“Like the swallows and the telegraph-wires”:[1] Road Safety in New Zealand, 1898–1930

ALEX TRAPEZNIK AND AUSTIN GEE

Abstract
Safety was a major concern for both motorists and other road users in the early decades of the twentieth century in New Zealand, as it was in many other countries. This article looks at road accidents, perceptions of reckless driving and the dangers posed to pedestrians, placing them in an international context. The response to the new dangers included a variety of safety campaigns, targeted particularly at children. The New Zealand experience closely matches the four traffic-safety paradigms identified by Peter Norton for the United States.

Concern for road safety was not new in early twentieth-century New Zealand, but it was given added urgency by the rapid adoption of motor vehicles. Motor cars in particular brought about a transformation that, according to the historian Bill Luckin, “involved a rewriting of the social relations of mobility and exerted a major impact on the distribution of spatial, economic and cultural power.”[2] This was reflected in the attitudes of road users towards one another. Many motorists thought pedestrians in particular should not be on roads, while for their part, pedestrians argued, initially at least, that “pleasure” motorists had no serious reason for being there either. Each blamed the other for making the roads unsafe; elements of wealth and class were clearly evident in the arguments adopted. Yet the problem of road safety was not seen as insoluble. Pedestrians could be educated to beware of cars and make their drivers’ task easier by keeping to footpaths and crossing roads only at designated points. Optimistically it was hoped that the testing of motorists would end dangerous driving, and licensing their vehicles would remove the cloak of anonymity for reckless drivers; when this failed to make an impact, harsher punishments for dangerous driving were expected to have a salutary effect. Compulsory third-party insurance was proposed as a way of making drivers take more responsibility for their actions.

The first private motor cars reached New Zealand only in the late 1890s, but the country rapidly made up for lost time. By 1925 there was on average one car for every 17 people; a decade later the ratio was one to 11.[3] This was not very far behind Australia, which had one car to every 13.8 people in 1925 and one to 7.5 by 1935.[4] The United States was nonetheless well ahead of everywhere else, with almost 90% of the world’s cars in 1924, equal to one car for every seven people.[5] By 1935 the United States had one car for every 5.6 people.[6] Canada came close,[7] while other wealthy countries such as France and Britain by the mid-1930s had car ownership ratios of 1:24.5 and 1:30.6 respectively; this was still well ahead of the world average of 1:66.[8] New Zealanders had a lower proportion of motorcycles to cars than was typical of European countries, about one to four by 1930, closer to the North American norm.[9]

The historiography of motoring in New Zealand has given little attention to the early concerns regarding road safety. The major works tend to concentrate on the cars themselves and what uses their owners made of them, rather than on wider social attitudes towards the danger they posed. John McCrystal’s *100 Years of Motoring in New Zealand*[10] is a good general

Journal of New Zealand Studies NS39 (2025), 26-43 https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.iNS39.9891

introduction to the social history, concentrating on the activities of automobile associations. The best survey of the history of transport in general is James Watson's *Links: A History of Transport and New Zealand Society*.[11] In general, the historiography shares to some extent the "love affair" depiction of American attitudes towards motor cars[12] that obscures the hostility seen, not least in the earlier decades, from non-motorists, which will be explored in this article. For the wider context of early motoring in New Zealand, in particular the roles of legislation and lobby groups, see our articles 'Furious drivers: Regulating New Zealand Motorists, 1900-1930'[13] and 'The Motoring Lobby in New Zealand, 1898–1930'.[14]

The New Zealand experience described here fits the transition from the first to the second of Peter Norton's four overlapping traffic-safety paradigms identified for the United States, "Safety First" (1900s-1920s) and "Control" (1920s–1960s).[15] In the first, motor vehicles were seen as inherently dangerous to more legitimate road users, who were generally seen as their innocent victims. The second paradigm is characterised by efforts to achieve safety through education, enforcement and improvements to the roads. Pedestrians were held responsible for ensuring their own safety; cars were no longer seen as inherently dangerous but rather their incompetent, careless or reckless drivers were.[16] The New Zealand experience follows this pattern quite closely. The press kept New Zealanders well informed about the progress of motoring in the United States, Britain and Australia, which primed local audiences to expect similar problems at home. For instance, accident statistics for major overseas cities were widely reported, along with examples of the road safety measures adopted there.

This article first looks at the dangers presented by motorised traffic on urban and rural roads. It considers the phenomenon of the "motor hog" and what it says about perceptions of motorists and of the social relations between them and other users of the roads. Not least were pedestrians, the subject of the following section. The dangers the elderly and children in particular were exposed to were a major road safety concern. From the end of the First World War there was growing alarm at the rapidly rising numbers of accident fatalities. This drove a variety of safety campaigns, which are examined in detail in the final section, in particular the indoctrination of children. Each of these subjects attracted extensive attention in the contemporary press, on which this article draws heavily.

1. Road Dangers

It was clear from early on that motor vehicles had added a new element of danger to daily life. Many commentators echoed the colonial premier's belief in 1902 that the motor car had come to stay.[17] Many, too, agreed with the leader of the opposition just a few years later that the "motor cars had become, through reckless driving, a dangerous nuisance".[18] Commenting on a collision between a car and a tram in Christchurch in 1904, *The Press* thought that, given the inevitable increase in the numbers of cars, "it is evident that roads will be utterly unsafe for ordinary foot or horse traffic unless these new conditions are dealt with in a practical way" by limiting speeds. "At whatever inconvenience to motorists, the safety of the public must be protected, for that is the first consideration."[19] As in Europe and North America, motor vehicles "provoked a disruption in the traditional uses of public space".[20] In New Zealand by 1906, "Sudden and horrible deaths [had] become matters of almost daily occurrence".[21] A quarter of a century later, matters seemed little better: the *Otago Daily Times* felt "All communities seem to have too passively acquiesced in the gradual introduction of a new menace to life and limb which might be likened to a Frankenstein monster out of control".[22]

By present-day standards these early cars were difficult to drive well, with inaccurate steering and very poor brakes, which were often on the rear wheels only; their drivers were often reluctant to change gear, and claimed that it was difficult and unsafe to maintain slow speeds.[23] Cars were especially dangerous in wet weather: asphalted surfaces were greasy, tyres were narrow and had little grip, and well into the 1920s many cars lacked windscreen wipers. As Mike Esbester and Jameson Wetmore have pointed out, "It is difficult to think of another technology that has … had such an impact on human life and death without having been intentionally designed to cause harm".[24]

2. Motor Hogs and Fiends

The recklessness of motorists was a source of complaint almost from the advent of motor cars in New Zealand. Hyperbole was characteristic, but reflects the fear engendered by the new development. As early as 1905, Wellington drivers were reported to be "racing" at "terrific speed", crossing intersections "like a flash" and threatening to dash pedestrians "to a pulp."[25] The lack of consideration for horses, frightened "by the sudden appearance of a loudly-snorting motor", led to "some degree of ill-feeling" between motorists and drivers of horse-drawn vehicles.[26] A series of narrowly averted collisions in 1905 meant at Forty Mile Bush in the Wairarapa "a feeling of terror has taken hold of the people; they dare not drive out either on business or pleasure for fear of meeting a motor … the motor man is generally regarded as a drunk or a maniac."[27] For its part, the horse "generally gives ample warning of what his views on motors are".[28]

