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Chapter 2

Pro Patria Mori:
Remembering the Regiment

The South African War was an important moment of transition in the nature and perception of the British army. A central element in this process of change was the growth of mass literacy. Almost every British soldier had at least basic literacy skills and could write about their experiences in letters to loved ones back home. Frequently such accounts were disseminated to a wider public through local newspapers, works journals and school magazines. The soldiers were also accompanied by journalists, artists, illustrators and cinematographers. Modern technology was then used to give a public educated in popular patriotism and imperialism an on-going diet of stories and information.¹ At the same time, the ranks of the army were swollen by a large number of volunteers, particularly from the British middle classes. This gave the army, albeit for a very short space of time, a demographic much more akin to its parent population.² These trends helped the army to transform the image of the Tommy from Wellington’s ‘scum of the earth’ to Kipling’s salt of the earth. This chapter will explore the extent to which this shift in perception was reflected in, and even exploited by, the military authorities as they embarked on the time-honoured tradition of raising monuments to their fallen. It will explore how the, often uneasy, relationship between regulars and volunteers impacted on the memorialisation process and, thus, provide an alternative window on the debates that surrounded the structure and function of the nation’s military forces on the eve of the Great War.

At regimental level the formation of an organising committee to oversee the memorialisation process was a relatively straight-forward matter. In the majority of cases, retired officers took the lead in conjunction with a smattering of serving officers. In London the Royal Artillery scheme commenced with a meeting at the Royal United Service Institute in November 1902. Former

¹ See Gooch (ed.), The Boer War, pp. 187–244.
commander-in-chief of the British army and cousin of Queen Victoria, the Duke of Cambridge chaired the meeting and oversaw the creation of a committee. Retired Major-General Sir George Marshall, who had commanded the Royal Artillery during the conflict, was appointed as chairman and was joined by two other major-generals and four retired colonels; three ex-officio posts were created for the Director of Artillery, the Inspector-General of Artillery and the Assistant Adjutant General at the War Office.³ Lord Roberts, the commander-in-chief in South Africa who masterminded the fall of the Boer capitals, also played an active role on the committee. Colonel A. Sprot, the recently retired commanding officer of the 6th Dragoon Guards (the Carabiniers), took the position of chair of the regimental committee assisted by a small group of other retired officers. He had to play a particularly active role as the regiment moved to India soon after the war and so was a long way from the centre of events.⁴ The idea to erect a memorial to the Royal Marines resulted in a poll of all officers on the active list to propose names for a memorial committee under the chairmanship of retired marine, Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur French.⁵ The historic and prestigious City of London volunteer unit, the Honourable Artillery Company, took direction on its war memorial from its governing body, the Court, under its chair, Lieutenant-Colonel the Earl Denbigh, which then created a Roll of Honour committee.⁶ Although the Royal Engineers chose, in the words of Major A. T. Moore, the honorary secretary of the committee, to adopt ‘a course which has been consecrated by long-usage in all non-official matters’ and elect its committee at a general meeting of the corps on 6 June 1903, the outcome, nonetheless, firmly reflected the existing command structure.⁷ Lieutenant-General Sir Robert Grant, Inspector-General of Fortifications until 1898 and senior serving officer, was voted in as president with the rest of the committee comprising two major-generals and two colonels.⁸

Occasionally civic authorities were included in the process, although where this was the case the schemes invariably originated within the confines of the military. The King’s Liverpool regiment, having launched a fund in the late 1880s for a memorial to the fallen of the Afghan and Burma campaigns,

³ *The Times*, 9 July 1910.
⁴ The National Archives (TNA) WORK 20/57 Carabiniers’ Memorial, 1905–1906. Letter from Sprot to Office of Works, 6 February 1906.
⁶ Honourable Artillery Company Archive (HACA), Court Minutes, Vol. JJ, 1899–1905, 19 January, 30 March 1903. (Many thanks are due to Justine Taylor, Archivist to the Honourable Artillery Company, for making the records available for inspection.)
⁷ Royal Engineers Museum (REM), RO270, Royal Engineers War Memorial Committee Book, Corps meeting minutes, 6 June 1903
⁸ However, as will be seen later, this committee was only formed after a lengthy and relatively protracted dispute.
agreed to widen the scope of the scheme in the wake of the South African War and allow the city’s mayor, Sir Charles Petrie, along with a number of other leading citizens to serve on the memorial committee.⁹ The Royal Sussex Regiment established a memorial committee at the start of 1901 in response to a series of letters ‘from the officers commanding the battalions’ and only after it was resolved that the scheme should take the form of a ‘Cottage Home’ was it felt necessary to cast the financial net wide through the inclusion of leading civic notables.¹⁰ The East Kent Regiment’s (The Buffs) scheme was initiated at a meeting held at Howe Barracks in Canterbury on 9 May 1903. Chaired by the Lord Lieutenant of the county, Earl Stanhope, who was supported by the colonel of the regiment, General Sir Julius Raines, acting in the capacity of vice president, the committee was, with one exception, made up of the senior officers of the regiment. The only civilian member of the committee was the deputy mayor of Canterbury, Alderman W. Mason, and this was simply a matter of form as the proposed site for the memorial was on municipal land.¹¹ Indeed, the extent to which Mason’s membership was meant to be no more than a courtesy became abundantly clear when a decision had to be reached as to the memorial’s exact positioning. Despite the assertion in the local press that the site had been chosen through ‘negotiation between the city council and the military authorities’, an examination of the council minutes tells a very different story.¹² A meeting of the parks sub-committee of Canterbury city council on 10 February 1904, chaired by the mayor, recommended that the memorial should be erected on the south side of the Dane John Gardens to avoid it ‘being dwarfed by the city walls’.¹³ However, the following week a full session of the council rejected the sub-committee’s recommendation on the grounds that ‘the military authorities saw objections’ and the memorial was built in the shadow of the walls.¹⁴

Regimental control over the memorialisation process can also be seen in the financing of the schemes. Committee members were all too aware of the proprietorial sub-text of subscription lists and so were keen to limit contributions to those who fell within the boundaries of their communities. For the military,

---

⁹ For much of the war, the local press had been calling for Liverpool’s civic authorities to become involved in the King’s Regiment’s commemorative plans. As early as November 1900, the Liverpool Mercury had published a letter insisting that the city council should mark the return of ‘our Imperial Volunteers’ with ‘some permanent recognition, some memorial worthy of the event’. Liverpool Mercury, 23 November 1900.

¹⁰ West Sussex Record Office (WSRO), RSR/MS/11/6 Royal Sussex Memorial Fund, minutes, 24 April 1902, p. 4.


¹³ Canterbury Cathedral Archives (CCA), CC/AC23, Parks Committee, minutes, 10 February 1904.

¹⁴ CCA, CC/AC/23/1, Canterbury City Council, minutes, 17 February 1904.
this could raise the delicate issue of how to deal with requests from bereaved relatives who wished to contribute to regimental memorials. When the mother of one of the fallen of the Royal Engineers sent in a donation of £20 towards the Corps’ memorial scheme it required a full meeting of the committee to ‘authorise that the money could be accepted on this occasion’.¹⁵ A similar compromise was reached by the memorial committee of The Buffs, East Kent Regiment. An announcement in the local paper stated that, although it had been unanimously decided not to open subscriptions to the general public, Hammond and Company in Canterbury and Cox and Company in London would still receive donations ‘in deference to the requests of relatives and friends of those who gave their lives for Queen, King and Country’.¹⁶ The Queen’s Own Royal West Kent Regiment chose to make no exceptions to the rule that the process should be kept in-house and donations for the regimental memorial in All Saints’ Church, Maidstone, were restricted to past and present members of the regiment.¹⁷ Similarly, although the Duke of Cambridge was fully aware of the desire of relatives to make a contribution to the Royal Artillery memorial, he was nonetheless adamant ‘that subscriptions should be confined exclusively to members of the regiment’.¹⁸ By insisting that contributions should come from the regiment alone, Cambridge cut the men from their families and made the dead the possession of the army.

Even the inclusion of non-military personnel on the organising committee did not automatically lead to an acceptance of civilian financial help. The memorial committee for the Queen’s Royal West Surrey regiment was chaired by a civilian, Viscount Midleton, the Lord Lieutenant of the County, and contained both the mayor of Guildford and the vicar of Holy Trinity Church, but still chose to restrict subscriptions to past and present members of the regiment only.¹⁹ On the relatively rare occasion when a regimental scheme was opened up to civilian financing, the primary ownership of the memorial was still made abundantly clear. The inscription on the commemorative tablet to the 10th Royal Hussars in All Saints’ Church, Aldershot, states that the memorial was erected by ‘Officers, Warrant Officers, Non-com Officers and men of the Regiment past and present and a few near relatives and friends’.²⁰ The Cheshire regiment and the Lancashire Fusiliers were equally keen to downplay the importance of civilian donations. The honorary secretary of the Cheshire regiment’s memorial committee pointed out to the editor of the Chester Chronicle that while ‘all ranks serving in the Cheshire regiment’ had subscribed to the

¹⁵ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers War Memorial Committee, minutes, 11 February 1903.
¹⁷ Chaplin, The Queen’s Own Royal West Kent Regiment 1881–1914, p. 111.
¹⁸ The Times, 9 July 1910.
¹⁹ Surrey History Centre (SHC), QRWS/1/8/2/22, unveiling programme, no date.
²⁰ Gildea, For Remembrance, p. 73.
regiment’s memorial, this had been supplemented by only ‘some friends in the county’. At the unveiling of the Lancashire Fusiliers’ memorial in Bury on 18 March 1905, Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Lees Knowles, chairman of the memorial committee and commanding officer of the 3rd volunteer battalion, was quick to make a similar distinction between civilian and military contributions. He opened his dedication address by informing those gathered for the ceremony that although ‘the townspeople of Bury’ had made some financial contribution, the scheme had been funded ‘principally by Fusiliers’. Colonel Donne of the Royal Sussex regiment felt equally obliged to set the financial record straight at the unveiling of the Royal Sussex memorial in Brighton. He noted that of the £1,400 collected, ‘the three Battalions of the Royal Sussex Regiment had subscribed £803 towards the erection of the monument’. By marginalising the financial input of the wider community the military authorities were carefully detaching the fallen from their civilian roots and were signalling their right to be viewed as their memory sites’ sole owners.

