order of the British Empire was viewed as particularly anachronistic by the time of the 1995 review, and ‘its colonial echoes inappropriate’, with the Advisory Committee urging the completion of a shift, essentially begun with the QSO in 1975, to a national system where the Queen of New Zealand honoured the work and merit of New Zealanders. When Sir Michael Hardie Boys was the first to be invested with a GNZM under the New Zealand Order of Merit in 1997, then Prime Minister Jim Bolger claimed that the event was significant as ‘in a sense another sign of our nationhood’. Sir David Beattie, former Governor-General of New Zealand, saw the removal of titles as part of New Zealand’s heading for complete independence, and another commentator saw the step as furthering New Zealand’s ‘emotional’ independence.

New Zealand’s development as an independent state on the international stage has been much debated in academic work, particularly in relation to its foreign policy, and it has been disputed at which moment or event New Zealand reached an independent
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stance, if at all. However, in some studies, episodes in the 1970s and 1980s have been viewed as significant points in relation to New Zealand’s independence in world affairs. Such episodes include Britain’s entry into the European Economic Community and New Zealand’s consequent diversification of markets, New Zealand’s changing relationships with Australia and Asia, the oil shocks in the Middle East, the anti-nuclear movement and the crisis over ANZUS, and the sinking of the Rainbow Warrior.\textsuperscript{194} These decades, of course, were the decades in which New Zealand instituted the QSO and the ONZ, the first important moves towards a distinct New Zealand honours system. As Gavin McLean has noted, these changes in the honours system were also occurring in the context of the shift to appointing New Zealanders as Governor-General, Arthur Porritt (appointed in 1967) having been born in New Zealand, and Edward Blundell (appointed in 1972) being resident in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{195} By the time of the move to the New Zealand Order of Merit in 1996, G. A. Macaulay had written an article questioning whether or not certain official procedures were compatible with New Zealand’s constitutional status as a ‘fully independent realm’.\textsuperscript{196} In the case of the honours system, Macaulay argued that

\textsuperscript{194} For instance, Belich, pp. 391-393, 424-440; Norrish, pp. 9-19. The view of these events as turning points has been discussed by Malcolm McKinnon, who, however, argued that independence is a ‘process’ not a ‘goal’; he identified different types of independence, some of which he considered to have been ‘embedded in the New Zealand political culture’ throughout the country’s history. He also noted that other, earlier, events have been identified by other writers as being important in the development of New Zealand’s independence, including the election of the first Labour government in 1935, the passing of the Statute of Westminster in New Zealand in 1947, or the signing of the ANZUS treaty in 1951 as New Zealand’s ‘first treaty with a foreign power’. M. McKinnon, Independence and Foreign Policy: New Zealand in the World since 1935 (Auckland, 1993), pp. 1-10, 219-222, 278, 298-301. W. David McIntyre also noted the changes in New Zealand’s diplomatic and trade relationships during the 1970s and 1980s, but wrote as well of earlier changes in New Zealand’s place in the world and developing independence since 1840, and suggested that New Zealand in the 1970s and 1980s was ‘a country still uncertain of its place in the world’. McIntyre, ‘From Dual Dependency to Nuclear Free’, pp. 520-538, particularly p. 537; McIntyre, ‘Imperialism and Nationalism’, pp. 337-347. Changes in honours over the twentieth century could also be considered in the context of the tension between identity as national or imperial, and movements such as ‘cultural nationalism’ in the arts. On ‘cultural nationalism’, see P. Simpson, ‘The Recognition of Difference’, in G. W. Rice, ed., The Oxford History of New Zealand, 2nd ed. (Auckland, 1992), pp. 571-573.


there was 'no evidence' that the statutes for the British orders of chivalry were part of New Zealand law. When New Zealanders were awarded honours in those orders, the warrants of appointment gave the titles of the Queen of New Zealand, a 'different legal persona' to the Sovereign of the orders, the Queen of the United Kingdom. Macaulay's conclusion was that the New Zealand honours system was 'based on seriously defective constitutional and legal foundations' and was 'inconsistent with New Zealand's national sovereignty'. 197 Shortly after that article, of course, the New Zealand Order of Merit was established and appointments to most British honours ceased.

Further, some commentators drew links between the cessation of titular honours and a perceived movement toward New Zealand's becoming a republic. One Member of Parliament, Graham Lee, reportedly claimed that the changes to the honours system bore the hallmarks of 'republicanism', and some were unhappy with the appointment of Philip Burdon, an MP perceived to be sympathetic to republican ideas, as the chair of the committee reviewing the honours system.198 More than one popular article seemed to link the abolition of titles in 2000 to an apparent republicanism among government members, and implied that the change could be another move towards becoming a republic.199 Similar connections between honours and independence were made with regard to Australia. Alister Taylor, who has produced biographical dictionaries of those granted royal honours during particular periods for both Australia and New Zealand, wrote of his expectation of further change in the Australian system as the country undergoes 'the inevitable move to republican status'.200

A familiar pattern: honours in former British colonies and the UK

Alteration of the royal honours system to better reflect national identity and independence is a theme apparent in many former colonies. By 1996, New Zealand was one of only a few small Commonwealth nations still using British Royal honours. Of those few, some, such as Papua New Guinea, had created distinctive national honours to be used alongside British ones.\textsuperscript{201} Recommendations for British honours had stopped coming from South Africa by 1952, after the Nationalist Party had come to power in 1948. India and Pakistan both ended participation in British honours upon their independence in 1947.\textsuperscript{202} As well as the changes made to the process of awarding honours that were discussed in the Introduction, both Canada and Australia have altered the awards available to citizens. Canada abandoned the British royal honours system considerably before New Zealand, ending recommendations in 1919. Recommendations were begun once more in 1933, but stopped again after a mere three lists, although non-titular British awards were used during World War Two.\textsuperscript{203} The country was without an official system of honours for a number of years, until in 1967, the year of the Centennial of Confederation, an indigenous Canadian system was established. The Order of Canada, as it is known, has three levels (Companion, Officer and Member), and is designed to recognise ‘lifetime achievement’.\textsuperscript{204} Awards within the order are made according to merit, ‘especially service to Canada or humanity at large’, and there are no titles within it.\textsuperscript{205} Canada’s various provinces also give honours in separate provincial orders.\textsuperscript{206}

Australia has also changed its honours system, moving away from a system in which British honours were distributed as in New Zealand, to a system where a national

\textsuperscript{201}Prime Minister’s Honours Advisory Committee, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{202}Galloway, pp. 72-73.
\textsuperscript{203}Prime Minister’s Honours Advisory Committee, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{204}Canadian Honours - Honour our Best, http://www.gg.ca/honours/index_e.asp. It once had only one class (Companions), as well as two medals (the Medal of Courage and the Medal of Service). Prowse, p.157.
\textsuperscript{205}Ibid., pp. 157-158.
honour, the Order of Australia, is the chief award available. The Order of Australia was created in 1975, with three non-titular levels, to which an upper level of knights and dames was added in 1976, after a new Government was installed. In 1986, the titles of Knight and Dame were removed from the order, although those who were honoured between 1976 and 1986 could continue to hold their titles and rank. The Order of Australia now has three levels and an associated medal: Companions (AC), Officers (AO) and Members (AM), and the Medal of the Order of Australia (OAM). Over 14,000 people have received honours in the Order of Australia since its creation in 1975. Like the Canadian system, the Order of Australia is given for services ‘to Australia or to humanity’. Unlike the changes made to the Canadian system however, Australia has retained some links to the British system. The new honours in Australia were incorporated into the previous order of precedence, whereas ‘all Canadian awards rank ahead of any Imperial awards’. Australian connection to the British system is further maintained by the continuation of the practice of announcing honours on the Queen’s official birthday, while a national flavour appears in the practice of announcing a list on Australia Day.

These changes towards more indigenous systems of honour have been understood within a discourse of national identity and pride. The Canadian honours system was compared with a national flag and a national anthem, in that it was to become a way ‘of fostering national unity and pride of country’. Taylor stressed that, after the changes made to it, the Australian ‘national honours system’ had ‘developed a real Australian
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identity'. 213 Among former colonies, national identity has often been discussed in terms of egalitarianism. As in New Zealand, the issue of titular honours was mentioned in Canada in relation to this perceived national characteristic. A. E. Prowse, in discussing the new Order of Canada in 1969, wrote that the absence of titles within the order and the lack of special privileges for recipients were ‘[i]n conformity with its distinctly Canadian character’. 214

Issues of colonialism and imperialism have not been ignored in the UK in relation to honours either. In the 1960s, the possibility of a change of name for the Order of the British Empire was raised in the United Kingdom, both at the popular level of letters to the editor published in newspapers and at the level of government. A variety of reasons were put forward for not changing it, such as lack of a demand from Commonwealth nations, the precedent of other orders existing with ‘obsolete’ names, and that a whiff of the past was no bad thing for an order of chivalry. 215 Honours in the UK are currently being reviewed, and the New Zealand DPMC has corresponded with the UK on this. 216 A report produced by the House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee contained a recommendation that, among other measures, the Order of the British Empire become the Order of British Excellence, as its name was ‘anachronistic and insensitive’ because of the echoes of imperialism. 217 The report also recommended that knighthoods and damehoods, as awards carrying class and rank connotations, be removed within five years, and that the number of available honours be reduced, meaning that, for instance, the Orders of the Garter and the Bath cease to be used. 218 Moreover, Baguley noted that
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Australia had once been told the ‘Palace’ would not be amenable to the renewal of titles. He considered that New Zealand ‘would be politely told it’s too late’ if a future government attempted to reverse the changes.219

What about the women? Women and honours

For the most part, women’s association with royal honours has been ignored in public discussion on the New Zealand honours system, the focus having been on the myth of egalitarianism, on class as it related to New Zealand’s national identity as a supposedly classless society. There has been a brief mention of the numerical inequality women experienced in the honours system, connected to the concern to alter New Zealand’s system to make it more relevant today; this concern, in the context of an increasingly multicultural society, has also encompassed race.220 Under the current system, an attempt is made to include numbers of female recipients of honours that reflect their numbers in society, as far as is possible according to the nominations. There are no quotas, however, either for women or for Maori, since such a system would be ‘impossible to police’ and would in any case ‘distort’ the system, presumably in the sense that it is a system based on nominations.221

Efforts to increase the numerical participation of women in the honours system reflect the limited nature of female participation in honours during the twentieth century. Women have not been honoured as regularly, or in the same numbers, as men, as is evident from even a cursory survey of the statistics. The first dame to appear in the New Zealand Gazette was the Countess of Liverpool, granted a GBE in 1918, nearly three-quarters of a century after New Zealand’s first knight, George Grey, was granted a KCB in 1848. The first woman born in New Zealand to be made a dame was Elizabeth Gilmer, who received the DBE in 1951, over a century after Grey’s honour. Still later, Te Arikinui Te Atairangikaahu, the Maori Queen, became in 1970 the first Maori woman

220 For example, Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, pp. 50-57.
221 Baguley, interview with the author, 11 May 2004.
made a dame, also given a DBE.\textsuperscript{222} Women received 25% of the honours awarded at all levels in 1950, a figure higher than might be expected given women's place in society. Yet even between 1991 and 1995, on average, only 40% of the honours granted went to women, excepting in 1993, the centenary of women's suffrage in New Zealand, when they received 51%.\textsuperscript{223}

Moreover, most of the honours granted to women in New Zealand have been awards of a lower level, where the percentage representation of women was significantly higher than at the higher levels. Of all awards of the OBE and the MBE gazetted between 1917 and 2000, of all divisions, 22.2% went to women. Women have received 32.1% of all QSOs gazetted since 1975, and 48.0% of all awards of the lower QSM. Only 11.2% of the titular honours, of all types, that were gazetted between 1917 and 2000 went to women.\textsuperscript{224} A mere fifty-eight awards bestowing the title of 'Dame' have been granted since 1917, thirty-one of those between 1985 and 1995, compared with seventy-nine knighthoods in those same ten years.\textsuperscript{225} These fifty-eight honours have created fifty-six dames in New Zealand, as Catherine Tizard has received three honours at the titular level. In contrast, a total of 458 knighthoods have been announced in the \textit{New Zealand Gazette} since 1917. Of those, eighteen men have been granted an honour bestowing a title more than once, with one of those, Paul Reeves, having received three honours at the titular level, meaning a total of 440 knights have been created and announced in the \textit{New Zealand Gazette} honours lists since 1917. As well as these knights, one additional knight was created, that is, extra to the statutory numerical limit on awards, and two knights were created on the separate Cook Islands list published in the \textit{New Zealand Gazette}.\textsuperscript{226}

Even after the institution of the New Zealand Order of Merit, only ten dames were

\textsuperscript{223} Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{224} 'Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000', see Appendix One.
\textsuperscript{225} Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, p. 57; 'Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000', see Appendix One.
\textsuperscript{226} These knights were Bernard Freyberg in 1944, Albert Henry in 1974 and Geoffrey Henry in 1992. 'Database of titular honours, 1917-2000', see Appendix Two.
created in that order, including one GNZM, compared to 24 knights, including 2 GNZMs.\(^{227}\)

Although the figures show far fewer women have received titular honours in New Zealand than men, New Zealand has been said to have a high percentage of recipients of the DBE when compared with the number of awards as a percent of the population in the UK.\(^{228}\) When Walker published in 1986, he recorded ‘approximately 3,500’ knights and ‘over 200’ dames, making female recipients approximately 6% of the total recipients of titular honours. He wrote that ‘the seventeen to one ratio is a sign of quite how equal women are seen to be by the British establishment’, though he noted that the ratio was better than that of women in the House of Lords (fifty-nine of 1202 or 20:1) or the House of Commons (twenty-three of 650 or 27:1) at that time.\(^{229}\) Nearly twenty years later, Baguley stated that honours at all levels in the UK are still ‘heavily weighted’ towards men, more so than in New Zealand.\(^{230}\) In a 2004 review, Sir Hayden Phillips reported that honours to women had increased in the UK in the past decade, from 27% to 37%, with 21% of awards at the level of CBE or above being granted to women.\(^{231}\) The aims of that review included that the ‘full and diverse range of society’ be ‘increasingly reflected’ in awards, as well as that the ‘transparency’ of the process be increased and that there be more ‘independence’ from government and civil service in the recommendations for honours.\(^{232}\) In Australia too, of the awards at all levels made within the Order of Australia by 2004, 29.5% had been given to women, a figure less than New Zealand’s average of 40% of all honours between 1991 and 1995.\(^{233}\)
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\(^{228}\) Taylor, *The New Zealand Roll of Honour*, p. 34.
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\(^{232}\) Ibid., p. 4.
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Conclusion

The potential for an honours system not dominated by an elite remained at least partially unrealised in twentieth-century New Zealand. At various times, royal honours were discussed in relation to New Zealand's supposed classlessness and the myth of egalitarianism, which were central to a perceived national identity, yet the institution of honours was grounded in the elite nature of the British system. While honours must retain a level of exclusivity and confer prestige if they are to be valued and accepted by potential recipients, honours in New Zealand between 1917 and 2000, reproducing the British pattern, were also exclusive in less positive ways, if to a lesser degree than in the UK. Recent alterations to the New Zealand honours system have attempted to reflect concepts of New Zealand identity, particularly egalitarianism, without removing the royal element of the honours system. While these heavy modifications to the institution have allowed links to New Zealand's heritage to be maintained within a national honours system, the numerical inequality of women within the honours system has not been similarly recognised and addressed. In simply numerical terms, the honours system in New Zealand reproduced the male norm of the British institution in the colonial setting, and that male norm was perpetuated throughout the period between 1917 and 2000. More significantly, the persistence of this numerical imbalance between men and women in relation to honours, particularly titles, suggests that traditional gender roles and identities have been implicated in the honours system throughout its history.
Chapter Two

In her own right: feminism, ideas of femininity and titles for women

Women’s association with royal honours in New Zealand has not merely been a matter of numbers. For most of its history, the British honours system excluded women, apart from as the wives of men who were knighted. The male norm of the system was effectively transferred to New Zealand, and continued to affect women’s participation in honours long after women were given entry to them. That male dominance was particularly evident in the awards that conferred a title, those at the upper echelon of the system. Changing circumstances and experiences in women’s lives during the twentieth century, and the shifting waves of the feminist movement, influenced the institution of honours, embedded as it was in society. Yet despite the change in women’s lives, and in their relationship with royal honours, the contradictions evident in the female experience of titular honours awarded between 1917 and 2000 suggested underlying continuities in women’s association with royal honours and in women’s expected roles in society. Throughout the period, women who were made dames remained ‘exceptions to the rule’ simply because they were present in the ranks of the titled as women who were honoured in their own right rather than as the wives of honoured men.

Receiving a title: the accolade and a woman’s title

Titled women were present in society long before the creation of the Order of the British Empire with its provision for the creation of dames. Wives of knights were styled ‘Lady’, followed by their (husband’s) surname, and this tradition continued throughout the twentieth century as well. According to Debrett’s Handbook of Australia and New Zealand, the title of ‘Dame’ was in the past also used for the wife of a knight, being followed by the wife’s Christian name; this style is now found only in legal
The word 'dame' is derived from the Latin, *domina*, meaning 'lady'. These women were honoured as the wives of men who had been rewarded with titles. The crucial difference when women were admitted to the Order of the British Empire as dames was that they were honoured in their own right, for their own efforts, rather than as the helpmate of a successful man. The title ‘Dame’ then signalled that the holder had been honoured in her own right. Like Antonia Fraser’s ‘warrior queens’, these women were exceptional, females present in their own right in an institution traditionally gendered masculine, not as the consort of a man.

However, in at least one way the honours system continued to assume a male norm in relation to titular honours, even after the title of ‘Dame’ became available to women to signify achievement in their own right. Women did not receive the accolade, the traditional touch on the shoulder with a sword, and were therefore not knighted when they were granted awards in the first or second classes of an order of chivalry, although such honours would usually confer knighthood. Members of the clergy, at least in the Anglican church, and those not subjects of the Crown were also refused the accolade, and thus not knighted when given these awards. The refusal to give the accolade to women, and clergy, as to men may appear a fine distinction, merely semantic, particularly when women still receive a title and many members of the public would be unaware of the difference. In an interview, Malvina Major stressed that the granting of the title of ‘Dame’ to a woman was an equivalent to the title of ‘Sir’ for men, and that although the accolade was not used, ‘it is considered the same ceremony’. However, the implications of who has been granted participation in this custom of the accolade, and who has not, are highly suggestive.
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Since members of the clergy in the Church of England are not given the accolade, they do not use the title ‘Sir’, although they may use the appropriate post-nominal letters, and their wives remain ‘Mrs’, rather than becoming ‘Lady’.\(^{238}\) While women do receive the title of ‘Dame’ when given a titular honour, or ‘Lady’ in a few cases, they do not do so on the same basis as men who receive the title ‘Sir’, because they are denied the accolade. Members of the clergy are believed to have been refused the accolade and knighthood because, as ‘Men of God’ who ought not to be ‘attacked with the sword’, they should not use weapons of war in combat, and thus should not be made knights, since a knight was intended to fight.\(^{239}\) Presumably, the explanation for the exclusion of women from knighthood, the denial of the accolade, is similar. Women have traditionally been seen as life-givers who were naturally peaceful. Having less physical strength than men, and fulfilling the role of the mothers of the race, women have been viewed as in need of protection, and war as a male occupation.\(^{240}\) Knights were supposed to ‘protect the weak, including women, widows and orphans’.\(^{241}\) When it was suggested in 1968 that the Order of the Bath be opened to women, one concern that was raised was that knights promised to ‘Defend Maidens, Widows and Orphans’.\(^{242}\) Some feminists also accepted the idea of a link between women and peace, arguing that war stemmed from ‘aggressive masculine values’, and might cease if women held the positions of leadership in the world.\(^{243}\)

\(^{238}\) Duke, ed., p. 200; Honours and Titles in Britain, p. 11
\(^{239}\) De la Bere, p. 32; Honours and Titles in Britain, p. 11, fn 1.
\(^{240}\) Fraser, pp. 326-330.
\(^{241}\) Boulton, p. 10.
\(^{243}\) Fraser, pp. 328-330, original emphasis.
Recipients of honorary titular awards, that is, those not subjects of the Crown, also do not use the title before their name, though they can use the appropriate letters after it. However, honorary awards are separated from ordinary membership in the orders of chivalry in other ways as well. Statutory limits on membership numbers do not apply to honorary awards, such awards are generally not gazetted, and they are usually not announced with the New Year and Queen’s Birthday lists. Because honorary awards are given to people in countries where Queen Elizabeth II is not the head of state, these differences in award are an issue of citizenship, and of the prior allegiance of the recipient to a foreign state. Yet in a sense, women who have received titular honours are ‘honorary knights’, given an award but not receiving the accolade in a similar way to that in which foreigners have been honoured, and having entered a system that assumed a male norm. Women may be considered as having been symbolically placed as foreigners in that they entered a male-dominated system with military antecedents. Further, the limited nature of titular awards given to women and to clergy as people who do not bear arms is suggestive of their also having limited citizenship, as in earlier warrior democracies. It has been argued, for instance, that early class democracy in Switzerland was linked to wide participation in the military among the male population, and the basis of democracy found in the ideal of the citizen-soldier. Women were unable to share in this ideal because they did not participate in the military, and this provides at least partial explanation for their remarkably late enfranchisement in that state. Viewed through
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245 O’Shea, p. 52.
246 B. Barber and P. Watson, The Struggle for Democracy (Boston, 1988), pp. 151-157. Women in Switzerland received the vote federally in 1972. Ibid., p. 151. The process of explaining the extension of the suffrage to women requires note to be taken of different contexts, and early enfranchisement in other states, such as New Zealand, requires alternate explanation. Others have, however, noted the conceptual links between war and citizenship in terms of masculinity. For example, G. Lloyd, ‘Selfhood, war and masculinity’, in C. Pateman and E. Gross, eds., Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory (Boston, 1987), pp. 64, 76. Conversely, as Marian Sawer has pointed out, social liberal understandings of ‘service’, the efforts of citizens that allowed ‘claims [to] be made upon the state’, was ‘gender-neutral’, and thus could encompass women’s unpaid work. M. Sawer, The Ethical State? Social Liberalism in Australia (Carlton, 2003), p. 89.
this perspective, women granted titles can be seen as 'honorary knights' in that, like those from other states who were granted honorary knighthood, they lacked citizenship, or at least had only limited citizenship.

One of the ironies of female participation in the titular levels of royal honours is that women have at rare times in history bestowed the accolade upon men, an act that seems as much associated with war and weapons as receiving the accolade. Indeed, the active creation of a knight through performing the accolade might be seen as more powerful than passively receiving it to be created as a knight. The women who have given the accolade to men in the UK were those 'singular exceptions', women who ruled, Fraser's 'warrior queens'. However, in at least one account of such an incident, the masculine essence of the action was preserved. Queen Victoria found the Sword of State too weighty for her to lift when she was to bestow the GCB on the Earl of Durham, and 'the ensuing awkwardness was overcome when Lord Melbourne supported it', and Victoria "only inclined it".

Women's titles, moreover, have been the subject of considerable confusion. According to Phyllis Guthardt, 'people never know what to call it', some referring to it as a 'knighthood', while she herself has often termed it 'my damenation'. In one magazine article, after noting that Marie Clay had been made a dame, reference was made to her 'knighthood'. Ngaio Marsh, a well-known writer of crime fiction and a prominent figure in New Zealand theatrical production, was known to call her honour 'me damery'. Guthardt also noted confusion over the proper use of the title 'Lady' in relation to that of 'Dame'. A Lady should be referred to by her title and her husband's last name, whereas a Dame, honoured in her own right, should be referred to by her title

247 Indeed, Raymond Waddington has pointed out that 'surprisingly little attention' has been given to Elizabeth's being 'the head of a male chivalric order'. Waddington, p. 103.
248 Risk, p. 55.
249 Guthardt, Dame Phyllis, interview with the author, 29 September 2004, Christchurch.
and her first name.\textsuperscript{252} Similarly, in an interview, Malvina Major stated that sometimes she was referred to as ‘Dame Major’ and sometimes just as ‘Dame’, rather than as Dame Malvina, while on other occasions, ‘people don’t know quite what ... to do, so they avoid it altogether’, or write ‘Ms’ in correspondence.\textsuperscript{253} Catherine Tizard too, was quoted in one article as saying that ‘[n]obody knows how to handle a woman’s title’, and that she had once been called ‘Mr Dame Tizard’.\textsuperscript{254} For some years after the decision to use the title of ‘Dame’ for women who received first and second class honours in the Order of the British Empire, there were suggestions that it was not as appropriate a title as ‘Lady’ would have been. When a new honour was suggested for women, to be equivalent to the honour of Knight Bachelor for men, one civil servant wrote that ‘Lady’ would be ‘a more pleasant and popular title than that of Dame’, as the latter title would ‘remain in the public mind for years to come as a description of a woman of great age, a widow, or a mistress of a school for young children’. In the same commentary, it was suggested that women granted the GBE or the DBE should be able to use either the prefix of ‘Dame’ or of ‘Lady’.\textsuperscript{255} These proposals were not accepted, and it was recognised that to do so would have raised the danger of women granted titles in their own right in the Order of the British Empire sliding into ‘the miscellany’ of the variety of positions that a holder of the title of ‘Lady’ may have.\textsuperscript{256} Confusion over a woman’s title suggests again the male norm of the honours system, and the situation of women having no such title in their own right for many centuries.

**Opening the honours system to female participation**

Although honours have been awarded for hundreds of years, all of the orders of chivalry applicable in New Zealand have only been opened to women in the twentieth

\textsuperscript{252} Guthardt, interview with the author, 29 September 2004.
\textsuperscript{253} Major, interview with the author, 4 November 2004.
\textsuperscript{254} Fleming, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{255} Cabinet Office, Ceremonial Branch, H 13, Memorandum from Sir Warren Fisher to the Prime Minister, 21 March 1933, quoted in Galloway, pp. 54-55.
\textsuperscript{256} Cabinet Office, Ceremonial Branch, H 13, Note on the title ‘Dame’ by Sir Christopher Bullock, Permanent Secretary, Air Ministry, 18 July 1933, quoted in Galloway, p. 55.
century. Outside those orders, the non-titular RRC was the first important award available in New Zealand to women. Established in 1883, it was in fact a solely female honour until 1976.\textsuperscript{257} It took longer for titular honours to be opened to women. Before the establishment of the Order of the British Empire in 1917, the few women to have received a title through admission to an order of chivalry rather than as the wife of a knight were found among royal women, though not always ruling queens. Although Edward III, the founder of the Order of the Garter, did create Ladies of the Garter, this practice does not suggest any real equality for women in terms of the awarding of titular honours. Edward’s wife and two daughters were made Ladies of the Garter, and there were fifty-nine women so honoured between 1348 and 1461.\textsuperscript{258} This was not ‘full membership’, however; it has been described as ‘a sort of quasi-admission to the order’, and it appears that those ladies who were granted the insignia and allowed to join in the order’s ceremonial proceedings were not seen as ‘regular members’ of the order.\textsuperscript{259} Moreover, the custom soon fell into disuse, as later monarchs were hostile to female participation in the order, and while it was renewed in 1902 with Edward VII’s appointment of Queen Alexandra by special statute, only royal women were appointed between then and 1987, when the order was opened to women.\textsuperscript{260} As well, ‘queens regnant’ such as Queen Elizabeth II, that is, those ruling in their own right rather than as a consort, were Sovereign of the Order.\textsuperscript{261} Excepting these few royal women, therefore, titles in one’s own right were not available to women within the British royal honours system until 1917.

\textsuperscript{257} Prime Minister’s Honours Advisory Committee, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{258} Taylor, The Australian Roll of Honour, p. 14; Collins, pp. 301-303.
\textsuperscript{259} Boulton, p. 142; De la Bere, p. 76; The Queen’s Role in the Modern State: Sovereign as Fountain of Honour: Orders of Chivalry: Order of the Garter, \url{http://www.royal.gov.uk/textonly/Page490.asp}; Collins, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{260} De la Bere, pp. 77-78; Taylor, The Australian Roll of Honour, p. 14. In effect, the order ‘remained exclusively male’ from 1509, when Henry VII’s mother, Lady Margaret Beaufort, died, until 1901, when Queen Alexandra was appointed. The Queen’s Role in the Modern State: Sovereign as Fountain of Honour: Orders of Chivalry: Order of the Garter, \url{http://www.royal.gov.uk/textonly/Page490.asp}.
\textsuperscript{261} De la Bere, pp. 77-78; The Queen’s Role in the Modern State: Sovereign as Fountain of Honour: Orders of Chivalry: Order of the Garter, \url{http://www.royal.gov.uk/textonly/Page490.asp}. 
By the time of the change to the New Zealand Order of Merit in 1996, women were eligible for all honours given in New Zealand, except that of Knight Bachelor. These honours had only been opened to women slowly, and that slow process reveals a telling correlation. Last to be opened to women were the oldest and most prestigious orders. The most recently created order, the Order of the British Empire, was available to women essentially from its inception. The Royal Victorian Order, founded in 1896, was opened to women in 1936; the Order of St Michael and St George, reordered in 1868, in 1965; and the Order of the Bath, constituted as an order in 1725, in 1971. The Order of the Garter, the highest order of chivalry in terms of social precedence, was instituted in 1348 and opened to female membership in 1987. The other orders of chivalry that were available in New Zealand follow the Garter in order of precedence, in the opposite order to that by which they were opened to women (see Figure Four below). The sole exception to this pattern is the honour of Knight Bachelor, which has never been opened to women and comes after the titular classes of the orders of chivalry in terms of precedence. However, it does fit the pattern in that it is also the oldest of the honours bestowing knighthood.

