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Abstract

During the First World War, over 100,000 soldiers from Australia and New Zealand were deployed to Egypt, with many staying for months or years. This thesis explores the interactions between Australasian soldiers and Egyptian civilians over the course of the war, investigating how the actions and attitudes of Australasians differed from the traditional agents of British imperialism in Egypt, with a specific emphasis on the ANZACs’ peculiar racial thought. The chapters examine (a) how Australasian imperial ideology was significantly less paternalistic than Britons’ in Egypt (b) how the Australasians’ penchant for ascribing Egyptians with blackening monikers affected imperial relationships and (c) how Australasians racialized different types of non-whites in Egypt.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

During one scene in Naguib Mahfouz’s First World War literary epic, Palace Walk, a shaykh recounts an unhappy story about being robbed. “Yesterday I was walking into the Muski when two Australian soldiers blocked my way. They told me to hand over everything I had,” he complains to another character.1 Dejectedly, the shaykh agreed, emptying his pockets of his sole possession, an ear of corn. To his continued dismay, he recounts how one of the Australians “took it and kicked it like a ball. The other snatched my turban. He unwound the cloth from it, ripped it, and flung it in my face.”2 In outrage at the affront, the shaykh describes raising his hand to the sky, calling out to “Almighty God [to] rip their nation to shreds the way they ripped my turban cloth.”3

While Palace Walk is a work of fiction, much of its literary strength comes from its ability to expose and comment on real tensions within Egyptian society during the First World War. The First World War brought tremendous social and economic change to Egypt, yet this period is critically understudied, leaving a dearth in the scholarship of colonial Egypt. This thesis will contribute to filling this gap by investigating a specific and significant wartime phenomenon: the influx of over 100,000 Australian and New Zealand soldiers into the country, which reshaped the ‘face’ of the British Empire in Egypt.

Beginning in 1914, Entente war planners deployed hundreds of thousands of imperial soldiers to Egypt, mainly from Australia, India, metropolitan Britain, and New Zealand. While very little actual combat took place in Egypt over the course of the war, the country’s proximity to key fronts at Gallipoli and Palestine allowed it to be utilized as a key training, healing, and staging ground for the Entente’s Middle Eastern campaigns.

---

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid, 40.
Members of the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZACs), made up a plurality of these deployed foreign forces. Over the course of the war, most of these ANZACs had many opportunities to interact with the resident populations of Egypt. It is these new imperial actors that this thesis will focus on assessing.

The object of this thesis is not, as previous investigations on the subject have done, to describe the broad narrative of the ANZAC experience in Egypt. Rather it will specifically explore the ways the influx of Australasians affected the dynamics of British imperial rule over Egyptians. For most of the war, Australasian soldiers outnumbered British Isles whites in Egypt by a significant margin. Moreover, the scale of wartime maneuvers meant that white Anglophone soldiers existed in higher volumes than in Egypt’s entire history. All this meant the ‘face’ of the British Empire had now radically shifted to a creature of a significantly different cultural import.

While language, self-definition, and customs likely made the ANZACs indistinguishable from typical metropolitan Britons in the eyes of most Egyptians, they were not entirely the same. For one, the class demographics of the ANZACs were significantly different. Given the immense preferential hiring bonuses Britons received in both Egypt’s private and public sectors, the professional classes came to be overrepresented in Egypt’s resident British population. The ANZACs on the other hand, hailed from a wide cross-section of Australasian society, with the majority of the deployed soldiers hailing from working class backgrounds.

But where cleavages between the Britons and ANZACs was greatest, was in their attitudes towards race. Race, of course, played a pivotal role in British society as a mark of pride and justification for empire. But in Australia and New Zealand, nascent nationhoods and powerful proximate Asian nations generated a level of racial paranoia.

---

4 Some members of the deployed Australasian forces, such as the Australian Light Horse, were technically not part of the Australia and New Zealand Army Corps. However, for the purposes of this essay though ‘ANZAC’ is used synonymously with ‘Australasian soldier’, including those who served outside the Corps like the Australian Light Horse. I use the demonym ‘Australasian’ when the context calls for terminology not beholden to a military context. When ‘Australian’ or ‘New Zealand’ are used as demonyms in this thesis, they refer to people from that designated dominion specifically.

unheard of in the British Isles. Race came to play a far more central place in Australasian identities, as racial solidarity substituted for the identity anchors Britain enjoyed but the Australasian dominions lacked: a long national history, a stable class hierarchy, and confidence in the national security apparatus.

These different attitudes on race would necessarily lead to significantly different relationships with the non-white populations that the ANZACs encountered during their wartime deployment. This thesis will explore the ways in which these differing racial attitudes manifested themselves in the context of the ANZACs’ stay in First World War Egypt.

By the beginning of the First World War, Egypt had a substantial history of British imperial penetration. Having financially defaulted in 1876, the Egyptian government was forced by its crediting nations, pre-eminently Britain and France, to submit itself to a series of foreign-dominated checks on its independence. This foreign dominance was exacerbated after a nationalist revolt against these controls failed in 1882, and the country was occupied by the British Army. This lent enormous power to Evelyn Baring, the British Agent in Cairo, and his successors, who in turn began to exercise considerable influence over Egyptian domestic politics, including the ability to control budgetary appropriations.

The British population in Egypt was considerably small throughout the duration of British imperial rule relative to other European nationalities. The 1907 census, the last prior to the beginning of the First World War, records 14,361 subjects of British Isles descent, along with 6292 other British colonial subjects (mostly Maltese). Thus the vast majority of Egyptians had little opportunity to interact directly with citizens of their chief colonial master. Nonetheless, British officials exercised a disproportionate influence in the country, with many of the higher level positions of the Egyptian army, police, civil service, and businesses being reserved for Britons.

\[6\text{ Ibid, 17.}\]
\[7\text{ Ibid, 117-118.}\]
1.1. Egyptian Historiography

Colonial Egypt is far from an understudied subject. The scholarship vests significant interest in the period of Evelyn Baring’s tenure as the British Agent in Cairo (1882-1907), and the tumultuous 1919 Revolution that sparked the decolonization process. Yet the wartime years between Baring’s resignation and the post-war rumblings of revolution go largely unnoticed in most English language historical narratives of Egypt.

Afaf Al-Sayyid-Marsot’s A History of Egypt from the Arab Conquest to the Present devotes a single paragraph to the subject of the First World War, briefly citing peasant dissatisfaction with wartime exactions. And while Jacque Berque’s Egypt: Imperialism and Revolution discusses the 1919 Revolution extensively, his only discussion of the war years is a brief mention to how the war financially empowered Egyptian elites through increasing credit flows into the country.

Other texts do a bit better. M.W. Daly’s chapter “The British Occupation 1882-1922” in The Cambridge History of Egypt is one of the few to devote modest attention to describing the 1914-1918 period. But while Daly does highlight the impact that cotton demand had on contributing to inflated food prices for Egyptians, most of his coverage of the 1914-1918 years revolves around maneuvers in high politics. Daly also briefly notes the “blind eye to abuses... by inexperienced newcomers,” a reference that presumably alludes to the ANZACs, but he does little to delineate the specifics of this.

Joel Beinin and Zachary Lockman’s Workers on the Nile spends seven paragraphs discussing the war years. They argue that urban food shortages and rapid inflation sparked labour union agitation. They discuss the 1917 cigarette worker strike at the

---

Coutarelli factory in Alexandria as well as the beginnings of tramway worker organization in 1918, before moving onto a very extensive discussion of the 1919 Revolution.\textsuperscript{11}

P. J. Vatikiotis’s \textit{The History of Modern Egypt} is slightly more thorough, devoting five pages to covering the war years. Vatikiotis highlights the economic malaise felt predominantly by the lower classes as cotton prices declined while the prices of consumer commodities increased. This, along with the onerous exaction of conscription and large presence of foreign soldiers helped deflate British popularity in the country, argues Vatikiotis.\textsuperscript{12}

But overall the modern English-language historiography of Egypt treats the First World War with an inexcusable amount of inattention. While very little combat took place in First World War Egypt, besides minor Ottoman harassment in Sinai and a small Sennusii insurgency in the west, the country was radically transformed in other ways. Hundreds of thousands of foreign imperial soldiers were brought to the country to train and defend, the \textit{de facto} British colonization was formalized with the 1914 declaration of the Protectorate, and the demands of the wartime economy provided a plethora of new opportunities and exactions for Egypt. All this was followed by a popular revolution which caught colonial officials off guard, a tension that deserves further exploration. And no period seems more promising than the turbulent First World War years for shedding additional light on this subject.

While there is certainly a dearth of attention to the First World War in Egypt, there are a handful of publications that do devote specific attention to the period in order to contextualize the war’s impact on Egypt’s wider historical trajectory. C.W.R. Long’s \textit{British Proconsuls in Egypt, 1914-1929} does an excellent job in cataloguing the tumultuous tensions and turnovers of Britain’s highest ranking politicians in Egypt during the war.\textsuperscript{13} In particular Long does a good job outlining the ways in which Reginald Wingate, the accomplished Governor-General of the Sudan, struggled with the more sophisticated and

complicated political milieu of Egypt after his appointment as High Commissioner. But Long’s work is largely restricted to the examination of high politics: interpersonal relationships between colonial titans and Egyptian aristocrats are well documented, but there is little commentary on what empire looked like at the ground level.

Lanver Mak’s *The British in Egypt*, also devotes a chapter to examining changes to British society during the war years. He notes how the sudden withdrawal of the veteran Army of Occupation to the fighting fields of France significantly disrupted social patterns of the British community in Egypt, as the departure of around 5,000 soldiers meant the small (and relatively insular) population of Britons in Egypt was significantly reduced. Many of the political, bureaucratic and economic apparatuses also faced significant disruption as many senior officials in Egyptian banking, police and the civil service volunteered to join the war effort in Europe. These were soon replaced by a great number of new soldiers; Mak estimates their total number to be 400,000. While some came from metropolitan Britain, most hailed from the colonies, particularly India, Australia, and New Zealand. Mak catalogues the challenges the British community in Egypt had in integrating these new arrivals. From the onerous costs of hospitals for wounded Gallipoli veterans to the conflicts erupting with the introduction of new working class voices into a predominantly middle-class community, the picture Mak paints is one of a community in flux, trying to make sense of its new roles in a wartime milieu.14

More pertinent to this thesis is Mario Ruiz’s 2009 article “Manly Spectacles and Imperial Soldiers in Wartime Egypt, 1914–19,” which attempts to catalogue British reaction to the influx of Imperial soldiers to Egypt. He describes the anxieties colonial officials and British military officers had towards these arriving soldiers. They feared Indian soldiers would be subversive if allowed to have prolonged communication with Egyptians, and so they generally restricted Indians to their bases. While the same mobility restrictions were not placed on the ANZACs, they were widely decried as being disorderly, especially in the aftermath of the Good Friday Riot of 1915. Ruiz argues that, in the colonial officials’ view, “disorderly conduct threatened the status of a man in relation to his peers, as well as his

individual ranking in a unit and, by extension, the hierarchical colonial order.”
Ruiz argues that these fears obliged British military officers to discipline colonial soldiers through force and propaganda that equated masculinity with orderliness, a formula which Ruiz argues was eventually effective.

Ellis Goldberg’s “Peasants in Revolt-Egypt 1919” even goes so far as to highlight the ways in which the macroscopic effects of the war helped exacerbate the underlying social tensions that led to the 1919 Revolution. He argues that much of the 1919 Revolution’s rural unrest was driven simply by the catalysts of peasant hunger and starvation anxiety. Goldberg argues the persistent sabotage of rail and communication infrastructure in the countryside marked a desperate effort by Egyptian peasants to prevent foodstuffs from leaving the countryside. He argues that the onerous exactions of the war effort through the drafting of human and animal labour and extraction of cereals to the cities sparked anxieties among peasants that rural starvation in 1919 was imminent, thus increasing rural enthusiasm for revolution.

1.2. ANZAC Historiography

The participation of both Australia and New Zealand in the First World War was extensive. Over 420,000 Australians from a population of 4.9 million, and 100,000 New Zealanders from a population of 1.1 million, were deployed overseas over the course of the First World War. A significant portion of these served at least some time in Egypt; historians estimate 103,000 Australasians occupied Egypt at their height. Having received dominion status in 1901 and 1907, respectively, Australia and New Zealand were relatively new nations. The scale of this war mobilization so soon after their national ‘births’

---

16 Ibid, 367.
meant that the First World War would play a critical role in shaping national identity in both

Accordingly, the ‘Anzac Legend’ has become a major locus of historical attention by Australasian scholars. Classical histories like C.E.W. Bean’s The Story of Anzac articulated a narrative of plucky ‘diggers’ performing courageous feats of military valor that shaped them into patriotic citizens.¹⁹ For the most part modern popular histories, such as Les Carlyon’s Gallipoli, have reiterated this sentiment, values which have helped entrench Anzac Day as a major commemoration in both Australia and New Zealand.²⁰

Race relations and interactions with Egyptians during the war tend to play a muted role in these narratives. In The Story of Anzac, Bean briefly alludes to the “occasional rough handling of natives” but does little to describe relationships between the ANZACs and Egyptians.²¹ The Egyptian portion largely focuses on commanders’ biographies and descriptions of troop maneuvers. Millions of interactions with Egyptian merchants, sex workers, thieves, beggars, guides, and onlookers are dismissed with a handful of sentences. Yet for both the ANZACs and Egyptian civilians, these interactions would hardly be all forgettable or insignificant.

More critical ANZAC histories like The Anzac Illusion: Anglo-Australian Relations During World War I, What’s Wrong with ANZAC?: The Militarisation of Australian History, and New Zealand’s Great War: New Zealand, the Allies and the First World War have been published in recent years.²² This scholarship is far more comfortable with critiquing the Anzac legend, warts and all. But they also tend to avoid dwelling much on the antagonistic interactions between the ANZACs and the colonized peoples they

---

²¹ Bean, Story, 130.
encountered. Instead, these Australasia-centric historians make holistic critiques that target ANZAC sexism, militarism, the challenges Maori and Aborigine recruits faced, and question whether Australasian involvement in the First World War was worth the cost, or even justified at all. Overall non-combat relationships with non-white populations serve as little more than a side issue. When the ANZACs’ racism and abuse of colonized populations like the Egyptians are featured, they are generally utilized to complicate the image of the ANZACs as ‘heroes’, rather than highlight their effect on longstanding colonial dynamics.23

The subject of the ANZACs’ interactions with non-white civilians likely resists attention not only because it fails as a patriotic stimulant, but because it takes place largely outside the realm of combat. The relationship between combat and war is so strong that it can be easy to neglect other aspects of military deployment. Some of the most extensive opportunities for ANZAC interactions with non-white civilians would take place between November 1914 and April 1915, as 50,000 ANZACs waited in suburban camps outside Cairo. There is a temptation among Australasian military historians however, both patriotic and critical, to gloss over this period, jumping to the fronts in Gallipoli and France, locations more commonly associated with the ANZAC legend. This is something all the aforementioned authors do.

One recent publication that focuses on the issue of race specifically is Peter Stanley’s chapter “He was Black, He Was a White man, and a Dinkum Aussie’: Race and Empire in Revisiting the Anzac legend.”24 Here Stanley describes the centrality of white imperial identity to the ANZACs, a formula rife for racial tension as the ANZACs were continually expected to serve alongside colonial soldiers they considered racially inferior. He also outlines and describes how the degrading treatment of locals at sub-Saharan and Sri Lankan ports by ANZACs sparked resentment towards their guests, although he does not delve into much depth on the consequences.

23 Reynolds and Lake, What’s, 162; Andrews, Illusion, 47-49; Crawford and McGibbon, New, 369.
In terms of evaluating the ANZACs’ impact on external colonial politics, including in Egypt, John Docker’s 2016 article “Storm Troopers of Empire?: Historical Representation in Breaker Morant, Naguib Mahfouz’s Palace Walk and Other War Histories” provides some interesting insights. Docker examines several atrocities perpetrated by Australians against Boers, Egyptians, and Irishmen between 1899-1919. He argues that in several cases the Australians eagerly acted as ‘storm troopers’ of empire, and were disproportionately violent, regardless of the potential problems such acts might cause for imperial tranquility.

By far the most substantial work reviewing the impact of the ANZACs on Egypt and its colonial dynamics, is Suzanne Brugger’s *Australians and Egypt, 1914-1919*. While Brugger is interested in painting a holistic portrait of the experiences of the Australians in First World War Egypt, she does devote some attention to interactions with the indigenous Egyptians in her chapter “Native Egyptians,” where she describes the broad strokes of the relations between Australian soldiers and Egyptian civilians. Brugger notes how an Australian tradition of racism towards Aborigines and Asian-Australians engendered an initial hostility toward non-whites in Egypt. But Brugger emphasizes that this predisposition towards hostility was intensely exacerbated by predatory commercial behavior on the part of Egyptian merchants, which in turn sparked the Australians to retaliatory violence. Brugger notes how violence often erupted for other reasons, including for the purposes of cruel humor or misplaced anger at being kept from the ‘real war’ in Europe. She also observes how Australians, unlike Britons, were far more willing to engage socially with Egyptians rather than ignoring them, even if this social engagement often took the form of bullying.