For the military, restricting subscriptions to those who fell within the boundaries of their self-contained communities was, by and large, a luxury it could well afford. Although regimental and corps committees generally made a point of proclaiming that donations were entirely voluntary, the organisational structure of the army meant that sufficient indirect pressure could be applied to the pool of potential subscribers that initial targets could be both ambitious and attainable. All of the regiments studied for this survey published lists of subscribers in the regimental magazines, with officers being individually named and the rank and file listed by company. These lists served the dual function of, on the one hand, celebrating those who had fulfilled their obligations and, on the other, encouraging the remainder to match their efforts. Such encouragement could, of course, take on an official tenor. In November 1903, the Royal Engineers’ memorial committee, in one last push to reach their target of £2,800, sent a letter to all the district commanders containing a list of ‘officers who are known not to have subscribed or to have notified their intention not to do so’ with the instruction that they should ‘ascertain whether they will subscribe’. Fund-raising for the Royal Marines was also not without its difficulties. Marines tended to contribute together from the ships on which

---

21 Chester Chronicle, 6 August 1908.
22 The Fusilier Museum (TFM), The Lancashire Fusiliers’ Annual, 1905, p. 3.
23 Brighton Herald, 5 November 1904.
24 REM, RO270, Royal Engineers Memorial Committee, minutes, 7 November 1902.
25 Royal Engineers, RE Journal; Royal West Kent Regiment, Queen’s Own Gazette; Royal East Kent Regiment, The Dragon.
26 REM, RO270, Royal Engineers War Memorial Committee, minutes, 11 November 1903. Although this final drive did have some effect with over £110 being collected in the following month, there was still a shortfall by the time of the memorial’s unveiling which resulted in two of the bas-reliefs not being added until a later date.
they were serving and it was noted in February 1901 that only thirty-seven ships had subscribed thus far. Three months later eighty-six had contributed, but thirty capital ships, on which the largest numbers of marines served, were still absent from the subscriptions lists.²⁷ The committee was prepared to concede that perhaps some of the problem was in the lack of information. It was noted that 'some of the circulars may not have reached their destination; that in many cases the appeal has been accidentally overlooked and forgotten; or that would-be subscribers are desirous of more information before sending their contributions'.²⁸ In August 1901 the committee came close to a 'naming and shaming' move of its former officers, as it stated that of 300 officers on the retired list only 120 had subscribed to the scheme. To remedy this situation the committee was going to send each of them a fresh letter of appeal.²⁹ The efforts of the committee paid off with the full amount in hand before the unveiling ceremony.³⁰

Where shortfalls in fund-raising did occur this was often, in part, the result of the memorial committee’s failure to provide concrete detail on the form. As will be discussed later, both the Royal Marines and the Royal Sussex regiment engaged in protracted debates about the relative merits of utilitarian versus plastic memorials. Consequently both launched their fund-raising campaigns before the nature of their memory sites, let alone their precise form, had been decided.³¹ For the Royal Sussex this meant that their original intention of raising subscriptions through the issuing of a discreet circular, on the grounds that the committee did ‘not want to bother people or worry them in any way’, was soon abandoned in favour of a more vigorous campaign involving charity balls, amateur dramatics, concerts and cinema showings.³² This more pro-active approach proved successful and by the time of the monument’s unveiling in

³¹ Globe and Laurel, Vol. VIII, No. 64 (February 1901), p. 21; WSRO, RSR/MS/11/6, Royal Sussex Memorial Fund, minutes, 24 April 1902, p. 7.
³² WSRO, RSR/MS/11/6, Royal Sussex Memorial Fund, minutes, 24 August 1902, p. 30; Royal Sussex Memorial Fund, subscriptions list, 31 October 1903. Another possible explanation for the difficulties the Royal Sussex faced was put forward by one potential donor. In declining to serve on the memorial committee, William Grantham suggested that donor fatigue may have an adverse effect on the scheme’s success. He noted that, ‘only a few weeks ago Lady Idina Brassey and other ladies in Sussex were asking me to subscribe in memory of officers and men who had fallen, to Cape Town Cathedral Fund, following on the heels of that was an application by the Lord Lieutenant for more funds for the Volunteer equipment fund, which I tried to get support for as chairman of my parish council, but could get hardly any to give besides myself, and then we want a good deal more money for our Soldiers and Families Fund in our district and on top of all this you bring out this
1905, a deficit of £700 only a year before had been turned into a surplus of £1,112.³³

As well as keeping a tight rein on fund-raising, most regimental war memorial committees also controlled the precise form of the memorial. In almost every instance the committees were the only body to examine different proposals and they usually made a choice without placing a shortlist or range of options before their constituencies. Even in those schemes where the wider community had been invited to contribute financially, it was not uncommon for decisions over form to be restricted to a small clique of senior officers. Three colonels of the Manchester regiment took the lead in selecting a design for the monument in St Anne’s Square and in Canterbury it was left to the commanding officer of The Buffs to provide precise instructions as to the form of the regimental memorial in the Dane John Gardens.³⁴ The Royal Marines’ memorial committee was an exception, as the committee members consulted every branch of the corps through representatives before resolving ‘that the memorial should be in the form of a monument, to be erected in some open space in London’.³⁵ However, in opting for a formal, plastic memorial, the Royal Marines fell in line with the decision reached by the overwhelming majority of committees.

Remarkably little dissent or disagreement was caused by this lack of consultation. However, where there was debate it was frequently sparked by the issue of the practical utility of the chosen designs. A member of the Honourable Artillery Company asked whether the regiment would do more good by sponsoring a hospital bed as a memorial.³⁶ The Manchester regiment had originally proposed that a soldiers’ club should form part of their plan, although the idea was dropped on the grounds of cost.³⁷ Despite the seeming acceptance of the Royal Marines’ scheme, it did not stop some officers from asking whether an educational fund for the orphans of NCOs should be established, and it was noted that repeat subscribers to the fund often asked for part of their donation to be diverted to other Royal Marine charities.³⁸ The suggestion to fund the education of NCOs’ orphans is particularly revealing of a late Victorian/Edwardian mindset for it shows a desire to encourage the respectable and self-improving element within the other ranks.

³³ WSRO, RSR/MS/11/6, Statement of accounts; 31 July 1904; Statement of Accounts 30 September 1905.
³⁴ CCA, CC/BB149, Canterbury City Council, minutes, 13 April 1923; Manchester Guardian, 10 October 1907.
³⁵ Globe and Laurel, December 1900, p. 163.
³⁶ HACA, Court Minutes, 19 January 1903.
³⁷ Manchester Guardian, 10 October 1907.
The decision by the committee of the Royal Sussex regiment’s memorial fund to establish a cottage home ‘for deserving soldiers of the regiment (including regulars, yeomanry, militia and volunteers) with or without their families, in memory of the officers, non-commissioned officers and men who have fallen during the South African War’ was also typical of the philanthropic drive of charitable society in this period. The initial impetus for the Royal Sussex’s scheme had been provided by Mrs Papillon, a leading light of Sussex polite society, who had offered to donate the £245 she had collected as part of the Prince Christian Victor fund for cottage homes should the regiment adopt a home as its memorial. However, notwithstanding the ease with which the resolution was passed at the memorial committee’s first meeting in April 1902, when the proposal for a cottage home was made public it was greeted by some influential dissenting voices from within the regiment. At the forefront of this opposition was the regiment’s commanding officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Donne. Still on active service, he wrote to the honorary secretary of the memorial committee expressing concern that such a utilitarian scheme would not only be unworthy of the regiment but would also be too limited in scope as it ‘would stand in the way of a great memorial TO ALL THE SUSSEX CORPS who have shared in the Campaign’. On the regiment’s return to England in mid-August 1902, Donne was duly elected to the memorial committee and his twin concerns about prestige and inclusiveness were dealt with when it was resolved at the very next meeting of the committee to abandon the cottage home in favour of ‘a memorial which shall be worthy of Sussex and the brave men of whose devotion to their country it is to be a lasting commemoration’ and a benefit fund ‘to assist as large a number of men as possible’. Colonel E. C. Browne of the Royal Scots Fusiliers shared Donne’s misgivings about utilitarian schemes, although his concern lay more with the didactic function of commemoration. Responding to the criticism that the regiment would have done better to have spent the memorial funds on practical schemes to ameliorate the sufferings of former soldiers, Browne argued that figurative monuments:

---

39 WSRO, RSR/MS/11/6, Royal Sussex Memorial Fund, minutes, 24 April 1902. For more on the philanthropic response of British society to the Boer War see Andrew Thompson, ‘Publicity, Philanthropy and Commemoration’, in Omissi and Thompson (eds), *The Impact of the South African War*, pp. 106–113.

