


Two Worlds?*



AS MODERN NEW ZEALAND and Pacific Islands culture contact history, or what might now be called encounter studies, gradually took shape in the 1950s and 1960s, there was considerable cross fertilization. There was an initial flow from New Zealand to Pacific history through the work of people like John Beaglehole, W.P. Morrell, Jim Davidson, Mary Boyd, Bill Pearson, G.S. Parsonson, Angus Ross, John Dunmore, and Andrew Sharp. Conversely, the exciting encounter studies that developed in New Zealand history in the 1960s and early 1970s were often inspired by a flow back from Pacific history, such as the writings of Bernard Smith, Niel Gunson, and Dorothy Shineberg.¹ Another import, Harrison Wright, published *New Zealand 1769–1840* in 1959. His book, which proposed a ‘fatal impact’ explanation for the Maori conversion to Christianity, sparked off the first real debate in modern New Zealand history.² Numerous masters theses were undertaken at The University of Auckland in the later 1960s, many supervised by Judith Binney, testing Wright’s argument about ‘fatal impact’ for various regions of New Zealand. This work was a platform for PhD study overseas which enabled newly formed ideas about New Zealand history to be exported and allowed historians to examine encounter issues elsewhere. In ‘my year’, Robin Fisher went to Canada and did this in British Columbian History.³ I went to Australia and did it in Pacific history.⁴ And there have been many others, both before and since.

In those days of apparent cross fertilisation, I strongly believed that we might develop a regional, comparative historiography that would integrate many aspects of New Zealand and Pacific Islands historical research. After all, New Zealand is in the Pacific, and shares many experiences with other islands. My youthful vision also included Australia in this scheme. A seemingly confirming comparative moment came with a festschrift for Fred Wood and John Beaglehole in 1969 entitled *The Feel of Truth. Essays in New Zealand and Pacific History*.⁵

Since the 1970s some authors have made attempts at aspects of the comparative history of the region.⁶ I wrote a comparative history of race relations in Australia and New Zealand, and have always put New Zealand in my Pacific history books and vice-versa.⁷ But it is a difficult enterprise, and the comparative fashion has never caught on, which is why I applaud the recent attempt by Donald Denoon and his co-authors Philippa Mein Smith and Marivic Wyndham.⁸ The reason why a more integrated historiography has not happened is that modern New Zealand and Pacific Islands history writing have taken increasingly different paths. Diverging historical agendas since the 1970s have created two historiographic worlds.

New Zealand’s historiography is determined by an underlying ‘nationalist’ focus. Pakeha New Zealanders never regarded themselves as ‘Islanders’ or as *of* the region, but as members of a self-constructed, advanced nation-state whose origins and subsequent external interests lay well beyond the Pacific Ocean. New

Zealand was thus only incidentally in the Pacific.⁹ Moreover, a dimension of New Zealand history that had particular and obvious connections to Pacific history, namely the broad area of culture contact, came to a sudden end in the mid-1970s as a direct result of Maori opposition to Pakeha writing about 'Maori history'. In the context of the new Maori assertiveness of the 1970s this was seen as an issue of gate-keeping and led to the notable public case of the castigating and effective banning of Michael King from writing Maori history.¹⁰ Aspiring history theses students, most of whom were Pakeha, simply chose less problematic areas of study. Historical research into culture contact virtually stopped. The priorities of Waitangi Tribunal-based research since the 1980s have prompted a major resurgence of historical investigation in this field, but it tends to be of a particular kind, variously described as grievance history or sovereignty history. However regarded, its fundamental purpose is to demonstrate Maori cultural and other loss due to the failure of governments to live up to the promises and ideals of the Treaty. The consequence of this is that there has been relatively little investigation of cultural encounter outside the framework of the Tribunal. I acknowledge that vast amounts of historical information lie embedded in Tribunal and related submissions and reports, but it is still largely unprocessed for other than Tribunal and related purposes.

Most of the relatively few historians working on Maori-Pakeha encounter and history tend to be purposefully and introspectively focused, for what may be very good reasons. But this means that they have become historiographically isolated from the wider Pacific region.

Historians of other Pacific Islands are more diverse, unstructured, and feral in their enterprises. It is not just that they are more numerous: they have been freer to range more widely across historical issues and themes since they are not working to a particular political meta-agenda. There are other agendas, of course. Since the Pacific Islands have not generally been sites of major white settler colonies, themes other than settler nationalism mark their historiography, namely how Islanders coped, or did not, with the coming of the West and the forces of imperialism and globalization. So although Pacific Islands history is less focussed than New Zealand history, it remains rather more inclusive, more wide ranging in what it attempts, and more open to intellectual currents from beyond the horizon.¹¹

Over the past decade or more I have become as familiar and influenced as most of us with the complex currents of postmodernism and postcolonialism. But there still remains an unreconstructed part of me that says that whatever else history might be, *sometimes* at least it should attempt to be about what happened and why, instead of being *entirely* consumed by studies of discursive practice. Moreover, while it is not fashionable to do so, I would make a plea for more 'curiosity-driven' research. Otherwise we can end up endorsing ignorance, and in the long run simply 'not knowing' cannot be to anyone's benefit.

