

Durham mostly wrong' in 1839. If Russell's logic had been applied for many years longer, Canada would have broken away, with incalculable consequences for the Empire and the world. Dr Cell does not seem very much at home in New Zealand history. It is an exaggeration to say (p. 120) that Lord Grey became 'a backer of despotism' by suspending the New Zealand constitution of 1846: it was a case of *reculer pour mieux sauter*. And why should it be 'more difficult to comprehend why he [Sir George Grey] should have decided only four years later to frame a constitution himself'? The suspension was only for five years and, as Lord Grey explains in his *Colonial Policy*, but for the pressure of other business in the House, there would have been a bill in 1851: this does not suggest a 'successful delaying action' on his part. Dr Cell also omits to point out that Wynyard's 'de facto acceptance of responsible government' soon broke down. But despite all this, the chapter on 'The Transfer of Power in the 1850s' is a good one and the comparison with India and Africa in the 1940s and 1950s is stimulating. Its successor, 'The Working of Responsible Government', with special reference to Canada (where Dr Cell uses a book of Dr J. E. Hodgetts which I have not seen) and New South Wales, is one of the most informative and shows once again how much still remains to be done on colonial administrative history. The final chapter of the section, 'The Implications of Responsible Government', deals mainly with defence and proposals of federation — a more familiar field.

There is a concluding section on 'Interdepartmental Relations'. 'The Management of Eastern Communications: a Case Study in Treasury Control', though it has some bearing on Australian history, reads more like an independent article than a chapter in a book on British colonial administration. The last chapter on 'The Coolie Convention of 1861 and the Annexation of Lagos' is well done and much more to the point.

There are unfortunately a number of slips. Stephen became a regius professor at Cambridge, not Oxford. The New South Wales politician was Henry, not Joseph, Parkes. Stafford Northcote was not a permanent official of the Treasury. It is not true that colonial bishops 'often served . . . as magistrates'; so far as I know, they never did. It was Van Diemen's Land, not Hobart, that had a population of 66,000 in 1847. In short, the book is far from faultless and somewhat lacking in unity. But it is competently written, scholarly in approach and makes a very useful contribution to colonial history. It is also, as one would expect from Yale, very well produced.

W. P. MORRELL

University of Otago

A New Britannia. An argument concerning the social origins of Australian radicalism and nationalism. By Humphrey McQueen. Penguin Books, Australia, 1970. 261 pp. Australian price: \$1.50.

A NEW BRITANNIA is a lively and very self-consciously provocative re-examination of some views on Australian radicalism and nationalism. It tries to show why Australian workers were integrated into the capitalist

system and failed to create a genuinely socialist party. According to a foreword by Manning Clark it presents the view of the 'New Left', and does indeed end by looking forward to a communist Jerusalem in Australia's (ideologically) dry and barren land.

The author claims to have learned much from 'the Gramscian concept of "Hegemony"' and from Lukacs. He professes an interest in 'the theoretical foundations' of history and from time to time refers to Marx, Lenin or Mao whenever he feels his argument needs a shot in the arm or one for the road. Yet the total contribution of political philosophy to his argument is about as great as the influence of Lascaux on Esquimaux carving. Rather his argument is shaped by political attitudes of a familiar sort.

It is hard at first not to suspect an elaborate send-up or put-on or spoof-out. For instance the author reviews his own book in an introduction written on 31 May 1970, indicating its 'great flaw', its inadequate attention to ruling class culture, since 'the past belongs to the enemy'. But by 1 September 1970 he has had further revelations and re-reviews it in a post-script confessing that his work really represents the 'old left' he is denouncing. (Toynbee has treated us to not dissimilar confidences about his illumination.)

If this seems too humourless not to be intentionally funny, more is to come. The author writes a sketchy but entertaining chapter on the role of the piano in Australia, as a goal of respectable enterprise, and later observes that abstinence from alcohol was a way of distinguishing the sheep from the goats. 'Seen in this way temperance bears a striking resemblance to the piano: both were outward signs of an inner striving, although the former was the means and the latter the proof of arrival.' This striking observation will no doubt appear in next year's exam papers: 'Discuss with reference to the period . . .'

On p. 115 he tells us that some of Lawson's 'finest lines' are in his war poem on 'Antwerp (1914)' and quotes:

'And the dead and the charred and the mangled,
and the wounded are everywhere.'

Clearly such a book deserves to be reviewed in the spirit in which it is written.

My first thought was that Humphrey McQueen was the pseudonym of Barry Humphreys. But internal evidence came to suggest Manning Clark. In his foreword, while predicting that the book may arouse angry debate, Clark leaves it to others to 'discuss the quality of the performance'. Such a modest disclaimer surely suggests author rather than introducer? The author (p. 198) talks of Henry George's 'contribution to socialist thinking', an error also found in Clark's *Short History* (Mentor Book), p. 164. But the evidence is inconclusive. On p. 166 it appears that H. McQueen realises that H. George was not a socialist. The reviewer accepts then the assurance that the author is a Senior Tutor in M. Clark's department.