40 Prince Christian Victor, the grandson of Queen Victoria, died of enteric on 29 October 1900 while serving in South Africa. See Pakenham, *The Boer War*, pp. 458–459. The fund was established at the end of 1900 under the presidency of Field Marshal Frederick Roberts with Sir Redvers Buller acting as chairman.

41 WSRO, RSR/MS/11/6, Lt-Colonel Donne to Colonel Kilgour, 8 March 1902 (capitalisation in the original).

42 WSRO, RSR/MS/11/6, Royal Sussex Memorial Fund, minutes, 12 January 1903.
educated and enriched the minds of youth, engendering a spirit of veneration for, and a desire to emulate, noble deeds and personal sacrifices undergone by their countrymen in times of stress and danger. Thus, the dead in the service of their country were made alive again on the canvas of the painter, in the marble and bronze of the sculptor.⁴³

However, monumental commemoration was not entirely unproblematic. Concern over the impact that the dominant iconographic message of the Royal Engineers’ commemorative project might have on regimental prestige resulted in the corps’ ambitious scheme at their headquarters in Chatham becoming embroiled in controversy. The first hint that all was not well with the corps’ memorialisation process was to come from a retired colonel, E. Lloyd. In a letter to the memorial committee, he expressed his concern that decisions had been taken without the convening of a general meeting of the officers, the traditional forum for such matters.⁴⁴ In fact, the committee could have been forgiven for assuming that such an informal channel for validation need not have applied in this case, for the scheme had been instigated by no less a person than Lord Kitchener. In May 1902, Kitchener had written to the commandant of the Royal Engineers at Chatham, Sir T. Fraser, with the offer of ‘four bronze statues of Boers and four bas-reliefs for use in a war memorial to the fallen’. For good measure he had enclosed a detailed sketch of the proposal.⁴⁵ Unsurprisingly, Fraser had been quick to accept the offer and a memorial committee meeting in October 1902, chaired by Sir Richard Harrison, the Inspector General of Fortifications, had unanimously agreed to press ahead with the plan.⁴⁶ Although Colonel Lloyd’s protest, which had been prompted by an article outlining the scheme in the regimental magazine, was soon followed by others, the committee ‘decided to inform the correspondents that they intended to continue with the memorial nonetheless’.⁴⁷ It was only when Field Marshal Sir John Simmons, former Inspector-General of Fortifications from 1875–1880 and governor of Malta until his retirement in 1888, added his name to the list of complainants that the committee eventually caved in and resolved ‘to defer any further action until a General Meeting of the Corps can be held’.⁴⁸ Predictably, the first resolution the general meeting passed was to elect an entirely new committee.

Yet, though procedural irregularities undoubtedly antagonised many retired officers, at the root of the Royal Engineers’ dispute lay much graver concerns over the form that the corps’ memory site should take. As Alex King has

---

⁴³ Quoted in Spiers, *The Scottish Soldier and Empire*, p. 205.
⁴⁴ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers’ War Memorial Committee, letter from Colonel E. Lloyd to the memorial committee, 7 November 1902.
⁴⁵ REM, RO270, letter from Kitchener to Sir T. Fraser, 21 May 1902.
⁴⁶ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers War Memorial Committee, minutes, 24 October 1902.
⁴⁷ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers War Memorial Committee, minutes, 21 November 1902.
⁴⁸ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers War Memorial Committee, minutes, 19 December 1902.
shown in his survey of commemoration in the aftermath of the First World War, choice of design was considered to be all-important in an age when it was generally believed that iconographical symbolism was fixed. The Boer statues and bas-reliefs at the centre of the Royal Engineers’ scheme had originally been intended as the focal points for a monument in honour of Paul Kruger, the former president of the Transvaal. The pieces had been embargoed at the outbreak of war and eventually donated to Kitchener who, as we have seen above, subsequently offered them to the Royal Engineers’ memorial committee. Such unpropitious origins must have rung some alarm bells even with the original memorial committee members and, indeed, they seem to have been not entirely unaware of the sensitive nature of Kitchener’s gift. Although, in general, they viewed the pieces as ‘impersonal’ and ‘works of art’, they, nevertheless, decided that a bas-relief depicting the peace conference at McNeill’s Farm after the battle of Majuba Hill was a step too far and should be replaced by a ‘plaque recording Lord Kitchener’s gift of the bronzes’. That this nod towards conciliation would prove to be far less than was going to be necessary to stem the tide of criticism that the committee would eventually face over the inclusion of such contentious images is hardly surprising, but that it should ever have been considered sufficient does provide us with a fascinating insight into the contested meaning of the war in Britain at the conclusion of hostilities.

Anti-Boer feeling, which was an inevitable consequence of the brutality of war for British combatants and which had been fuelled domestically by the ‘yellow press’, sat uneasily with the assimilation of the Boer Republics into a federated British South Africa by the Treaty of Vereeniging. Although nearly all those present at the general meeting of the Royal Engineers on 6 June 1903 were in agreement that the original plans of the memorial committee to include the Boer statues and bas-reliefs on the corps’ memory site should be abandoned, there were still heated exchanges when it came to providing a rationale for this stance. Major M. Hildebrand, a retired Royal Engineers officer, clearly articulated the view that consideration of Boer sensibilities had to take precedence when it came to commemorating the war. In a letter sent to the editor of the Royal Engineers’ journal and read out at the meeting, he made plain the repercussions that pressing ahead with the original plan would have:

Having lately been in the Transvaal, I learned that the idea [of using the statues and bas-reliefs on the Royal Engineers’ monument] had become known to the Boers, to whom, I was assured, it would give immense annoyance

49 Alex King, Memorials of the Great War in Britain, pp. 11–15.
50 REM, RO270, Royal Engineers War Memorial Committee, minutes, 24 October 1902. The battle of Majuba Hill, 27 February 1881, was a decisive defeat for the British in the First Boer War. See Ian Castle, Majuba 1881: The Hill of Destiny (Colchester: Osprey, 1996).
and pain. My informant, who broached the subject with me asked if it were true, which he did not until then believe, had exceptional opportunities of learning the Boer sentiments, though himself a supporter of the new order of things. He said to make such use of what had been intended for Mr. Kruger’s statue would cause the keener feeling of resentment amongst our new fellow subjects.⁵²

Major-General Sir Elliott Wood, who had served as engineer-in-chief during the war and was a member of the original memorial committee, was quick to voice his support for this line of reasoning. Having been responsible for drawing up the original sketch-plan of Kitchener’s scheme, he was clearly keen to distance himself from what had turned out to be a contentious and manifestly unpopular proposal.⁵³ The choice of design was, he insisted, ‘a very important question … for it might become more than a corps matter; it might go beyond this and affect the army and perhaps the country generally, if we were to give offence to our new fellow subjects’.⁵⁴ For two retired senior officers, however, the memory of the human cost of the recent fighting was still too fresh for consideration of such political niceties to take priority. Arguing that it was first important ‘to clear up our own views before we consider those of other people’, Lieutenant-General Sir Robert Grant, Inspector General of Fortifications from 1891 to 1898, urged those assembled to ‘remember that it was through what we hold to be [the Boers’] mistaken views and their mistaken actions that we lost the officers and men to whom we wish to erect the memorial’.⁵⁵ General Sir James Browne, a former Colonel Commandant of the corps, was prepared to go one step further when apportioning blame. In a letter read out at the meeting on his behalf, he maintained that to use such ‘undesirable images would be a monument to bad taste, never to be effaced’, for the statues ‘were made to honour Mr. Kruger, the man above all others in this world responsible for the deaths of those we wish to honour’.⁵⁶

An interesting argument to bolster further the case against the original proposal was presented by Sir Thomas Gallway, who had succeeded Sir Richard Harrison as Inspector General of Fortifications earlier that year. Insisting that the minutes should record his ‘strong protest’ against Kitchener’s scheme on

⁵² REM, RO2070, letter from Major Hildebrand to Royal Engineers War Memorial Committee, undated.
⁵³ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers Memorial Committee, minutes, 6 June 1903. Later in the same meeting, Wood explicitly disassociated himself from ownership of the sketch by insisting that, ‘The sketch was not … in any sense my sketch, except that I embodied the ideas of Lord Kitchener in that sketch’. REM, RO270, Royal Engineers Memorial Committee, minutes, 6 June 1903.
⁵⁴ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers Memorial Committee, minutes, 6 June 1903.
⁵⁵ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers Memorial Committee, minutes, 6 June 1903.
⁵⁶ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers Memorial Committee, minutes, 6 June 1903.
the grounds that the statues ‘represent an armed enemy’, Gallway raised the moral stakes by arguing that, before any decision could be reached, the meeting must first ‘consider the feelings of the relatives of our gallant dead’.⁵⁷ Major J. Winn, a member of the original war memorial committee, although differing on the nature of the views held by the bereaved, was still equally adamant that they merited special consideration. His attitude had, he said, ‘hardened’ against using the statues as the result of a letter he had recently received from the father of one of the fallen:

I am thinking of a man who in a letter said he thought that, if the Boers would consider it to be a bad thing for the figures to be used, it ought not to be done. Knowing that man lost a son in the war, I feel more strongly that his views should carry weight on the subject.⁵⁸

In advancing their own viewpoints by privileging the opinions of a group which fell outside the bounds of the military community, both Winn and Gallway

---

⁵⁷ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers Memorial Committee, minutes, 6 June 1903. The was a tactic that would be deployed with greater regularity in the more heated and protracted debates over commemorative form in the aftermath of the First World War. See Donaldson, *Ritual and Remembrance*, p. 72.

