

Towards an Urban Social History for New Zealand

THE EXTENT to which urban historians now try through conferences and journals to acquaint themselves with work being done in other countries makes it more likely that future studies will lay a better foundation for comparative analyses. Urban social history, a relative newcomer among specialities within the field, has already benefited from systematic comparisons by Michael Katz and his collaborators of a Canadian and an American city.¹ Further attempts to discover the similarities and differences in social patterns among cities in the British periphery hold the promise common to comparisons in which many characteristics are shared: what is distinctive in the experience of the nations compared can be identified more precisely. Those British colonies which began as new frontiers separated by great distances, such as Canada and Australia or the United States and New Zealand, seem peculiarly useful laboratories for investigations with an eye to comparison.²

My own sense of their promise grew out of a Fulbright stay in Auckland, where Sally Griffen and I collaborated on an investigation of sources for a social history of that urban area.³ From observation and from historians of New Zealand we discovered how much our nations seem to have shared and also obvious and crucial differences. Keith Sinclair, for example, has emphasized the fraternal resemblances between New Zealanders' and Americans' 'egalitarianism, their easy-going fellowship, their devotion to mechanical appliances'. But his history suggests that antimonopolism had

1 Michael Katz, Michael Doucet, and Mark Stern, *The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism*, Cambridge, Mass., 1982.

2 J. G. A. Pocock emphasizes the complexity of relationships among areas within the British periphery. His idea of an expanding zone of cultural conflict and creation and his corresponding rejection of Louis Hartz's simplistic fragment thesis for the founding of new societies will be useful to anyone undertaking studies of one area within the British periphery, especially if they hope to contribute ultimately to synoptic views of change. See Pocock's 'British History: a Plea for a New Subject', *The New Zealand Journal of History* [NZJH] VIII, 1 (1974), pp. 3-21.

3 Clyde Griffen and Sally Griffen, 'Sources for the Social History of Auckland', a report to the Department of History, University of Auckland, June, 1985, 175 pp.

more impact on public policy in New Zealand and he notes that the span of incomes there remains 'low by comparison with the United States'.⁴

From a different angle of vision, Graeme Wynn also emphasizes contrast in public policy but similarity in general outlook and values. In his essay responding to the *Oxford History of New Zealand* (1981), he notes that the 'peculiarities of the staple economy led workers to accept state intervention more readily than, for example, their counterparts in the United States'. But his major claim about the national history is that 'the opportunity of New Zealand has reinforced a basic faith in the small man, a belief in the competence of the individual, and a sense of the importance of private property among most of its people, for whom home, family, independence, prosperity — the leitmotifs of middle class life — are pervasive values'.⁵

Wynn believes that the *Oxford History* shows that these values have meant a fundamentally conservative electorate, even during the progressivism of the early twentieth century, and one unlikely ever to be radicalized by the nation's dissident liberal intelligentsia. For an American historian this calls to mind a frequent interpretation of national politics in the United States during the same period. He hears other echoes of home in the debate among New Zealand historians during the 1970s over the relevance of ideas of social class and class consciousness to their national history and to different settings in city, town, and country.⁶ He wants to know more about social relations in New Zealand, especially in its cities, which invite comparison with younger cities in the United States.

My thoughts about directions for an urban social history of New Zealand follow, with some account of their development.

You arrive in Auckland, New Zealand's largest city, which now has a metropolitan population of more than 800,000, making it larger than Cleveland, Milwaukee, Denver, or San Francisco. You see suburbs spreading in every direction, covering a land area much greater — nearly 500 square miles — than larger, but older, cities elsewhere.⁷ Even in the inner city, single-family dwellings predominate; multiple-unit housing has been so rare as to be remarkable until recently. Linear shopping areas dating from the tramway era serve many of the older suburbs, but scattered

4 Keith Sinclair, *A History of New Zealand*, Harmondsworth, 1980, pp. 316, 323-4.

5 Graeme Wynn, 'Reflections on the Writing of New Zealand History', NZJH, XVIII, 2 (1984), pp. 115-6.

6 See the comments by W. H. Oliver and Erik Olssen, both titled 'Class in New Zealand', in NZJH, VIII, 2 (1974) pp. 182-3 and IX, 2 (1975), pp. 200-1; David Pitt, ed., *Social Class in New Zealand*, Auckland, 1977; Miles Fairburn's review of Pitt in NZJH, XI, 2 (1977), pp. 190-5.

7 A useful brief overview of Auckland's development and contemporary character by a geographer can be found in David G. Rankin, 'Urban Auckland', in Warren Moran and Michael Taylor, eds., *Auckland and the Central North Island*, 1979, pp. 88-113. See also P. H. Curson, 'Inter-Ethnic Relations and Assimilation in the Urban Setting: Some Comments on a Socio-Spatial Model of the Inner City', *New Zealand Geographer*, XXXI, (October 1975), pp. 142-59.

throughout the metropolitan area are old village centres around which suburban residences developed. Meat and fish markets, greengrocers, dairies (the New Zealand equivalent of Mom-and-Pop groceries), takeaways, and other small shops are usual. The number of supermarkets increases; shopping malls have made their appearance, but the mammoth covered mall is yet to come.

Most impressive for the American visitor is the relative absence of visible social extremes. If you wander around enough you will discover rundown areas along the perimeter of the older inner city and pockets of racial clustering both there and in the newer southern suburbs. But the signs of poverty, even for the indigenous Maoris and newer Polynesian migrants, do not stand out, looking more like Watts before the riots than like Harlem. At the other extreme, few houses even in the prosperous suburbs look like mansions. The small scale of both lots and housing throughout the metropolis makes differences in status and wealth less obvious than in American cities. And in previously decayed inner city areas, restoration through gentrification is made easier by the dominance of villas and bungalows which are attractive to young singles and small families.