One wonders where the author grew up (the blurb says Brisbane). Although the aim of the book is clearly to shock, the tone is one of constant, shocked surprise. Even among Australian historians most of whom are parsons' sons (like M. Clark) he is eminently shockable. He is shocked that Australia is a capitalist society. Although anyone knowing of its taxation and social security systems might think it one of the most ruthless

capitalist societies in the world, according to the author (p. 12), Australian socialists don't realise this and all his thunderings, he believes, will not serve to convince them. He is shaken by the fact that Australia is racist. But who thinks Australians aren't racist? One has heard of 'white Australia' and heard Aussies referring to 'bloody abos'. He is shocked that academics dabble in military matters (p. 98).

He is surprised that Australian nationalists and left-wingers were once racists and anti-semites. In this sense the book is a profoundly unhistorical interpretation, taking modern attitudes firmly back into the past. He is perturbed that 'the Labor Party was racist before it was socialist'. But who last thought it was socialist?

It is hard to believe that the author hopes to have readers for whom these matters will have the force of revelation. Rather they are old hat, even for the audience he seems to have in mind — the readers of Brian Fitzpatrick, Russel Ward and Robin Gollan.

Where what the author says is new it often stops a good way short of being convincing. He has apparently, as we have seen, discovered afresh that Australia is capitalist, racist and imperialist. It is a capitalist frontier (believe it or not) in Asia. It was the threat of Asia that made Australians racist. Their nationalism is really British race patriotism. It is, he claims, chauvinism made racist by proximity to Asia.

On this last crucial point, the evidence is so thin that it would not support a spider's argument. One of his main contentions is that the 'mainstay' of Australian nationalism was not anti-British feeling but, in the long run, anti-Asian. He tries to show that during Hughes's pro-conscription campaign the aim was to keep Australia white by keeping out the Japanese with a conscript army. Alas! Wartime censorship, the author says, prevents us (on p. 78) from learning what importance Hughes actually attached to the Japanese.

In another section, the author tries to argue that the shearers (like other sections of Australian society) were property owners. But his principal evidence (p. 170) appears to be a story by Henry Lawson. This is an argument which may be had both ways. By p. 216 he says the Queensland shearers are 'frustrated smallholders'. Presumably this means *landless* smallholders, a novel social category which Mr McQueen's views require to have existed. There is another similarly original class or section which provides another exam question: Discuss the assertion that the diggers were in fact or in spirit 'dispossessed small-holders' (p. 179).

There is much similar fizzy stuff; not champagne perhaps, but at least coke. For instance, 'Labor is not inherently corrupt'.

The author lays about with gay but careless abandon. He may have readers who do not know that William Lane ended up editing the super-imperialist *New Zealand Herald*, exhorting the youth to join up for World War I. But he should not on the same page (193) quote Marx to characterize Lane as a utopian socialist who rejects all political action, and then quote Lane as saying 'one seat won in Parliament is worth more than a successful strike'.

Australian Labor parties may have been planned before the strikes, but this does *not* explain why anyone voted for them. The author says (p. 143) that the search for gold led to imperialism, but his evidence suggests that imperialism led to gold.

Reeves was not a minister when he wrote on socialism and he did not write it up to Marx but up to Sidney Webb (p. 189). Nor did he introduce compulsory arbitration in 1890.

Despite this sort of thing, *A New Britannia* is the kind of book which any bold and able young historian would like to have written. I shall recommend it to my students. The author, like the diggers, will then grow rich and respectable. But there is one sobering thought he should consider. What if his communist millenium arrives? If it is of the Russian sort, and that is what Australia, as he describes it, is likely to get, he will find himself living in a militaristic, racist, anti-semitic, expansionist, imperialist, undemocratic, piano-playing utopia.

KEITH SINCLAIR

University of Auckland

The Collected Works of Edward Gibbon Wakefield. Edited with an Introduction by M. F. Lloyd Prichard. Collins, Auckland, 1969, 1040 pp. N.Z. price: \$13.95.

DR PRICHARD'S stated purpose in compiling the collected works of Wakefield ('this remarkable man') was to allow 'a fuller assessment of his worth' through a reading of 'his printed works'. The introduction was 'to give further understanding of Wakefield' by quotations from 'his own words from speeches, letters and articles'. Her intentions were good and for individuals and libraries attempting to increase collections of nineteenth century materials, the volume is an addition. It will allow students and scholars to come to know the theories of systematic colonization better by making available to them in one volume some of the publications on the subject.

In the tradition of Garnett, Harrop, O'Connor and Bloomfield, Prichard glorifies Wakefield and gives an unquestioning credit to him as author of the pamphlets and works in the collection, including Appendix B of the Durham Report. The evidence for such claims is questionable. She includes *A Letter from Sydney The Principal Town of Australasia* as Wakefield's work, conceding only in her introduction that it was edited by Robert Gouger (p. 13). In the same paragraph Prichard mentions *Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia* as Wakefield's first pamphlet but adds that 'Outline of a System of Colonization', the appendix to *A Letter from Sydney*, 'was a modified version of his first pamphlet'. Were the changes only a modification or did they embody a fundamental shift from a set of specific proposals to a series of abstract 'principles'? The author of *Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia* stated quite specifically that colonial land was to be sold at £2 per acre and that British emigrants selected for assisted passage were to be between 18 and 24 years of age, married couples without children or single persons in equal numbers between the sexes. In 'modifying' those specific proposals, Wakefield (or Gouger?) omitted them entirely in 'Outline of a System of Colonization' in favour of an unspecified amount to be charged for land and a vague statement that selected emigrants should be young persons.