⁵⁸ REM, RO270, Royal Engineers Memorial Committee, minutes, 6 June 1903.
were, inadvertently, raising wider questions surrounding the ownership of the memorial. Only four months earlier members of the organising committee had made abundantly clear, by the grudging manner in which they had accepted an unsolicited contribution to the memorial fund from a bereaved mother, that the construction of a memory site should be a matter for the corps alone.⁵⁹ However, aware that such an exclusive approach could not be sustained if a climate developed where iconographical symbolism and, by extension, the very meaning of the war were contested, the meeting unanimously resolved to elect a new committee with instructions to start the process afresh. The threat of any further dissent was subsequently averted by devolving the question of form to the professional care of an established architect, Ingress Bell.⁶⁰ His decision to opt for a triumphal arch, to mirror the Crimean Arch erected at the corps’ headquarters in Brompton in the 1860s, was reassuringly uncontroversial and the project proceeded to completion without further hitches.⁶¹

Such debates highlight the extent to which, for the military, remembrance was underpinned by regimental prestige. Location as well as form could be crucial. Having made commitments to extravagant memorials, it became important that the positioning of memory sites drew the public attention their scale demanded. The Royal Marines’ memorial committee originally requested a site in front of the Royal Exchange. A highly significant location passed by many thousands each day was regarded as fitting for the corps with its long history and deep connections with the City of London. The corps’ journal referred to it as ‘a spot which has been rightly called the “Centre of the Universe”’.⁶² When the City authorities announced that a place could not be guaranteed, the committee turned to another prestige site, requesting Trafalgar Square or a site near the Admiralty as the memorial ‘will to a great extent be of national interest’, and enlisted the assistance of the Prince of Wales to help secure it. The Office of Works duly obliged by allotting a space on the corner of St James’s Park and the Mall facing the newly planned Admiralty Arch, which itself formed part of the Queen Victoria memorial project.⁶³

---

⁵⁹ See p. 50 above.
⁶⁰ Ingress Bell had previously worked as a surveyor for the War Office and was a partner of Aston Webb, the then president of the Royal Institute of British Architects. See A. Stuart Grey, *Edwardian Architecture: A Biographical Dictionary* (London: Duckworth, 1985), pp. 46–47.
⁶¹ The political significance of the Boer statues was once again brought into high relief in the aftermath of the First World War. In December 1920, General Smuts, the Prime Minister of South Africa, approached Alfred Milner, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, requesting their return. Milner duly obliged for, in his words, ‘political reasons … as an act of goodwill’. REM, *The Sapper*, Vol. 26, No. 307 (February 1921), p. 99.
⁶³ TNA WORK 20/55 Royal Marines’ memorial. Letter from Major-General A. French to Office of Works, 31 October 1901; Office of Works to French, 25 November 1901; *Globe*
Royal Marines to the monarch’s formal London home and the Royal Navy, the service which formed its home, was thus achieved. The memorial committee had no doubts about the impact such a prestigious site would make:

The position is an excellent one, within a few yards of what, in a few years, when the Victoria Memorial scheme is accomplished, will be a much used thoroughfare. There are no buildings within sixty yards or so, therefore there will be nothing to dwarf the Monument, which will then be seen at its best advantage.⁶⁴

The Royal Artillery also petitioned for a site equalling its perceived importance and was granted a site facing Carlton House Terrace on the Mall.⁶⁵ Having achieved this enormously significant site, the war memorial committee found themselves required to submit all plans to Lord Esher who was chairing the Queen Victoria memorial scheme which included the refashioning of the Mall. As will be seen, this was not always an easy relationship and led to much intrusion into the Royal Artillery scheme. By contrast, the Carabiniers were forced to accept a much less visible location. Allocated a position on the corner of Chelsea Gardens on the approach to Chelsea Bridge, the site lacked real presence. In his 1928 survey of London statuary, Edward Gleichen rather tartly states that the Carabiniers’ memorial was placed there because the Office of Works could think of nowhere else.⁶⁶ The Manchester regiment also had to settle for a relatively modest site. Anxious to secure a prominent position in St Albert’s Square opposite the town hall, the war memorial committee approached the council about removing the statue to Bishop Fraser to make room for the regiment’s monument. However, with the town council concerned that the ‘war memorial would be out of keeping with the other statues in the square’, the regiment had to accept the offer of a secondary site in less prestigious St Anne’s Square.⁶⁷

Even where plans were on a more modest scale, location was still an important consideration. Although the Honourable Artillery Company limited its memorial plans to a bronze tablet for its headquarters, it also took the decision to erect a small marble tablet in its church of St Botolph, Bishopsgate. The second memorial gave the Company’s sacrifice public presence in a way a memorial sited in the headquarters, and inaccessible to the general public, could

and Laurel, Vol. VIII, No. 74 (December 1901), p. 137.
⁶⁵ TNA WORK 20/59 Royal Artillery memorial, Office of Works memorandum, 12 December 1905.
⁶⁶ Gleichen, London's Open-Air Statuary, p. xl; See also file TNA WORK 20/57 Carabiniers’ Memorial.
⁶⁷ Manchester Guardian, 10 October 1907.
not.\textsuperscript{68} This was supplemented still further by financial support for an official history of the Honourable Artillery Company during the war compiled by two of its members, Basil Williams and Erskine Childers, published by Smith, Elder and Co. in 1903.\textsuperscript{69} A large number of regiments chose a cathedral location as the most obvious way of providing a local presence.\textsuperscript{70} This simultaneously served to reinforce regional ties and underscore regimental tradition. The King’s Royal Rifle Corps chose to erect a plaque in Winchester Cathedral because it was the regiment’s ‘Valhalla’. It was, according to the regimental magazine, in a cathedral ‘that every young rifleman begins his career as a soldier and learns to be proud of his regiment’.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{68} HACA Court Minutes, 19 January, 30 March 1903; City Press, 8 June, 20 July 1904.

\textsuperscript{69} HACA Court Minutes, 21 March, 11 April 1904.


\textsuperscript{71} Jones, ‘A Survey of Memorials to the Second Anglo-Boer War’.
Themes of tradition and continuity frequently underpinned the iconographical symbolism of regimental memorials. For the Coldstream Guards the weight of regimental history was the leitmotif of its memorial tablet. Designed by the celebrated sculptor, William Goscombe John, the engraved tablet imparts a message of tradition, heroism and sacrifice. The foreground of the panel consists of two soldiers on the veldt; one wounded, the other in the act of providing solace. In the middle distance are the famous kopjes of South Africa, while the sky contains the ethereal presence of former Coldstreamers including General Monck, who raised the original force, figures from the Peninsula War, Waterloo and the Crimean campaign. This host, looking down approvingly on their modern counterparts, signals that the honourable traditions of the regiment have been maintained. John employed a similar symbolic artifice for the memorial to the King’s Liverpool regiment in St John’s Gardens, Liverpool. Flanking the central statue of Britannia are two soldiers standing at ease: one in the uniform of 1685, the year of the regiment’s enrolment,

72 See Gildea, *For Remembrance*, p. 129.
the other in the field-service uniform of the South African War. At the rear of the monument, linking past and present, is the figure of a drummer-boy from the battle of Dettingen in 1743. In the act of beating the call to arms he reinforces the message that, throughout its glorious history, the regiment has answered its country’s call.\textsuperscript{73} John was not the only sculptor to employ this technique. Thomas Rudge’s commemorative frieze to the Cheshire regiment in the south transept of Chester Cathedral bookends the central panel listing the names of the fallen with two niches in which stand a soldier from 1689, the date the Duke of Norfolk first raised the regiment, and a bugler from 1902.\textsuperscript{74} A more common way of stressing regimental tradition was to have inscribed on memorials references to previous battle honours. The figure of a soldier commemorating the fallen of the Lancashire Fusiliers sports a primrose hackle in his busby and a red rose on his tunic; the former a reminder of the colour of the regiment’s original facings, the latter a reference to the roses worn by the men during the battle of Minden in 1759.\textsuperscript{75} The Suffolk regiment adopted a more direct approach. Recalling the most famous episode in the regiment’s history, the word ‘Gibraltar’ was given pride of place on the memorial plaque in St Mary’s Church, Bury St Edmunds.\textsuperscript{76}

For the committees of the Royal Marines and Royal Artillery, the key issue of impressing the importance of their worth and role was expressed in their desire to erect memorials of the finest quality making a significant aesthetic statement in the process. Artistic value was regarded as a prime signifier of a memorial’s value. Given a site in the Mall, the Royal Artillery committee was extremely keen to provide a memorial grand in drama and aesthetic quality and approached an established sculptor, W. R. Colton, to commence work on designs.\textsuperscript{77} The site allocated to the Royal Artillery drew in King Edward VII, as it would form an integral part of the Mall widening and Victoria memorial scheme, on which he was consulted at every stage by the project’s chair, Lord Esher. As will be discussed later, Esher was initially worried about the inclusion and positioning of the roll of honour on the memorial, eventually insisting that