Figure Four
Honours bestowing knighthood in New Zealand, 1917-2000, by precedence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precedence (high to low)</th>
<th>Date established</th>
<th>Date opened to women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order of the Garter</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of the Bath</td>
<td>1725*</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of St Michael and St George</td>
<td>1868**</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Victorian Order</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order of the British Empire</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1917/1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight Bachelor</td>
<td>Thirteenth century, at least</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* date when constituted as order  
** date when re-ordered as general colonial honour

The exclusion of women from honours for so long, particularly old and prestigious honours, contributed to the numerical inequality of women in the honours.

262 'Honours and Women', provided by the Honours Secretariat, DPMC, 2003.
system, most of all at the level of titular honours. The exclusion of women from the relatively common title of Knight Bachelor, or from access to an equivalent title, which continued in New Zealand until 1996 and still continues in the UK, was a particularly significant cause of inequality in relation to titular awards. Various proposals were made throughout the twentieth century to remedy this situation, but none were implemented. As early as 1932, it was suggested by Sir Herbert Samuel, Home Secretary and leader of the Liberal Party in England, that a title of ‘Dame’ be created to be given outside an order. 264 There appears to have been an intention to begin awarding an honour termed ‘Lady of Grace’ that was dropped in 1933. 265 The issue arose again in the UK in 1965, when Elizabeth Lane became the first female Judge in the High Court, as High Court Judges customarily received the honour of Knight Bachelor. The Lord Chancellor, Lord Gardiner, wanted her to receive a knighthood and the title of ‘Lady’, but was advised that ‘there is no precedent’ and that giving her a knighthood ‘may arouse ill-feeling among a number of distinguished ladies who have been created Dames of the Victorian and British Empire Orders’. 266 Instead, Lane received a DBE, as did other women appointed as High Court Judges in later years. 267 In 1975, the need for a title equivalent to Knight Bachelor for women was again noted in the UK, when it was recognised that the lack of such a title limited the honours available to women. 268 However, there was again no success, it being said that there could be nothing ‘less attractive than... a Dame Spinster’ for women. 269 The suggestion of a title of ‘Dame Bachelor’ appears to have been neither made nor received with any enthusiasm. 270

264 Galloway, p. 54.
265 Ibid., p. 55.
266 Cabinet Office, Ceremonial Branch, H 13A, Sir George Coldstream to Derek Mitchell, 15 September 1965, quoted in Galloway, p. 55.
267 Galloway, p. 55.
268 Ibid., p. 56.
269 Cabinet Office, Ceremonial Branch, H 13, Kenneth Stowe to Norman Warner, 24 June 1975, quoted in Galloway, p. 56.
270 Galloway, pp. 56-57.
The honour of DBE thus became ‘generally accepted’ as the equivalent to a Knight Bachelor, and it was suggested in 1975 that the quota of DBEs and KBEs should simply be increased when necessary. It has been recently claimed that, although ‘discriminatory in form’, the exclusion of women from the honour of Knight Bachelor is not ‘discriminatory in impact’ since ‘there is no evidence that women who merit an honour at that level do not receive one because of the existence of this distinction’. However, this solution must be unsatisfactory, as the quota placed on the award of the DBE cannot possibly allow for as many women to be honoured as men, who have available both the KBE and the honour of Knight Bachelor. Moreover, to simply increase the quota of DBEs and KBEs when necessary cannot be thought to solve this imbalance, as it would also allow for more KBEs to be created. Clearly, since Knights Bachelor are by far the largest group of knights in New Zealand, and KBEs the second largest, there is an inherent gender inequality created in the honours system when women have available the DBE but no equivalent to the Knight Bachelor.

A century of change: feminism and the honours system

Extending membership of orders of chivalry to women is one of a number of rights women have gained in the UK, in New Zealand and elsewhere during the last century or so. The opening of honours to women during the twentieth century has occurred in the context of changes in the position and experiences of women, and the shifting waves of the feminist movement. First wave feminism was largely a liberal feminism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that focused on natural equality and individual civil liberties. This first wave of the feminist movement was
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271 Cabinet Office, Ceremonial Branch, H 13, P. S. Milner-Barry to Kenneth Stowe, 10 July 1975, quoted in Galloway, p. 57.
273 It appears that numerical quotas of recipients are not divided according to whether the award creates a dame or a knight. To increase the quota of DBEs, then, would simply require an increase in the total number of awards of the second class of the Order of the British Empire that could be made (both KBE and DBE). Pamm, Honours and Rewards, pp. 179, 182-187; Galloway, pp. 50-51, 57; 'Statutes of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire' (1970), pp. 5-6.
centred on the women’s suffrage movement. In New Zealand, suffrage for women was achieved in 1893, well before the title of ‘Dame’ was made available to women in the Order of the British Empire. However, in the UK, where the Order was created, winning the vote took much longer, and it was not until 1918 that women were partially enfranchised, just after the establishment of the Order. In Burke’s Handbook to the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, published in 1921, it was noted that women’s being given entry to the order ‘coincided’ with the granting of female suffrage in the UK, and this statement was followed with considerable praise of their contributions to the war effort.

Indeed, it has been argued that women’s contribution to the war effort had an impact on the timing of their winning the vote in the UK. During the war, militant suffragette action by the Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU) had ceased, and the non-militant National Union of Women’s Suffrage Societies (NUWSS), despite internal division, supported war work rather than taking a pacifist stance. Some former opponents of female suffrage, such as Asquith, alluded to the importance of women’s war work, as well as to a desire to avoid renewed militancy, in changing their stance to one of acceptance of at least limited enfranchisement. While historians continue to debate the extent of the impact of the female contribution to the war effort on their gaining the suffrage, it seems that the mobilisation of women in World War One did intersect with other factors in the enfranchisement of women. In the case of honours, women’s war
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275 Thorpe, ed., p. 11.
277 A. Rosen, Rise Up, Women! The Militant Campaign of the Women’s Social and Political Union, 1903-1914 (London and Boston, 1974), pp. 256-265. However, Harold Smith has argued that a number of those who voted for extending the franchise to women had not in fact altered their beliefs on the issue, but merely ‘changed sides’ for practical reasons, such as to avoid renewed militancy, or because they considered ‘that reform was inevitable’. Smith, pp. 67-68.
278 Rosen, pp. 255-266; Smith, pp. 55, 60; C. Rover, Women’s Suffrage and Party Politics in Britain, 1866-1914 (London, 1967), pp. 205-206. Sandra Stanley Holton, on the other hand, argued that women’s own work in the suffrage movement had put their ‘cause’ in a ‘strong position’ by 1914, and even suggested that
work does appear to have been important in their being included in the Order of the British Empire when it was established to reward the population’s war effort. As it was explained in *Burke’s Handbook*:

> The womanhood of the country was marshalled and mobilised as never before, and showed an equal courage and an equal endurance with the men, and that great outstanding fact was not forgotten by those who framed the Statutes of the Order of the British Empire.²⁷⁹

Although it is not inconceivable that women’s contribution to the war effort would have been thus recognised without the context of the first wave feminist movement, the demand for equality may have helped to produce an environment in which such recognition was more likely. The first wave feminist movement had created a climate in which women’s concerns, particularly the liberal feminist claim for equality of opportunity, were more visible. Within that climate, during the early twentieth century, women had received entry to the Order of Merit as well, in 1902, with, as already mentioned, Florence Nightingale receiving this honour in 1907.²⁸⁰

An awareness of women’s interests is evident in comments made by Ponsonby, at the time when proposals for the Order were being made and women’s participation discussed:

> ...opinion is divided as to whether women would prefer a separate Decoration of their own. In recent years the Suffragette movement has rendered it difficult to create such an Order, or even discuss its creation in a calm atmosphere, but now the difficulty does not arise.²⁸¹

²⁷⁹ Thorpe, ed., p. 9.

²⁸⁰ Delahunt, p. 66; ‘Honours and Women’, Honours Secretariat. Indeed, it may be that the disputed links between the granting of the suffrage and the impact of the war could be further tested by comparisons with the opening of honours to women, as well as with colonial experiences of the granting of the suffrage.

²⁸¹ Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood, OBE Institution Letters Box, Memorandum by Sir Frederick Ponsonby, November 1915, quoted in Galloway, p. 3.
Yet these statements suggest that the admittance of women to the new Order on equal terms with men was not simply a straightforward consequence of the first wave feminist movement. Ponsonby’s words also hint that, as with the suffrage, women’s turn to patriotic efforts during the war, and the concurrent cessation of militant feminist action, may have made it more possible to solve the question of women’s inclusion in honours. In the institution of the first order of chivalry where women were able to receive titular honours in their own right, the feminist movement’s pressure for equal opportunity appears to have interacted with entrenched conservatism.

Over the period of almost a century between the title of ‘Dame’ becoming available to women in the Order of the British Empire and the cessation of awards of titular honours in New Zealand, the lists published in the *New Zealand Gazette* display a clear, if rather unsteady, increase in the volume of all honours given to both men and women. This trend is also visible in the UK, and the increase in New Zealand was likely concurrent with that in the UK, as the limitations on membership were increased in British orders. Awards of the civil division of the MBE in New Zealand, for instance, totalled forty-four in the 1930s, and had reached 492 in the decade between 1990 and 1999. The population of course increased as well, but while there was a slight increase in the percentage of the population to have received honours each census year from 1971 to 1991, that percentage never rose above 0.1% in any census year during the whole period from 1917 to 1996.282 Numbers of titular honours granted also increased over time, although the pattern is more uneven, particularly between men and women. Twenty-five grants of the title of Knight Bachelor were made between 1950 and 1959, rising to fifty-nine between 1980 and 1989, while KBEs of both divisions rose from eight in the 1930s
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282 This figure was calculated including all honours granted in orders of chivalry or their associated medals, and honours in non-titular awards of a similar level, such as the CH. The calculation was made using: ‘Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000’, see Appendix One; *1996 Census of Population and Dwellings: Population and Dwellings Statistics* (Wellington, 1997), p. 19. In 1959, one criticism made of honours in New Zealand was that the ‘number of honours awarded in 1959 does not appear to have increased in relation to the growth of New Zealand’s population’, particularly regarding titles. Investigator, p. 3.
to a high of twenty-eight in the 1970s. An increase also occurred in the award of the title of ‘Dame’ in New Zealand, the chief difference being that the vast majority of dames were created after 1970. Before 1970, there had been only a handful of titular honours given to women in New Zealand: three GBEs and three DBEs. Indeed, a mere eleven women were made dames in New Zealand before 1980.283 One dame was created in the 1960s, and five in the 1970s; the more significant increase occurred then, with the number of dames created in a decade more than doubling, to fifteen in the 1980s (see Tables One to Five, Appendix One).284

The majority of dames in New Zealand have, then, been created since 1980, following the second wave of feminism connected with the counter-culture climate of the 1960s and 1970s. The counter-culture climate encompassed movements connected to three major cleavages in society, all questioning the hegemonic: race (the anti-racist and civil rights movement), class (the socialist movement) and gender (the second wave feminist movement). The second wave of the feminist movement saw an increase in ‘organisation and militancy among women’.285 Second wave feminism incorporated a variety of different incarnations of feminism, from radical to socialist to liberal, and the first women’s liberation groups in New Zealand were formed at this time, espousing a more radical form of feminism. These groups addressed a wide variety of issues, including equal pay, abortion rights, availability of child-care centres and, more widely, women’s role in society.286 As well as protest aimed at achieving particular aims, consciousness-raising groups and events such as the International Women’s Year and the United Nations Decade for Women emphasised the value of women’s contributions and abilities both within and apart from a domestic setting.287

283 ‘Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000’, see Appendix One.
284 Ibid.
285 Dann, p. 4.
286 Ibid., preface, pp. 1-10.
The immense increase, proportionally, in the number of titular honours given to women in New Zealand after 1980 suggests that the second wave of feminism had an important impact on the royal honours system, perhaps more so than the first wave. Rather than merely having the right to be given titles for their own achievements but rarely receiving them, women in New Zealand from 1970 more often actually received those titles. Ann Hercus, who was granted a DCMG in 1988, linked the changing statistics of female participation in honours to the influence of feminism, as well as to efforts by Labour Governments ‘since the 1970s ... to redress the very obvious imbalance’. Since the 1970s, there have been important changes in New Zealand society, including a shift away from the traditional nuclear family, a trend toward women having children later and an increase in the numbers of women employed, including employed mothers. By 1993, it was written in a history of women in New Zealand that they had a ‘wide choice of occupations’ and were not ‘faced with the stark choice of marriage or a career’. The strength of the women’s movement in the 1970s and early 1980s did not immediately translate into greatly increased awards of titular honours, and there was no hegemonic feminism with one programme, but rather different strands of feminism with different focuses. However, the visibility of the second wave feminist movement, and the changes in women’s status in society, may have created a climate in which due to the efforts of many feminists, there was an increased awareness of women’s contributions to society.

The intersection of the second wave feminist movement with the royal honours system in New Zealand was also apparent among the female recipients of titles.
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288 Hercus, Dame Ann, personal communication with the author, October 2004. It should be noted that detailed study of the distribution of honours during periods of Labour government compared with those of National government could provide further insight into the links between the honours system and the political and social climate. Townsend considered this issue in relation to honours awarded between 1969 and 1976, finding, however, ‘a remarkable degree of similarity’ in honours awarded under Labour and National, at least in relation to titles. Townsend, pp. 46-51.

289 Coney, ed., pp. 55, 81, 177, 211.
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themselves. Although honoured for work in a variety of areas, a number of women who received titular honours in New Zealand identified themselves as feminist, or displayed an awareness of feminist concerns. Fiona Kidman, in an interview some time before she was made a dame, was quoted as saying that New Zealand literature had not been ‘about women’s lives’, but had been ‘dominated by the man-alone theme’, and that her writing fiction centring women had been ‘something fairly deliberate’. 291 When interviewed by reporters at the time of her award, Georgina Kirby, made a dame for services to the Maori people, was self-consciously feminist. 292 She was president of the Maori Women’s Welfare League (MWWL) between 1983 and 1987, and worked in issues of Maori women’s health and in promoting women’s representation in political issues. 293 The same year that she was made a dame, Ann Hercus was written of as a ‘declared feminist’, while Sylvia Cartwright was termed a ‘champion of women’s rights’. 294 Jean Herbison has said that she is ‘a feminist’, although ‘by example’ rather than being a ‘radical’. 295 As well, several dames were active in work related to women’s issues and concerns, although their award did not necessarily cite services to women in particular. A surprisingly large number of dames were involved in the National Council of Women, including Barbara Freyberg, Dorothy Winstone, Stella Casey, Dorothea Horsman, Miriam Dell, Vivienne Boyd, Laurie Salas and Elizabeth Harper. 296 All of these women were honoured with a title after 1975, and if they were not part of more radical women’s organisations, they were part of a feminist organisation that shared a number of the same
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295 Herbison, interview with the author, 18 November 2004.
The Crown approbation signified by the honouring of these feminist women suggests that second wave feminism, as a social movement, had influenced women’s position relative to the royal honours system.

Another point at which feminist concerns can clearly be seen to have intersected with the royal honours system in New Zealand was at the 1993 centenary of women’s suffrage in New Zealand, when women outnumbered men in receiving honours, the first and only time they have done so. The celebration of the centenary had an important impact on women’s history in New Zealand. A number of books on women in New Zealand society appeared at this time, including a special issue of the *New Zealand Journal of History* focusing on women and politics, a history of women’s organisations in New Zealand, and a history of women in New Zealand since 1893. A number of other publications, such as *New Zealand Historic Places* and the *IRMT Journal*, published special suffrage centenary editions that focused on women in relation to their subject matter.

The celebration of the suffrage centenary solidified the trends towards recovery and celebration in women’s history in New Zealand, which retained the women’s subject, while elsewhere there had been a turn to gender history. The celebratory trend extended to the honours system as well, with seven damehoods bestowed in 1993 as a recognition of the centenary, over twice the number bestowed in any other single year except 1995, when four dames were created. Indeed, in the Queen’s Birthday honours, in June 1993, there were no new knights created. As well, a New Zealand commemoration medal was produced for 1993, and given largely to women.
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297 Page, pp. 131-132. In its early years, the NCW of New Zealand was known as the ‘Women’s Parliament’, an interesting observation given the significant numbers of knights created for political or public services, discussed in Chapter Four of this thesis. R. Nicholls, *The Women’s Parliament: The National Council of Women of New Zealand 1896-1920* (Wellington, 1996), pp. 9-10, 34-37.
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The commemoration of the suffrage centenary celebrated the achievement of one of the goals of first wave feminism, and, more broadly, the contributions of women to society. Connections between honours and feminist concerns in relation to the suffrage centenary were noted in the media. The announcement of the Queen’s Birthday honours list in *The Press* opened by noting that there had been no men given titles in that list, a decision labelled ‘an unusual move’.301 One cartoon published in the newspapers at the time commented on the predominance of women in the list, showing a smiling Queen Elizabeth II stamping the list ‘sisterhood special’ (see Illustration One below).

**Illustration One:**
‘93 Sisterhood Special’

![Illustration One: “93 Sisterhood Special”](image)


These media comments suggest that women receiving honours in larger numbers than men was seen as uncommon, but also that it was perceived as stemming from feminist concerns. However, there is a caveat to this honours list as a celebration of female endeavour and feminist goals, which lies in its very uncommonness. Making women the majority of recipients in one year does not negate or remove previous or later years’ numerically unequal treatment in the honours system. Ironically, attempts to specially honour women could even reinforce the unusualness of awarding honours to

---

women by giving them many awards in a year seen as special, and then reverting to the
traditional pattern in which men gain the majority of honours. The ‘aura’ of
exceptionalism that clings to the dame, as to the ‘warrior queen’, was potentially
strengthened by these special honours to women, particularly when these special honours
were a one-off occurrence.

There were even signs of opposition to the 1993 Queen’s Birthday honours list. It
was reported following the publication of the list that the leader of the Christian Heritage
Party, Graham Capill, had criticised the awarding of titles to women only as being a
‘political and sexist’ choice, and quoted him as saying that ‘putting sex before true
achievement’ was discriminatory as well as ‘degrading and patronising’.

Phyllis Guthardt, one of the recipients of honours in that list, was contacted by The Press to
respond to Capill’s comments that she had not deserved the honour, since she had simply
been doing her job. Guthardt’s response was that he was ‘exactly right’, because she had
been ‘doing what I felt was … my work’ without thinking of honours. On the other
hand, the national president of the NCW, Alison Roxburgh, reportedly argued that the list
acknowledged the value of women. She was quoted as suggesting that ‘maybe we need a
little affirmative action every now and then to redress past imbalances’, and if so, ‘why
not in the centennial year of women’s suffrage?’

According to one media report, she had criticised the balance of awards the year before, claiming that the work of many
women was not being valued.

Between the two waves of the feminist movement, although activity in the
women’s movement did not cease, there was a turn toward emphasising and glorifying
the conservative female roles of housewife and mother, particularly in the years after the
Second World War. Women were expected to return to the home, and the value and pleasure of being a 'homemaker' was stressed in media such as women's magazines and radio serials. At the same time, the proportion of women engaged in paid work, particularly married women, 'was steadily increasing', and the view of women's place as being in the home as a housewife was not universally accepted. Within the NCW itself, 'a firm line on the duty of mothers to make the home their primary responsibility' co-existed with efforts to secure equal pay and equal opportunity for unmarried women or married women with dependents. While the correlation between the changes in the circumstances of women's lives and the changes in their participation in the royal honours system was not so strong in this instance, there being three dames created in the 1950s, the turn toward the home was at least partially reflected in honours. From the 1920s to the 1960s, men were awarded knighthoods in steadily increasing numbers, while a mere five dames were created in those entire five decades (see Tables One and Two, Appendix One). Awards of the civil CBE to men increased from eleven in the 1920s to seventy-five in the 1950s, without a corresponding increase in the number of women receiving them. One woman received the civil CBE in the 1920s (8.3% of the total awards of that honour), and three women (3.8%) received it in the 1950s, the decade when the 'back-to-the-home' movement was strongest. Similarly, awards of the civil OBE to women dropped from 15.8% in the 1940s to 11.2% in the 1950s, and 8.5% in the 1960s; numerical increases in the number of these awards to women did not keep pace with increases in the number of awards to men. It is suggestive, in terms of the interaction between feminism and the royal honours system, that this trough between the peaks of the feminist movement, although feminist efforts did not entirely cease, appears

308 Page, pp. 102, 108.
309 'Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000', see Appendix One.
310 Ibid.; Coney, ed., p. 80.
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to have been echoed in royal honours granted to women. Like any institution, the honours system does not operate in a vacuum, but is shaped by trends and movements in society, which it in turn may shape.

**Threads of continuity: the ‘helpmeet’ model of femininity**

The history of women’s relationship with royal honours has been a complex blend of change and continuity, as is evident from the contrast of the feminist movement and changes to women’s status in society with the continued uncommonness of honoured women, particularly at the titular level. Another aspect of female association with royal honours that displays this contrast is the issue of honoured women’s links to men. The establishment of the title of ‘Dame’, of course, signified that women could receive a title in their own right, to recognise their own achievements, rather than simply as a consort and helpmate of a man who had achieved. Yet the reality of the earliest awards of titular honours to women was rather more blurred. Of the eleven women made dames before 1980, four (36.4%) were the wives of either a Prime Minister or a Governor-General of New Zealand, and two were directly linked to their fathers and one to her husband in the area in which they gained their honour.312 The pattern diminished considerably after the increase in the number of dames and the influence of second wave feminism in the 1980s, but did not altogether disappear.

Wives of Prime Ministers and Governors-General often became New Zealand’s very first dames. The first two women to be made dames who are recorded in the honours lists in the *New Zealand Gazette* are examples of this pattern, and they were the only women to receive titular honours in those lists in the first thirty-three years in which titular honours were open to women. Annette Countess of Liverpool was the wife of the Governor-General, the Earl of Liverpool, who had himself received more than one titular honour. She led the ‘Pakeha women’s effort’ in World War One, and shared with Miria (later Lady) Pomare the leadership of the Lady Liverpool and Mrs Pomare’s Maori

312 'Database of titular honours, 1917-2000', see Appendix Two.
Christina Massey, who received a GBE in 1926, was the widow of William Massey, Prime Minister from 1912 to 1925. With him, she was involved in community affairs, becoming known nationally after he became Prime Minister. As well as acting as his hostess, she fundraised and performed social services in World War One, was president of the Plunket Society, and was involved with the Red Cross, the Lady Liverpool Fund and the Victoria League. Massey received a CBE in 1918 for her war services. In 1926, being ‘self-effacing’, she accepted the GBE ‘on behalf of her late husband for services they had both given to their country’. A short article in *The New Zealand Times* praised her:

> Everyone in the Dominion knows her as the great helpmate for thirty years of a great citizen, who for nearly half that period worthily held the position of Prime Minister, guided the Dominion wisely through the Great War, and gained high recognition during the peace negotiations, as well as a solid reputation as a consulting statesman in the region of Imperial Conference. In addition, Dame Christina was foremost for many years in the humanitarian work which strongly appealed to her sense of duty as the Prime Minister’s wife.

Most of this lists her husband’s work, her own contribution summed up in the telling word, ‘helpmate’, her own work thus de-emphasised in favour of her husband’s. Christina Massey was admired for having fulfilled that traditional feminine role of helpmate, and as linked to her husband’s work and successes.

In the short biographies of honours recipients provided in another newspaper, her connection to her husband was similarly emphasised. She was referred to as the ‘relict of the late Right Hon. W. F. Massey, P.C., LL.D.’ and described as ‘a loyal and devoted helpmate of her illustrious husband’, before her involvement in humanitarian work was
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Further, the emphasis on her husband’s work was strengthened by reporting that he had declined honours:

Her husband refused all offers of decoration. The conferring on her of the Grand Cross of the Empire is a graceful, thoughtful act, for which the Dominion will ever be grateful to King George V.\textsuperscript{317}

It appears then, that the granting of the GBE to Bill Massey’s widow was a method of recognising his work, after he had turned down honours. Had he accepted, one must wonder if Christina Massey would have been offered the choice. Yet, in another article on the Birthday Honours list for that year, in the \textit{Feilding Star}, the writer commented that Christina Massey was ‘more deserving’ than opera singer Dame Nellie Melba. The reasoning in that judgement was that as a Prime Minister’s wife:

\[\ldots\text{[Massey] has had the stress and strain of public life, whereas Melba earned great fees and was well rewarded already in the exercise of what was literally a golden voice.}\textsuperscript{318}\]

Besides displaying the early existence of criticism of giving honours to people already recompensed for their work with money, this judgement criticised the grant of high royal honours to a woman whose success had been in her own right, in favour of a woman who had been a self-sacrificing helpmate to a man in high office.

Barbara, Lady Freyberg, who received the GBE in 1953, was also the wife of a Governor-General. In the \textit{Dominion} in January 1953, recipients of titular awards and third class awards all had brief biographies inserted, except Lady Freyberg, whose award was listed with merely a sentence identifying her as the wife of Lord Freyberg.\textsuperscript{319} Her award was given in recognition of her work ‘in connection with the welfare of New Zealand forces’ in the Second World War and of her time ‘as wife of the Governor-General’, when she was involved in many organisations concerned with women, children

\textsuperscript{316} ‘Birthday Honours’, copy provided by David Baguley, 2004.
\textsuperscript{317} ‘The Birthday Honours of 1926’, copy provided by Baguley.
\textsuperscript{319} ‘Distinction in New Year Honours List for Lady Freyberg’, \textit{The Dominion}, 2 January 1953, p. 8, copy provided by David Baguley.
and health.\footnote{\textit{Honours List for New Year 1953}, copy of citation provided by David Baguley, 2004.} Ruth Kirk, Lady Thea Muldoon and Lady Norma Holyoake were all wives of past Prime Ministers of New Zealand. Kirk and Muldoon, like Christina Massey, were granted their honours after the death of their husbands, while Lady Holyoake received hers in the same year as her husband was knighted.\footnote{List of Dames in New Zealand provided by the Honours Secretariat, DPMC, 2003; G. A. Wood, 'Holyoake, Keith Jacka 1904-1983', in C. Orange, ed., \textit{The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography} (Auckland and Wellington, 2000), p. 235; L. Taylor, 'Years of hard work finally earn reward', \textit{New Zealand Herald}, 31 December 1992, p. 9.} Both Kirk and Holyoake were created as dames before the end of 1980, while Muldoon received her DBE in 1993. Townsend considered that Kirk's award had had more to do with her husband's work than her own:

\begin{quote}
...despite the official citation, the award was little more than a mark of respect for her late husband. It is fair to say that she received her husband's knighthood.\footnote{Townsend, p. 34.}
\end{quote}

In an interview, Kirk was quoted explaining that she had seen being made as a Dame in 1975 as 'a marvellous honour – \textit{a tribute for the way Mr Kirk struggled for New Zealand, particularly in the past two years}'.\footnote{T. Potter, 'First lady from the old school', \textit{Sunday Star Times}, 26 March 2000, accessed from Factiva; my emphasis.} She reportedly said that she decided to accept 'for Norm's sake. He had done so much for the nation'.\footnote{Bungay, p. 64.} Lady Muldoon, who received her honour for 'services to the community', was married to Sir Robert Muldoon, himself knighted prior to her being created as a dame. She argued in an interview in the \textit{New Zealand Herald} that the honour was recognition of her own hard work 'behind-the-scenes', which was often unnoticed by the public, as well as of women's equality. She recalled Sir Robert's pleasure when she received the Queen's Service Order (QSO) in 1985: 'He thought it was so wonderful that somebody had noticed I had done something'.

The article closed with the reflection: 'Dame Thea is content with what she has achieved in her life, satisfied that she managed to find \textit{her own niche in her husband's career}'.\footnote{Taylor, 'Years of hard work finally earn reward', p. 9; my emphasis.}
As well as the women who were so directly linked to their husband in the honour that they received, another of the first New Zealand dames, Cecily Pickerill, was honoured for work that she did in the same area as her husband. She received the DBE for her services to medicine, and particularly to plastic surgery. Her husband’s ‘pupil and associate’ before their marriage, she worked in that field with him, and continued her work after his death in 1956, receiving the OBE in 1958 and her DBE in 1977.

Relationships to fathers have also been significant for some women made dames in New Zealand. Whina Cooper was ‘following in her father’s footsteps’ when she became a prominent Maori leader, and Augusta Wallace was ‘part of a legal “dynasty”’, with a father and husband working in the law, and her daughter as well. Te Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikaahu, the Maori Queen, is directly descended from the first Maori king, Potatau Te Wherowhero, and has succeeded her father, Koroki Te Wherowhero.

In the case of Elizabeth Gilmer, made a DBE in 1951, she herself continually emphasised her relationship to her father, Richard Seddon. In her unsuccessful attempts to gain election to Parliament, she stressed that relationship, and her intentions to follow in his footsteps. In one campaign poster, the picture of her was smaller than a central picture of Seddon, and the phrase ‘Like Father, Like Daughter’ was prominent. One dame whose experience was in contrast to this trend of being linked to men was Rangimarie Hetet, who learnt Maori weaving from her mother and aunts. Not given to her until she was 100, Hetet’s honour acknowledged her efforts at preserving a traditional female skill, and
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was made in a late twentieth century climate of increased appreciation for diversity, of both race and gender, as well as of an increased recognition of the arts.