The visitor who happens to be a historian wonders immediately about how much this eminently liveable city in the present owes to its past. Was it always this way? Some facts about Auckland's past which suggest possible answers to these questions can be discovered quickly. The population of New Zealand's cities remained overwhelmingly European for their first century (1840-1940), mostly Protestant and from the British Isles. In 1891 Roman Catholics, largely Irish, comprised 20% of some of the poorer suburbs, but only 14% of the nation as a whole.⁸ The Maori and Polynesian presence, now more than 12% of Auckland's inhabitants, is recent.⁹

The steady growth of New Zealand's four major centres — not far apart in population throughout their first century — resulted in about 100,000 inhabitants for the largest, Auckland, in 1900 and little more than 200,000 as late as 1936. Geographic spread started early when the population was still small; a horse-car railway began serving one inner suburb by 1884 and the age of the electrified street railway began in Auckland in 1902.¹⁰ Enough overcrowding in housing in the core had developed to result in investigations in 1906 and again in 1918, after the influenza epidemic.¹¹ But home ownership already was widespread. The 1916 census

8 Erik Olssen, 'Towards a New Society', in W. H. Oliver, ed., with B. R. Williams, *The Oxford History of New Zealand* [hereafter OH], Wellington, 1981, pp. 264-5.

9 C. J. Gibson, 'A demographic history of New Zealand', Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1971, p. 90; Graeme Dunstall, 'The Social Pattern', in OH, p. 403.

10 Fred Dahms, 'Urban Passenger Transport and Population Distribution in Auckland, 1860-1961', *New Zealand Geographer*, XXXVI (April, 1980), pp. 2-7. The density of central Auckland in 1926 was only 29 persons per acre. *New Zealand Official Yearbook 1981*, Wellington, 1981, p. 66.

11 Linda Bryder, 'Lessons' of the 1918 Influenza Epidemic in Auckland', NZJH, XVI, 2 (1982), pp. 104-11.

found 46% of Auckland city's heads of household owning their homes (including those still carrying mortgages or buying on time) compared with about 25% for Boston suburbs in both 1900 and 1910 and 36% for Detroit in 1900.¹²

Except for some major strikes around the turn of the century, social relations in Auckland — and other major New Zealand cities since their founding in the 1840s — seem to have been relatively peaceful compared with those in many American cities. A rampage by a youthful, inter-racial crowd downtown in 1984 genuinely surprised Aucklanders. They have no history of public riots such as American cities experienced in the antebellum decades nor any race riots in the twentieth century. Before 1940 Maoris comprised less than 2% of the city's population; despite evident discrimination in employment and residence since then, attitudes toward inter-racial social intercourse, dating, and marriage are more relaxed than in the United States.

Prejudice against Asians was virulent with frequent talk about the 'yellow peril', despite the small number of the largest group, the Chinese, in New Zealand. And Auckland has experienced moments of ethnic tension among Pakeha, notably when religious and patriotic concerns converged. The Protestant majority was outraged by Irish Catholic sympathy for the rebellion in Ireland after 1916.¹³ But there is no recurrent violence such as occurred in Boston and other American cities in the wake of the famine migration.

Social stratification did appear early in Auckland's residential development, made more visible by a topography of ridges (where the rich settled) and gullies (left for the poor). But awareness of social differences coexists with a general pride among New Zealanders about being less class-ridden than the English, whom they have emulated in other matters. Although working-class voters in Auckland and other cities gave the Labour Party its base of strength in parliamentary elections since 1910,¹⁴ they have turned out much less strongly and often voted for more conservative candidates in municipal elections.¹⁵ All four of New Zealand's major cities had ward systems from the 1870s until the first two decades of the twentieth century, but unlike the United States their easy abolition without protest suggests that neither class nor ethnic groups had developed a stake in

12 From tables in the Dwelling Section of the 1916 New Zealand census; Sam Bass Warner, Jr., *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870-1900*, New York, 1969, pp. 16, 120; Olivier Zunz, *The Changing Face of Inequality: Urbanization, Industrial Development and Immigrants in Detroit, 1880-1920*, Chicago, 1982, p. 153; Table 6.4.

13 On the hostility to Irish Catholics and the virulent prejudice against the small numbers of Asians, see Olssen, 'New Society', p. 265 and P. J. Gibbons, 'The Climate of Opinion', pp. 304-5 in OH.

14 Michael Bassett, *Three Party Politics in New Zealand, 1911-1931*, Auckland, 1982.

15 E. P. Aimer, 'The Politics of a City: A Study in the Auckland Urban Area, 1899-1935', M.A. thesis, University of Auckland, 1958; Graham Bush, *Decently and in Order: the Centennial History of the Auckland City Council*, Auckland, 1971.

decentralized representation. Overt conflict between employers and workers at the workplace did characterize some industries by the 1880s and major strikes by maritime workers in 1890 and again in 1913 provoked vigilante and government repression.¹⁶

An American historian concerned with urban social history cannot help being fascinated by a city larger than St Louis or San Francisco where social differences and conflict rarely have loomed large, a city composed of suburbs which have the atmosphere of small towns and a central business district which has lingering traces of that atmosphere. You want to know how far the realities of social relations in Auckland and in other New Zealand cities in the past as well as in the present support the general impression you quickly gain of smaller differences and more interaction between members of different classes and ethnic groups than you find in the United States. Beyond the extent of group differences and interaction, you want to know what variables seem most likely to explain them, such as differences in population, in the scale of settlements and of economic enterprise, in the structure of inequality, or in the nature of social networks.

The scholarly literature does not allow you to go very far in satisfying your curiosity about urban social relations in the past because systematic work on urban populations has been largely confined to contemporary investigations by social scientists since World War II. A few geographers and sociologists have done studies of particular phenomena, such as household structure, geographic and occupational mobility, property mobility, and location of manufacturing, in individual cities for earlier periods of time.¹⁷ Suggestive generalizations from these studies and from national time series have been made in the debate in recent decades over whether inequality is increasing in New Zealand, but that discussion has tended to focus on the nation as a whole rather than on its cities. For example, sociologists David Pearson and David Thorns in *Eclipse of Equality* (1983) do not break down many of their analyses to distinguish urban and rural patterns although they draw upon their own historical studies of several suburbs.¹⁸

Large questions about New Zealand society as a whole have attracted

16 H. O. Roth, *Trade Unions in New Zealand, Past and Present*, Wellington, 1973.

17 For example, geographers have studied the household structure of Auckland, the location of manufacturing and the journey to work. See P. H. Curson, 'Household Structure in Nineteenth Century Auckland', *New Zealand Geographer*, XXXII (October 1976), pp. 177-93; G.J.R. Linge, 'Manufacturing in Auckland: its origins and growth', *New Zealand Geographer*, XIV (April 1958) pp. 47-64; and F. A. Dahms, 'The Journey to Work in Central Auckland: a geographic analysis', Ph.D. thesis, University of Auckland, 1966. Sociologists have studied property mobility and long term social change. See Bob Hall, David Thorns and Bill Willmott, *Community Formation and Change: A Study of Rural and Urban Localities in New Zealand*, Department of Sociology Working Paper No. 4, Canterbury University, 1983; D. G. Pearson, *Johnsonville: Continuity and Change in a New Zealand Township*, Sydney, 1980.

