

Culture and Colonization: Revisiting the Place of Writing in Colonial New Zealand

TONY BALLANTYNE

This essay attempts to untangle a central conceptual and analytical knot in recent New Zealand historical writing: the interrelationship between culture and colonization. It explores the ways in which approaches to New Zealand's colonial past have been transformed over the past 25 years and attempts to historicize these shifts by framing them against international intellectual developments and the cultural and political currents that reconfigured visions of the past in these islands. The essay then offers an assessment of a key preoccupation of recent scholarship: the relationships between writing and colonization. This discussion identifies some limitations of the existing work as well as underscoring where it does have real analytical purchase, before closing by pointing to some possible paths for future work. These new lines of inquiry, I argue, not only require us to ask some new questions about the cultural work writing did in a colonial context, but also necessitate a reassessment of how colonization actually worked on the ground.

In explaining how the question of culture came to occupy centre stage in the historiography on colonial New Zealand, we must recognize that this shift is not unique but rather part of a broader shift in the intellectual terrain of Anglophone nations. Over the past three decades there has been a remarkable rekindling of historical work on colonialism. Questions about the dynamics of empire-building and the nature of colonial culture have shifted to the very centre of historical debate and humanities scholarship. In the late 1970s, the study of empire had seemingly reached a dead end and it was not an intellectual enterprise that was generating new analytical models or much controversy. Literary scholars and anthropologists remained only marginally interested in the question of imperialism. Certainly Talal Asad's work signalled a new willingness amongst anthropologists to grapple with the question of colonialism, their discipline's implication in empire-building, and the ways in which the realities of colonialism inflected the governing assumptions of anthropology.¹ But it was really from the mid-1980s that anthropologists began to interrogate their discipline's entanglement with colonialism in a sustained way. While there was a growing scholarly

engagement with African and South Asian writers during the 1970s (primarily in Britain under the umbrella of ‘Commonwealth Literature’), that work had not yet captured large international readerships or generated a scholarship that posed any real challenge to the disciplinary *status quo*. Nor had received understandings of the purpose of criticism, the nature of the ‘canon’, and the project of teaching literature been shaken by the developing national literary traditions of former colonies.²

In the discipline of history, the focus of this essay, historians of empire in the late 1970s were trapped within narrow lines of interest and interpretation. Endless dissertations on local colonial case studies – typically testing the Robinson and Gallagher thesis – continued to be produced by budding imperial historians.³ Senior scholars of imperial history routinely offered narrowly economic readings of both empire-building and anti-colonial resistance, reflecting the intellectual primacy of debating the costs and benefits of empire and the political primacy of the question of development. Unfortunately, these preoccupations meant that the study of empire was increasingly separated off from the mainstream of British historical writing and historians of “metropolitan” Britain exhibited limited interest in the former colonies or what the empire had meant for Britain’s development. But the marginal status of work on empire and colonialism in the British context was hardly unique. Questions of empire were also marginal in European historiography: the histories and legacies of colonialism were not prominent as the new social history transformed approaches to the European past and historians of France especially began to exhibit strong interest in questions of culture and text.

At this point in most former colonies, say around 1980, imperial history was fading from view: it was seen as increasingly irrelevant to the pressing project of filling in the gaps in national history traditions.⁴ This diminishing significance reflected, at least in part, imperial history’s concern with understanding the broad dynamics of imperialism, including the impetus for imperial expansion, the mechanics of empire-building, the organization of empire and the ‘costs and benefits of empire’.⁵ These concerns sat uneasily with the circumscribed analytical vision of national histories and, as a result, the history of colonized communities and long patterns of local development were typically left in the hands of scholars working in the former colonies. There is no doubt that this was a pernicious division of labour, but the growing gulf also reflected a divergence between the imperial history tradition and the concerns of scholars working on building national historiographies for the former colonies. Historians in the former colonies had not only turned away from exploring the nature of connections to the imperial metropole, but because of the growing dominance of social history, they prioritized finely grained case studies of the production of

social collectives (primarily defined by race and class), collectives that were understood as the building blocks of the nation.⁶ This is not to say that colonialism was unimportant in national histories, but within this kind of framework the 'colonial' figured as a kind of national pre-history. It was the slightly awkward and embarrassing prelude that set the stage for the real story, the emergence of distinctive national political and literary traditions and the consolidation of an independent national identity.