Links to men were clearly important among the dames created in New Zealand after 1917. This pattern supports an argument that women entering traditionally male-dominated spaces did so, at least to begin with, through their connections to men, as husbands, fathers, or perhaps simply mentors. Antonia Fraser has shown the importance of links to men in the lives of 'warrior queens', who not only came into power through their connections to male rulers, but who emphasised their connections to 'strong masculine figure[s]' to strengthen their position. The importance of male mentors has been explained by Katie Pickles in relation to the first academic women in Anglo-Canada, Australia and New Zealand. According to Pickles' study of the first female political leaders throughout the world, many of the very first had important 'dynastic' links to previous male politicians and leaders. As with the female leaders discussed by Pickles, many of the dames who most clearly were linked to men were among the very first women to receive titular honours in New Zealand. Whilst dames were neither ruling nor honoured directly through their fathers, their awards reflect the traditional importance of links to men in gaining entry to a male-dominated system.

Admittedly, a dynastic pattern was sometimes evident in the creation of knights as well as dames in New Zealand. More than once a father and son were both knighted, and in one family, titular honours seem almost to have been part of the family name. Of the knights and dames listed in the honours lists in the New Zealand Gazette between 1917 and 2000, at least twenty-one were the son or daughter of a knight. As well, four sets of
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siblings were granted titles, one uncle and nephew and one uncle and niece. In one family, the father was knighted, while two of his sons and one of his daughters were also granted titular honours. When David Hay was knighted in 1991, he said in a newspaper article briefly profiling him that he had ‘joined his family’s “knights bachelor club”’, with his father and twin brother and sister. His sister Laurie Salas’ honour ranks more highly, being a DBE, since women cannot be made Knight Bachelor. Despite that, she is not mentioned in the article’s headline: ‘Sir David joins twin, father in “knight club”’. In another family, three generations were both knighted and Governor-General of New Zealand during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (James, Charles and Bernard Fergusson, in that order). Some links are also evident among both knights and dames by marriage. Knighted in 1972, Harcourt Caughey, who was the managing director and chairperson of Smith and Caughey, and the chairperson of the Auckland Hospital Board between 1959 and 1974, married the daughter of Sir George Finlay, a judge of the Supreme Court and president of the Land Sales Court, knighted in 1955. Another judge, Maurice Casey, who was knighted in 1991, was married to Stella Casey, who was made a dame in 1991.

However, an important distinction is evident between the latter links among the recipients of titular honours, and those women who were linked to husbands or fathers in relation to their award. When women such as Christina Massey and Barbara Freyberg were made dames, they were honoured for work directly connected with their husband’s work and position, their work as wives of prominent government figures. The husband or father with whom dames were linked in these instances, although usually a prominent
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figure, had sometimes not been knighted himself. He may even, like Bill Massey, have
turned the honour down. These women’s links to husbands were sometimes emphasised
rather more than the recipient’s own work. In these cases, usually to be found among the
awards of titles to women before 1980, the title of ‘Dame’ almost acted as the equivalent
of the title of ‘Lady’; that is, it signified recognition of the helpmate of a successful male.
Among sons of knights, some daughters and other relations, on the other hand, this was
not the case. Stella Casey, wife of a titled man, Laurie Salas, the daughter of a knight,
and Barbara Goodman, the niece of one, do not appear to have been consistently
portrayed as linked with those men, and they did not receive their awards for work
connected with those men. Salas was heavily involved in peace and disarmament work,
as well as being part of many committees and community organisations.\(^{340}\) Although
Goodman was Mayoress of Auckland between 1968 and 1980 for her uncle Sir Dove-
Myer Robinson during his time as Mayor, this was only one, early, aspect of her work,
and not the most important to her award.\(^{341}\) These three women were all honoured after
1985.

Although direct links to men in the work for which dames were recognised were
more a feature of the early awards of titular honours to women, male support was often
important in other dames’ achievements. A number of dames, when interviewed by the
media, pointed to their husband’s support as an important influence in their success. In
one interview, Miriam Dell spoke of her husband Richard as having always given her
much support in her efforts, as well as sharing domestic work.\(^{342}\) When Augusta Wallace
was made a dame in 1993, the brief article about her award in the *New Zealand Herald*
reported her awareness that her husband Neville had ‘supported and encouraged her’.\(^{343}\)
Louise Henderson’s husband was also supportive. She had been unable to paint before

\(^{340}\) Lambert, ed., pp. 553-554.
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her marriage, as it as not seen as appropriate for a female, but her husband Hubert was reported to have told her that ‘I want you to grow well, like a plant’.

When Ann Hercus became New Zealand’s ambassador to the United Nations, her husband, John, who was the director of Christchurch Polytechnic, took two years’ leave and went to New York with her. John also, Ann reportedly said, took on household responsibilities while she was commuting between Tuesdays and Thursdays each week to Wellington from Christchurch as a member of the Price Tribunal. In a slightly different way, male support was important in Barbara Goodman’s community work, which was what she was honoured for. After her husband’s death, she said in an interview that she could not afford to continue doing so much unpaid work in the community.

On the other hand, some dames were divorced or single at the time of their greatest success. Ngaio Marsh never married, and Sister Mary Leo, the famous singing teacher whose pupils included Kiri Te Kanawa and Malvina Major, spent most of her life in the female environment of a convent. Both Cheryll Sotheran and Catherine Tizard were divorced when they reached the peak of their achievements.

Several dames criticised the honours system in media interviews for not recognising the importance of husbands’ support to dames, expressing dissatisfaction with the practice of awarding a title to the wives of knights but not to the husbands of dames, a sort of reverse discrimination. In an interview reported in North and South in 1999, Susan Devoy was quoted as saying, in relation to becoming a dame, that she was ‘a
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little bit disappointed’ that her husband John Oakley did not ‘get anything’ because her award was ‘a product of what we have done together’. As well as their personal relationship, John had been Susan’s personal manager, and was once quoted as saying, ‘I don’t mind living in Susan’s shadow’ as he thought he could ‘take a lot of responsibility off her shoulders’. Similarly, Augusta Wallace was reported to have said that husbands of dames should be recognised as the wives of knights were. In Malvina Major’s opinion, the practice of granting a title to a knight’s wife but not to a dame’s husband was ‘a bit chauvinistic’, and added to the ‘confusion’ about titles, particularly with respect to understanding who was a titled woman in her own right. In its 1995 report, the committee reviewing honours in New Zealand acknowledged that the title of ‘Dame’ was not ‘universally welcomed by women, some of whom also regret the lack of recognition afforded their husbands’. Yet the support of a husband was sometimes an important factor in a woman’s opportunity to succeed in a male-dominated occupation. Even in the traditionally female-dominated area of voluntary community work, women were often able to achieve because their husband fulfilled the role of breadwinner.

Conclusion

As a system with medieval antecedents rooted in war, and which had shifted to one providing recognition for those in the male-dominated field of public service in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the honours system remained a male-dominated institution in the twentieth century. Titular awards were not available to women on the same terms as men. In the next chapters, as the services for which men and women were honoured are considered, this gendering of the honours system is further explained by the patterns evident in which areas of service were most clearly valued between 1917 and 2000. Feminism, as a social movement, did intersect with the institution of royal
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honours, and women’s association with honours shifted as their circumstances and lives changed. Yet change was slow, and not always straightforward, particularly in the upper levels of honours. Despite the opening of royal honours to women in the twentieth century, allowing women to receive titles in their own right, early awards to women continued to display important links to men in the work being recognised. Even later, although not acknowledged in honours, the support of a husband could be important to a dame’s success. Although women who were made dames were ‘singular exceptions’ in that they were part of a small group of women who were honoured with a title in their own right, they were not always as far from conventional images of femininity as might be expected.
Chapter Three

The work of dames and knights: exceptional women and traditional images of the feminine

If dames, as a minority of women in a male-dominated honours system, were 'singular exceptions', what of the services to the country that their awards recognised? What of the ways in which they were portrayed in popular magazines and newspapers? A gendered analysis of the patterns evident in the services for which titular honours have been granted to men and women between 1917 and 2000 can reveal much about gender identities and roles in twentieth-century New Zealand, both the feminine and the masculine. Such an analysis casts light not merely on the inner working of the honours system as an institution, but also upon the society it operated within. Although the circumstances and experiences in women's lives have changed greatly since 1917, these patterns display an underlying continuity in expected gender roles in society, roles that were potentially reinforced by the honours system itself. This continuity often extended to the representation of dames in popular culture, where traditional images of the feminine were frequently evoked in relation to these exceptional women.

Volunteer work and philanthropy: dames, knights and community service

Marked patterns were evident in the services for which men and women in New Zealand received titular honours between 1917 and 2000, many persisting over time. One such significant pattern was that substantially more dames were created to recognise their community service efforts than for any other type of service. Almost a third (32.8%) of the women created as dames were honoured for their community service, either by itself or along with other services. No other category of service was so often rewarded with the title of Dame; most other categories appeared relatively infrequently by comparison. Since most dames received their title after 1980, no clear trend over time
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toward or away from rewarding women for community service was evident, although in the five years from 1995 to 1999, more dames were created for services to various branches of the arts than for any other service.\textsuperscript{356} When women were honoured with a title in their own right, it was a strong possibility that they had been involved in community service (see Figure Five below).

**Figure Five:**
*Services in the citations or careers of those awarded damehoods, 1917-2000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of damehoods*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War/patriotic work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal to Sovereign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages are out of the 58 damehoods awarded, and are rounded to one decimal place.

Barbara Goodman, for example, was involved in various organisations concerned with drug addicts, women’s refuges and the disabled, as well as being Mayoress of Auckland for her uncle.\textsuperscript{357} Ann Ballin was the Chairperson of the Victims’ Task Force and of the National Organisation for the International Year of Disabled Persons, and was a member of various public commissions and councils, such as the Royal Commission on Social Policy in 1987 and 1988.\textsuperscript{358} Both of these women received the DBE ‘for services

\textsuperscript{356} Ibid.
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to the community'. Much earlier, Barbara Freyberg’s work in the community in New Zealand was in women’s, children’s and charitable organisations; as *The Dominion* put it, she was involved in ‘many welfare and cultural organisations in the women’s sphere in New Zealand’. These included the Girl Guides’ Association, the New Zealand Red Cross Society, the NCW, the New Zealand Crippled Children’s Society and the League of Mothers. Other women were made dames for community service as well as other services, with both being included in the citation for their award. Recognition of Malvina Major’s contribution to opera was combined with recognition of her work in the community: ‘for services to opera and the community’. Her charity concerts became something she was known for, and she was reported as earning more money for charity than for herself during some years of her career. Susan Devoy was given the honour both for her achievement as a highly successful international squash player, a non-traditional career for a woman, and for her community work.

While there were also seventy-seven men granted a knighthood whose work included community work or philanthropy, the proportion (16.8%) is considerably smaller than the proportion of women so honoured. Other types of work, particularly political, legal and commercial, were more common among knights. Numbers of men being knighted for work that included community service increased from the mid-1970s, at much the same time as the number of dames being created increased. However, over half (forty) of those knights who were honoured for their community service were also honoured for their work in industry, business and commerce. Robertson Stewart, for instance, was knighted for ‘services to manufacturing and the community’, having donated to many causes, including making large contributions to the Antarctic Wing at

---

359 ‘Database of titular honours, 1917-2000’, see Appendix Two.
362 ‘Database of titular honours, 1917-2000’, see Appendix Two.
364 ‘Database of titular honours, 1917-2000’, see Appendix Two.
365 Ibid.
the Christchurch Museum and to Ferrymead Historical Park, and giving to the Stewart Foundation and the Christchurch Cathedral Restoration Appeal.\textsuperscript{366} Men such as Leonard Southward and Lewis Harris, knighted solely for community or philanthropic work, were much rarer, numbering just nine (11.7\% of the knights whose honour included community service), compared to ten women (52.6\% of the dames whose honour included community service). The patterns in the services for which men received a title, and the changes over time in services given by both knights and dames, are summarised in Figures Six, Seven and Eight below.

\textbf{Figure Six: Services in the citations or careers of those awarded knighthoods, 1917-2000*}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of knighthoods**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal to Sovereign</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War/patriotic work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding those awarded additional or honorary knighthoods, or those awarded knighthood in the separate Cook Islands list published in the \textit{New Zealand Gazette} from 1983; the total excluding these being 458.

** Percentages are out of the 458 knighthoods awarded, and are rounded to one decimal place.

\textsuperscript{366} Ibid.; Lambert, ed., p. 605.
Figure Seven:
Services given by those awarded knighthoods, 1920-1999*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal to sovereign</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War/patriotic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding those awarded additional or honorary knighthoods, or those awarded knighthood in the separate Cook Islands list published in the New Zealand Gazette from 1983.
Figure Eight:  
Services given by those awarded damehoods, 1920-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of War/patriotic service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal to Sovereign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Moreover, dames whose honour included services to the community had often been involved in volunteer work, and seem rarely to have made notable donations to community organisations.\textsuperscript{367} Laurie Salas, for instance, was much involved in voluntary work in the community, including in the NCW, the Parliamentary Watch Committee, the Alcohol Liquor Advisory Council and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, and she became the president of the United Nations Association of New Zealand in 1988, the same year she received her DBE.\textsuperscript{368} Elizabeth Harper was involved in the Save the Children fund from 1969, when she drove a car for the annual collection, and held the position of national president between 1989 and 1993. When she received her honour, the organisation was voluntary, excepting six staff in Wellington.\textsuperscript{369}

**Dames and community service: women’s caring mission**

The strength of the theme of caring for and serving the community among dames reflected the glorification of the roles of wife and mother in the years after the Second World War, but also had earlier antecedents in the nineteenth-century ideology of the cult of domesticity. The theme echoed images of women as nurturers and life-givers stemming from that ideology, which placed women in the home as ‘wives, mothers, homemakers and housekeepers’: the ‘angel in the house’.\textsuperscript{370} Women’s caring virtues were emphasised, opening a way for women to work in public spaces in charitable organisations and clubs. Linked to contemporary Christian ideas, women were imagined as ‘moral, modest, … gentle, … compassionate [and] self-sacrificing’.\textsuperscript{371} Philanthropy, therefore, was ‘the leisured woman’s most obvious outlet for self-expression’ in the

\textsuperscript{367} Entries in the *Who’s Who and Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* record lists of organisations belonged to by dames, but rarely, if ever, state that a dame had been a large donor to anything, whereas entries for knights do sometimes mention such donations.

\textsuperscript{368} Lambert, ed., pp. 553-554.


nineteenth century, and an avenue through which to escape boredom and inconsequential pursuits.372

There was, of course, a split between the ‘prescriptive’ ideology and rhetoric of the cult of domesticity and the reality of life for many women even in the nineteenth century in England, as many were not wealthy enough to live in this way, and were often not ‘as separate from the public world as is implied by the ideal suggested’.373 It is, however, the existence of the ideal that is of importance in relation to ideas about suitable female activities, and to the representation of women in the popular media. At the same time, Phyllis Guthardt has suggested that the smaller number of women who have been honoured in comparison to men is linked to the way in which volunteer work in the community was ‘expected’ of women. Community service, she noted, is ‘not the sort of job that gets very much applause or recognition’.374 Similarly, Malvina Major suggested that women’s tendency to ‘just do’, to get involved in an organisation and do what is necessary, is linked to the numerical inequality in awards of honours to men and to women. Their work, she considered, was often unknown outside of the organisation, and the organisation may never consider nominating people.375 A tension therefore existed between the rhetoric placing importance on women’s caring work and the high number of dames who have been involved in this work, and the invisibility of women’s community service work, particularly voluntary work.

The pattern of voluntary community service among dames had further significance besides that it was in charitable work that opportunities for middle class women to work in public spaces were most available in the nineteenth century. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the division between voluntary and paid

372 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
374 Guthardt, interview with the author, 29 September 2004.
375 Major, interview with the author, 4 November 2004.
work was often viewed as the crucial difference between "ladies" fulfilling their "womanly mission" and women stepping into the realm of masculine work and authority. Moreover, the gendered pattern whereby dames involved in community service often did volunteer work while knights whose work included community service were often wealthy men who made donations to various causes suggests that women were more able to contribute their time than monetary resources, and implies the traditional model of gender roles where the male was the breadwinner. In turn, this reinforces the suggestion that a class element continued to operate in the honours system in New Zealand throughout the twentieth century. Middle and upper class women who did not need to undertake paid work were more able to give time to charitable work, and the prevalence of community service in the work of dames thus suggests also a prevalence of elite women among dames. Even in the late twentieth century, the creation of dames displays a continuation of traditional ideas that placed middle and upper class women in community service, as volunteers rather than as paid workers.

Further, the strength of the gendered pattern in which women were honoured for community work more often than men is reinforced when the type of work done by those women granted a title for public service is taken into account. Margaret Bazley, for instance, was formerly the Chief Executive of the Department of Social Welfare, and Vivienne Boyd sat on the Equal Opportunities Tribunal and was the President of the NCW between 1978 and 1982. Although Lady Norma Holyoake received the DCMG for 'public services', a rare award to women because of its nature as an award for diplomatic and political service, she also received a QSO for community service, as the

377 See, for example, the concept of the 'male breadwinner wage', a concept that was based on the assumption that a man was supporting his wife and children, and which in New Zealand 'existed in practice' in the early twentieth century, although it did not apply unproblematically. M. Nolan, *Breadwinning: New Zealand women and the state* (Christchurch, 2000), p. 22.
378 Database of titular honours, 1917-2000', see Appendix Two; Lambert, ed., p. 71.
wife of a Governor-General. The importance of community service in the work of honoured women is noticeable at the lower levels of the honours system as well, particularly with the QSO and QSM. While women and men received an equal number of QSOs for community service over the quarter of a century between 1975 and 2000, awards of the QSO for public services to men far outstripped those to women. Of the total number of QSOs granted for public services in that period, men received 349, or 79.7% of them. Awards of the lower QSM also show the pattern clearly, with women having received 58.7% of the QSMs for community service that were given between 1975 and 2000, and only 36.3% of those given for public services (see Table Six, Appendix One). Twice, a Governor-General has received the QSO for public services, and his wife for community services, in the same list. David Beattie, Governor-General from 1980 to 1985, was given the QSO for public services in 1985, and the same year his wife Norma was given the QSO for community services. Earlier, in 1980, the year in which Norma Holyoake received the QSO for community services, Keith Holyoake received it for public services.

**Doing their bit: dames, knights and patriotic work**

Three dames who were involved in community service also gave their time and efforts to patriotic and war-related organisations. As already mentioned, Lady Annette Liverpool led the female war effort between 1914 and 1918. She was the patroness of the Federated Women's Patriotic Societies of New Zealand, for instance, and produced a book of knitting patterns for women to use. Lady Barbara Freyberg had run the New
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Zealand Forces Club in London in World War Two.\textsuperscript{384} These activities were gendered feminine, as ways for women to support the war effort, usually at home, while men were fighting overseas. Ten of the men made knights between 1917 and 2000 had been involved in patriotic or war-related work. Made a Knight Bachelor in 1934, George Wilson was ‘well-known for his work in patriotic and social movements’ in New Zealand, as well as being involved in commercial endeavours. He was ‘responsible’ during the First World War for the establishment of ‘several funds which contributed so largely to the comfort of the soldiers overseas’, was a member of the board of the Auckland Patriotic Association, and was the first to donate to the Auckland war memorial fund.\textsuperscript{385} William Perry, who was knighted in 1946, was the President of the New Zealand Returned Services Association (NZRSA) between 1935 and 1943, as well as being President of the New Zealand Defence League and the Wellington Navy League.\textsuperscript{386}

Although these knights outnumber the dames who had been involved in patriotic or war-related work, they represent only 2.2% of all titular awards to men announced in the \textit{New Zealand Gazette} since 1917, whereas the awards to women in this area represented 5.2% of all titular honours received by women.

\textbf{Women’s affairs, feminism and community service}

Another related area in which several dames were active was women’s affairs, as discussed in the previous chapter. While services to the community or public services were sometimes cited in their award, these women were involved in work related to women’s issues and concerns. Dorothy Winstone, for instance, was honoured for her services to the community. She was the president of the New Zealand Federation of University Women (NZFUW), was made a life member of the NCW and was involved in

\textsuperscript{384} ‘New Year Honours List’, \textit{The Press}, 2 January 1953, p. 6. Before working at the club in London, she had received the OBE for other similar war service. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{385} ‘The Birthday Honours’, \textit{The Press}, 4 June 1934, p. 8. In \textit{The Press}, it was noted that Lady Wilson ‘also has been an active worker among women’s organisations, and shares the honour which has come in recognition of continuous and long service in patriotic causes throughout the Dominion’. Ibid.
the Royal Commission on Contraception, Sterilisation and Abortion between 1975 and 1977. A headline in *The Dominion* when she received her award stated: ‘Women’s fighter rewarded’. Similarly Stella Casey worked in the NCW, the NZFUW, the World Union of Catholic Women’s Organisations and the Catholic Women’s League of New Zealand, as well as being involved in a number of committees and conventions concerning women’s affairs. Four women were recognised explicitly for their services to women: Daphne Purves, president of the International Federation of University Women (IFUW) between 1977 and 1980; Miriam Dell, president of the International Council of Women (ICW) from 1979 to 1986; Silvia Cartwright, who carried out an inquiry regarding cervical cancer treatment at the National Women’s Hospital between 1987 and 1988; and Phyllis Guthardt, who was also recognised for her services to the Methodist Church. Guthardt had, for instance, argued for the use of inclusive language, rather than the way that reports were requested of ‘the men’ for synod. She ‘was a bit disappointed’ that the citation for her award mentioned specifically services to the church, as ‘I’d regarded my ministry as a much wider ... service’ that also included service ‘to the community’.

The importance of community service as a field in which women have received high honours seems at first paradoxical. Despite the impact of second wave feminism on the honours system, and the importance of feminist ideas and women’s rights to several dames, many women were recognised for their efforts in this traditionally feminine field of work. Yet second wave feminism itself re-valued women’s domestic and caring work, and, as previously mentioned, writing in the 1970s often emphasised women’s biological
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difference from men as childbearers. Such work sometimes emphasised feminine nurturing qualities as a basis on which society should be re-shaped.\(^{393}\) The risk of this approach, logically, was that such an emphasis on the value of women's traditional work could lead to those traditional roles, and differences between men and women stemming from biology, being reinforced. It is within this celebratory approach that titular honours as recognition of women's caring role in the community, and the presence of feminist women working in community service, can be understood.

As well, while several dames have worked in women's organisations, they have sometimes been compared with other, more radical, feminists. In one article, Dell was quoted as saying that the Auckland media had considered her 'too worthy to be newsworthy' in the 1970s and 1980s, unlike those feminists whom the reporter termed her 'more strident and arresting sisters', supposedly 'burning bras and pasting up the first copies of *Broadsheet*'.\(^{394}\) Similarly, in a profile of Goodman, the writer noted that she was not seen to ‘fit in with the radical feminism that was to sweep through the early 80s’, as she was ‘still married, lived in Parnell, didn’t go out to work, [and] wore lipstick and blusher’.\(^{395}\) These women were depicted as conservative, despite their feminist beliefs, and often belonged to more conservative women’s organisations, such as the NCW. Going further, Kiri Te Kanawa seems to have deliberately distanced herself from radical feminism, at least. She was once quoted as saying that: ‘I know that within the context of a performance I represent women’, but ‘feminine women’, not ‘aggressive women’.\(^{396}\) Although dames became ‘singular exceptions’ through their joining the male-dominated honours system, a conformity to traditional images of the feminine sometimes remained evident in their relations with feminism, as it did in the prevalence of community service work in their achievements.


\(^{395}\) Du Chateau, ‘Great Dame’, pp. 116-117.

\(^{396}\) R. Mellor, ‘Dames just wanna have fun’, *New Zealand Woman’s Weekly*, 1 January 1996, p. 10.
Continuing the imagery: representing dames as mothers

Conformity with traditional images of the feminine has also often been evident in portrayals of dames in popular magazines and newspapers. Although it was in community service, where images of the female as caring and nurturing could be most clearly imagined, that women were most often honoured at the titular level, these images also appeared in relation to women honoured for many types of service. Many dames were portrayed in popular culture in ways that underlined their adherence to traditionally accepted gender norms, particularly through the evocation of the maternal image. A North and South interview of Susan Devoy opened by presenting the image of children and toys throughout her house, while Devoy herself was ‘trim and energetic-looking’ in the midst of this ‘domestic racket’. In 2002, an entire, though brief, article was focused on Devoy’s role as a mother of four boys who would have liked a daughter. The great voices of Sister Mary Leo’s students were said to have been ‘first nurtured in the warmth and concern of her little Auckland studio’. Similarly, although she never married, Ngaio Marsh was once described as ‘a motherly figure’ who reportedly ‘referred to herself as “Mum”’ in relation to the young actors she ‘nurtured’, who were described as her ‘children’. Going further, the author of an article in the New Zealand Woman’s Weekly downplayed Kiri Te Kanawa’s career, albeit in a tongue-in-cheek way, writing that: ‘In between keeping herself fit and looking after two children, Dame Kiri also holds down the most successful female opera career in the world’. Representation of women in maternal images was not unique to those granted titular honours. Before being honoured, Kate Harcourt was described in one article as ‘the prototypical “loving mum”’.
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a born nurturer with a lovely wide smile and comfortably greying hair'. Similarly, early academic women were often linked to images of the female as nurturer, or constructed themselves in this way. Emphasising that highly successful women were fulfilling the traditional female role of mother removed the focus from their careers, downplayed their exceptionalism and reinforced that gendered role as natural.

However, images of motherliness were not unproblematic in portrayals of dames. Catherine Tizard reportedly felt she would not have wanted to hold the position of Mayor of Auckland had her family still been at home. She was quoted as saying that it was 'hard' to be a female mayor 'because you don’t have that wonderful support service called a wife'. Daphne Purves was quoted by her biographer as recalling that she had become ‘a sort of mother figure’ to the students at Otago Boys’ High School, where she taught, particularly the shyer boarders. However, it was her later work in the IFUW and NZFUW for which she was honoured. These achievements came in the years when ‘[f]amily responsibilities were largely over’ and she was able to pursue her own interests once more. Other dames, such as Marsh and Phyllis Guthardt, did not marry and have children at all. The ironic reality for some dames was perhaps that, despite their being depicted in a maternal light, the years while their children were young were not the years in which they reached the successes that they were honoured for, while others never filled the role of biological mother.

**Selfless and graceful: further images of dames**

Besides the construction of a maternal image, dames have been depicted in gendered terms in a number of other ways. Images of women in the Victorian era not only encompassed the ‘angel in the house’, the weak yet selflessly loving carer, but also
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included a ‘touch of frivolousness’. Women supposedly had short attention spans, loved to shop, and were ‘illogical’ and ‘tender-hearted’. These basic images of women were echoed considerably later in some portrayals of dames in popular culture. In an article remembering her after her death, Stella Casey’s life was termed ‘pious and selfless’, while the ‘charmingly feminine’ Ngaio Marsh was ‘kind’ and ‘always determined to be available to others’. Ann Ballin was described as compassionate and ‘empathetic’, although also ‘forthright’ and a ‘steely fighter’. Even before being made dames, Miriam Dell was described as ‘comfortable to be with, full of fun and never stuffy’, and Ann Hercus, although her office was ‘not the first place you would seek a shoulder to cry on’, was portrayed as full of ‘practical advice’. Although working for feminist goals, Dell was depicted as non-threatening: ‘not high-powered, not bombastic, not crusading, nor a thrusting aggressive here-I-am woman’. Rather, she was ‘a hard-working lady who really cares about people’.

The frivolous image associated with Victorian women had its later echo in portrayals of dames in the frequent comments on their appearance in popular magazine and newspaper articles, profiles and interviews. Before Silvia Cartwright took up the position of Governor-General, she was interviewed about her past career and new direction. In the resulting article, she was described as ‘tall, elegant and utterly charming’. Similarly, Barbara Goodman was described as looking ‘every inch the society lady’, although she also ‘rolls up her sleeves... for a good cause’. Reporting on historian Anne Salmond and her work, Lester Thorley wrote that she was ‘an engaging and graceful woman, grey hair scraped back into a bun, large pearl and silver
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earrings, and a large brooch on her jacket', as well as mentioning her 'blue eyes' and 'broad smiles'.

In the *New Zealand Woman's Weekly*, Laurie Salas appeared as 'a small, sensibly clad lady of middle age, an eminently respectable doctor's wife', who did not match the 'stereotype of a peace worker'. Much earlier, in 1945, Hilda Ross' appearance was discussed at some length in a brief article in the *New Zealand Magazine* profiling her. She was termed 'a trim figure', who was:

...a grandmother, but does not look it. She wears her black hair cut short, almost like a boy's. She has a bright, alert eye, and a quick and springy step. Her voice is that of a woman of refinement, but there is no womanly backwardness about her when she is attacking any public problem that she regards as urgent.

The focus on Ross' appearance and voice served to stress that although she did not fulfil cultural ideas of women as retiring when working, she remained womanly, and acted out of an idealistic conviction, rather than out of a desire for power. In another article on Ross and her career, five (admittedly short) paragraphs were devoted to discussing her wardrobe and the difficulties of finding time in a busy schedule for appointments with a dressmaker or hairdresser. Sometimes, appearance was even considered as a window onto political and social opinions. Miriam Dell, in 'bifocals, rose-coloured knit suit, snappy silk blouse and sensible brown shoes... might at first glance, [sic] appear a conservative herself'. The description of dames in terms of their appearance, however, was part of a wider trend in the media to focus on women's appearance rather than their achievements. Women's liberation groups protested against media articles that focused on men's 'actions and opinions' and women's looks and family situation, and against the descriptions of women successful in science or politics or literature as 'vivacious single
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brunettes’, or suchlike.419 While these depictions were applied to women besides dames, the important point is that dames, although women recognised by the Crown for their work, could not always escape these constructions.

