

# New Zealand Regional History and its Place in the Schools

---

THE CHIEF purpose of this brief discussion of New Zealand regional history is to assist post-primary teachers and their pupils who wish to take advantage of a recent and welcome innovation in University Entrance Board (U.E.B.) history prescriptions.<sup>1</sup> The 1978 Bursaries and Scholarship examination papers each included for the first time a question based on a 'regional study', on which candidates had been allowed to spend up to one-third of their course time. In retrospect, it appears that this new feature was insufficiently matured before being put into practice. More guidance should have been offered on a new type of study. A greater range of questions was needed to cover the variety of approaches forced on schools by the material available to them. Christchurch teachers were not impressed by the 1978 examiners' brief and unconstructive remarks, and their views were confirmed at a recent meeting of the Post Primary Teachers' Association History Section.

The Education Department is considering a similar proposal at School Certificate level. The officials concerned appear to be having not unexpected problems, and have issued no general statement. It is understood that pilot projects may be introduced in a few Wellington schools in 1980, under departmental supervision. The P.P.T.A. meeting mentioned above understandably resolved that further delay is preferable to another inadequately prepared change. An obvious and necessary step is a conference of teachers (university as well as post-primary), together with archivists and librarians, to consider the whole field and its possibilities for school study. There are also some distinguished regional historians outside these categories who could make a valuable contribution. Among the universities' contingent should be included some historical geographers.

If New Zealand regional history is to be properly understood at any level of study, some preliminary discussion of its nature, terms, and problems seems necessary. Most current misconceptions about regional

<sup>1</sup> This survey represents a personal viewpoint, and no group or organization is committed to its expressions of opinion. However, I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of A.G. Bagnall and P.J. Gibbons, with whom I have worked on the J.M. Sherrard Awards in New Zealand Regional History. The U.E.B. history prescription includes 'race relations'. I have not discussed this aspect, for lack of both space and competence; my remarks are addressed to European colonization. I have found it difficult to offer specific advice in relation to a brief, vague prescription. It is a matter of urgency that the latter be spelled out fully and precisely, with examination papers to match.

history stem from taking it too lightly. The first point to be made is that the correct generic term is *regional history*. For too long the phrase 'local history' has been wrongly used in this country to cover all levels of study in this field. It is also the symbol of a credibility gap between academic historians and the actual practitioners in 'local history', as represented, say, by the New Zealand Federation of Historical Societies. To the latter, the quest for detail carries its own justification; they would welcome contact with academics — on their own ground. The academic historians tend to stand off rather ineffectually, insisting the while that local history must justify itself in terms of something else: 'The parish pump must be related to the cosmos'. We ought to be progressing beyond such arguments. Regional history is a major and rising study overseas, and should become one here. Metaphors such as 'parish pump' (Olde Worlde and irrelevant) or Denis Glover's 'main drain' (more relevant, but with the suggestion of a fastidious sniff) are to regional history as 'plonk' is to wine. It is good to be able to report that more promising contacts are being made in Auckland, Otago, and Wellington.

Regional history is about communities and the areas with which they identify themselves, the definition of both being a matter of special difficulty and imprecision in New Zealand. If the primary function of history as a humane study is to find out 'how people lived' (as distinct, for example, from how they were governed, or who governed them), a fundamental point must be to establish *where* they lived their lives. The normal ambit of the individual is regional and not national, and local rather than regional. Of course, wider trends in events and in public opinion impinge on the individual's daily sphere, but his reaction to them is usually expressed within or through the local framework. Along these lines we can attempt to arrive at some historical definitions of community and region. There is one set of difficulties associated with the period when New Zealand had only a few settlements which were thinly spread in their respected regions. There is another set of problems for the more recent period where more and larger communities overlap untidily in much the same territory, but do not possess strong, long-standing traditions.