But even in the early 1980s, when some leading imperial historians were raising severe doubts over the coherence of imperial history and worried about the growing divide between imperial history and the national historiographies of former colonies, new political and scholarly currents were reframing the significance of colonialism as a historical problem. Indigenous activists and prominent intellectuals in former settler colonies began to argue that colonialism did not merely set the scene for the main drama of nation-building; rather, they suggested, the violence and dispossession enacted by the colonial order framed national development and colonialism's legacies were largely responsible for the social, economic, and cultural marginalization of indigenous peoples.⁷ In New Zealand, of course, these kinds of arguments were anticipated in works like Dick Scott's *Ask That Mountain* (1975) and Tony Simpson's *Te Riri Pakeha: The White Man's Anger* (1979), which focused new attention on the centrality of violence and state aggression in the shaping of nineteenth-century society. But in the wake of the 1981 Springbok rugby tour, Donna Awatere's *Maori Sovereignty* offered a radical rereading of the place of race in New Zealand history and was fiercely critical of the complicity of white feminists and liberals in the established racial order. Ranginui Walker's work as a columnist and his historical writings also dwelt at length on questions of race and colonization: he imagined colonialism as a 'cultural invasion' that impoverished Maori, undercut chiefly authority, and created a deep-seated inequality between the cultural status of Maori and Pakeha.⁸ In academic historiography, James Belich's *New Zealand Wars* was particularly important as it not only reread the military history of the wars, but it stressed the ways in which colonial and imperial interpretations of the conflict minimized Maori military capacity in order to shore up the cultural foundations of the colonial enterprise.⁹

These kinds of scholarly re-evaluations which framed the development of colonial culture around dispossession and racial conflict rather than the transplantation of British social models and institutions to the colony were not unique to New Zealand. In Australia, from the middle of the 1970s, scholars like Raymond Evans, Kay Saunders and Kathryn Cronin had foregrounded the centrality of exclusion, exploitation and extermination in shaping race relations in colonial Australia. Henry Reynolds's work offered a radical rereading of the process of colonization in Australia.¹⁰

In India, the Subaltern Studies collective began to undercut the progressive narratives of both nationalist and Marxist historians, stressing the centrality of conflict between social collectives and the inherently relational nature of social identities. Violence, suppression and dispossession were seen not as unfortunate side effects of the nationalist movement and the nation-building process, but instead as integral to it.¹¹

Thinking about Subaltern Studies, of course, reminds us that there was a marked intellectual shift within history as a discipline. The new social history had prized the discipline open in the 1960s and two generations of historians who sought to write history from the bottom up were energized by interdisciplinary engagements: most importantly, they were reading economics and sociology. By the early 1980s, some historians were increasingly looking to anthropology, literary studies, and gender theory. Their “new cultural history” was much more concerned with how meaning was made and the history of mentalities. For historians of colonialism, this turn towards culture was marked by a new engagement with Foucault’s work, with Said’s arguments about the role of Orientalism in both legitimating empire-building and constituting the European self, and an abiding preoccupation with the construction of cultural difference.

Many imperial historians based in Britain, and British historians more generally, operated with a business-as-usual approach – they seemed to hope that these faddish ideas from France and America would quickly disappear. But this position became increasingly untenable as they were challenged by a diverse body of energetic new work, work that sparked an intense sequence of debates which still intermittently rekindle. From Lancaster, John MacKenzie was focusing on the ways in which the empire shaped Victorian and Edwardian culture and his work on the culture of imperialism was a powerful blow to the vision of British history as an “island story” of isolation.¹² The work of historians of Britain’s Afro-Caribbean and South Asian communities, like Rozina Visram, as well as the influence of the Birmingham tradition of cultural studies, simultaneously emphasized the long histories of migration that reshaped Britain and the centrality of white racism in the constitution of a national identity that occluded Britons with non-white origins.¹³ Finally, feminist historians, especially Catherine Hall, Antoinette Burton, and Mrinalini Sinha, highlighted both the centrality of gender in the cultural politics of empire as well as the ways in which colonialism fed back into the politics of gender “at home” in Britain.¹⁴ Taken together these were the elements that created the “new imperial history”, a loose and sprawling tradition of work characterized by its concern with the cultural realm and the complex patterns of cultural traffic that constituted the empire and Britain itself.

These international currents did filter into the new work on colonialism in New Zealand; but not in any consistent way. From the later 1980s, a growing body of work strove to understand the colonization of New Zealand as a cultural project. While Belich's *New Zealand Wars* was certainly an important contribution to this new vision (and had significant international impact), the work of Peter Gibbons really stands at the head of this new interpretative tradition. Across an arc of important essays, Gibbons offered a new reading of the colonial past that tightly laced together culture and colonization. Two foundational arguments ran through these texts. First, he suggested that colonization was not a chronologically demarcated process that ended around 1850 (or even 1890). Rather than seeing the Liberal government, Gallipoli, or the literary nationalists of the 1930s marking a moment where the nation broke free from empire and transcended the colonial past, Gibbons stressed that colonization was an ongoing process that moulded and delimited the possibilities of the nation-building process into the late twentieth century.¹⁵ While Gibbons here was arguing against the optimistic nationalist framing of the past *à la* Sinclair, I think that in fact an enlarged understanding of colonialism as an extended process of invasion and occupation was actually more widespread by the early 1980s than he allowed.¹⁶