From about 1905 the press came to be fascinated by the phenomenon of the motor hog. The original "road hogs" were cyclists, but the term was quickly applied to motorcyclists and to drivers of motor cars also. Most of the early reports of their "callous recklessness" and arrogant disregard for the safety of others were from overseas, and Britain in particular, but local examples of 'the hooligan type of motorist' were soon found.[29] They were said to take a "malevolent delight at seeing the "scatteration" which follows the toot of [their] horn" and were callously indifferent to the fate of those who failed to get out of their way.[30] Local authorities were primed to "keep a watchful eye on enthusiasts" lest their recklessness became "a menace to the safety of the people."[31] Much the same attitude had been taken towards "scorching" cyclists from the mid-1890s.[32]

These "motor fiends" were believed to represent only a small minority of motorists, and the concept helped reinforce the impression that most drivers were careful and responsible. "[N]ine out of every ten motorists were careful men. The tenth was a 'hog'", thought one delegate to the Farmers' Union Conference of 1908.[33] Motorists' organisations, which were formed throughout the country from 1903, were able to present themselves as the face of responsible motoring; the "hogs" were always non-members. Given "the present state of popular prejudice" in 1906, drivers were advised to avoid accidents "at all costs", not to "insist on [their] due and proper rights", and to make allowances for "foolish and incompetent" pedestrians and horse drivers.[34] By custom, pedestrians had unrestricted rights to the streets, and the responsibility fell to motorists to take precautions to avoid accidents, not those on foot. Yet Luckin has pointed out that in practice in large European cities the "informal etiquette of the road" that pedestrians must make efforts to avoid traffic long pre-dated the arrival of motor vehicles.[35]

Yet the impression was widespread from early on that "the motor man looks upon the road as his own private property — he has not the slightest consideration for other travellers".[36] The attitude on the part of vehicle drivers that pedestrians had less of a right to use the roads than they did has been traced in Britain to at least the 1860s.[37] John Christie, editor of the *Ashburton Guardian* and a persistent and severe critic of motorists, thought "motorists have too generally acted as though streets and roads and highways were theirs to use as they liked, and that all other people must use them on sufferance, and subject to the motorist's insane passion for speed and insolent indifference to the immemorial human rights and safety of his fellow creatures", a situation he found "humanly, morally, and legally wrong and intolerable".[38]

Reports from Britain and the United States prepared New Zealanders for the prospect of the heartless plutocrat on the highway. In England, reported the *Wanganui Chronicle*, "It was hoped that the respectable motorists would deter the disreputable ones by the force of their example, [but] The hope has been disappointed. Some of the worst offenders ride in the smartest and most expensive cars."[39] The nouveau riche were singled out, their sudden wealth having allegedly led to a decline in moral standards.[40] The most egregious instance of this was the reluctance of motorists to stop after an accident, what would by the mid-1920s be called a hit-and-run incident.[41] As early as 1906, "As a rule, more especially after dusk, the motorist, if he bumps up against or knocks a person over, is generally in a hurry to vanish, which doesn't give the police the slightest chance to recognise or identify the law-breakers."[42]

Though not the first fatality due to a motor vehicle,[43] the death of the wife of a senior civil servant, run over in central Wellington in December 1906, set off a particularly venomous correspondence in one local newspaper between motorists and those who feared they might become their victims. The editor concluded "The vigorous letters … clamouring for the suppression or the annihilation of motorists probably represent a long-nurtured hatred come to the point of boiling over … most people who do not drive motor-cars are tinctured more or less with a sentiment ranging from doubt and disapproval to positive hatred."[44] "[T]o the average person the reckless motorist is his Satanic Majesty incarnate", declared a rival Wellington newspaper.[45] Not to be outdone, the *Free Lance* declared the "motor bounder … a complete savage … he surges along, a very Juggernaut, careless apparently of what may happen. His hooting abomination exudes the vilest perfume, he usually observes no rule of the road, and he is a law unto himself … a bigger plague than scarlet fever, and not so easily eradicated."[46] When in Britain the Marquess of Queensberry asked whether he would be justified in carrying a revolver to protect himself from "the hooligan type of motorists", many New Zealanders were sympathetic.[47] Despite the violent rhetoric, there seem to have been no instances of physical assault on motorists who harmed pedestrians, in contrast to the United States.[48]

Without apparent regard for the law of libel, newspapers regularly labelled motorists who appeared before the courts as "motor fiends" or "motor hogs".[49] Resentment at their selfishness, carelessness and blatant display of wealth was thought to be encouraging the growth of socialism.[50] While social class was not often alluded to, it was an important factor in the public perception of motorists, as in Europe and North America.[51] *Truth* habitually referred to the arrogant owners of expensive cars as "the haw! motah drivahs".[52] When car ownership became more socially mixed in the 1920s, the pre-war years came to seem a golden age of good driving when only gentlemen could afford a motor car. "The motor owner of those days was a man who had attained a position of comparative wealth by long and strenuous

exertion; therefore he valued his possession … He also took it for granted that other motorists obtained their cars under the same conditions, and were in all respects gentlemen."[53] Though the histrionic language gradually subsided, the problem of dangerous driving continued to worsen.

3. Pedestrians

Pedestrians, it was frequently asserted, had as much right to use the streets as anyone else. Yet though they had the legal right to do so, motorists complained that they had no serious purpose being there, wandering aimlessly across the street or using it as an impromptu venue for conversations with friends. When urged to move on, pedestrians were inclined to become obstreperous or abusive. Such complaints had been made by cyclists in their turn. In 1900 cyclists complained that the pedestrian behaved as if the road belonged to him, "surpassing all other users of the road in his defiance. He will often just saunter off the kerb and defy anyone to run over him."[54] Motorists were unaccustomed to their demands not receiving prompt attention, and often seemed surprised that hooting at pedestrians only raised their hackles. One complained that on encountering a Salvation Army meeting in progress in the central square of Palmerston North, "Although I tooted the horn continuously and tried to get a passage through the crowd, not one of these street loafers, for they are nothing else, attempted to move until, forced by cramped space, I had to run the car straight at them. Then they moved, but with such injured looks that I wondered if the streets had been sold, and I was unaware that these individuals had purchased them."[55] By the mid-1920s motorists' attitudes, if anything, had hardened towards pedestrians asserting their right to use the road. Walkers obliged to use suburban roads because the footpaths were inadequate, "oblivious of the nuisance they cause", were said by the motoring organisations to be usurping the motorists' right-of-way.[56]

Even young women wearing fashionably short skirts could be singled out as disruptors of traffic: "Gentlemen pause, jay walkers turn their heads, motorists slacken speed, while the unconscious(?) cause of it all demurely crosses her legs in the tram and powders her little nose", while older women, "most critical judges, stop and turn and mutter something that sounds like 'brazen hussy.' … It gives you a headache, a drive through the city like this. No matter wherever you go, you see them. No matter how much you are on your guard, you are caught. No matter who you are, your mind is distracted. It's the same everywhere. The short skirts must go! Nothing else for it!" If they were banned, "jay walking sheiks won't suffer neck and eye strain … A chap like Mussolini would do the job in a minute."[57]

A frequent complaint of motorists was the unpredictability of pedestrians in the face of the danger posed by their vehicles. In 1904, a visiting expert Australian motorist referred to "the inexplicable stupidity of the average pedestrian when he finds a motor [cycle] about to confront him."[58] Motorists complained that the indecisiveness and unpredictability of pedestrians made them difficult to avoid: "Fair Play" thought "anyone with only the ordinary amount of commonsense must know that, once a pedestrian starts hesitating, and dodges both ways, the car or cycle must run into them … This senseless railing against the 'murderous' motor is usually by some old man or woman, possibly slightly deaf, with nerves, but certainly narrow-minded."[59]