For many New Zealanders a continuing problem has been one of scale. They have assumed (with most historians) that the only way to make sense of a small country's history is to deal in the largest possible units and patterns. Further, though our most incisive observers have insisted that politics arise from society and not *vice versa*, there has been a preoccupation with national (and previously, colonial) political rhetoric and its symbols. It has been an uphill fight to banish from our nineteenth-century history such larger-than-life dualisms as Provincialism v. Centralism, and Liberal v. Conservative. If we pick up the regional end of the stick, there should be far less difficulty in grasping the simple truth about the preponderance of small patterns in small society's history. One does not have to go round saying 'small is beautiful'. We should be

mature enough to accept our history as it was.

The 'geometry' of the individual's ambit in society is roughly composed of radii from a centre. Multiplied however many times are necessary, these overlapping patterns would block in an area around whose shadowy outer reaches some historical geographers may feel inclined to draw a circumference, thus 'defining' a social region. From so difficult and debatable an exercise our European history has conveniently rescued us — if we do not set our sights too high and if we accept that earlier political and administrative divisions reflected in substantial degree actual communities, and helped to consolidate them.

If we take such boundaries (drawn or contemplated) as a crude guide to communities, we may say that our European history has given us an interlocking hierarchy of community areas: provincial, regional and local. The largest units in New Zealand history have been the provinces of the period 1853-76, ten in number if we allow Southland's partial claim to such status. The provinces continued an informal political existence well into the 1880s, and our communication and export systems are still in great degree provincial. When New Zealanders seek to identify themselves in the broadest terms inside their own country, it is probably a provincial term that comes most often to their lips: 'I'm from Otago'. Such attitudes may be weakest in parts of Auckland. That province possessed the largest territory and the least coherence before 1876, and has seen the greatest amount of sub-provincial development thereafter. It is not surprising that Auckland has failed to produce a provincial history, though one was planned in the 1950s. Aucklanders are entitled to retort that advocacy of provincial history is evidence of retarded regional growth. Otago is the largest province with a reasonably high sense of continuing identity. Yet it is rather revealing that A.H. McLintock in his *History* devoted to Otago after 1876 only one-quarter of the space given to settlement before that date.

Below the province in New Zealand history stands the region. One general trend in socio-economic development has been for regions to grow at the expense of the old parent province. To call this aspect of our history 'regional' is to invite confusion with the generic meaning of the term — as I do in this article. Every alternative I have tried seems worse, but one can not slide over a great area of our past because it is hard to find a special new name for it.<sup>2</sup> How many New Zealand regions are there? In the mid-1950s the New Zealand Historic Places Trust had to divide this country's territory on the basis of a compromise between its present and past communities. The Trust chose a general level below the provincial, and at present it operates in seventeen regions, together with four large provisional districts. Auckland has been transmuted into five regions and two districts; Otago remains a single region. Possibly the

<sup>2</sup> This is, of course, a gentle invitation to others to try their hand at coining a general and/or special term.

most conspicuous regional activity in New Zealand is rugby football. (Soccer is by contrast an urban game; rugby league is somewhat more widespread as an industrial workers' sport.) There are twenty-six unions affiliated to the New Zealand Rugby Union; they cover our society across the board. The most marginal of them have fiercely and successfully resisted amalgamation. The general definition of our regions lies somewhere in the range used by the Historic Places Trust and the Rugby Union.

Some regions have their roots in the provincial period. One or two of them may be considered 'failed provinces'; the classic example is South Canterbury. Central Otago and North Auckland also had regional ambitions associated with railway construction, but these were long frustrated by their own internal dissensions. The nineteenth-century test of a region was the growth of a substantial new 'port-capital', as in the case of Wanganui, Gisborne, and Tauranga. On the other hand, our two largest regional centres, Hamilton and Palmerston North, reflect inland and mainly twentieth-century development. The latter was first associated with the Great Bush, which led to considerable regional development in the hinterlands of Taranaki, Wellington and Hawke's Bay. Each city remains within the land communications system of its former provincial capital.

The standard bearer and advocate of the region was the daily newspaper (or newspapers), printed at its chief town. Such papers gradually eliminated the other local dailies in the region and also resisted the encroachments of the metropolitan press.