Secondly Gibbons drew new attention to the manifold and strong connections between cultural production and the processes of colonization. He suggested that colonization could be understood as a sequence of processes where exploration, invasion, occupation, appropriation, and nation-building depended on the creation of cultural asymmetries as well as political and economic inequalities. In particular, he focused attention on the centrality of the written and printed word in enabling colonization. In his important essay on 'Non-Fiction' in *The Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English* Gibbons argued that the long-standing implication of writing in cross-cultural violence and imperial conquest was extended in colonial New Zealand:

. . . the basic conditions which generated non-fiction writing had been established [before the emergence of a self-conscious local tradition of writing]. These conditions were the extension of European power into non-European territories and the way in which writing was intimately engaged in expressing that power; writing, like Marx's capital, arrives in New Zealand 'dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt.' Writing in and about New Zealand was henceforth involved in the process of colonization, in the implementation of European power, in the description and justification of the European presence as normative, and in the simultaneous implicit or explicit production of the indigenous peoples as alien or marginal.¹⁷

Gibbons argued that the 'archive of exploration' produced by missionaries, traders and explorers had begun to textualize 'New Zealand' before Britain's annexation of these islands in 1840. Between 1840 and 1890, Gibbons focused on the strong connections he identified between colonization and writing, dubbing works of the period the 'Literature of Invasion'. And he characterized writing from 1890 to 1930 as the 'Literature of Occupation', as writers increasingly appropriated local elements and Maori words and motifs as they strove to become 'indigenous writers'.¹⁸

Gibbons further developed his reading of the interweaving of writing and colonization in later essays. In a 2002 piece he argued:

Writing and printing were crucial technologies in maintaining and extending the power of settler society over the indigenous inhabitants. The use of the written and printed word as a sharp instrument of colonization, in such examples as treaties, proclamations, laws and ordinances, and prospectuses of colonizing agencies, is well known.¹⁹

Yet, he contended, colonial power rested in print culture more generally. The spirit of colonization suffused the 'books and newspapers and journals and other mechanically reproduced materials with no direct relationship to the more obvious acts of colonization'.²⁰ Through these works, Gibbons suggested, 'Maori themselves and their cultures were textualized by Pakeha, so that the colonists could "know" the people they were displacing. It is not too much to say that the colonists produced (or invented) "the Maori", making them picturesque, quaint, largely ahistorical and, through printed materials, manageable.'²¹

We should note that this reading of colonial knowledge as a hegemonic sequence of texts produced by the colonizers was increasingly out of step with work in other colonial historiographies. At the conclusion of his 2002 essay, Gibbons suggested that 'cultural colonization' was a way of 'examining and accounting for the form and content of some Pakeha cultural activities.' Colonial texts, in this view, were the product of the minds and pens of the colonizers: Maori 'collaboration' in the making of these texts and their 'appropriation' of them were essentially beyond the purview of 'cultural colonization'. These questions were part, Gibbons suggested, of the 'total context' within which the practices of cultural colonization operated, but he failed to illuminate the ability of Maori to shape, reshape and contest these texts.²² Conversely, in India there has been a long tradition of examining the ways in which the presence of the colonized imprinted colonial texts. In the early 1980s Ranajit Guha, for example, was arguing that the 'rebel consciousness' of various subaltern groups framed the letters, reports, and narratives produced by colonial officials.²³ More recent work by Eugene Irschick and Chris Bayly has stressed the 'dialogic nature' of

much colonial knowledge. Bayly, Norbert Peabody, and Michael Dodson have reconstructed the ways in which pre-colonial traditions of thought and practice moulded the development of colonial knowledge under, first, the East India Company between 1765 and 1857, and then the Crown Raj (1858 to 1947). Unlike the bifurcation that structures Gibbons' argument, this South Asian work imagines colonial culture as a series of spaces, albeit highly uneven ones, where ideas, arguments, and ideologies were openly contested and reformulated by a range of experts, institutions, and individuals, both colonizers and colonized.²⁴

