

for indigenous communities. But there are contributions that plot the way forward in more optimistic terms. Parry Agius and others discuss the proposal for a South Australia-wide agreement; Sue Jackson writes about maritime agreements in the Northern Territory; Bruce Harvey comments on the cultural changes in mining company Rio Tinto that resulted in the formulation of the Cape York agreement; and Ian Anderson describes the agreements in place to address indigenous health issues. Still with the theme of looking to the future, Michelle Grossman's chapter details how intellectual property law is moving towards statutory recognition of communal rights, while Ciaran O'Fairchaellaigh sets out a methodology for agreement making. In the final chapter, Gillian Triggs recounts the creative way in which the Timor Gap dispute between Australia and East Timor was resolved.

This volume has an ambitious vision. While it goes much deeper than Elazar Barkan's *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices* (2000), it is not necessarily as broad in terms of its subject-matter. Unlike *The Guilt of Nations*, however, this book deliberately problematizes the 'honour' that nations might claim in their dealings with indigenous peoples: the question mark in the title should therefore be heeded. The title (and the cover illustration) suggest a global focus, yet the overwhelming majority of chapters and contributors address aspects of the Australian experience and the contemporary challenges of native title. From a total of 19 chapters, four address Canadian experiences and there is only one chapter on New Zealand. The limited attention given to New Zealand seems odd — especially when out of all the settler societies under scrutiny in this book, New Zealand has a single Treaty with a clearly defined process of settlement and resolution for Treaty breaches. *Honour Among Nations?* is a dense text, with chapters delving into specific issues. It has lengthy but comprehensive footnotes, although the bibliography is only available online. (Am I the only reader who finds this frustrating?) Perhaps this enables the references to be updated and modified. These quibbles aside, this is an important text, a product of a major research project that deserves a wide readership both inside and outside academia.

GISELLE BYRNES

Victoria University of Wellington

The Anzac Experience: New Zealand, Australia and the Empire in the First World War. By Christopher Pugsley. Reed Publishing, Auckland, 2004. 256 pp. NZ price: \$49.99. ISBN 0-7900-0941-2.

THE 'ANZAC EXPERIENCE' is such an obvious and necessary subject that many who pick up this book will bitterly upbraid themselves that they did not think of it first. But very few of us are as qualified as Chris Pugsley to tackle it, and indeed to do so with such assurance. Pugsley, late of New Zealand, for a time in Australia and now in Britain, has been thinking, writing and especially speaking about the Australasian experience of the Great War and its various impacts for 20-odd years. This book originated in the sort of catastrophic computer glitch which seems to be the twenty-first century's counterpart of the maid throwing a manuscript on a sitting-room fire. Fortunately he was able to retrieve the affected files and they suggested the core of this timely compilation.

If the traditional project of Anzac history has been focused first on the nation and then on the nation's relationship with Britain, Pugsley's book suggests a new and welcome inflection on this familiar approach. He looks sideways at Australia and New Zealand's relationship, with an examination of their individual and joint relationships with Britain and Canada from a fresh perspective. It is in many ways a loose grouping of not altogether connected pieces. Some began life as papers or lectures delivered years before. They

have been re-warmed, but often with fresh ingredients added, to make what is ultimately a nourishing if eclectic brew. Cumulatively, they make a powerful re-examination of seemingly familiar themes.

I have been puffing my own recent *Quinn's Post, Anzac, Gallipoli* as the first truly Anzac history of Gallipoli. Pugsley's book, though, compares the two before, during and after the Gallipoli campaign, giving a mature and refreshingly candid re-assessment. He has an enviable span, reading the experience of 1914–18 against a broad understanding of the military and diplomatic context of the Australia–New Zealand relationship. In discussing the linking of units of the two dominions into divisions and corps he observes not only that 'the New Zealand linkage was expendable if Australian interests were at stake', but that 'it has always been so'. While able to put aside or rise above parochial tendencies, he also notes feelingly and surely correctly that 'Digger' has been totally colonized by Australia.

Pugsley's chapters comprise useful re-considerations and examinations of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force (notably 'The New Zealand Mounted Rifles Brigade in Sinai and Palestine') and essays examining the Anzac partnership as a component of an imperial army. While it is a pity that in some areas he has not revised earlier pieces in the light of later scholarship (such as not using Craig Wilcox's 2002 *Australia's Boer War* in examining the South African precursor to the Great War) his pieces generally offer either novel or pithily restated conclusions.

His comparative chapters are the book's most valuable offerings. Given the nauseating sycophancy directed at Monash (notably by Roland Perry's recent *Monash the Outsider who Won a War*), Pugsley's rigorous analysis of Andrew Russell and John Monash is timely. He neatly and authoritatively puts Monash in his place, arguing that Russell bettered Monash as a divisional commander and that his Canadian counterpart, Arthur Currie, bettered him as a corps commander. Indeed, he argues that Monash was a classic 'chateau general' who 'destroyed the instrument that had given him his victories'.

Likewise, his reminder (well known to Great War operational specialists but perhaps less obvious to general historians and readers) that the dominion and imperial forces learned from each other is instructive. Nearly 20 years ago Peter Pedersen demolished the idea that Australians were 'natural soldiers', and instead learned to apply modern weapons through hard training, but the myth persists. Pugsley demonstrates how dominion forces learned from and adopted each others' techniques, and argues convincingly that 'it was the Canadians who set the benchmark for tactical brilliance'.

This volume comes as a warranted fillip to military history in New Zealand. Hitherto a distinctly minority pursuit, regarded by the wider academic community as antiquarian and marginally relevant, military history has in recent years emerged to become a more catholic field. Its component parts — notably operational history and social history — still co-exist in an often uneasy partnership. Pugsley's work demonstrates the value of the interaction of those two components. In his book *On the Fringe of Hell* (reprinted by a chapter in this collection, 'Flotsam on the fringe of hell') he has shown the value and the power of tackling social and operational history as parts of a unified whole.

As an Australian who would also deplore the suggestion of a compatriot who claimed that Quinn's Post had no New Zealand connection, I must congratulate Chris Pugsley on a fascinating and provocative study, one that reinforces his standing as one of New Zealand's finest military historians. Was there truly an 'Anzac experience'? Pugsley's book allows us to offer many and diverse answers to that question.

PETER STANLEY