**Modesty: gender and the down-to-earth Kiwi**

A further theme in the representation of dames in popular culture is that of modesty, of having remained humble, ordinary New Zealanders. While this image was not distinctive to women, it reinforced that dames were non-threatening, despite their foray into the masculine domain of the honours system, and sometimes into male-dominated occupations as well. Exemplifying this theme is Fiona Kidman, ‘whose grand title is belied by her modest, homely manner’.420 Similarly, regardless of ‘what the title implies’, Patricia Evison ‘is neither aristocratic or haughty’.421 Sister Mary Leo and Evelyn Stokes have both been termed ‘self-effacing’, Te Arikinui Te Atairangikaahu ‘modest’ and ‘unobtrusive’, and Barbara Goodman and Stella Casey, although both tenacious in pursuing a cause, both had an ‘unassuming’ approach.422 Thea Muldoon, interviewed in her role as the wife of a politician before she became a dame, was described as a ‘little lady, sitting poised and trim, [who] seemed diffident but anxious to please’.423 In interviews, a number of dames have claimed that they saw their awards as an honour for others involved in their projects as well. Being made a dame was for Elizabeth Harper ‘an honour for the [Save the Children] fund, as well as everybody who worked so hard’, and she was reported to have been unsure whether or not she could cope
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with the title. After the announcement of her honour, Ballin reportedly said that the award ‘belonged also to the people who had supported her throughout her work’. Modesty in their achievements is also evident in the surprise that many dames were reported to have expressed after the announcement of their honour. Anne Salmond was quoted as saying that she was ‘astonished’ by being made a dame, Stokes reportedly said she was ‘stunned’, and Ann Hercus admitted she was ‘absolutely gobsmacked’. The honour was ‘a surprise’ to Malvina Major, because she had ‘struggled against the system in New Zealand’ and had ‘chosen to live in New Zealand instead of living as an international artist’. She had thought that her OBE was the highest honour she would receive.

Modesty, of course, is a characteristic that has often been seen as part of a New Zealand national identity. A recent book titled Grassroots Kiwis, which contained very brief profiles of a number of New Zealanders and was organised into chapters such as ‘Some Rural Blokes’ and ‘Five Publicans’, focused on New Zealand identity. In the foreword, a ‘real bloke or blokess’ was said to have ‘humility’, as well as being able, dependable and kind. After the announcement of his knighthood, Richard Hadlee was reported as saying that he was ‘still good old Paddles’. Ronald Scott, knighted in 1974, reportedly said that he had accepted his title as an award for all of those who were part of the Games Organising Committee for the tenth Commonwealth Games, which he chaired, and for the community. However, for dames, portrayal as humble and down-to-earth had effects besides that of emphasising their New Zealand identity. For instance,
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at the televised opening of Te Papa Tongarewa, New Zealand’s new national museum, chief executive Cheryll Sotheran, who was given the DNZM in 1999, was described as a ‘diffident-looking’ woman, drawn forward by Sir Howard Morrison to receive acknowledgement of her efforts. The image of her as ‘overwhelmed, even close to tears’ was at odds with the image of her as ‘single-minded’ and ‘driven’ that appeared later in the same article.\textsuperscript{431} The implication of this representation is that Sotheran appeared as conventionally feminine, modest and somewhat weak, at the same time as she was set apart from the traditional image of the feminine by her drive and determination.

**Elitism and images of the feminine in portrayals of dames**

Depictions of dames that echo the older images of the ‘angel in the house’, and the weak woman with a great capacity for loving, also emphasise the continuing elite nature of the honours system. It was upper middle class, leisured women to whom nineteenth-century images such as the loving ‘angel in the house’ applied, rather than to the lower middle class woman or the working class woman in domestic service or in the factory.\textsuperscript{432} Elite imagery was also present in the revealing comment from the author of one magazine article, Carroll Du Chateau, that Barbara Goodman looked ‘more a lady than a dame’.\textsuperscript{433} This depiction of Goodman as a ‘lady’ evokes images of aristocracy and of an hereditary elite, reinforcing her exceptionalism. The remark also displayed an acceptance of the negative connotations that some have seen adhering to the term ‘Dame’, and a sense that women who entered the masculine domain of the royal honours system became ‘honorary men’, leaving behind their claim to be ladies.\textsuperscript{434} In this imagery, Goodman is shown as having retained her femininity despite entering the honours system. These various constructions of dames in popular culture reinforced
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traditional gender roles, taming these highly successful women who were honoured in their own right and rendering their success less of a threat to the male essence of the honours system. Moreover, these images potentially reinforced those gender roles.

**Dames and knights in the arts**

A high proportion of dames were also honoured for their services to the arts. Twelve women were made dames for their achievements in the various branches of the arts, representing 20.7% of all titular honours given to women in New Zealand since 1917. Among these dames were opera singers Kiri Te Kanawa and Malvina Major, artist Louise Henderson, concert organist Gillian Weir, author Fiona Kidman, actor Kate Harcourt, and Rangimarie Hetet, famous for her skill in traditional Maori weaving. In comparison, a very small proportion of men have received titular honours for their contribution to the arts. Ten men (2.2%) were honoured for careers that included services within the arts. Among them were entertainer Howard Morrison, composer William Southgate, ballet dancer Jon Trimmer, opera singer Donald McIntyre, and historian and writer Keith Sinclair. Only relatively recently were men granted a knighthood in New Zealand for achievements within the arts. In 1974, Alfred Reed, who founded the major New Zealand publishing house A.H. and A.W. Reed, was knighted, having also given significant service to the community, while in 1949 Professor James Shelley was knighted, having been involved in founding the New Zealand Symphony Orchestra (then the National Orchestra) and been an important figure in drama in Canterbury. Excepting the contribution of these men to the arts, no men were knighted for work relating to the arts until Gordon Minninnick was made a knight for his services as a cartoonist in 1976, and Tosswill Woollastone for his achievements as an artist in 1979.
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Similarly, nine of the twelve dames who were honoured for work in the arts received their honour in the 1990s. The other three were Ngaio Marsh, who received the DBE in 1966; Sister Mary Leo, who received it in 1973; and Te Kanawa, who was made a dame in 1982.\footnote{Database of titular honours, 1917-2000, see Appendix Two.}

Women have had a ‘complex association’ with the arts in history. There were considerable obstacles to women’s success in the arts, including restrictions on what was seen as appropriate for female artists and writers, the difficulties of finding time amongst domestic duties, or a lack of acceptance of domestic subject matter as ‘serious’ work.\footnote{Coney, ed., pp. 262-263.} Despite these difficulties, awards of titles for work in the arts did not go to men in greater numbers, because recognition of services to the arts at the titular level has been a relatively recent development. Indeed, the high proportion of dames who were honoured for their achievements in the arts suggests that this was an area of endeavour more readily open to female success than other areas, such as politics or the law, where women were honoured far less often, as is discussed in the next chapter. In Britain, ‘accomplishments’ such as skill in music, painting and drawing or dancing had customarily been taught to middle-class girls to improve their chances of marriage. New Zealand women during the colonial period were looked upon as the ‘guardians of refinement’ in arts and culture as well as in terms of society’s morals.\footnote{Ibid., p. 262.} Rather later, when Barbara Freyberg was made a dame, the short profile of her in The Press made note of her ‘expert insight on music, art, drama, handcrafts and horticulture’, which she had supposedly gained from ‘[a]ncestral ties and friendships in England’, and recalled how she had ‘delighted’ listeners at the Canterbury centennial celebrations with her singing, as well as with her ‘informed observations’.\footnote{‘New Year Honours List’, The Press, 2 January 1953, p. 6.} In an interview, Malvina Major pointed out that in her profession as an
opera singer, she was 'doing a job that requires a woman'. The gendered pattern in relation to the granting of titular honours for work in the arts may also be reflective of aspects of masculine gender identity related to New Zealand national identity. Jock Phillips suggested that the 'male stereotype' in New Zealand, to which rugby, drinking alcohol and mateship were central, may have suppressed some talents in some men, such as playing the piano, by pushing them in other directions. The honours system mirrored this stereotype in society by rarely honouring men for services to the arts, thus potentially reinforcing it. The increase in titular awards given for services in the arts in the 1990s suggests a weakening of that stereotype, that work in the arts came to be seen as more worthy of recognition than previously.

Nursing and teaching: the female professions and honours

Clearly, there has been an important opposition between different aspects of women’s inclusion in the titular levels of the royal honours system in New Zealand. While women who received a title were in a sense ‘honorary knights’, accepted into a male-dominated institution, conformity to traditional images of the feminine continued in both their work and in depictions of them in popular culture. This central paradox of women’s participation in titular honours is further complicated by consideration of the links between honours for women and two important early careers for women, nursing and teaching. Just as leisured women’s early involvement in philanthropy, comparative to their involvement in other public areas of work, was reflected in the award of titular honours to women, such links are evident in relation to teaching and nursing. Women first entered professional employment in areas emphasising their role as nurturers, paid work that utilised ‘their domestic skills of care and nurture’, and teaching and nursing were two of the most important such professions.
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It was women’s perceived role as nurturers that allowed nursing to be viewed as ‘a legitimate extension of the domestic sphere’. Indeed, it was in nursing that Florence Nightingale became, as mentioned earlier, the first woman given membership in an official order, albeit non-titular. Nightingale was known as ‘the Lady with the Lamp’ and an ‘angel’ tending injured soldiers. She was celebrated as a woman whose feminine virtues were strong; she was visible in traditional history as a ‘super-womanly’ exemplar of the supposedly feminine virtues. Nursing as work worthy of honour was a theme in New Zealand too. The first woman to receive an honour in New Zealand, Miss A. Crisp, was given the RRC for her service as a nurse with British troops in Africa and Egypt, and the first New Zealand woman to be honoured, Matron J. W. M. Williamson, was also given the RRC, for her work as a nurse with the New Zealand soldiers in the South African War. Of the early awards in the Order of the British Empire, at the lower levels of the order, nurses were prominent. Sibylla Maude, of the Nurse Maude District Nursing Service, was given the OBE in the civil division in 1934, and of the ten women who received the civil MBE in a 1937 list nine held positions as matrons and one as a nurse inspector. Nurses also featured among the small proportion of awards in the military division of the Order of the British Empire that were given to women, all at low levels of the honours system. For example, Ida Willis, Matron-in-Chief of the New Zealand Army Nursing Service, received an OBE in the military division in 1944.

Despite the importance of nursing as an early profession for women, however, only two women received honours at the titular level for medical work in New Zealand.
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Cecily Pickerill was an innovative plastic surgeon, and Norma Restieaux was a cardiologist and an associate professor of medicine at Otago Medical School at the time of her honour. The lack of women to have received titles for medical work is at first glance surprising, given the frequent honouring of women for community service. However, the explanation for this apparent contradiction lies in the split between the positions of nurse, which was seen as a suitable position for women from the later nineteenth century, and doctor, a higher status occupation which remained for much longer a male-dominated profession where women’s opportunities were limited, often to ‘women-oriented specialisations’ such as obstetrics. It appears that, as a career viewed as women’s, nursing was not valued as men’s work was, and thus not honoured at the titular level. Women in medicine, it seems, were only honoured at the titular level when they followed male career paths as doctors and researchers.

Consideration of women in education in relation to the award of honours in New Zealand supports this analysis. Work in education or in academia featured in the citations of nine women (15.5%) who received titular honours before 2000. Among these were Marie Clay, a professor at Auckland University who developed the Reading Recovery programme, Christchurch Girls’ High Principal Dawn Lamb, historian Anne Salmond and anthropologist Joan Metge. Teaching, like nursing, became one of the first professions that women entered because it could be justified by evoking images of the female role as nurturer and mother. Awards of the DBE to Lamb, and to Sister Pauline Engel, Principal of Carmel College between 1983 and 1991, fit the pattern of women being honoured for work related to these images. As well, women were occasionally honoured for work in education at the lower levels of the honours system in
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the first decades of women’s inclusion in honours. In 1928, Mary McLean, the former Principal of the Wellington Girls’ College, was granted the civil CBE; this was the first award to a woman in an order of chivalry to appear in the *New Zealand Gazette* since 1920, apart from Christina Massey’s GBE.456

Yet although a significant number of women were made dames for their work in education, these titular honours often went to women who worked at the tertiary level. As well as Clay, Salmond and Metge, Evelyn Stokes was a geography professor at Waikato University when she was honoured, as well as having been on the Waitangi Tribunal for eleven years, and Patricia Bergquist and Ella Campbell, both honoured for their ‘services to science’, were both researchers and university lecturers.457 After teaching at Avonside Girls’ High School, Jean Herbison moved to the Christchurch Teachers’ College, holding the position of vice principal between 1968 and 1974. She then became the Associate Director at the Christchurch Polytechnic in 1975, remaining in that role until 1984.458 The higher reaches of academia have traditionally been a male space, and women entering that space in the early twentieth century often faced difficulties, including lower pay than male academics, and less opportunity for promotion.459 The honouring of academic women again suggests that women were honoured when they achieved in traditionally male ways.

Amongst knights, a significant proportion of titles were given for academic and medical work, often both. Fifty-two knights (11.4%) were honoured for services that included academic work, and twenty-nine (6.3%) for work in the field of medicine; fifteen of these knighthoods encompassed both medical and academic work. Graham Liggins, for instance, received the honour of Knight Bachelor in 1991 for his services to
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'medical research', and had been a lecturer at the University of Auckland.\textsuperscript{460} The importance of the academic and medical fields as areas in which men received titular honours supports the contention that the royal honours system remained a male-dominated space in the twentieth century. While honours to men in medicine and academia reflected the rise of the professions since the nineteenth century, these fields remained male-dominated for much of the twentieth century. Women who received titular honours in these areas of work had usually succeeded at a traditionally masculine level, in contrast to those women who were honoured for community services, work that conformed to the customary feminine role. There was a tension, then, between areas of work considered women's that were re-valued and honoured, and those that continued to be valued less highly than related, but customarily male, professions. Although nursing and teaching were professionalised through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, they were largely viewed as 'feminised profession[s]'\textsuperscript{461} The women who worked in these areas fell between the area of voluntary community service that had come to be accepted as feminine in the nineteenth century, and the areas of work that had been traditionally perceived as masculine, including as doctors and academics. Women in both of the latter two, the conforming and the exceptional, were honoured at the titular level, whereas women in the ‘feminised profession[s]’ were largely excluded from high level honours during the twentieth century. Honours were granted at lower levels to these women, suggesting that these ‘feminised profession[s]’ were not held in high esteem in society in comparison to women’s voluntary work or to supposedly masculine careers.

\textbf{Extending conformity: a white norm as well?}

In a similar way to that in which these women were honoured for achieving in traditionally male ways, the honours system has been a conservative space in relation to


\textsuperscript{461} The phrase is from: W. Robinson, 'Frocks, frills, femininity and representations of the woman teacher in \textit{The Woman Teacher's World: reconstructing the early twentieth century English 'schoolmarm'}', \textit{Journal of Educational Administration and History} 35(2), September 2003, p. 98.
race, and Maori have often been honoured for achieving in traditionally Pakeha ways. A number of knights and dames were honoured for services to the Maori people, and in this area of service as well, a greater proportion of awards went to women than to men. Five dames were created whose work involved service to Maori, or 8.6% of titular awards to women since 1917. These awards included Maori leader Whina Cooper and the Maori Queen Te Arikinui Te Atairangikaahu. As well, Georgina Kirby and Mira Szaszy were made dames for services to the community that included work with the MWWL and other areas of Maori life. Seventeen men were knighted for work that included service to Maori, 3.7% of titular awards granted to men since 1917. Among these were Graham Latimer, President of the New Zealand Maori Council; Hugh Kawharu, foundation professor of Maori Studies at Massey University and Waitangi Tribunal member; and James Henare, a Maori leader who was also involved in a number of community organisations, such as the NZRSA and the Federated Farmers of New Zealand (FFNZ).

Among those who were honoured for work including services to Maori, links and connections are evident. The earliest Maori knights, after 1917, were Maui Pomare, Apirana Ngata and Peter Buck. They were students at Te Aute College, associates of each other involved in reforming Maori healthcare along Western lines, and had all served as Members of Parliament at least once in their careers. Others who were later granted titular honours for services to Maori were often linked to these early Maori knights, including Ngata’s son Henare in 1982; Kingi Ihaka, whose father was a friend of
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Ngata, in 1989; and Whina Cooper, who was a friend of Ngata and a supporter of his land development schemes, in 1981. Charles Bennett, made a Knight Bachelor in 1975 ‘for public services, especially to the Maori people’, had been educated at Te Aute, and had been a commanding officer of the Maori Battalion. When he received his knighthood, he was the president of the Labour Party, which was in power at the time. Kirby and Szaszy were honoured for their work in the community, as were many other dames. These awards to both knights and dames show that Maori were often honoured when they had, in a sense, entered the Pakeha establishment, although often pressing Maori concerns. Like the honouring of female doctors, researchers and academics, these awards reinforced the traditional white male norm of the honours system at the same time as transgressing it. The white male essence of the royal honours system was thus not threatened by bestowing titularhonours on these men and women. Further, the potential threat to the establishment posed by those seeking Maori rights could be lessened by honouring them, displaying that they had been accepted into the establishment.

**Conclusion**

Women who were made dames were clearly not simply ‘singular exceptions’ in an institution with a male norm. Their position was more complex, for while they had joined the male-dominated honours system, many dames had fulfilled traditional gender roles in the services for which they were recognised. Although the granting of a title in their own right, for their own achievements, was a non-traditional step that signified some change in women’s position, traditional gender roles were potentially reinforced by the frequent honouring of women whose work exemplified the supposedly feminine

---
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virtues of caring and nurturing, particularly in the field of community service. Images of women in the popular media contributed to this underlying thread of continuity that ran through the creation of dames in New Zealand even in the late twentieth century. Yet, perhaps unexpectedly, it was the women who had followed predominantly male career paths to be doctors, researchers and academics who were honoured in the fields of medicine and education, not those in female-dominated roles that exemplified caring attributes. Achievements that reflected ‘super-womanly’ virtues were not the only type of success for which women were made dames.
Chapter Four

The work of dames and knights: traditional patterns in honours and non-traditional work for women

While many dames received their titles for their achievements in fields that reflected supposedly feminine roles and qualities, not all women made dames fitted this pattern. Like the women working as doctors and academics, some women were recognised for their success in traditionally male-dominated occupations. Yet although work in fields of activity such as law, commerce, or politics and government was non-traditional work for women, the award of titles to women for their work in these fields was part of a pattern in which the grant of titles in New Zealand since 1917 was weighted towards these areas. It was for work in politics or public service, in commerce or industry, and in the judiciary that men most frequently received titles during the period. This pattern was also common in the UK, being reproduced in New Zealand through the use of an essentially British honours system for much of the twentieth century. Among the dames whose work in male-dominated roles was non-traditional, yet whose honour was linked to traditional patterns in the granting of titles, distinct similarities were visible in their lives, and in the ways in which they were portrayed in popular culture.

Knights and dames in public service...

If many dames received their titles for work in areas traditionally viewed as women’s, so too did many men receive their knighthood for work traditionally considered a male preserve. An overwhelming preponderance of men who received titular honours in New Zealand were given the honour for their services in public affairs, the judiciary, commerce and industry. Of all the services given by those who received titular honours between 1917 and 2000, work in public affairs appeared the most frequently in the careers of knights. Public services are services to the state and government, and include regional work (as in local government), national work (in the
legislature and the executive, for instance), and international work (for example, in the diplomatic service). Governors-General, Prime Ministers, politicians, diplomats and mayors, sometimes retired and sometimes still serving, have all appeared frequently in the honours awarded since 1917, receiving all types of titular honours. Of the 458 knighthoods announced in the *New Zealand Gazette* since 1917, over a third went to recipients who had given public service at the local, national or international level (172, or 37.6%) (see Figure Six in Chapter Three). At one end of the scale, a number of long-serving mayors, usually of major New Zealand cities, have been made Knights Bachelor; at the other, Keith Holyoake, Prime Minister in 1957 and between 1960 and 1972, and Governor-General from 1977 to 1980, received both a GCMG in 1970, and the prestigious KG in 1980. On the whole, though, national or international public affairs work predominated over local, with 122 knighthoods being given to men who had performed some public service at that level.

The pattern of honouring men in public service was a remarkably static trend over the years between 1917 and 2000. Only in four five-year periods during these years did other types of services outnumber public in the work done by male recipients of titular honours (see Figure Seven in Chapter Three). In three of those cases, public service was the second largest category of services to have been performed by men who became knights. In the fourth, between 1940 and 1944, during the Second World War, only one knight was created, as well as one additional knight. Both of those, Major-General John Duigan and Major-General Bernard Freyberg, were given KBEs in the military division. Among men who were knighted, public service was clearly a common thread, and one that has remained strong in the awarding of titular honours to men for almost a century.
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Women have been created as dames for their public services as well; indeed, this area of work appeared quite frequently in the services of women created as dames, after community service and equal to services in the arts. Nine titular awards have been given to women for work that included public service at the national level, and three for work that included public service at the local level. These twelve awards constitute 20.7% of the fifty-eight titular honours to women that have been announced in the *New Zealand Gazette* (see Figure Five in Chapter Three). Of those twelve honours, three were granted to Catherine Tizard: a DBE in 1985 for public and community service, including as Mayor of Auckland, a GCMG in 1990 when Governor-General Designate, and a GCVO in 1995 when Governor-General.\(^{472}\) The GCMG, not awarded in great number in New Zealand anyway, was generally given to Governors-General or Prime Ministers, and the even rarer GCVO to Governors-General who had particularly served the monarch.\(^{473}\) Tizard’s GMCG and GCVO, therefore, stemmed from this custom, and reflected her position as Governor-General.

Although a relatively high proportion of women received high honours for their public service, this proportion is deceptive in a number of ways. Firstly, because honours were used after their eighteenth- and nineteenth-century revival and expansion to reward those who served the state, public service work provided a high proportion of all honours, at all times and all levels. In New Zealand between 1917 and 2000, nearly one third (32.9%) of all titular honours were granted for work that included public services.\(^{474}\) Until 1975, civil servants were also able to receive the lower, non-titular Imperial Service Order (ISO) after giving ‘long and meritorious service’. The ISO was never given to a woman in New Zealand between 1917 and 1975, although the rarely given Imperial
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Service Medal (ISM) appears to have been given once to a woman, before 1917. The award was no longer given in New Zealand after the QSO and QSM were established, as those awards catered for rewarding public service as well. The corollary to women’s having received more QSOs and QSMs than men for community service, as was discussed in Chapter Three, was that men received the majority of the QSOs and QSMs awarded for public service. Similarly, in the UK, Walker examined the honours list for June 1982 and recorded that civil servants received a sixth of the honours at all levels, despite forming a mere sixtieth of the population. As for politicians, he noted that in the list for June 1985, ten knights and one dame were created for political services. The continuing dominance of honours given for public service work throws the gendered nature of the honours system into sharp relief, since public service positions have traditionally been dominated by men. The number of titular honours given to women for work that included public services, twelve, simply does not approach the number given to men, 158. In the more traditionally female area of community service, on the other hand, the disparity was far less. Nineteen women received titular honours for work including community service, compared to seventy-seven men.

Secondly, as discussed in the previous chapter, women who were created dames for public services according to the citations for their awards, had often still worked in areas linked to traditionally feminine nurturing roles, such as commissions dealing with women’s and children’s issues. Hilda Ross, for instance, who worked in that male space as the National MP for Hamilton between 1945 and 1959, is remembered also as the first Minister in charge of the Welfare of Women and Children. As well, public service was combined with community service in the awards given to some dames. The DBE
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granted to Elizabeth Gilmer, a city councillor in Wellington between 1941 and 1953, recognised her strong involvement in community service as well as her contribution to local government. She was involved in the local branches of the Plunket Society, the New Zealand Crippled Children Society and the NCW, as well as a number of other organisations, and represented New Zealand at the 1949 ICW conference.\(^{479}\) Similarly, Catherine Tizard in 1985, and Dorothy Fraser in 1987, both received DBEs for community service as well as public service.\(^{480}\) The public service given by dames, therefore, was closely related to the community service for which women were more frequently honoured. Exceptions to this pattern were the DCMG granted to Ann Hercus, the first female Minister of Police, who was, however, also Minister of Social Welfare and the first Minister of Women’s Affairs; and Catherine Tizard’s GCMG and GCVO as New Zealand’s first female Governor General.\(^{481}\) Both women were exceptional, being the first women in traditionally male spaces. Yet at the same time, these awards were highly traditional, given for work that often featured in the careers of those honoured with a title. Indeed, in one newspaper article, Hercus’ title was cited as an example of a politician receiving an award after ‘only one term as a cabinet minister’.\(^{482}\) This view of her honour does not recognise her achievements as a woman entering a traditionally male space.

Some explanation of the predominance of (mostly male) politicians and public servants in the award of titular honours is found in the practice of reserving certain honours for rewarding public service, especially long service. The Order of St Michael and St George, set up for rewarding colonial service, was usually a reward for civil

---


\(^{480}\) ‘Database of titular honours, 1917-2000’, see Appendix Two.


service in or relating to the Commonwealth, and for diplomats. Of the thirty-four awards of the KCMG since 1917, twenty-four were given to politicians and diplomats, five to Chief Justices, and two to Chief Ombudsmen. The honour was also given to three university professors, Algernon Thomas, Albert Liley and Peter Buck, who was then director of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum in Hawaii. It is still the case that certain honours are restricted to certain types of service in the UK: the Order of the Bath given to ‘State Servant[s] only, including members of the Armed Forces’; the Order of St Michael and St George for ‘members of the Diplomatic Services and to those who render service to UK interests overseas’. The reserving of particular honours for ‘civil servants, army officers or diplomats’, and the ‘automaticity’ of some awards, is the target of one of the reforms proposed in a recent review in the UK, which recommended that awards no longer be given in the Orders of the Bath and of St Michael and St George, or for holding a certain position. Given the type of services these orders were reserved for, the small number of women given titular honours within them (none in the Bath and just two DCMGs and one GCMG in St Michael and St George) is unsurprising, as these have been areas traditionally dominated by men, particularly at the high levels. In the New Zealand honours system in 2004, however, David Baguley stated that the honours lists now held few state servants and diplomats in comparison to members of the general public. Indeed, he stated that serving public servants were no longer usually considered for honours, except where their service had been outstanding, or where they were nearing retirement.
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Another traditionally male space in which knighthoods were frequently granted was the judiciary. Many judges, usually those in the High Court (or as it once was, the Supreme Court) and Court of Appeal, have been made knights since 1917. Eighty-five knighthoods, 18.6% of all knighthoods bestowed since 1917, were granted for legal services, the majority of those to serving or retired judges. This pattern of titular honours going to members of the judiciary extended throughout the period between 1917 and 2000 unabated. In 1917, John Denniston was made a Knight Bachelor, after becoming a Judge in the Supreme Court in 1889; in 2000, Rodney Gallen received a KNZM for his work as a High Court Judge between 1983 and 1999. In between, three or more, usually more, knighthoods were given for work that included legal services in all but one five-year period, the exception being 1940-1944. Fifty-three Judges were made Knight Bachelor between 1917 and 1996, eight were given the civil KBE, six of those after they were appointed to a more senior position such as President of the Court of Appeal, and five received the KNZM. Higher awards, including the KCMG, the GCMG and the GBE, have gone to nine men who held the position of Chief Justice of New Zealand. Two of those, Michael Myers and Richard Wild, received the KCMG after being appointed as Chief Justice and a higher first class titular honour during or after their time in that role.

Just twice has a woman in New Zealand been made a dame for legal services, and both awards clearly demonstrate and reinforce the gender inequality in the profession, as well as stressing the uncommonness of these women. Augusta Wallace received a DBE
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488 Database of titular honours, 1917-2000', see Appendix Two.
490 Database of titular honours, 1917-2000', see Appendix Two.
for her service as a District Court Judge, a level of seniority not generally sufficient for a male judge to have been knighted, although a Chief District Court Judge, Desmond Sullivan, was knighted in 1985, and a Stipendiary Magistrate, James Wicks, in 1978. Wallace, who had had her own legal practice and been a city councillor in Papatoetoe for three years, became New Zealand’s first female Stipendiary Magistrate in 1975, when women made up a mere 2% of lawyers. Her uniqueness was augmented by her being the first woman granted a titular honour for legal services. By 1992, 47.5% of those admitted to the bar were female. Sian Elias, the second woman made a dame in New Zealand for legal services, received a GNZM in 1999, after she became New Zealand’s first female Chief Justice. A first class titular honour was customarily granted to Chief Justices in twentieth-century New Zealand. As with Catherine Tizard’s GMCG and GCVO, it may be argued that Elias’ office was the reason for her honour, and her status as the second woman in New Zealand to receive a titular honour for legal services was simply coincidental.