18 David Pearson and David Thorns, *Eclipse of Equality: Social Stratification in New Zealand*, Sydney, 1983.

historians as well as social scientists in recent years, producing enough important monographic work to invite synthesis in and to give a distinctive cast to W. H. Oliver, ed., *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (1981). Two years earlier *The New Zealand Journal of History* devoted a special issue (October 1979) to social history which concluded with S. R. Strachan's useful survey of 'Archives for New Zealand Social History'. But little has been done as yet on urban social history and urban history in any form has attracted relatively little attention from professional historians. No biographies of the four major cities have yet been attempted, although Erik Olssen has provided some fascinating sections on the social history of Dunedin in his history of the province of Otago.¹⁹ Useful theses and dissertations have been written on various aspects of urban political and economic history. General treatments of the social history of particular cities at a given point in time have described in some depth local public and private institutions like schools, but the commentary on social groups and interaction relies on contemporary impressions and anecdotes. Some specialized studies have been done on demographic questions and on social mobility for particular localities, but generally the techniques of the new social history have not yet been applied to the history of individual cities and suburbs or to particular industries in them.²⁰ An important exception which will begin to yield published results in the near future is the ambitious project of Erik Olssen and Tom Brooking on Dunedin's suburb of Caversham in the early twentieth century.

Quite apart from differences between nations in the timing of historiographical fashions, there are good reasons why social history in New Zealand has continued to focus on national patterns rather than moving as quickly as historians in the United States have to community studies. National policy in regulating the economy and conducting overseas relations, especially with Britain, has loomed larger than local life and affairs. An agricultural export economy in so small a nation has required a consistently 'interventionist' state. (During the era of settlement, regional differences did find expression in provincial governments, but these governments were abolished in the 1870s.)²¹ The greater social homogeneity in New Zealand — or perhaps more accurately, the lesser visibility of the pluralism that does exist — seems to have made investigations of social differences within urban areas less urgent to historians. Harder for

19 Erik Olssen, *A History of Otago*, Dunedin, 1984, especially chapters viii and ix.

20 For Auckland, for example, R.C.J. Stone's dissertation on the colonial business community has been published as *Makers of Fortune*, Auckland, 1967. Traditional theses on social history include J. R. Phillips, 'A Social History of Auckland 1840-53', M.A. thesis, University of Auckland, 1966; Judith Elphick, 'Auckland 1870-74: a social portrait', M.A. thesis, University of Auckland, 1974; Margaret Mutch, 'Aspects of the Social and Economic History of Auckland 1890-1896', M.A. thesis, University of Auckland, 1968. A study of fertility using parish records has been made by Susan Sheehan, 'A social and demographic study of Devonport, 1850-1920', M.A. research essay, University of Auckland, 1980.

21 Raewyn Dalziel, 'The Politics of Settlement', in OH, pp. 103-5.

the outsider to assess is the influence of what Ian Breward sees as the continuing 'search for New Zealand identity, with the tendency to focus on what fosters national and local unity, rather than exploring what is or was perceived to be different'.²²

However important the reasons for a continuing national focus are, the result for descriptions of urban life is unfortunate. The descriptions may be colourful in illustration, but they are also overgeneralized and superficial, asserting social and cultural homogeneity rather than demonstrating it. The explanations offered for conservatism and lack of group conflict seem oversimplified, given what American historians have been learning about the complex relationships between different factors which may produce that general result in different settings. Moreover, focusing on that general result can obscure significant differences in the nature of social relations between areas within the same metropolis, often related to dominant forms of employment.

In some firms and industries, but not in others, paternalism may be pronounced and even extend beyond the workplace through employers' domination of the leadership of churches and other voluntary associations. Some American community studies offer evidence of sponsored mobility for workers who interact with their employers in these settings.²³ Social control may take subtle and often benevolent forms in a nation like New Zealand which has egalitarian values and many small-scale settings which make easier the promotion of images of community rather than class. Investigation of the possible presence of subtler forms of control which have been found elsewhere will be important even if investigations of urban areas in New Zealand should discover substantial social mixture and interaction in workplace, neighbourhood, voluntary association, and other institutions as well as frequent geographic and social mobility.

If the general need for urban community studies in New Zealand seems evident to a social historian from the United States, the questions to be asked and the special circumstances and characteristics which need to be taken into account in framing working hypotheses are not. Important facts and generalizations from the national history provide a point of departure for thinking about what needs to be done. First are those concerning urbanization, crucial in the development of New Zealand from the very beginning of the English colony in 1840. Immigration initially provided almost all of the urban population but already by the 1870s

22 Ian Breward, 'Religion and New Zealand Society', NZJH XIII, 2 (1979), p. 140.

23 For corporate paternalism in an American mill town, see Tamara Hareven, *Family Time and Industrial Time*, Cambridge, 1982, chapter iii; Paul Johnson provides a suggestive analysis of sponsored mobility in an early nineteenth-century canal town in *A Shopkeeper's Millennium*, New York, 1978, pp. 121-8. Accessible sources for the study of employer-worker relations in Auckland are likely to become much richer in the near future as a result of the aggressive search for records of business firms by the Northern Archives and Records Trust. Unexploited as yet are some invaluable previous donations, like the payroll records from 1920 to 1970 of the Coles shoe factory, held by the Auckland Institute and Museum.

natural increase surpassed immigration as a source of population growth in the nation as a whole.

By 1861 nearly 11% of the nation's non-Maori population lived in Auckland, Christchurch, Dunedin, and Wellington, each of the four cities possessing more than 10,000 inhabitants. By 1871, only three decades after annexation, 20% of all New Zealanders of European descent lived in these cities compared with 21% of all Americans living in places of 8,000 or more inhabitants.²⁴ The development of smaller urban places was slower in New Zealand, however. Although the four largest cities comprised 28% of the nation by 1896, all other places of 8,000 or more comprised less than 2%. A somewhat more balanced urban hierarchy had developed by 1926; although the four cities now comprised 36% of the total population, other cities with more than 10,000 inhabitants accounted for 7% and those with between 5,000 and 10,000 an additional 5%.²⁵ But as noted earlier, the size of the four major cities remained modest compared with the larger American cities before World War II, and urban densities remained low.