It is the third level of regional history which is correctly described as 'local'. Its largest and oldest historical units are the counties and boroughs created or confirmed in 1876-77. The original list of these local authorities totalled ninety-nine (sixty-three counties and thirty-six boroughs). Local pressures compelled an increase in numbers to over 250 in the 1960s. The Local Government Act 1974 foreshadowed the merging of local into regional government — on financial and administrative grounds. Those local divisions have often been condemned as forcing narrow views and narrow-minded leadership on the smaller New Zealand communities. They have survived over a century of such onslaughts. Inertia and vested interest have, it is true, provided much of their successful defence. But basically, local authorities would not have endured if they did not correspond in substantial degree to social realities: life in New Zealand has been largely localized; it has been social sense to construct local government at a comparatively 'low' level. Even this small-scale social picture is complex. New Zealand's fluid population has developed its suburbs, towns and townships without generating sufficient of what older societies would consider the necessary corresponding loyalties. Life has indeed been localized, but for a fairly rapidly changing population in any given community. We are, in any comparative scale, rather a rootless lot. For this reason, just as much as for the conventional arguments con-

cerning finance and administration, New Zealand has always had problems of regional government.

These century-old divisions are more firmly based in country than in city. It is not surprising that the chief published expression of community history at this level is the history, usually centennial, of a county.<sup>3</sup> Local history has been in popular thinking and in practice primarily a rural affair. The more subtle aspects of community life are usually ignored in favour of a well-tryed and popular sequential treatment, studded with the names of local notables. Maoris, whalers, squatters, miners, timber-workers, gum-diggers, and small farmers (as appropriate) in turn occupy the centre of the stage. Long-standing family connections provide a background of social continuity as well as the best private source material. There are two major defects in such local history. Firstly, the sequential pattern is usually exhausted by the 1920s, and the coda tends to lapse into unrelated topics. The redefinition of community in wider social and economic terms is found difficult (and unpatriotic) and not tried. Secondly, the district's towns and townships fit awkwardly into a story of rural land development. The usual formula of 'service-centre plus anecdotes' does not do justice to them.

This brings us to the greatest problem in New Zealand regional history: where do urban centres fit in, if at all? D.A. Hamer has recently reaffirmed R.M. Chapman's 'town and country' approach in regional politics.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, it would be generally admitted that studies which put an urban centre firmly within the region which sustains it, and which it serves, are legitimately regional. But what of city, town and township, when studies are limited to their respective areas? W.H. Oliver, musing on his own boyhood, has recalled the sense of separation which even small town people felt when they viewed the farmers 'out there', whose service centre they were supposed to be. In the largest cities, the community spirit of suburbs was being heavily eroded even before 1914 by social mobility, by industrial specialization, by the consequent separation of home and workplace, and by the proliferation of suburban trains and trams. Identification with *part* of a perceived total area seems to me the basic feature of social regionalism, and in the more advanced urban areas this sense was probably falling below some critical level. Some would argue that the trend was simple: the individual was shifting his community ties and interests from suburb to city, but this is a proposition I find hard to accept. My tentative view is that on balance urban history *per se* does not possess sufficient of the elements of community

3 A sizeable crop of these appeared in 1976-77, or later. The great majority of these, e.g. Piako, Raglan, Rodney and Waikato, showed little or no advance in the writing of local history. A great opportunity was lost.

4 D.A. Hamer, 'Towns in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand', *New Zealand Journal of History* (NZJH), XIII, 1 (April 1979), 5-20; R.M. Chapman, 'The Decline of the Liberals', *Ends and Means in New Zealand Politics*, Auckland, 1961.

and region to be subsumed under regional history.<sup>5</sup> It should be studied separately in its own right, particularly when suburbs have lost most of their self-containment. It is interesting to note that two recent and valuable Wellington suburban studies — A.G. Bagnall on the Eastern Bays and D.G. Pearson on Johnsonville — both deal with communities physically separated from the main urban corpus.<sup>6</sup> I doubt if similar studies with a regional element could be written about older city suburbs in the twentieth century.