What strikes me in comparing New Zealand and Pacific research about cultural encounter is the marked absence of certain topics in New Zealand.¹² For many of the 'what happened' questions in New Zealand there is still reliance on the 1960s and early 1970s scholarship of encounter, particularly in the work of Keith Sinclair, Alan Ward, Ian Wards, John Williams, Eric Schwimmer, Keith

Sorrenson, Ruth Ross, John Owens, Judith Binney and Graham Butterworth. Whatever the scholarly merits of their work, and they are very considerable, it dominates by default.

The issue of pre-contact indigenous population sizes and subsequent depopulation and disease questions are a major, indeed sometimes a central feature of much Pacific Islands scholarship and debate. There is a huge literature not only on demographics but also on the discourse of depopulation and the related discourses on diseases and tropical medicine.¹³ There is relatively little information on such matters in the New Zealand literature, and even less debate.¹⁴ Contrary to what is known about the medical history of many Pacific Islands, there is as yet no basic study of nineteenth-century epidemics amongst Maori.

Related to these issues is the question of muskets. Again there is a very significant Pacific literature on the military and socio-political role of muskets for indigenous societies, but very little for New Zealand.¹⁵

The indigenous use of western economic practices and activities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is also well covered for many Pacific Islands. There are detailed studies about the nature of, and local responses to, most of the major Pacific trading activities, such as sea otters, pork, *bêche-de-mer*, sandalwood, coconut oil and copra, whaling, and pearl shell.¹⁶ What is known about such matters in New Zealand tends mainly to come from an earlier generation of historians, and it is usually fairly New Zealand-centred. Studies look at sealing, whaling, and the flax and kauri timber industry as localized and essentially Pakeha activities, rather than examining such enterprises in the context of either Maori participation, or of regional Pacific and imperial commercial systems.¹⁷ It is surprising, for example, that until the recent work of Paul Monin, the main source of information on the very extensive nineteenth-century Maori agricultural development was the more than 40-year-old research of R.P. Hargreaves.¹⁸ The extensive overseas travel of Maori, participating in trading networks, is not well known, unlike the significant scholarship on Pacific Islanders and their ubiquitous roles as travellers, traders and labourers.¹⁹

The role of missionaries and Christianity remains an ongoing topic of significant study in the Pacific Islands which examines past and present indigenous uses of it.²⁰ In New Zealand such study mainly petered out in the 1970s and has never really been resumed, largely, I suspect, because missionaries are now too readily seen as agents of wicked colonial practice, at least in historical if not theological communities. Yet Christianity has been perhaps the most powerful of all western influences used by Maori and Islanders, and has had profound consequences for all aspects of their respective cultures. The analysis of the 'conversion' processes in the Pacific Islands has invariably been linked to socio-political change, notably the possibilities of political centralisation and bureaucratic controls. Literacy was a key component of these developments. But not since Michael Jackson's 1967 thesis has there been a serious consideration of Maori attainment of literacy, which was a major feature of their responses to new influences.²¹

Likewise it has become unfashionable to study Pakeha in frontier contexts. The role of beachcombers and other transculturites, as well as life in more organized frontier communities, is better known in the Pacific than it is in New

Zealand.²² It is almost as if the Pakeha frontier has historiographically become a location of avoidance, except to illustrate negative consequences for Maori.

The patterns of macro and micro socio-political change for indigenous societies as a result of Western arrivals are also far better understood for many Pacific Islands than they are for New Zealand.²³ We actually know very little about the details of life in Maori communities across the nineteenth century, though there is plenty of rhetoric about victimization and loss.

An understanding of the wider Pacific context of British colonial policy could shed further light on New Zealand in the period leading up to 1840. British understanding, or misunderstanding, of the broader Pacific indigenous socio-political environments has a bearing on what happened in New Zealand, especially when the British saw major contrasts between, for example, the centralized, ordered ‘kingdoms’ of places like Tahiti, Tonga and Hawaii and the fragmented, localized political arrangements in New Zealand. In the 1980s I offered a deliberately provocative argument (which no one has followed up) that further understandings of the reasons for the annexation of New Zealand might be found in British misinterpretations of Maori society and activity. Maori themselves sometimes provided strong support for the humanitarian and commercial push for annexation. Maori enthusiasm for trade and commerce made European settlement in New Zealand seem viable in the first place. For the humanitarians, apparent Maori acceptance of the two fundamental ingredients of civilisation — agriculture and Christianity — endorsed amalgamationist dreams. And the fact that Maori had no centralized leadership and government was a further rationale for those arguing that they required imperial guidance, protection and regulation.²⁴ The influence on missionaries, travellers, administrators, politicians and others of a culturally imbibed ethnography is too little considered in New Zealand history.