In later chapters Brugger examines the role played by Australian soldiers, particularly the Australian Light Horse, in the 1919 Revolution. Reviewing the particularly infamous role Australians had in the burning of several villages she eventually comes to

---


26 Brugger, *Australians*.
the sharp conclusion that “politically they brought disastrous results,” for “Egyptians do not remember that Australian troops were particularly responsible for [these] crimes. It was against the British Empire that Egypt was struggling and it is Britain which bears the blame.”

The more recent 2012 publication *Anzacs in the Middle East* by Mark Johnston also devotes some specific attention to the interactions of the Australians and Egyptians, albeit during the 1940s. In his chapter “Gyppo Land” Johnston explores the experiences of Australian soldiers in Egypt during the Second World War. Johnston reiterates several of the same claims that Brugger made in her First World War context, including that Australians’ views on Aborigines shaped their perceptions of Egyptians, that Australian-Egyptian commercial relationships were commonly marred by two-sided fraud, and that the Australians expressed acute disgust at Egyptian hygiene.

Another vein of existing historiography that is critically important to understanding ANZAC-Egyptian relationships is the literature pertaining to how race was socially constructed in Australasia. Works like *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* and *East by South: China in the Australasian Imagination* attest to the particular centrality race played in shaping the identity of white settlers in both Australia and New Zealand as their nationalisms were solidified in the early twentieth-century. The non-white served as the chief ‘Other’ in these national discourses, imagined to bear values antithetical to those of Australasian whites. The Australasians’ obsession with their own white identity and an established tradition of fear and derision for non-whites more generally would be instrumental in setting the stage for ANZAC antagonism towards Egyptian civilians over the course of the war.

---

27 Ibid, 141-142.


1.3. Chapter Outlines

While there is adequate research dealing with both British imperial rule in Egypt and the experiences of ANZAC soldiers in Egypt, there is very little that ties these two stories together. The intent of this thesis is to deliberately push the experiences of the ANZACs into the story of British imperial rule in Egypt. It will explore how the sudden and sizeable influx of Australasians brought new dynamics to colonial relationships. Each of this thesis’s three body chapters investigates the ways in which the ANZACs presented an image of empire differently from their British colonial predecessors to the Egyptian population.

Chapter 2 seeks to expose the fundamental differences between the imperial ideologies of the ANZACs and the existing British colonial apparatus in Egypt. It argues that the ANZACs conceived the role of empire significantly differently from most Britons. Britons tended to justify their occupation of Egypt, to the Egyptians and themselves, with a pretense of paternalism. In contrast, Australasian imperial ideology had little interest in the integration of non-whites into the imperial polity, even in a subaltern status. Accordingly, they largely rejected paternalism, expressing either apathy towards the Egyptians or a preference for crude domination.

Chapter 3 examines how the ANZACs racialized Egyptians differently from the Britons. Britons imagined racial quality as a graduated hierarchy, in which Egyptians fell somewhere in the middle. Egyptian nationalists only slightly modified this logic in order to place themselves in the top layer, alongside Europeans. However, the newly arriving ANZACs tended to conceive of race as a black-white binary. When they encountered Egyptians for the first time during their wartime deployment, they immediately and vocally categorized Egyptians into the black pole of this imagined binary, a discourse which inflamed some of Egyptian nationalists’ deepest anxieties.

Chapter 4 explores how ANZACs racialized Egyptian class groups differently. It examines how different subtypes of Egyptians; the affluent, fellaheen, and urban poor came to be racialized in starkly different ways. In ANZAC eyes, the cultural Westernization of the affluent, and a romantic image of the fellaheen, protected these Egyptians from the most intense forms of dehumanization. This meant the urban poor bore the brunt of
ANZAC racism. For a class group which had had little direct interaction with Britons previously, this would make the ANZACs unfortunate ambassadors of empire.

1.4. The Geography of ANZAC-Egyptian Interaction

Throughout the course of the war, the ANZACs ventured across a wide variety of Egyptian locales: battle lines in the Sinai, suburban training camps, the bustling urban hub of Cairo, hospitals in Alexandria, and even tourist sites in Upper Egypt.

Their first encounters with Egyptians generally occurred along the Suez Canal. Troop ships from Australasia stopped in Canal cities like Suez to fuel and offload soldiers, with others making their way up to Alexandria to disembark. It was from the decks of these troopships that most ANZACs would have caught their first glimpses of Egyptians, nestling up to the Canal banks.

Some soldiers were immediately deployed along the Canal in garrisons meant to ward off Ottoman harassments, but the bulk proceeded inland to suburban Cairo. The Australian camps at Mena and Maadi and New Zealand Zeitoun camps served as the primary residences of this first wave of ANZACs. It was here that those destined for the Gallipoli front would train, as they waited for the much-delayed land assault to commence. These also had easy logistical access to the city of Cairo. ANZACs were granted leave to the Egyptian capital from their deployments all over the country. But it was when they were encamped in these Cairene suburbs that the capital was most accessible. Cheap trams meant there was little trouble for the ANZACs here to visit Cairo on a regular basis. Generous leave allotments and salaries further augmented this accessibility. Many of the richest descriptions of Egyptian-ANZAC encounters stem from the accounts of this period.

---

30 Brugger, Australians, 38.
Cairo was not the only place that ANZACs encountered Egyptians. Egyptian entrepreneurs seeking to make a profit by selling things like food, newspapers, and souvenirs were aggressive at seeking out the ANZACs even when they were posted to

---

relatively remote locations. The sales pitches of these enthusiastic, and often annoying, entrepreneurs would be a staple of the ANZAC experience in Egypt.

Tourism expeditions to other parts of the country also occasionally occurred. From simple day tours of nearby villages to concerted expeditions to the Old Kingdom wonders of Luxor in Upper Egypt, accounts of ANZACs going out of their way to explore Egypt pepper the archives.

Eventually the Entente decision to launch an offensive campaign into Palestine would bring many ANZACs into the Sinai Peninsula, with periodic leave retreats back to the Canal settlements, like Ismailia, Suez, Port Said and a military camp at the small town of Tel-el-Bekir. Egyptian Labour Corps members and Bedouin inhabitants interacted with the ANZACs in the Sinai, although the ANZAC accounts tend to be rather inattentive to their presence, focusing more on the drama of battle maneuvers.

1.5. Methodology

My evidence for this project is principally derived from primary source materials I collected from a variety of archives. This included reviewing physical documents during a research trip to the United Kingdom at the Durham Sudan Archive, Liddell Hart Military Archives, the British National Archives and most importantly the archives of the Imperial War Museum. I also was able to acquire access to numerous published works including poetry, memoirs, journalism, and diaries through both inter-library loans and digital archives including the websites of the National Library of Australia, Forgotten Books, archive.org, and the New Zealand Electronic Texts Collection. I also gathered documentation from a host of unpublished memoirs, correspondence and diaries from digital sources, including the websites of the Australian War Memorial, the Library of New South Wales, diggersdiaries.org, as well as numerous private websites operated by
veterans’ descendants or military enthusiasts – such as halwinterswar.info and anzacs.net.\textsuperscript{32}

My sources are generally personal accounts, mostly written by Britons, New Zealanders and Australians who served in some sort of military capacity in Egypt during the First World War. While I utilize diaries and memoirs from throughout the war, the richest of my sources tend to pertain to the period of the first wave: from the ANZACs’ initial arrival in Egypt to their bulk deployment on the Gallipoli front (November 1914- April 1915). Evidence from British accounts are deployed in significantly lower quantities, mainly by way of contrast with the ANZACs at specific times and places.

I have also opted to draw my evidence from a selection of works of fiction written by ANZACs or close associates, such as the journalist Charles Blocksidge and the Red Cross volunteer Mabel Brookes.\textsuperscript{33} While using creative literature has its own set of problems, it can be an invaluable source of information that might not make its way into conventional nonfiction. In particular, this fiction has been useful in shedding light on sensitive issues like interracial sexuality, as well as dialogue samples between the ANZACs and Egyptians.

I read few of these sources in their entirety. In each text I located the chapters or date ranges pertaining to the given soldier’s Egypt sojourn. From this abbreviated scope I searched for commentary pertaining to, or descriptions of, interactions between imperial soldiers and Egyptians, particularly Arab-Egyptians. I compiled these segments into my notes, and used this data as my evidence bank. I tried to augment many of these files with biographical details garnered from the texts themselves, secondary sources, and correspondence with the families.

My thesis attempts to use these segments pertaining to interactions with Egyptians to paint a picture of the evolving imperial relationships between the ANZACs and the

\textsuperscript{33}Charles Blocksidge, An Anzac Muster, (Sydney: Privately Printed, 1921); Mabel Brookes, Old Desires, (Melbourne: Australian Authors’ Agency, 1922).
Egyptians. This work is first and foremost a social history, one attempting to outline a critical relational dynamic as a new imperial ‘face’ was conferred on Egypt. This thesis, of course, only tells part of this story. Nearly all the primary sources consulted for this thesis are from either a British or Australasian perspective, rather than an Egyptian one. I try to tease out Egyptian voices the best I can from secondary source citations and examining Egyptian dialogue recorded in ANZAC accounts, but without sustained access to Egyptian-penned primary sources, the conclusions reached from such analysis are extremely limited.

It should be noted that not all ANZAC accounts dwell on the subject of the Egyptian, with some failing to mention the local inhabitants entirely. Many memoirists skip quickly through their Egyptian sojourn to get to more detailed narratives about frontline combat. Many diarists are not interested in waxing Orientalist, and simply restrict themselves to topics like their food quality and relationships with platoon mates. Many of the technocratic official histories focus entirely on the internal discipline of their nation’s army, scarcely acknowledging the existence of Egyptians. Thus to a certain extent a selection bias might exist in the sources I chose. Potentially ANZACs with stronger opinions on other races, or those with more particular experiences with Egyptians, may be eclipsing a more apathetic zeitgeist in the ANZACs as a whole.

However, it is probable that the subject of race loomed large in the minds of most ANZACs. Debates about how best to prevent racial intermingling—physically, sexually, and culturally—captured the public imagination in early twentieth-century Australasia, especially in Australia. Such a milieu implanted a specific set of prejudices that often differed from those constructed in the British Isles. These prejudices combined with new ideas about non-whites, and Egyptians in particular, that the ANZACs developed over the course of their wartime sojourn. These ANZAC racial attitudes, and their deviations from previously established British imperial norms, would help reshape colonizer-colonized relationships over the course of the war, likely leaving a troublesome legacy for the tumult of 1919.
Chapter 2. The Good Friday Riot and the ANZACs’ Deviant Imperial Ideology

On April 2, 1915 tens of thousands of ANZACs stationed at camps in the environs of Cairo were granted leave for the Good Friday holiday. Many took the opportunity to engage in uncontroversial diversions, such as church services or visiting a sports club. However many more opted to congregate in the Was’ah, the primary Red Light District of Cairo. Thousands assembled here for sex and intoxication. The Was’ah was located proximate to the prosperous Azkabeya neighbourhood and many Western cultural outposts like the Shepheard’s Hotel, which made it very accessible to the ANZACs, even to soldiers who did not want to venture too far into the eastern Cairene slums. Once predominantly a neighbourhood of Euro-Egyptians, the Was’ah had gained a large proportion of Sudanese and native Egyptians in the urbanization boom of the early 1900s, making for an extremely ethnically heterogeneous population.


35 Properly called the Wajh al-Birkat- “the face of the lake” in Arabic- usually abbreviated by the ANZACs to one of many different Roman spellings including Was’ah, Wazir, Wowser, Wozzer, Wazza and Birka.

36 For the purpose of this thesis, ‘Euro-Egyptian’ refers to numerous Egyptian residents of European descent or immigration origin: mostly Greek, Italian, French and Maltese.

Sometime between 4 and 5 o’clock a disturbance erupted. A group- mostly comprised of ANZACs- began throwing sex workers and brothel furniture out onto the street. British military police were summoned to arrest the offenders, but a crowd of sympathetic soldiers cowed them into leaving. Egyptian fire brigades appeared to quench the fires, although their attempts to do their jobs were obstructed by aggressive rioters. Their attempts to defend themselves with their hoses brought even worse backlash. At its height, somewhere in the range of 2000-3000 ANZACs participated, along with a lesser number of Britons (around 1000). While most of these congregants were most likely onlookers, rather than active participants in the riot, the size and scope of the incident was nonetheless considerable.39


For the most part, ANZAC opinions about the Good Friday Riot deviated considerably from the official opinion of the British colonial regime. Many ANZACs attempted to justify the riot by appealing to the offenses done to white imperial soldiers by the Egyptian population. British officials, on the other hand, expressed mostly disgust at the riot, and the chaotic disorder and the threat to imperial tranquility it represented.

By comparing these reactions to the Good Friday Riot, this chapter aims to expose tensions that manifested themselves in wartime Egypt between imperial ideals of newly arrived ANZACs, and the longstanding British colonial regime in Egypt. Australasians’ dual obsession with both social egalitarianism and white supremacy prevented them from imagining a role for non-whites in their polity. Britons, on the other hand, espoused a white supremacy that was relatively muted in its intensity, at least when compared to that of the Australasians. Moreover, British society’s more confident class structure allowed them to easily imagine a role for non-whites in their imperial polity, albeit it in a confirmed subaltern status. Additionally, unlike Australasians, British colonial officials were accountable for actually administering populous non-white territories. Thus motivated by a desire to control Egypt through cost-effective measures, and to provide lip-service to a civilizing mission, Britons tended to take a far quieter and strategic approach to imperialism in Egypt than did the Australasians. However, in the imaginations of most ANZACs, the opinion of non-whites was imagined as strategically irrelevant.

2.1. Australian Justification

Some ANZAC accounts do contain critiques, especially among higher ranking officers, towards the conduct of the Good Friday rioters. But the majority of the ANZAC accounts commenting on the subject express some measure of sympathy for the rioters. Suzanne Brugger notes it was extremely difficult for officials to get ANZAC witnesses to testify against the rioters. In many cases the ANZAC accounts even contain outright justification. These justifications were of three types: (1) that the Egyptians were to blame

40 While this incident is more commonly designated “Battle of the Was’ah,” or “Battle of the Streets”, for the purposes of the thesis I have opted for the lesser used designation “Good Friday Riot”, to better convey the rioters’ lack of cohesion and avoid glamourizing the incident.
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for initiating the tumult, (2) that the ANZACs were righteously retaliating against an unbearable siege of temptations that undermined their sexual and medical integrity, or, in a vein of sociopathic mundanity, (3) that rioting was simply fun.