New Zealand clearly fits Richard Wade's 'urban frontier' thesis, in which urban nodes facilitate agricultural settlement.²⁶ The context for urbanization was an economy with an extractive emphasis, notably in timber and gold mining, during the frontier era and an early development of sheep farming on large stations. By the 1890s the national government under the Liberal Party played a major role in the decisive shift towards the expansion of the pastoral economy through small family farms, especially in dairying, and that has been the heart of New Zealand's agricultural export economy ever since. New Zealand manufacturing from the beginning emphasized processing for export; the small population provided only a limited market for consumer-goods manufacturing. Lack of demand and of natural resources discouraged heavy industry.

Pearson and Thorns suggest that perhaps the most important shift over time has been that from 'a relatively small scale individualized structure characterized by small town capitalism to an ownership structure dominated increasingly by large scale corporatively owned companies and financial institutions'.²⁷ They do not spell out how rapidly or pervasively that shift has been translated into changed social relations, but it seems clear that they believe the ethos of 'small town capitalism' continues to characterize much of New Zealand society, including urban society. They see the familiar patterns of stratification of a capitalist society yet with distinctive local characteristics owing to smallness of scale and the recentness of formation. They argue that the 'size effect' works in concert with prevailing ideologies of egalitarianism and community to emphasize personal relationships

24 Jeanine Graham, 'Settler Society', in OH, p. 136: Table 4; Adna Weber, *The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century*, Ithaca, 1967, pp. 22, 140, 144.

25 Olssen, 'New Society', p. 254; *Yearbook 1981*, p. 65.

26 David Hamer, 'Towns in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand', NZJH, XIII, 1 (1979), p. 5; Sinclair, pp. 99-106.

27 Pearson and Thorns, pp. 249-50.

between individuals of different background and status, including workers and their employers, and thus to evoke images of community rather than images of class.²⁸

Contemporary analysts also emphasize the continuing frequency of self-employment. Differences in the aggregation of data make statistical comparison with the United States problematical, especially determining the relative importance of farm proprietors, but it does seem that urban self-employment will prove more frequent in New Zealand from at least the beginning of the twentieth century.²⁹ Of equal interest for the historian concerned with the potential for paternalism in the workplace will be the greater proportion of manufacturing workers in firms with less than 50, or even 100, employees. In the United States by 1914 firms with 50 or more workers already comprised 9% of the manufacturing labour force, but in New Zealand as late as 1929 they accounted for 6%. Tom Brooking states that a good many enterprises were family firms until the 1930s.³⁰

While some historians seem to emphasize the smaller scale and family ownership of New Zealand enterprise at least until the 1930s, suggesting a major contrast with England and the United States in the timing and frequency of at least one feature of industrialization (in this case, the increasing distance between employers and workers), other historians have stressed a maturation of their society and economy from the 1890s to the 1920s which seems not too different even in timing from the American experience. For example, Erik Olssen and others have emphasized the passing of the demographic profile of a frontier society by 1900. Although some single-industry towns still had an excess of males, the male-female ratio had become normal in urban areas. A small surplus of women appeared in Christchurch and Dunedin as early as the 1880s and by 1900 females exceeded males in all of the four largest cities.³¹

More important for these historians' portrait of modernization, they find increasing specialization and bureaucratization early in the twentieth century. The bureaucratization can be seen readily in the rapid expansion of government agencies under Liberal governments during the first decade of the twentieth century especially. The evidence for modernization in

28 *ibid.*, pp. 244-7.

29 Dunstall, 'Social Pattern', p. 411. Dunstall's estimate that small proprietors comprised a fifth of the nation's work force as late as 1951 seems too high since the absolute number he cites appears in the government statistics for that year to cover all employers of labour and all 'own account workers', which would include big proprietors and professionals. For the United States, see Stanley Lebergott's estimate of 14% self-employed for 1957 in Seymour Harris, ed., *American Economic History*, New York, 1961, p. 292. These statistics on self-employment for both nations include farm proprietors, who form a higher proportion of the work force in New Zealand than in the United States. So it could turn out that there is not much difference between the nations in the frequency of *urban* self-employment.

30 Tom Brooking, 'Economic Transformation', in OH, p. 246; U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Abstract of the Census of Manufactures 1914*, Washington, 1917, p. 391: Table 193.

31 Olssen, 'New Society', p. 251.

the world of work, especially of jobs becoming vocations and specialization becoming more important than versatility, is suggestive, but further investigation is needed. The proportion of white-collar workers, especially in semi-professional and clerical categories, grew rapidly between the 1901 and 1921 censuses and the proportion of those designating themselves as unskilled labourers shrank.

Some important industries like freezing (meat-packing) and tanning still employed many men in 1921 who described themselves as 'labourers', presumably meaning temporary hands who also worked at various times at alternative employments, but by 1936 they reported themselves primarily as hands in the specific industry.³²

Whether this change in self-reportage can be taken as spelling the end of the jack-of-all-trades remains to be demonstrated through systematic investigation of individual work histories for the labour force in industries with many unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. In the meantime, anyone framing working hypotheses for urban social history in New Zealand must take seriously the possibility that the transformation of urban labour forces there does not differ much from the transformation in other English settler societies, except in ethnic diversity and in the frequency of paternalistic relations with employers facilitated by smaller scale.

The consequences for urban populations of certain policies of the national government after the 1890s also require consideration, especially for community studies concerned with the extent of social levelling and interaction and with class awareness. The egalitarian spirit of Liberal governments at the turn of the century found its most striking expression in policies affecting rural New Zealand, encouraging increase in small family farms and decline in the great sheep stations. Pearson and Thorns suggest that the State Advances programme of 1906 did provide a significant boost to urban home ownership, but they do not think that government policies overall resulted in any significant redistribution of wealth in New Zealand.³³

Perhaps the most important legislation affecting urban life before the 1930s was the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1894. That act, widely remarked upon by social reformers throughout the English-speaking world, did change the course of labour relations profoundly. It encouraged unionization in industries where labour had been too weak to organize effectively, but also made the resulting 'registered' unions dependent upon government action in the form of arbitration awards for wage increases and improvements in working conditions. Some industries with large numbers of workers concentrated in a few firms or one place continued to have sporadic episodes of militancy, notably between the formation in 1906 of the Federation of Labour (the so-called 'Red Feds', often compared with the American Industrial Workers of the World) and

32 *ibid.*, pp. 266-7; comment by B.J.G. Thompson, NZJH, XIII, 1 (1979), p. 63.