Other recent New Zealand urban studies have acquired a different kind of regional element from an unexpected source. Erik Olssen and other younger historians (of what may be called a 'conflict' point of view) have been impressed by Gramsci's views on 'hegemony' and the related developments in American sociology. They have discarded 'community' as the main social test of what may be called for the moment urban regionalism in favour of 'class' and are looking for 'sub-cultures' in working-class suburbs. Olssen has introduced an honours course at Otago University on Caversham and its place in Dunedin, building the first year of studies round the theme of 'modernisation'.<sup>7</sup> The most substantial New Zealand study of the place of 'community' and 'class' in a wider regional setting is written in a similar spirit. J.H. Angus's Ph.D thesis, 'City and country: change and continuity', provides a penetrating study of Otago electoral politics and society, 1877-93. Angus concludes that a distinct social and political cleavage emerged between Dunedin and its hinterland in this period. 'Community' continued to govern life in rural regions: by 1890 the politics of class predominated in Dunedin, Labour having achieved a secure base in the city's working-class areas. Historians of a 'consensus' persuasion will find these arguments overstated. This combination of class and suburb indeed does not fit easily into what some will regard as my conventional framework of regional history. It seems to me to possess regional validity only as part of a wider 'conflict' community, in this case Dunedin. Should New Zealand regional history be redefined to include such urban tensions? I would prefer to wait until both 'conflict' and 'consensus' historians have worked more fully in this field. Research on the early coal-mining towns of Westland and Buller may provide valuable indications on this general topic. In them, community and class (so far as the latter term was applicable) were often almost interchangeable, a sense of region was strong, and the 'ruling class' maintained only a token presence.

At this point, one ought to ask what is the relationship between

5 It must be remembered that New Zealand was primarily a rural country in fact and in expectations in the nineteenth century.

6 A.G. Bagnall, *Okiwi*, Eastbourne, 1972; D.G. Pearson, 'Class, Status and Reminiscence, A Research Note'. NZJH, XIII, 1 (April 1979), 83-88.

7 Erik Olssen kindly supplied me with notes on this course. It will not escape notice that just as I have difficulty in fitting urban history into my pattern, Olssen has corresponding problems with rural society (see his *Social Class* article).

regional and social history, but this is hardly the place to raise so large a question. The Turnbull Library conference did not consider this problem, and no regional study was presented at it.<sup>8</sup> Yet it is true to say that many or most of the generalizations of social history ought to arise from, and all should be tested by, regional studies. The enormous amount of work which any adequate regional survey involves points to team work rather than individual effort. I have made this point before and make it again: New Zealand needs at least one fully-staffed department of social history, which will include regional studies in its purview. It will not be a place for the tidy-minded student, even if much of its work will be done on computers. Will all this get us nearer understanding people living out their lives in early New Zealand communities? It may be that the best academic instrument to bridge the final gap will be a regional historian turned novelist. From such a writer we may perhaps at last receive the Great New Zealand Novel. From this person and from his or her colleagues we may also expect better New Zealand history. A leading Australian historian has revolutionary expectations for his country: 'Regional history . . . has the potential to fracture beyond repair the assumptions embodied in the general histories.'<sup>9</sup> Why should we look for less in New Zealand?

In fact, New Zealand historians do not need to look at Australia for a lead. They have paid insufficient attention to a seminal paper by W.H. Oliver, delivered a decade ago. Oliver undertook his history of the East Coast region (so he tells us in the preface to *Challenge and Response*) primarily in his role as general historian examining 'the history of New Zealand within a regional context. . . . New Zealand experience as a whole' was to be *illuminated* by the particular experience of the East Coast Region.<sup>10</sup> Yet, he had, in 1969, produced what I regard as a more 'illuminating' statement, when distilling his ideas on regionalism rather than one region into the Hocken Lecture, *Towards a New History?* In discussing how some important questions in New Zealand history could be resolved, Oliver concluded that 'it would not be possible to do this except as a series of regional generalisations', and spoke of 'build[ing] these regionalisations into a larger generalisation'.<sup>11</sup> Though he did not develop the great issues implicit in this statement, he was clear on the question of emphasis: 'The job of social history is to move from the centre to the periphery'. He went on to speak (with implied approval) of a 'half-way house between the microcosm and the macrocosm',<sup>12</sup> a posi-

8 See 'Special Issue on New Zealand Social History', NZJH, XIII, 1, (April 1979). Teachers should make full use of this issue for both ideas and sources relating to New Zealand social history, and transfer them to regional studies. See also R.C.J. Stone, 'Clio and the Parish Pump', NZJH, VII, 1 (April 1973).