2.1.1. Egyptian Initiation

One way in which the ANZACs’ discourse moved to justify the riot was to place the blame on the Egyptian residents for initiating the riot through some manner of provocation. The scholar Michael Dunn cites the testimony of the Australian private John Jensen who records an incident in which an English soldier invited a group of ANZACs to help remove his sister from the employ of a Was’ah brothel.42 “At first they could not find the girl again but at last she was found in a particularly vile house…our chaps & some New Zealanders & English troops went in to raid these houses,” Jensen writes.43

Another circulating story credited the riot’s start to an incident of Egyptian brothels racially discriminating against Maori soldiers, which in turn upset their white co-nationals.44 For New Zealanders, who discursively imagined the Maori as a “lost branch of the Caucasian race,” this belittlement by native Egyptians and Egyptians of Southern European descent would have inflamed racial tensions.45 The Australian lieutenant Oliver Hogue, a prolific writer on his ANZAC experience espouses this narrative: “It all happened so simply. Some publicans and other sinners presumed to treat Maoris as ‘niggers.’ This was too much for the New Zealanders, and they began to pull some of the furniture out of a public house, and to make a bonfire of it in the street, the while the Maoris danced a war danced around it.”46 But Hogue goes on the defend his fellow soldiers: “But human nature is human nature….Hence to call the Maoris ‘niggers’ – well who can blame the New

43 Ibid.
44 Brugger, Australians, 147.
Zealanders for resenting it, and who can blame the Australians for siding with the New Zealanders, or the [English] Territorials for assisting their overseas brethren.”47 Hogue goes on to conclude that the situation was thus redeemable because it ultimately displayed a transcontinental “British brotherhood.”48

Additionally, more mundane explanations pepper the primary source accounts that conclude the riot was provoked by some ordinary theft, or allegations of fraud on the part of a brothel. This narrative was most sympathized with by Brugger, who emphasizes the role theft played in causing frustration.49 Regarding the riot, the Australian private Herbert Farrell concludes “no doubt [it was] the Authorities own fault, as they should have stepped in & prohibited these places of ill fame, which are undoubtedly a disgrace to a civilized country, & when one of their mates (the Soldiers) get robbed it is only natural that the rest want to have revenge.”50

2.1.2. Siege Victims

Regardless of the initiating incident, few riots are the result of a sudden or single complaint alone, and the Good Friday Riot was no exception. The ANZACs had many longstanding grievances against the behaviour, or even the very existence, of the Was’ah businesses. Brugger emphasizes the ANZACs’ widespread frustration with the high theft rate within the Was’ah, Dunn cites their irritation with the frequent sales of adulterated alcohol and recent price increases.51

Yet the most acute of these ANZAC anxieties towards the Was’ah related to sex. The Was’ah was a major attraction to ANZAC troops on leave. While many were just curious onlookers, evidently many of the well-paid soldiers removed from their home

48 Ibid 61.
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environments patronized the brothels. This in turn caused noticeable panic among the ANZACs. Besides the flagrant violation of Australasian sexual ethics that brothel patronage implied, many ANZACs were threatened by venereal disease. Infection by a major venereal disease—either syphilis or gonorrhea—averaged a rate of 12% among the Australian forces. This provoked acute anxiety among many officers.52 “Venereal diseases are very prevalent in Egypt. They are already responsible for a material lessening of the efficiency of the Australasian Imperial Forces, since those who are severely infected are no longer fit to serve... Intercourse with public women is almost certain to be followed by disaster,” warns the Australian general William Birdwood in a 1914 circular to new arrivals in Egypt.53 Fear of venereal disease plagued not only officers, but the rank and file as well. In his well-researched short story collection, An Anzac Muster, Charles Blocksidge writes:

Some talk then followed about this salacious scourge [syphilis] that has stalked so largely through the ranks of all armies. More than one of the assembled company had a first-hand acquaintance with the subject; and tales by the score upon it, with the ease that comes of ripe knowledge, could have been furnished at short notice.54

But since the brothel frequenters were their fellow soldiers—people whom they imagined as patriots serving alongside them in a war of self-sacrifice—they were able to evade much blame. Thus the blame for the impact of the sex industry was generally cast externally, upon the native Egyptian, Euro-Egyptian, and Sudanese-Egyptian pimps and prostitutes. Few actors were more passionate in this endeavour than the New Zealand chaplain Guy Thornton. In his memoir, he records spending extensive amounts of time in the Was’ah attempting (mostly unsuccessfully) to dissuade ANZACs from patronizing brothels. However, despite his passion for this crusade, Thornton displays an extensive amount of sympathy towards the ANZAC brothel frequenters. “From lands where, happily few sexual temptations prevail,” he writes “they were plunged into the vortex of a notoriously evil Oriental city... disgrace, disease and death have befallen many men, who

52 Arthur Butler, Official History of the Australian Army Medical Services, 1914-1918 vol. 3. The Venereal Diseases in the War of 1914-1918, (Canberra: Australian War Memorial, 1943), 77.
54 Charles Blocksidge, An Anzac Muster, (Sydney: Privately Printed, 1921), 151.
under normal temptations would have remained straight, but under the indescribably abnormal temptations of the Esbekia and Fishmarket districts have succumbed.\textsuperscript{55}

Thus to the ANZACs, the only way to reconcile the respect they held for their co-nationals, was to emphasize the agency of the Cairene sex workers. Consequently, ANZAC primary sources tend to display the pimps and prostitutes as assertive and powerful in their interactions with white soldiers. Regarding the Cairene Red Light District, the ANZAC poet C. J. Dennis comments: “It’s as cunnin’ as the oldest imp in ‘ell;/ An’ the game it plays uv lurin’ blokes, wiv love-songs, to their doom/’Ave yeh ’eard their owl uv anguish when they tumbled to the same,/ ’Avin’ found they wus the victums uv a snare?”\textsuperscript{56}

Here, Dennis is careful to discursively imbue the Was’ah and its employees with a great deal of power; they are wily and deliberate, while his fellow ANZACs are hapless and naïve. In a curious reversal of period gender norms, the Egyptian prostitutes are imagined as assertive and aggressive. The Australian sergeant- and future Antarctic explorer-Charles Laseron, writing about navigating through the Red Light Districts, notes, “It was hard work to get through many of these places, for the girls were very enterprising and endeavoured to almost drag into their dens.”\textsuperscript{57} An Anzac Muster describes a scene inside brothel reflecting a similar theme: “the wenches, laying hands upon [the Australians], pushed them into one of the rooms; and without more ado they opened and threw off their clothes, and began to show their tricks off.”\textsuperscript{58} Language in passages like these, such as the verbs “pushed” and “drag”, connotes an overwhelming power, one that the wayward ANZACs are helpless to resist.

Overall, these latent anxieties of feeling under a sexual and somatic siege, provoked sympathy from ANZAC accounts. Even Andrew Carbury, a medical corps veteran writing the official medical history of New Zealanders in the First World War, admits this sympathy. Remarkning on the horrors of syphilitic infection, Carbury remarks


\textsuperscript{57} Charles Laseon, \textit{From Australia to the Dardanelles}, (Sydney: John Sands, 1916), 40
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“The retribution that fell upon the evil places of the ‘Sharia-el-Banat’ [the Was’ah] on Good Friday, at the hands of the Colonial troops was perhaps not unmerited if it was inexcusable,” before appending “but it was certainly not an acceptable solution of the problem.”59

Accordingly, many ANZAC accounts display a justification discourse along the lines of the rioters’ roles of purifying agents. “An’ Bill wus only one uv ’em to fall to Eastern sin/ Ev’ry comp’ny ’ad a rotten tale to tell, / An’ there must be somethin’ doin’ when the strength uv it sunk in/ To a crowd that ain’t afraid to clean up ’ell,” writes Dennis.60 The Australian intelligence officer Reginald Knyvett adds his voice to this chorus, remarking in his memoir, “The burning of those pest-houses must have risen like incense to heaven, and one very good effect it had, about which there will be no dispute—it put the fear of God into the Gyppo.”61 To both these voices, punishment and score-settling featured as a justification for the riot. To them, Egyptians needed to be put in their place, and the effort to do this invoked an ethos of manliness or piety in the face of weakness from the official colonial machine.

2.1.3. Fun

The third reason posited by ANZAC apologists for the Good Friday Riot was that the event was exciting and engaging. By April 1915, the bulk of the ANZAC forces in Egypt had been there for five months. Few initially expected their Egyptian sojourn would be long, and a grievance of being left out of the ‘real war’ in Europe prevailed among the soldiers. The Australian corporal Walter Rainsford’s diary provides a description of the order of events, as they transpired, including the fact that rioters were killed and property was destroyed. Yet he goes on to gleefully conclude that it was “Very interesting!”62 To

60 Dennis, “Battle.”
61 Reginald Knyvett, *Over There with the Australians*, (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1918), 93.
Rainsford, even as he recognized the violence, the spectacle was still alluring compared to the monotony of military training in Egypt.

One New Zealand sapper vividly describes this delight among the ANZAC rioters he witnessed: “a struggling mass of grim Colonials, who, to an ear-splitting accompaniment of yells, cat-calls and coo-ees, were devoting their energies to an all-round wrecking and smashing game.” 63 Despite the fact that the sapper is writing retrospectively, the tone of his commentary is still unnervingly playful. “Crash! went a wardrobe as it struck the ground…R-i-p-p ! went the balcony itself as it followed…Hither and thither rushed the lightly-clad love-ladies screaming as only Eastern women can, and stopping only to hurl a… missile at some grinning Vandal who ducked quickly, then went on enjoying himself.”64

Other writers are even more explicit in their amusement with the riot. “Ar, we woke up old Cairo with a shout, We shook the dead bazaars alive an scared the Moslems sick,/ An’ the yashmacked Cleopatras pattered past us coy an’quick,  As we turned the whole caboodle inside out,” celebrates the ANZAC poet Arthur Adcock.65 The New Zealand private John Donn’s diary records a similar sentiment, albeit in more banal prose: “On arrival at the triangle near Cooks we found a riot was going on down the street and hastened to see the fun.”66 To these men, there did not seem to be an ideological objection to finding amusement in local residents’ suffering and inconvenience.

In all these cases of Good Friday Riot justification, there exists an inward focus. Egyptian welfare and British imperial strategies are the furthest things from the ANZACs’ minds, eclipsed by the desire for inward fulfilment through vengeance and amusement.

63 Anzac, On the Anzac Trail: Being Extracts from the Diary of a New Zealand Sapper, (Wellington: W. Heinemann, 1916), 100.
64 Ibid, 100-101.
2.2. Britons Aghast

British reaction against the Good Friday Riot was more critical. The sources I evaluated for this thesis were united in their condemnation of the disorderly conduct of the rioters. "It would not do to let [the Australians] play their silly games for England and now to protect Egypt and that is how we had to go and stop their games," opines the British private H. Henfrey, "[General John] Maxwell, who is in charge of the Regular Forces out here, has ordered all Australian forces to move away from Egypt at once [but] I think would be better to bung them back to the place where they came from." 67

This disdain was apparently communicated to the ANZACs as well. Herbert Collet's divisional history of the Australian 28th records Maxwell expressing his frustration with Australian enthusiasm for the Good Friday Riot. Collett records "having in mind the recent disturbances in Cairo [on Good Friday 1915], Maxwell addressed the Australian soldiers with the reminder 'that Egypt was now a British Protectorate and that the Egyptians were, equally with Australians, British subjects. He expressed a wish, therefore, that there would be no 'knockin' 'em about.'" 68

2.3. British Imperialism

There is little evidence that British disgust at the Good Friday Riot derived from any inherent altruism. But there was an understanding that disorderly conduct and arbitrary applications of violence onto Egyptian civilians was bad for imperial stability. When the Ottoman Caliph declared jihad against the Entente with its entry into the war, some British colonial officials did react with anxiety regarding the possibility of popular revolt in Egypt. These fears quickly evaporated, but they do highlight the notion that popular tolerance by the Egyptians was considered a necessary factor in the continuation of the colonial project. 69

67 Private Papers of H Henfrey, Documents 11665, Imperial War Museum Archive, London.
68 Herbert Collett, The 28th: A Record of War Service with the Australian Imperial Force, 1915-1919, vol 1, (Perth: Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery of Western Australia, 1922), 32.
Thus the British colonial regime justified its occupation to its Egyptian subjects by asserting rhetoric of a ‘civilizing mission’, an ideological component of their wider imperial project. In *Africa and the Victorians*, the authors argue that humanitarian concerns often came into the calculus of Britain’s general imperial policy towards its African possessions. They cite the economic irrationality of British blockades directed at the Zanzibar slave economy in the mid-nineteenth century as evidence towards this, as well as the major role humanitarian activists such as the Aborigine Protection Society played in tilting British discourse and policy against the Boers in favour of Zulu rights. 70 For the Egyptian milieu specifically they cite the importance that touting the anti-slavery efforts that British influence brought in order to make entanglement in Egypt and the Sudan more palpable to the metropolitan public. 71

In colonial Egypt, British imperial discourse tended to imagine the Empire as a benevolent force that would ultimately better the Egyptian population. Evelyn Baring, the British Agent in Egypt from 1882-1907, writes in his memoir:

> The Englishman… came to Egypt with the fixed idea that he had a mission to perform, and, with his views about individual justice, equal rights before the law, the greatest happiness of the greatest number… he will not unnaturally interpret his mission in this sense, that he is to benefit the mass of the population. 72

Baring and many of his collaborators did not see their mission as a short-term goal, but were optimistic that their ‘pedagogy’ would eventually mature Egypt into a well-run state capable of self-governance. As Baring summarizes, “the Englishman will soon find that the Egyptian, whom he wishes to mould into some-thing really useful with a view to his becoming eventually autonomous, is merely the rawest of raw material.” 73

The British imperial apparatus’ approach to this ‘raw material’ was one of an intrusive rectification agenda. Baring and his colleagues intensified the monitoring of

---
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Egyptians, even in the countryside. “Following the British military occupation of Egypt in 1882, a central office was set up to organise the official registration of births in every Egyptian village,” or what Baring “liked to call 'systematic English inspection', the everyday method of power that colonialism sought to consolidate.” This monitorial supervision would be extended into the fields, the classroom, and even the bathroom as colonial officials sought to internalize in Egyptians a longing for order in matters of work, education, hygiene and many other aspects of daily life. Many of these policy tendencies had their roots in the indigenous modernization efforts began by Muhammad Ali and his successors, but in many regards this agenda intensified even further under British direction.

These goals of controlling the Egyptian for reasons of their own betterment (along with less benevolent ones) required detailed knowledge of their intricacies. For as the literary scholar Edward Said surmises of Orientalist imperialists' sentiments: “knowledge of subject races or Orientals is what makes their management easy and profitable; knowledge gives power, more power requires more knowledge, and so on in an increasingly profitable dialectic of information and control.” Actors in the British colonial endeavour in Egypt (and elsewhere) were thus obsessed with deducing the intricacies and specific of their colonial subjects, albeit through an often obfuscating Orientalist lens.

Thus British colonialists in Egypt imagined themselves as concerned parents: interested in their ‘child’s’ habits and daily life, attentive and hopeful regarding the direction of future development, and convinced that their authority was the best avenue to bettering them. These sentiments certainly felt patronizing to many in a nation inhabited by adults, and British imperial behaviour certainly fell short of such prescribed ideals. But these sentiments do reflect, at the very least, a self-perception of benevolence.

---
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2.4. Colonial Ideology in British Wartime Arrivals

At the beginning of the war the two British armies in Egypt – J.H.C. Byng’s Army of Occupation garrisoned in Cairo, and Reginald Wingate’s Egyptian Army stationed in the hinterlands, were withdrawn to the military priority in Western Europe due to their experience. In turn, they were replaced by rawer recruits from England such as the Lancashire Territorials as well as a variety of forces from the Empire, including the vast bulk of the ANZACs.78 Soldiers from the metropole and Australasia though would take markedly different stances towards the civilizing mission.

Many of the new British recruits to Egyptian deployment mirrored the optimistic paternalistic attitudes of their colonial predecessors. “After the nature of the child all the world over, [the Egyptian] possesses within him the seeds of every good and every evil quality; and the responsibility lies upon us now to see that he develops on the right lines,” argues a memoirist from the British medical corps pseudonymously dubbed Serjeant-Major.79 E.K. Venables, a lieutenant in the Egyptian Labour Corps, is particularly confident in the dynamic of this relationship: “However exasperating these [Egyptian] peasant workers might be in their clumsiness and unreliability, they showed an almost childlike reliance on their officers, especially in difficulty or emergency; ‘kalam ingleez’- an Englishman’s word- was true in those days before the present age of inversion when dubious jungle upstarts presume to query responsible statesmen.”80 Many British soldiers like Venables held a deep pessimism about autonomous Egyptians’ progress, but also great hope in the paternalistic framework of empire, at least rhetorically.

It is likely these sentiments carried beyond the officer corps: “Scepticism as to the uses of Empire, which too often beset the Manchester man at home before the War, was dissipated by seeing what Anglo-Egyptian sovereignty and British character and industry have achieved in a land so long tormented by slave-traders and despots…. everywhere

80 Private Papers of Lieutenant EK Venables, Documents 10416, Imperial War Museum Archive, London.
were signs of economic progress,” boasts the British colonel Gerald Hurch in a description of his enlisted men who ventured into Egypt and the Sudan.81

Like their colonial predecessors, British wartime soldiers grounded their confidence in rearing Egypt to maturity in their ability to analyze and comprehend their culture. Herbert Aubrey, a British intelligence officer with colonial travel experience assigned to Egypt in 1914, remarks “The Egyptian has always seemed to me harder to understand than his neighbours. It may be because there is less in him to understand. The Greeks, Turks, and Arabs have all got very salient characteristic qualities, but though the characteristics of the Egyptians are probably as strongly marked, they are less conspicuous to the foreigner's eye.”82 Aubrey is confident his ability to study the Orient here gives him an edge in his ability to help rule it. He is careful to avoid regional generalizing though, attentive that knowledge of the perceived specifics of Egyptian culture must be emphasized. Serjeant-Major echoes this value, praising one of his commanders for “that much rarer, though also essentially British [quality], that of being able … to realise the fundamental divergences of character and temperament between the various coloured races, and to adopt his methods accordingly.”83 For Serjeant-Major “a true estimation of [the Egyptian’s] peculiar racial qualities depends all our success in governing him both in the present time of war and hereafter.”84

While the British certainly used violence- both on an institutional level and individual level- to control and orient Egyptians in preferred directions, there is ample reason to believe that ANZACs were more excessive in their application of violence on Egyptians. Many British soldiers on the other hand valued restraint. “The most disastrous mistake we could well make would be to attempt to rule [the Egyptian] mainly by the rod;” avers Serjeant-Major, “not because he does not sometimes deserve… the cane of his British overseer, but because he is … in the main, incapable of profiting in the right way
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by physical punishment.” A continued openness to measures of control alternative to blunt force persisted among the new British arrivals to Egypt.

2.5. Imperial Ideology in Australasia

It cannot be said that the Australasian dominions were anti-imperial, or opposed to the projection of British imperial power, per se. This is especially untrue about the ANZAC military recruits themselves, most who had joined up in a patriotic passion to defend the British metropole against perceived German aggression. But it would be equally untrue to argue that the ANZACs envisioned British imperialism the same way as the metropole did. A history of easy victories in colonial wars against the Aborigines robbed the Australians of their wariness towards the limits of brute force subjugation. Yet at the same time, they were considerably less confident about the sturdiness of their own national character, and more paranoid about the subversion of their nation by the racial and cultural ‘pollution’ of non-whites. Neither of these sentiments was conducive to an ethic, or even pretense, of paternalistic stewardship.