33 Pearson and Thorns, pp. 42, 250.

the disastrous strike of the maritime workers in 1913.³⁴ But the general effect of the arbitration system seems to have been to sharpen divisions among workers in attitudes towards the strike as a method of securing gains for labour and so to limit the likelihood of general sympathy among unionists for particular strikes.³⁵

Although some features of the welfare state, such as old-age pensions, came much earlier to New Zealand than to the United States, the 1930s brought a decisive expansion under the first Labour government, elected in 1935. Like the New Deal, that government and even its post-war National party successors seem to have helped to bring part of the urban working-class into the middle class through government policies that reduced burdens and insecurities and expanded opportunities. One highly visible form of assistance that had a profound impact on the character of individual suburbs and on urban development generally was the great expansion of public housing. Between 1936 and 1949 29,000 state houses had been built in a nation which still had only two million inhabitants.

The new housing, rented directly by the state as landlord, no doubt contributed to what one historian has described as the more finely-graded post-war urban social structure. Individual suburbs included many different occupations; perceptions of social rank became more ambiguous and there seems a strong possibility that class awareness diminished.³⁶ The role of government policy and activity in shaping the social environment will need to be considered in any urban community studies for the twentieth century. But since that role seems so much more important from the 1930s, it should reinforce the tendency to regard that decade, at least in framing working hypotheses, as a turning point in periodization.

Can we discover what focus might be most useful, at least initially, for an urban social history for New Zealand in what we have learned from general interpretations about the early development of urban centres, the emergence and rapid growth during the early twentieth century of specialization and bureaucratization, the role of government in limiting labour conflict and, to a much lesser extent, in social levelling, and the possible importance of the small scale of enterprise and of cities in fostering social interaction between employers and workers? I think so. We need first to determine how sharply differentiated New Zealand society has been during particular periods of time, without any presumption — such as that common to interpretations of industrialization influenced by Durkheim — of increasing differentiation. We need to learn how much social

34 Olssen, 'New Society', pp. 270-1.

35 For the early years under the ICAA, see James Holt, 'Compulsory Arbitration in New Zealand, 1894-1901: The Evolution of an Industrial Relations System', NZJH, XIV 2 (1980), pp. 179-200. For the twentieth century see James Holt, *Compulsory Arbitration in New Zealand: the First Forty Years*, Auckland, 1986; also Len Richardson, 'Parties and Political Change', in OH, pp. 207-8 and Robert Chapman, 'From Labour to National', in OH, pp. 339, 357-60.

36 Dunstall, 'Social Pattern', pp. 399, 404.

interaction has characterized different areas and social groups within New Zealand cities during these periods, and how and when both the extent of differentiation and interaction have changed.

Urban social history can build initially upon the established periodization for national change. The election of a Liberal government in 1891 on a platform calling for the subdivision of great estates has been commonly accepted as marking a turning point in national social as well as political history. Raewyn Dalziel observes that by 1890 'there were many indications that the economic and social change of the 1880s would be reflected in more bitter political conflict than ever before'.³⁷ Jeanine Graham emphasizes a deepening sense during the 1880s that the opportunities for ordinary people, taken for granted during the frontier era, were diminishing and that privilege and poverty were increasing. 'There would be a conscious reaction against those aspects of the imported heritage that were inappropriate and hostile to a now cherished colonial ethos of open opportunity for all. Since the efforts of individuals had shown that it was impossible to protect that code, the state would have to safeguard it'.³⁸

Given this emphasis upon the 1890s as the beginning of state intervention with an egalitarian bias and upon the 1930s as the time when government advanced social levelling in a more decisive way, urban social historians should be asking whether the period from the 1890s to the 1930s should be regarded as the formative period for contemporary urban social relations in New Zealand. I would propose as a working hypothesis that this period saw some reduction in the visible stratification which had developed in Auckland and other cities during the frontier era and the strengthening of an egalitarian ethos in behaviour and institutions. Evaluating this general hypothesis will require community studies which cover long enough periods of time to span at least one of the two major shifts. In this essay I will only suggest some subjects to be investigated and some questions to be asked about the directions of change before the 1930s. There is a substantial literature in the social sciences on change since then.³⁹

To determine the relative sharpness or blurring of social differences, the likelihood of interaction between members of different groups, and the probable consequences for group awareness, community studies should examine those dimensions of experience which may or may not converge to develop and to reinforce group awareness. Those dimensions include work and authority relations within the workplace, residential location, consumption patterns and levels, formal and informal voluntary associations, family organization and strategy, and ethnic group relationships. If groups are sharply divided on these dimensions, group consciousness, and even antagonism, may override forces working in the

37 Dalziel, 'The Politics of Settlement', pp. 109-11.

38 Graham, 'Settler Society', pp. 138-9.

39 See, for example, the bibliography by Pearson and Thorns, pp. 260-79.

locality for a more inclusive community consciousness. If the differences are not sharp and if social mobility is common, then we should expect to find, as Pearson and Thorns suggest, an ideology of community and individual opportunity which denies the importance of class and class distinctions.

Questions about the changing structure of inequality in urban New Zealand and about shifts in the frequency and avenues of social mobility in cities should be subjects for early investigation. The dramatic rural shift from the heyday of the great sheep stations to the expansion of smaller family farms in the early twentieth century has received the most attention in discussions of egalitarianism in that period; whether cities saw any comparable expansion of opportunity seems doubtful but remains to be determined. A first and difficult step will be to try to chart changes in the distribution of urban wealth, not only for cities as a whole, but for particular urban districts and suburbs.