A new generation of studies of imperialism is emerging, especially from the United Kingdom. These studies do not simply disparage imperialism, as has been the case in the more recent past, but usefully reread it.²⁵ Jane Samson’s *Imperial Benevolence* is a good example of an application of these new approaches to the Pacific Islands.²⁶ Her general conclusions about British imperialism in the Pacific — that it was fraught with hesitations, ambiguities, contradictions, disagreements and confusions — are a significant appreciation of the complexities of the past, specifically of imperialism in both theory and practice, and particularly the role of local situations and cultures. She provides a useful foil to a now commonly stated assumption that imperialism was a coherently organized, homogeneous, and all-powerful system for evil-doing. Imperial actions could certainly be evil, but the commonly heard condemnation of its supposedly purposeful, unrelenting, generalized depredations is not very scholarly. Samson puts a case for complexity and historico-cultural explanation rather than moralistic certitude and judgement. The ‘what actually happened’ dimension is important.

In this context, the last word has surely not been said on colonial policy and practice in New Zealand. Moreover, newer understandings of Pacific-wide and extra-Pacific imperial strategic and trade systems and networks, and perceptions of global contexts, could usefully be applied to New Zealand.²⁷ So too could

works which touch on various dimensions of Enlightenment imperialism such as botany and representations of nature and the implications of that for Pacific and other peoples.²⁸ In this latter context, one of the more intriguing and unusual insights into aspects of New Zealand's nineteenth-century history has come from Geoff Park, a botanist.²⁹

There are significant event and/or time gaps in modern New Zealand historiography. The period from about 1815, when Anne Salmond unfortunately ends her studies, to 1840 is a black hole.³⁰ Is it a coincidence that for much of this period Maori society had to cope with possibly the most traumatic event of its history, the so-called musket wars? No Maori anywhere in New Zealand, including the remote Chatham Islands, remained unaffected either by the military campaigns and/or by subsequent socio-political realignments and migration in this period. If serious historians do not tackle these topics other less able chroniclers will get in on the act. The popular myth that Maori were somehow in a pristine state until 1840 seems stronger now than ever.

Another glaring nineteenth-century silence has to do with the majority of the Maori population who did not participate in the wars of the 1860s. It is currently fashionable to focus on the achievements of so-called nationalist heroes or resistance movements, but they hardly typify Maori society as a whole as it variously and disparately struggled to cope with colonization and modernization. That some Maori may have wished to co-operate in a range of matters with colonial authorities rather than oppose them, or adopt and adapt a range of Western practices and values rather than reject them, has become a matter of disapproval. The current political discourse about Maori sovereignty and *tino rangatiratanga* has the capacity to simplistically lock all nineteenth-century Maori into the categories of either brave nationalists or collaborators. This is not good historical analysis. It perpetrates, in different words, the common nineteenth-century colonialist division of Maori into rebels or loyalists.

Apart from largely biographical mine shafts into aspects of Maori life, there really is a dearth of modern scholarship on race relations/Maori society in the twentieth century. In contrast, in the last ten years or more, Pacific Islands scholarship has shifted its focus from the nineteenth to the twentieth century.³¹ Topics such as Maori migration, urbanization and the dependency role Maori occupy in the modern economy have been surprisingly little compared and contrasted with Pacific Island urbanization and the Pacific economies typified by migration, remittances, aid, welfare, and bureaucracy.³²

Among the topics/subjects that dominate Pacific Islands scholarship is a significant, revealing, and ongoing reflection on its very nature, as it has kept reinventing itself from imperial, to island-centred, to postcolonial. It is historiographically far richer and more self-conscious than any New Zealand equivalent. In 1996 Clive Moore and Doug Munro listed over 75 such studies for the Pacific Islands.³⁴ There have been many more since. I doubt there are a dozen even now for New Zealand.

Finally, there is the category of writings to do with identity/indigeneity and with contestation of issues of historical ownership. Again this material from Pacific studies is both more prevalent and more complex than its New Zealand counterpart. An excellent example is a recent volume of the journal

The Contemporary Pacific that evokes diversity, possibility, and plurality.³⁴ In contrast there is a limited and often simplistic discussion in New Zealand that tends to offer yes/no, right/wrong answers to questions of historical ownership and interpretation. New Zealanders generally are not very good at living with complexity, and are apt to divide the world into simple, binary categories.