9. J.W. McCarty, 'Australian Regional History', *Historical Studies*, XVIII, 70 (April 1978), 104.

10 W.H. Oliver, *Challenge and Response*, Gisborne, 1971, Preface. (Emphasis mine.)

11 W.H. Oliver, *Towards a New History?*, Dunedin, 1971, p.24.

12 *ibid.*, p.22.

tion different from the one he was to take in 1971. What appears to be Oliver's final word represents a retreat from his first stance: he set out to treat East Coast history 'as a set of variations upon a New Zealand theme',<sup>13</sup> a statement which suggests that there is a prior and established general history. While I agree that New Zealand regional histories do not vary greatly, it is far from true to say that any published general New Zealand history is a mean of these variations — in those aspects in which it should be.

When it comes to offering suggestions on how to manage courses in regional history, I am not presuming to address the many able, experienced teachers who do not need such help. I have in mind junior teachers, new to a region or taking up its history more or less *ab initio*. In general, I would urge caution on them. Published regional histories are not written for schools, and the idea that their subject matter is somehow 'simpler' could lead to trouble. This option demands more work from both teachers and pupils. At this stage only the ablest and most industrious among the latter should be accepted for the course. Regional history seeks to get as close as possible to individuals in society, and the price of this is a high degree of particularity, especially in the naming of people in their community. The U.E.B. prescription-makers appear to regard regional history as a manageable, practical way of introducing candidates to social history, yet they make no allowance for the difficulties of moulding its proliferation of detail into understandable (and examinable) social generalizations. Teachers short of time may be better advised to tackle the course at the provincial or regional level, where such problems are diminished.

Courses should be geared to the strengths rather than the weaknesses of existing regional histories. From them, by judicious selection, the succession of socio-economic groups which predominated in the region's history can be illustrated vividly and directly on landscapes familiar to pupils. A strong element of historical geography should be built in, for example, maps of runs and small farm settlements. Early photographs of people and places should be carefully analyzed and compared to help recreate past life-styles in the imaginations of pupils. For explanation of economic change it is necessary to look outside the region, but this aspect should be kept firmly under control. Stereotypes which exaggerate regional differences should be eschewed or examined critically. On the other hand, the more concrete differences between the region and its neighbours may be looked at, explained and trimmed to size. The basic aim is for pupils to gain some idea of how people (in many cases their forebears) lived their lives in a particular New Zealand community before 1914.

It is assumed that teachers will have access to regional sources: univer-

13 Oliver, *Challenge*, p.10.

sity departments, libraries, archives, historical journals, and (where appropriate) institutional histories. Principals should be made to realize that without extra photocopying and photographic facilities a course will lack necessary dynamics. As a general rule, teachers should concentrate on the simpler sources, as even these will need extensive adaptation for class use. A valuable suggestion in the U.E.B. prescription is the use of contemporary accounts. They should be used selectively, and in conjunction with English courses so that they can return their full value as works of New Zealand literature as well as history.

The following list, mainly of published books, is offered as a guide to the better material available for purchase or in libraries.<sup>14</sup> A degree of leniency has been occasionally exercised to ensure coverage of as many regions as possible. For lack of space and sufficient quality, the list cannot be comprehensive. It will provide content for some teachers; others can get help in planning courses from parallel material outside their region. What sort of progress has been made in new Zealand regional history? With some notable exceptions, the record is hardly one of historiographical success. It seems best to begin with a short list of work in which theory is advanced as well as practice:

J.H. Angus, 'City and Country, Change and Continuity, Electoral Politics and Society in Otago, 1877-93', unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Otago, 1976; R. Arnold, 'The Opening of the Great Bush', unpublished Ph.D thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1971; W.J. Gardner, 'Grass Roots and Dredge Tailings', *Landfall*, 43 (September 1957), 'Introduction', *A History of Canterbury*, Vol. III, Christchurch, 1965; W.H. Oliver, *Towards a New History?*, Dunedin, 1969, *Challenge and Response* [Gisborne East Coast], Gisborne, 1971; E. Olssen, 'Social Class in 19th Century New Zealand', in D. Pitt (ed.), *Social Class in New Zealand*, Auckland, 1977.