The problem of determining personal property is at least as great in New Zealand before the 1930s as in the U.S.A., but probate may be suggestive, despite its bias toward older residents. The predominance of single family dwellings and higher levels of home ownership in New Zealand from an early date make use of real estate as a proxy for wealth less unsatisfactory than in the United States.⁴⁰ For the late nineteenth century when both a ward system and property qualification for municipal franchise prevailed, it will be much easier to reconstruct and compare the extent of inequality in the ownership of real estate in different parts of cities. After 1900 Pearson's finding for Johnsonville, a Wellington suburb, of a general pattern of 'narrowing of inequalities between 1905 and 1928' might be taken as a working hypothesis for the direction of change within the suburbs at least.⁴¹

Whether the suburban trend among the better-off made inner-city populations more homogeneous by lowering the range of social and economic status needs investigation. Certainly the periodic outcries about slum conditions during the early twentieth century, notably by the Royal Commission of Inquiry after the 1918 influenza epidemic, suggest substantial urban poverty. But how frequent or infrequent long-term poverty was in New Zealand cities, as distinguished from temporary destitution, remains to be determined. That question can be dealt with systematically for any city for which the applications for public relief survive, as they do in Auckland for the entire period between the Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act of 1885 and the Social Security Act of 1935.⁴²

The limited research on occupational mobility in New Zealand so far

40 On records for valuation of property and for probate, see Griffen and Griffen, 'Sources', pp. 99-116. The Certificate of Title system of land registration in New Zealand facilitates estimates of wealth in real estate by recording mortgages outstanding.

41 Pearson and Thorns, p. 228, and David Pearson, 'Small Town Capitalism and Stratification in New Zealand, 1880-1930', NZJH, XIV, 2 (1980), pp. 110-20.

42 Griffen and Griffen, 'Sources', pp. 158-64 and Graham, 'Settler Society', pp. 136-7.

suggests several long-term trends. A higher rate of upward mobility during the first decades of the frontier era, especially long-distance mobility in the agricultural sector, was followed during the late nineteenth century by diminishing opportunities to rise as good land became less easy to acquire.⁴³ Whether urban opportunities changed much before 1900 is not clear. But structural change in the labour force during the early twentieth century, increasing the proportion of professional, managerial, technical, and clerical workers, favoured some increase in short-distance mobility from manual to non-manual positions. The twentieth-century analyses depend largely upon inter-generational comparisons at time of marriage and so they may underestimate upward mobility compared with what career tracing would show.⁴⁴ More important, while they capture occupational inheritance at one moment in time, they do not tell enough about changing avenues of mobility for urban populations over time. A priority for mobility case studies, whether the base sample be for an entire city or an area within it, should be an analysis sufficiently disaggregated to show change in the occupations which most often served as preparation for higher positions in commerce, manufacturing, and government.

In a nation whose cities had many small businesses and government workers during the early twentieth century, comparisons are needed of the proportions achieving self-employment in different kinds of private enterprise and moving upward within large organizations, private and public. Disaggregated exploration is more important for case studies at this moment than the specific working hypothesis about changing mobility frequencies that is chosen for investigation. But the general trends which have been discovered in mobility studies elsewhere should be kept in mind, to see how far the participation of New Zealand in modernizing tendencies throughout the European world resulted in similar shifts in patterns of mobility. For example, does geographical mobility from the late nineteenth century to the 1930s decrease among blue-collar workers and increase among upper white-collar workers as it did in the United States?

In New Zealand, which has remained dependent upon an agricultural export economy while seeing continued rural-urban migration, the experience and mobility prospects of farm workers who move to cities must loom large in considering how and how far its egalitarian ethos is maintained. Evidence from one locality suggests that farmer's sons who left farming distributed themselves fairly evenly across the occupational structure before World War II, but since then have largely experienced downward mobility.⁴⁵ If that finding for the earlier period has wider applicability, then farm-born migrants to the city might be expected to

43 *ibid.*, p. 135. Miles Fairburn questions the usefulness of occupational mobility analysis for the frontier era in his 'Social Mobility and Opportunity in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand', *NZJH*, XIII, 1 (1979).

44 Pearson, 'Small-Town Capitalism', pp. 123-5 and Pearson, *Johnsonville*.

45 Pearson and Thorns, p. 119.

play a larger role in influencing the urban environments which they entered before the 1940s than they would subsequently.

The same may be even more true of migrants from the towns where, if P. J. Gibbons is correct, a dominant petit-bourgeoisie gave a 'peculiar twist to the urban experience . . . and even when tempted to cities they have preferred to organize city life after the patterns and values of the town'. Gibbons thinks 'Main Street runs pretty well the whole length of New Zealand'.⁴⁶ Whether Gibbons is right or wrong about the values townspeople held and their success in imposing them, any investigation of urban social interaction will need to consider the role of migrants from town and country in the cities, their relative success and the nature and extent of their leadership in their new settings. Information on parents' birthplaces on their children's birth certificates, supplemented by tracing in city and national directories, provides one means of getting at extra-local origins for residents of particular urban areas.⁴⁷

The corollary to Gibbons's view that in New Zealand, unlike England, the lower middle classes became 'socially central' is that the colony lacked a coherent working class, despite its many working-class immigrants. Class consciousness surfaced intensely, if sporadically, among some urban workers, but a major concern of any urban social history — as it has always been of labour history — is why it remained so limited. Labour historians have emphasized the role of the arbitration system adopted in the 1890s in dividing workers on the issue of militancy.⁴⁸ But social historians can help determine the influence of differences in the composition of the work force in particular industries and in the authority relations in the workplace in firms of varying size and organization. The small scale of the enterprises and, according to Tom Brooking, the failure of most family firms to turn to professional management before the 1930s suggest a working hypothesis. The hypothesis is that imposition of scientific management measures came later, and more traditional and informal habits of regulating work survived longer in manufacturing in New Zealand than in the United States.

Whether a relatively benevolent paternalism or tendencies toward sweated labour were more common remains to be determined by what testimony survives about individual firms. But the likelihood for particular industries can be inferred from the detailed breakdowns of wages, hours, and workforce for individual cities in the reports of the Department of Labour and other sources after 1900. The records of the National Efficiency Board, 1916-1920, at the National Archives, for example, have classifications specifying which jobs in each industry are deemed essential by employers, which require expert training, which may be performed by men, by women,

46 Comment by Gibbons in NZJH, XIII, I (1979), p. 21.

47 On the usefulness for social historians of New Zealand's national system of birth, marriage, and death registration, see Griffen and Griffen, 'Sources', pp. 117-24.