It is true that there are many more Pacific historians than New Zealand historians, but the way they go about their business is notably different too. With more voices come more perspectives. Some time ago I calculated that at least a third of all active participants/publishers of Pacific history are self-identified as 'indigenous', or, the term many of them have now adopted, 'native'. Pacific Island indigeneity is a complex phenomenon, given obvious cultural and political variation. Hence there is a wide a range of opinion from Hawaiian sovereignty nationalists at one end to far more conservative opinion from communities whose members feel far less culturally endangered. Moreover the supposed boundaries between so-called insiders and outsiders in Pacific Islands history are far more blurred than in the past.

In Pacific history, outside voices have not been muted, as they have been in New Zealand. Thus the Pacific Islands have continued to provide both sources for historians and others from anywhere. One could perhaps invidiously select a list of the world-class scholars writing on Pacific history — Oskar Spate, Bernard Smith, Greg Dening, Marshall Sahlins, Derek Freeman, Doug Oliver, Glyn Williams, Gananath Obeyesekere. All such writers notably connect their Pacific topics to wider intellectual and geographic frameworks. Some of the issues they address continue the age-old practice of using the Pacific as a proving ground for big issues and ideas. For example, the Sahlins/Obeyesekere debate over the death of Cook was at least partly about deep anthropological issues — accounting for human action in terms of a debate between 'different rationalities' and 'practical rationality'.³⁵

By contrast, New Zealand history, like so much else in New Zealand, tends to have a home-grown touch, which is partly cultural, but also because fewer New Zealand historians these days have PhD experience overseas, and sabbaticals/overseas conferences have become prohibitively expensive. There also seem to be fewer 'visitors' from overseas who write about New Zealand encounter history (other than Treaty matters), and sometimes those who do receive a rough reception.³⁶ Moreover, apart from a few writers such as Te Maire Tau who reflect on a broader, international discourse, Maori historians have also been nationally/culturally introspective.³⁷ The self-styled 'native' historians of the Pacific, people like Vince Diaz, Teresia Teaiwa, and David Gegeo have been much more aggressive in their use of the intellectual tools of postmodernism and postcolonialism. Moreover the range of historical representation and approach seems to be far more eclectic. At present many 'native' Pacific historians are exploring what is called triangulation — the interconnections of the trilogy of 'Natives Study/Pacific Studies/Cultural Studies'. It is a heady mix and for all its imperatives and sometimes contradictions it nevertheless opens rather than closes possibilities.³⁸

The ongoing input from anthropologists in Pacific Islands history is particularly notable. This probably is a reflection of the fact that modern British

anthropology, and specifically anthropological functionalism, was developed in island Melanesia in the early twentieth century by a succession of prominent anthropologists including A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and Bronislaw Malinowski. The Pacific Islands have long been a major anthropological testing ground, perhaps most notably with Margaret Mead who went to Samoa to support Franz Boas' project of arguing the primacy of nurture over nature. Modern Pacific history has always had a highly conscious application of anthropological strategy whereby history and anthropology intertwine. Among the more prominent current theoreticians and practitioners are Greg Denning, Marshall Sahlins, and Nicholas Thomas.³⁹

In New Zealand there is not the same quantity or depth of anthropologically/ethnographically informed history. But where it has occurred, the results are memorable, for example, in Anne Salmond's two volumes on early encounter, Geoff Sissons' interpretation of Rua and Tuhoe history, Angela Ballara's *Iwi*, and Atholl Anderson's *Welcome of Strangers*.⁴⁰

Literary-based Pacific cultural studies are also flourishing. The study of Pacific literature, as with anthropology, has a very long tradition. But modern studies have moved well beyond the traditional canon, as is seen in the Pacific works of Poe, Defoe, Melville, Stevenson, London, Maugham, Brooke. They now also deconstruct a wide range of texts, such as comment from explorers, beachcombers, missionaries, and through postcolonial eyes, offering new and sometimes controversial interpretations of contact history.⁴¹

Pacific history is increasingly characterized by a vitality, diversity, interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinary, at least to a much greater degree than is the case in New Zealand. All such endeavour is facilitated by the much wider range of publishing outlets for Pacific history. There are numerous journals, such as the *Journal of Pacific History*, *Pacific Studies*, *The Contemporary Pacific*, *Journal de la Société des Océanistes*, and *Journal of the Polynesian Society*. Major regional and international presses continue to support a flourishing line of Pacific history publications.