The elderly, along with children, were seen to be the prime victims of careless drivers. With characteristic black humour, newspapers parodied drivers' attitudes: "Motorist: 'I don't mind

about grown up people and dogs, but do be careful about children and babies.' Chauffeur: 'Yes, them feeding-bottles do cut up the tyres dreadful".[60] "A Futurist" argued motorists were "rendering a service to humanity by getting rid of the surplus population," and that one day they "will be able to rush about without being hindered by the ridiculous pedestrian."[61] Not only were pedestrians frequently blamed for their own deaths, they were sometimes accused of having effectively committed suicide as a result of their own actions. Dunedin pedestrians in 1919 were accused of being "self-elected members of the Suicide Club".[62]

Most rural roads and many suburban streets lacked proper footpaths, obliging pedestrians to use the road. A lady was walking by the roadside in Masterton in 1918 when a "motor car load of 'road hog' gentlemen-type deliberately drove as near to her as possible to scare the life out of her. One of the occupants then turned round, grinned, and brayed out, 'Get on to the footpath!'"[63] Pedestrians were not even safe on the beaches. An eight-year-old boy was killed on New Brighton beach near Christchurch by a racing motorcyclist, William Rhodes-Moorhouse, in 1907. Five years later, having returned to England, he killed a man with his car. A pioneer aviator, Rhodes-Moorhouse applied his skills to killing Germans, becoming the first pilot to be awarded the Victoria Cross.[64]

Many school committees and residents' associations appealed to local councils and motorists' associations for help in reducing the danger to children from motorists. Warning signs were the usual response, though they had only limited effect.[65] Schoolboys at least enjoyed throwing stones at them.[66] One ambiguously worded sign in Petone, reading "Motorists Beware of Schoolchildren", "caused a good deal of amusement in motoring circles … What particular form of devilry the schoolchildren are hatching against motorists has yet to be determined."[67] In a few cases railings were installed outside school entrances to make it difficult for children to cross the road directly. At least one school considered moving its entrance entirely to avoid the new danger.[68] Others were tempted to take offensive action. "Some irate parents in Feilding, witnessing the risks their children run going to and coming from school, have been tempted to put up hurdles in the track of the road-hogs."[69] Some parents encouraged their offspring to take a stand against motorists arrogating the road for their own convenience. One Hawke's Bay motorist complained in 1927 that "frequently, out of pure cussedness, they stand in the middle of the road and won't shift … parents encourage the children, and … say, 'Don't move for him.'" His fellow motorists concurred: "Some adults are worse than children … it makes you feel inclined to teach them a lesson sometimes."[70] When in 1930 the Manawatu Automobile Association suggested that local schools change their lunch hour to avoid the busy time for traffic, one school committee asked why it should be their arrangements to "be altered for the convenience of motorists", and responded by suggesting the association instead advise its members to take more care when passing schools.[71]

Some parents complained that traffic had become so dangerous they were obliged to escort their children to school. In Wellington the situation was thought so serious by 1927 that the School Committees' Association suggested to the regional Education Board and the national Education Department that an accident insurance scheme be established for schoolchildren.[72] When this was discussed in parliament, Sir Thomas Mackenzie thought things were "coming to a pretty pass when children could not pass along the streets in safety."[73] Such an insurance scheme for pedestrians had been floated briefly the previous year. One of the large, lurid advertisement for the Pedestrian Protection Corporation was headed "Satan Drives With the

Dare-Devil" and showed the Prince of Darkness grinning malevolently as a car full of riotous youths sped past, flinging up stones and frightening a pig. Pedestrians were told "you need some protection; for every day more and more people are being injured, maimed, and killed by motor driven vehicles … we always have with us the 'dare-devil,' the reckless driver, and they menace you every time you cross a city street." For a premium of 2s 6d, or 5s for a family, the Corporation undertook to provide "the best legal counsel available" to secure compensation for injuries.[74] Unfortunately for the nervous pedestrian, the business model of the Corporation turned out on investigation to be flawed and its funding "pitifully inadequate"; it was run by "two amusing rascals".[75] A few years later, an attempt to form an Anti-Road Hog League in imitation of those in Britain and Australia foundered when its organiser was prosecuted for fraud.[76] From time to time the lack of a pedestrians' association was lamented, as it "would do much to counteract the influence of the automobile associations".[77] The organisations campaigning for the rights of pedestrians formed in the United States and Britain however received regular attention in the New Zealand press.

One of the main concerns of motorists' organisations was to stop children playing on the streets. Ironically, some early critics of motoring saw private motor cars as "playthings" for the rich.[78] One newspaper reader lampooned motorists' complaints about children in the streets: they "display a lack of consideration for the unfortunate motorist. The little beggars don't seem to care how often they cause you to swerve your car in order to avoid running them down … some of them actually run across your path just for the pleasure of it. I suppose the little wretches enjoy the thrills and hairbreadth escapes … The young blighters only seem to appreciate the joy of being alive; of being able to run about and play like a lot of puppies."[79] Children enjoyed throwing stones at passing cars, and some tried to poke sticks between the spokes of their wheels.[80] In a show of competitive bravado, children would sometimes try to touch the wing of a passing car.[81] The editor of a British motoring journal warned that "Permitting children to make playgrounds of our streets with games of tag, roller-skates, scooters, and the like, is not much better than legalising infanticide."[82] It was felt that however careful most motorists were, the danger to children remained acute. Parents were urged to "to take special pains to train their children against the unavoidable dangers of road traffic."[83] As in some American cities, dedicated urban playgrounds were seen as a solution to children playing in the streets. One was proposed for central Wellington in 1908, several years before motor traffic came to be seen as the principal danger.[84]

Even if children could be discouraged from playing cricket or football in the streets, improvements to the road surface tempted them to return. The smooth concrete hillside streets of Auckland were ideal for the go-cart craze of the 1920s.[85] Though "toboggan" riders were banned from some urban streets, "these young terrorists … constitute[d] a desperate anxiety to the drivers of other vehicles."[86] Yet non-motoring adults continued to defend the right of small boys to use the streets, and argued it was the motorised "road hog" who ought to be more careful.[87]

4. Death on the Roads

As New Zealand's population was relatively small — it had reached one million only in 1908 — the proportion of serious road accidents was masked by the low absolute numbers. Foreign visitors sometimes remarked how casually or lightly road deaths were taken.[88] Nonetheless increasing public anxiety at the rapid increase in deaths was evident as the First World War

neared its end. Newspaper reports from overseas, particularly the United States, sensitised the public to the increasing danger from motor cars. The medical superintendent of the Christchurch public hospital was a prominent critic of reckless motorists, drawing attention to the recent "truly alarming" increase in accidents.[89] Dr Walter Fox pointed out that as early as August 1918 more accidents were caused by motor traffic than all other causes combined.[90] He told an inquest "I would have all these men who were convicted of inconsiderate driving conscripted … If they want to kill people, let them go and kill Huns."[91] Were it not for traffic accidents, Dr Fox claimed in 1920 his hospital "accident ward would be closed down at times."[92] His comments on the "dastardly" behaviour of hit-and-run drivers were raised in parliament and received the backing of the prime minister.[93] One of the Christchurch evening newspapers in particular took up the cause, emphasising the growing number of road accidents. In June 1919 *The Star* published a detailed list of traffic accidents that had occurred over the past six weeks, an almost daily account of injuries sustained by pedestrians, cyclists and drivers of horse-drawn vehicles at the hands of motorists, including three deaths.[94]