48 Richardson, 'Parties and Political Change', pp. 211-12.

or by both. They also contain wonderful evidence on working-class customs, some of which caution against any expectation of simple relationships between firm size and modernization. A report by one of the biggest employers in a large-scale industry, freezing, details the time lost through absenteeism on and after racing days and Fletcher Ltd's sense of helplessness in doing anything about it.⁴⁹

Investigation of class relationships elsewhere in the English-speaking world increasingly has emphasized their complexity, and there seems no reason for assuming that New Zealand is exceptional. Resentment by wage-earners of subordination within the workplace and even overt conflict there, together with support for political parties and candidates favouring labour, have coexisted with acceptance of middle-class norms for family life, housing, and other forms of consumption. Fluctuating levels of class awareness and even class consciousness and antagonism have not been incompatible with rising expectations about standard of living and even spontaneous deference in some circumstances to employers and other members of the employing class. A comfortable informality or familiarity may characterize inter-class relations in some settings, encouraging members of different classes to think more about what they share than about what separates them, about community more than class. Correspondingly, any adequate urban social history needs to ask how experiences within and outside the workplace converge or diverge in shaping the outlook of individuals in different class, occupational, and ethnic or racial groups.

The extent to which wage-earners also are property owners, usually only of their own homes, and able to afford certain amenities in housing is one important clue to their changing situation and outlook over time. Under the State Advances Act of 1906 the national government provided some financial assistance for prospective urban home-owners and, as previously noted, by 1916 nearly half of all Auckland heads of household had purchased their own homes (including those still under mortgage and those buying on time). How great and how gradual an increase since the 1840s this represented has not been determined, nor how much it varied over time among areas within the city and among occupational groups. It would be useful to compare New Zealand cities in the late nineteenth century, for example, with Canadian and American cities. The few investigations on that subject in North America see home ownership as a common strategy for family survival among wage-earners. By contrast, salaried employees within the business class more often rented apparently in order to afford servants and to save capital for investments in business.⁵⁰

A strategy for survival, especially if it means frequent inability to maintain ownership in periods of adversity, need not mean any acceptance of middle class norms for family life and consumption. But the record of improvements

49 Griffen and Griffen, 'Sources', p. 20.

50 Katz, Doucet, and Stern, *Social Organization*, chapter iv, and Zunz, *Face of Inequality*, pp. 152-61 and 170-6.

in homes owned by wage-earners may be more suggestive about their expectations and outlook, especially where similarities or differences between classes in the timing of improvements in domestic technology can be determined. Fortunately, the field books kept by municipal tax assessors provide, in Auckland at least, a remarkably detailed record for each dwelling since 1900 of changes made in the number of rooms, equipment, and outbuildings, including new plumbing, gas and electricity, porches, and garages.⁵¹ Comparison of amenities among and within neighbourhoods seems even more important in New Zealand cities because visible stratification has been lessened by the small size of lots and by the generally smaller differences among classes in respect of the size of houses.

Two decades after the founding of the colony differences in ornamentation had begun to point up differences in wealth.⁵² But the most obvious expression of stratification in the hillier cities like Auckland was location: the rich on the ridges, the comfortable on the upper slopes, and the poor in the gullies, so the common description ran.⁵³ The distances between were not great and the change on many slopes gradual, judging by dwellings surviving from the late nineteenth century in some inner city areas. What has yet to be determined is how mixed or segregated particular neighbourhoods, and streets within them, were. Because of their small size, New Zealand cities had little area specialization before 1900 and an inner city retailing centre could still be surrounded by a mixture of homes of merchants and professionals and of boarding houses.⁵⁴ Manufacturing remained centralized in Auckland, for example, until the 1930s. How rapidly and how far residential segregation progressed has yet to be shown for particular areas within the major cities before 1940. For the period before 1920 Geoffrey Rice's study of the influenza epidemic in Christchurch provides a working hypothesis. According to Rice, the 'mixture of status groups in nearly every suburb seems to indicate a distinctive feature of the New Zealand experience' by comparison with British and American cities where 'most suburbs were already socially-segregated to some degree . . .'⁵⁵ E. W. Rogerson has described the development of distinctively working-class suburbs in West Auckland in the 1920s.⁵⁶

As a working hypothesis, increasing differences between suburbs in dominant classes and occupations should be expected, but not sharp

51 Griffen and Griffen, 'Sources', pp. 99-107.

52 Graham, 'Settler Society', p. 124.

53 Curson, 'Inter-Ethnic Relations', p. 143. For a description of residential segregation in Dunedin by the 1880s, see Olssen, *History of Otago*, p. 92.

54 L. L. Pownall, 'Metropolitan Auckland, 1840-1945: the historical geography of a New Zealand city', *New Zealand Geographer*, II (October, 1950), p. 119.

55 Geoffrey Rice, 'Christchurch in the 1918 Influenza Epidemic', *NZJH*, XIII, 2 (1979), p. 130.

56 E. W. Rogerson, 'Cosy Homes Multiply: A Study of Suburban Expansion in Western Auckland, 1918-1931', M.A. thesis, University of Auckland, 1976.

segregation. As part of the general decrease in transients, single males, and boarders which historians like Miles Fairburn and Erik Olssen find after the frontier era,⁵⁷ we might expect greater stability in working-class neighbourhoods in the inner city. But variation should be expected in areas like the waterfronts of the major port cities or the environs of manufacturing plants like freezing works which depend upon a seasonal influx of workers.

Should the residential separation of class, occupational, and ethnic groups prove to be greater than impressionistic evidence suggests, then the extent of segregation or mixing in voluntary associations will be even more important in determining the likelihood of much interaction between members of different groups. Evidence so far suggests a mixture of classes in the churches, but not in the sects, resembling the prevailing pattern elsewhere. But New Zealand may pose a special problem for use of church membership as an indicator of social mixing. Hugh Jackson has found that in 1886 usual church attenders comprised only 28% of the population, less than in England or in the New South Wales and Victorian colonies in Australia.⁵⁸ He suggests that greater social homogeneity weakened 'religious belonging. At home social divisions went deep and political and religious allegiances reinforced one another'. Ian Breward commented earlier that New Zealand churches were weak and not aggressive by comparison with those in the United States.⁵⁹

Even where participation in churches and other voluntary associations by members of different groups can be shown, the question of their leadership and its significance will need to be considered. Gibbons claims that what he regards as the ruling 'lower middle classes', shopkeepers especially, dominated most of the voluntary associations except the unions, a few workingmen's clubs for self-education, and local branches of the Labour Party. Urban social historians will want to look at direct testimony as well as do quantitative analyses of leadership compared with membership in evaluating Gibbons's sweeping claim that 'sports clubs, churches, schools, local government bodies, public libraries, newspapers, and pubs' were 'firmly in the hands of the ruling classes and mediated their values'.⁶⁰

Urban social historians will also want to follow up with more detailed area studies the suggestive analysis by A. R. Grigg of the relation of Roman Catholic, Anglican, and nonconformist churches to prohibition as a means of social reform, especially the relation of the level and mix of church

57 Miles Fairburn, 'Local Community or Atomized Society?', NZJH, XVI, 2 (1982), p. 160 and Olssen, 'New Society', pp. 251, 258. Olssen believes, however, that a 'remarkably high proportion of the unskilled, at least as late as 1914, were transient'.