In Australasia, support for British imperial power was largely rooted in existential geopolitical anxieties. Both dominions had small populations, little military capacity, and an intense white supremacist ideology. Australia especially was incredibly fearful of annexation by a nearby Asian power. After the Japanese victory over a European power in 1905 and its muscular foreign policy afterwards, these anxieties intensified. The outside chance of a Japanese conquest threatened a deeply racist Australian population to the point of paranoia. Thus to the Australians the British Empire was a valuable bulwark that deserved enormous respect, for they relied on it to protect them against outside forces. Thus to Australians, the chief value of the British Empire’s projection of power was rooted
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in domestic security concerns, rather than in an outward looking ideology of expansion, and especially not in a globe-ranging civilizing mission. In such circumstances it is easy to see why Australians’ faith in conventional force as the chief fount of imperial stability took root.

Additionally, neither Australasian dominion had a history of dealing with an assertive or resistant non-white colonized people. While the Maori certainly qualified as such, New Zealand society reimagined the Maori as ‘white’ in order to dispel the uncomfortable position of having to cope with the existence a powerful non-white domestic constituency. But the Australian Aborigines lacked the requisite social institutions, numbers, or military power to format effective resistance or wring concessions from their colonizers. Given such an imperial political milieu, where colonial power was so much more lopsidedly dominant than in the bulk of Britain’s colonies, it is easy to see how the ANZACs would be far less concerned with the opinions and concerns of a subject non-white people.

While the Australasians did not fear physical resistance from their colonized people, they feared cultural and racial ‘pollution’ from non-whites with a significantly more acute intensity. Particularly concerning was the prospect of Asian immigration. During the Victoria Gold Rush of the 1850s tens of thousands of Japanese and Chinese migrants were attracted to Australia. Accordingly, the pre-Federation Australian states, and later New Zealand as well, instituted a series of immigration law reforms that made it difficult to impossible for non-white immigrants to enter Australasia.

These anxieties towards non-white immigration were accentuated by the fact that the Australians placed more value on the goal of social egalitarianism than Britons. While Britons were comfortable with ideas of hierarchical class structure, Australians eschewed
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these ideas in favour of social egalitarianism and a fetishization of the working class.\textsuperscript{90} Yet, this was a working class that was loathe to associate or stand in solidarity with non-whites or imagine them as co-heirs the victories of the turn-of-the-century’s powerful labour movement.\textsuperscript{91} Therefore, in a nation that fetishized social egalitarianism while simultaneously vigorously advocating white supremacy, non-whites had little place in the Australian polity.\textsuperscript{92} A similar sentiment manifested in New Zealand as well.\textsuperscript{93}

These anxieties about being culturally subsumed by non-whites were not only economic, but socio-cultural as well. In his monograph \textit{Writing the Colonial Adventure}, Robert Dixon suggests that Australian literature in this period was particularly concerned about whiteness because Australians were paranoid about their nation becoming conceived as ‘black’ as they began to develop a new identity apart from Britain. Dixon notes the popularity of a particular subgenre of adventure fiction in 1890s Australia. In these books a hybrid white-black civilization is generally discovered by the adventuring protagonists. The confused identity and racial decay of the hybrid civilization jars the protagonists, and presumably the audience as well. Accordingly, these stories posit an object lesson to maintain a paranoid vigilance against the seductions of collaboration with non-white elements and reject any measure of racial syncretism.\textsuperscript{94} For the young ANZAC soldiers of the 1910s, the literary shadow of this 1890s boys’ genre was likely present. And notions that non-white Egyptians were imperial brethren would have likely seemed a temptation this genre criticized sharply. Stressing their difference would be judged as all the more important.

Australian internal imperial ethos reflected this ideology. It was one focused on exclusion, rather than domineering integration. Dominion policy focused on minimizing
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Australian whites’ exposure to Aborigines by isolating them on rural reserves. It also
discursively reimagined Aborigines as a ‘dying civilization’, the existence of which was
only temporary; thus the dominion could be assured that no long-term plans were needed
to integrate the Aborigines.\textsuperscript{95} The idea that non-whites could someday come to attain and
deserve the same privileges as whites, even at a distant future date, was not manifest in
the Australasian imperial imagination. That the ANZACs would eschew the paternalistic
rhetoric of British colonial officials in Egypt thus cannot be surprising.

\section*{2.6. ANZAC Imperial Ideology in Egypt}

The ANZACs were thus more reluctant to flaunt paternalistic rhetoric with the same
intensity of the Britons. They believed their inherent superiority to non-whites ought to be
stressed, rather than de-emphasized. Responding to critiques that the ANZACs were
disorderly in the aftermath of the Good Friday Riot, particularly from the chief Australian
war correspondent Charles Bean, the Australian gunner F.E. Westbrook wrote a poem
protesting the harshness of the criticism that was widely circulated. Westbrook argues that
“We’re not out to fight the devil / In a new Salvation stunt/ To reform the Arabs morals / While we’re waiting for the front.”\textsuperscript{96} To Westbrook, and likely many of his fans as well,
administering security in Egypt appeared to be little more than a distraction from the ‘real’
war. He imagines Egyptian morality as something inert, unworthy of imperial attention to
change.

When the ANZACs do express a positive portrayal of British imperialism in Egypt,
and their role in it, it is not the civilizing mission or paternalistic rhetoric they celebrate, but
narratives of unnuanced domination. “There were we, a mere handful (but a superior race)
in a city of nearly a million people of dozens of races and even creeds, all kept in their
proper place by the benevolent might of Britain,” boasts the New Zealand lieutenant Colvin
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The newly arrived Australian ambulanceman Harry Baily expresses this domination narrative even more explicitly, remarking “We must treat Egyptians and Arabs as niggers or they [sic] think they are better than us.” In many of these ANZAC accounts of encounters of empire there exists little attention to justifying rule over the Egyptians with the slightest measure of benevolent rhetoric.

In the efforts to sustain domination, the ANZACs seemed to fetishize conventional force and violence, rather than control through modern panoptical social architecture. “The following story told of Sir William Macgregor... shows the way of Britishers in governing native races,” Knyvett assures his readers “Sir William... had with him two white men and twelve native police. He strode into the centre of these blood-thirsting savages, grasped the chief by the scruff of the neck, kicked him around the circle of his warriors, demanded an immediate apology and the payment of a fine... the bluff worked, as it always does.”

For Knyvett, the dubious assertion that brute force was the most feasible method of controlling a subject population remained a truism.

Even Hogue, reputed as an objectivity-seeking writer with a history of defending Turks from spurious rumours, seems to agree with the sentiment. According to Hogue “there is not the slightest doubt that the presence of 50,000 Colonial troops had a wonderfully steadying effect on the disaffected natives. They suddenly became loyal again. All talk of sedition ceased. The best-laid schemes of the German plotters went ‘agley.’” To Hogue, blunt projection of power had succeeded where colonial politicking had failed.
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In his regimental history, the New Zealand lieutenant-colonel Charles Powles reflects a similar faith in these displays of military might at stabilization. Describing a march of ANZACs through Cairo on December of 1914, Powles confidently avers that “there is no doubt it succeeded in its object and staved off the revolt that even then was threatening. A similar display of force would probably have squashed the revolt that broke out in later years.”\(^\text{102}\) To Powles as well, displays of blunt strength are the key to keeping non-whites in line. In his mind, even the groundswell of popular protest in 1919 needed to be solved through displays of brute power, rather than through negotiated compromise or panoptical manipulation.

Paradoxically, many of the ANZACs seemed to think that their harsh domination rhetoric was not in danger of inciting Egyptian backlash. Writing a divisional history of the Australian 5\(^{\text{th}}\), Captain A.D. Ellis comes to the conclusion that “the royal air of affable superiority which was assumed as naturally by the Australian private as it was accepted without question by the Egyptian natives.”\(^\text{103}\) Another Australian captain, William Cull, even goes so far to opine “Really I think cruelty is the only thing they [Egyptians] will respond to: extraordinary beings.”\(^\text{104}\) The ANZACs’ confidence in the power of force and the needlessness of restraint was indeed acute.

### 2.7. ANZAC Imperial Practice in Egypt

This disengagement with imperial stewardship and even the pretense of a civilizing mission engendered a markedly more violent and uncaring attitude toward Egyptians on the part of the ANZACs. Kicking, mockery, and acts of outright sadism were all too common tropes of ANZAC-Egyptian interaction.\(^\text{105}\)
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Abusive pranks and spectacles of violence were among the most frequent triggers of ANZAC amusement at Egyptians. This is apparent from some of the earliest ANZAC-Egyptian interactions. Before disembarking from their ships docked on the Canal, many report enjoying bidding the Egyptians to perform the arduous tasking of diving for coins thrown down by bored ANZACs. Sometimes the coins would even be burnt to further the ANZACs’ amusement. “As soon as we pulled in, thousands of niggers came up to the side of the boat singing out ‘Bucksheesh’, [tip] so we put some pennies in the fire and throw them down. We had some great fun watching those niggers catching the hot pennies then yelling out, when they found they burnt,” happily recounts the Australian gunner Kenneth Day.\(^\text{106}\)

These spectacles were often frowned upon by Egyptian police, who sought to violently break up the affairs. This violence further amused many ANZACs: “The children would hold out their hands for money, and each time a coin was thrown, there would be a general scramble. Then the police would come along and chase them away, hitting them with their canes. It was a very amusing scene,” recounts the Australian private Percy Smythe.\(^\text{107}\) Such circumstances likely did little to prevent antipathy towards outside imperialism from increasing among the Egyptian actors involved.

The cane was a staple of the ANZAC arsenal in Egypt. “The native children are thick and awful pests, so much so that nearly all the men have bought canes of their own accord,” remarks the bookish Australian lieutenant Alan Henderson.\(^\text{108}\) These canes could prove tools for eliciting entertainment at the Egyptians’ expense. When the Australian sapper Thomas Drane and his friends were approached by a peanut hawker on Ghezra (Zamalek) he expresses disdain at the hawker’s product: “no doubt they looked very unwholesome, so thought Cookie for he gave the [peanut] pile a crack with his stick and knocked them in all directions much to the dismay of the native crowd, then he cracked


the native across the seat with his cane. Oh what a rumpus there was, we cleared laughing at the incident."¹⁰⁹

What is striking about reviewing archival material on the ANZACs’ interactions with the Egyptians is not only the frequency of these tales, but the casual celebratory tone in which these incidents are described. Casual abuses of Egyptians for slight offenses (or none at all), are not primarily seen as a form of political control or instructive discipline, but merely as entertaining distractions.

Amidst these plentiful tales of gleeful abuse, only a single ANZAC voice in the primary sources I examined raised any sort of moral objection. The Australian private Langford Colley-Priest decries a fellow Australian’s assault on a child hawker before concluding “There is no need to treat the natives like dogs.”¹¹⁰

2.8. Tensions of Imperial Ideology

The tension between these conflicting imperial ideologies do not feature as the most significant flashpoints of antipathy between British and ANZAC soldiers in wartime Egypt. The bulk of the existing literature focuses on the more pronounced tensions between Britons and ANZACs on disagreements over military discipline and officers’ authority.¹¹¹ Yet this disagreement over imperial ideology did not go completely unnoticed either.

Reginald Campbell has an interesting biography that gave him a unique perspective on tensions of empire. Born in Scotland, he spent a large chunk of his young adult life in Australasia, serving as a journalist for both Australian and New Zealand

papers. He later returned to Britain. During the First World War he found himself deployed to Egypt for his military service, where he once again had the opportunity to interact with Australasians. He commemorated these experiences by penning the novel *The Kangaroo Marines*, which largely lionizes the Australian soldiers he served alongside in Egypt. Yet in it Campbell was not above spelling out problems in the Australians’ imperial conduct. In one scene he explores the tensions between official colonial ideology, advocated for by an Anglophile Australian officer, and the attitudes of more stereotypically Australian ‘bushmen’ recruits.

"Look here, men," said Colonel Killem, "I want to talk to you about some interesting things, especially your conduct towards Mohammedans. First of all, Doolan, tell me what a Mohammedan means?"

"Sure, sir, it manes a nigger who jabbers 'Allah' when yis put a bayonet in his guts."

"Not exactly… what would you shout if you got a bayonet in the tummy… a Mohammedan's a sort of eastern fanatic who thinks he'll get a 'corner lot' in Paradise if he reads the Koran and dies on the edge of your bayonets… Now, men, these Mohammedans are very touchy. You've got to be careful how you treat them. For example, their headgear is sacred. Don't touch it."

What we witness in this passage is a fundamental disagreement over the nature of imperial rule. The Anglophile Killem tows the line regarding the traditional colonial ethos; he expresses an interest in learning about local culture for the purpose of best preserving order. In stark contrast, Doolan—portrayed by Campbell as a more ‘authentic Australian’—expresses a more disinterested, crude, and violent sentiment towards a subject population that the Empire is interested in keeping docile.

Many of the British wartime sources posit complaints regarding the behaviour of the ANZACs, and the image they presented of the Empire. The British chaplain H. M. E. Price expresses concern at Australian relations with the Egyptians: “the [Greek?]
Christians here have a way of inciting the Australians... they treat our men to Arrack - a strong liquor, and then work them up against the other [Egyptian] people. This easily leads to a brawl and firearms too readily come out,” he laments, “Capt. Wilkinson says that on a whole the conduct of the men here has been quite good but I take it that he thinks they have been here long enough.” Price’s primary worry appears to be over disorderly conduct more broadly, rather than particular concern over Egyptians’ well-being. Nonetheless he realizes that abuses of Egyptians are a consequence of disorder, and disavows their abusers.

The British trooper A.W. Bradbury more explicitly connects ANZAC misbehaviour to Egyptian dissatisfaction. His diary notes that Australians’ “relations with the native population [of Egypt] were often strained, whereas this was not the case to any great extent with British troops.” Like with Price, these sentiments seem to mainly stem from concerns over discipline and stability rather than concerns for Egyptian welfare.

Captain George Johnstone, a competent Arabic speaker with experience in Egypt, indicates a belief that the reverence and awe for Imperial soldiers waned since the beginning of the war, a fact which he credits to the Australians. “Pre-war [Egyptian hawkers] would have thought twice before approaching a British Tommy unless he were drunk; but now Australians had consorted with them and the New [British] Army had followed their example,” he bemoans “so that by 1916 there was very little respect left for the English soldiers.” Kitchener’s alleged to have said in the consequence of the behaviour of the troops “the British Raj had been trailed in the mud and his twenty ears’ work of civilizing the Egyptians had been wiped out.” While Johnstone does not specify what he means by “consorting,” the picture that emerges from the ANZAC accounts is one of habitual abusiveness. In Johnstone’s view, the ANZACs had degraded the image of the

---

114 Private Papers of Right Reverend HME Price, Documents 12971, Imperial War Museum Archive, London.
115 Private Papers of AW Bradbury, Documents 7356, Imperial War Museum Archive, London.
117 Ibid.
white colonizer. The white colonizer was no longer a paternal figure demonstrating exemplary behaviour, which undermined popular faith in the ‘proper’ imperial hierarchy.

Yet despite these grumblings by Britons, the was relatively little appetite among imperial military officials to discipline the ANZACs involved in unsanctioned violence against Egyptians. Practical obstacles- like the limitation of wartime resources and the difficulty in convincing ANZACs to testify against each other- certainly mattered. But, as historian Bill Schwarz points out in The White Man’s World, metropolitan Britons were sensitive to settler societies’ “incessant boast that they alone knew the native... [and therefore the] obligations [of] a white man.” To many Britons, who did not want to be seen as “effete pen-pushers of Whitehall,” that were betraying their race to the interests of non-whites, a certain leeway was often provided for settler societies’ during these types of racial collisions.

2.9. Conclusion

The British had worked hard (at least in their self-perceived view), to ensure the ‘child’ colony of Egypt was given the best of the Empire’s benefits. The British tended to believe their influence in the realms of Egyptian education, law, and economy was the best for the Egyptians and would ultimately be appreciated in the long run; they imagined a future Egyptian state willingly subservient to British-style modernization and Whitehall’s geostrategic concerns. They wished to eventually depend more on willing subservience than brute force in directing Egyptian policies and society in favourable directions.

However, concerns of wartime strategy demanded the influx of many soldiers from elsewhere in the Empire that had developed a different ideology of imperialism. The hundred thousand plus ANZACs to enter Egypt during the First World War espoused a similar attitude toward Anglo-Saxon racial and cultural superiority. But they believed that this superiority ought to be marked with efforts to exclude and ignore non-whites, rather
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than rule and uplift them. Paternalism towards non-whites inhabiting a land that seemed to have little to do with either their home or the Empire's metropole did not seem to penetrate the ANZACs' ideology. Thus they generated a dismissive attitude towards the Egyptians, one in which both sadism and ignorance were perfectly acceptable.