The numbers killed on New Zealand roads in the 1920s seemed insignificant when compared with the thousands who died in the United States, yet in proportion to the population the figures were not dramatically better. In 1923 about 100,000 Americans died on the roads but only 59 New Zealanders, yet this was a rate of 48 deaths per million of the population, compared with the United States' 94.[95] In both countries comparisons were made with wartime deaths.[96] The numbers killed rose from 69 in 1921 to 108 in 1925, and to 220 in 1930, after which there was a slight decline "as a result of the economic depression".[97] Yet it was widely believed that matters were far worse. Even the motoring organisations did not dispute the unofficial average figure of two deaths per day in 1920.[98] The number of violent deaths almost doubled in the 15 years from 1913, most the increase being it due to motor vehicles.[99] The situation was particularly acute in Auckland. In the first four months of 1926, seven pedestrians and eight drivers or their passengers were killed, prompting the Auckland Automobile Association to mount a "Safety First" campaign.[100] The impression of relentless and worsening numbers of deaths and injuries on the roads was reinforced by detailed newspaper reporting of accidents, often under such headlines as "The Toll of the Road". Casualty statistics and accounts of the more sensational accidents in Australian, American and British cities were regularly reported in New Zealand newspapers, reinforcing the impression that the local experience was representative of a world-wide trend.

5. Safety Campaigns

"Safety First" was a concept widely applied to industrial and domestic hazards. It came to prominence in relation to railway safety, but its impact was greatest when applied to road safety. The concept was not uncontroversial: some felt it encouraged an excessively cautious, pusillanimous approach to life, and sports in particular. By the end of the 1920s "safety first" was invoked less uncritically; it was neatly subverted in the title of the Harold Lloyd comedy film *Safety Last!* (1923) and the advertising slogan from of MG sports cars, "Safety Fast!"

Road accidents were not seen as inevitable or unavoidable. They were not acts of God but instead due to the actions of individuals, who could modify their behaviour. With enough training, goodwill and rigorous enforcement of the traffic regulations, road accidents might be eliminated. Some of the early road safety campaigns today can seem touchingly optimistic,

even naive. Slogans, posters, stickers and films were expected to have a salutary effect on both drivers and pedestrians. Strict enforcement of speed limits would remove a major danger.

Motorists were exhorted to drive with more care and consideration for other road users, who were in turn asked to modify their behaviour to make motoring safer. Owners of horse-drawn vehicles were urged to carry lights at night. Property owners were asked to remove fences or trim hedges and trees that blocked drivers' sight-lines at dangerous corners or railway level crossings. Trams were a particular concern of early motorists. The lines typically ran along the centre of streets, with the electric wires suspended from poles in the middle. These power poles were seen as a hazard to motor traffic. Passengers waited for trams beside the tracks, where they were vulnerable to being hit by careless motorists. Refuges were provided, protected by bollards and typically edged with a low concrete kerb.[101] Incompetent car drivers hit these, too. Tram passengers were in greater danger crossing to and from the pavement. Most by-laws stipulated that motor cars had to wait while trams picked up or put down passengers, but motorists complained it was difficult to tell if a tram was stopped or not, and that passengers moved unpredictably. Motorists' organisations tried to propagate the notion that trams were archaic and would soon be replaced by motor buses, so the impediments to the free movement of motor cars could be done away with. Tram passengers were not safe even from normally slow-moving vehicles. Stepping off a tram and about to cross a suburban street in 1917, an Auckland woman was hit by a hearse "travelling very fast". Fortunately she survived so did not need the professional services of the reckless undertaker.[102]

Rare early examples of measures to protect pedestrians from motor traffic were the three raised asphalt crossings constructed in a suburb of New Plymouth in 1912. They served "the dual purpose of affording pedestrians a dry passage across the road and of considerably checking the fast driving by motorists."[103] The latter were "perturbed"[104] at the prospect of damage to their cars' suspension; one councillor considered one of the "motor bumps" in particular "heathenish! … worse; it is barbarous!"[105] Many local residents approved, however, thinking "a broken axle is of less account than a broken neck".[106] Defined crossings for pedestrians remained rare well into the 1920s. Lines were painted across busy central Auckland streets in 1923 to mark marking crossing places for pedestrians, and initially policemen were stationed nearby to ensure they were used.[107] Traffic however was not compelled to give way, so pedestrians saw them as no safer than crossing anywhere else. One suggested each street corner should have a machine gun and a supply of hand grenades and flame throwers so those wishing to cross could keep the cars at bay.[108] Motorists and tram drivers habitually ignored pedestrian crossings with impunity: on revisiting Auckland in 1936, someone accustomed to British practice wondered "whether crossings here are for pedestrians" safety or motorists', for I see motor-cars swish through the stream of pedestrians willy-nilly … What are they really for?"[109]

A concerted programme of safety campaigns was begun by the motoring organisations in 1926. The Auckland Automobile Association's "Safety First" campaign was intended to check the "gross carelessness" of some drivers. The association approved of heavier penalties for traffic offences, but it did not want responsible drivers to be "penalised by irksome by-laws",[110] "harassing restrictions" or "absurd speed limits".[111] On the other hand, it was happy to advocate limiting the liberties of non-motorists. Attempts to familiarise the American concept of "jaywalking" however had only limited success in New Zealand. The state followed the British approach, rather than that of western Europe and North America, in imposing few legal

restraints on pedestrians.[112] The North Island Motor Union adopted the "Safety First" campaign and distributed "a quantity of propaganda" obtained from the British National "Safety First" Association.[113] In Britain, the road safety campaign was soon "stigmatised as an insidious attempt to throw the onus of taking care on to pedestrians",[114] but it seems to have elicited a less cynical response in New Zealand. The Canterbury Automobile Association took up the motorist-friendly findings of the second American National Conference on Street and Highway Safety of 1926, proposing a nationwide "Safety First" week, safety films and lantern slides, radio talks, schools for motorists, "safe driver" clubs, mass meetings, and yet more stickers and pamphlets.[115] One northern newspaper, rather tastelessly, dubbed this "a Dominion-wide 'Don't get killed' publicity campaign".[116] The precedents were not encouraging. A "Safety First" week had been tried in Auckland in 1920 to little effect. Motorists attached to their cars' windscreens warning notices "in polite language, that anyone who steps off a footpath on to the road with his eyes shut or his nose in the air, is in danger of being knocked over by a motor".[117] Some pedestrians unsurprisingly took umbrage, seeing these exhortations as an insult.[118] One newspaper columnist thought the notices would be better on the inside than the outside of the windscreen, with messages such as "Time saved on top speed may be lost in carrying an injured pedestrian to the hospital."[119] The *Observer* carried a full-page cartoon showing pedestrians harried by motorists, parodying the "Safety First" rules.[120]

