

been helpful to have had an account of J.T. Paul's development as a revisionist. Compared to most previous historians, however, Dr Gustafson at least gives the so-called 'moderates' the prominence they deserve. Of the issue he deems central—politics—four strategies at least can be discerned; Lib-Lab, independent labour, de Leon's revolutionary strategy, and the anti-political views of the I.W.W. (Chicago). By not recognizing this he courts confusion.

The moderate-militant dichotomy distracts attention away from the political system and the society in which working men and women decided to pursue independent political power. It also over-simplifies a complex ideological reality and exaggerates the role of ideology. Like the others who have used moderate-militant as the key to understanding what happened, Dr Gustafson also gives too much attention to the 'militants'. In 1914, for instance, candidates put forward by the IRCs did better than those put forward by the Social Democratic Party and the electoral base for their success, and Labour's later growth, had been laid by 1911 everywhere but Auckland. This is not to say that the SDP has no importance, but that its importance must be more carefully delineated. Equally the de Leonites and the apostles of 'the Bummery' were important before 1913, but mainly because they discredited the Liberals as credible representatives of labour. By focussing on ideology Dr Gustafson ignores the complicated interplay of occupation, locality, tradition, sub-culture, and personality. Although he states that the Labour Party was 'based on the trade union movement' (p. 16) he did not consult the records of any unions. Thus he also precludes the possibility that the decision to seek political power constituted only part of a broader strategy whereby working men and women, whether employed or not, hoped to shape New Zealand to their own ends. Similarly he excludes the possibility that his story might best be seen within the context of working-class history, or, more probably, the histories of the new society's working classes. The old-fashioned ideological dichotomy precludes such possibilities and themes. I suspect that, with greater speed than usual, a generation of revisionists will cut their teeth on *Labour's Path to Political Independence*.<sup>4</sup> If that is so it will have served a very valuable purpose.

ERIK OLSEN

*University of Otago*

*The Journal of Henry Sewell 1853-7* (2 vols). Edited by W. David McIntyre. Whitcoulls, Christchurch, 1980. Vol. I, 510 pp. N.Z. price: \$40. Vol. II, 371pp., index. N.Z. price: \$25.

SEWELL wrote his journal for an audience. It was 'a running newsletter for his family and friends in England, especially Lord Lyttelton, the chairman of the Canterbury Association'. Sewell toyed with the idea of publishing it himself. But

<sup>4</sup> The process has started; see Valerie J. Smith, ' "Gospel of Hope" or "Gospel of Plunder": Socialism from the mid-1890s up to and including the Blackball Strike of 1908', B.A. Hons. research essay, Massey University, 1976 and E.W. Plumridge, 'Labour in Christchurch: Community and Consciousness, 1914-1919', unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Canterbury, 1979.

the journal was also a personal document, and although Sewell sent it to Christchurch in 1879 perceiving that it should be part of Canterbury's historical resources, 'yet it is so full of personalities (just or unjust) that under no circumstances ought it to be published or laid open for general inspection'. One hundred years later it has been published. Historians and teachers of New Zealand colonial history should be grateful to Sewell and Professor McIntyre for the record it provides.

McIntyre has chosen to let the journal stand alone. He has not abridged it. Footnotes are used to identify people and places mentioned in the text, not to amplify it. Their tone is discreetly helpful, not officious. Sewell's contradictions, changes of mood, fits of enthusiasm and gloom are left for the reader to reconcile. The reader is also left to struggle through Sewell's compulsive recording of detail on issues which were of great importance at the time but are of little interest to anyone but specialists now—the correct procedure for establishing churches for example. In this the *Journal* is a useful reminder of the preoccupations of Victorian society—because creating a society, a working social organism, is Sewell's main concern. Here McIntyre's introduction is invaluable; it provides a lucid explanation of the tangled financial background to the Canterbury settlement—a matter dealt with at great length by Sewell but almost unintelligible to later readers. Sewell was passionately involved in the land issue and he schemed incessantly to achieve successful compromise in this area. Moreover he was writing for an audience which was as involved in the financial web as he himself. No reader of the *Journal*, however casual, could fail to grasp the centrality of the land issue—but few, I suspect, would understand more than that without the help of the introduction.

