

dently, 'New Zealanders, the people' are represented in the photographs by only fourteen human figures — nine in Antarctica, one underground, and four on a Japanese ship.

R. GERARD WARD

Australian National University

The Search for Security in the Pacific, 1901-14. By Neville Meaney. Sydney University Press, 1976. 306 pp. Australian price: \$18.

THIS WORK by a senior lecturer in history at the University of Sydney has another title which perhaps indicates its content a little more specifically: the title given above is the one which appears on the spine of the book and in heavy black print on the title-page but we learn of the very special, if not absolutely exclusive, Australian interest of this book from the secondary name, *A History of Australian Defence and Foreign Policy 1901-23: Volume I*. Most Australian historians have neglected the field of foreign policy or have relegated it to a paragraph or two in a concluding chapter dealing with events from about 1938 onwards. Of course, it is a matter of constitutional history and fact that in the years under review in Meaney's two volumes Australia did not have a foreign policy simply because it was still part of the one undivided British Empire wherein the powers to deal with international relations and crises were concentrated in the Foreign Office in London. Nevertheless, as Dr. Meaney is at pains to point out, the Australian Commonwealth leaders were so conscious of the geo-political situation and its very different meanings for men in London and Sydney that they were in process of evolving their own foreign strategy, with some particular reference to defence needs, long before the outbreak of the First World War.

Dr. Meaney is to be congratulated on his deep-probing research and his careful analysis of the diplomatic interests and defence programmes of the Australian politicians who were concerned with the security of their land in its Asian-Pacific context. He has uncovered the origins of certain ideas and policies and has shown clearly that many problems which were crucially important in and after the Second World War were considered very seriously in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by such men as Edmund Barton, Alfred Deakin, J. C. Watson, Andrew Fisher, W. M. Hughes, G. F. Pearce, and Joseph Cook. He takes his analysis of early Australian nationalism and of proposals to cope with the rise of Japan, especially after that country's defeat of Russia in 1905, very much further than any of his predecessors in this field. Possibly, he goes too far in arguing that 'It is in the study of trade, immigration and most especially defence and foreign policy that the true character of Australian nationalism can be discerned.' What came from the minority of informed leaders did not necessarily represent what the people or the nation was thinking. Nevertheless, Meaney does show that there was a growing realization of the conflict between imperial loyalties and Australian needs: one could not support wholeheartedly the ideal of 'One Empire, one navy, one flag' at the same time that one was insisting upon the special defence requirements of an island in the south-west Pacific.

While this book has great importance in the study of Australian foreign policy and defence questions, it also has some interest for students of New Zealand history. This is so in the first place because both Australia and New Zealand frequently faced the same problems in very similar South Pacific situations. Their attitudes to the Pacific Island questions (e.g. the New Hebrides) which Dr. Meaney discusses were not dissimilar. No doubt because Australia was older and bigger and therefore more capable of taking an independent stance on questions which New Zealand preferred for far too long to leave to the Mother-country there was bound to be some divergence between the two Dominions. Incidentally, Dr. Meaney applies the term 'Dominion' to New Zealand when dealing with the 1902 Colonial Conference and to Deakin-Seddon exchanges of 1906 whereas it was only in 1907, after the 1907 Colonial Conference, that Sir Joseph Ward secured the alteration which was admittedly more a change in nomenclature than in national status. But such mistakes as are made are more in emphasis than in fact. Thus, in claiming that 'New Zealand wanted partition' of the New Hebrides in 1903, Dr. Meaney overlooks a long history of consistent opposition to any cession of any part of that group to the French and elevates one alternative to the level of a definite policy. But, of course, it is in respect to the reasons for Australian arguments for a separate Australian navy or naval squadron that this book is at its best.

Perhaps it is ultra-pedantic and old-fashioned to criticize the English style of a book which is eminently readable and perfectly intelligible, but this reviewer cannot let pass without comment such usages as 'He argued Salisbury', 'that important', 'to try and secure', and 'Deakin wrote the Colonial Office'. Perhaps Australian historians are prepared to go all the way with L.B.J. and other Americans!

ANGUS ROSS

University of Otago

'Hauhau': The Pai Marire Search for Maori Identity. By Paul Clark. Auckland and Oxford University Presses, Auckland, 1975. 186 pp. N.Z. price: \$9.40.

NEW ZEALAND scholars commonly refer to the high quality of the M.A. theses, at least in history, written in their universities. While in most countries the M.A. has degenerated into an upward extension of undergraduate work, in New Zealand it remains a downward extension of the professional demands of the doctorate. Paul Clark's short, but telling, study of the Hauhau movement, having originated as a Master's essay at the University of Auckland, provides yet another example in support of these contentions, for it has all the hallmarks of the accomplished scholar: thorough and imaginative research, careful and prudent composition, an ability to see its subject matter against a broad canvas, and a happy flair for revisionism without irresponsibility. Maori history has lost a sound practitioner, as Mr. Clark pursues his doctorate in Chinese history at Harvard.

As Clark notes in his Preface, the Hauhaus have been given a bad name in New Zealand historiography. Without falling into the error of over-compensa-