The study of encounter issues in New Zealand has, for the past 20 years, been relatively circumscribed: certain things should or should not be written about, certain people should or should not do the writing. Either/or, rather than both/and have characterized the scholarly enterprise. Overall lies the Tribunal paradigm and priority. Apart from its particular generation of historical information, it has also spawned a publishing industry on The Treaty. Much of this is about process and positioning rather than original historical investigation. Surprisingly, relatively few academic historians in New Zealand have contributed to Treaty books or articles. It has been left to lawyers, political scientists, journalists and amateur historians. Bill Oliver has noted that the *New Zealand Journal of History* has only ever published eight articles on the Treaty in the last 30 years, and all of these were by 'Treaty professionals' who have been directly engaged in the process.⁴²

The reticence of academic historians to research, participate and openly debate in this arena since the mid-1970s is largely because of various measures of discomfort and/or self-censorship. Many have long expressed private concerns at the uses to which the Tribunal and governments and other agencies of the

State have used history, particularly its projection of today's moralities on to unsuspecting peoples of the past. But they have not generally gone public for two reasons. Coming from a liberal tradition most have not wanted to be seen to be criticizing or possibly challenging the major social policy of redress that they basically support. Nor have they wanted to give support to the ever-receptive, red-neck element in society. They question the justification of current Treaty policy by ahistorical 'history', not the policy itself with its intended long-term outcome of helping to redress socio-economic inequalities.

In this context, I believe that there are two fundamental lessons from Pacific history that might be considered for New Zealand history. First, in the 1960s and 1970s, Pacific historians unpicked, at an academic level at least, the longstanding interpretive straitjacket of the 'fatal impact'. What I believe needs to happen in New Zealand history now is a similar unpicking of the overarching paradigm of Maori as victims. They were, but there are also many other dimensions to Maori-Pakeha encounter and histories. James Belich is one of the few historians to state this case, but it yet remains to be demonstrated in depth.

Second, over a decade ago Pacific history experienced a fundamental shift in perspective. Old imperial history had been replaced by island-centred history in the 1960s and 1970s. It was part of the process of rejecting the older imperial history. But the baby had to some extent been thrown out with the bath water. What happened by the later 1980s was a rediscovery that the islands are a part of both Pacific Rim and global systems of investment, trade and defence. In an ironic way this represented something of a return to some of the concerns of the older, discredited imperial history, but viewed now through the new lenses of post-imperial scholarship, and looking outwards at influences and power structures rather than myopically inwards.⁴⁴ Oskar Spate once said that island-centred Pacific historians of the 1960s and 1970s were sometimes unable to 'see the Ocean for the Islands ... [and were] marooned in the tight but safe confines of their little atoll of knowledge, regardless of the sweep of the currents which bring life to the isles ...'.⁴⁵ This metaphor now seems far more applicable to New Zealand history.

However, I believe that some seismic shifts may be underway in New Zealand historiography. Late in 2001, Peter Gibbons presented the Keith Sinclair Memorial Lecture entitled 'The far side of the search for identity: reconsidering the shapes of New Zealand history from a world history perspective'. His paradigm-inverting argument was that 'New Zealand' has unthinkingly been reified. Instead he suggested that it is a discursive construct that is in need of serious deconstructing, and that instead of considering such usual topics as 'New Zealand's role in the world', the world's role in New Zealand should be addressed. This would precisely parallel what has happened in Pacific Islands history writing over the past ten years.

Second, the publication of Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh's *Histories. Power and Loss*, and notably the essay by W.H. Oliver about the Tribunal's historical presentism, brings the private intellectual debate about the Tribunal's uses of history into the open.⁴⁷ In the same volume, Lyndsay Head also bravely challenges existing historiographic approaches. She suggests that nineteenth-century Maori history needs to be freed from 'the straitjacket' of 'the Treaty',

and in ways that are ‘grounded in neither “fatal impact” theory nor current romanticism’.⁴⁷

Finally, Russell Stone’s history of the Auckland region to 1840,⁴⁸ and Paul Monin’s study of the Hauraki district⁵⁰ are welcome engagements once more with fundamental contact history, outside the Tribunal paradigm of guilt-seeking.

There are signs, then, that New Zealand’s contact historiography may well be heading towards acceptance of complexity and variety. It might become more inclusive. I hope that the point has now past where *any* debate is instinctively seen as an attempt to subvert social policy or Maori aspiration. It is about enriching a hitherto very limited historiography. The House of New Zealand History has many rooms. But for the past 20 or so years it has been situated in a bit of a cul-de-sac, and too many of its rooms have remained empty, or locked. Perhaps it needed to happen, but not any more.

K.R. HOWE

Massey University – Albany

NOTES

*This paper is an extended version of my plenary keynote address to the New Zealand Historical Association Conference and Pacific History Workshop, University of Canterbury, December 2001. My focus is on issues of race relations/culture contact, as it is represented in books, articles, and other items that the public, students and teachers might have access to.