The titles in the general list are grouped by provinces. Within each section there are categories denoted by the following abbreviations: (P)—provincial; (R)—regional; (L)—local; (U)—urban; (M)—contemporary accounts, memoirs.<sup>15</sup>

**Auckland.** (P) J. Horsman, *Coming of the Pakeha to Auckland*, Wellington, 1971. (R) W.H. Oliver, *Challenge and Response*; R.C.J. Stone, *Makers of Fortune* [Waikato, Northland], Auckland, 1973. (L) L.H. Barber, *View from Pirongia*, Te Awamutu, 1978; N.M. Morris, *Early Days in Franklin*, Pukekohe, 1965; E.S. Beer and A.R. Gascoigne, *Plough of the Pakeha*, Cambridge, 1975; H.C.M. Norris, *Armed Settlers*, 1963, and *Settlers in Depression*, 1964, both

<sup>14</sup> The following list represents a compromise between the views of Bagnall, Gibbons and myself. I take responsibility for its content and form. I have included works on urban history in spite of my doubts. The U.E.B. prescription does not exclude such studies.

<sup>15</sup> From the above list, I offer the following titles as providing most general guidance in their respective fields: (P) *History of Canterbury*; (R) Bagnall, Oliver, Stone; (L) Gardner, Marks, Sherrard; (U) Gibbons, Stone.