Before the establishment of the Transport Department in 1929, the state was not normally involved in road safety campaigns. The government-owned railways were however concerned by the growing number of level crossing collisions. The Railways Department conducted a "vigorous" newspaper advertising and poster campaign in 1926 drawing attention to the danger. A poster showing a car being hit by a locomotive at an unguarded level crossing was reproduced as a sticker and sent to all holders of driving licences. It was hoped they would attach it to their cars "as a constant reminder … of the need for care".[121] Such stickers may have proved counter-productive, if the widely reported case of an English motorist fined £5 for dangerous driving is anything to go by. Asked by the judge why she ran down a man in broad daylight, she explained her windscreen "was almost completely obscured with 'Safety First' stickers."[122]

Radio broadcasts on road safety appear to have been monopolised by motoring interests. The contents of these talks are mostly lost, but a few were reprinted by newspapers. "Chassis", the motoring columnist of the Christchurch newspaper *The Sun*, broadcast a talk in 1927 on the recently established local station of the Radio Broadcasting Company. He praised the motoring organisations for their concern for road safety, and placed much of the blame for accidents on pedestrians' "total disregard" for the danger posed by motor vehicles. Only the vigilance of motorists saved the majority from serious injury or death as a consequence of their own carelessness. The "total abandon" of pedestrians, "Chassis" lamented, "makes motoring a nightmare." He claimed the "spineless" local authorities were "scared to death to make any by-laws governing the pedestrian" while "the motorist is bound and gagged by laws, by-laws, and regulations and thou shall nots."[123] How this talk went down with the radio listeners, most of them pedestrians, was not recorded. The Radio Broadcasting Company approached the Wellington Automobile Club in 1930 offering to broadcast a series of talks by its members: "it was proposed to address the motorists, as well as pedestrians. Both required educating."[124] New Zealand listeners were not restricted to local broadcasts; listings for Australian stations

were published in the newspapers. These too were dominated by proponents of motoring, such as when the President of the Royal Automobile Club of Australia, spoke on the "Safety First" campaign on a Sydney station in July 1930.[125]

6. Educating Children

Those members of the public who had reached maturity before motor cars had become common were often thought to be imbued with notions that pedestrians had equal rights to the streets, and were prepared to stand up for them. They were beyond convincing that the world had moved on; children, on the other hand, were seen as ripe targets for indoctrination by the motoring organisations. While before the first world war the novelty of motor cars meant children were unaware of the danger they posed, by 1930, cars had become so common that children were thought to have become blasé, and so insufficiently wary of them.[126] They were accustomed to playing in the streets, which brought them into direct conflict with motorists. Their non-motorist parents were blamed for allowing their children "to over-run the streets."[127] In 1913 the Canterbury Automobile Association asked the Education Board to distribute leaflets to schoolchildren on road safety. Bluntly expressed in question-and-answer form, they contained such advice as: "Bear in mind that motor cars come swiftly and silently, and, if they strike you, are very apt to kill you." Perhaps unwisely planting the idea in their minds, the leaflet asked "Why should a child not throw a stone at a motor car?" The pupils were told "You may injure the occupants, or cause the driver to lose control; besides it is mean and cowardly. Don't do it."[128] In the immediate post-war years, when accident numbers rose dramatically, the Canterbury Association returned to the problem. It proposed in annual prizes for the best essay on "The Perils of the Highway and How to Avoid Them."[129] While thinking this a good idea, one commentator was "tempted to suggest that a number of motorists should be required to write essays on 'The Peril of the Children, the Aged and the Deaf and How to Avoid Them.'" He thought the Association "laid rather too much stress on the obligations of the pedestrian and too little on those of the motorist."[130] Later in 1919 the New Zealand Automobile Union addressed the question of "safety first" lectures to children. Believing these lectures needed to be bright and instructive in order to arouse and sustain pupils' interest, the Union optimistically and rather insultingly proposed motor club officials should give them as "The mere fact of someone other than a teacher speaking to the children would be sure to claim their interest".[131] Later on, traffic patrolmen in uniform were expected to command even greater attention.[132] These "lecturettes" included advice on how to cross roads, ride bicycles and alight from trams safely. Children were exhorted not to "play or stand talking on the roadway."[133]

Practical demonstrations in the playground of how to cross streets and avoid traffic were proposed, along with "films describing the risks of haphazard pedestrianism".[134] The Canterbury Automobile Association showed one such film made in the United States, *Play Safe*, in 1925. Among other warnings, "The audience [was] shown how unprofitable it may be to insist continually upon the right of way".[135] However worthy, it was at least an improvement on earlier films such as the British animated short *Road Hogs in Toyland* of 1911. Depicting the "ruthless devastation" caused by reckless drivers, it was thought calculated to "amuse the children and bewilder the parents".[136]

The Wellington Education Board distributed cards to schools in its district showing children the "proper" method of crossing streets.[137] Some saw this as the indoctrination of the young when it was the motorists who should reform their ways. "Juggernaut" expressed his mock

dismay that civilisation was degenerating as "a number of youngsters are born into this world in total ignorance of the rights of motorists". He proposed as a solution "that a special course be set in all schools, and young children taught to behold in awe and reverence — from the safety of the footpath — the 'king of the road' as he shoots past in his trumpeting car, knocking down anyone who gets in the road, and gazing with disdain on those unfortunate mortals who have to walk."[138] The self-interested nature of much of the motoring associations' propaganda aroused some official opposition also. The Otago Motor Club complained that the local education authority "turned down cold" its attempts in the mid-1920s to introduce "safety first" measures "for the benefit of school children … We could get no co-operation … and had to leave it there."[139] This was unsurprising, given the solipsistic approach of some motoring associations. For example, in 1930 the North Island Motor Union issued posters and a list of "danger spots" to schools, asking each pupil "to take an oath every month promising to observe stated precautions at such spots."[140]

Undeterred, the Canterbury Automobile Association's Safety First Committee recommended that sketches be hung in classrooms "illustrating how accidents occur, and what happens to the careless or foolish pedestrian commonly called the 'jay walker'".[141] When by 1926 it became clear that these exhortations were having little effect, the Wanganui Automobile Association concluded that a well-written article in the *School Journal* would "do far more good than all the lectures."[142] The Shell Oil Company distributed 250,000 illustrated "safety first" blotter pads to schools,[143] while the two Motor Unions combined to print and circulate posters.[144] More practically, some schools instituted crossing patrols monitored by senior pupils.[145] In its revised primary school syllabus of 1929, the Education Department formally stipulated that "In all classes 'safety first' rules for crossing streets, etc., should be taught." This was part of wider education on dealing with common emergencies, with an emphasis on swimming and lifesaving lessons.[146] School playgrounds were marked out with street intersections which traffic inspectors used to demonstrate hand signals and how pupils should cross the road.[147]

Conclusion

Early motor cars had been seen as a dangerous nuisance, a menace that was out of control. The worst drivers were arrogant, maniacal and homicidal, terrors to the public. Even their respectable brethren behaved as if they had exclusive rights to the road. There was a clear element of class consciousness in this criticism of the behaviour of wealthy motorists towards their social inferiors, and versions of it were seen in many other countries. Some dogged pedestrians continued to resist the encroachment of motor cars into the 1920s, though their response to road fatalities was muted in comparison with other nations, not least the United States. As in Britain, organised promotion of road safety came mainly from the motorists' organisations, and reflected their priorities. Regimentation of pedestrians and indoctrination of children were among the measures most often promoted, though to only limited effect. The fictional Henry Wilcox may have been unduly optimistic in expecting Edwardian children to adapt to motor vehicles as Victorian swallows had done to the presence of telegraph wires, but by the start of the 1930s there had been a significant change in public attitudes towards the dangers presented by this new technology.