1 Bernard Smith, *European Vision and the South Pacific 1768–1850: A Study in the History of Art and Ideas*, London, 1960; Dorothy Shineberg, *They Came for Sandalwood: A Study of the Sandalwood Trade in the South West Pacific 1830–1865*, Melbourne, 1967; Niel Gunson, 'The Missionary Vocation', MA thesis, University of Melbourne, 1956; Gunson, 'Evangelical Missionaries in the South Seas 1797–1860', PhD thesis, Australian National University, 1959. These two theses were subsequently reworked and published as *Messengers of Grace: Evangelical Missionaries in the South Seas, 1797–1860*, Melbourne, 1978.

2 For example, J.M.R. Owens, 'Christianity and the Maoris to 1840', *New Zealand Journal of History* (NZJH), 2, 1 (1968), pp.18–40; Judith Binney, 'Christianity and the Maoris to 1840: A Comment', NZJH, 3, 2 (1969), pp.143–65.

3 Robin Fisher, *Contact and Conflict: Indian-European Relations in British Columbia, 1774–1890*, Vancouver, 1977.

4 K.R. Howe, *The Loyalty Islands: A History of Culture Contacts 1840–1900*, Canberra, 1977; Howe, 'The Fate of the "Savage" in Pacific Historiography', NZJH, 11, 2 (1977), pp.137–54.

5 Peter Munz, ed., *The Feel of Truth: Essays in New Zealand and Pacific History Presented to F.L.W. Wood and J.C. Beaglehole*, Wellington, 1969.

6 For example, William S. Livingston, and William Roger Louis, eds, *Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific Islands Since the First World War*, Austin, 1979; Keith Sinclair, ed., *Tasman Relations: New Zealand and Australia 1788–1988*, Auckland, 1987.

7 K.R. Howe, *Race Relations Australia and New Zealand: A Comparative Survey 1770s–1970s*, Wellington, 1977. Chapters on New Zealand were included in K.R. Howe, *Where the Waves Fall: A New South Sea Islands History from First Settlement to Colonial Rule*, Sydney, 1984; and in K.R. Howe, Robert C. Kiste, and Brij V. Lal, eds, *Tides of History: The Pacific Islands in the Twentieth Century*, Honolulu, 1994.

8 Donald Denoon, Philippa Mein Smith with Marivic Wyndham, *A History of Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific*, Oxford, 2000.

9 K.R. Howe, 'New Zealand's Pacifics: Memories and Reflections', NZJH, 34, 1 (2000), pp.4–19.

10 For example, Michael King, 'In This Together: The Case Against Cultural Separatism', *Listener*, 1–7 April, 1978, p.16.

11 While in this instance I argue that Pacific history has merits not always shared by New Zealand history, I have in other contexts been a longstanding critics of Pacific history. My latest statement on that subject appears in K.R. Howe, *Nature, Culture and History: The 'Knowing' of Oceania*, Honolulu, 2000.

12 The best bibliographic source for Pacific history is the annual bibliography of the *Journal of Pacific History* (JPH). Other good sources of recent bibliographic information are in Donald Denoon, ed., *The Cambridge History of the Pacific Islanders*, Cambridge, 1997; and Denoon et al, *A History of Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific*. General histories of the Pacific Islands include Howe, *Where the Waves Fall*; Howe, Kiste, Lal, *Tides of History*; I.C. Campbell, *A History of the Pacific Islands*, Christchurch, 1989; Deryck Scarr, *The History of the Pacific Islands: Kingdoms of the Reefs*, Melbourne, 1990; Denoon, *The Cambridge History*.

13 Foundational demographic work is in Norma McArthur, *Island Populations of the Pacific*, Canberra, 1967. Recent issues are discussed in, for example, David E. Stannard, *Before the Horror: The Hawai'ian Population on the Eve of Western Contact*, Honolulu, 1989; Andrew F. Bushnell, "'The Horror" reconsidered. An Evaluation of the Historical Evidence for Population Decline in Hawaii, 1778–1803', *Pacific Studies*, 16, 3 (1993), pp.115–61; A.W. Crosby, 'Hawaiian Depopulation as a Model for the Amerindian Experience', in Terence Ranger and Paul Slack, eds, *Epidemics and Ideas: Essays on the Historical Perception of Pestilence*, Cambridge, 1992; Donald Denoon, 'Pacific Island Depopulation: Natural or Un-natural?', in Linda Bryder and Derek A. Dow, eds, *New Countries and Old Medicine*, Auckland, 1994, pp.324–39; Raeburn Lange, 'European Medicine in the Cook Islands', in Roy Macleod and Milton Lewis, eds, *Disease, Medicine, and Empire*, London, 1988,

pp.61–79; Vicki Lukere, 'Mothers of the Taukei: Fijian Women and the Decrease of the Race', PhD thesis, Australian National University, 1997; Howe, *Nature, Culture, and History*.