\textsuperscript{73} Terry Cavanagh, \textit{Public Sculpture of Liverpool} (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997), pp. 177–179.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Chester Chronicle}, 6 August 1904. Goscombe John continued to employ this iconographic device in the aftermath of the First World War. See his monument to the Royal Welch Fusiliers at Wrexham.
\textsuperscript{75} TFM, \textit{The Lancashire Fusiliers’ Annual}, 1907, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{76} The Suffolk regiment had held out for four years against a Spanish blockade of Gibraltar in the late eighteenth century. As a result the regiment took as its own the coat of arms of Gibraltar. Lieutenant-Colonel E. A. H. Webb, \textit{History of the 12th (Suffolk Regiment)} (London: Spottiswoode and Co., 1914), pp. 1899–1901.
\textsuperscript{77} For details on Colton’s career see \textit{British Sculpture, 1850–1914}, p. 28.
it should be relegated to a less prominent location.⁷⁸ Colton duly amended his plans, but this did not resolve the matter. Sir Shomberg McDonnell, the Secretary to the Office of Works, was concerned by the sketches of the horse, representing the spirit of war, due to crown the memorial. He wrote to Colton outlining his belief that the King would not approve the current designs: ‘In fact without wishing to urge upon you the design of a conventional horse it is quite certain that only a perfect horse is likely to meet His Majesty’s approval’.⁷⁹ Colton was content to oblige and confirmed the changes he had made to bring the designs into line with the requests.⁸⁰ However, the final design of the memorial was still not set. In December 1906, Colton requested permission to exhibit a model of the memorial at the Royal Academy with a notice that the design had been approved by the King. McDonnell agreed to the exhibition of the model, but refused permission to advertise the King’s approval, as it had not yet been formally agreed.⁸¹ Somewhat amazingly, the issue made no progress over the next three years. The precise reasons for this delay are obscure, but were probably caused by Colton’s commitments to other projects. A model was ready for exhibition in 1909, but still caused disquiet. By this time, McDonnell’s patience with Colton was severely stretched and he was using Thomas Brock of the Royal Academy as an intermediary to influence Colton’s designs. In one letter to Brock, McDonnell took the opportunity to vent his frustrations:

Mr Colton, for some reason of his own which he endeavoured to describe, but which I confess I am not quite able to fathom, has placed the right wing of the figure at a curious angle: the effect is to make the wing droop over the neck of the horse, and to give the impression that Peace has sustained a wound in that member, and is unable to keep it at the same angle as the left wing.

I feel that this must be remedied, and the two wings placed at the same angle: otherwise the symmetry of the monument will, I think, be seriously impaired, and it may possibly appear a little absurd, which would be unfortunate in the highest degree.⁸²

This time, Colton seems to have taken everything to heart and produced a fresh model. McDonnell travelled to Colton’s studios near High Wycombe to examine

---

⁷⁸ TNA WORK 20/59 Royal Artillery memorial. Secretary of Office of Works [Sir Shomberg McDonnell] to Lord Knollys [Royal Private Secretary], 9 December 1905.
⁸⁰ TNA WORK 20/59 Royal Artillery memorial. Letter from Colton to McDonnell, 16 November 1906.
⁸² TNA WORK 20/59 Royal Artillery memorial. Letter from McDonnell to Thomas Brock, 9 May 1909.
it and found ‘the result extremely good’, as he told Esher by letter. However, he still had a problem with the angle of Peace’s left wing. The intention was that it should cover the horse conveying the impression that Peace had tamed War. ‘This idea may be excellent, but the result is grotesque: it gives the impression that somebody has shot at the angel and tipped it in the wing’. McDonnell confirmed that Colton ‘is a charming man, and his work is delightful; but he is rather inclined to be obstinate about it’; he therefore requested Esher to visit Colton personally in order to press the case.³³ By the autumn the amendments had been made and the memorial was finally given royal consent.³⁴

Having completed fund-raising in 1906, explaining the delay to both the regiment and the general public was extremely difficult and embarrassing. Lord Roberts, honorary chair of the Royal Artillery memorial committee, had been anxious to exhibit full designs of the memorial to contributors in 1906, but had not been able to do so.³⁵ When the memorial was finally unveiled in July 1910, The Times noted that the delay in completion was due to debates over

³³ TNA WORK 20/59 Royal Artillery memorial. Letter from McDonnell to Esher, 10 June 1909.
Remembering the South African War

siting. The source of this information is unclear, but it was a tactful excuse to cover the catalogue of revisions.⁸⁶ Rather sadly, the memorial was not then considered an unqualified success. F. W. Speight of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings complained that the memorial had not been centred on the Duke of York’s steps on the opposite side of the Mall meaning that it looked unbalanced to anyone descending the steps.⁸⁷ Another correspondent to The Times drew attention to the fact that the names were placed too low down, and overheard two spectators at the unveiling ‘disputing as to whether the wings on the monument belonged to the “horse or the lady.” I shared their doubts.’⁸⁸ Two more complaints were then received on the position of the names. Both correspondents implied that the hapless Colton was to blame, when in fact he had originally proposed a much more prominent siting of the name panels.⁸⁹

The convoluted gestation of the Royal Artillery memorial reveals the tensions inherent in a public memorial. Because of its location, it was expected to conform to a different aesthetic from that originally desired by its instigators. However, the Royal Artillery committee was never prepared to forego the prestigious site in order to regain closer control of its form and function.

The Royal Marines were also keen that the corps’ exulted standing should be reflected in the aesthetic quality of any proposed memorial. As with the Royal Artillery, an established sculptor, Adrian Jones, a former cavalry officer, was commissioned to undertake the work.⁹⁰ The committee was quick to stress the reputation of Jones and the favourable reaction to his ideas from experts, stating in the corps’ journal: ‘An eminent sculptor has volunteered his service and advice to the Committee, and has furnished a design of a monument which has been criticised in most favourable terms by the leading artists of the day’.⁹¹ However, aesthetic values could clash with the desired narrative, for on inspection of the full design the committee had certain reservations: ‘while all admired the artistic effect of the design as a work of art, it was not considered suitable to the purpose in view, being not sufficiently true to fact and there being no direct allusion to China, or principle achievements which have brought fresh honour to the Corps both in South Africa and China’.⁹² The committee decided to request amendments asking Jones to include figures of two marines,

⁸⁶ The Times, 9 July 1910.
⁸⁷ The Times, 21 July 1910.
⁸⁸ The Times, 23 July 1910.
⁸⁹ The Times, 26 July, 2 August 1910.
⁹⁰ Adrian Jones had a distinguished career as a war memorial sculptor, especially of cavalry subjects. He also designed the Carabiniers’ memorial. For details of Jones’s career see Selwyn Hodson-Pressinger, Captain Adrian Jones, 1845–1938. Military and Equine Works (London: Sandilands Press, 2004) and Selwyn Hodson-Pressinger, Adrian Jones, 1845–1938, British Sculptor and Artist (London: Sandilands Press, 1997).
one ‘wounded lying down on or falling to the ground, the other standing over, or by him, firing or at the “Charge” bayonet fixed’.⁹³ Jones duly supplied the required drama, which was much admired by the committee. The twin themes of the quality of the memorial and its drama were then reinforced once again during the unveiling ceremony. General Sir Arthur French told the crowd that Jones had ‘provided the Corps with what has been described by critics well versed in art as one of the best Monuments in London’, and he concluded:

All who see the memorial will recognize how well the two marines have done their work … One has just received a severe wound, and has fallen. His comrade is standing over the prostate body, raising rifle to shoulder in the grim determination to defend and avenge. The scene, simple as it is in accompanying detail, is one of singular realism, and the sculpture will be regarded as an important addition to the finest public memorials of the Metropolis.⁹⁴

---

⁹³ *Globe and Laurel*, August 1901, p. 87.
Such ‘singular realism’ was a characteristic of regimental memorials that was frequently pinpointed as being of particular importance. The editor of the local paper in Chatham, noting that the redesigned bas-reliefs on the Royal Engineers’ memorial depicted scenes of the corps’ work in South Africa, informed his readers that, ‘All these have an historical value inasmuch as they are based upon photographs of the actual incidents’.⁹⁵ The citizens of Canterbury were urged by their local paper to visit The Buffs’ figurative monument in the Dane John Gardens as it would allow them to gain ‘a clear impression of the costume worn in South Africa’.⁹⁶ The readers of the Scotsman were told that the battle scene depicted on the bas-relief of William Birnie Rhind’s Black Watch memorial in Edinburgh had been ‘purposely modelled to hand down to the future the uniform and accoutrements worn in the Boer War’. The paper’s editor was certain that such an insight into military life would ‘no doubt prove of considerable interest to the public’.⁹⁷ To underscore a monument’s verisimilitude, it was sometimes stressed that figures had been modelled on serving soldiers. The Manchester Guardian pointed out that William Hamo Thornycroft’s memorial to the Manchester regiment in St Ann’s Square could be ‘fairly described as a study from life, for it was suggested by an incident of the fighting in which the Manchesters took part at Caesar’s Camp near Ladysmith and Mr Thornycroft had two of the Manchesters – two who survived the terrible slaughter – to pose for him as models’.⁹⁸ Both the Lancashire Fusiliers and the Royal Scots Greys went one step further and named the soldiers on whom their memorials were modelled.⁹⁹ This focus on realism, the insistence on precision and accuracy in figurative representations, does point towards a growing fascination with all things military in late Victorian/Edwardian society.¹⁰⁰

For memorial committees, realistic commemorative sculpture had the advantage of not only engaging the public’s interest but also emphasising both the ennobling qualities of military service in general and the worth of individual