[1] E.M. Forster, *Howards End* (1910), chapter 23: Margaret Schlegel, being driven to Howards End at speed along the Great North Road through Hertfordshire, "had chickens and children on the brain. 'They're all right,' said Mr. Wilcox. 'They'll learn — like the swallows and the telegraph-wires.' 'Yes, but, while they're learning —' 'The motor's come to stay,' he answered. 'One must get about.'" See also Andrew Thacker, 'E.M. Forster and the Motor Car', *Literature & History*, third series 9:2 (2000), 37–52.

[2] Bill Luckin, "Motorists, Non-drivers and Traffic Accidents between the Wars: A Provisional Survey", *Transfers* 2:2 (2012), 5.

[3] Calculated from "Road Transport: The Motor Age", in *An Encyclopaedia of New Zealand*, ed. A.H. McLintock (1966); McCrystal, *100 Years of Motoring in NZ*, 69, says New Zealand had the second-highest rate of car ownership after the USA with one motor vehicle for every 5.4 people by 1937.

[4] Calculated from Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, *Official Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia*, No. 19 — 1926 ([Melbourne, 1926]) and No. 29 — 1936 (Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer, [1936]).

[5] Kerry Segrave, *Parking Cars in America 1910-45: A History* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2012), 52.

[6] L.J.K. Setright, *Drive On! A Social History of the Motor Car* (London: Granta, 2003), 84.

[7] The ratios for Ontario in 1929 and 1939 were closer to those of the United States, at 1:6.4 and 1:5.6 respectively: calculated from Gerald T. Bloomfield, "No Parking Here to Corner: London Reshaped by the Automobile, 1911-61" *Urban History Review* 18:2 (1989): 139–58. https://doi.org/10.7202/1017752ar.Bloomfield, "No Parking Here to Corner", 141.

[8] L.J.K. Setright, *Drive On! A Social History of the Motor Car* (London: Granta, 2003), 84 (no precise is given for these figures); see also Barker p. 6.

[9] *The New Zealand Official Year-Book 1931*, Chapter 15. Section XV. Roads and Road Transport. Motor-Vehicles Act, www3.stats.govt.nz/New_Zealand_Official_Yearbooks/1931/NZOYB_1931.html

[10] Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett, 2003.

[11] Wellington: Ministry of Transport, 1996.

[12] Peter Norton, "Four Paradigms: Traffic Safety in the Twentieth-Century United States", *Technology and Culture* 56:2 (2015), 323–4.

[13] Alex Trapeznik, and Austin Gee, "Furious Drivers: Regulating New Zealand Motorists, 1900-1930", *law&history: Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Law and History Society*, 10:1 (January 2024), 110–38.

[14] Alex Trapeznik and Austin Gee, "The Motoring Lobby in New Zealand, 1898–1930" *Journal of New Zealand Studies*, new series 27 (2018), 130–46.

[15] The others are Crashworthiness (1960s-1980s) and Responsibility (1980s on).

[16] Norton, "Four Paradigms", 321, 324–7, 331 (Table 1).

[17] Sir Joseph Ward, then acting premier, speaking on the Motor Cars Regulation Bill, *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates*, vol. 122 (2 September to 3 October 1902) (Wellington: John Mackay, Government Printer, 1902), 141, col. 1.; "The Speed of Motor Cars" [editorial], *Wanganui Chronicle*, 27 December 1905, 4.

[18] William Massey, in the debate on the Motor Regulation Bill, reported in the *Hastings Standard*, 5 October 1906, 4.

[19] "Motoring and the Public Safety" [editorial], *The Press* (Christchurch), 8 October 1904, 6.

[20] Massimo Moraglio, "Knights of Death: Introducing Bicycles and Motor Vehicles to Turin, 1890–1907", *Technology and Culture* 56:2 (2015), 375.

[21] "A Dangerous Nuisance" [editorial], *Ashburton Guardian*, 22 December 1906, 2.

[22] "Traffic Dangers" [editorial], *Otago Daily Times* (Dunedin), 5 July 1930, 12.

[23] "Street Traffic. Need for Regulation. The Pedestrian Wanderer", *Evening Post* (Wellington), 12 December 1925, 8.
[24] Mike Esbester and Jameson M. Wetmore, "Global Perspectives on Road Safety History", *Technology and Culture* 56:2 (2015), 308.
[25] *Evening Post*, 8 May 1903, 6.
[26] "Horses and Motors", *Ashburton Guardian*, 12 January 1904, 2.
[27] A.W. Sedcole, "Reckless Motor Travelling" [letter to the editor] Pahiatua, 26th October, *Evening Post*, 17 November 1905, 4.
[28] "A Motorist", "Motors and the Rules of the Road", *Otago Daily Times*, 2 September 1905, 8.
[29] "'Motor-Fiends" and "Road-Hogs"', *Otago Daily Times*, 6 July 1905, 10.
[30] "Road Hogs", *Wanganui Herald*, 18 April 1907, 4.
[31] "Motor Maniacs" [editorial], *Wanganui Chronicle*, 3 November 1905, 4.
[32] See for example "Demon", "Cycling Notes", *Otago Witness* (Dunedin), 1 October 1896, 37.
[33] "Topics of the Day", *Evening Post*, 28 May 1908, 6.
[34] "Motorists" [editorial], *Feilding* Star, 3 April 1906, 2.
[35] Bill Luckin, "Drunk Driving, Drink Driving: Britain, c.1800–1920", in *Governing Risks in Modern Britain: Danger, Safety and Accidents, c.1800–2000*, ed. Tim Crook and Mike Esbester (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 173.
[36] A.W. Sedcole, "Reckless Motor Travelling" [letter to the editor] Pahiatua, 26 October, *Evening Post*, 17 November 1905, 4.
[37] Muhammad M. Ishaque and Robert B. Noland, "Making roads safe for pedestrians or keeping them out of the way? An historical perspective on pedestrian policies in Britain", *Journal of Transport History* 27:1 (2006), 118.
[38] "The Man on Foot" [editorial], *Ashburton Guardian*, 19 January 1907, 2.
[39] "The Speed of Motor Cars" [editorial], *Wanganui Chronicle*, 27 December 1905, 4.
[40] "Visitor", "The Reckless Motorist" [letter to the editor], *New Zealand Herald* (Auckland), 16 April 1906, 3.
[41] See for example "Rambler", "Rural Notes. Careless Motorists", *Wanganui Herald*, 18 April 1907, 2.
[42] A.W. Bremner, "Motor Driving" [letter to the editor] 5 December, *Otago Daily Times*, 7 December 1906, 6.
[43] Janet Meikle, a passenger in her husband"s car, had been killed when it rolled down a bank on their farm near Timaru three months earlier: "New Zealand"s first fatal car accident 8 September 1906", *New Zealand History*, 4 September 2020, nzhistory.govt.nz/page/new-zealands-first-fatal-car-accident.
[44] "Motors and the Public" [editorial], *New Zealand Times*, 21 December 1906, 6.
[45] "The 'Motor Fiend.' Excesses in Wellington", *Evening Post*, 25 March 1907, 7, referring to both motorcycle riders and car drivers.
[46] "The Motor Hog. Still Devastating", *Free Lance* (Wellington), 6 July 1907, 6.
[47] "Motoring Notes', *The Star* (Christchurch), 15 August 1905, 4; S.A.B., 'The Motor Fiend' [verse] Manaia, 12 February, *Hawera & Normanby Star*, 15 February 1908, 5. Some German drivers did carry revolvers: Luckin, 'Motorists, Non-drivers and Traffic Accidents', 10.
[48] See Norton, *Fighting Traffic*, 26–7.
[49] See for example "The Motor Hog. Two Fetch a Fiver Apiece", *Truth* (Wellington), 23 May 1908, 6.
[50] "The Victim", "The Motor Hog" [letter to the editor], *Lyttelton Times* (Christchurch), 31 October 1908, 7.
[51] See Moraglio, "Knights of Death", 375.
[52] "Reasonable Speed. The Menace of the Motor Hog", *Truth*, 14 September 1912, 6
[53] "Late Instructor in Motor Engineering and Motor Schools", "Motoring and Pedestrians" [letter to the editor] 18 November, *Evening Star*, 21 November 1925, 11.