- Hamilton; E.M. Stokes, *The Land Remains* [Tauranga County], in press. (U) G.W.A. Bush, *Decently and in Order* [Auckland City], Auckland, 1971; R.C.J. Stone, *Makers of Fortune*, [Auckland city and suburbs], Auckland, 1973; P.J. Gibbons, *Astride the River*, Hamilton, 1977. (M) J.L. Campbell, *Poenamo*, 1881, Golden Press reprint, 1973; I. Coates, *On Record*, Hamilton, 1963; J.E. Gorst, *The Maori King*, 1864, K. Sinclair, ed., Hamilton, 1959, also Capper Press reprint, 1974; *Auckland Journals of Vicesimus Lush*, 1850-63 and *Thames Journals of Vicesimus Lush*, 1868-82, A. Drummond, ed., Christchurch 1971, 1975.
- Taranaki.** (P) R.G. Wood, *Plymouth to New Plymouth*, Wellington, 1959. (L) K.W. Thomson, ed., *Legacy of Turi*, [Patea], Palmerston North, 1976. (M) C.F. Hursthouse, *Account of the Settlement of New Plymouth*, 1849, Christchurch, Capper Press reprint, 1975; J. Rutherford and W.H. Skinner, *Establishment of New Plymouth, 1841-3*, New Plymouth, 1940.
- Hawkes Bay.** (P) J.G. Wilson, *History of Hawkes Bay*, 1939, Christchurch, Capper Press reprint, 1976; (L) S.W. Grant, *Waimarama*, Palmerston North, 1977; A.E. Woodhouse, *Guthrie-Smith of Tutira*, Christchurch, 1959. (U) M.D.N. Campbell, *Story of Napier, 1874-1974*, Napier, 1975. (M) H. Guthrie-Smith, *Tutira*, 4th ed., Wellington, 1969.
- Wellington.** (P) A.E. Mulgan, *City of the Strait*, Wellington, 1939. (R) A.G. Bagnall, *Wairarapa*, Masterton, 1976; S.H. Franklin, 'The Village and the Bush . . . Wellington Province', *Pacific Viewpoint*, 1, 2 (1960); G.C. Petersen, *Forest Homes* [Forty Mile Bush], Wellington, 1956. (L) A.G. Bagnall, *Old Greytown*, 1953, *History of Carterton*, Carterton, 1957; M.H. Holcroft, *The Line of the Road* [Manawatu County], Dunedin, 1977; B.E. Macmorran, *In View of Kapiti*, Palmerston North, 1977. (U) A.G. Bagnall, *Okiwi* [Eastern Bays, Wellington], Eastbourne, 1972; A.H. Carman, *Birth of a City*, Wellington, 1970; D.P. Millar, *Once Upon a Village* [Lower Hutt], Wellington, 1972; G.C. Petersen, *Palmerston North*, Wellington, 1973; M.J.G. Smart and A.P. Bates, *Wanganui Story*, Wanganui, 1972; J. Struthers, *Mirimar Peninsula*, Mirimar, 1975. (M) E.J. Wakefield, *Adventure in New Zealand*, 1845, Auckland, Golden Press reprint 1975.
- Nelson.** (P) R.M. Allan, *Nelson, Early Settlement*, Wellington, 1965. (R) J.N.W. Newport, *Footprints, Nelson Back Country*, Christchurch, 1965. (L) M.C. Brown, *Difficult Country*, Murchison, 1976; J.N.W. Newport, *Collingwood*, Christchurch, 1971; E.M. Washbourn, *Courage and Camp Ovens* [Golden Bay], Wellington, 1970. (U) R.M. Allan, *History of Port Nelson*, Wellington, 1954. (M) *The Dillon Letters*, 1842-53, C.A. Sharp, ed., Wellington, 1954.
- Marlborough.** (P) A.D. McIntosh, *Marlborough*, Christchurch, 1940, Capper Press reprint, 1977. (L) M.C. Goulter, *Keeper of the Sheep*, Christchurch, 1955; D.W. Grady, *Guards of the Sea*, Christchurch, 1978; A.L. Kennington, *The Awatere*, Blenheim, 1978; L.W. McCaskill, *Molesworth*, 3rd ed., Wellington, 1975; J.M. Sherrard, *Kaikoura*, Christchurch, 1966.
- Canterbury.** (P) J. Hight, C.R. Straubel, and W.J. Gardner, eds., *History of Canterbury*, Christchurch, Vol. 1, 1957, Vol. 2, 1971, Vol. 3, 1965; L.G.D. Acland, *Early Canterbury Runs*, W.H. Scotter, ed., Christchurch, 1975. (R) O.A. Gillespie, *South Canterbury*, 2nd ed., Timaru, 1971; D.N. Hawkins, *Beyond the Waimakariri*, 1957, Christchurch, Capper Press reprint, 1978; R. Pinney, *Early South Canterbury Runs*, Wellington, 1971. (L) W.J. Gardner, *The Amuri*, Culverden, 1956; O.A. Gillespie, *Oxford*, Oxford, 1954; W.H. Scotter, *Ashburton*, Ashburton, 1972. (U) F.O. Bennett, *Hospital on the Avon*,

Christchurch, 1962; J.P. Morrison, *The Evolution of a City* [Christchurch] Christchurch, 1949; New Zealand Federation of University Women, Canterbury Branch, *Sydenham*, Christchurch, 1977; W.H. Scotter, *History of Port Lyttelton*, Christchurch, 1968. (M) Lady M.A. Barker, *Station Life in New Zealand 1870*, Auckland, reprinted 1978; S. Butler, *First Year in Canterbury Settlement 1863*, Christchurch, reprinted 1964; J. Deans, *Pioneers of Port Cooper Plains*, Christchurch, 1964; C. Godley, *Letters from Early New Zealand 1850-53*, Christchurch, reprinted 1951; L.J. Kennaway, *Crusts* [Canterbury squatting], Christchurch, Capper Press reprint 1970.

**Westland.** (P) P.R. May, *West Coast Gold Rushes*, 2nd ed., Christchurch, 1967, and *Miners and Militants, 1865-1918*, Christchurch, 1975. (L) P.R. May, *Gold Town* [Ross], Christchurch, 1970. (M) G. Mueller, *My Dear Bannie* [goldfields 1864-65], Christchurch, 1958; J.D. Pascoe, *Mr Explorer Douglas*, Wellington, 1957; G.O. Preshaw, *Banking under Difficulties*, 1888, Christchurch, Capper Press reprint, 1971.

