

Nearly 80% of those who voted favoured it.

Nor am I convinced by assertion that the U.S.A. was alone responsible for starting the Cold War, especially when it is backed up by a reference to a *New Statesman* article by A. J. P. Taylor.

The reader is given many doses of the author's personal opinions—on education, for instance. He wishes to eliminate 'vocational' or trade subjects from high schools and teach 'educational' subjects to all. The former he sees as a form of class discrimination, not as subjects attractive to less intelligent or 'non-academic' children. Accrediting for the university entrance examination was wise and liberal: the School Certificate examination should now be abolished. The universities are conservative bodies; 'spiritually', they are 'glorified night schools'. With the latter remark the *New Zealand Herald* has at times agreed. A surprising number of teachers might be found not to agree with the other observations.

Much of Dr Sutch's *Quest* is that of an author in search of his autobiography. Yet his book will outlive most more scholarly histories. There is nothing comparable for anyone who wants to know something of the 'feel' of recent New Zealand history—and this despite the fact that Dr Sutch's eye-witness accounts from the fighting zone do not agree with most of the others. His book is a mine of gossip about famous battles of not-so-long-ago: the satchel-snatching incident, for instance. Sometimes there is brilliant detail to engage our sympathies to the full—the struggle to rebuild the Social Security building after a fire and in time for the introduction of the 1939 Act to mark 'the defeat of poverty'. His record of New Zealand achievements in creating full employment—a feat elsewhere unmatched; in winning social security; the achievements of economic planning during World War II; is all the more convincing for the hard-hitting criticism on other pages.

He has succeeded, with sweeping flair, often careless of detail, in putting a generation's history in a perspective with chiaroscuro. Whether the 1958 'black' budget will become white I cannot say. Certainly it already looks grey, when one looks back from the 1967 economic 'squeeze'. But agree or not, future historians will be as much in his debt as present citizens are for more than they know.

KEITH SINCLAIR

University of Auckland

Race Conflict in New Zealand, 1814-1865. By Harold Miller. Blackwood and Janet Paul, Auckland, 1966. 238 pp. N.Z. price: \$4.20.

IT is rare today to find a disciple of von Ranke, whose aphorism *wie es eigentlich gewesen*—simply to show how it really was—inspired three generations of German, French and British historians into a passion of fact-collecting. Harold Miller is one such disciple; like von Ranke he believes (according to the dust-jacket of *Race Conflict in New Zealand*) that 'the business of the historian is simply to describe what happened'. Thus he presents us with a concise narrative of the events leading to the Taranaki and Waikato wars of the eighteen-sixties. Then, so that the documents can speak for themselves, he follows von Ranke's device (used in the *History of the Popes*, Vol. III) of adding a collection of Supporting Material. We are told that Dr Miller believes the historian must keep fact and comment separate, must prevent his theories from influencing his

choice of facts. We are also told that he succeeds admirably. Since Dr Miller and his publishers make such claims for the book, it must be judged on these grounds.

Dr Miller is no stranger to New Zealand history. He has spent thirty years working on the materials which form the basis of this book; and he has published several notable essays, including a chapter in I. L. G. Sutherland's *The Maori People Today* (1940) and the short history, *New Zealand* (1950). These essays contain the core of Miller's beliefs about race relations in the period and some paragraphs are repeated in *Race Conflict*: he says (p. vi) 'I took great trouble over these then . . . I see no reason why they should be altered.' The present book is essentially a restatement of the views Dr Miller has long held, and these views are, in many respects, a mere reiteration of the arguments of the 'philo-Maoris' of last century—Octavius Hadfield, Sir William Martin, Bishop Selwyn, John Gorst and G. W. Rusden.