[54] "Demon", "Cycling Notes", *Otago Witness*, 25 January 1900, 45.
[55] "Benzine", "Motor Traffic" [letter to the editor] Kimbolton, 19 November, *Manawatu Times* (Wanganui), 20 November 1917, 7.
[56] "'Safety-First' A.A.A. Campaign", *New Zealand Herald*, 8 May 1926, supplement, 10.
[57] "Less [sic] Traffic Accidents. Short Skirts Must Go", *The Sun* (Auckland), 11 October 1927, 7.
[58] "Cycles", *Auckland Star*, 25 June 1904, 12.
[59] "Fair Play", "The Motor Fatality" [letter to the editor] 19 December, *New Zealand Times* (Wellington), 20 December 1906, 8.
[60] "Brief Mention", *Waimate Daily Advertiser*, 5 March 1909, 3.
[61] "A Futurist", "The Toll of the Motor" [letter to the editor], *Auckland Star*, 14 May 1923, 8.
[62] "Civis,'Safety First!' Control of Motor Traffic. Action Necessary", *The Dominion* (Wellington), 22 December 1919, 11; see also "Focus", "The Motor World. Controlling the Pedestrian", *New Zealand Herald*, 4 June 1921, supplement, 6 and "Keep to the Left", "The Traffic Danger. Thoughtless or Speeding Motor" [letter to the editor], *Manawatu Times*, 21 May 1926, 8.
[63] "Parent", "The Motor Hog" [letter to the editor], *Wairarapa Daily Times* (Masterton), 23 July 1918, 5.
[64] "Furious Motoring" [editorial], *The Star* (Christchurch), 25 March 1907, 2; Peter G. Cooksley and Peter F. Batchelor, *VCs of the First World War: The Air VCs*, new edition (Stroud: History Press, 2014).
[65] "Local & General", *Gisborne Times*, 14 February 1928, 4.
[66] "Protecting the Children", *The Sun* (Auckland), 7 October 1929, 7.
[67] "General News", *Timaru Herald*, 24 May 1929, 8.
[68] "Safety First. Crossing Precautions at the School", *Horowhenua Chronicle* (Levin), 15 August 1928, 5.
[69] "Swift-Moving Danger" [editorial], *Feilding Star*, 11 June 1918, 2.
[70] "Children's Carelessness. Danger in the Streets. Trouble to Motorists", *Poverty Bay Herald* (Gisborne), 23 August 1927, 10.
[71] "Children on Streets. Danger from Cars. Motor Association's Request', *Manawatu Standard* (Palmerston North), 7 June 1930, 6.
[72] 'In Danger Daily. Children Going to School. Accident Insurance Plan. Department Interested', *Auckland Star*, 11 October 1927, 11.
[73]'Legislative Council. Fatal Motor Accidents", *Evening Post*, 17 August 1927, 11.
[74] *Otago Daily Times*, 21 October 1926, 15.
[75] "Protecting Pedestrians from the Perils of the Pavements", *Truth*, 25 November 1926, 1.
[76] "Mythical League. Anti Road Hog Movement. Prosecution Fails", *Auckland Star*, 1 April 1930, 10.
[77] C.L., "Motor Accidents" [letter to the editor] 6 April, *Evening Post*, 7 April 1930, 8.
[78] "Mercator", "The Murderous Motor" [letter to the editor] 17 December, *New Zealand Times*, 19 December 1906, 2; "Motors Must Give Way" [editorial] *Bay of Plenty Times* (Mount Maunganui), 19 February 1913, 2.
[79] "A Hogg", "Instruct the Children", in "Motor Traffic. "Safety First" Campaign. Some Correspondents" Views", *Evening Post*, 4 December 1919, 5.
[80] "Torque", "Modern Motoring. Safety First", *Auckland Star*, 23 January 1923, 9.
[81] "Torque Rod", "The Motor World. Special Street Crossings. A Motorist's Greatest Danger", *New Zealand Times*, 6 December 1919, 10.
[82] Alexander Johnston, "The Huns of the Highway", *The Sun* (Christchurch) 8 November 1920, supplement, 29.
[83] "Children and Motorists", *Nelson Evening Mail*, 5 January 1921, 4.
[84] "For the Children … City Playground Suggested", *The Dominion*, 22 June 1908, 8; for the United States, see Norton, *Fighting Traffic*, 85.
[85] "Torque", "Modern Motoring. Safety First", *Auckland Star*, 23 January 1923, 9.