But these actions and attitudes were likely not perceived as such by the British or the Egyptians. ANZACs spoke like, looked like, and exercised authority like the Britons. It is quite likely these ANZAC abuses exacerbated antipathy towards the Empire in the minds of the Egyptians they encountered. And since the peace time garrison of British soldiers numbered only a few thousand, while the ANZACs numbered 103,000 at their height, the high visibility of the ANZACs would have likely had a significant impact on the image of the Empire in Egypt.\footnote{Mak, \textit{British}, 191, 179.} Patronizing paternalism was never popular with the Egyptian populace, but it seems probable it was more appreciated than unapologetic abusiveness.
Chapter 3. Diggers Shouting “Nigger!”: The Introduction of a Blackening Discourse to Egypt

Like many ANZACs stationed in Egypt during the First World War John Falconer opted to visit the Pyramids. While Falconer reports a pleasant time at the necropolis itself, his account of the tram ride there is far less complimentary: “The first mile or two is taken up with arguing and trying to convince about thirty niggers that you do not want a guide. The argument gets tiring in the end and eventually we had to kick a couple of them out of the tram or else pay their fare.”122

The influx of over 100,000 ANZACs into Egypt during the First World War led to an unprecedented level of interaction between Australasians and Egyptians.123 With their fierce dedication to Empire and their obvious physical and cultural similarities to Britons, these ANZACs would have played an increasingly important role as the visible ‘face’ of the British Empire in Egypt. It is unlikely this did the British Empire any service in the realm of local hearts and minds. That the relationship between the ANZACs and the local Egyptian populace was antagonistic is something well-established in the existing literature. So too is the role of racism in contributing to this antagonism.124

However, inadequate attention has been paid towards analyzing the impact of the specifics of the ANZACs’ discourse on race. They ignored the Britons’ distinction of Egyptians from sub-Saharan blacks. Instead the ANZACs affixed the Egyptians they met with monikers of blackness with remarkable frequency. This marked a significant shift in how the most visible agents of imperialism in Egypt racialized the local population.

This chapter aims to fill this void by examining the different ways in which ANZAC and British soldiers racialized Egyptians over the course of the First World War. Specifically, it explores how—unlike the vast majority of Britons—the newly arrived ANZACs imagined Egyptians as ‘blacks’ and routinely ascribed Egyptians with apposite monikers of such belief. This chapter will examine the reasons why the ANZACs opted to ascribe blackness on Egyptians with far more regularity than Britons, the circumstances these ascriptions appeared in, the manifestations they took, and finally consider the political consequences of this shift.

3.1. Race Discourse in Britain and Australasia

Race was a fundamentally important marker of identity in both Victorian British and Australasian imaginations. Whiteness marked superiority and civilization, blackness the inverse. However British and Australasian conceptions of race diverged significantly during the nineteenth century. Most Britons came to imagine racial hierarchy as a multi-tiered pyramid, while most white Australasians pictured race as a black-white binary.

In early 1900s Britain many scientific racists sought to overturn previous ambiguities about racial boundaries, and attempted to locate a hierarchy of clearly delineated categories. While the competing scientific racist models classified Middle Easterners differently (vigorous debate emerged over whether they were inferior or superior to Indians), British scientific racists nearly universally agreed that Middle Easterners were racially superior to sub-Saharan and inferior to Northern Europeans.125 Thus British academia would have tended to view Egyptians as somewhere in the middle in the hierarchy of races, distinct from both white and black in their quality. A robust museum culture and sensationalist tours helped perpetuate these scientific racist beliefs not only among the elite, but among many lower-class Britons as well.126 Thus Egyptians would be ultimately imagined as racially inferior, but capable of progress as well.

In the far flung corners of the South Pacific, away from the world’s cosmopolitan hubs, the same sort of exhibitionist culture could not exist. Even in 1914 the Australasians were still, to a certain extent, a frontier society and accordingly less attentive to cosmopolitan ideas like scientific racism. Instead intellectually cruder variants of racism prevailed, stemming more from a discourse of an us-versus-them conflict than a paternalistic collection fetish. This resulted in a far more binary view of race, with white Australasians routinely applying blackening monikers to non-whites of non-African extraction.127

Aborigines were the most frequent recipients of these labels. While Australian Aborigines generally had significantly lighter skin pigmentation than most people of sub-Saharan descent, Australia’s white settlers began referring to them as ‘black’ in the early days of colonization.128 It is difficult to ascertain exactly when this began. However, it is interesting to note that in many of the earliest encounters, some of the Aborigine pidgins that developed utilized the term ‘black’ in order to distinguish the Aborigine from the settler. Tiffany Shellam’s research on the King-Ya-nups’ encounters with the earliest British settlers on the Swan River records the development of such a pidgin.129 In linguistically pidgin encounters, the paramount importance of simplicity could have engendered binary definitions of race as colonists reached for the easiest verbal distinguisher from their whiteness.

With the onset of the Victoria Gold Rush in the 1850s the influx of fortune seekers from Japan and China ignited concern among white Australians. Asian immigrants eagerly tried to integrate into the settler economy, sparking competition. These developments were particularly alarming to Australia’s working class, who sought to denigrate this competing labour pool by affixing labels of blackness onto them. Working class publications like the Bulletin began to refer to Asians with the slur “nigger,” at this time, a
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rhetorical tactic meant to damage Asians’ racial reputation by associating them with the more discursively maligned sub-Saharan and Aborigines.\textsuperscript{130} Appeals to racial prejudice were key components of the labour movement’s ability to gain capitalist allies in their fight against the import of cheap non-white labour.\textsuperscript{131}

The result of this was that Australian conceptions of blackness came to be far more expansive than most Europeans’. Unlike their scientific racism-obsessed counterparts in Europe, Australians imagined a binary between “white” and “black,” rather than a complex hierarchy. While scholars like Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds note this discursive direction towards binarism was advancing in other parts of the ‘white’ world at the beginning of the twentieth century— including in Britain- they aver it was far more developed in Australasia.\textsuperscript{132}

New Zealand beliefs also reflected a similar preference as their Australian neighbors for the race binary, with the notable caveat of Maori exceptionalism. Unlike in Australia, the indigenous people of New Zealand retained a relatively cohesive and organized social structure after white settlement. Thus the Maori remained politically significant and were able to force white New Zealanders to integrate them into the social and political fabric of the dominion.\textsuperscript{133} New Zealanders, who sought to imagine their archipelago as a utopian haven for white civilization, coped with the continued presence of a robust indigenous population by mythologizing the Maori as a lost branch of the Caucasian race.\textsuperscript{134} Efforts by other whites, in either Britain or Australia, to insinuate that
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the Maori belonged on the ‘black’ layer of a race hierarchy were subsequently taken with great offense by white New Zealanders.\textsuperscript{135}

3.2. Bringing the Binary Abroad

By 1914, the populations of Australasia who were not white or Maori were scarce in number. Few previous opportunities to interact with non-whites would have existed for ANZACs; the vast bulk of whom would have been raised after the introduction of bans on the immigration of non-whites to Australasia. The few Aborigines who remained were restricted to rural reserves away from Australia’s largely urban population.\textsuperscript{136}

However, the eruption of the First World War served as an impetus to large scale encounters between Australasians and non-white populations. The routes to the fronts in Europe and Turkey led through ports populated by non-whites, such as Freetown, Colombo, and Aden. The ANZACs quickly affixed the populations here with blackening monikers and derision, in Asian ports as well as African ones.\textsuperscript{137} “Anchored [at] Port Aden, blackies came along with their wares. Natives [here] blacker than at C[olombo],” observes the Australian nurse Annie Bell during her transit.\textsuperscript{138} Yet it is not likely the ANZACs’ stays in these ports would have been sufficiently long to transform locals’ impression of Empire.

But in Egypt it was a different story. ANZAC forces operated in the country from 1914-1919, being involved with the Gallipoli Campaign, the Palestine Campaign, anti-Senussi operations, and Egyptian internal security. Generous leave, lavish salaries, and excellent transit infrastructure meant the ANZACs, especially those encamped in
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suburban Cairo, could spend significant amounts of their time touring the urban hub of Cairo. Likewise, Cairene entrepreneurs could access the ANZACs in their camps. Opportunities to interact with Egyptians thus abounded.

Once in Egypt, the ANZACs immediately began affixing the locals with descriptions of blackness. One Australian private Percy Smythe from the deck of a troopship upon entering the Suez Canal. The Australian military doctor John Nash’s first description of Suez similarly comments on Egyptians’ pigmentation. “The natives are black, of the Arab class. Nothing picturesque about them,” he surmises. The quickness of these labels indicate there was no learning curve or acculturation from previously established colonial occupiers. In every respect the discursive blackening of Egyptians reflected an impromptu response informed by racial attitudes formed in Australasia.

### 3.3. Black Slurs

ANZAC accounts abound with casual descriptions of the Egyptians as black. The ANZACs often affixed the adjective black onto an Egyptian's profession— for instance describing one as a “black waitress,” a “black guide,” or a “black policeman.” In some case the casual affixations of blackening labels are even in positive reports. Working with the Egyptian Labour Corps, one New Zealand war correspondent merrily notes that
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“The black and the white, Christian and Mohammedan, work cheerily together in the common cause!”

But blackening terminology in the ANZAC accounts occurred far more commonly in their negative descriptions of the Egyptians. While there is a peppering of miscellaneous black-themed slurs in the ANZAC accounts, including “black angels,” “black swine,” “darkies,” and “Crows,” by far the most common blackening moniker they marshalled against the Egyptians was the slur ‘nigger.’ While ‘native’ is a slightly more frequent moniker for Egyptians in the ANZAC sources I analyzed, the term nigger is nearly as ubiquitous, eclipsing other common monikers like Arab, fellaheen, Mohammedan, gippi, Gyppo, and even Egyptian in the frequency of its usage. Additionally, given the colloquial character of the word, it seems likely the slur would have been even more frequently emitted in spoken discourse than in written. Certainly the nigger slur seems to have operated as one of the most important monikers for Egyptians by the ANZACs.

It is also worth emphasizing the diversity and scope of the ANZACs who opted to use this moniker. The nigger slur was used pervasively by both New Zealanders and Australians, by both urbanites and farmers, by both officers and enlisted, and by soldiers from both working and middle class backgrounds.

The ANZACs quickly developed a very negative view of the Egyptian population. Many came to the conclusion that the local Egyptians posed threats to their purses, peace,
and hygiene. The nigger slur provided a ready avenue to express this discontent at these offenses, both perceived and real.

Australian soldiers were the best paid Entente soldiers, and New Zealanders too possessed impressive wealth relative to the local Egyptian population. This likely made them targets of Egyptian entrepreneurs for overcharging and fraudulent sales. Unfamiliar with Egyptian currencies or price schemes, many newly landed ANZACs believed they were often taken advantage of. As they became more familiar with Egypt, frustrations with this ensued. The nigger slur was often used to vent these frustrations. “The nigger canteen sold us [lemonade] for two and half pence... they are not philanthropists,” grumbles the New Zealand bombardier Roderick McCandish. His fellow New Zealand bombardier, Robert Scott, similarly complains about overcharging: “We got a guide and two donkeys but after we got started the nigger asked us to pay 3 [piasters] each for himself and donkey so we dismounted and told him to emshee [shoo]...the price he asked was fair robbery.”

Even when soldiers remained vigilant against incursions on their purses, they still found themselves frustrated by Egyptians. Beggars and entrepreneurs constantly tried to solicit funds from the ANZACs, who, accordingly, found this persistent solicitation aggravating. Consequently, many complaints using the nigger slur litter the ANZAC accounts against the “thousands of niggers with their infernal [cries of] ‘Baksenhi’.” Often this vituperation complemented violence: “We... then roamed around [Cairo], cracking the niggers with my cane to get them out of the way... The natives are selling things all over the place. They got on my nerves,” vents the Australian private John Noakes.

---
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The most frequent complaint regarding Egyptians to appear in the ANZAC sources, however, did not pertain to their commercial behavior, but to their hygiene. Blackening slurs are most often associated with reference to Egyptians’ supposed ‘filthiness.’ ANZACs took particular offense when they thought Egyptians’ proximity threatened their own cleanliness, and often responded with vituperation. “Woke up somewhere about this morning [on a train] by a nigger crawling all over me, mistook me for the carriage door mat I think. I knew it was a nigger by the beautiful perfume,” the alarmed New Zealand gunner Ralph Doughty writes wryly. “They thrive in filth… the nigger that touched my tunic with the tip of his finger would be due for pity – if I had a stick with me,” defensively complains the Australian lieutenant William Cull.154 During the Good Friday Riot, one New Zealand sapper blames the riot’s escalation on Egyptian police attempting to physically restrain the frenzied ANZACs, for “no Colonial will stand the touch of a nigger’s hand on his shoulder.”155 Visceral encounters with supposedly unhygienic Egyptians triggered disdain, which was expressed with blackening slurs, reinforcing the imagination of Egyptians as blacks.

3.4. A Dehumanizing Discourse

Given Victorian associations between blacks and animals, the blackening terminology allowed for a quick transition to dehumanizing Egyptians. ANZAC descriptions of Egyptians as blacks and Egyptians as animals often go hand in hand. The New Zealand chaplain Guy Thornton describes a set of Egyptian prostitutes he encounters as “black, painted, bedizened creatures.”156 The Australian private Ernest King channels images of black plumed birds to describe the Egyptians: “the Crows hang round and picks up bits of stuff out of the rubbish tins and dumps and that seems to be their main food,” he
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concludes.\textsuperscript{157} Similarly a character in a novel by a close ANZAC affiliate complains of Egyptians by saying “the black swine’s selling sherbet. He never wipes the glass slobbered over by dozens of dirty nigs!”\textsuperscript{158} Likewise Cull hatefully avers “the nigger... I think that they are most awful creatures... really I think cruelty is the only thing they will respond to: extraordinary beings.”\textsuperscript{159} While not all the ANZAC accounts that provide dehumanizing descriptions of Egyptians utilize blackening discourse, the association is common.

3.5. Black Denotation

Despite its ubiquity, the nigger slur deployed by the ANZACs never appears to deviate from its denotative meaning. ANZACs utilize the nigger slur as both a benign slang and as an intentional insult, but the literal blackness of the subjects it denotes never seems to be far from their minds.

At times ANZACs even use the term nigger as a simile to describe themselves. When obligated to perform harsh and degrading physical labour, ANZACs invoke comparisons to “niggers.”\textsuperscript{160} This indicates that the nigger slur represented a connotation for a particular type of behavior. In other cases however, these nigger similes are clearly used to invoke a physical comparison. For instance, the Australian private William Lycett records how “coal dust from stack near by [sic] made me as black as a nigger.”\textsuperscript{161} For the
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ANZACs, the nigger moniker operated not merely as an insult, but as a denotative descriptor for particular racial behavioral and physical aspects.

Indeed, the nigger moniker itself is deployed by ANZACs towards Egyptians that they did not seemingly have a conscious reason to denigrate. In a few cases, ANZAC soldiers even deploy the term nigger when actively complimenting Egyptians. "We got [our] horses clipped," writes the Australian corporal David Lindsay, "The Niggers were clipping them. I told them mine was an officers horse so they took especial care of him."162 The Australian officer Aubrey Wiltshire, upon being impressed with the rail service notes "The Egyptian State Railways is a splendid institution, admirably run, express trains are splendid, the clerks smart and the nigger engine drivers in their fezs as good as any."163 Similarly one New Zealand sapper applauds the wisdom of several Egyptian hawkers in avoiding their bomb throwing practice: “even the niggers, keen as they were to sell their oranges, wouldn’t come within one coo-ee of our mob when [we were] engaged in bomb-throwing operations. They knew a thing or two, did those niggers.”164

Despite the usage of blackening monikers in neutral and complimentary discourse, many ANZAC accounts acknowledge the implicit negativity of the blackness denotation. Attempts to associate blackening labels with the Maori were taken with particular offense by New Zealanders. “Our impression of [the native quarter of Alexandria] was not very good, and the niggers are not to be compared to the Maoris,” avers the New Zealand trooper Wilfred Fitchett.165 Indeed, one of the circulating rumors for the cause of the Good Friday Riot was that New Zealanders were offended when their Maori countrymen were “treated like niggers.”166

---
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3.6. Shades of Black

Despite this pervasive mental colouring of the Egyptians as black, glimpses in the sources do exist of people questioning the use of blackening labels for Egyptians. Occasional comparisons to other Africans led Australasians to recognize Arab-Egyptians’ comparatively lighter pigmentation. “The Nubians… are much blacker than the Arabs in colour,” admits the Australian officer’s wife Irene Read, a woman unafraid of ascribing Egyptians with the nigger epithet.  

Sometimes brown ascriptions are used instead. The Australian trooper Donald Black carefully parses the “pale yellowy brown [skin] of the Egyptian,” from the “white skin of Britons [and] the ebony black of Abyssinians.” Similarly the Australian journalist Sydney de Longhe notes “a passionate throng gathered outside the gates [of Cairo]… Brown, frantic faces closed in.”