**Otago.** (P) A.H. McLintock, *History of Otago*, Christchurch, 1948, Capper Press reprint, 1975. (R) K.C. McDonald, *White Stone Country* [North Otago], 1962, Christchurch, Capper Press reprint, 1977. (L) J.H. Angus, *One Hundred Years of Vincent County*, Clyde, 1977; R. Marks, *Hammer and Tap* [Tuapeka County], Lawrence, 1977; F.W.G. Miller *Golden Days of Lake County*, 5th ed., Christchurch, 1973; J.C. Parcell, *Heart of the Desert*, Christchurch, reprinted 1976; I.O. Roxburgh, *Wanaka Story*, 1957, Christchurch, Capper Press reprint 1977, and *Jacksons Bay*, Wellington, 1976; W.H. Scotter, *Run, Estate and Farm*, Christchurch, 1948, Capper Press reprint, 1978. (U) H.O. Bowman, *Port Chalmers*, Christchurch, 1948, Capper Press reprint, 1978; K.C. McDonald, *City of Dunedin*, Dunedin, 1965; A.H. McLintock, *Port of Otago*, Christchurch, 1951.

**Southland.** (L) B.H. Howard, *Rakiura, Stewart Island*, Christchurch, 1940, Capper Press reprint, 1975; F.W.G. Miller, *West to the Fiords*, 2nd ed., Christchurch, 1975, *History of Waikaia*, 1966, and *King of Counties* [Southland], Invercargill, 1977. (U) J. Hall-Jones, *Bluff Harbour*, Bluff, 1976; M.H. Holcroft, *Old Invercargill*, Dunedin, 1976.

The two main sources of periodical articles on regional history are the *New Zealand Journal of History* and the *New Zealand Geographer*. These selected references are abbreviated. NZJH: R. Arnold, 'Taranaki Immigration', VI, 1; S.T. Eldred-Grigg, '[Ashburton] Gentry', XI, 1; G.J. Rosanowski, 'West Coast Railways', IV, 1; R.C.J. Stone, 'Thames Valley Railway', VIII, 1; D.B. Waterston, 'Matamata Estate', III, 1; J. Williams, 'Pastoralists and Maoris [Wairarapa]', XI, 1. NZG: R. Arnold, 'Virgin Forest' [regional milling], XXXII, 2; J. Forrest, 'Otago Goldfields Population', XVII, 1; R.P. Hargreaves, 'Pioneer Taranaki Farming', XIX, 1; W.B. Johnston, 'Pioneering Taranaki Bushlands', XVII, 1; M. McCaskill, 'Westland Goldrush Population', XII, 1; K.A. Pickens, 'Canterbury's Nineteenth Century Population', XXXIII, 2.

A list of unpublished theses was also prepared, but it proved both too specialist and too unwieldy. Those interested are referred to the library and history department of the university concerned, or to the section on 'Research, Theses Completed' in the October issues of NZJH, or to the local library's inter-loan services.<sup>16</sup>

From all this new study, it is hoped that a new generation of history

students will arrive at the universities with appetites whetted for more detailed studies in New Zealand history. It is from their ranks that must come the regional and social historians which New Zealand so badly needs.

W.J. GARDNER

*University of Canterbury*

Postscript: The long-delayed formation of the New Zealand Historical Association in August 1979 promises a closing of the 'gap' mentioned on p.183 above. See also pp 212-3.

---

If you are interested in New Zealanders outside New Zealand  
ask your bookseller for

**LANDFALL 131**  
(September)

or send your subscription, \$9.00, to  
P.O. Box 25-088, Christchurch

---

*If not, wait for LANDFALL 132*  
*(December) which is about children and literature*

---

16 Teachers who wish to explore the possibilities of local history studies 'in the field' should consult S.T. Eldred-Grigg, 'Longbeach, Material Life in the South Island Countryside', *Historical News*, forthcoming issue. My advice would be to introduce such studies elsewhere than in University Entrance classes.