[86] "Toboganning. Danger in the Streets. Temerity of Youth. Restrictions Should be Enforced", *Auckland Star*, 9 April 1925, 11.
[87] "Traffic Control. Observations Abroad. Suggestions for Auckland. Congestion and Safety", *New Zealand Herald*, 2 February 1929, 13.
[88] "These Accidents. The Speed of the Motors. Toll of the Road", *Auckland Star*, 11 January 1926, 8.
[89] "The Motor Menace"[Editorial], *Grey River Argus*, 24 September 1918, 2.
[90] "Motor Speeding. Doctor's Sharp Comments", *The Sun* (Christchurch) 17 August 1918, 11.
[91] "General News", *The Press*, 19 August 1918, 6.
[92] "The Deadly Motor", *The Star* (Christchurch) 5 August 1920, 6.
[93] "Political Gossip. Motor Accidents. 'Drastic Action Must be Taken'", *New Zealand Times*, 6 August 1920, 4.
[94] "Traffic Casualty List. A Six Weeks" Record. Compiled for the "Star", *The Star* (Christchurch) 13 June 1919, 5.
[95] "H.", "Motor Smashes … Accident Rate Abnormally High in New Zealand", *Evening Post*, 16 August 1924, 13
[96] For a comparison with the wars of the 1860s, see "The Road Hog" [editorial], *Franklin Times*, 9 March 1928, 4. See also Bill Luckin, "Motorists, Non-drivers and Traffic Accidents between the Wars: A Provisional Survey", *Transfers* 2:2 (2012), 5.
[97] *The New Zealand Official Year-Book, 1930*. Section VI — Vital Statistics. Subsection C. — Deaths. Deaths From Violence. www3.stats.govt.nz/New Zealand Official Yearbooks/1930/NZOYB_1930.html; *The New Zealand Official Year-Book*, 1935. Section IV — Vital Statistics Subsection C. — Deaths. Deaths From Violence. www3.stats.govt.nz/New Zealand Official Yearbooks/1935/NZOYB_1935.html
[98] "'Safety First.' Motorists Wait on Council. Valuable Suggestions", *The Dominion*, 24 January 1920, 10.
[99] *The New Zealand Official Year-Book, 1930*. Section VI — Vital Statistics. Subsection C. — Deaths. Deaths From Violence. www3.stats.govt.nz/New Zealand Official Yearbooks/1930/NZOYB_1930.html
[100] "'Safety-First.' A.A.A. Campaign", *New Zealand Herald*, 8 May 1926, supplement, 10.
[101] A safety zone was first tried in Auckland in late 1921: "Our Busy Street Dangers. Guarding Pedestrian Safety. New Zone Islands for Tram Passengers", *Auckland Star*, 8 November 1921, 4. Christchurch followed in 1922: "Safety First", *The Press*, 2 March 1922, 6. Pedestrian refuges had been in use in Britain since the early nineteenth century: Ishaque and Noland, "Making roads safe for pedestrians", 129.
[102]"Run Down by Hearse. Widow Claims Damages. Question of Rule of Road", *New Zealand Herald*, 16 November 1917, 4.
[103] "Local and General", *Taranaki Daily News* (New Plymouth), 4 October 1912, 4.
[104] "Local and General", *Taranaki Daily News*, 4 October 1912, 4.
[105] "The Motor Hog. 'Break Some of Their Necks!'", *Taranaki Daily News*, 16 October 1912 Page 2; see also "That Crossing. 'A Barbarous Thing'", *Taranaki Herald* (New Plymouth), 10 December 1912, 6.
[106] "Motor Hog", "That Crossing" [letter to the editor], *Taranaki Herald*, 11 December 1912, 4.
[107] "Crossover", "Street Crossings" [letter to editor], *New Zealand Herald*, 13 April 1923, 3.
[108] "Teffle", "Traffic Regulation" [letter to the editor], *New Zealand Herald*, 11 April 1923, 7.
[109] E.H.B., "Pedestrian Crossings", *New Zealand Herald*, 4 April 1936, 17.
[110] "One Death a Week. Toll of Motor Vehicles'Safety First' Campaign", *New Zealand Herald*, 3 May 1926, 12.
[111] "The Motor World. Notes of Interest. "Safety First."", *Wairarapa Daily Times*, 17 June 1926, 6.
[112] See Joe Moran, "Crossing the Road in Britain 1931–1976", *Historical Journal* 49:2 (2006), 477–8; for the contrasting approach to jaywalking in the United States, see Peter D. Norton, *Fighting Traffic:*

The Dawn of the Motor Age in the American City (Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 2008), 72–8, 221.
[113] "North Island Motor Union", *Hawera Star*, 16 August 1926, 11.
[114] "Motoring Causerie. Safety First", *New Zealand Herald*, 30 June 1923, supplement, 12.
[115] "Safety First. Motor Union Campaign. Startling Accident Incidence", *Evening Star*, 26 March 1927, 11; "Traffic Safety. National Campaign. Motorists' Proposals", *Ashburton Guardian*, 28 March 1927, 6; on the 1926 conference, see Norton, *Fighting Traffic*, 232–3.
[116] "Safety First. Big Campaign Proposed", *The Sun* (Auckland), 26 March 1927, 14.
[117] "Mercutio", "Local Gossip", *New Zealand Herald*, 30 October 1920, supplement, 1.
[118] "Torque", "Modern Motoring", *Auckland Star*, 2 November 1920, 10.
[119] "Mercutio", "Local Gossip", *New Zealand Herald*, 30 October 1920, supplement, 1.
[120] "Blo" [William Blomfield], "Safety First. A Few Simple Rules Unissued, for Observation by the Motorists", *Observer*, 6 November 1920, 14. For a discussion of the tensions inherent in safety weeks in the United States, see Norton, *Fighting Traffic*, 70–1.
[121] "Safety First … Effective Publicity Campaign", *Evening Post*, 1 December 1926, 10. The poster is reproduced in the *Otago Daily Times*, 4 December 1926, 7.
[122] "Notes", *New Zealand Herald*, 1 August 1925, supplement, 10.
[123] "Accidents in Traffic. A Radio Talk", *Otago Daily Times*, 18 April 1927, 5.
[124] "Safety on the Road. Need of Education. Motorists and Pedestrians", *New Zealand Herald*, 2 September 1930, 10; the Touring Manager of the Auckland Automobile Association also gave radio talks that were distributed to regional newspapers: see for example "'Safety First' Talk by R.E. Champtaloup", *Franklin Times*, 3 November 1930, 7 and "'Safety First' Message from the A.A.A.", *Bay of Plenty Times*, 8 November 1930, 4.
[125] "Radio Programmes", *Manawatu Standard*, 24 July 1930, 3.
[126] "Safety for Children", *Otago Daily Times*, 14 July 1930, 4.
[127] "Mascot", "Motoring", *The Dominion*, 17 September 1913, 8.
[128] "The Motoring Season. Risks of the Traffic. Warning School Children", *The Press*, 25 September 1913, 4.
[129] "Motor Menace", *The Press*, 9 May 1919, 8.
[130] D.W.M., "Perils of the Streets", *The Sun* (Christchurch), 12 May 1919, 6.
[131] "A Safety Campaign", *The Dominion*, 25 July 1919, 2.
[132] "Dangers of Traffic. Lectures for Children. Patrolmen in Uniform", *Auckland Star*, 14 June 1930, 18.
[133] Poverty Bay Herald 7 March 1922, 2.
[134] "A Safety Campaign", *The Dominion*, 25 July 1919, 2.
[135] "Safety First. An Educational Film", *The Press*, 24 July 1925, 5.
[136] Directed by Arthur Melbourne Cooper: "Hayward's Pictures", *Wanganui Chronicle*, 4 March 1912, 8.
[137] "Local and General", *Evening Post*, 16 September 1920, 6.
[138] "Juggernaut", "Safety First" [letter to the editor], *New Zealand Herald*, 27 February 1922, 3.
[139] *Evening Star*, 14 August 1929, 8, referring to events of about four years earlier.
[140] "Death on the Road. Safety Moves Proposed at Motorists' Meeting", *Evening Post*, 7 June 1930, 11.
[141] "Safety First Campaign", *The Press*, 2 March 1922, 6.
[142] "Local and General", *Gisborne Times*, 24 September 1926, 4.
[143] "Warnings for Children. Shell Company Gives Blotters", *The Sun* (Auckland), 17 December 1929, 12.
[144] "'Safety First' in the Schools", *The Star* (Christchurch), 28 March 1930, 5.
[145] "Safety First. Protecting School Children. Danger of Motor Traffic", *Evening Star*, 20 July 1927, 5; "Protecting the Children", *The Sun* (Auckland), 7 October 1929, 7; A photograph of one such patrol

appears in “Safety First for Schoolchildren: Senior Boys Form Patrol at Busy Intersection”, *Auckland Weekly News*, 26 August 1936.

[146] “New Instruction Course For Schools Embodied In Lengthy Regulations”, *The Star* (Christchurch), 12 January 1929, 11.

[147] “Safety First. Instruction in Schools. White Lines on Playgrounds”, *Auckland Star*, 20 November 1929, 8; “Traffic Dangers … Demonstrations in Schools”, *New Zealand Herald*, 7 December 1929, 14; A photograph of one such demonstration appears in “Safety First: Instructing School Children in the Dangers of Traffic”, *New Zealand Herald*, 7 December 1929, 10. Similar visits to schools were not introduced in Britain until 1936: see Moran, 482.