McIntyre describes Sewell as 'a pessimistic, lonely, snobbish man, who was never really committed to pioneering life'. The recording of material was probably therapeutic, as it was to his contemporary, Gladstone, who tended at moments of stress to compose 'Memorials'. Although Sewell's detail becomes daunting it is invariably relieved by a shrewd comment or a perceptive analytical summary. Sewell's great talent was his capacity to analyse problems. Because his analysis was subtle his solutions were sometimes over-ingenious, leading to his reputation as a 'dodgy lawyer'. The later part of the *Journal* where Sewell is writing more reflectively, at weekly rather than daily intervals, is more readable because less cluttered with detail. Here Sewell's talent for observation and social analysis comes out most clearly. For example his terse, dramatic account of the achievement of responsible government written on 11 June 1854, in which he describes Wakefield as 'an admirable political General, bold, skilful, and above all things, knowing where to plant his weapon deepest and deadliest in his enemy's side.' (p.28, Vol. II.) The succinct description of his visit to New South Wales and Victoria in 1856 is one of the most interesting parts of the *Journal*. He wrote of Ballarat: 'The population comes and goes, like flocks of birds. This state of unfixeness is an insuperable bar to any effective measures of good. It is impossible to civilise nomadic tribes. What interest can men take in a place which to them has nothing of home. That is the one prominent idea forced upon me by the Diggings. A population without a home. And unless this can be supplied by fixing them, the real value of the Gold will be lost to the Colony.' (p.299, Vol. II.)

New Zealand is relatively rich in written accounts of its first decades of European settlement. Many colonists were careful observers of the land and of their own colonizing efforts. This may have been particularly so in the planned col-

onies where the immigrants were consciously participating in a social experiment. The Wakefield colonies produced the Godleys' letters, the Richmond-Atkinson papers, Lady Barker's memoirs, the propagandist writings of the Wakefields and C.F. Hursthouse. Sewell's *Journal* is a fuller, shrewder record than any of these. Its obvious parallel, *The Richmond-Atkinson Papers*, is heavily edited and suffers from the obvious disadvantage of a collection of letters and papers as compared with a methodically kept journal—the composition of letters depends too much upon chance. Sewell's *Journal* reveals a quaintly artificial quality about Canterbury, where social engineering took place on an unusually smooth surface. He scarcely mentions Maoris. There were few near Christchurch and those Sewell saw he tends to compare with the Irish, living in misery and squalor beyond the Pale. They were not merely peripheral to European settlement, they were an irrelevance. In Canterbury the land question focussed upon price, not ownership.

JUDITH BASSETT

*University of Auckland*

*Class Structure in Australian History.* By R.W. Connell and T.H. Irving. Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1980. xii, 378pp., photographs. Aust. price: \$20.35 cloth; \$14.35 paper.

THIS BOOK has caused a stir within the profession in Australia. The reasons for this are various and would repay inquiry but they certainly include the challenge Professor Connell and Dr Irving make to that tradition of interpretation whose *locus classicus* is W.K. Hancock's *Australia*. Hancock largely left class out of Australian history; Connell and Irving seek to put it back in. Their method is that 'full-scale theoretical analysis of social organization and change' which Connell foreshadowed in the late 1960s and claimed to be essential if there were going to be any improvement on Hancock.

After an opening chapter on the nature of class analysis the two authors proceed to practise it. The story of class relations is neatly periodized. The first fifty years of European settlement see colonial capitalism established under the benign eye of the state; from 1840 to 1890 we have the hegemony of the mercantile bourgeoisie; then the major working-class challenge of 1890-1930; the final chapter traces the impact of industrialization, ending with the fall of Whitlam. From Arthur Phillip to Malcolm Fraser the permutations are many, but for Connell and Irving it is basically a tale of two classes, the rulers and the ruled.

This may make the book sound little more than a political tract so I wish to emphasize that Connell and Irving are to be taken seriously. A short review cannot do justice to the sweep or weight of their arguments. They attempt 'total history' much in the manner that Marc Bloch did in *Feudal Society* but where Bloch's feudalism was a relatively simple phenomenon, Connell and Irving deal with a country whose European settlement was contemporaneous with the industrial revolution and the inception of rapid social change. The result is a remarkable synthesis of a vast range of historical information. The patterns seem contrived at times but the authors almost convince that it is possible to see a