⁹⁵ Chatham News, 29 July 1905.
⁹⁶ Kentish Gazette and Canterbury Press, 4 June 1904.
⁹⁷ Scotsman, 25 May 1908.
⁹⁸ Manchester Guardian, 27 October 1908.
⁹⁹ There remains some confusion over the true identity of the model for the Scots Greys’ memorial. The day after the unveiling, the Glasgow Herald named ‘Frank Dodd, the father of the current regimental secretary’ as the subject but this was subsequently challenged by the Edinburgh Evening News, which opted for Robert Alexander, the Weekly Scotsman, Johnny Hadden Banffshire, and the regiment’s own in-house journal, Eagle and Carbine, Sergeant-Major Anthony James Hinnigan. The debate continues to this day on the website, edinfinity.org.uk. Glasgow Herald, 17 November 1906; Edinburgh Evening News, 30 April 1947; Weekly Scotsman, 22 June 1967; Eagle and Carbine, Vol. 16 (May 1987).
¹⁰⁰ A similar trend towards authenticity can be found in battle paintings of this period. See J. Hichberger, Images of the Army: The Military in British Art, 1815–1914 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 114–118. For more on the growing popularity of the army in this period see Bowman and Connelly, The Edwardian Army, pp. 177–180.
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regiments in particular. The latter could be accentuated if the statuary referred to a specific incident. As shown above, the Manchesters’ memorial in which a soldier with bayonet fixed is seen defending a wounded comrade who is offering him his last cartridge was drawn from the regiment’s heroic defence of Caesar’s Camp in January 1900. Described by the Manchester Guardian as being ‘at once dignified, impressive and rich with virile beauty’, Sir George White, the hero of Ladysmith, was sure that the monument would act as ‘an imperishable memory … to the steadfastness of devotion of the Manchester regiment’.¹⁰¹ The Royal Sussex’s memorial in the King’s Road, Brighton, recalled the regiment’s role in the fall of Johannesburg in May 1900. A press release issued by the memorial committee on the eve of the unveiling ceremony explained that the monument was ‘surmounted by a figure of a bugler of the regiment sounding the charge at Doornkop, where the 1st Battalion charged and cleared the Boer entrenchments’.¹⁰² To ensure that the full significance of this iconographic reference was appreciated, Colonel Donne, who had commanded the 1st battalion during the war, reminded those gathered for the unveiling of the memorial in November 1905 that ‘this was the very ground on which Jameson’s forces had surrendered’.¹⁰³

The most prolific exponent of the commemorative battle scene was, undoubtedly, the Scottish sculptor, William Birnie Rhind. Elected an academician of the Royal Scottish Academy in 1905, Birnie Rhind worked for the majority of his career in Edinburgh and was commissioned by a series of regimental memorial committees in the aftermath of the South African War, most notably the Highland Light Infantry in Glasgow, the Royal Scots Guards and the Black Watch in Edinburgh and the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders in Alloa. The typical product of these commissions, all of which were figurative, was the Highland Light Infantry memorial in Kelvingrove Park, Glasgow. Unveiled on 28 September 1906, the monument, which takes the form of an anxiously alert infantryman clambering over a rocky outcrop, was described by the regimental journal as a ‘vigorous representation of a soldier engaged in scouting duty’ designed to convey ‘a vivid impression of the strenuousness

¹⁰² Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times, 5 November 1904.
¹⁰³ Brighton Herald, 5 November 1904. Leander Starr Jameson’s attempt to instigate an Uitlander uprising in the Transvaal had come to an inglorious end on 2 January 1896 when his force was captured by the Boers at Doornkop. See Chris Ash, The If Man: Leander Starr Jameson, the inspiration for Kipling’s Masterpiece (Solihull: Helion and Company, 2012), pp. 246–251.
Remembering the South African War and heroism of active military service.¹⁰⁴ An interesting deviation from this pattern of heroic realism was the Royal Scots Greys’ memorial on Princes Street in Edinburgh. Depicting a mounted trooper in review order uniform as if on parade, the monument was notable for the absence of any action scene. For Michael Bury such an omission was deliberate, stemming from the memorial committee’s desire to erect a memory site in which iconographical symbols would act ‘as visual reminders of the heroic traditions of the regiment through history, rather than of its performance in the South African campaigns in particular’.¹⁰⁵ The context of the memorial’s unveiling would certainly seem to support Bury’s view. With the construction of the memorial coinciding with the cost-cutting proposals of the Liberal Secretary of State for War, J. B. S. Haldane, to remove the regiment from its Piershill barracks in Edinburgh and exclude mounted troops from the Scottish command, for many the memorial came to be viewed as symbolic of not just the regiment’s but the nation’s martial traditions. In its coverage of the unveiling ceremony on 16 November 1906, the Glasgow Herald clearly conveyed just how deep the outpouring of national sentiment that surrounded the memorial was:

The newest statue in Princes Street is very instructive. It is of a trooper on horseback. Who is he? Why, he is the last of our Scots Greys. He is the only one left to us of our famous regiment, so long quartered in Edinburgh, and the pride of Scotland. Who has not heard of the Scots Greys at Waterloo? It was at Waterloo that Sergeant-Major Ewart took the eagle from three Frenchmen. It was the conduct of the Greys at Waterloo that won the regiment the right to bear its emblem, an eagle, and the word ‘Waterloo’. But the story that sets every true Scot’s blood tingling is the story of how, late in the day, the Scots Greys charged to the cry of ‘Scotland for Ever’ … Here, in Princes Street, stands the memorial to those of the Scots Greys who fell in South Africa. It was unveiled on a cold, wet November day in 1906 by Lord Rosebery, who made one of his most inspired speeches – a speech whose impression will not easily be forgotten by those who heard. ‘Flesh of our flesh’, he said, ‘bone of our bone, Scotland for Ever’. The Scots Greys have left us. There stands the silent mounted trooper in Princes Street – ‘Lest we forget’.¹⁰⁶

Unveiling ceremonies were invariably used to reinforce iconographic messages and provide memory sites with meaning. Unsurprisingly, for the military these occasions were seized on as prime opportunities to impress upon those present that regiments had lived up to their traditions and inheritance. General French

¹⁰⁶ Glasgow Herald, 17 November 1906.
reminded those at the unveiling of the Royal Marines’ memorial of their pride in their fallen comrades who had added ‘their names to the already glorious roll of fame of our Corps’, which brought forth cheers from the crowd.¹⁰⁷ When Lieutenant-General Sir John Fryer spoke at the Carabiniers’ memorial, he noted that the regiment had been raised in 1685, had served ten sovereigns and before the South African War had participated in the Afghan campaign of 1879: the dead had upheld the ‘old character of the Carabiniers’.¹⁰⁸ The same connection between past and present was made by Lord Roberts in Chester Cathedral at the unveiling of the Cheshires’ commemorative frieze. Having recounted the history of the regiment at Dettingen, Gibraltar, Quebec, Mecanec and in India, he concluded by asserting that in South Africa ‘all ranks had upheld this glorious tradition’.¹⁰⁹

Both General Sir Ian Hamilton and Viscount Midleton, the Lord Lieutenant of Surrey, presiding at the unveiling ceremonies of the Manchester regiment and the Queen’s Royal West Surreys respectively, found in the battlefields of South Africa new chapters to add to the regiments’ glorious histories. Refashioning the war into a traditional heroic narrative, Hamilton opened his address with a stirring account of the Manchesters’ performance under his command at Elands-laagte in October 1899:

Never was a fairer stand-up fight than Elands-laagte. Not a thought amongst the Boers of giving way, not a notion amongst the British of hanging back. Each side determined, resolute, fired with desperate intent. Manchester lads – boys who had never before heard the vicious whistle of a bullet – advanced boldly across the open veldt. I remember the Manchesters fixing bayonets and then pipes playing and drums beating; the irresistible rush on to and over the guns; the white flag raised; the premature ‘Hurrahs’; the Boers – powerful men in their prime, aristocrats, landowners – surprised, astonished to find themselves routed; the last of them rallying, refusing defeat – no surrender; scorning death, ignoring the white flag. I remember the Manchesters advancing again with a yell and again that wild cry of ‘Majuba, Remember Majuba’ ringing out over the darkening veldt proclaiming victory and the honour of the army retrieved.¹¹⁰

Drawing inspiration from Thorneycroft’s memorial, he then concluded with an equally rousing description of the regiment’s defence of Ladysmith at Caesar’s Camp in January 1900:

There were no shirkers; malingering was unknown. From 2:30 in the morning until five thirty in the afternoon on the 6th of January those ragged, starving

¹⁰⁸ The Times, 25 June 1906.
¹⁰⁹ Chester Chronicle, 6 June 1904.
¹¹⁰ Manchester Guardian, 27 October 1908.
boys kept back the enemy from the vitals of the town. Never did the Manchesters win greater glory.¹¹¹

In Guildford, Midleton also turned to the set piece battles of the war’s early stages for evidence that a proud record of martial prowess had been upheld, although this time it was in defeat not victory that such proof was to be found. Citing the unlikely example of Colenso, he argued that the Surreys’ conduct had been ‘so conspicuous for its courage, its coolness, its steadiness and its reliability that it justified my remark that the history of the regiment has been largely a replica of the history of England’.¹¹²

For the Sharpshooters, active service in South Africa was seen to have established rather than extended regimental tradition. Lieutenant-General Robert Baden-Powell, the hero of Mafeking, insisted, when unveiling the regiment’s memorial in St Martin’s-in-the-Fields, London, that the regiment should no longer consider itself to be a junior partner in the army:

The Sharpshooters had had as a regiment but a short life, but in the four years of their existence they had made a history for themselves such as any other regiment might be proud of by the self-sacrifice and devotion to duty they showed when in South Africa.¹¹³

At the unveiling of the Lancashire Fusiliers’ memorial in Bury, Sir Lees Knowles, colonel of the 3rd volunteer battalion and chairman of the memorial committee, linked regimental tradition with the immutable qualities that underpinned military service and in the process took the opportunity to extol the virtues of army life in general:

‘While a man is able to do his duty it is infamous to retire’. These are the words of General Wolfe. This regiment was commanded by Wolfe, it was commanded by Wellington, and it was mentioned by General Buller, who, in South Africa, declared that the Lancashire Fusiliers had ‘magnificently maintained the best traditions of the British Army’. May this memorial, unveiled this day by the Lord Lieutenant of the county, enthuse each one of us with the spirit of self-sacrifice, obedience, patience, endurance, fortitude – fearing God and honouring the King – to keep and to maintain the brilliant traditions of an excellent and honourable past. (Cheers)¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Manchester Guardian, 27 October 1908.
¹¹³ Historical Record of the 3rd County of London (Sharpshooters) Imperial Yeomanry, 1900–1905 (London: no imprint, 1905), pp. 67–68.
¹¹⁴ Salford Reporter, 25 March 1905.
Such focus on the intrinsic moral worth of the army as an institution was a major theme of many unveiling ceremonies. The Reverend F. L’Estrange Fawcett told the congregation of St Mary’s Church, Bury St Edmunds, assembled for the unveiling of the Suffolk regiment’s memorial plaque that it was ‘the pride of all Englishmen to remember acts of grace or heroism or unselfishness on the part of any of their fellowmen’ but that this was especially the case when ‘those deeds were done at the call of duty, in obedience to the word of command, with unswerving fidelity’.¹¹⁵ Colonel F. E. Mulcahy hoped that those who stopped to drink from the water fountain in the Army Ordnance Corps memorial would reflect on the memorial and its message of ‘duty well done … that they may thereby be inspired with feelings of loyalty and devotion to Sovereign and country’¹¹⁶ Similarly, the Royal Fusiliers’ memorial was to act ‘as a bright example to those who came after – a bright example of devotion, loyalty and patriotism to the young men of the country’.¹¹⁷ Pride at those who had fallen doing their duty was also the theme of the Duke of Connaught’s address during the Honourable Artillery Company ceremony.¹¹⁸

Central to any claim about the personal integrity and moral fibre of those who had fought was the inclusion of the ordinary soldier. This was made explicit by Sir Lees Knowles when he reminded the citizens of Bury that, ‘Today in this simple model of a soldier we glorify the rank and file of the British army.’¹¹⁹ No longer was the function of a regimental memorial simply to glorify the service of an individual general or the aristocratic officer corps, but instead it was to celebrate the sacrifice of all who had fought. This shift was most apparent in the naming of the fallen where equal prominence was given to all who served, regardless of rank. Indeed, one of the few memorials not to include a full roll of honour was the Coldstream Guards’ memorial in St Paul’s cathedral, which was confined to officers only. However, even a socially exclusive Guards regiment felt the need to offset this omission. The Household Brigade Magazine explained that ‘it had been found impossible to record the names of the 207 non-commissioned officers and men on the memorial in St Paul’s Cathedral owing to the limited amount of space available, but all the names will be inscribed in the Guards’ Chapel and in the Cape Town Cathedral’.¹²⁰

The Royal Artillery scheme provides further evidence of just how embedded in the work of memorialisation the full listing of names had become. As we have already seen with the allocation of a prime site on the Mall, the memorial

¹¹⁶ The Times, 8 December 1905.
¹¹⁷ City Press, 18 January 1908.
¹¹⁸ The Times, 18 July 1904.
¹¹⁹ Salford Reporter, 25 March 1905.
committee of the Royal Artillery found itself subjected to a significant amount of outside interference, not least from Lord Esher, who had been tasked with overseeing the Victoria memorial project. Esher’s aesthetic tastes were immediately disturbed by the preliminary designs he received from the Royal Artillery and in the process he cut to the heart of the memorial’s function. Recognising the importance of every member of the regiment and revealing an understanding of the equality of sacrifice, the Royal Artillery committee wanted to include panels giving the full roll of honour. For Esher the name panels were abhorrent. He wrote to the Secretary of the Office of Works: ‘one thing is absolutely hideous, which is the idea of inscribing the long list of names on the memorial … It would be turning St James’ Park into Kensal Green’.¹²¹ Esher clearly believed the listing of names was inappropriate in this public space and was instead the preserve of a cemetery – hence the reference to one of London’s great Victorian necropoli, Kensal Green. However, finding himself isolated by adopting this position, with even the King offering broad support for the plan, Esher backed down and gave his permission for the panels to be placed at the bottom of the memorial. Although such a half-hearted concession shows that Esher still believed that it was inappropriate to allow the roll of honour to dominate the memorial, it does, nonetheless, highlight the strength of support there was for a full record to be included.¹²²

In honouring the courage and sacrifice of the ordinary soldier, unveiling ceremonies could also be used to promote regimental connections with and standing in the local community. General French reminded the audience gathered for the Royal Marines’ ceremony of the corps’ roots in the London trained bands; while Major-General Sir George Barton presented a potted history of the Royal Fusiliers when unveiling its memorial and referred to the regiment’s long-standing association with the City of London.¹²³ In Brighton, Colonel Donne, having recounted for those assembled for the dedication of the Royal Sussex memorial the ‘gallant deeds’ of the regiment, was quick to ‘draw attention to the fact that it was composed almost entirely of Sussex men’.¹²⁴ The same pattern held true for Scotland. Having witnessed the unveiling of an Ionic cross to the memory of the fallen of the Seaforth Highlanders, the people of Ross-shire were told by Provost Macrae that they should be proud of their ‘county’ soldiers, while Lord Lovat insisted that the memorial the townsfolk of Beauly had just seen unveiled should remind them that the Lovat Scouts were ‘a movement in which Highlanders alone were occupied. It was the development

¹²¹ TNA WORK 20/59 Royal Artillery memorial. Letter from Lord Esher 9 November 1905 (emphasis in the original). See also his letter of 13 November 1905.
¹²² TNA WORK 20/59 Royal Artillery memorial. Secretary of Office of Works [Sir Shomberg McDonnell] to Lord Knollys [Royal Private Secretary], 9 December 1905.
¹²⁴ Brighton Herald, 5 November 1904.
of a particular form of duty for which Highlanders were specially adapted, and
the men and officers were entirely Highland’.¹²⁵

Unsurprisingly, volunteers were particularly keen to lay stress on their local
connections. Having, with the exception of the City Imperial Volunteers and the
Imperial Yeomanry, been amalgamated with the regular army on deployment in
South Africa, volunteers battalions were often eager to reassert their individual
identity by having their active service commemorated separately at an intimate,
community level. The 3rd, 6th and 7th volunteer battalions of the Manchester
regiment all chose to erect commemorative plaques in their former drill halls.
Both the 2nd volunteer battalion of The Buffs, East Kent Regiment and the 2nd
volunteer battalion of the Queen’s Own, Royal West Kent Regiment, although
included on regimental memorials in Canterbury, Rochester and Maidstone, also
opted to dedicate memorial tablets in the parish churches of their base towns.¹²⁶
This desire to go ahead with commemorative sites, in which inclusion was so
narrowly restricted, not only highlights the parochialism that underpinned the
volunteer movement at the turn of the twentieth century but also hints at some
of the tensions that existed between the regular and reservist forces.¹²⁷ With
over 30,000 volunteers having served in South Africa, it is perhaps unsurprising
that their performance should have become the subject for close scrutiny by
both the press and Whitehall.¹²⁸ Although the public, in general, applauded
the volunteers’ patriotism, their professionalism was viewed in a much more
critical light by government experts. St John Brodrick, the Secretary of State for
War between 1900 and 1903, made little attempt to mask the grave concerns
which he felt the volunteers’ performance in the war had raised regarding
their ability to fulfil their primary function of home defence. In early 1903
such expressions of doubt were given official form with the appointment of
the Norfolk Commission to look into the organisation and terms of service
of the militia and volunteer forces. Inevitably the Commission interpreted its
remit in a relatively elastic manner and its focus fell on the performance of
the volunteers on active service.¹²⁹ Such a highly charged atmosphere could
make volunteer battalions all the more determined to celebrate publicly their

¹²⁵ Ross-shire Journal, 12 August 1904; Inverness Courier, 22 December 1905; both quoted
¹²⁶ The 2nd volunteer battalion of The Buffs’ memorial was erected in St Dunstan’s parish
church, Cranbrook; the Royal West Kent’s equivalent can be found in St Alfege’s parish
church, Greenwich.
¹²⁷ Bennett, Absent-Minded Beggars, p. 31
¹²⁹ Stephen Miller, Volunteers on the Veld: Britain’s Citizen-Soldiers and the South African
War, 1899–1902 (Oklahoma: Oklahoma University Press, 2007), pp. 166–180; Hugh
Cunningham, The Volunteer Force: A Social and Political History, 1859–1908 (London:
individual contributions to the war effort. At a fund-raising dinner held by the memorial committee of the 2nd volunteer battalion of the Queen’s Own, Royal West Kents in May 1903, the battalion’s commander, Colonel Satterthwaite, clearly viewed the committee’s memorialisation project as a way to counter public criticism. Although he was confident that the war would be ‘the means of bringing the volunteer battalions in closer touch with their comrades of the line’, he was, nonetheless, insistent that, ‘as the volunteer force had been, and still was, the subject of much abuse … in the half-penny press’, it was essential that the proposed memorial ‘should be something more worthy than a tablet’.¹³⁰ In fact, restricted funds meant that Satterthwaite was to be disappointed and a simple commemorative plaque to the fallen of the 2nd volunteer battalion was unveiled in St Alfege’s parish church, Greenwich the following year.