Indeed, a variety of honours in New Zealand have been essentially automatic, being traditionally given to the occupants of certain posts. The custom of granting the title of Knight Bachelor to the Speaker of the House stretches back to Clifford in 1858. Newspaper articles discussing the move to end titular honours in New Zealand noted that such a change would deprive a former Speaker, Doug Kidd, of his turn to receive the title of Sir. A continuing element of automaticity was hinted at in Helen Clark’s suggestion that Kidd could receive a different honour. It was customary to give a mayor in his or her third consecutive term a titular honour. A number of mayors did appear among the
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knights created after 1917, such as James Gunson, Mayor of Auckland from 1915-1925; James Barnes, Mayor of Dunedin between 1968 and 1977; Hamish Hay, Mayor of Christchurch who retired in 1989 as the city's then longest serving mayor; and Harry Barker, who completed nine consecutive terms as Mayor of Gisborne. Among the small number of knights created in the military divisions of the Orders of the Bath and the British Empire in New Zealand, many stemmed from the apparently automatic honouring of the Chief of Defence Staff or Chief of General Staff. The most recent such award was a KBE in the military division given in 1994 to Vice Admiral Somerford Teagle, who was Chief of the Defence Force between 1992 and 1995. Similar awards appeared 16 times throughout the years between 1917 and 2000. In 1935, for instance, Major-General Sir William Sinclair-Burgess, the General Officer Commanding the New Zealand Military Forces and already a Knight Bachelor, received a KBE in the military division. In 1967, a military division KCB went to Lieutenant-General Leonard Thornton, then Chief of Defence Staff, and Chief of General Staff between 1960 and 1965. In the case of the judiciary, it was reported that Chief Justice Sir Thomas Eichelbaum argued in his submission to the Prime Minister's Advisory Committee that honours accompanied the occupation and helped to compensate judges for the drop in income from that of a successful lawyer. The report of the committee acknowledged the practice of giving honours to 'senior members' of the judiciary, but, while agreeing that judges' positions were demanding and that they should be eligible for honours, urged
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that merit be the vital criteria for awarding honours, not position or level of seniority. In the report, the committee also contended that New Zealand had gone further than the UK towards making honours available to many people, for service rather than due to rank or office, 'reflecting the egalitarian traditions of New Zealand society'.\textsuperscript{503} In the recent Select Committee report on honours in the UK, one recommendation made was that civil servants no longer received automatic awards; while in a 1993 review on honours in the UK it was stated that honours ought not to be given automatically because one was employed in a certain occupation.\textsuperscript{504}

...and in business

A large number of knights were also created among industrialists and businessmen. Of the 458 knighthoods announced in the New Zealand Gazette since 1917, 106 (23.1\%) were granted to men whose careers included significant business interests.\textsuperscript{505} For instance, Woolf Fisher, who formed Fisher and Paykel with Maurice Paykel and was involved in technological development, was made a Knight Bachelor in 1964, and James Doig, an industrialist involved in a number of companies, was granted the same honour in 1970. James Fletcher, the retired president and director of Fletcher Challenge, was knighted in 1980; his father, and the company's founder, had also been knighted in 1946.\textsuperscript{506} Industrial and commercial figures have frequently been given high honours in the UK as well. From Margaret Thatcher's election as Prime Minister in 1979 until June 1985, Walker recorded sixty-four 'private-sector industrialists' who had been made knights.\textsuperscript{507} Along with public services and the judiciary, business has consistently been one of the three most frequently-appearing areas of work in the careers of men made

\textsuperscript{503} Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, pp. 45, 59.
\textsuperscript{504} Public Administration Select Committee, paragraph 146; Phillips, Review of the Honours System, p. 14.
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\textsuperscript{507} Walker, p. 164.
knights in New Zealand since 1917. Forty of the 106 men received their knighthood for careers that included both industrial or commercial interests and community service, particularly from the 1960s, when community service began to be an important element in the work of significant numbers of men made knights. Only one woman in New Zealand has been honoured for work of a commercial nature. Cheryll Sotheran received her DNZM for her services ‘to museum administration’ as the chief executive of New Zealand’s national museum, Te Papa Tongarewa.\textsuperscript{508} Even then, her work in establishing New Zealand’s national museum was closely related to public services.

Agriculture, including the dairy and the meat industries, has also produced a number of knights in New Zealand, which is unsurprising given the extent to which these activities have been important in the New Zealand economy. While these knights were sometimes involved in academic work and research, they were also often involved in the meat and dairy industries themselves, for instance in marketing and exporting. Thirty-one of the 458 titular honours granted to men since 1917 (6.8\%) went to men whose careers had included services to agriculture.\textsuperscript{509} Created a Knight Bachelor in 1956, Walter Mulholland was the secretary of the Darfield branch of the New Zealand Farmers’ Union (NZFU) at the age of seventeen in 1904, on the New Zealand Meat Producers’ Board from 1943-1961, the president of the Dominion NZFU for nine years, and the first president of the FFNZ.\textsuperscript{510} In 1988, Peter Elworthy was knighted for his ‘services to agriculture’, having been the president of the FFNZ between 1984 and 1987, and the founding president of the New Zealand Deer Farmers’ Association between 1978 and 1981.\textsuperscript{511} No women have received titular honours in this area. Although it has never provided particularly large numbers of knights, this area is also one that has featured in

\textsuperscript{508} Database of titular honours, 1917-2000', see Appendix Two; 'Warrior chief who battled for Te Papa', \textit{The Dominion}, 8 June 2002, accessed from Factiva.
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the careers of men granted knighthoods throughout the years from 1917 to 2000. However, the services of these knights, given the traditional importance of the agricultural sector in the New Zealand economy, were closely related to those of men who were knighted for their work in industry and commerce.

**Controversy in rewarding politicians, judges and entrepreneurs**

Some of the criticism that has been directed at the royal honours system in New Zealand focused on the large proportions of honours that have been given to those in public service, law or commerce and industry. This criticism generally revolved around the concern that such people were simply doing their jobs, and were already well rewarded with good salaries. As recently as 2000, Jim Anderton, then Deputy Prime Minister, argued that honours were cheapened through knighting ‘successful businesspeople’ and ‘high-profile politicians’. He disapproved of honouring them for successes that ‘in a way they have already got recognition for’.

In the same year, when removal of titles was again being discussed, it was written in one newspaper that knighthood was ‘too often conferred for no higher achievement than longevity in a prominent and usually well-paid position’.

Similarly, when Roger Douglas, architect of the controversial ‘Rogernomics’ policies in the Labour government elected in 1984, was knighted in 1991, this argument was an important thread in the disapproval expressed in the media. Writing in *The Evening Post* on that New Year’s honours list, Ruth Laugesen suggested that honours had often gone to public servants for ‘only doing what they have been paid to do’.

The same point was made in a letter to the editor on Douglas’s knighthood. Much earlier, similar criticisms appeared in a 1959 *Weekly News* piece, where the author noted that the civil service were already paid by the Government, yet received a high proportion of honours through the work they did ‘for the
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In the UK, one MP, commenting on the select committee review of honours, argued that honours should not merely be given for ‘doing your job well’.\textsuperscript{517} In a separate report, Sir Hayden Phillips recommended that the ‘balance of awards’ in the UK be ‘further shifted away from state service’, including the civil service, the military and the diplomatic service; he recommended that 20\% of awards go to those in state service, rather than the 27\% given for state service in 2003.\textsuperscript{518} In a different version of this criticism of honours, De la Bere argued, in relation to those who had become ‘well known, and usually highly paid, public figures’ in sport or entertainment, that such people had ‘really not done anything out of the ordinary for the good of their country’, as people working in charity, medical research or science might have.\textsuperscript{519} Criticism of the weighting of the honours system toward particular services was linked to the issues of control and corruption surrounding the process of distributing awards that were discussed in the Introduction of this thesis, and which are worthy of further study in the future.

**Dames and knights in other traditionally male activities**

Titular honours were also granted in small numbers to recognise important contributions in various other areas of traditionally masculine endeavour. In the military lists published in the *New Zealand Gazette*, all eighteen titular honours were granted to men, and women received only a small proportion of honours at all levels in the military division of the Order of the British Empire. Six OBEs, twenty-eight MBEs and twenty-four BEMs were given to women in the military division of the Order of the British Empire between 1917 and 1996, a little over 3\% of all the total number of those awards.

\textsuperscript{516} Investigator, p. 3. On the other hand, the same anonymous writer argued that industrialists should receive more honours, because they had advanced New Zealand, and frequently served their communities as well. Ibid.
\textsuperscript{517} Vera Baird MP, quoted in Morrison, p. 14.
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given in that period in the military division.\textsuperscript{520} Seven men were knighted for services to a profession other than the law, medicine or academia; no women received titular honours in similar fields.\textsuperscript{521} For instance, Miles Warren, whose architectural designs, which include the Christchurch Town Hall and the public library, are well-known in New Zealand, received the civil KBE in 1985 for his ‘services to architecture’.\textsuperscript{522} Two knights, and no dames, were created in New Zealand for their services to the trade union movement. One of those was Federation of Labour (FOL) president Tom Skinner, whose 1976 knighthood was viewed by some as co-opting him, and his acceptance as unfaithful to the movement.\textsuperscript{523} Three men and one woman were given titular honours for work that included services to religion. The three men were Paul Reeves in 1985, when he was Anglican Primate and Archbishop of New Zealand; Edward Norman in 1984, Anglican Bishop of Wellington since 1973; and Dean Goffin in 1983, Commissioner and Territorial Commander of the Salvation Army in New Zealand. Phyllis Guthardt was the only dame created for services to religion, and she was honoured for her services to women as well as to the Methodist Church.\textsuperscript{524} A Methodist minister, she was the first woman ordained in any of the mainstream churches in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{525}

Although it was only relatively recently that honours for sport appeared at the titular level, a similar pattern is evident to that in other areas of endeavour not traditionally considered feminine. Fifteen men were granted a title for their services to various sports, and only one woman. Lance Cross, who was a sports broadcaster and a member of the International Olympic Committee’s executive board, was made a Knight

\textsuperscript{520} ‘Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000’, see Appendix One. The military list has in the past been subject to criticism on the grounds that, proportionally, more awards (at all levels) were made to those in the military than considered appropriate in times of peace. For instance: Investigator, p. 3; Riddell, p. 9.
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Bachelor in 1984; before his award, only two titular honours announced in the *New Zealand Gazette* had been granted for work involving sport.\(^{526}\) Other men knighted for their services to sports included Richard Hadlee in 1990, well-known New Zealand cricket player from 1973 to 1990; Peter Blake, then skipper of Team New Zealand, in 1995; and in 1999 Brian Lochore, former All Black captain, and coach of the team between 1985 and 1987, the year the All Blacks won the World Cup.\(^{527}\) Susan Devoy was the only woman made a dame in New Zealand for her services to sport, and this recognition of her success was combined with recognition of her services to the community.\(^{528}\) Similarly, however, Brian Lochore and Murray Halberg, who won Olympic gold in Rome in 1960, were recognised for their services to the community as well as to sport.\(^{529}\)

**Explaining the imbalance: a reflection of society?**

In all these traditionally male-dominated areas of endeavour, from public service to the judiciary, from commerce and industry to the military or sport, titular honours were clearly granted to women far less frequently than to men. Titular honours were also given to women in these areas less frequently than they were given to women who had been involved in community service, an area constructed as feminine in which men were honoured less often, as a proportion of the total, than women. This pattern is particularly strong in those areas where men were granted titles in the greatest numbers, such as public service, business and law. In a way, the imbalance in the types of services for which men and women were most often honoured reflected an imbalance in society itself.
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As careers in government, business, law or the military were traditionally the province of men, women faced obstacles entering and excelling in these fields. For instance, in 1966, Sian Elias was one of only eight females in a class of 400 law students at Auckland University. After completing her studies in the early 1970s, she discovered that a law firm where she had applied for a position, which she did not get, had been surprised that a woman would apply. The firm felt that she would be unable to have morning tea with the male staff but would be ‘bored’ with the secretaries. In the church too, Phyllis Guthardt experienced significant obstacles to her career for a number of years; when she was to become a candidate for the ministry, ‘quite a number of people made it very plain’ that they did not wish her to be ordained. She recalled her early years in the ministry, when: ‘I think people were afraid that I might bury the wrong person at a funeral, or perhaps ... marry the bride to the best man’. Since women often faced difficulty in entering or choosing careers, such as politics, law and commerce, in which many knights were created, the low number of women made dames for such work is not altogether surprising. The small number of women honoured in the Order of St Michael and St George, for instance, is partially explained as a result of the practice of reserving it for diplomats and politicians. Women have in the past reached posts where they might expect such an honour less often than men. As pointed out by David Baguley, the practice therefore created structural constraints until that honour was removed from the New Zealand system in 1996.

Certainly, the committee reporting on honours in 1995 believed that ‘[a]n honours system mirrors a society’. In his review of the UK honours system, Sir Hayden Phillips suggested that the smaller number of awards going to women, as to ethnic
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531 Guthardt, interview with the author, 29 September 2004. On the other hand, Guthardt tells of one small girl who, hearing that a male minister was to take up Guthardt’s position in one parish, asked her mother how a man could be a minister. As Guthardt explains, ‘I was all she’d known’. Ibid.
533 Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, p. 57.
minorities, might 'reflect a deeper problem of gender and racial inequality in types of work', and in the 'numbers of women/ethnic minorities achieving key positions in many areas of society'. He suggested that women may achieve 'influential positions or noteworthy roles of service to the community' less often than men because of 'family responsibilities at some stage in their lives'. Baguley also stated that an honours system is 'supposed to reflect society' and what is considered important in society; he suggested that the honouring of individuals such as Brian Lochore, as an All Blacks player and coach, reflected a public desire that such people be honoured. The rise in women receiving honours carrying the title of Dame from the 1970s might then be accounted for by the influence of second wave feminism being felt, the increased value being placed on activities more often open to women, and by the changes in women's lives that had meant women more frequently entered public positions where such an honour was likely.

Yet there was no dramatic shift towards large numbers of women being recognised for their success in largely male-dominated fields after 1980. Rather, as seen in the previous chapter, it was only after 1980 that most dames were created, and community service work predominated among them. The explanation for this pattern lies in the way that work gendered feminine has been valued comparatively to work gendered masculine. As a state expression of what is valued, the honours system can influence society by honouring certain services more often than others, and therefore suggesting that they are more valuable. By creating honours such as the Order of St Michael and St George that were reserved for traditionally male careers, the work women traditionally did was devalued. An example of this devaluing of female work was the claim, written in a UK newspaper article at the time of the creation of the Order of the British Empire, that it was inappropriate to place the MBE before the Military Cross because 'any lady... who
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leaves her home to take care of itself while she fusses about at a soldiers’ canteen’ could receive the MBE. In the same article, the author argued that it was inappropriate to give the same honour in the Order of the British Empire to official photographers who had worked with soldiers and risked their lives as to ‘girls [who] have been engaged all the time in comfortable… billets at home’.

As previously discussed, second wave feminists often emphasised the value of women’s qualities and their unpaid domestic and community work. Moving beyond rhetoric, this emphasis included arguments that the value of traditionally female work should be acknowledged in a quantifiable way. Marilyn Waring, for example, wrote of the way in which women’s unpaid work, productive and reproductive, was not seen as valuable in narrow systems of economic theory. Linking this failure to ascribe value to women’s work to the invisibility of women, she argued that such invisibility would continue so long as their ‘unpaid productive and reproductive labour remain invisible’, and contended that what women do without payment should be recognised as work, and themselves as part of the labour force.

While economic theory and scholarship may not have adopted ideas such as Waring’s, the increase in the honouring of women working in community service or in women’s affairs after 1980 can be understood in the context of an increased recognition of women’s caring role in the community as feminists emphasised the importance of that role.

However, a clear imbalance remained between women and men in the granting of titular honours through the 1980s and 1990s, both in total numbers and in the types of service rewarded. In a submission to the committee reviewing honours in 1995, the NCW contended that voluntary work, especially work in the community by women, had
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537 Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood, OBE Letters, Box 4, Truth, 21 August 1918, p. 235, quoted in Galloway, pp. 43-44.
been undervalued.\textsuperscript{539} In a brief article after Stella Casey was made a dame, the reporter wrote of Casey’s desire to see ‘more women in the community … recognised for the work they do’, and of her belief that the ‘lack of recognition for women’ was due to ‘the media and the community profile men are given, compared to the often “invisible” work of women’.\textsuperscript{540} The report of the committee in 1995 concluded that:

\begin{quote}
women’s access remains constrained by the roles played by women in our society, by the value put on women’s work and, it appears, by a reluctance on the part of women to see their names put forward.\textsuperscript{541}
\end{quote}

This statement encompasses as explanations both the career inequalities present in society, which were reproduced in the honours system, and the low valuation given to work traditionally gendered feminine, which could be reinforced by the honours system itself. Both of these interacting processes centred around the weighting of the honours system towards traditionally male careers, which was typified in the vast number of knights created in comparison to the number of dames, and in the small proportion of dames who did work in male-dominated careers.

\textbf{Being first: dames as exceptional role models?}

Dames working in male-dominated careers were therefore doubly exceptional, both as women given titles in their own right and as women who entered traditionally male domains. Moreover, many of the women who were given titular honours for work in male-dominated occupations achieved a ‘first’ for women by entering those occupations, or by reaching particular positions within them, thus strengthening their exceptional status. Being the first woman to enter roles traditionally gendered masculine was a common theme in the lives of many dames. Augusta Wallace and Sian Elias in the judiciary, Catherine Tizard in the vice-regal role, Phyllis Guthardt in the Methodist Church and Ann Hercus as Minister of Police, were all the first women in New Zealand

\textsuperscript{539} Prime Minister’s Honours Advisory Committee, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{540} ‘Dame protests lack of honours for women’, \textit{The Evening Post}, 31 December 1990, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{541} Prime Minister’s Honours Advisory Committee, p. 57.
to fill certain customarily male positions. Margaret Bazley, honoured for public services, was the first female State Services Commissioner in New Zealand, and Jean Herbison was the first female chancellor at a New Zealand university, holding the position at the University of Canterbury between 1979 and 1984. Ella Campbell, whose work on orchids, native liverworts and ferns was internationally recognised, was the first female member of staff at Massey University. Although the latter three were working in areas where women were more often honoured than those who worked in politics, the judiciary or commerce, they were succeeding at a largely male-dominated level. Similarly, in the UK, New Zealand-born Dame Judith Jonas was the first woman to become the Provost of Kings College, Cambridge.

As well as these achievements, some dames had careers filled with ‘firsts’ for women. Tizard was also the first female mayor of Auckland, Elias one of the first two women to be appointed as Queen’s Counsel in New Zealand, and Guthardt the first female elected president of the New Zealand Methodist Church, in 1985. Hercus, besides being the first woman in politics to move away from the areas of health, welfare and education at Cabinet level, had also previously been the first woman appointed to the Commerce Commission, and subsequently became one of only two female ambassadors to the United Nations in the late 1980s. Gillian Weir was the first woman to hold the positions of president in the Incorporated Association of Organists and in the Royal College of Organists, while Marie Clay was the first female professor, the first female

544 'Waitangi Day award to Cambridge provost', The Press, 7 February 2004, section A, p. 3.
546 Bowman, 'Dame Ann... Behind the Public Face', p. 20; 'Ann Hercus', in Celebrating Women, p. 36. The other woman at the United Nations with Ann Hercus was also a Dame, Ruth Nita Barrow of Barbados. B. Riley, 'On Stage in the Big Apple', New Zealand Listener, 3 September 1988, p. 29.
head of department, and the first female emeritus professor at the University of Auckland.\textsuperscript{547} In a similar way, some dames have been known as the only woman, if not the first, in particular positions. When Dorothy Winstone was given her title, it was reported in \textit{The Dominion} that she had been known as 'the "token woman" on the various male-dominated committees' she had been a part of, although she reportedly said that 'she never felt that way'.\textsuperscript{548} Miriam Dell herself acknowledged her exceptional position, being quoted in \textit{North and South} as saying that she had in the past referred to herself as 'New Zealand's professional token woman'.\textsuperscript{549} This concept of a 'token woman', in a perverse way, supports the argument that second wave feminism had increased the visibility of women's concerns, by suggesting that previously all-male organisations and groups saw a need to present themselves as inclusive of women.

The 'firsts' for which women were honoured had important implications. In a sense, they opened new paths for women simply by achieving entry to male-dominated occupations. Moreover, as women who had been highly successful in male-dominated careers, these women demonstrated women's ability to reach the upper levels in their careers. Some dames themselves expressed a desire to be role models whose success blazed a trail for other women to follow. Before being made a dame, Margaret Bazley, commenting as the 'highest ranking woman in the New Zealand civil service', was reported as hoping that 'her example will encourage other women to pursue active and ambitious career paths'.\textsuperscript{550} Catherine Tizard considered that becoming Governor-General was 'another male bastion ... quietly crumbling', and one reaction felt by Ann Hercus when she was given the title was 'immense pride in being a role model and being

\textsuperscript{548} 'Women's fighter rewarded', p. 7.
\textsuperscript{549} 'Our Living Treasures: Dame Miriam Dell', \textit{North and South}, January 1990, p. 91.
honoured for that by the Government'. 551 Hilda Ross viewed her honour as 'recognition of work done by a woman, for women'. 552 The approbation from the Crown signified by the award of a titular honour in a sense strengthened the position of women in non-traditional occupations as role models for women to aspire to.

One dame who has shown an awareness of this potential for her being honoured for her work to facilitate the opening of paths for women into non-traditional occupations is Catherine Tizard. She was quoted in a New Zealand Woman's Weekly article as saying that she accepted the title 'because it was a statement about women’s rights to aspire to public office'. 553 In an earlier article profiling her, she said that when she became Mayor of Auckland she was:

aware of being on trial, not only on my own behalf but as a woman. If I messed it up ... it would prove that women in general couldn’t hack such a high-pressure job. 554

In a similar way, Phyllis Guthardt said in an interview that she saw her award as honouring women’s ‘very capable leadership’, which had ‘made it possible ... to imagine ... ordaining them’. She saw her honour as being a recognition of her work in ‘breaking new ground’ in the church, and was ‘very aware of women who’d come before me’. 555

These comments show the importance of the award of a title in giving honour to women’s efforts in the past, as well as in creating role models, and suggest how the grant of a title, as a royal honour, can have wider significance than merely honouring one person’s achievements or service. As an expression of approbation from the Crown, titular honours granted to women who were the first to enter careers traditionally gendered masculine had the potential to endorse those women as role models, and thereby smooth the progress of other women entering similar occupations.

553 Fleming, p. 23.
554 T. Redgrave, ‘No 1 in Auckland’, New Zealand Listener, 13 June 1987, p. 36.
555 Guthardt, interview with the author, 29 September 2004.
Yet that same commendation from the Crown could also increase the distance between these women who had achieved ‘firsts’ and other women. All dames, including those whose work has been in traditionally female areas, were ‘exceptions to the rule’ in an institution that assumed a male norm. Moreover, the title itself could create distance between the recipient and others, although this phenomenon was not necessarily distinctive to the experiences of dames. Tizard was reported more than once as saying that titles imposed ‘a barrier’ between the recipient of the honour and other people.556 On the other hand, Ann Hercus felt that there were not barriers created by the title, and that she was ‘not aware of being treated differently’, while Jean Herbison did not consider that there had been distance placed between her and other people by the title.557 Phyllis Guthardt noted that she was accustomed to there being a barrier ‘from people who didn’t know me because the thought of a woman in the ministry always made people uncomfortable for a long, long time’, and that ‘it never occurs to me’ that people might be ‘shy’ of the title.558 Dames who achieved female ‘firsts’ were, however, doubly exceptional. No other woman can be first, and therefore, the level of achievement in traditionally masculine fields at which the title of Dame was granted appears impossibly high. As ‘singular exceptions’ in male-dominated spaces, their exceptional status meant that it was difficult for other women to follow them.

**Forthright and fierce? Representing dames in traditionally masculine terms**

Images in the popular media of these doubly exceptional titled women who worked in traditionally male positions were often more reminiscent of the characteristics customarily gendered masculine than those gendered feminine. Labelled as ‘not a woman to be trifled with’, Ann Hercus’ public image was as ‘intimidating’ and

556 Clark, p. 59; Fleming, p. 23.
557 Hercus, personal communication with the author, October 2004; Herbison, interview with the author, 18 November 2004.
558 Guthardt, interview with the author, 29 September 2004.
‘formidable’. It was reportedly said that the ‘softest thing about [Hercus] is her teeth’, and the same remark appeared in an article profiling Margaret Bazley. Bazley was called ‘the Government’s hatchetwoman’, ‘a formidable woman’ with a ‘no-nonsense approach’, and even a ‘man-hater’. Less negatively, Susan Devoy was portrayed in a 1999 article as having been a ‘feisty character’ during her squash career, and a similar image reappeared after her retirement, as a ‘ferocious’ defender of the Halberg Trust sports awards. With the phrase: ‘Devoy equals determination’, she was included in a list of one hundred great New Zealanders of the twentieth century. She was depicted in an interview presented in *North and South* as having a ‘steely resolve’.

Portrayals of dames as tenacious and formidable were not confined to those women who worked in traditionally male spaces or achieved a ‘first’ for women. One interviewer wrote that Ngaio Marsh was ‘daunting’, although ‘enchanting to interview’ once ‘the awe wore off’; another termed her a ‘battler’. Kiri Te Kanawa’s ‘determination’ has been described as ‘legendary’, and she has been said to have a ‘steely will’. Long before she was made a dame, in a 1955 article, Whina Cooper was described as ‘a fighter – a fiery, hard hitting one’ who ‘relentlessly pursued’ her causes.
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559 Bowman, ‘Dame Ann... Behind the Public Face’, p. 20.
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564 Legat, ‘Face to Face: Susan Devoy’, p. 74. The same author used that phrase again in another article in relation to Cheryll Sotheran. Legat, ‘Cheryll Sotheran’, p. 51. It has, however, been written that a ‘tenacious spirit’ is a characteristic of New Zealanders. Male, p. 6. Similarly, the representation of Elizabeth Gilmer as ‘bluff, downright, full of fun and a great battler’ shows characteristics traditionally seen as masculine and perceived as a New Zealand characteristic. ‘Elizabeth May Gilmer, D.B.E.’ *New Zealand Libraries*, April 1960, p. 91. Portrayals of political women as ‘steel sheila[s]’ have been considered by Julia Baird. J. Baird, *Media Tarts: How the Australian Press Frames Female Politicians* (Carlton North, Victoria, 2004), p. 260 (for example).
until she succeeded, with 'no retreat'.\textsuperscript{567} Mira Szaszy was said to have had an 'often feisty career', and Mary Leo was depicted as 'the feisty little nun', who was 'iron-willed and imperious by nature', and 'a relentless, tough-minded perfectionist' in her teaching.\textsuperscript{568} One reported issue in a case before the Employment Relations Authority was alleged 'aggressive and nasty' treatment by Georgina Kirby towards an employee of a Maori art gallery that she managed.\textsuperscript{569}

The image of dames as fierce or determined has sometimes, as with Bazley and Kirby, extended to their being depicted as unpleasant. In one newspaper article on titles, the reporter suggested that, although knights no longer usually won their award in battle, 'something of the glamour of St George seemed to rub off' on them, while 'the awesome aura of the dragon seemed to emanate from the dames'.\textsuperscript{570} Sotheran has often been portrayed as forthright, and even disagreeable. In one article, she was described as 'forbidding... a contrast to the feelgood [sic] cultural emporium she oversees [Te Papa]', and as being '[d]ressed all in black and slow to smile'. She was reportedly called 'Chernobyl' and 'the foul-mouthed dame' by her employees, because of her quick temper and tendency to criticise staff.\textsuperscript{571} Her 'fearsome reputation' and 'fiery temper' were much in the media in relation to a case, similar to that Kirby was involved in, in which a former employee alleged before the Employment Relations Authority that Sotheran had 'created a "climate of fear" in the museum'.\textsuperscript{572} One colleague interviewed for an article profiling Sotheran considered that her 'daunting intellect', zeal, and need to complete an

\textsuperscript{567} Taylor, 'Whina Cooper', p. 17.
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ambitious project 'would not raise a second look in a man'. These images have not necessarily been confined to the portrayal of dames, but may extend to other women successful in traditionally male spaces. Considerably before being made a dame, for instance, Tizard was described as outspoken, sometimes 'indiscreet', and as a 'maverick'. The important point, however, is that even women who have been honoured by the Crown for their work have been portrayed in these ways, stressing masculine qualities and their difference to other women.

As 'honorary knights', a minority of women who were accepted into the high levels of a system with distinct male norms, dames have sometimes been represented in ways that suggested they were 'honorary men'. One particularly clear example occurred in the article in The New Zealand Herald profiling Augusta Wallace when she was made a dame in 1993. Her husband was quoted commenting that:

My wife has achieved this honour not because she is a woman but because she has been a very competitive and able lawyer and judge and, dare I say, much more of a 'gentleman' than many of the men who sit on the Bench.

At the time of the celebration of the centenary of women's suffrage, this remark emphasised that she had not been honoured merely because she was a woman. Rather, she was a gentlemanly woman, and an 'honorary knight'. Constructing dames as honorary men appears to lessen any threat they could pose to the established gender order, making them part of the masculine sphere, and thus set apart from the feminine despite being a woman.