14 Some basic statistics are in Ian Pool, *Te Iwi Maori*, Auckland, 1991. There are some recent forays into the field, for example, Raeburn Lange, *May the People Live. A History of Maori Health Development, 1900–1920*, Auckland, 1999; and Derek A. Dow, *Maori Health and Government Policy, 1840–1940*, Wellington, 1999.

15 See Paul D'Arcy, 'Maori and Muskets from a Pan-Polynesian Perspective', NZJH, 34, 1 (2000), pp.117–32.

16 For example, Shineberg, *They Came For Sandalwood*; O.H.K. Spate, *Paradise Found and Lost*, Canberra, 1988; H.E. Maude, *Of Islands and Men: Studies in Pacific History*, Melbourne, 1968; Ken Buckley, and Kris Klugman, *The History of Burns Philp*, 2 vols, Sydney, 1981, 1983.

17 Spate, *Paradise Found and Lost*.

18 For example, R.P. Hargreaves, 'The Maori Agriculture of the Auckland Province in the Mid-Nineteenth Century', *Journal of the Polynesian Society* (JPS), 68 (1959), pp.61–79; Hargreaves, 'Maori Flour Mills of the Auckland province 1846–1860', JPS, 70, 2 (1961), pp.227–32. See also Paul Monin, *This is My Place: Hauraki Contested 1769–1875*, Wellington, 2001.

19 For example, Peter Corris, *Passage Port and Plantation: A History of Solomon Island Labour Migration 1870–1914*, Melbourne, 1973; Dorothy Shineberg, *The People Trade: Pacific Island Laborers and New Caledonia*, Honolulu, 1999; George Quimby, 'Hawaiians in the Fur Trade of North-West America 1785–1820', JPH, 7 (1972), pp.92–103; Clive Moore, Jacqueline Leckie, and Doug Munro, eds, *Labour in the South Pacific*, Townsville, 1990; David A. Chappell, *Double Ghosts. Oceanian Voyagers on EuroAmerican Ships*, Armonk, NY, 1997.

20 For example, Gunson, *Messengers of Grace*; Hugh Laracy, *Marists and Melanesians: A History of Catholic Missions in the Solomon Islands*, Canberra, 1976; David Hilliard, *God's Gentlemen: A History of the Melanesian Mission 1849–1942*, St Lucia, Queensland, 1978; John Garrett, *To Live Among the Stars: Christian Origins in Oceania*, Suva, 1982; Garrett, *Footsteps in the Sea: Christianity in Oceania to World War II*, Suva, 1992; Garrett, *Where the Nets Were Cast: Christianity in Oceania Since World War II*, Suva, 1997; Tony Swain and Garry Trompfs, *The Religions of Oceania*, London, 1995; Manfred Ernst, *Winds of Change: Rapidly Growing Religious Groups in the Pacific Islands*, Suva, 1994.

21 Michael Jackson, 'Literacy, Communication and Social Change: The Maori Case, 1830–1870', MA thesis, University of Auckland, 1967.

22 For example, Caroline Ralston, *Grass Huts and Warehouses: Pacific Beach Communities of the Nineteenth Century*, Canberra, 1977; Maude, *Of Islands and Men*; I.C. Campbell, 'Gone Native' in *Polynesia: Captivity Narratives and Experiences from the South Pacific*, Westport, Conn., 1998; J.M.R. Young, *Adventurous Spirits: Australian Migrant Society in Pre-Cession Fiji*, St Lucia, Queensland, 1984.

23 Virtually every main island or island group now has reasonably detailed histories of contact and socio-economic and political change. The literature is too vast to mention here, but see bibliographic material in JPH.

24 Howe, *Where the Waves Fall*, p.229.

25 For example, Robin W. Winks, *The Oxford History of the British Empire, vol.5, Historiography*, Oxford, 1999; Alan Frost and Jane Samson, eds, *Pacific Empires: Essays in Honour of Glyndwr Williams*, Melbourne, 1999.

26 Jane Samson, *Imperial Benevolence: Making British Authority in the Pacific Islands*, Honolulu, 1998.

27 For example, P.J. Marshall, and Glyndwr Williams, *The Great Map of Mankind: British Perception of the World in the Age of Enlightenment*, London, 1982; Spate, *Paradise Found and Lost*; David Mackay, *In the Wake of Cook: Exploration, Science and Empire 1780–1801*, Wellington, 1985; Alan Frost, *Convicts and Empire: A Naval Question*, Melbourne, 1980.