For one who has searched so long, Dr Miller's range of documents is curiously limited. True, he has examined a good many contemporary books and pamphlets, even if he does rely mainly on one or two favoured works like Gorst's *Maori King* (1864); and he has worked through the large collection of British and New Zealand parliamentary papers, again with much emphasis on reports of such partisan observers as F. D. Fenton and Gorst. Otherwise there is nothing much: a few newspaper reports, a few published collections of letters and journals. Very little use is made of unpublished papers in the narrative or for the Supporting Material. There is no evidence that Dr Miller has used the files of the Maori Affairs Department, or the Gore Browne, McLean, Stafford and C. W. Richmond Papers; nor again the extensive collections of missionary correspondence and journals available in most of the libraries. The only Maori documents Dr Miller used are the few that found their way into parliamentary papers and newspapers. Documents, it seems, are unimportant to Dr Miller unless they are published.

Yet printed documents and published books and pamphlets are a notoriously unreliable source for a historian who seeks to describe what really happened; they merely record those facts and opinions which the authors thought significant and worthy of publication. From such partial sources, Dr Miller makes a partial selection of extracts for publication. It has been said that the historian usually gets the facts he wants; Dr Miller is no more immune from this occupational hazard than the rest of us.

It is notable that Dr Miller, like Gorst and Rusden, relies heavily on the New Zealand Parliamentary Papers for 1860. These contain the Report and Evidence of the Waikato Committee, set up by Parliament to examine the appointment of F. D. Fenton as magistrate in the Waikato in 1857 and his withdrawal, on Donald McLean's representation, in 1858; and Fenton's Report and Journals covering his magistracy. Dr Miller takes much of this material at face value, though the Committee (including Fenton who acted as secretary) was hardly a disinterested body. Its main object was to attack McLean and Gore Browne for their handling of the King movement, and for withdrawing Fenton from the Waikato two years earlier. Fenton's withdrawal, it was said, marked the abandonment of the only real attempt to satisfy the Maori demand for law and order. The Maoris felt humbugged and set up their own government under a Maori King.

However, it is possible to go through this and other evidence and come up with a different view of Fenton's activities in the Waikato. One could

regard Fenton, not McLean, as the villain of the piece—because Fenton was associated with the Direct Purchase Association in Auckland. This hoped to use the Stafford Ministry's Native Territorial Rights Bill as a means of obtaining Maori land. What else was Fenton's 'law and order' but an attempt to promote the individualisation of Maori land titles in preparation for the direct purchase of those individual interests? Had he read Fenton's Journals more critically, Dr Miller would have noted that Fenton spent much of his time trying to persuade the Maoris to divide up their land and sow it in grass, in preparation for the grant of titles and direct dealings. It was Fenton's activities in the Waikato and the threat that they posed to Maori land, not his withdrawal, that stimulated the movement towards the establishment of the Maori King. The basic conflict here between Maori and European was one of the authority, particularly authority over land. This could not be resolved by handing over authority to a government magistrate like Fenton who had once squatted on Maori land in the Waikato and was still on friendly terms with other squatters like James Armitage. Dr Miller should have noticed these points, and taken them into consideration in assessing the value of Fenton's testimony.

But the trouble is not simply that Dr Miller has too much faith in a few partisan witnesses. There are also some substantial omissions. Though the book is supposed to deal with race conflict in the years 1814 to 1865, very little is said about race conflict before 1860. The conflicts of the eighteen-forties are brushed over as a 'little fighting' (p. xix), though the 'Wairau Massacre' of 1843 is mentioned later (p. 21) without explanation. Heke's war in the north is not mentioned; nor is the fighting in the Hutt valley and Wanganui in 1846 and 1847. In the little wars of the 'forties over a hundred Europeans and over a hundred Maoris were killed. Surely this race conflict was worthy of inclusion in Dr Miller's narrative of 'what happened'. And why stop at 1865 if the subject is race conflict? As is well known, the conflict continued intermittently until 1872. One can only guess the answer. Is it that with the surrender and death of his hero, Wiremu Tamehana, Dr Miller has lost interest in a struggle that was now being carried on by 'villainous' Hauhaus? After all, Dr Miller does make the King movement end with the death of Tamehana in 1866, a remarkable feat of fiction.