However, alongside the representation of dames as formidable and determined, or as 'honorary men', the same women have often also been depicted as possessing the nurturing and caring qualities that have been customarily considered feminine, the types
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of representations discussed in the previous chapter. Mary Leo, although a demanding teacher, was also said to be compassionate and understanding to pupils.\textsuperscript{576} In a newspaper article after Whina Cooper’s death, Winston Peters was quoted describing her as ‘compassionate, … maternal and loving’ as well as ‘manipulative and autocratic’.\textsuperscript{577} Described as ‘[s]mall and twinkling’, Augusta Wallace ‘believes her courtroom reputation for formidability’.\textsuperscript{578} Even Margaret Bazley was described as appearing in pictures as ‘a rather motherly-looking soul, dressed conservatively’, and as being very caring to her staff if they worked well.\textsuperscript{579} In depictions of dames’ appearances too, womanly images were sometime placed alongside images that emphasised their exceptionalism as women with masculine qualities. Bazley ‘is slightly built and gently spoken’, yet firefighters would not ‘dare’ to ‘jostle her in the street’, as they did to her predecessor.\textsuperscript{580} A young actor she had worked with remembered Ngaio Marsh as ‘mannish in appearance’, with a ‘deep voice’ and large feet, but also as ‘intensely feminine’.\textsuperscript{581} Portrayals of dames, then, did not follow a straightforward adherence to one of two models; rather, there was often a juxtaposition of masculine and feminine traits, of being an ‘honorary man’ yet maintaining femininity. These representations also lessened any threat these women’s success may have posed to the traditional gender norms, by emphasising that although they were successful, they continued to possess attributes that have been constructed as feminine. In the case of Sotheran, one portrayal of her evoked a maternal image to justify her supposedly warrior-like actions, a description with strong echoes of the ‘warrior queen’. She was referred to as ‘Te Mama’, the ‘matriarch of the institution [Te Papa]
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with the warrior reputation’, who had ‘fought many a battle’ and ‘defended the museum’. 582

**Ethnicity and images of dames**

A further complexity is evident in the representation of dames, as Maori heritage could add another dimension to the exceptionalism that adhered to a dame. As well as the ‘supposed integration’ of Maori that Kiri Te Kanawa might be seen to symbolise, her Maori ethnicity has led to representations of her as exotic, as Katie Pickles has discussed. 583 In Te Kanawa’s case, the familiar focus on the appearance of successful women held a hint of the exotic and exceptional. She was depicted as ‘imposing’, at 1.7 metres tall, ‘with huge brown eyes, honey-brown hair and a tan complexion’; she ‘dazzles co-stars and public with her striking good looks’. 584 She herself was quoted in one magazine article as saying, ‘I’m exotic because I have two cultures on my side’, and she was once described as carrying ‘the exotic blood of native Maori aristocracy’. 585 Not only was she honoured by royalty, but she herself was portrayed as part of an hereditary elite. In one popular article, an interview with Te Kanawa was depicted in terms that gave the account a decidedly royal flavour:

> Many of the reporters automatically rise to their feet as she enters. We seem to be on the edge of spontaneous applause .... She has graciously consented to be among us. We are privileged and enthralled. In fact we are enchanted. 586

Although Te Kanawa had not entered a male-dominated field of activity as women in politics or law had done, the perceived exoticism of her race intersected with gender, making her too appear doubly exceptional, with suggestions that she belonged to an
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aristocracy reinforcing the sense that she was exceptional, distanced from other women, and even from most men.

**Conclusion**

The women who entered the elite white male space of the royal honours system in New Zealand were placed in a position replete with tensions. The system was clearly oriented toward certain types of service, although by the 1990s greater recognition was being given to arts, sport and community service; the predominating areas of work were largely male-dominated occupations, particularly in the upper levels. Those few dames who were honoured for their roles in these traditionally male careers were exceptional because they had succeeded so highly in these areas, as well as because they had been given titles in their own right. Through depictions of them as ‘honorary men’ or as having qualities that had been traditionally gendered masculine, portrayals of dames in the popular media sometimes reflected the status of dames as removed from other women. Yet the gender norms in society were not threatened by such portrayals, as, alongside their determination and forthrightness, dames were also often shown to retain the supposedly feminine caring attributes.
Conclusion

The experience of being honoured with a title

Receiving a titular honour is an individual experience in many ways, a reward given for services not entirely like any other recipient's, and responded to in different ways by different individuals. Even the experience of the investiture itself has varied between recipients. For Phyllis Guthardt, the ceremony was 'quite delightful' although 'very swift', simply going forward when her name was called.\textsuperscript{587} Five family members went to Wellington with Jean Herbison for her investiture, and she was pleased to be recognised with the award 'almost before I retired'. She rarely had occasion to wear the insignia for her award, and noted that she had not thought to wear them when attending the investiture of another person.\textsuperscript{588} Malvina Major, whose award was the result of 'lots' of nominations, accepted an invitation to have the ceremony on her own, with a morning tea and sixty guests invited. She turned down the possibility of having the Queen invest her with her honour, partly to accept the invitation of a private ceremony, and partly because she did not receive sufficient invitations to Buckingham Palace for all of her children to attend.\textsuperscript{589}

Individual recipients of titles have also had differing experiences of holding that title. While some dames, such as Kiri Te Kanawa and Malvina Major, have become well-known during their careers, others, such as Elizabeth Harper, have been far less so. Some found that holding the title affected their lives very little despite its being a highly visible honour, while others noted change in their lives. Ann Hercus found that the award affected her life 'very little' within New Zealand, as 'very few...call me “Dame”', although she did meet some 'curiosity' outside of New Zealand, such as during her time
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Phyllis Guthardt does not believe that holding the title has changed any part of her life: ‘not a thing’. She herself has not used her title, although it was used by the University of Canterbury during her time as Chancellor, and she noted that ‘Nobody in the church even remembers I’ve got it’. She finds it ‘a surprise’ when people do use her title, and tells an anecdote of a tradesperson addressing her as ‘Phyl’, noting that he would not have even known she had a title. Guthardt also noted that she did not consider she had become more of a public figure after receiving her title, because she was ‘already retired from the ministry’, and because, although she was involved in public speaking in her university roles, she is now a ‘reluctant public speaker’. Similarly, Jean Herbison did not consider that her life had changed after being given the title, saying ‘I’ve just gone on being me’. Interviewed in 2004, she stated that ‘very few’ call her ‘Dame Jean’, even in correspondence, although the title was used when she was at the university as chancellor. Another who has been quoted as saying that she does not use her title is Janet Paul, who reportedly said that ‘titles seem to be not our way of doing things in New Zealand’, and that she felt she should have refused the title.

On the other hand, Malvina Major has found that people do use her title, and that holding the title ‘did change my life’. As an example, she noted that, instead of ‘a constant battle’ on her many trips overseas to reach her destination and ‘be ready to sing’ after arriving, ‘suddenly, ... everyone wants to pick your bag up and run after you, and ... upgrade you’. Major also considered that after being made a dame she had received a greater number of invitations to become a patron of, or become involved in, charitable and community organisations. In a similar way, Susan Devoy was quoted as saying
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that the title ‘made “a little bit of difference” in gaining people’s respect, especially overseas and among older people’, while Catherine Tizard has reportedly said that holding the title ‘does open doors’, and that it causes her to be ‘treated more formally’.\(^\text{596}\) Fiona Kidman was also quoted suggesting that the title ‘does lend some air of respectability to your requests’.\(^\text{597}\)

Despite all these differences of experience, the women who have been made dames, and the men who have been made knights, share in the experience of receiving a high royal honour, of having their work recognised with a visible title. Almost all countries in the world do have an honours system.\(^\text{598}\) In New Zealand, royal honours, and the giving of titles, have been a part of society almost since 1840; honours have a far longer history in the United Kingdom, from where the New Zealand system derived. The cessation in New Zealand in 2000 of the practice of granting titles to those who received high level honours has been one of a number of major changes to the New Zealand honours system over its lifetime. Knights and dames in New Zealand now are a group whose numbers will only decrease in the future. The patterns and trends visible in the awards of titles since 1917, however, have implications not only for the new honours system, but also for the way in which success is understood for men and women. Despite the vast changes in New Zealand between 1917 and 2000, the award of titles to women and men is an important part of the country’s history, and one where both continuing threads and divergences are evident, suggesting much about gender identities and roles in New Zealand, as well as shedding light on the perception and operation of national identity and class in New Zealand history.
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National identity and controversy in honours as a system of recognition

The changes made to the New Zealand honours system over the twentieth century reflect connections that have been perceived between honours and national identity, suggesting that honours have an important place, albeit a largely unexamined one, in New Zealand society. As uniquely New Zealand awards have been instituted, the balance between imperial British awards and national New Zealand awards has shifted, particularly with the establishment of the New Zealand Order of Merit in 1996. As an official award, honours have been viewed by politicians and the media in terms of New Zealand’s independence and supposed national character. The cessation of recommendations for the British state orders of chivalry was linked by many commentators to New Zealand’s place as an independent and maturing nation, while the removal of titles was discussed in terms of the egalitarianism and supposed classlessness that is so often seen as a part of New Zealand’s national character as a new settler society. Those who argued for the retention of titles argued on the grounds of history, for the retention of a rich tradition, or on the grounds that titles gave a greater visibility and recognition to national heroes such as Edmund Hillary, and heroines such as Kiri Te Kanawa.

This last argument reveals the current explicit central purpose of honours, which is to be a means of rewarding and recognising those who have achieved highly, as well as those who have given significant service to society. In a recent review of the UK honours system, these two ‘strands of contribution’ were identified, and it was recommended that honours should be given when the service is of a level where the person concerned has ‘gone the extra mile’ or where the achievements have made them visible ‘head and shoulders’ above the others in their field.599 Dames and knights in New Zealand have contributed in both of these ways, and have been granted that most visible of honours, a title, to acknowledge these contributions. Indeed, the very visibility of a

title was a factor in their removal, as there was concern that New Zealand’s highest honour was devalued by the lustre of titles given below it.

Yet beyond the lustre of titles, the award of titular honours has sometimes been plagued with controversy and criticism, as has been the case with all honours. Undoubtedly, the royal honours system in the UK was not always administered in what would today be considered an honourable way. New Zealand, through reproducing the British honours system, has also experienced some criticism of its honours system in terms of process, although such criticism has been muted in comparison to that in the UK. As well, there has been a continuing problem of public uncertainty as to the workings of the system. One common error was that an OBE meant an Order of the British Empire, rather than an Officer. Similar problems continue under the new honours system, as people are unsure, for instance, what an MNZM is (Member of the New Zealand Order of Merit). David Baguley identified this uncertainty as an issue that still requires a solution. 600 Indeed, as discussed in Chapter One, it has been suggested that the changes to the system, including the removal of titles, have increased this problem, making awards ‘increasingly irrelevant’ as people receive ‘a conglomerate of confusing initials’ to follow their name. 601 Baguley acknowledged that post-nominals, the letters after the name, are seldom used by New Zealanders, considering this ‘a pity’, since then ‘no one knows they’ve got it’. 602 Even titles, despite being more visible than an honour signified solely by post-nominal letters, have sometimes suffered this lack of exposure, as is evident from the experiences of those who make little use of their title. Baguley suggested that New Zealanders’ supposed modesty, and the so-called ‘tall poppy’ syndrome, whether a reality of the national psyche or a myth, render it more difficult to increase the profile of honours. 603

600 Baguley, interview with the author, 11 May 2004.
603 Ibid.
As a system of national recognition, the royal honours system in New Zealand is likely to continue to be subject to criticisms relating to the distribution of honours as well as in relation to the honours themselves and the profile of the system. As Baguley pointed out, an individual award can always be debated; a follower of rugby, for instance, will view an honour granted to a player or coach with more satisfaction than will a non-follower. In his words, however, comparing recipients in terms of how deserving they may be is impossible, because it is ‘comparing apples and oranges’, and the dividing line between levels of honour is ‘grey’.604 Debate as to what should be the criteria for honours is equally fraught and subjective. While some in the UK have suggested that the frequent honouring of civil servants is justified by their receiving a smaller salary than those working in the private sector, others have argued that salaries have ‘improved’, that those in the voluntary sector receive even less, and that awards to civil servants should therefore be reduced.605 In New Zealand, some have also questioned the frequent award of honours to those in commerce and industry who are making money without seeming to serve the community.606

Even within an honours system where excellence and achievement in any field can be honoured, as was the case with the Order of the British Empire and is now with the New Zealand Order of Merit, difficulties remain. Some areas of work, for instance, may be more often nominated, perhaps by organisations that understand the system, and thus may appear more valued in society. Phyllis Guthardt identified a possible lack of public knowledge about the honours system and the nomination process, as something that impacts upon who is and who is not honoured. She herself received the title after the Canterbury Methodist Women’s Fellowship and the New Zealand Methodist Women’s
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604 Ibid.
605 Public Administration Select Committee, paragraphs 50, 136, 146.
606 For instance: Fiona Kidman, quoted in Register, p. 15; Guthardt, interview with the author, 29 September 2004. Guthardt, however, noted that she might ‘underestimate ... the importance of business to New Zealand’. Ibid.
Fellowship had 'prepared, unknown to me, a folder ... that they presented'. Guthardt also suggested that feminist women who were aware of the system, in organisations such as the NCW and the NZFUW, may have been able to influence the honours system through the nominations that were sent to the committee, since a 'sufficient volume' of nominations would encourage greater equality in awards. Criticisms of honours, then, are in many ways subjective and difficult, yet they must be addressed, since if the honours system is to be an effective way of recognising achievement, it must be respected.

**Equity, diversity and honours**

One aspect of the honours system in New Zealand that has clearly needed examination is the level of equity evident in the distribution of honours, particularly in terms of the diversity, or lack thereof, of recipients. Today it is generally accepted that honours should be available to all who achieve very highly or who give valuable service to their local community or to the country. Diversity has not always been a feature of honours. Particularly in the UK, titular honours have been criticised in class terms, first because they were not being restricted to the nobility but were being given to those who had been commercially successful, and later because titles themselves were seen as inherently implying unwelcome class distinctions. Less attention has been paid to the position of ethnic minorities in honours, although recent reviews of honours in both New Zealand and the UK included some consideration of this issue. The committee reviewing honours in New Zealand sought Maori perspectives, and desired the creation of a system that 'reflects the cultural diversity of New Zealand and the Treaty partnership in which we operate'. Similarly, women's position in relation to honours, titular or otherwise, has rarely been considered, although the recent reviews of honours did consider women's

---

607 Ibid.
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situation in the honours system, particularly in numerical terms.\textsuperscript{610} The 1995 report of the committee reviewing honours in New Zealand discussed the grant of honours to women, concluding that there was still a divergence between awards to men and awards to women that required addressing.\textsuperscript{611} This thesis, while framed with an awareness of class and race difference in society and in the honours system, has focused on the patterns that are evident in relation to gender difference in the award of honours.

Clearly, women's participation in the royal honours system in New Zealand was very different to that of men; the distribution of honours in the twenty-first century has a legacy of inequality to overcome. This legacy of inequality is indicative of women's unequal, although changing, position in society. It is not merely numerical, as honours lists in New Zealand over the years since 1917 have also not included women at the same level or on the same terms as men. Not until 1917 did women have the right to receive a title in their own right, whilst men had been made knights for centuries; even then, entry to the oldest and most prestigious orders of chivalry was denied them until much later, the Order of the Garter finally allowing female membership in 1987. Women received honours in smaller numbers, particularly at the titular level, and remained excluded from the relatively common honour of Knight Bachelor when appointments to British honours ceased in 1996. Until 1970, the creation of a dame was a very rare event, having occurred a mere six times. The total number had increased merely to eleven by the end of 1979. Even during the 1980s and 1990s, after the second wave feminist movement had emphasised the value of supposedly female qualities and work, as well as campaigning for equal pay and equal opportunity, the number of dames created remained significantly less than the number of men made knights. In the one year when women did outnumber men among the recipients of honours overall, and when one list contained all dames and no new knights, there was comment on the sex bias. These comments on

\textsuperscript{610} Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, pp. 7-8, 56-57; Phillips, \textit{Review of the Honours System}, pp. 5, 42.

\textsuperscript{611} Prime Minister's Honours Advisory Committee, p. 57.
the 1993 list clearly expose the assumed male norm of the honours system that persisted into the 1990s. Few mentions of any sex bias were apparent for other honours lists, although Dorothea Horsman, like Stella Casey, was quoted in an article written after she was made a dame stating that she considered honours should represent women equally with men, although women may often work in different areas.612

**Traditionalism and exceptionalism among dames**

Ironically, although calls to increase female participation in honours have focused on community service and volunteer work, this area of activity was the area for which women were most frequently honoured with a title. Many dames had given their services to their community; they were involved in organisations concerned with women’s affairs, children’s concerns or patriotic work. Even those honoured for their work in traditionally male-dominated occupations had sometimes been concerned with women’s or children’s issues. Although the ideology of public and private spheres never matched reality so starkly as its rhetoric may have suggested, even in its nineteenth-century heyday in England, echoes of this ideology reverberated in the royal honours system in twentieth-century New Zealand in the predominance of supposedly women’s sphere activities among dames. The honouring of women with titles, however, is replete with contrasts and contradictions, and a number of women were also made dames for their work in areas of activity that had been gendered masculine and dominated by men. These dames were often the ‘firsts’, venturing into areas where no woman had gone before, and their exceptional status was recognised with an award that made them exceptions twice over, women honoured with a title in their own right for work in traditionally male-dominated activities. While they may be seen as role models, and indeed sometimes themselves accepted that identity, because they were opening new paths for female achievement, their very exceptionalism made them difficult to emulate, even impossible, in the sense
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that no other woman could ever be first. At the same time, the titles granted to these
women exemplified tradition, as it was in areas such as government, law and industry that
honours had most often been given during the twentieth century, and before. These areas
had a much stronger precedent for the granting of honours than did community service,
or women’s affairs, for instance. The predominance of these areas in the careers of those
granted titles reveals the gendered nature of the honours system, where traditionally male
areas of work were recognised and rewarded more often than traditionally female areas of
work.

Another irony of the grant of titles in twentieth-century New Zealand is that,
while these exceptional dames who achieved ‘firsts’ retained the link to tradition in this
way, those women who were the first dames were also often linked to tradition despite
their particularly exceptional status as titled women in their own right. Many of the first
dames were the wives of prominent men, either knighted themselves, or who had perhaps
declined honours or died before they may have received an honour. These women might
also be seen as role models, in that the Crown, through giving them such high, and rare,
honours, endorsed and applauded their fulfilment of that imagined female role as
‘helpmeet’, wife, mother and community worker. Moreover, the threads of working in
activities gendered feminine and of entering work traditionally gendered masculine were
sometimes entwined together in one woman’s life. For instance, Catherine Tizard’s
career in local politics began after her husband, a lecturer and MP, put her name forward
for municipal elections in 1971. Her family responsibilities were combined with teaching
and work on the council, and she became the first female Mayor of Auckland, and later
the first female Governor-General of New Zealand. As well, she has been throughout a
‘strong supporter of community, charitable, educational and women’s causes’.

\[^{613}\textit{New Zealand Official Yearbook}, p. 11.\]
Conservatism and change in the honours system as an institution

The tension evident between the highly traditional nature of the honours system and women's fulfilment of roles perceived as feminine, and the exceptional status of a dame as a woman honoured in her own right and perhaps employed in an area perceived as masculine, is emblematic of the continuing tension between the persistence of old conventions and the acceptance of new practices in the honours system in general. Undoubtedly, the royal honours system has experienced a variety of immense changes since the medieval systems of knighthood, where a knight was a military horseman, particularly in the last three centuries. Change has been in a sense inevitable, as society itself shifted in vast ways. No institution exists in a vacuum, and the honours system is no exception; to survive, it has had to adapt, to accommodate and reflect changes in society if not completely match them. Such adaptation is evident in the establishment of new awards or new classes of award, and the increasing numbers of award possible according to statute. These increases were necessary in order to provide for the honouring of a wider range of people engaged in a wider range of activity, as English society grew more democratic, to accommodate the population increase that contributed to there being more people deemed deserving of honours, or to allow for the rewarding of many who were mobilised for war under the new conditions of total war between 1914 and 1918.614 In relation to women's participation in honours, such adaptation is evident in the gradual inclusion of women into most honours over the twentieth century, as feminism, in both its waves, influenced society and its attitudes. These changes in the British honours system were replicated in the New Zealand honours system, at least until 1996. The increase in New Zealand in the number of women granted titular honours after 1980, and the concurrent decrease in their being honoured for their efforts as the wives of prominent men, also shows the influence of feminism as a movement that impacted upon societal attitudes by demanding change, and on women's experiences and opportunities,

614 Pamm, Honours and Rewards, pp. 179, 188.
bringing considerable change to women’s position in New Zealand society in 2000 from that in 1917. In wider terms, just as society’s increasingly democratic nature was reflected in the expansion of honours and their opening to women, the increasing acceptance of diversity and multiculturalism of the late twentieth century was at least partially reflected in honours. Some recognition occurred of the need to ensure ethnic minorities as well as women were catered for in honours, and increasing numbers of awards were made for services to the arts, sport and community service.

However, alongside these trends of change, the honours system remained static in other ways, a conservative and traditional institution in a shifting society. Besides the traditionalism inherent in a system that includes the bestowal of a title that has been in existence since at least the twelfth century in England, the honours system has been an elite institution about which many members of the public know little, and which has retained aspects of class exclusivity throughout its existence, including in supposedly egalitarian New Zealand, although to a lesser extent. In New Zealand, it has been a system where a white norm was assumed as well as a male norm, where Maori who were honoured had often achieved in traditionally Pakeha ways. Perhaps the clearest evidence of the static nature of the honours system, however, was the continued predominance of certain areas of service in the careers of those who received titular honours in New Zealand between 1917 and 2000, particularly among the men. Law, politics, the civil service, commerce and industry were, throughout the period, the services most often honoured. Other bastions of masculinity, such as the military, medicine and academia, also featured throughout the period in the careers of those granted titles in New Zealand, although in smaller numbers. Honours were often granted in these areas to men of wealth and status, while areas such as women’s voluntary work were overlooked. Despite the increase in titular honours given for services to the arts, to sport or to philanthropy and in the community, these traditionally honoured areas were not displaced by the time titles were removed from the New Zealand honours system.
Exceptionalism and conformity: complexities in the portrayal of dames

A similar disjunction to these tensions between traditionalism and exceptionalism, change and continuity, has been evident in the representation of dames in the popular media in New Zealand. Dames have been portrayed in terms of supposedly feminine attributes, as motherly, as compassionate nurturers, or as self-sacrificing and unassuming. Like many successful women, dames have been described in terms of their appearance, suggesting a continuation of a belief in female frivolity. On the other hand, many dames have also been depicted as formidable, determined, and even occasionally as unpleasant. These qualities have traditionally been deemed to be naturally masculine, although it is generally in relation to women that they have been at times seen as unpleasant qualities. Some dames even represented themselves in these ways in interviews with the media. Susan Devoy, for example, described herself in one interview as ‘feisty’ and ‘impulsive’, completely focused on her sport and on winning, while Whina Cooper described herself as a ‘fighter’.\(^{615}\) Images of dames therefore are complicated by the complicity of the women themselves in their construction.

The clear disjunction between conformity to traditional images of the feminine and the exceptional possession of qualities traditionally perceived as masculine suggests that dames have been victims of the same dualism that has plagued women visible in traditional history. Like the ‘female kiwi icons’ of Katie Pickles’ study, these women have been either ‘super-womanly’ or ‘honorary men’.\(^{616}\) In the case of dames, as for the first female Prime Ministers and Presidents, these images were further complicated.\(^{617}\) Women whose work was in the traditionally feminine sphere of community service were

\(^{615}\) Legat, 'Face to Face: Susan Devoy', p. 76; L. Wilson, 'Fiery Whina Goes Home to Fight Again!' Te Iwi o Aotearoa, October 1988, p. 14. While men may have also constructed themselves in these ways, further study would be required to explore this, and the implications would be different, as it would be men representing themselves with qualities seen as masculine, and in the case of being a fighter, as particularly part of the New Zealand male identity.

\(^{616}\) Pickles, 'Kiwi Icons', p. 13.

\(^{617}\) On the first female Prime Ministers and Presidents, see Pickles, 'Exceptions to the Rule', op cit. As already discussed, constructions of female saints in Australasia were similarly complicated. Pickles, 'Colonial Sainthood in Australasia', p. 8.
sometimes still described as tenacious and strong. They were sufficiently exceptional as women to be honoured in a visible way for supposedly female work that has often been invisible. Women who entered traditionally male-dominated occupations were sometimes still described as compassionate and motherly; they were still feminine. Sian Elias, for instance, New Zealand’s first female Chief Justice, was described by one colleague as exemplifying ‘human family values that put a perhaps slightly softer face on what is sometimes seen as the unfeeling face of the law’.618 The interaction of images of exceptionalism and of traditional femininity may be seen in descriptions of Dorothy Fraser after she received her honour. She was written of as determined and ‘extraordinary’, but at the same time ‘comfortingly ordinary’, not ‘flamboyant’ or ‘quiver[ing] with fervour’.619

Gender identities, success and honours in the twenty-first century

Women’s history has often focused on feminist women and their organisations, or on women whose everyday lives were invisible in traditional history, ‘hidden from history’.620 To a limited extent, dames have been included in these histories, where they have been part of organisations such as the NCW. A number of dames have been part of that organisation, and many have been involved in work for women and children, and in community service organisations. As titled women who have been recognised for their work, dames have occasionally been the subjects of biographical work; most dames, however, have not. The focus on the recovery of women who have traditionally been invisible in history is one explanation for the lack of study of the lives of women who became dames. This thesis has made a contribution to women’s history, recovering the work and experiences of women who were recognised for their achievements, who

619 G. Bowman, ”We must leave the world a better place”, New Zealand Woman’s Weekly, 23 May 1988, p. 70.
620 The phrase is from the title of Sheila Rowbotham’s classic work. S. Rowbotham, Hidden from History: 300 Years of Women’s Oppression and the Fight Against It, 3rd ed. (London, 1977).
contributed both in traditionally feminine areas of work and in breaking down barriers to women’s participation in other areas that remained masculine domains for much longer. In doing so, it has suggested disjunctions and complications in the dualisms between ideals and areas of work perceived as masculine and feminine.

This thesis has also addressed the lack of work on the New Zealand honours system, which has been studied little, and the need for a collective examination of recipients of honours in New Zealand. If these men and women are models of what was considered success in New Zealand society, if the honours system has reflected society, the study of titular honours and their recipients is a critical one. The frequent honouring of women involved in community service and voluntary work, for instance, reveals an underlying continuity in attitudes to women’s roles and work. In professions such as nursing and teaching, that became ‘feminised profession[s]’, women were not often honoured at the titular level; in community service work, also seen as a female area, but one with less financial reward, titles were given to women. This pattern continued in the 1980s and 1990s, suggesting that women are considered worthy of the highest honours when fulfilling that traditional role, their caring mission, giving of themselves outside of a profession. Not all dames were active in these areas; however, those who were not were often succeeding in traditionally masculine fields, or at male-dominated levels of their field. They were exceptional, the first women in particular roles, and, equally importantly, they often succeeded in areas where there was a strong precedent for honours.