58 Hugh Jackson, 'Churchgoing in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand', NZJH, XVII, 1 (1983), pp. 52, 57.

59 Breward, 'Religion', p. 21.

60 Gibbons, 'Climate of Opinion', pp. 307, 321.

membership in specific licensing districts to no-licence votes.⁶¹ And they will want to analyze systematically the extent of change over time in the composition of rugby teams in urban areas so as to determine how far the social reality supports the mythology of rugby after 1900. Through that mythology, according to J. O. C. Phillips, 'New Zealanders kept alive their image as a classless society, and they were able to avoid confronting the growing class divisions within their society'.⁶²

The need for work on differences among groups in home ownership and their possible relation to family strategy has already been mentioned. Were there also family strategies in reproduction and in pooling and increasing income, resembling the collective family economy evident among so many immigrant groups in the United States? Some work has already been done on fertility differentials between Protestants and Catholics. That should contribute to the clarification of one of the important and relatively neglected dimensions of urban social structure in New Zealand, the distinctiveness and place of predominantly Irish Catholics in a largely Protestant nation and their relations with members of similar class and occupational groups.

Generally, New Zealand historians have emphasized the relative social homogeneity of their nation, and have seen class differences as more important than either ethnic or religious differences. But the Catholic Irish have been seen as maintaining a sense of separate identity partly through clerical leadership and controversy over issues like aid to parochial education and Irish independence.⁶³ How distinctive and insular in fact the Irish were in various social patterns needs to be determined. To what extent did they cluster in and even dominate certain occupations in the cities? tend to cluster residentially, especially around their parishes? maintain their own organizations and largely confine to them their participation in voluntary associations? maintain a higher rate of fertility and different family strategies than Protestants? resist cultural assimilation even when they were economically successful?

My own presumption is that Irish Catholic behaviour will show less insularity over time and stronger tendencies toward assimilation than some of the accounts I have read suggest. I would expect their experience in New Zealand cities to be more like that of the Catholic Irish in Midwestern cities in the United States where natives as well as immigrants were

61 A. R. Grigg, 'Prohibition, the Church, and Labour: A Programme for Social Reform', NZJH, XV, 2 (1981), pp. 134-54.

62 J.O.C. Phillips, 'Rugby, War and the Mythology of the New Zealand Male', NZJH, XVIII, 2 (1984), pp. 102-3.

63 Gibbons, 'Climate of Opinion', p. 305. Ernest Simmons says that the increase in anti-Catholic bigotry after 1870 'helped to create a corresponding anti-Protestant bigotry in Catholics and caused them to close ranks and regard themselves as a persecuted minority'. Simmons, *In Cruce Salus: A History of the Diocese of Auckland, 1848-1980*, Auckland, 1982, p. 190.

newcomers and society was more fluid than in the more hostile environments of older cities in the Northeast. The weakness of religious ties in New Zealand also encourages that presumption as a working hypothesis. So does the fact that, unlike that in the twentieth century and despite the 'strategy of institutional separatism', church attendance among Catholics throughout the nineteenth century remained lower than among members of some Protestant denominations.

Before this tentative comparison with the Irish in Midwestern cities can be evaluated more needs to be known about their situation in New Zealand cities and the variables shaping it. For example, do the solidarity and separatism which Olszen and Gibbons attribute to the predominantly Irish Catholics as a whole seem to be primarily a function of class and numbers? In those poorer suburbs where Catholics often comprised a fifth of the population were there also stronger residential clustering and more evidence of institutional separatism than in urban areas with smaller proportions of Catholics and especially of unskilled Catholics? By the time that the second and especially the third generation of Irish descent in New Zealand entered the labour force is there much attrition in the initial areas of Irish residential concentration as there was in Detroit's Corktown by 1900? Or was there enough replenishing by new Irish immigrants and enough nearby employment opportunities to perpetuate the initial concentrations?

Even this crude raising of questions about the situation of Irish Catholics in New Zealand cities during their first century suggests diversity in their experience. It anticipates the complexity which the urban social historian is likely to discover in investigating the extent of group differentiation, especially the inter-relationships between class, ethnicity, and religion. Insofar as New Zealand historians have shared what seems to be the nation's stake in emphasizing its relative classlessness and the social homogeneity of its European population, they would be likely to underestimate the importance of various kinds of pluralism at different periods in their history. As noted previously social scientists generally have given substantial attention to the expanding presence of the Maoris and Polynesian immigrants in the cities after 1940. But like this essay, unfortunately, they tend to slight urban Maoris before then because they comprised less than 2% of the populations of the largest cities. Americans, with a similar wish to deny classes and important group differences of any kind, have been so visibly polyglot in their largest cities since the mid-nineteenth century that historical attention to group differences had to become important earlier.

Systematic investigation of pluralism in the United States, however, has still been recent. That makes the potential contribution of urban social history in New Zealand and other parts of the British periphery seem urgent, as well as large, to an American historian. I, for one, look forward to what your local studies of social structure and interaction will add to the continuing debates about class formation and social mobility and about ethnic group separation and assimilation in the wake of urbanization,

industrialization and immigration. Your investigations may help us clarify the issues as well as put our findings in larger perspective.

Vassar College

CLYDE GRIFFEN

PARISH ARCHIVES HANDBOOK

In 1986 the Provincial Archives Committee of the Anglican Church of New Zealand produced a Parish Archives Handbook to instruct vestry officers on the care and preservation of parish and diocesan records. Although parish histories have traditionally been celebratory chronicles, they are now part of a field increasingly professionalized. Regrettably, through lack of historical discrimination or through sheer neglect records are still being lost. This handbook could help to remedy this deficiency, and its lack of a pronounced denominational character should extend its usefulness to other religious groups. It is not on sale through booksellers, but can be obtained for \$3.50 from the Provincial Archivist, St John's College, 22 St John's College Road, Auckland.