These omissions suggest that Dr Miller has failed to prevent his theories from influencing his choice of facts. For Dr Miller's view of 'what happened' is merely what is significant to him; the 'facts' are his facts, even if many of them are second or third hand. The view of early New Zealand history that he presents is a simplistic one. It begins with the missionary saga—after the years of trial, a splendid success; continues through the years of racial co-operation—with the Maoris decently becoming civilised (assimilated) through Christianity and commerce; then it is unfortunately interrupted by the 1856 depression which forces the Maoris in their 'poverty' to consider their grievances; and finally, Gore Browne and McLean fail to satisfy the Maori yearning for government, so they set up a king and government of their own. Then there are the wars—ably narrated so far as 1865—and after that brief hints as to the future: the 'rejection' of Christianity and the 'savagery' of Hauhausism; the post-war periods in which the Maori people become 'sullen and dispirited', and turn to 'mischief or to very mundane consolations . . . to great temptations' (why so mealy-mouthed about alcoholism?); and finally, after forty years, 'a new spirit of hope' takes over the people (the Maori Renaissance, obviously).

This view of Maori acculturation was largely the creation of the social

scientists Firth, Keesing and Sutherland, though Dr Miller and other historians were happy enough to adopt it. But Dr Miller is now almost alone in sticking to it. He does so by ignoring virtually everything that has been written on the subject since 1950. For instance, one could note the work of three visiting American scholars, Harrison M. Wright, *New Zealand, 1769-1840: Early Years of Western Contact* (1959); Robin M. Winks, 'The Doctrine of Hauhauism' (*Journal of the Polynesian Society*, September 1953); and John A. Williams, 'Maori Society and Politics, 1890-1909' (a thesis which is available in New Zealand). Their studies show that Dr Miller's comments on early mission conversions, Hauhauism, and Maori attitudes after the wars are far from adequate.

Instead of coming to grips with the work of recent scholarship, Dr Miller has hidden behind the coat-tails of von Ranke. Dr Miller has marshalled his facts and sent them into battle against recent scholars: he regards his Supporting Material as a useful device, 'especially when the waters have been muddied by controversy' (p. 139). But history thrives on controversy; Dr Miller ought to lead his facts into battle not prod them from the rear.

Shorn of its pretensions, *Race Conflict* is a useful restatement and elaboration of Dr Miller's earlier works. It contains a concise summary of the events leading to the Taranaki and Waikato wars. The book is simply written and nicely designed. All the more pity then that it can serve no very useful purpose. Future historians of the topic will have to go beyond the limited range of documents used by Dr Miller; and they will have to approach their task with an open mind.

M. P. K. SORRENSON

University of Auckland

Dusky Bay. By A. Charles Begg and Neil C. Begg. Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd., Christchurch, 1966. 239 pp. N.Z. price: \$5.50.

IN our country of diverse and remote regions there is a case for close studies. These can sustain editors' narratives; they can provide pioneers' interpreters; they can place human activities in context with the wild life and the natural history of the environment; they can map and illustrate the area to illuminate it for students and for the general reader.

Some regions have been fortunate in their chronicles. For example, Hawke's Bay farming gained a near-immortality when H. Guthrie Smith wrote his memorable regional study *Tutira*¹ where the emphasis was on station life and management, local history and Maori legend, all in an ecological nimbus, so to speak. Rapport with land, inhabitants and fauna has seldom been so clearly expressed by geographers and historians as by the squatter-naturalist.

Fiordland, with its natural boundaries of sea and mountains, was an obvious choice for regional study. Four books have recently focused on this area. Jack McClenaghan has handled the theme superficially and not accurately in *Fiordland*² Rupert Sharpe gives a magnificently subjective account of a bush drover's life in *Fiordland Muster*³ which for genuine enthusiasm and power of writing is equalled by George A. Howard in *The Heart of Fiordland*.⁴ The book, *Dusky Bay*, chosen for this review,

¹ 3rd edition, London, 1953.

² Wellington, 1966.

³ London, 1966.

⁴ Christchurch, 1966.