The tension between these two major models of female success, the fulfilment of supposedly feminine ideals and the achievement of a first in an occupation deemed masculine, was linked to a tension between the changing context in which women lived over the twentieth century and the continuation of traditional images of the feminine and patterns of female experience in their lives. In the late twentieth century, many more women, including married women, worked in paid employment than in the early years of
the century. Women had gained political rights, and had held many of the major roles in the country's government, including Attorney-General, Chief Justice, Prime Minister and Governor-General. In Katie Pickles' words, women at the end of the century filled roles 'unimaginable' in the past. These changes had other consequences as well. For instance, mothers in paid work had less time to give to community service and volunteer work, with 'the age of the professional volunteer ... largely drawing to a close'. As well, for women who juggled family responsibilities and paid work, often doing part-time work, the opportunities for advancing in their professional life were often almost as limited as their opportunities for giving their time in community service work. In the changing context in which women live their lives at the start of the twenty-first century, how will women's experiences of the honours system in New Zealand shift? Although titles are no longer granted in New Zealand, honours continue to be bestowed at a variety of levels. If women are to reach a position of equality in honours, receiving equal numbers of awards on equal terms, shifts in society must continue to be filtered through into the honours system. Just as the numbers of women granted titular honours increased as second wave feminism gave women's affairs greater visibility and influence, women's changing position in relation to paid employment, community service and high-level positions in employment must be reflected in a greater diversity in awards of honours to women. Women who work their way upward in their chosen career, through difficulties and obstacles, may be worthy of honours. Women who give their time and energy to community organisations in a genuine desire to improve others' lives may be rewarded. What of those women who juggle career and community work in the belief that both are equally important? Or the single mother who works long hours to both earn money to keep her children and to ensure they have a loving and secure home environment, and who also attempts to be available to help neighbours and friends?
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621 Pickles, 'Introduction', p. xii.
622 Ibid., p. xvii.
David Baguley viewed those receiving the lower awards such as the QSM or the MNZM, who had served their community for years with ‘no reward’, as the ‘backbone’ of society. Yet those who fulfil important public service or judicial roles particularly well, whose commercial and industrial enterprises contribute to New Zealand’s economy, whose artistic endeavours open New Zealanders’ eyes to new ideas or whose sporting success inspires others may also be considered to play a crucial role in New Zealand society and deserve recognition. In all these questions of who should receive honours, it is clear that gender is heavily implicated, if often unexamined. Periodically, calls have been made to value women’s community service more, and to nominate and honour more women who quietly work in these areas. Such calls, however, continue to view community service as a part of a supposed female caring mission. If gender is, as Judith Butler has argued, ‘performative’, then perhaps it is time to move beyond dualisms where particular areas of endeavour are seen as peculiarly linked to one gender, and traits considered natural to that gender. If ‘the action of gender requires a performance that is repeated’, and if ‘gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylised repetition of acts’, then perhaps there are ways in which the granting of royal honours, titular or otherwise, can destabilise binary conceptions of gender identity. Disjunctions in the honouring of women, like those visible in the grant of titles to women in New Zealand between 1917 and 2000, must be accepted as complicating factors in the discourses surrounding concepts of success and of gender. Ideas of what constitutes success worthy of recognition, feminine or masculine, must also be widened, transgressed and challenged, and dualisms complicated, as women’s

623 Baguley, interview with the author, 11 May 2004. Indeed, according to Townsend’s earlier case study of honours, awards for community services formed a larger proportion of the total in the grant of lower awards than in the grant of titular honours. Townsend, pp. 45-46.
624 J. Butler, Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity (New York and London, 1990), pp. 139-141, original emphasis removed. Indeed, Judith Butler’s most recent book, Undoing Gender, is a collection of essays considering ‘what it might mean to undo restrictively normative conceptions of sexual and gendered life’, and examining the ‘experience of becoming undone’ both in ways that allow and that hinder living a ‘livable life’. J. Butler, Undoing Gender (New York and London, 2004), p. 1; original emphasis.
situations continue to change. Although titles have been removed from the honours system, replaced with less visible awards, the system of honours remains, and if it is to be an effective way of recognising and inspiring New Zealanders, these issues should not be ignored. Honours must be available in a flexible way to women and men regardless of gender, class or race, to public figures who visibly contribute to New Zealand or internationally, and also to those whose contribution is much less visible and much more local, but which makes New Zealand society richer.
Appendix One:

Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000
### Honours awarded in New Zealand, 1917-2000

Table One: Knighthoods announced in the *New Zealand Gazette*, 1917-2000, by type of award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of award</th>
<th>Kt</th>
<th>KG</th>
<th>GCB</th>
<th>KCB</th>
<th>GCVO</th>
<th>KCVO</th>
<th>GCMG</th>
<th>KCMG</th>
<th>GBE</th>
<th>KBE</th>
<th>GNZM</th>
<th>KNZM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917-1919</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Two: Damehoods announced in the *New Zealand Gazette*, 1917-2000, by type of award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>GCVO</th>
<th>DCVO</th>
<th>GCMG</th>
<th>DCMG</th>
<th>GBE</th>
<th>DBE</th>
<th>GNZM</th>
<th>DNZM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917-1919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decade</td>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Three: Companionships and Commanderships announced in the *New Zealand Gazette*, 1917-2000, by type of award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>CB men</th>
<th>CB women</th>
<th>CMG men</th>
<th>CMG women</th>
<th>CVO men</th>
<th>CVO women</th>
<th>CBE men</th>
<th>CBE women</th>
<th>CNZM men</th>
<th>CNZM women</th>
<th>Total men</th>
<th>Total women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917-1919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Four: Awards of honours of the fourth class announced in the *New Zealand Gazette*, 1917-2000, by type of award*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>LVO/MVO 4th men</th>
<th>LVO/MVO 4th women</th>
<th>OBE men</th>
<th>OBE women</th>
<th>ONZM men</th>
<th>ONZM women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917-1919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decade</td>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes the QSO, the Queen's Service Order. See separate table.
Table Five: Awards of honours of the fifth class announced in the *New Zealand Gazette*, 1917-2000, by type of award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>MVO (5th)</th>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>MNZM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-1919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table Six: Awards of the Queen’s Service Order and Medal announced in the *New Zealand Gazette*, June 1975-January 2000, inclusive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QSO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- community service</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- public service</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QSM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- community service</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- public service</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes on tables:**
- Figures given for a period of less than a decade are in italics.
- Where an award is made in both a military and a civil division, both divisions are included in the figure given.
- Awards are not necessarily given in order of precedence.
- The sex of recipients was determined according to name and title (such as Miss); women appear to have been referred to as Miss, Mrs or Ms, while male recipients were not always referred to as Mr.
- Percentages are rounded to one decimal place.

**Key**
- Kt: Knight Bachelor
- KG: Knight of the Garter
- GCB: Knight Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath
- KCB: Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath
- CB: Companion of the Order of the Bath
- GCVO: Knight or Dame Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order
- KCVO: Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order
- DCVO: Dame Commander of the Royal Victorian Order
- CVO: Commander of the Royal Victorian Order
- LVO/MVO: Lieutenant of the Royal Victorian Order/Member of the Royal Victorian Order
- (4<sup>th</sup>): Order (4<sup>th</sup> class)
- MVO (5<sup>th</sup>): Member of the Royal Victorian Order (5<sup>th</sup> class)
- Not an order

Class 1
- Class 2
- Class 3
- Class 4
- Class 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>Knight or Dame Grand Cross of the Order of St Michael and St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMG</td>
<td>Dame Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMG</td>
<td>Companion of the Order of St Michael and St George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBE</td>
<td>Knight or Dame Grand Cross of the Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBE</td>
<td>Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Dame Commander of the Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td>Commander of the Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBE</td>
<td>Officer of the Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBE</td>
<td>Member of the Order of the British Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNZM</td>
<td>Knight or Dame Grand Companion of the New Zealand Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>Knight Companion of the New Zealand Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td>Dame Companion of the New Zealand Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNZM</td>
<td>Companion of the New Zealand Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONZM</td>
<td>Officer of the New Zealand Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNZM</td>
<td>Member of the New Zealand Order of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSO</td>
<td>Companion of the Queen’s Service Order (divided into community service and public service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSM</td>
<td>Queen’s Service Medal (divided into community service and public service)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**

Appendix Two:

Database of titular honours, 1917-2000
# Database of titular honours, 1917-2000

## Knights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knight</th>
<th>Year of Honour</th>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Main areas of work</th>
<th>Category of service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Allen</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>KCB</td>
<td>MHR 1887-1920; Minister of the Crown 1912-1920; Acting PM; High Commissioner for NZ in the UK 1920-1926; NZ representative on the League of Nations; VC and chancellor University of Otago; member UNZ Senate.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Denniston</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Supreme Court Judge 1889-1919.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fraser</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Otago Provincial CI 1867-1870; chair County CI 1883-1893; MP 1893-1919; MLC 1919-1923; Minister of Mines in NZ Cabinet, appt 1912; also Minister of Public Works, Industries and Commerce; took up Earnscleugh Station.</td>
<td>Public – local; public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sinclair</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>MLC 1907 until at least 1925; barrister and solicitor; notary public; company director, incl of Otago Daily Times Co, Mosgiel Woollen Co and Executors and Agency Co; Otago HS board of governors, incl 8 yrs as chair.</td>
<td>Public – national; business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Plunkett</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>KBE</td>
<td>Governor of NZ, 1904-1910.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Johnston</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>MP 1881-1887; MLC 1891-1918; Speaker of the House 1915-1918; a director and chair of Wellington Woollen Co.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Salmond</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worley Edwards</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court, 1896-1921.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Herries</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>MP 1896 until at least 1921; Minister of the Crown many years, incl of Native Affairs, Railways, Labour, Marine and Customs.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton Rhodes</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>KBE</td>
<td>MP 1899-1925, Minister of the Crown 1912-1925, incl of Public Health, Defence, PMG; appt MLC in 1925; Minister in Attendance, Royal Tour 1927; farmer and horticulturalist; president Philatelic Society of NZ;</td>
<td>Public – national; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fenwick</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>benefactor, incl to Canterbury Museum; Canterbury University College Cl; board of directors Christchurch Press Co; gave land for school; chair board of directors Rhodes Convalescent Home; and more.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Roberts</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Newspaper editor and owner, incl <em>Otago Daily Times</em> (ed. 1890-1909), and setting up <em>Cromwell Argus</em>; NZ Press Assn and United Press Assn; company director; involved Otago SPCA and in raising funds for Hocken Library, a hospital ward, and more.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilus Cooper</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Company director, incl Union Steam Ship Co, Donaghy’s Rope and Twine Co; Mayor Dunedin 1889; chair Taieri County Cl; president NZ and South Seas Exhibition 1889-90; member Cl of Otago University 1885-1921; on Otago Harbour Bd; chamber of commerce; involved royal commissions, incl on federation in 1901. Son of Sir John Roberts.</td>
<td>Business; public – national; public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hunter</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>MP 1881-1896; Minister of the Crown 1883-1884, 1887-1891, incl Public Works, Native Affairs; PMG; Mayor of Auckland 1903-1905; MLC 1920-1934; chair Harbour Bd; University Coll Cl.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin Mitchelson</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td><strong>Formerly Mayor of Wellington</strong> 1913-1921; MP, incl 1918-1928; Wellington City Cl 1898-1911; member Hospital Bd; involved in business, S Luke and Sons; president NZ Engineers’ and Ironmasters Assn.</td>
<td>Public – local; public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Luke</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td><strong>Director-General of Medical Services, NZ Military Forces</strong>, 1919-1923; honorary surgeon Wellington Hospital; honorary surgeon to Governor-General.</td>
<td>Medical; military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald McGavin</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>MP 1881-1896; Minister of the Crown 1883-1884, 1887-1891, incl Public Works, Native Affairs; PMG; Mayor of Auckland 1903-1905; MLC 1920-1934; chair Harbour Bd; University Coll Cl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Chaytor</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>KCVO</td>
<td><strong>Commandant, NZ Military Forces</strong> (GOC), 1919-1924.</td>
<td>Military; personal to sovereign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fraser</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>KCVO</td>
<td><strong>Minister of Mines in NZ Cabinet</strong>; as above.</td>
<td>Public – national; personal to sovereign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Coates</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>General Manager, National Bank of NZ, 1893-1914; wartime relief committees; company director, incl Guardian Trust and Executors Co.</td>
<td>Business; war/patriotic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ross</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Chair Ross and Glendinning Ltd; on Cl of Otago University.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui Pomare</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Maori health officer; MP 1911 until at least 1928; Minister of the Cook Is 1916-1928; Minister of Health 1923-1926; encouraged Maori recruitment World War One; set up commission on land confiscation with Apirana Ngata.</td>
<td>Maori; public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Occupation and Achievements</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Carncross</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Speaker of Legislative Council, elected 1918; MLC, appt 1903, chair of committees 1910-1918; MP 1890-1902; editor and proprietor <em>Eltham Argus</em>.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Bell</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>Lawyer, partner, Crown solicitor 1878-1911, president NZLS 1901-1918, A-G; Mayor Wellington 1891, 1892 and 1897; MP 1893-1896; Minister of the Crown; MLC, appt 1912; son of Sir Francis Dillon Bell.</td>
<td>Legal; public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Beauchamp</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Chair and director, Bank of New Zealand; company director; member Wellington Harbour Bd; member royal commission on federation 1901.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Elliot</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Chair, Bank of New Zealand; company director; member of royal commissions.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Nolan</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>KBE</td>
<td>Established prosperous business; manager soldiers' club; official of NZ War Contingent World War One (London); chair Hawera Gas Co; director permanent building society.</td>
<td>Business; war/patriotic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Chapman</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of Supreme Court, 1903, 1907-1921; Judge of Court of Arbitration, 1903-1907.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Myers</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of Auckland, elected 1905; MP 1911-21, Minister of the Crown, incl of Customs; generous benefactor, incl of land for park; involved in business.</td>
<td>Public – national; public – local; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindo Ferguson</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Dean of Faculty of Medicine, Otago University 1914-1936; ophthalmologist at Dunedin Hospital 1884-1935; patron of the arts and gave basis of Ferguson Fund scholarship.</td>
<td>Medical; academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sim</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court of NZ, 1911 until at least 1925.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gunson</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Auckland, 1915-1925; president Auckland Chamber of Commerce; chair Harbour Bd; company director, incl NZ Insurance Co; involved in Red Cross, Order of St John and other organisations.</td>
<td>Public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Richardson</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>GOC Administration in NZ, 1919-1923; Administrator in Western Samoa, 1923-1928.</td>
<td>Public – national; war/patriotic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hosking</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of Supreme Court.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Brett</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Newspaper proprietor for over 50 years, formed Brett Printing and Publishing Co; director United Press Assn; Mayor of Auckland 1877-1878; harbour board, and more.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Wigram</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Formed Canterbury (NZ) Aviation Co, 1916; founded Canterbury (NZ) Seed Co; Mayor of Christchurch 1902-1904; MLC, appt 1903; president Canterbury Chamber of Commerce 1911-1913.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Holdsworth</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Managing Director of the Union Steam Ship Co of NZ (Ltd), 1914-1930.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Statham</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Speaker of the House of Representatives; MP 1911-1935.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Allen</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton Rhodes</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>KCVO</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Skerrett</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Chief Justice of NZ, appt 1926.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Maclean</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Bred animals, Maraekakaho station; chair Hawkes Bay County CI;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prominent Navy League; chair NZ War Contingent Assn; involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charitable Aid Bd, Road Bd and more; MP 1896-1899; company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>director; member various societies; son of Sir Donald Maclean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apirana Ngata</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>MP 1905-1943; Minister of the Crown, Native Affairs; much involved in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>land reform, Maori health reform, Maori social and economic reform,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sport, arts and culture; involved Maori war effort WW1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Barnett</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Surgeon; became professor of surgery 1909; retired from University of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Otago 1924; part of founding College of Surgeons of Australasia;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>research; editor New Zealand Medical Journal 1893-1900; benefactor to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Otago Medical School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Stringer</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court, 1914-1925.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fowlds</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>MP 1899-1911; Minister of the Crown, incl Education, Public Health,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1906-1911; benefactor and involved patriotic work World War One.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Nosworthy</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>MP 1908-1928; Minister of the Crown 1919-1928, incl Immigration,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External Affairs, Agriculture, PMG 1926-1928.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrick Robertson</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Surgeon and medical lecturer; pioneer in surgery in NZ, founding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fellow College of Surgeons of Australasia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Herdman</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court; MP; Minister of the Crown 1908-1918,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>incl of Justice; Attorney-General 1912-1918.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Buckleton</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>General Manager of the Bank of NZ, appt 1919 (joined BNZ, Sydney,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1878).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ward</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>Prime Minister; MP; Minister of the Crown for 23 and a half years,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>incl Public Health, Finance; Leader of the Opposition; PMG.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Myers</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Chief Justice, appointed 1929, retired 1946.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sidey</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Attorney-General; MP 1901-1928; Minister of the Crown, incl of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justice; MLC; Mayor of Caversham 1894, 1899, 1901; Otago BHS and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>Occupation and Achievements</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wilford</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>High Commissioner for NZ in London: NZ representative at League of Nations; MP 1899-1929; Minister of the Crown, incl. of Justice; Leader of Liberals 1920-1925 Mayor of Wellington 1910-1911; member Wellington Harbour Bd; active in business.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Bankart</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Company chair, incl. Campbell and Ehrenfried Co, NZ Breweries Ltd, NZ Insurance Co, Bankart Bros. Ltd. and others; Auckland Harbour Bd; Drainage Bd; Transport Bd.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Dobson</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Surveying and engineering; city engineer Christchurch 1901; founded Midwest Railway Co with father; discoverer of Arthur’s Pass.</td>
<td>Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil Leys</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Newspaper editor, managing director; involved NZ Newspapers Ltd; director United Press Assn; delegate to Empire Press Conference 1925; pres Leys Institute; member council Auckland Institute and Museum.</td>
<td>Business; community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hunt</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Company chair and director, incl chair Wright Stephenson and Co; public boards and committees, incl chair Public Service Commission 1912; station manager; member Southland A and P Assn.</td>
<td>Business; public – national; agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil Day</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Official Secretary to His Excellency the Governor-General, 1912-1936.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gray</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Barrister and solicitor; founded firm; president NZLS; involved legal committees.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Perry</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Sheepfarmer and breeder; involved Farmers' Union, Meat Control Bd, and more; published on sheepfarming; Massey Coll Cl; 16 yrs chair Wairarapa County Cl.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Allen</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Administrator to Western Samoa 1928-1931; honorary ADC to Governor-General 1925-1928; Mayor of Morrinsville 1927; lawyer; involved in business, incl Cargill Publishing Co.</td>
<td>Public – national; public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Acland</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Surgeon and founding fellow College of Surgeons of Australasia; chair Peel Forest Bd.</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sinclair-</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Aide-de-Camp to the King, General Officer Commanding NZ Military Forces; General Officer Commanding NZ Military Forces.</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Grose</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Manager of the National Bank of NZ (general manager 1928-1937).</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wilson</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>In business – Wilson and Canham, involved in trade with Canada; benefactor, incl to YWCA and Auckland war memorial fund; Auckland</td>
<td>Business; community; war/patriotic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutha MacKenzie</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Director of the NZ Institute for the Blind. Patriotic Assn; responsible for instituting funds contributing to welfare of soldiers overseas; director NZ Insurance Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Sargood</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Director of Sargood, Son and Ewen; benefactor and supporter of many organisations (community, patriotic, charity). Son of Sir Frederick Sargood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Young</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>KCVO</td>
<td>Minister in Attendance; MP 1911-1935; Minister of the Crown, incl of Health; chair Native Affairs commission; 3 times mayor; chair Hospital Bd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Parr</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>High Commissioner for NZ in London 1926-1929 and 1933-1936; Mayor of Auckland; MP, 1914-1925; Minister of the Crown, incl Public Health, Education, Justice; PMG; MLC; involved Auckland Harbour Bd, Education Bd and more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Ransom</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Minister of Lands; Mayor of Dannevirke 1910-1919; first elected MP 1922; Minister of the Crown, incl of Public Works; acting PM at times; involved in business; president Dannevirke Chamber of Commerce; chair Fire Bd 1911-1920, and more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Frazer</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Formerly a Judge of the Court of Arbitration, appt 1921.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Hart</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>KBE</td>
<td>Administrator of Western Samoa 1931-1935.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shirtcliffe</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Manager, chair A S Paterson and Co; Wellington City Cl 1907-1913; founded a scholarship; chair Cl of Scientific and Industrial Research 1927-1935.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sinclair-Burgess</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hutchison</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Editor of Otago Daily Times (since 1909); connected with journalism for 56 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reed</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Senior Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand appt puisne judge 1921; Judge Advocate General 1911; acting Chief Justice 1936.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Elliott</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Surgeon; foundation fellow College of Surgeons of Australasia; editor New Zealand Medical Journal 1911-1933; published.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Troup</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of Wellington 1927-31; member board of National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum; 39 year career with NZ Railways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Harper</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Lawyer, partner; member board of governors Christ’s College 1900-; chair Metropolitan Relief Assn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algernon Thomas</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td><strong>Professor Emeritus, Auckland University College</strong>: professor of natural science; Senate of UNZ; Auckland University Coll Ct; chair Auckland Grammar School board; researcher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Davis</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td><strong>Mayor of Auckland, 1935-1941</strong>: company director, incl Hancock and Co; involved formation NZ Breweries Ltd; on various social bodies and boards, incl Auckland Harbour Bd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Norwood</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Company chair and director, incl CB Norwood Ltd, Dominion Motors, and more; mayor of Wellington 1925-1927; chair Harbour Bd, Fire Board; president Wellington Manufacturers' Assn, Chamber of Commerce, and more; member board of trustees NZ Crippled Children Society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Myers</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td><strong>Director, Cawthron Institute, 1933-</strong>: research; scientific societies; member CI of Scientific and Industrial Research 1926-1954.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Rigg</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Chair of chemistry and physics, Victoria University Coll, appt 1899; research; published; first director Cawthron Institute, appt 1919; Professor Emeritus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Easterfield</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Mining manager Pacific Phosphate Co; company director; phosphate commissioner for New Zealand; published.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ostler</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td><strong>Judge of the Supreme Court of NZ, 1925-1943.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Luke</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of Wellington 1895; MLC, appt 1907; member of executive NZ Exhibition 1885; chair Wellington Hospital Bd several years; 6 yrs chair Wellington Chamber of Commerce, and more; involved in Young Men's Christian Assn, Wellington Free Ambulance Assn; involved S Luke and Sons: brother of Sir John Luke (Kt 1921).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Benham</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td><strong>Professor Emeritus, Otago University Coll</strong>: zoologist; professor of biology; UNZ Senate; published.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hunter</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Professor Victoria University Coll; important in developing experimental psychology; VC UNZ 1929-1947; UNZ Senate; involved adult education, incl WEA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Duigan</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td><strong>Chief of the General Staff, NZ Military Forces</strong>: earlier military command positions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Freyberg</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td>Military commands, incl 2NZEF, 2nd NZ Div. Later, Governor-General.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Berendsen</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td><strong>NZ Minister at Washington, 1944-1948</strong>: high commissioner to Australia, 1943-1944; Secretary Dept External Affairs 1928-1943.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Turnbull</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Administrator of Western Samoa 1935-1946. Public - national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archibald Blair</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of Supreme Court, 1928-1948. Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fletcher</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Company chair, incl of construction company involved in state housing and defence construction during World War Two (became Fletcher Challenge). Business; war/patriotic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Perry</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>President NZRSA 1935-1943; barrister, solicitor; MLC, Minister Armed Forces &amp; War Coordination in 1940s; patriotic organisations, incl president NZ Defence League; chair NZ Breweries. War/patriotic work; public – national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Puttick</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>KCB - M</td>
<td>General Officer Commanding, NZ Military Forces, 1941-1945; other command military positions. Military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Isitt</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td>Chief of the Air Staff, Air Officer Commanding, RNZAF, 1943-1946; military command positions. Military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Bowerbank</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td>Director-General NZ Medical Services (Army and Air). Military; medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Buck</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Director of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, appt 1936; involved in medicine, and Maori health; MP briefly; work in anthropology. Academic, Maori; medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Professor of Classics, Victoria University Coll; FNZIA; UNZ Senate; VC 1923-1926; published. Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil Whitney</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Managing director and company chair, incl Whitney and Sons (became Colonial Ammunition). Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey O'Leary</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Chief Justice of NZ, for 7 years from 1946. Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hight</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Professor of history and political science 1919-1948 Canterbury University Coll; UNZ Senate 36 years; pro-chancellor for 10 years. Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hercus</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Professor of public health and bacteriology (University of Otago Medical School); Dean of Medical School, elected 1937; research; surgeon. Medical; academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hunter</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Founder and first director of the State Dental Service for School Children; director of Division of Dental Hygiene, Dept Health. Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Johnston</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Former Judge of the Supreme Court, and of the Court of Appeal, 1934-1947; son of Sir Charles Johnston (1918 Kt) Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Dawson</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Professor of Midwifery and Gynaecology at the University of Otago, 1931 or 1932 until 1950; research. Medical; academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Smith</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court of NZ, 1928-1948; president Crippled Children’s Society 1935-1939; chancellor UNZ 1945-1961. Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Kippenberger</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Editor-in-Chief, NZ War Histories (23 volumes produced under his leadership); president NZRSA; barrister and solicitor; command positions in military. Academic; war/patriotic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Cameron</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of Dunedin, first elected 1944.; City Cl, elected 1935; member Public – local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Weir</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td>Chief of the General Staff, NZ Military Forces, 1946-</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Donnelly</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Director, Bank of NZ 1935-, chair 1937-; company director, incl NZ Newspapers, NZ Breweries; Crown solicitor; involved NZ Cricket Cl; stabilisation commission.</td>
<td>Business; legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kennedy</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court, 1929-1950.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Shelley</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Lecturer, incl on art history, Canterbury University Coll; founding director of broadcasting; founded New Zealand Listener; involved WEA courses; important in dramatic circles, incl founded Canterbury Repertory Society; involved in founding NZSO.</td>
<td>Academic; business; arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Heenan</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Dept Internal Affairs, including nearly 14 years at its helm; CEO NZ centennial celebrations; royal commissions; involved sporting bodies, incl New Zealand Olympic and British Empire Games Assn.</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erima Northcroft</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court, appt 1935; judge advocate general 1933-1935; NZ judge on International Military Tribunal for the Far East.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McKenzie</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>In business, incl McKenzies; supported charities, donated over 1 million pounds in lifetime, and began J. R. McKenzie Youth Education Trust and J. R. McKenzie Trust.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Johnstone</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Lawyer, partner; president of New Zealand Law Society at time of honour.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Nevill</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td>Chief of Air Staff, RNZAF.</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Allum</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of Auckland 1941-1953 (at least three terms); City Cl 1920-1929, 1938-1941; chair Auckland Metropolitan Patriotic Cl; established business in 1922.</td>
<td>Public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Andrews</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Elected Christchurch City Cl 1918, member for 32 years, including mayoralty from 1941-1950; member NZ Cl of Education; Christchurch Fire Bd, and more.</td>
<td>Public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Appleton</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of Wellington, 1944-1950, and other local government positions; company director, incl Griffin and Sons; president Municipal Assn of NZ 1948-1951; involved community groups.</td>
<td>Public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrid Sim</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>President National Party for 7 year; lawyer; Christchurch City Cl 1925-1927; director Mount Cook Tourist Co of New Zealand, Wellington Publishing Co; charity; son of Sir William Sim (Kt 1924).</td>
<td>Legal; public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Duncan</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Philanthropic work, for example, endowed hospitals for treatment of infantile paralysis; chair NZ Meat Board, for approximately 10 years;</td>
<td>Community; agriculture; business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Polson</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Farmer and owner of Otari station. Dominant president NZ Farmers' Union, 1921-1936; MP 1928-1946; Minister of the Crown; acting leader of the opposition 1943; MLC; farmer.</td>
<td>Public – national; agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Fair</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court and of the Court of Appeal, 1934-1955.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Ewen</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Chair of directors Sargood, Son and Ewen Ltd; director Reserve Bank of New Zealand, appt 1934; director AMP Society; member Government Supply Cll; involved YWCA, and more.</td>
<td>Business; public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Meredith</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>30 years as Crown solicitor; represented Wellington in rugby and was manager of All Blacks team that went to England 1935, and selector Auckland and NZ Rugby Unions.</td>
<td>Legal; sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jordan</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>MP for 14 years; NZ High Commissioner in London for 15 years from 1935; NZ representative on League of Nations.</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Doidge</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>High Commissioner for NZ in London, appt 1951; MP 1938-1951, Minister of the Crown, incl of External Affairs.</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Bell</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>27 year tenure of chair of surgery at University of Otago Medical School; founding fellow College of Surgeons of Australasia; retired 1952; published.</td>
<td>Medical; academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Goodfellow</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Formed/director of companies, incl being managing director NZ Co-operative Dairy Co 1919-1932, established Challenge Phosphate Co, director NZ Newspapers; benefactor, incl to erect chapel at Auckland University Coll; set up radio station.</td>
<td>Business; agriculture; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enoch Levy</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Director Grasslands Division of DSIR; published; 40 years in public service, retired 1951.</td>
<td>Agriculture; academic; public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ilott</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Company chair and director, incl J Ilott Ltd, and more; involved many community organisations, incl NZ Crippled Children's Society, Boy Scouts Assn.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby Norrie</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>GCVO</td>
<td>Governor-General of NZ, and Commander-in-Chief of NZ, 1952-1957.</td>
<td>Public – national; personal to sovereign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bodkin</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>KCVO</td>
<td>MP, first elected 1928; Minister of the Crown, incl Civil Defence, Internal Affairs.</td>
<td>Public – national; public – local; personal to sovereign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Henry</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Chair of board, NZ Forest Products Ltd, appt 1936; started mill; endowed</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Occupation and Achievements</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ross</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Chair Ross and Glendining Ltd; president and chair NZ and S Sea Exhibition 1925-1926; manufacturing associations; son of Sir John Ross (Kt 1922).</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Munro</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Ambassador of NZ in the USA, 1952-1958; permanent representative of NZ to UN, incl on Security CI 1954-1955; university council; lecturer in law 1924-1938, and more.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cunningham</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Lawyer and partner; Crown Prosecutor; military service (incl command); sometime honorary ADC to Governor-General; president NZLS; involved NZRSA.</td>
<td>Legal; military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Finlay</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Appt to Supreme Court 1943, later senior puisne judge; appt president of Land Sales Court 1943.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Broadfoot</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>26 years in House of Representatives (first elected 1928); PMG for 5 yrs; Minister of the Crown.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Tyndall</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Secretary of Mines, 1934-1940; Judge of Court of Arbitration 1940-1965.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Webb</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>High Commissioner for NZ in the UK, 1954-1958; MP 1943-54; A-G; Minister of the Crown, incl of External Affairs, Justice; published.</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Mulholland</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Member NZ Meat Producers Bd, 1943-1961; appt president Dominion NZFU 1936 (held position for 9 yrs); first president FFNZ; farmer.</td>
<td>Agriculture; business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Ashwin</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Secretary of the Treasury 1939-1955; director Reserve Bank by 1945; retired 1955 after 43 years as public servant; company director, incl Tasman Pulp and Paper.</td>
<td>Public – national; business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Stanton</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court, 1948-1957.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Wright</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Dunedin, first elected 1950; company director, incl McLeod Bros Ltd; chair Otago Development Cl.</td>
<td>Public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Gresson</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Judge of Supreme Court, 1947-1957; first president Court of Appeal, 1957-1963; sat on Judicial Committee of Privy Cl.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Role/Position</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hale</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Involved in business, incl as director NZ Dairy Co, chair Auckland Farmers’ Freezing Co; involved NZ Meat Bd; 10 years Hauraki Plains City Cl.</td>
<td>Business; agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Marsden</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Professor of physics, Victoria University Coll 1914-1922; assistant director of education 1922-1926; secretary DSIR and CI 1926-1946, left DSIR late 1940s; president of Royal Society of New Zealand, 1947.</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Burns</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surgeon; head of department of cardiology Wellington Hospital; commissioner Southland Hospital 1966; foundation fellow Royal Australasian Coll of Physicians.</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Smirk</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Chair in Medicine, University of Otago, appt 1940; research; research professor and director Wellcome Medical Research Institute; Royal Australasian Coll of Physicians.</td>
<td>Medical; academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Stewart</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td>Generals’ List (Retired), Chief of the General Staff 1949-1952, commander NZ Division.</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Peren</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Chair of Agriculture, Victoria University Coll, 1924-1927; professor of Agriculture and Principal of Massey Agricultural Coll, 1927-1960. Linked to Perendale breed of sheep.</td>
<td>Academic; agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hutchison</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court 1948-1966; son of Sir James Hutchison (Kt 1936).</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Cotton</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Lecturer in geology and geomorphology; published; professor at Victoria University Coll 1921-1953; Professor Emeritus after retired.</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Cleary</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of new permanent Court of Appeal, appt 1957.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gillies</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Surgeon; fellow of Royal Australasian Coll of Surgeon; involved Red Cross and Order of St John.</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred North</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Member Court of Appeal 1958-72, and president 1963-1972; Judge of Supreme Court 1951-1957.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walsh</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>KBE</td>
<td>Editor New Zealand Dental Journal; professor of dentistry, dean and director Otago University Dental School 1946-1971; chair Dental Cl of NZ; member Otago University Cl.</td>
<td>Medical; academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Currie</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>VC, UNZ, 1952-1961, important in giving colleges more autonomy; chair commission on education.</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Adams</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court; Judge of various Pacific Island courts, incl Fiji Court of Appeal 1960-1964.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander McKenzie</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Company director (twelve companies) and chair, dominion president of the National Party 1951-1962.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Stout</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Medical editor of New Zealand War History; surgeon; son of Sir Robert Stout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Carroll</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>KBE – C</td>
<td>Farmer; member Wairoa County Cl 1924-1959 (chair 1935-1959); chair Wairoa Dairy Co Ltd; member East Coast Maori Trust Cl; Wairoa Hospital Bd and Harbour Bd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kerridge</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Owned and controlled 133 theatres by 1947, retired as Kerridge Odeon's managing director in 1976 (stayed chair).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Kelliher</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Editor Ladies' Mirror; in business, incl Kelliher &amp; Co, Dominion Breweries; director Bank of New Zealand; patron of arts; donor to charities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Andrew</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Farmer; dominion president FFNZ 1952-1956; NZ Meat Producers Bd; director Farmers' Mutual Insurance Co, and more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Archey</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Director Auckland Institute and Museum, 1924-1964; research; published; fellow Royal Society of NZ; UNZ Senate 1941-1961.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Linton</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Farmer; NZ Dairy Bd; chair NZ Dairy Production and Marketing Bd, and more; Dairy Research Institute 1935-1959; involved in dairy companies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooll Fisher</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Part of forming Fisher and Paykel; involved in developing technology; Auckland Chamber of Commerce, and more; founded Wooll Fisher Trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ormond</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>NZ Meat Producers' Bd 1944–1972, and briefly before war, chair 1951–; farmer.</td>
<td>Agriculture; business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Smith</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Company director and chair, incl Cadbury Fry Hudson (chair and managing director 1932–1963), Bell Tea Co; community groups.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Phipps</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>KBE–M</td>
<td>Chief of Naval Staff, first NZ'er to be admiral in NZ forces; chair of Chiefs of Staff Committee (Chief of Defence Staff), appt 1963.</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred North</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>KBE–C</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stevenson</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>KBE–C</td>
<td>Manager New Zealand Olympic Team, Tokyo; Mayor of Howick; endowed scholarships, benefactor to many causes. ‘[F]or outstanding services as a generous public benefactor and leader in community welfare,’</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Sayers</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Surgeon; published; professor of therapeutics and Dean of Otago Medical School 1959–1967; chair in therapeutics; founding fellow Royal Australasian Coll of Physicians; research.</td>
<td>Medical; academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Nash</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>Prime Minister 1957–1960; Leader of the Opposition; MP, first elected 1929; Minister of the Crown, incl of Finance; Deputy PM and president of the Labour Party at times.</td>
<td>Public–national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Butland</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>KBE–C</td>
<td>Founder and chair J R Butland Pty Ltd, and other companies, company director, incl Rothmans Tobacco (Holdings) Ltd (UK).</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wild</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>On his assumption of the office of Chief Justice of New Zealand; lately Chief Justice of New Zealand.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wattie</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Managing director of J Wattie Canneries (became Wattie Industries, was managing director and chair), and involved in other companies; benefactor.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Plimmer</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>KBE–C</td>
<td>Company director, incl Wright Stephenson and Co, Dunlop (NZ) Ltd, and more; member royal commissions.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George McGregor</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court, 1953–1969.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Turner</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turners and Growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1962; founder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Distributors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltd 1951-1979;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innovations in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>markets and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology; 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on executive of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce; 18 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Harbour Bd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Blundell</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer 1930-1968;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>president NZ Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society 1962-1968;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company director;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on royal commissions;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ High Commissioner to London 1968-1972; Governor-General of NZ 1972-1977 (first NZ resident appt).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Manning</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-1968; involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in adult education,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl president WEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942-1948.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public – local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Thornton</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>KCB - M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, NZ Armed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces, 1965-1971;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Meech</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>KCVO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secretary of Civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence 1959-1967;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of Writs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-1967; director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Royal Visits 1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 1966; involved in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts organisations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl Queen Elizabeth II Arts Cl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal to sovereign; public – national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Grace</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private secretary to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Maori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affairs 1949-1959;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member boards, incl Maori Purposes Fund Bd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maori; public – national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mackay</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of directors,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder Mackay Co Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chair and managing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>director Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading Co; director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ Forest Products Ltl</td>
<td>11 years; member Auckland Harbour Bridge Authority 1952-1957; president Auckland Crippled Children’s Society, and more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>director YMCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years; member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Harbour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Authority 1952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 1957; president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Crippled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Society,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and more. For ‘services to the community in commerce, local authority and welfare work’;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business; community; public – local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Bate</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Hastings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-1959; president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary; president</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Boy Scouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assn; company director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[F]or outstanding services to local government and the community’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public – local; community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Donald</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP 1928-1931; PMG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-1931; involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in business, incl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald and Edenborough, Island traders; financed and supervised children’s home; member Door of Hope Assn, and more; contributed to funds of many charitable organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[F]or outstanding services to the community’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Blyde</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer for 40 years;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>director Lepperton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Co for over 37 years (chair 25 years); member FFNZ and local branch chair Farmers’ Union for 31 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture; business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Mitchell</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘[F]or outstanding services as President of the New Zealand Returned Services Association since 1962’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>War/patriotic work; community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Doig</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director A S Paterson and Co Ltd, Kiwi United; chair and managing director UEB Industries Ltd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