Despite the negative press surrounding the military contribution volunteers made to victory in South Africa, local volunteer forces remained points of community interest and were frequently seized on as the foci for civic pride. General Sir Owen Tudor Burne opened proceedings at the unveiling of the Lancashire Fusiliers’ memorial by noting that ‘the county of Lancashire had been the first to offer to the country the aid of Volunteer active service companies’, while the congregation in St Giles’s Cathedral, Edinburgh, for the Royal Scots’ dedication service were told by Lord Rosebery, the Lord Lieutenant of Mid-Lothian, that they should take pride in the fact that, ‘this regiment of Royal Scots, the regiment most closely identified with Mid-Lothian, was the only one of which it could be said that all its reservists had come to the colours, or been fully accounted for’.¹³¹ In a similar vein, although the readers of the Manchester Evening News were told that they should feel a sense of deep satisfaction that Manchester had sent nearly 5,000 men to the war, it was ‘the 12 officers and 465 men from the volunteer battalions’ who were singled out for special mention.¹³²

Yet, such local pride was not simply confined to the exploits of volunteers. In his dedication address before unveiling the Lancashire Fusiliers’ memorial in Market Square, Bury, Lord Derby, the Lord Lieutenant of the county, focused on the significance the regiment as a whole had for the status of the town: ‘We feel that it is an honour to be the home of the regiment, and we hope that this connection between the Lancashire Fusiliers and the town of Bury will remain … as a source of honour to the town’.¹³³ He then proceeded to provide an explanation for the strength of the bonds that connected the civic and military worlds:

¹³⁰ Queen’s Own Gazette, Vol. XXI, No. 6 (June 1903), p. 1858.
¹³² Manchester Evening News, 26 October 1908.
There were those who thought some years ago, when the scheme was established for bringing the depots of battalions and localising them in different counties, that no connection would grow up between regiment and county. I would ask those who were of that opinion to look round and see those vast crowds in all directions as far as the eye could reach, all anxious to come and see an occasion which was one of honour to the regiment with which they were connected.¹³⁴

Although Derby, who had served as War Secretary between 1878 and 1880, was, in part, vindicating his own support for the localisation of the army and the subsequent territorialisation of volunteers, he was, nevertheless, not alone in drawing civic pride from the war record of a localised regiment.¹³⁵ The editor of the Kentish Gazette, notwithstanding the regimental nature of The Buffs’ memorial in Canterbury, felt sure that the ‘men who had died had not only raised a monument to themselves but also to the patriotism and military efficiency of East Kent’.¹³⁶ Councillor Mitchell, on accepting custody of the Highland Light Infantry memorial in Kelvingrove Park, was certain that Glaswegians would be especially proud to possess such ‘a work of art’ because ‘it spoke of the bravery of the officers and men of a regiment which had been so long associated with Glasgow’.¹³⁷ Sir Thomas Thornhill Shann, mayor of Manchester from 1903 to 1905, used the unveiling of the Manchester regiment memorial as an opportunity to rebrand the city as a seat of loyalty and respectability. The memorial would, he said, ‘serve to show that in this city of Manchester, however much we are all immersed in the fierce strife of commerce and industry, we are by no means insensible to the claims of patriotism, and that we are ready, as ever our forefathers, to come forward in the hour of need to our country’s aid’.¹³⁸

This fusion of military and civic pride could mean that the focus on the dead became lost at unveiling ceremonies. The following description from the Brighton Herald of the unveiling of the Royal Sussex regiment’s memorial in Regency Square clearly captures the combination of military spectacle and civilian pageant that suffused the day:

With all the pomp and circumstance attending a military ceremony in the sunshine, the monument erected opposite the West Pier, Brighton, to the memory of soldiers of the Royal Sussex Regiment who fell in the South African War, was unveiled on Saturday by the Marquis of Abergavenny. For

¹³⁵ For more on the reforms to the regular and volunteer forces see Beckett, Riflemen Form, pp. 129–138 and Spiers, The Army and Society, pp. 177–206.
¹³⁶ Kentish Gazette and Canterbury Press, 4 June 1904.
¹³⁷ RHFM, Highland Light Infantry Chronicle, December 1906, p. 133.
¹³⁸ Manchester Guardian, 27 October 1908.
the time being Regency Square, at the foot of which the statue stands, was fairly under a military occupation. The roadways about the square resounded with the tramp of marching men; on the wide square of green, men in red and men in khaki manoeuvred; excited officers – why do officers always get excited? – were dashing about on horseback; bugles sounded, drums beat; and in the bright sunshine everything made a brave show. The balconies and windows in the square – many decorated – had their groups of spectators, and away from the privileged enclosures, themselves filled with a fashionable throng, stretched enormous crowds of the general sightseers. One would have to go back to Coronation times to remember a similar crowd in Brighton.¹³⁹

The addition of a visit by an important public figure to officiate at an unveiling merely added to the excitement of the occasion. On the day of the dedication service for the Cheshire regiment’s memorial in Chester an ‘animated’ crowd lined the route to the cathedral ready to greet the appearance of Lord Roberts ‘with loud cheering, waving of handkerchiefs and clapping’.¹⁴⁰ The ‘thousands of sightseers’ who poured into an ‘en-fête’ Bury to witness the Lancashire Fusiliers’ ceremony cheered not only the arrival of Lord Derby but also the moment the memorial was unveiled.¹⁴¹ In the Medway towns of Rochester, Gillingham and Chatham, the determination of the local populace to use the King’s attendance at the unveiling of the Royal Engineers’ memorial as an excuse to turn the day into a patriotic carnival was vividly captured by the Chatham News: ‘Flags! Flags! Flags! Flags here, flags there, flags everywhere – nothing but flags of all colours, all sizes and all descriptions, the whole combining to make a bright display’.¹⁴²

Yet, on this occasion, the event failed to match the expectations and efforts of the public. Determined that the ceremony should remain exclusively a military one, the parade ground in Brompton Barracks where the victory arch was situated remained firmly closed to civilians. Indeed, for the organisers of the day not even the demands of the national press were to be allowed to detract from the military splendour of the occasion. The Times’ royal correspondent was unable to provide an account of the King’s unveiling address because, as he deferentially explained in his report of the event, ‘It had been felt, rightly perhaps, that the presence of anybody in plain clothes would have spoilt the brilliant effect of the military picture’.¹⁴³ The assertion of such exclusive rights over the ownership of the memory of the fallen did not, however, sit easily with the editor of the Chatham News. Although full of admiration for the precision

¹³⁹ Brighton Herald, 5 November 1904.
¹⁴⁰ Chester Chronicle, 6 August 1904.
¹⁴¹ Salford Reporter, 25 March 1905.
¹⁴² Chatham News, 29 July 1905.
¹⁴³ The Times, 27 July 1905.
of the Royal Engineer’s organisation and the panache of the military spectacle, he felt obliged to conclude his coverage of the unveiling on a note of discord:

In one respect only could there have been an improvement suggested. One would liked to have seen a further recognition, on the part of the military authorities, of the fact that it was a civic as well as a military function, for if the event of the day was a tribute paid to military faithfulness and valour, it was paid by civilians no less than by their comrades.¹⁴⁴

Occasionally passing references were made to the sense of sorrow that underscored the unveiling of regimental memory sites, although these were rarely allowed to detract from the dominant celebratory mood. The Manchester regiments’ official souvenir programme noted that it was only with the sounding of the last post at the conclusion of proceedings that, ‘the vast mob around and in St. Ann’s Square, the crowds in and on buildings, seemed to realise what the function meant, that it was in a sense a funeral service’.¹⁴⁵ The equivalent publication for the Queen’s Royal West Surrey regiment was similarly sure that pride not grief was the leitmotif at the dedication of its memorial in St Mary’s Church, Guildford. Acknowledging that the service was ‘solemn and impressive’, it went on to argue that, ‘it was not mournful for though the regiment sustained heavy loses … the emotions which were uppermost in the minds of those present were more akin to the feeling of ultimate triumph’.¹⁴⁶

The South African War had certainly raised the public profile of the army. Although administrators in Whitehall and senior commanders on operations were subjected to stinging criticism, especially in the disastrous early stages of the war, the rank and file, by contrast, received almost universal praise. This new found admiration for the professional soldier was, of course, augmented by the public’s admiration for the patriotism of the tens of thousands of volunteers that flocked to the colours from late 1899 onwards. In the aftermath of the fighting, the military authorities looked to capitalise on the wider community’s fascination with khaki through a wave of commemorative activity. Memorials to the fallen, more often than not figurative and realistic in design, served to promote regimental prestige through the veneration of the personal qualities and heroism of the ordinary fighting man. Yet, if the war in South Africa in general, and the volunteer movement in particular, helped to make the civilian population more receptive to such didacticism, they also resulted in fresh tensions surrounding the control and nature of military commemoration. By connecting the service of respectable citizens to the professional army, the war

¹⁴⁴ Chatham News, 29 July 1905.
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¹⁴⁶ SHC, QRWS/1/8/2/22; Queen’s Royal West Surrey Regiment Unveiling Souvenir (Guildford: Surrey Advertiser and County Times, 1904), p. 2.
and, by extension, its memorialisation became focal points for civic pride. Thus, although the military authorities retained, for the most part, firm control of the commemorative process, they, nonetheless, found themselves under increasing pressure from the expectations of outside agencies and the weight of civilian sensibilities.