28 For example, David Philip Miller and Peter Hanns Reill, eds, *Visions of Empire: Voyages, Botany, and Representations of Nature*, Cambridge, 1996; Richard H. Grove, *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism 1600–1860*, Cambridge, 1995; Grove, *Ecology, Climate and Empire*, Cambridge, 1997.

29 Geoff Park, *Nga Ururoa. The Groves of Life: Ecology and History in a New Zealand Landscape*, Wellington, 1995.

30 Anne Salmond, *Two Worlds: First Meetings Between Maori and Europeans, 1642–1772*, Auckland, 1991; and *Between Worlds: Early Exchanges Between Maori and Europeans 1773–1815*, Auckland, 1997.

- 31 Howe, Preface in *Tides of History*.
- 32 For example, Geoff Bertram, 'The MIRAB Model Twelve Years On', *The Contemporary Pacific. A Journal of Island Affairs* (CT), 11,1 (1999), pp.105–38.
- 33 Clive Moore and Doug Munro, 'The Nature of Pacific History. A Bibliography', in Doug Munro, ed., *Reflections on Pacific Historiography*, special issue of *The Journal of Pacific Studies*, 20 (1996), pp.155–60. See also Jocelyn Linnekin, 'Contending Approaches', in Denoon ed., *The Cambridge History of Pacific Islanders*, pp.3–36.
- 34 CT, special issue, *Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge*, Vincente M. Diaz and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, eds, 13, 2, 2001.
- 35 Gananath Obeyesekere, *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific*, Princeton, 1992; Marshall Sahlins, *How 'Natives' Think. About Captain Cook, For Example*, Chicago, 1995.
- 36 For example, there was major opposition in the media, often by people who had not read the work, to reports of Alan Hansen, 'The Making of Maori Culture: Invention and Its Logic', *American Anthropologist*, 91 (1989), pp.890–902.
- 37 Te Maire Tau, 'The Death of Knowledge: Ghosts on the Plains', *NZJH*, 35, 2 (2001), pp.131–52.
- 38 CT, 13, 2, 2001.
- 39 For example, Greg Dening, 'Ethnohistory in Polynesia: The Value of Ethnohistorical Evidence', *JPH*, 1 (1966), pp.23–42; Dening, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land. Marquesas 1774–1880*, Melbourne, 1980; Marshall Sahlins, *Islands of History*, Chicago, 1985; Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*, Cambridge, 1994.
- 40 Salmond, *Two Worlds*, and *Between Worlds*; Jeffrey Sissons, *Te Waimana: The Spring of Life. Tuhoe History and the Colonial Encounter*, Dunedin, 1991; Angela Ballara, *Iwi. The Dynamics of Maori Tribal Organisation from c.1760 to c.1945*, Wellington, 1998; Atholl Anderson, *The Welcome of Strangers: An Ethnohistory of Southern Maori A.D. 1650–1850*, Dunedin, 1998.
- 41 For example, Neil Rennie, *Far-Fetched Facts: The Literature of Travel and the Idea of the South Seas*, Oxford, 1995; Rod Edmond, *Representing the South Pacific: Colonial Discourse from Cook to Gauguin*, Cambridge, 1997; Vanessa Smith, *Literary Culture and the Pacific: Nineteenth Century Textual Encounters*, Cambridge, 1998; Jonathan Lamb, Vanessa Smith, Nicholas Thomas, eds, *Exploration and Exchange: A South Seas Anthology, 1680–1900*, Chicago, 2000.
- 42 W.H. Oliver, 'The Future Behind Us: The Waitangi Tribunal's Retrospective Utopia', in Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh, eds, *Histories. Power and Loss, Uses of the Past – A New Zealand Commentary*, Wellington, 2001, p.212, note 2.
- 43 Howe, 'The Fate of the "Savage"'.
 44 K.R. Howe, 'The Future of Pacific Islands History: A Personal View', in Brij V. Lal, ed., *Pacific Islands History: Journeys and Transformations*, Canberra, 1992, pp.225–31; see also Howe, Preface in *Tides of History*.
- 45 O.H.K. Spate, 'The Pacific as an Artefact', in Niel Gunson, ed., *The Changing Pacific. Essays in Honour of H.E. Maude*, Melbourne, 1978, p.34.
- 46 Oliver, 'The Future Behind Us', pp.9–29.
- 47 Lyndsay Head, 'The Pursuit of Modernity in Maori Society', in Sharp and McHugh, *Histories*, p.99.
- 48 R.C.J. Stone, *From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland*, Auckland, 2001.
- 49 Monin, *This is My Place*.