But these ‘browning’ ascriptions are often used interchangeably with the blackening sort. Doughty reflects of himself, “today I had a look at myself in a mirror… [I] am as brown as a nigger.” The Australian private Henry Cicognani’s diary records seeing “men of all shades of blackness, gathered. There were coal black Soudanese, nut brown Arabians, & light brown Egyptians.” Cicognani, like Read, recognizes Egyptians’ blackness while simultaneously acknowledging the limitations of this description.

One New Zealand sapper even goes so far as to question the extent which Egyptians’ pigmentation actually qualifies them for a blackening label. When selecting from a line-up of rural prostitutes, the sapper observes: “some of them were real pretty; quite as modest, too, in their own way, as most white girls. Not that they were niggers

(except in name); the colour of a ripe peach would about fill the bill.” But even this memoirist realizes the difficulty in deviating from a dominant race discourse in which non-whites were automatically placed on the black pole of the race binary. Questioning this pervasive belief requires specific attention, the sort the sapper only establishes after being given a pressing reason to closely examine Egyptians’ bodies. The sapper however, like Read and de Longhe, opts to use blackening labels on Egyptians in other parts of his text, indicating this deviation was not truly meant to de-blacken Egyptians.

3.7. Receiving Designations of Blackness

This sharp disjunction between ANZAC and British racializations of Egyptians would be of little consequence if the Egyptians themselves greeted blackening monikers neutrally. But it is doubtful this was the case. Both Brugger’s First World War history and Mark Johnston’s Second World War history acknowledge the wide usage of the nigger epithet towards Egyptians by Australian soldiers, but make little issue of the word’s potential discursive impact. For in all likelihood, in addition to the negative connotations, the denotative meaning of blackening designations like ‘nigger’ would have agitated Egyptians as well. And with many dedicated Egyptian entrepreneurs opting to learn limited degrees of English to access the lucrative military market, it is likely the meaning of such a common moniker would have filtered into many Egyptians’ understanding.

In their book *Egypt, Islam, and the Arabs: The Search for Egyptian Nationhood 1900-1930*, Israel Gershoni and James Jankowski observe the tendency that Egyptian nationalists were preoccupied with differentiating themselves from Maghrebi and Asian Arabs. Indeed, they demonstrate that Egyptian nationalists went to great lengths to emphasize their distinction from the Orient and their cultural and racial similarities to the

---

Mediterranean (i.e. European) world. In the view of post-war Egyptian liberals, the best way to legitimize their country’s place at the table of civilized nations was to draw a line between themselves and the genuinely ‘backward’ nations. Therefore, rather than ignoring Western categories of racial hierarchies, Egyptian elites accepted them (for the most part) but also insisted on highlighting their own nationality’s closeness to the white world. While this tendency reached its height in the 1920s after independence, it was by no means absent prior to this period.

If Egyptian nationalists were dismissive towards other Arabs, attitudes towards sub-Saharan Africans were even more intensely negative. In A Different Shade of Colonialism, Eve Troutt-Powell puts forth a thorough argument showing how after the colonization of the Sudan in 1820, the Egyptian literary class persistently portrayed the dark-skinned Sudanese as an ‘Other’ to contrast themselves against. Egyptians used their domination over the Sudan to stress their credentials as a (implicitly white) colonizer. They believed this colonial authority strengthened their nation’s claim of having more in common with European civilization than with the discursively maligned African and Oriental worlds. For the most part Egyptian elites accepted European theories of race that placed lighter pigmentation on top and darker hues on the bottom. Troutt-Powell argues the idea of being equated with “Africa haunted politicized Egyptians… Nationalists fended off any identification with those who were more ‘properly’ the objects of European imperialism, and who were, in their minds, Africans.” Thus the terms ‘nigger’ and ‘black,’ if comprehended, would carry a particularly offensive punch to an elite Egyptian. To an Egyptian audience, being called a nigger was more than just being dubbed a foreign word with an insulting connotation. Rather, the term’s denotative meaning was part of a discourse that Africanized Egypt- threatening the country’s hope for autonomy. This pierced some of the Egyptian nationalists’ deepest anxieties.

Whether the ANZACs specifically were identified as having inflamed these passions remains uncertain. There exists no thorough scholarly examination of the
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perceptions of the ANZACs among Egyptians. But occasionally one can find a hint of these anxieties. Writing a history of the 1919 Revolution, the Egyptian nationalist Muhammad Sabri complains:

[Egypt] suffered at seeing herself treated with disdain and cruelty, like 'damn niggers' and gypsies by the innumerable and ignorant functionaries, filled with arrogance, that England had been sending to Egypt since the declaration of the protectorate [in 1914] and by the Tommies [British soldiers] who believed that Egypt was English and the natives were black men introduced to the country. Also, more than one Australian said that he would clean out the country, if he was permitted.\textsuperscript{180}

Sabri’s complaint clearly demonstrates frustration with the affixation of Egyptians with blackening designations. He places special blame on the wartime period for engendering this humiliation, mentioning the Australians specifically. And while there is little evidence Britons applied blackening monikers onto Egyptians with any sustained frequency (although they certainly ascribed the Gyppo slur), in Sabri’s mind the abuses of the Australians and Britons are fused. His anger with being blackened is not restrained to Australian targets alone, but applied to his British colonial overlords as well. This might indicate the ANZAC presence helped bolster anti-colonialist sentiments among certain Egyptians.

While there is ample evidence demonstrating that literate Egyptians were anxious about being perceived as black, the extent to which this anxiety occupied the illiterate classes remains more shrouded. Few ANZACs would have had the opportunity to interact with literate Egyptians, but engaged regularly with plenty of illiterate Egyptian hawkers, bootblacks, tram drivers, guides, and sex workers. It appears likely it is on these people that the ANZACs’ influence and impact would be most potent.

But Troutt-Powell does observe how elite Egyptian ideas about race could trickle down to popular discourse through art. She notes how a popular Egyptian actor, Ali al-Kassar, who acted in blackface, is repeatedly discriminated against by Egyptians within his plays, but never “insist[s] on his right to greater upward social mobility.”\textsuperscript{181} If the assumptions about race in these plays reflect typical audiences’ preconceptions, they
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would indicate that the ‘othering’ of blacks was found among a much wider strata of the populace.

These othering tendencies seemed to be well and alive in wartime Egypt as well. H. W. Hicks accounts in his diary a subaltern Egyptian’s disdain for being blackened by Australians. After having his fortune read underneath Khufu’s Pyramid, Hicks records questioning the guide:

It stuck me as rather strange that while telling my fortune he knew me for an Englishman, there are a lot of Australians here and I was wearing an Australian hat and uniform…. I asked him how he knew and his answer was really funny, he said , 'when I spik [sic] to the Australian he say ‘f- - - off you black b - - -’ but you listen to what I say and don’t swear at me.’ I roared laughing and he showed and excellent set of teeth in a grin, we both said ‘Saieda’ shook hands and I wended my way back to camp.182

The anti-Australian complaint of Hicks’ guide is short, but it deliberately emphasizes the ANZAC penchant for emitting a blackening discourse against Egyptians. It suggests that blackening designations would have apparently had an opportunity to sneak through the language barrier, and were not appreciated.

Brugger’s work on wartime Egypt concludes that the bulk of the Egyptian merchants interacting with the ANZACs did not comprehend English in any meaningful way, but did generally acquire a basic vocabulary sufficient for rudimentary commercial communication.183 However, one Australian private, Sam Norris, insists that Egyptians “had a large stock of Australian slang words and oaths. Perhaps in years to come some professor, wondering how they have acquired these, will decide that the Egyptians are really a lost tribe of Australian bushmen.”184 If Norris is correct in his observation about patterns of Egyptian English acquisition, it seems likely a ubiquitous slur like ‘nigger’ would be a probable candidate for translation, even if the term was peculiarly Australasian.
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It remains unclear to what extent the ANZACs realized how infuriating discursively blackening Egyptians might be. The ANZACs undoubtedly believed ‘blackness’ to be a negative attribute, and the nigger slur was usually meant as an insult. But it is unlikely more than a few would have understood how sharp a barb such language would be in Egypt’s particular nationalist milieu.

The only glimpse the sources provide of an Australasian awareness towards this comes from the 1922 novel *Old Desires*, written by the Australian Red Cross Volunteer Mabel Brookes. In it she portrays an affair between an English woman and an affluent Egyptian nationalist. Describing one of their encounters, Brookes notes how the English woman’s “paleness, her healthy skin and supple limbs intoxicated him… She was a thing of beauty, yet an affront to him, a constant reminder of his colour, which he hated, being appreciably darker than the average Egyptian, a heritage from a Nubian forbear that he would have gladly forgotten.”185 Brookes’ fiction integrates the observation that Egyptian nationalists could be anxious about being blackened, and wished to avoid association with their Africanness. While her civilian background is not like the typical Australasian sojourner to 1910s Egypt, her writing does imply that at least some Australasians came to be aware of Egypt’s peculiar racial anxieties.

### 3.8. Blackness in the Context of the 1919 Revolution

Egyptians had many reasons to complain about British imperial influence in their country, which was particularly potent after the occupation in 1882. Condescending micromanagement by colonial officials, tough budgetary regimens, preferential vocational and legal treatment for Europeans, an economy tailored to serve British interests before Egyptians’, and a lack of indigenous autonomy vexed the elite, efendiyya, proletariat, and fellaheen alike for the entire duration of British rule. Yet prior to the war- and even during-despite this persistently bubbling frustration of the colonized, few colonial officials felt Britain’s hegemony in Egypt was under any sort of popular threat. They viewed their
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accommodation to local customs, patronage of local elites, purported generosity, and the innate ‘docility’ of the Orient as sufficient dams against the upsetting of imperialism.

But between 1918 and 1919 unrest and popular revolt shook Egypt. Egyptian nationalists managed to utilize this unrest to make massive gains in their agenda. In capitulation to the unrest, Britain agreed to grant Egypt independence shortly after in 1922. While at the beginning of the war British imperialists feared Egypt might erupt in a pro-Ottoman revolt, these fears quickly abated when no such revolt materialized, returning to their pre-war confidence. Yet somewhere between this calm in 1914 and the chaos of 1919, something had changed in Egypt to make revolution possible in the minds of the citizenry.

Thus novelties of the wartime environment of 1914-1918 deserve particular attention in analyzing the 1919 Revolution. The experience of martial law, the wartime exactions of taxes and draft animals, and hopes unleashed by Woodrow Wilson’s discourse of self-determination have been demonstrated in the scholarship to have stimulated revolutionary intent among the populace. But on the whole, the vast array of the complexities of the war and its fallout remain understudied.

It is this vein of scholarship that this chapter has intended to contribute. One of the undeniable novelties of the war was the frequent application of blackening labels onto Egyptians. The ANZACs’ racialization of the Egyptians proved to be a sharp disjunction with previous race discourses of colonial agents. Of the ANZAC sources I examined, approximately two thirds of those featuring descriptions of Egyptians also include some

manner of blackening terminology regarding them. In contrast, of the dozens of British sources I examined only two accounts affixed Egyptians with labels of blackness. The heavily Australian-influenced captain A. M. McGrigor mentions a “black Arab servant” and O. W. Burnett refers to a Giza tomb guide as a “nigger.”¹⁹⁰ Neither uses a blackening label more than once. Besides these two isolated exceptions though, the blackening labels applied to Egyptians were exclusively Australasian in origin in the sources I examined.

From 1914-1919 the ANZACs operated as some of the most visible and vocal representatives of the imperial project in Egypt. And their vision of the Egyptian was black. In a milieu where Egyptians and Europeans alike shared the assumption that blackness invited colonialism, this could do little to assuage Egyptian nationalists from the notion that Britain had anything but long-term intrusive paternalism planned for their country’s political future.

If Egyptians as diverse as the Hicks’ guide and the effendi Sabri were aware and concerned about the ANZACs’ blackening discourse, it is not untoward to assume it contributed to anxieties about the temporal length of imperial rule in Egypt. Did the tramway workers who observed Falconer and his friends call their fellow Egyptians “niggers” and kick them off the train retain those memories when their union struck in 1919? It is certainly plausible that bitter memories of having their fellow countrymen maligned as blacks contributed to some individual Egyptians’ anxieties about the nature of Britain’s colonial designs.

Chapter 4. Dodging Denigration: Examining Exceptions to ANZAC Racism in Egypt

In a letter to the Shoalhaven News and South Coast District Advertiser, the Australian sergeant Robert Bice attempted to describe Egyptians to his domestic audience: “The natives are terrible rogues, and rob us right and left if we aren’t pretty shrewd. They are generally very dirty devils, as well as thieves, and they smell like polecats.” To evidence his point, Bice recounts how shortly after he first arrived in Egypt “a nigger rooked me by selling me two 1d sticks of chocolate for 9d. But we know better now. When thieving fails the natives try cadging, and they are so persistent that only a few good kicks will drive them away.”

The image Bice paints of the typical Egyptian is an undeniably antagonistic one, and racially charged. But it is also an image based on a particular set of experiences, with a particular set of Egyptians: poor and aggressive hawkers. Yet while these people easily fell into the category of the prototypical ‘nigger’ of Australasian imagination, not all of the non-whites the ANZACs encountered in Egypt fell so neatly into that category. The purpose of this chapter is to inject some nuance into this thesis’s earlier chapters by exploring the ways in which the ANZACs blurred the black-white binary in their imagination of non-whites in Egypt, in some situations coming to see them as more than just disparaged ‘niggers.’ This chapter will elucidate what factors led the ANZACs to posit alternative racializations of non-whites, focusing on three categories of non-whites in Egypt that largely escaped ANZAC denigration: (1) affluent Egyptians, (2) romanticized fellaheen, and (3) Indian soldiers.
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4.1. The Australasian Foundations of Prejudice

The sort of interaction most ANZACs had with the Egyptian public differed significantly from those of prior British travellers. Most Britons travelled to Egypt as either short-term pleasure tourists, or as long-term professional migrants. In the tourists’ case, interaction with the public was severely limited, mediated by a layer of protective guides.\textsuperscript{193} As for the numerous Anglo-Egyptian officers, bureaucrats, and businessmen that oversaw the administration of Egypt after the 1882 occupation, their community life was largely defined by a series of insular enclaves and social institutions that demarcated them from the Egyptian public, particularly the lower classes.\textsuperscript{194}

For most ANZACs this was not the case. At the time of the ANZACs’ arrival in Egypt, the British population in Egypt hovered between 4-5000, a number that was nowhere near large enough to socially absorb the ANZACs, whose numbers amounted to twenty times that.\textsuperscript{195} In turn, this meant that, other than the officers, the ANZACs had to turn elsewhere for diversions, which meant engaging in far more frequent patronage of lower-class Egyptian businesses, especially in the vibrant urban hub of Cairo.\textsuperscript{196}

Despite the ANZACs’ robust engagement with lower-class Cairenes, slums marked acute anxieties in Australasian imagination. In *The Imagined Slum: Newspaper Representation in Three Cities, 1870-1914*, Alan Mayne notes by the 1910s slum-clearing reforms had largely improved the living standards of Sydney’s working class, although the methods used to establish improved hygiene came at the expense of many working class livelihoods whose homes and businesses were obliterated to make room for this new reality by imperious upper class municipal officers.\textsuperscript{197} Turn-of-the-century Australia was
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wound up in these debates, with a print media that deliberately sensationalized the supposed danger and grossness of slums in order to improve their papers’ sales.\textsuperscript{198} Thus, anxieties about the dangers of the urban slum would be quite prominent in the minds of many departing ANZACs.

Cairo would be an apposite arena to experience these fears. While hygiene is to a certain extent a social construction that varies across societies, on several measures colonial Cairo’s poorly funded yet rapid urban sprawl had engendered problematic sanitary conditions. In \textit{Cairo: 1001 Years of the City Victorious} Janet Abu-Lughod describes how “regular trash collection was attempted from 1895 onward, but the system was primarily confined to newer sections of the city,” and how the city’s sewage system was first inaugurated only during the middle of the First World War.\textsuperscript{199} In comparison to Australasian cities like Sydney had already been subject to a great deal of slum clearing and sanitation infrastructure improvement by the 1910s, even in working class neighbourhoods.\textsuperscript{200} Or as, the Australian ambulanceman Langford Colley-Priest opines, “Sydney slums are palaces when compared with Old Cairo.”\textsuperscript{201}

These Australasian apprehensions about urban slums were augmented by fears about hygiene more generally. Australians, especially in the early twentieth-century, were known for being particularly attentive to the state of their hygiene, both on a personal and societal level. In her monograph \textit{Imperial Hygiene: A Critical History}, Alison Bashford examines how concerns about hygiene became interwoven with anxieties about race and preserving Australia’s whiteness. She argues “the pursuit (at many levels) of health, hygiene and cleanliness was one significant way in which the ‘whiteness’ of white Australia was imagined, as well as technically, legally and scientifically implemented: purity was the project of public health, as well as the project of nation.”\textsuperscript{202} Thus Australasian prejudices
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had the ANZACs well-prepared to imagine a dichotomy between the ‘clean white’ and ‘dirty nigger,’ a lens which would shape many of their interactions with Egyptians.