189
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Danks</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>KBE-C</td>
<td>On staff of economic department, Canterbury University 1943-1966,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>professor 1962, pro-vice-chancellor, North Canterbury Hospital Bd,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commission on social security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Jack</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>MP, first elected 1954, Speaker of the House of Representatives,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appt 1967; Wanganui City Cl 1946-1955.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove-Myer Robinson</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Auckland City Mayor, first elected 1959 (held position for 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between 1959 and 1980); Auckland Metropolitan Drainage Bd, and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Holyoake</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>Prime Minister of NZ 1957, 1960-1972; MP 1932-1977; Minister of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crown, incl Agriculture; Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and over NZ 1977-1980; involved in Farmers' Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Barratt-Boyes</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>KBE-C</td>
<td>Surgeon; Surgeon-in-charge, Cardiothoracic Surgery Unit, Green Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital 1965-1989; published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Proctor</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>KBE-C</td>
<td>Chair and managing director Dunlop NZ (retired 1965); president NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturers' Assn; chair Remunerations Authority 1971-1972;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>involved National Society of Alcoholism, and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Cole</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Made home, Moose Lodge, available to distinguished guests and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>charitable causes; builder before WWI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Smythe</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>KBE-C</td>
<td>Associated with forestry industry since 1928; managing director NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Norwood</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Chair NZ Motor Corp Ltd, CB Norwood Ltd; benefactor, incl Botanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gardens; trustee, Norwood Crippled Children Trust; son of Sir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Norwood (Kt 1937).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harcourt Caughey</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>KBE-C</td>
<td>Director and chair many companies, incl Smith and Caughey Ltd; chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caughey Preston Trust Bd 1954-1980; chair Auckland Hospital Bd 1959-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1974; All Black 1932-1937.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard O'Connell</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Managing director, deputy chair of NZ Breweries (had joined company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1935).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Burns</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>KBE-C</td>
<td>Director Canterbury Agriculture Coll 1952-1974 (22 years as director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and later principal) (became Lincoln Coll); research; senior lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in soil science 1937-1949.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Richmond</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme (now High) Court 1960-1971; Judge of the Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Appeal 1972-1981; President of the Court of Appeal of NZ 1976-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Background and Achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Savory</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Former chair Auckland Harbour Bd; former president NZ Harbours Assn; Auckland City Cl 1953-1962; member NZ Cl of Technical Education, and more; president NZ Builders’ Assn 1964-1967.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Roberts</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>General manager TEAL, then chair, worked to get Air New Zealand; involved aviation groups, incl president International Air Transport Assn 1973-1975.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Liley</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Professor in perinatal physiology, University Auckland; developed techniques; national president Society for Protection of the Unborn Child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hart</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Managing director British Hearing Aids Ltd; pioneer of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Turner</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick O'Dea</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>KCV0</td>
<td>Director of Royal Visits, NZ Secretary to the Queen 1969-1978, 1981; secretary of Internal Affairs 1967-1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alec Haslam</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the Supreme Court, 1957-1976.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Reed</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Developed business into major NZ publishing house (A.H. and A.W. Reed); set up generous trust, benefactor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Scott</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Chair Organising Committee, Commonwealth Games, Christchurch 1974 (and leader of delegation that won the games over Melbourne).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Macarthur</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court (Judge of Supreme Court 1959-1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaddeus McCarthy</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Blundell</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>GCVO</td>
<td>Governor-General of New Zealand, 1972-1977; as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Tait</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to local govt. Mayor of Napier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Dunlop</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to the farming industry, President FFNZ 1973-1974.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Hadley</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Lately High Commissioner for NZ in the UK. For public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Wood</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For public services, esp as Chairman of the Consumer Council since 1959 (until 1975).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Bennett</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For public services, especially to the Maori people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Skinner</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to the trade union movement and the community. Labour MP 1946-1949; president NZFOL 1964-1979 (and vice president 1959-1963; trade union official.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Wigley</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to the tourist, travel and aviation industries. Managing director Mt Cook and Southern Lakes Tourist Co (became Mt Cook Group).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hunn</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For public services, esp as Chairman of the Fire Services Commission. Involved in other commissions as well; secretary for defence 1963-1965; chair Waikanae CI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Honours</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Minhinnick</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Perry</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Todd</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McAlpine</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Cooke</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Davies</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Perry</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Community; Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randal Elliott</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Myers</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Newman</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Richmond</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>KBE</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Barker</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to the City of Gisborne. Mayor of Gisborne, first elected 1950 (held position for 27 years, 9 consecutive terms); editor Poverty Bay Herald; on Gisborne District Roads Cl, and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Henare</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to the community, esp Maori Affairs. District Maori welfare officer; involved Waitangi National Trust Bd, and many Maori organisations; involved Order of St John, and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Perry</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to commerce and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald McKay</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>For public services. Minister of the Crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam Dowling</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>KBE</td>
<td>For services to local body and community affairs. Chair Hawke's Bay Hospital Bd, Medical Research Fdn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Rodger</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to the accountancy profession. Dean of Commerce, lecturer in accountancy and author on accountancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wicks</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services as a Stipendiary Magistrate, 1961-1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wild</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>GBE - C</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaven Donne</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Chief Justice of the High Court of the Cook Islands and Chief Justice of Niue; also in other Pacific Island courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepi Te Heu Heu</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to the Maori people and the community. Turamakina Tribal Committee; member Tongariro National Park Bd; chair Tuwharetoa Trust Bd, and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Miller</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to the Ross Dependency, conservation and surveying. Surveys; involved Trans-Antarctic Expedition 1955; on Ross Dependency Research Committee; involved World Wildlife Fund, and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson Stewart</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to manufacturing and the community. Chair PDL Holdings, involved trade missions; on Canterbury Manufacturers' Assn; Christchurch City Cl 1969-1972; donated to Antarctic Wing, Christchurch Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Harris</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to handicapped people and the community. Involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Honours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tosswill Woollaston</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Fletcher</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to industry and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Latimer</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>President of the NZ Maori Council, appt 1972; involved in appeals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Gilkison</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to aviation, export industry and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Thompson</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to commerce and the community:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Beattie</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>GCVO</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hilgendorf</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For public services, especially as Chairman of the NZ Meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Wilson</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to commerce and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Stewart</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor of Massey University since 1964 (until 1983).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Fowler</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Wellington, 1974-1983; City Cl 1968-1974; had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>For services to the meat industry and the community. Managing director R and W Hellaby Ltd, appt 1963 (joined company in 1948); director of other companies, incl NZ Insurance Co, Pacific Steel, Rheem NZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Hellaby</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>President of the Court of Appeal, 1981-1986; as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Elsmore</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to horticulture and the community. Created garden (Tupare); involved in establishing gardens, benefactor; involved Outward Bound Trust of NZ, and more; company director, incl Ivor Watkins Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Matthews</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Lately, a Judge of the High Court of NZ, 1970-1981.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John White</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to the Maori people. Member NZ Maori CI 1962-1984, and more; company director; accountant; son of Sir Apirana Ngata (Kt 1927).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Francis</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Christchurch, 1974-1989; City CI 1959-1974; company director; community groups; son of Sir James Hay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Anderson</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td>For services to the transport industry. Managing director, R. H. Pettigrew Transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Pettigrew</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Judge of the High Court of New Zealand 1966-1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stewart</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to local government and the community. Mayor of Lower Hutt 1970-1986; City CI 1962-1972; Wellington Harbour Bd; former trustee National Museum and Art Gallery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kennedy-Good</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Commissioner and Territorial Commander of the Salvation Army in NZ. For services to the Salvation Army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Goffin</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to banking, commerce and the community. General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mowbray</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>For services</th>
<th>Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurence Stevens</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Rowling</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>PM NZ 1974-75</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Bowman</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Export</td>
<td>Public – local; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Regan</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Ross</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thorn</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Public – local; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Muldoon</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>PM NZ 1975-84</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Leechars</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>War/patriotic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rex</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Premier</td>
<td>Public – national (Niue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil Cross</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Govan</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Weir</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Agriculture; business;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot Adams-Schneider</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>KCMG</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Norman</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cooper</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Academic; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester Moller</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>High Court</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond Sullivan</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>District Court</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Warren</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Award(s)</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Reeves</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>Governor-General Designate of New Zealand; as above. Public - national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Roper</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lately, a Judge of the High Court, 1968-1985. Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Sinclair</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>For services to historical research and literature. Professor of history 1963-1987, editor <em>New Zealand Journal of History</em> 1967-1987; published. Academic; arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Clark</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>For services to manufacturing, export, sport and the community. Business; sport; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Southward</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>For services to the community, especially the disabled. Company director; speed boat racer. Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jamieson</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>KBE - M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chief of Defence Staff; Chief of Air Staff 1979-1983. Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Isaac</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>For services to conservation. Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivor Richardson</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Judge of the Court of Appeal, appt 1977. Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Richardson</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>For services to manufacturing. Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Cooke</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td></td>
<td>President of the Court of Appeal, 1986-1996; as above. Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Reeves</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>GCVO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Governor-General, 1985-1990; as above. Personal to sovereign; public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan McMullin</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Judge of the Court of Appeal. Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Renouf</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>For philanthropic services. Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangaroa Tangaroa</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Queen’s Representative in the Cook Islands 1984-1990. Public – national (Cook Is)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Love</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to the Maori people and the community.</td>
<td>Maori; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Ongley</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Lately a Judge of the High Court.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Skeggs</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Mayor of the City of Dunedin, for 12 years; member Otago Harbour Bd</td>
<td>Public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Manchester</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to medicine, especially plastic and reconstruction surgery. Head of department Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Middlemore Hospital, 1950-1979.</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bennett</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to education. Chair Maori Education Foundation; brother of Sir Charles Bennett (1975 Kt).</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Brierley</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to business management and the community. Chair and director Brierley Investments Ltd 1961-1989.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Halberg</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to sport and crippled children. First NZ'er to run 4 minute mile; gold medal at Olympics Rome 1960; world records; established Halberg Trust 1963.</td>
<td>Sport; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Scott</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to medicine. At Middlemore Hospital; Head of Department of Medicine at University of Auckland 1979-1987.</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingi Ihaka</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to the Maori people.</td>
<td>Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Irvine</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>Vice-Chancellor, University of Otago.</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy McKenzie</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to education and the community. Patron Outward Bound Trust; company director, incl McKenzie's (NZ) Ltd; son of Sir John McKenzie (KBE – C 1950).</td>
<td>Academic; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Eichelbaum</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>GBE - C</td>
<td>Chief Justice of New Zealand, appt 1989.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to business management and the community. Founder and executive chair Robt Jones Investments Ltd.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Graham</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>1990 Kt</td>
<td>For services to the dairy industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hadlee</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>1990 Kt</td>
<td>For services to cricket. Played for NZ 1972-1990; first player in test history to take 400 test wickets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Morrison</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>1990 Kt</td>
<td>For services to entertainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hay</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>1991 Kt</td>
<td>For services to NZ Heart Foundation. First Medical Director National Heart Foundation 1977-1992; son of Sir James Hay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colin Maiden</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to education and business management.</td>
<td>For services to local govt and the community. Mayor of Manukau City, first elected 1983; City CI 1968-1983; involved Jean Batten Memorial Trust, and more.</td>
<td>Academic; business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Moore</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to otolaryngology.</td>
<td>Reader in Otolaryngology, University of Auckland School of Medicine; performed world first operations.</td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Carter</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to business management.</td>
<td>Executive director Carter Holt Harvey Ltd, and more; president NZ Merchants’ Fdn, and more.</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald McIntyre</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to opera.</td>
<td>Executive director Carter Holt Harvey Ltd, and more; president NZ Merchants’ Fdn, and more.</td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to local government.</td>
<td>For services to local government.</td>
<td>Public – local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Wallis</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to deer farming, export and the community.</td>
<td>For services to deer farming, export and the community.</td>
<td>Agriculture; community; business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipene O'Regan</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to the Maori people and the community.</td>
<td>For services to the Maori people and the community. Chair Ngai Tahu Trust Bd, appt 1983.</td>
<td>Maori; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden Spring</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to the dairy industry.</td>
<td>Director NZ Co-operative Dairy Co Ltd (chair 1982-1989), and more; involved FFNZ.</td>
<td>Agriculture; business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Southgate</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to music.</td>
<td>For services to music.</td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Anderson</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to business management, banking and the community.</td>
<td>For services to business management, banking and the community. Company director, incl NZ Steel; executive positions National Bank of</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Community/Public/Academic/Sport/Professions/Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Goodman</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to business management, export and the community. President Emeritus Goodman Fielder Ltd; chair Heinz-Watties Ltd.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Waters</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Kt</td>
<td>For services to education. Emeritus Professor of Chemistry, Auckland University; VC, Massey University, appt 1983; published.</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Blake</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>KBE - C</td>
<td>For services to yachting. Racing Skipper Team NZ 'Black Magic' 1993-1995.</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hardie Boys</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>GNZM</td>
<td>Governor-General of NZ and Chancellor of the NZ Order of Merit; as above.</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mahuta</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to the Maori people. Director of Centre for Maori Studies and Research, Waikato University; member Tainui Maori Trust Bd, and more.</td>
<td>Maori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence McLean</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to sporting journalism.</td>
<td>Sport; professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Thorp</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>Judge of the High Court 1979-1996.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Owens</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to business and the community. Chair Owens Group; trustee Owens Charitable Trust.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wallace</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>Lately a Judge of the High Court 1982-1996.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Carter</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to engineering and business administration.</td>
<td>Professions; business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajeshwar (Roger) Bhatnagar</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to business and the community.</td>
<td>Business; community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian McKay</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services as a Judge of the Court of Appeal (1991-1997) and to the law.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Whineray</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to sport and business management. Captain of the All Blacks 1958-1965; director Carter Holt Harvey and other companies; chair National Bank of New Zealand, appt 1998; trustee Halberg Trust for Crippled Children.</td>
<td>Sport; business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Charles</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to golf.</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn Cushing</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to business, sport and the arts. Executive director Brierley Investments; director Air NZ, Carter Holt Harvey, and more.</td>
<td>Business; sport; arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Llewellyn</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to agriculture and the community.</td>
<td>Agriculture; community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Birch</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>GNZM</td>
<td>For public services as a MP and Minister of the Crown. MP, first elected 1972; Treasurer, appt 1998; Minister of Finance, Revenue.</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus Tait</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to technology, manufacturing and export.</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Tompkins</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services as a Judge of the High Court and to the community. High Court Judge 1983-1997, acting High Court Judge, appt 1997; involved Outward Bound, and more.</td>
<td>Legal; community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Trimmer</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to ballet (Head of Royal NZ Ballet).</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Gallen</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services as a Judge of the High Court 1983-1999.</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Hogan</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to thoroughbred breeding and racing. Owner of Sir Tristram; chair New Zealand Thoroughbred Breeders’ Assn.</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Simpson</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to information technology, commerce and the community. CEO Aoraki Corp; chair Christchurch City Mission Special Appeals campaign.</td>
<td>Business; community; academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Turei</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>KNZM</td>
<td>For services to Maori.</td>
<td>Maori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dame</td>
<td>Year of Honour</td>
<td>Type of Award</td>
<td>Main areas of work</td>
<td>Categories of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countess of Liverpool</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>GBE</td>
<td>Wife of the Governor-General.</td>
<td>Community; war/patriotic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Massey</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>GBE</td>
<td>Widow of former PM; “loyal and devoted” helpmate of husband; humanitarian work, organisations for betterment of women and children; war work World War One.</td>
<td>Community; war/patriotic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Gilmer</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Wellington Hospital Bd 1938-1953; Wellington City Cl 1941-1953; involved various associations, incl Crippled Children’s Assn; NZ representative International Cl of Women 1949.</td>
<td>Public – local; community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara, Lady Freyberg</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>GBE</td>
<td>Wife of the Governor-General; work with New Zealand clubs; involved in Girl Guides’ Assn, NCW; New Zealand Crippled Children’s Society, League of Mothers, Mothers Union, and more; daughter of Colonel Sir Herbert Jekyll. 'In recognition of her services to New Zealand during the war period, in connection with the welfare of New Zealand forces, and as wife of the Governor-General of New Zealand from 1946 to 1952'.</td>
<td>Community; war/patriotic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngaio Marsh</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Literature (first book published 1933) and stage direction, Shakespeare, 1938-1964.</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Arkinui Te Atairangikaahu</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>The Maori Queen, acceded 23 May 1966.</td>
<td>Public – national; Maori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister Mary Leo</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Singing teacher, incl of Major and Te Kanawa.</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Kirk</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Widow of the Rt Hon Norman Kirk, PM. For public services.</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecily Pickerill</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For services to medicine, especially in the field of plastic surgery. Plastic surgeon.</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whina Cooper</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For services to the Maori people. Led land march; founding president MWWL 1951-1957; descended from chiefs; involved in Maori organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiri Te Kanawa</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For services to opera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Tizard</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For public and community service. Auckland City CI 1971-1983; Mayor of Auckland 1983-1990; Auckland University CI; ASB Community Trusts, and more; Governor-General Designate of New Zealand; Governor-General of NZ 1990-1996 (first woman).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothea Horsman</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For services to the community. National president NCW 1982-1986; national president NZFUW 1973-1976; various boards and organisations, incl YMCA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Fraser</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For services to the Otago Hospital Board and the community. Chair Otago Hospital Bd 1974-1986, member 1953-1956, 1962-1986; Dunedin City CI 1970-1974, and more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Metge</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For services to anthropology. Fieldwork and research; Associate Professor at Victoria University, anthropology, 1968-1988.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Salas</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For services to the community. 30 years voluntary work, incl NCW, ALAC, peace and disarmament work, elected national president UN Assn of NZ 1988; daughter of Sir James Hay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Goodman</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>For services to the community. Chair International Woman's Year Committee 1975; chair Odyssey House Trust 1981-1983, and more;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>For services to</td>
<td>For services to</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Cartwright</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>women</td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miraka Szaszy</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Winstone</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Tizard</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>GCMG</td>
<td>Governor-General</td>
<td>as above.</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Casey</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvina Major</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>opera and the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangimarie Hetet</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>traditional Maori arts and crafts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maori; arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Restieaux</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>cardiology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Ballin</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Evison</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>theatre, television and the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thea, Lady Muldoon</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>the community</td>
<td>Married to Sir Robert Muldoon (GCMG 1984).</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Guthardt</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>the Methodist Church and to women.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religion; women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Henderson</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>service to art.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Lamb</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Wallace</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>District Court Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Bergquist</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Mayo</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>art</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgina Kirby</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>the Maori people</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Honours and Other Achievements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Salmond</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td><strong>For services to historical research.</strong> 1995.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Tizard</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>GCVO</td>
<td><strong>Governor-General of New Zealand,</strong> 1990-1996; as above. 1995; as above.</td>
<td>Public – national; personal to sovereign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian Weir</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>DBE</td>
<td><strong>For services to music.</strong> Concert organist; sister of Sir Roderick Weir (Kt 1984). 1996.</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Harcourt</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For services to the theatre.</strong> Various performances, also work in publicity, scriptwriting, films and TV. 1996.</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella Campbell</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For services to science.</strong> Lectured at Massey University 1945-1976, world recognition for research. 1997.</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Paul</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For services to publishing, writing and painting.</strong> Involved Blackwood and Janet Paul Ltd; published; painter. 1997.</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Kidman</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For services to literature.</strong> Many publications; also lectured in creative writing; NZ Book Cl. 1998.</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Devoy</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For services to sport and the community.</strong> Three times world champion in squash; walked length of New Zealand to raise money for muscular dystrophy. 1998.</td>
<td>Sport; community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hanan</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For services to the community.</strong> Dunedin City Cl, first elected 1986; president NZFUW Otago 1990-1992; Consumer Cl 1986-1988; Dunedin Showcase Trust; and more similar. 1998.</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryll Sotheran</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For services to museum administration.</strong></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Bazley</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For public services, lately as Chief Executive of the Department of Social Welfare.</strong> Chief executive, Ministry of Transport, and many public appointments. 1999.</td>
<td>Public – national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sian Elias</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>GNZM</td>
<td><strong>Chief Justice of New Zealand.</strong></td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Stokes</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>DNZM</td>
<td><strong>For services to tertiary education and Maori.</strong> 2000.</td>
<td>Academic; Maori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:
Bold notation denotes the citation provided in the *New Zealand Gazette* or obtained from the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. The C or M noted in some awards granted denotes civil or military division.
All dates given for awards are those of the notice published in the *New Zealand Gazette*, rather than of the announcement given in the media, which was often given for awards in the New Year List on 31 December of the previous year.
Categorisations of services are derived from citations in *The New Zealand Gazette*, or those provided by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Where such citations were unavailable, biographical information from other sources was used, particularly where the award of the titular honour and the reason for it was discussed. The timing of the award in relation to the work done or positions held was taken into account in categorisation.
This table does not contain all positions held, or work done, for reasons of space. Rather, major appointments and career achievements have been included, those directly relevant or close in time to the award given, or one of a number of similar positions. For instance, where a Judge has been granted a title, previous positions as a barrister or solicitor were not included.

Abbreviations:
ADC  Aide-de-camp
A-G  Attorney-General
ALAC  Alcohol Liquor Advisory Council
appt  appointed
Assn  Association
Bd  Board
Cl  Council
Co  Company
Coll  College
EEC  European Economic Community
esp  especially
Fdn  Foundation
FFNZ  Federated Farmers of New Zealand
GOC  General Officer Commanding
HS  High School
ICW  International Council of Women
IFUW  International Federation of University Women
incl  including
MLC  Member of the Legislative Council
MP  Member of Parliament
MWWL Maori Women's Welfare League
NCW National Council of Women
NZ’er New Zealander
NZEAS New Zealand Educational Administration Society
NZFU New Zealand Farmers' Union
NZFUW New Zealand Federation of University Women
NZHBA New Zealand Hospital Boards Association
NZHPT New Zealand Historic Places Trust
NZLS New Zealand Law Society
NZRSA New Zealand Returned Services Association
PM Prime Minister
PMG Postmaster General
TEAL Tasman Empire Airways Ltd
UN United Nations
UNZ University of New Zealand
VC Vice Chancellor
WEA Workers’ Education Association
YMCA Young Men’s Christian Association
YWCA Young Women’s Christian Association

Sources:
Citations sent from the Honours Secretariat, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2003-2004.
The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, all editions.
The Dominion.
The New Zealand Gazette.
The New Zealand Herald.
The Press.
Who’s Who in New Zealand, all editions.
Herbison, Dame Jean, interview with the author, 18 November 2004, Christchurch.
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