Nor was the supposed unhygienic nature of non-whites the only racial prejudice held by the ANZACs. While Brugger surmises it is unlikely that the ANZACs initially had any prejudices against Egyptians specifically, Australasian culture was deeply prejudicial against non-whites more generally. As the previous chapter has noted, the arriving ANZACs widely felt Egyptians should fall on the black pole of their imagined racial binary. Accordingly, the Egyptians inherited many of the prejudices that Australasians held toward non-whites.

In Australia the most common recipients of blackening monikers tended to be Aborigines. While few ANZACs likely had much actual contact with Aborigines, who were severely depopulated and strictly segregated by the early twentieth-century, they were educated with a deep reservoir of racial biases against Aborigines. Australians imagined Aborigines to be lazy, unhygienic, sexually perverse, and inclined towards theft and other forms of crime.

Even more central to Australasian Orientalism was the Asian ‘Other’, particularly the Japanese and Chinese. Unlike Aborigines, who were imagined to be a ‘dying race’ who would never pose a long-term threat to white civilization, Asians were imagined as being vibrant and numerous enough to pose a threat to the futures of Australia and New Zealand. Asian-Australians were generally othered as “unmanly, inherently servile coolies.” They were imagined as a people that had no civilizational or trade unionist aspirations and who would drag down white attempts in Australia and New Zealand to
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build a society that allowed a fair deal for the working man. They were also looked upon with suspicion, imagined to be carriers of diseases and having depraved sexual appetites that threatened white Australasian women. These are all tropes that ANZACs ascribe onto Egyptians during their wartime sojourn, suggesting many of these anti-Asian prejudices were indeed transferred.

While geography led the bulk of racial othering and prejudice in Australasia to be directed against Aborigines and East Asians, there is also evidence that many Australasians, were acquainted with European prejudices against the Middle East as well. The accounts of many ANZACs and their associates, particularly among the more educated, are peppered with Middle Eastern-centric Orientalist tropes like the “wily Arab,” the unknowable “Oriental mind,” the “fatalism of orientals,” and the East’s milieu of “seductive and sensual voluptuousness.” These imagined self-evident ‘truths’ about the nature of the Islamic Orient represented a congruency with a deeply ingrained discourse in Western literature. They helped pre-condition many ANZACs with a ready language of othering the Egyptians they encountered.

Altogether, these traditions of racism against non-whites left the Australasians departing for war well-prepared to think the worst of the non-whites they would meet. But the intensity of this antipathy would be unevenly distributed amongst the different segments of the non-white population in Egypt that they encountered. Lower-class urban
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Egyptians would bear the brunt, while antipathy towards affluent Egyptians, fellaheen, and Indian soldiers would be comparatively muted.

4.2. The Ambassadors of Egypt

When attempting to describe Egyptians in general, ANZAC opinion is almost universally negative. As previously noted, there was most definitely a racial component to these prejudices, which originated from a pre-war Australasian context. Yet ANZAC prejudices further developed over the course of the war, with negative stereotypes intensifying following interactions with most lower-class Egyptians.

By far the most common sort of interaction between the ANZACs and Egyptians during the First World War was the latter soliciting funds from the former. ANZAC wages were significantly higher than local wages, a discrepancy that was compounded by the ANZACs’ back wages from months of ocean travel. This earned many of them the moniker “six bob a day tourists,” with Australian wages far exceeding even their British counterparts.217 Accordingly, it is likely many Egyptians sought to extract finances from their country’s rich new guests.

Not all extraction methods were welcomed by the ANZACs. Complaints about tenacious begging and outright theft loom large in ANZAC accounts of Egypt: “[Egyptians] are the dirtiest creatures physically and morally you could meet anywhere, and the greatest of thieves. In fact thieving in Egypt is a profession with the natives, just like medicine, or astronomy in European countries,” concludes the Australian sergeant John Falconer.218 Alleged persistent begging could be taxing on the ears and emotions of disinterested ANZACs as well. “[A] class of native… are continually beg, beg begging socks, shirts, boots, in fact anything which one has or wears seems to be the thing which
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they would like to have. They pester the life out of one, no matter how you talk to them,” complains the frustrated Australian ambulance man James McKenzie.²¹⁹

Even more present than beggars and thieves in ANZAC complaints is the character of the hawker. Petty entrepreneurs, typically selling cheap food and souvenirs, were an omnipresent feature of the Egyptian landscape to the ANZACs, a ubiquity driven by the Egyptians’ vibrant initiative. “The native vendors of fruit and eggs were always a source of wonder. No matter where one might be, perhaps out in the desert twenty miles from any known habitation, as soon as a halt was called natives came running from all directions,” commentates one fascinated New Zealand officer.²²⁰

With such high financial stakes, it is unsurprising that many Egyptian entrepreneurs sought to maximize their profit from ANZAC purses. “The natives... will do anything for the dollars. They may have had souls once; but now they have sold them long ago,” criticises one New Zealand sapper.²²¹ Price-gouging was a common complaint against the Egyptian hawkers by the ANZACs. Ignorant of local prices and currencies, it seems likely many ANZACs were persuaded to pay above market value for many goods and services, experiences which later induced them to intensify their resentment toward the Egyptians as a whole.²²² “Every [native] person you meet has something to take you down with. The money here is a joke. We were robbed of our change. We did not understand, but the natives knew. We know now that we were robbed of 10s[hillings] out of every £ we spent,” grumbles the Australian sergeant Hector Hallam in a letter to a Victoria newspaper.²²³

Egyptian entrepreneurs’ purported assertiveness in their soliciting of goods and services also frustrated many ANZACs. “The most persistent of professionals were the bootblacks. You had to have your boots cleaned whether you liked it or not! Stop for a

---

²²¹ Anzac, Trail, 48.
²²² Brugger, Australians, 46-47.
moment to talk to a friend and there was a nigger on each foot, industriously brushing
away as if his life depended on it,” complains the irritated Australian intelligence officer
Reginald Knyvett.224

Close contact with the locals was also unwelcome by the ANZACs for another
reason: hygiene. Many ANZACs decried what, in their view, “appear[ed] to be the
prehistoric bias of the East against cleanliness.”225 They grew alarmed at the prospect of
close contact with a society they viewed as unhygienic. “We would be assailed by
anything-but-clean niggers, who would draw oranges and other fruit from inside their
shirts,” writes Knyvett, “We had been warned against eating anything in Egypt that could
not be skinned, and when we saw the niggers and where they kept their stock in trade we
knew the reason.”226 The Australian captain William Cull opines a similar unease about
approaching hawkers, averring that “the nigger that touched my tunic with the tip of his
finger would be due for pity – if I had a stick with me [because] the natives are detestable
filthy beasts.”227

The picture the ANZACs came to have of Egyptians was a people who were
impoverished, unscrupulous, greedy, obnoxious, and dirty, echoing many Australasian
pre-war stereotypes about non-whites. But because most ANZAC-Egyptian interactions
occurred in the realm of what the ANZACs viewed as overly high-pressure commerce, this
antagonism further intensifed. These unhappy commercial encounters would
subsequently come to colour the ANZACs’ perceptions of Egyptians more generally. Thus
when asked to imagine or describe an Egyptian, most Australasian veterans of
deployment in Egypt would echo Bice and paint a portrait of this unfavourable archetype.
But not all non-whites would provoke the same level of disdain.
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4.3. Affluent Egyptians

By far the most common type of Egyptian differentiated from this ‘nigger’ prototype was the affluent Egyptian. Throughout the war, the Egyptian notables and efendiyya alike came to occupy a different psychic space in the ANZACs’ racial imagination.

Class distinctions in Egypt generally fell into several categories, including the fellaheen (i.e. peasants), the urban lower-classes, the traditional merchant middle class, the landowning nobility, and the modern educated efendiyya class. The lion’s share of political power was concentrated in the hands of the landowning nobility, especially prior to the 1919 Revolution. This status quo was especially contested by the efendiyya. These modern professionals, white collar bureaucrats, and lettered men articulated themselves as a self-consciously ‘modern’ class that saw themselves as more progressive than the nobility, and were accordingly frustrated with their exclusion from the levers of power.228

This nobility-efendiyya delineation is mostly lost upon the ANZACs though. Australasia was rife with class conflict in the early twentieth century, particularly Australia. With its assertive working class, an awareness of class identity permeated popular attitudes.229 This fixation with discriminating class background helped shape how ANZACs perceived different classes of Egyptians, but these discriminations make little of the class divide between the nobility and efendiyya. However, the ANZACs’ discrimination between the lower-classes and the broader category of affluent Egyptians (or at least those that appeared to be affluent) is particularly frequent in ANZAC sources. “The better-class Egyptian frequents the cafes very much and can be seen sitting at little tables in the open air smoking their hubble-bubbles and playing backgammon,” notes the Australian private Sam Norris in a casual description of Cairenes.230 This sort of delineation can be seen from the beginning of the ANZACs’ arrival in some accounts. Upon docking at the Canal,

the Australian soldier Frederick Forrest records that the “native police are funny in the extreme, especially the way they control the lower classes.”

In the ANZACs’ delineation between lower-class and affluent Egyptians, the former receive significantly more disparaging commentary. Several sources even go so far as explicitly contrasting the quality of affluent Egyptians with lower-class Egyptians, usually in binary terms. One New Zealand sapper attests that “the Egyptian of the better class struck me as rather a fine fellow in a way. He was certainly intelligent, handsome as men go, and clean-run enough while on the right side of thirty.” He contrasts his positive description of affluent Egyptians against the “the lower-class natives [who] were just a cut above the poor devils of donkeys they exercised their cruelties on,” targeting complaints of misogyny, greed, and fraud at this class specifically.

Likewise, another sapper, the Australian Thomas Drane, expresses in his diary the importance of not pre-judging affluent Egyptians based on their poorer countrymen. “The children you see are a filthy looking crowd (of course I am speaking of the lower class of natives, for up to date I have had no chance to study the [affluent] Egyptians),” he clarifies. In a later entry, Drane records having the opportunity to fulfill that aspiration and meet members of the Egyptian upper class. While he provides little detail on these encounters, the overall result is positive. “[I] find them not quite so snobbish as ours,” he pleasantly concludes.

It is not only in their descriptions that the Australians demonstrate a preference for affluent Egyptians. They demonstrate this in their social interactions as well. While the ANZACs record few positive social interactions with Egyptians, a disproportionate number of these happen with affluent Egyptians. For instance, the Australian trooper Frederick Blake describes attending the wedding of a couple of well-to-do Egyptians, presumably
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efendiyya. In his review of the event, he attempts to delineate between the classes. “That higher class Egyptian is entirely Westernised in his mode of dress. My [largely disparaging] remarks in this Diary only applies to the lower cast of Egyptian,” he clarifies.235

An even more striking example of racism being mitigated by positive class prejudice lies in Cull’s letters. While Cull is amongst the most disparaging voices towards Egyptians, describing them as “detestable filthy beasts” and fantasizing about violence, he reports having a markedly cordial conversation with an Egyptian doctor.236 This doctor, allegedly both a son of Urabi Pasha and the husband of an Englishwoman, could claim impeccable efendiyya credentials, and likely a presentation more in line with Australasian hygienic expectations.237 Cull describes the doctor as “a fine chap and [he] speaks quite deacently [sic],” insinuating that he had “an interesting talk” about the Urabi Revolt, his acute malice towards Egyptians apparently forgotten during the conversation.238

One attribute that appeared to have impressed the ANZACs the most about affluent Egyptians, at least in comparison to lower-class Egyptians, was their hygiene. While most of the ANZACs’ experiences with Egyptians intensified the imagined dichotomy between the ‘dirty nigger’ and ‘clean white’, many interactions with affluent Egyptians subverted it. By appearing to take on habits the ANZACs viewed as hygienic, they managed to allay racial boundaries as well, opening up increased room for cordiality.

Indeed, many of the ANZACs’ explicit delineations between the Egyptian classes directly reference hygiene as a reason for discrimination. For instance, the Australian private Ernest King uses food hygiene to distinguish the Egyptian classes: “The Egyptians… hang round and picks up bits of stuff out of the rubbish tins and dumps and

237 Ibid; Ryzova, Age, 20, 184.
that seems to be their main food.\[239\] Yet he carefully appends “that is the poorer class, the better class Egyptians are much cleaner and dress better.\[240\]

Similarly, Colley-Priest draws attention to the differing quality of neighbourhood between lower-class and affluent Egyptians: “The stench in some places along these alleys [in Cairo] is very unpleasant, sanitary arrangements well, there are none… I can’t imagine how the natives live under these conditions.”\[241\] Yet he, like King, clarifies the class scope of such commentary: “of course this is the lower class of Arab, the refined Egyptian [sic] are really a very nice class of people, in some cases it is hard to tell whether they are French or Egyptians. They live in fine dwellings.”\[242\] For Colley-Priest, the affluent Egyptians’ mannerisms and neighbourhood hygiene not only makes them objects of compliment, but also literally confuses his power to distinguish them from whites.

### 4.4. Romanticized Fellaheen

Unlike most other industrial economies, colonial Australia was populated by urban dwellers diffusing into the countryside, rather than industrialization prompting rural dwellers to congregate in cities. During the 1800s, people generally immigrated first to the metropoles of Sydney and Melbourne, and then distributed themselves in the rural areas.\[243\] The consequence of this, is that the hinterlands became populated by more nationally confident old stock Australians, while the cities were disproportionately peopled by culturally confused immigrants. Thus, as the prominent Australian historian Russel Ward has argued, the values of the countryside came to be fetishized as ‘the

---


\[240\] Ibid.


\[242\] Ibid.

authentic Australia’, although this tendency did start to dissipate after the First World War.\textsuperscript{244}

Kate Murphy argues this rural fetishization was wound up with Australians’ deep racial anxieties. She argues that “Australia’s failure to fill its ‘empty spaces’ with sturdy white defenders of the race was frowned upon by imperial observers and constantly lamented in local thought from the late nineteenth century. This anxiety was exacerbated by the accelerating ‘drift’ of rural populations to the city after 1900.”\textsuperscript{245} Rural populations were seen as standing as the vanguard of preserving the nation’s very survival, and thus they were imbued with reverence by Australians as a whole.\textsuperscript{246}

In contrast, ‘the City’ was viewed with a skeptical eye. As Lionel Frost notes regarding early twentieth century Australia, “there was wide support for the physiocratic view that the only real wealth came from the soil and so the size of the capital cities was evidence of a distorted and unsound economy.”\textsuperscript{247} Moreover, because urban centers were the recipients of significantly more infrastructure investment than rural areas, many came to the conclusion “that the capital cities were parasites.”\textsuperscript{248}

Mostly restrained to barren desert camps like Mena and Tel el-Kebir during duty hours and attracted to the polluted urban landscape of Cairo during leave, most ANZACs were left with a poor impression of the Egyptian environment. The novelist John Cooper, the father of two ANZACs, exposes this tension when one of his character’s others himself against Cairo by emphasizing his ‘wholesome’ rural roots:

The novelty of [Cairo] may hold you for a time, but Australians want Australia. We men from the hills want the green lush of fern in the sassafras gullies. One minute’s sight of the stream flowing under Sawpit hardwood
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bridge, pegged together anyhow, would do me more good than an hour spent on the Karz bridge, with its lion statues, looking at the Nile.[249]

The flip side of this tendency of articulating criticisms of Egypt in anti-urban terms was that many ANZACs were relieved when given the opportunity to exit this milieu. Greenspace in the suburbs and farming villages on the Nile banks were a welcome relief from the harsh desert of the training camps and Cairo’s polluted urban landscape. Ion Idriess, a trooper from suburban Sydney, exemplifies this delight. “We have arrived at [the village of] Salhia. It looks [like] a little Eden in the desert. The ground all green under intense cultivation, a splendid grove of date-palms... and [it has] a picturesque population of Arabs, Egyptians, and Greeks” he exclaims.[250]

This relief at seeing greenery inclined many ANZACs towards a positive view of the local populations as well. The irrigation skills of the fellaheen in particular fascinated the bulk of ANZAC commentators on rural Egypt. “The country we passed through was very interesting, that is one thing that we must give the Egyptians credit for, & that is the marvelous [sic] way in which their land is irrigated,” remarks an impressed Colley-Priest.

Such a frame of mind left the ANZACs visiting the countryside in a frame of mind to romanticize the locals they came across into a noble savage mold. While not exactly an empowering discourse, it does contrast the tonal sharpness ANZACs had for urban Egypt. In a letter to the Goulburn Evening Penny Post the Australian private D. Lees disdainfully decries Cairo as the “most immoral place I have ever been,” yet demonstrates charmed fascination with rural Egypt. In the same letter he waxes delightfully on the topic of the “magnificent” countryside, expressing significant interest in the traditional modes of agricultural economy: “[The land] is worked in a most primitive fashion, an old wooden plough being drawn by two oxen, a great deal of the work also being done with hoes and spades [and] The men still wear the same long robe,” he writes.[252]
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While most ANZACs did not have the opportunity for extensive interaction with Egyptian fellahen in their villages, some did come to see the fellahen as more ‘authentic’ representations of the Egyptian nation. For instance, one lance-corporal from rural Tasmania asserts that “to understand something of the romantic life of the dwellers in this ancient land you must leave the cities with their artificial civilization and get away into the heart of the country.”

One New Zealand sapper’s memoir provides a particularly comprehensive account of an Egyptian village. The sapper recounts a Sunday excursion to the “village of Maarg… a typical Arabic-Egyptian settlement… quite unvisited by the troops.” He describes the excursion in relatively flattering terms, beginning with the environment: “it was all irrigated soil... a belt of land blooming with flowers, lush grass, and magnificent berseine crops,” but he extends this tone to interactions with the people as well. He recounts enjoying distributing candy to the locals in a respectful effort to impress, hails the village headman as an “affable old gentleman,” and relays amusement at his flirtations with Maarg women. Overall it is a curiously positive portrayal of Egyptian civilians, especially given the sapper’s unrestrained criticism of Cairenes and enthusiastic participation in the Good Friday Riot.

For many ANZAC commentators, romanticizing the fellahen created an illusion of timelessness. “With its old wooden plough, with two oxen (buffalo) and a few sheep and goats with donkeys and camels, and the flat roofed native village in the background, one fancies they [go] back 2,000 years,” comments one Queenslander. Another Australian, the sergeant Charles Laseron, echoes this sentiment, writing that the villages he saw “might have emerged from any period in the world’s history.”
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Exposure to rural Egypt reminded many ANZACs of a specific period though: a biblical timeframe. “In the villages… women…still carry water in earthenware pitchers on their heads, as they did in the old Biblical days. They have changed little in all these years,” opines the Australian gunner Wal McMullen. For the ANZACs, interactions with rural Egypt often invoked pleasant allusions to biblical figures of Egyptian residence like Joseph, Moses, and Jesus. “You discover a picturesque and quaint people,” writes a Tasmanian lance-corporal, “here the peasants sow and reap their crops in the same primitive way as they did in the days of Pharoah [sic], while the shepherds guard their flocks just as they were doing on that memorable night, nearly two thousand years ago, when the Prince of Peace was born.”

This tendency of viewing the fellaheen through a biblical lens created a semblance of familiarity and awe that might not otherwise exist. As John Pemble argues in The Mediterranean Passion: Victorians and Edwardians in the South, for travellers “so devoutly Christian and so deeply immersed in Scriptural lore Palestine and Egypt had a unique and sacred significance.” Accordingly, in these lands, “the way of life and the landscape were so reminiscent of Scripture that they stirred the deepest roots of a traveller’s remembrance.” This biblical lens in turn helped them romanticize and appreciate the people in these lands, whom they felt gave them a window into the sacred stories of the Bible.

It is likely that these same assertions could be made about the ANZACs as well, even if personal piety played a far bigger role among the affluent British Islanders that Pemble examines than it did for the Australian working class. For instance McKenzie expresses joy at having the opportunity to observe the “agricultural classes,” because “the more I see of the natives in there [sic] everyday life the more I can understand the scenes
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depicted in the Bible.\textsuperscript{266} The modern bustle and strangeness of Cairene hawkers might repulse the ANZAC, but encounters with a people made ‘familiar’ from countless Sunday school stories would engender curiosity and attentiveness.

ANZAC interactions with the fellaheen did not go exclusively well. Many villages off the beaten path did not have the same number of assertive hawkers as the military camps or Cairo, but they did have some. And complaints about fellaheen hygiene are almost as frequent as those targeted at other lower-class Egyptians. Yet nonetheless the environment, appearance, and economy of the fellaheen marked them as distinct enough to be racialized in far tamer and more romantic terms than the ANZACs’ typical urban Egyptian contacts.

4.5. Indian Soldiers

In marked contrast to the ANZACs’ mostly vitriolic commentaries regarding non-white civilian populations, their descriptions of the non-white Imperial soldiers they encountered in Egypt are generally either neutral or flattering. East Indians were the most common non-white foreign soldier in Egypt during the war. “At camp station is the camping ground for several regiment[s] of Indian Gurka, small of stature like unto a Japanese, terrible good fighters. Punjabis fine upstanding fellows,” commentates the New Zealand private John Donn, a man no stranger to deriding Egyptians.\textsuperscript{267} Only a single ANZAC source I viewed refers to Indian soldiers as “niggers,” despite the moniker’s liberal application not only to Egyptians, but Yemenis and Sri Lankans as well.\textsuperscript{268} Even in the few interactions with black Caribbean soldiers in Egypt, the ANZACs also displayed affable impressions.\textsuperscript{269} “It looked funny to see these fine bodied coloured men [from Jamaica], for they were black as coal, [swimming] in the water with us chaps, and it wasn’t very long
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before [we] were the best of friends,” writes the cautiously cordial Australian soldier W. Barry.  

The ANZACs remain aware of the Indian soldiers’ racial difference, but this awareness does not appear to manifest itself in either denigration or sour relationships. The ANZACs come to racialize the Indian soldiers in Egypt in a fashion in which the ‘othering’ is significantly mitigated. The factors that contribute to this mitigation appear to be (1) the civil reception of the ANZACs by the Indians, (2) the ANZACs’ good impression of the Indian soldiers’ hygiene, and (3) the Indians soldiers’ patriotic-imperial credentials.

The ANZACs, that reference Indians in Egypt, are almost universal in acknowledging their politeness. This warmth of Indian soldiers towards the ANZACs is even noticed by many particularly racist ANZACs, such as the Australian officers Aubrey Wiltshire and Reginald Knyvett, both whom gleefully celebrate abusing Egyptian and Sri Lankan bystanders. “Fine fellows Gurkhas and Sikhs most punctilious in saluting,” praises Wiltshire. “Met some of our lordly Sikhs from India, who were all smiles when they discovered we were Australians,” commentates Knyvett.

This unmarred cordiality from the Indians seems to have provoked affection on part of the ANZACs. As Phillip Schuller, war correspondent for The Age, reminisces about his arrival to Egypt, “Indian troops, Sikhs and Gurkhas... came running across the sand to the banks of the Canal, where they greeted us with cheers and cries, answered by the [Australian] troops.” The Australian sergeant Eric Clarke echoes this record of mutual affection: “The Indian Soldiers are very popular with our fellows & seem to me to be all gentlemen. Very civil & they all want to shake hands with you.” Yet in the very next
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sentence Clarke vaults into an unfavourable comparison to the Egyptian civilians, lamenting at how during his arrival at the Zeitoun rail station, he was “besieged with Arabs selling fruit etc, & all crying for 'Backsheesh'.”

For Clarke, the warm reception of the Indian soldiers engendered appreciation that directly contrasted his annoyance that he felt towards encounters of high-pressure commercial solicitation.

Another frequent complaint that the ANZACs had towards the Egyptians, was that they were, in their view, dirty and unhygienic. However, the ANZACs in Egypt do not apply these same criticisms in their descriptions of Indian soldiers. Many of the most prominent ‘martial’ races, like the Sikhs and Gurkhas, were known for a cultural fetish of cleanliness, something complemented by rigorous colonial military discipline.

The Australian officer Frank Weir records an incident where he sat on the court martial of an Indian gunner, accused of murdering his commanding officer in Asyut. While Weir readily sides with the prosecution based on the evidence, he does so reluctantly, remarking “These are fine looking men & it will be pity to have to Condemn to death such soldiers.” As the trial waxed on, Weir’s diary directly contrasts the Indians’ hygienic quality with the Egyptians, remarking that the “court [was] crowded with unwashed Natives [But] The INDIAN SIKHS are fine clean good looking Soldiers.” For Weir, the Indian soldiers’ standards of hygiene impressed him.

Many of the ANZACs’ accolades of Indian soldiers in Egypt appeared to stem from respect for the Indian soldiers’ military reputation. Describing some hospitalized Gurkhas, the New Zealand captain Edward Cox declares: “These men are splendidly trained and are excellent fighters, and being in touch with them personally… I have gained a very high opinion of them.” Even Cull echoes this military-based respect for the Indians: “I spent
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a long time talking to the Indian soldiers in the Citadel hospital: they are a fine body of men, men that have been fighting at the Dardanelles – Sihks,[sic] Ghurkas [sic] and Punjabas [sic],” he concludes.281

It is not only the Indians’ apparent military prowess that impresses the ANZACs, but also a sense of shared struggle. En route from the Canal to Cairo, the Australian private Wilfred Allsop recounts how at “each platform the Indian troops who were guarding the line were cheered and our men were singing from every carriage ‘Advance Australia Fair’, ‘Australia will be there’ & ‘Brothers in Arms are We.’”282 Allsop appears to convey being rather impressed at this show of respect demonstrated by the Indians. And while Allsop does not comment on it explicitly, the song titles that he mentions exhibit an attempt to imply an intention towards edifying comradery, on the part of the Indians.

We also see glimpses, in Australasian accounts, of an awareness that the Indians were involved in the same patriotic-imperial struggle as them. The ANZAC officer’s wife Florence Holloway records a particularly striking conversation with an Indian merchant in Cairo. “Lots of our Aust. boys are lying [at Gallipoli] dead,” she remarks to him.283 The merchant responds to her “in a very voice tone not to be forgotten. ‘Only Australians madam, only Australians?’”284 Holloway seems emotionally struck by the Indian merchant’s pathos, leading her to express explicit empathy with a man she comes to see as a co-suffering imperial brother. “The tradegy [sic] in his face & voice made me question – he has lost 7 sons,” she comments in her diary.285 The shared experience of being affiliated with the Entente military is something that appeared to help dampen racial barriers.

While it is true many Egyptians served in the Labour Corps with the ANZACs, particularly in Palestine, the ANZACs do not appear to have afforded these men the same sort of respect they do Indians. Egyptians who served on the frontlines generally did so in
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a context of menial support services, such as diggers and orderlies, niches that would not be given the same ‘manly’ reverence that the frontline combatants in the Indian Army received.

Combined, the perceived civility, hygiene, and military credentials of the Indians soldiers, were conducive to engendering cordial relations, and allowing the ANZACs to imagine them as something more than just ‘niggers.’ Even men like Donn, Knyvett, and Cull- some of the most vitriolic ANZACs in their commentary and in their treatment of Egyptians- express fondness for the Indian soldiers. ANZAC accounts appear to recognize, and dwell on, significant virtues that they perceive among the Indian soldiers. For so many parochial ANZACs, many from working class backgrounds, these would likely be some of the only positive interactions they would ever have with non-whites. Whether these experiences had any effect on their attitudes after, remains impossible to determine, but the account of the Australian private Herbert Reynolds offers a ray of hope in this direction. On an excursion to the Citadel, Reynolds mentions running into a group of Indian soldiers, who proceeded to give them a tour of their hospital. During “a good long talk,” to a pair of officers, including a college educated man “who spoke the English language equally as well as we ourselves,” Reynolds describes how “they spoke on many subjects, and gave us a great deal to think about over many things we have given little thought [sic] to. They both said much about our attitude towards their nationality in respect to the White Australia Policy.”

4.6. Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to expose the fact that despite having an overarching rubric of racial binarism, these categories still had an amount of flexibility. There was no conscious attempt by the ANZACs to re-racialize the three groups discussed here as ‘white’, and likely any attempt to suggest that these three groups ought to be allowed to immigrate to Australasia would likely be met with derision. Yet the race binary
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of Australasian imagination could indeed be massaged. While the most common types of encounter with Egyptians intensified ANZAC hostility and prejudice towards non-whites, this disdain could retreat if interactions happened outside of the realm of commerce or were perceived as less alien. The more attractive hygiene standards of affluent Egyptians paved the way for those classes to receive a far warmer reception by the ANZACs than their poorer countrymen. The ANZACs' imagination of the fellaheen as noble savage tropes and biblical set pieces transformed them into tame, approachable, interesting people so unlike the intimidating strangeness of Cairenes. And the shared military legacy of the Indian soldiers with the ANZACs garnered the former significant respect from the latter.
Chapter 5. Conclusion

On November 1, 1914, the SS Hororata departed the port of Albany in Western Australia. For many of the ANZACs aboard, the destination was still unknown. “We don’t know where we are going or what port. It may be Colombo, it may be round or to the Cape of Good Hope… Let’s hope it means Colombo and [then] Europe,” writes Lieutenant Alan Henderson.287 Tens of thousands of men from both Australia and New Zealand had signed up to protect the British Empire from the threat of a newly assertive Germany, but with both powers having colonial entanglements across the globe, the nature of the ANZACs’ service could take many possible forms. For most, like Henderson, the hope was clearly for fighting Germans on the Western Front. Yet the following day, Henderson records hearing word that Britain had declared war on the Ottoman Empire and poses his diary the query “Will it affect us?”288

It would of course. Henderson and over a hundred thousand of his fellow ANZACs would find themselves first diverted to Egypt. Many would stay there for several months as they prepared for Entente campaigns against the Ottomans at Gallipoli and Palestine. Through a series of unlikely historical coincidences, an opportunity for large-scale interaction between Egyptians and Australasians had abruptly manifested. It was not what most ANZACs wanted, but it would have dramatic effects on both their lives, and the lives of countless Egyptians as well.

This turn of events offers scholars a unique lens for examining a variety of racial and imperial themes in the context of the transnational British Empire in the early twentieth-century. The ANZACs brought with them a plethora of ideological baggage from Australasia that made their suitability for being the new ‘face’ of the British Empire in Egypt dubious. Many of the ANZACs conceptions of both imperialism and race would clash not only with the hopes and expectations of Egyptian civilians, but with the colonial ethos of many traditional British imperialists as well.
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While the haughty imperial British metropole deigned itself the uplifter of its non-whites subjects, the anxious and ever-fragile Australasian dominions merely wanted to keep themselves apart from the non-white world. Often the ideologies of racial paternalism and racial exclusionism get grouped together in the macro-category of ‘racism.’ Yet this discursive amalgamation obscures the substantial cleavages between these ideologies.

The ANZACs’ disinterest in paternalism helped reduce their inhibitions at using their imperial authority to engage in casual violence. The abuse of Egyptian civilians by ANZACs was widespread and was often triggered by the slightest of reasons. The enthusiasm on the ANZACs in the participation, justification, and cover up of the Good Friday Riot exemplifies this acceptance of casual violence.

This violence was frequently accompanied by vituperation. To make matters worse for British colonialists seeking an unfrustrated Egyptian populace, the ANZACs’ verbal abuse of Egyptians was augmented by their proclivity for ascribing Egyptians with blackening monikers. For Australasians, unlike their scientific racism-obsessed British counterparts, tended to construct race as a black-white binary rather than a complicated hierarchy. Thus, to the ANZACs, non-whites, including Egyptians, were simply ‘blacks’. Consequently, the ANZACs ascribed them with monikers of such belief, especially the nigger slur.

But for Egyptians, who conceived blackness as an invitation for perpetual colonialism, this would have been a horrifying prospect, and likely further undermined their faith in British assurances that the occupation was simply ‘temporary.’ Thus the ANZACs further undermined the interests of the British imperial project in Egypt, the architects of which hoped to assuage the Egyptian public’s frustration with colonialism by emphasizing the hope of an autonomous Egyptian future. A blackening discourse challenged this prospect.

Finally, this thesis has examined the ways in which ANZAC racism was unevenly applied to different sub-groups of Egyptians. For while both Australians and New Zealanders had developed a vast repertoire of racial biases against non-whites, Australasian Orientalism was chiefly preoccupied with analyzing people from the proximate Pacific Rim, rather than the Middle East. Accordingly, there was slightly more
flexibility in how Egyptians were imagined upon encounter. Indeed, the pre-war Australasian racial imagination also offered avenues for allaying some of the ANZACs’ worst racist impulses with some Egyptians. Because Australasians wedded ideas of white racial purity and hygiene, when the ANZACs observed affluent Egyptians who emulated modern Western hygiene standards they became far less vitriolic than they were with lower-class Egyptians. Likewise, the ANZACs’ anti-urban biases and fetishization of the biblical Middle East also pre-disposed them to stereotype Egyptian fellaheen in complimentary terms, at least in comparison to the attitudes they displayed toward most Cairenes.

Overall, the tale of this thesis tells is of a people with a radically different imperial education and radically different racial imagination thrust into a radically different social milieu than most traditional British colonialists would have experienced in Egypt. Under such circumstances, it should be anticipated that these new agents of Empire would forge new behavioral standards from previous colonial administrators.

What we see instead with the ANZACs’ entry into Egypt is a volatile cocktail of bravado, cultural insensitivity, and disregard for long-term colonial strategy. Accordingly, it should be unsurprising that the contact with these hundred thousand plus new faces of Empire might intensify Egyptian anti-colonialism, just like the robbed Shaykh from Palace Walk who came to curse not only Australia, but also wish “that [God] afflicts the English and their allies with a shocking defeat leaving them without a leg to stand on.”
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