Working in the wake of Peter Gibbons, two scholars in particular have developed his vision of 'cultural colonization'. Giselle Byrnes traced the ways in which surveying enabled colonization and the transformation of the land into a commercialized object. She has also examined the place of travel narratives, maps and place names in processes of cultural colonization, which, she argues, have 'rendered the European presence as normative, and correspondingly, the Maori as marginal'.²⁵ Chris Hilliard explored the culture of writing between 1890 and the 1940s, specifically the ways in which colonization shaped the development of a national literary culture, demonstrating the real power of the 'cultural colonization' line of analysis to illuminate the dynamics of textual production in early twentieth-century New Zealand.²⁶ Thinking through 'cultural colonization' allows a rereading of the past from the juncture of cultural and intellectual history, or, as Hilliard put it, 'a cultural history whose primary disciplinary reference point is intellectual history'.²⁷ Of course, it is also Hilliard who began to pick at the seams of this approach. In 2002 he argued that the reductive tendencies of this method of analysis needed to be guarded against: 'while hardly anything in New Zealand is unconnected with colonization, not everything is adequately *explained* by its colonial entanglements'. Cultural colonization was not the best set of analytical tools for all our history; it does not furnish us with a 'skeleton key' to unlock the entirety of the past.²⁸ Within this critique of cultural colonization lay a growing awareness that as an approach it certainly illuminated the projection of authority and dominance at the heart of colonization, but it shed little light on the transplantation and meaning of a whole range of colonial cultural practices – practices that had at most an angular relationship with the consolidation of colonial power.

An important arc of essays written by Michael Reilly also marked a significant development in approaches to cultural colonization. Reilly's work came out of a different set of intellectual genealogies but shared some of the preoccupations of the Gibbons tradition. In exploring the history of colonial collecting and ethnographic writing, Reilly read colonial intellectual activity within a broader Pacific frame (seeing connections between the endeavours of men like with John White and Pacific collectors like William

Wyatt Gill in Mangaia).²⁹ Reilly's work also pushed New Zealand history writing in challenging directions as his disciplinary affiliations with Maori Studies posed some critical questions about the limits of Pakeha historical perspectives and the authority of history as a discipline. Not surprisingly, given his disciplinary affiliation, Reilly's work also exhibited a sustained interest in the ways in which Maori themselves were involved in the production of ethnographic knowledge. Throughout his essays, Reilly has exhibited a more sustained engagement with postcolonial thought – including Pacific thinkers like Epeli Hau'ofa as well as Fanon, Spivak, and Bhabha – than any other New Zealand historian.

Taken together, the body of work produced by scholars like Gibbons, Reilly, Byrnes and Hilliard, produced a powerful reassessment of colonization. As a consequence of their scholarship, colonization was reimagined as fundamentally a cultural project, rather than primarily a set of economic or political asymmetries. This cultural reading of the colonial past swiftly became influential in New Zealand – with remarkably little contestation – for two main reasons. First, it gained purchase swiftly because of the shape of the existing historiography. There was no very strong alternative interpretation of colonization emerging in academic writing on New Zealand's past and nor was there a strongly embedded prevailing interpretation. In fact, work on the process of empire-building in New Zealand was really quite diffuse in its concerns and inchoate in its analytical vision. Much of it, of course, was informed by the kind of left liberal consensus that has moulded so much of our historical writing and this political orientation has generally proven to be receptive to work that has prioritized race, representation and the critique of empire. Here the New Zealand case diverged markedly from other colonial contexts, especially India and South Africa where new cultural readings of empire-building confronted firmly entrenched Marxist traditions of interpretation which analyzed the colonial past within the broader history of capitalist development and were deeply concerned with the material base of colonialism. In India, this Marxist tradition was initially internalized by and then subsequently partially displaced by the work produced in the wake of Subaltern Studies. Conversely, in South Africa the Marxist tradition – which had always exhibited a distinctive interest in the nexus of race and class – has remained stronger and has ceded less ground to culturalist readings of empire.

Secondly, work on cultural colonization in New Zealand was in tune with broader shifts in the political and intellectual terrain. One of the key planks of the resurgence of Maori political activity and cultural production in the 1970s and 1980s was the idea that colonialism was a project to displace the culture of the colonized and that Maori communities lost language and culture, as well as the land, as a result of colonization. Here I think historical

research and political arguments were mutually reinforcing. At the same time, academic research increasingly reflected and reinforced the state's growing embrace of biculturalism. Landmark works like Claudia Orange's *Treaty of Waitangi* or Anne Salmond's *Two Worlds* and *Between Worlds* were texts that framed early cross-cultural encounters and the development of the colonial state in a way that dovetailed neatly with the project of building an explicitly bicultural vision of the nation's past and future.

Reading the colonial past through the lens of culture was, therefore a crucial transition in our historiography. Most importantly, this new approach greatly enlarged our understanding of what colonialism was. Colonialism was no longer simply a process that could be accessed through examining the development of the state's 'native policy', but rather the colonizing impulse was seen as permeating the culture. This meant that legislation, government records, or parliamentary debates were not the best way to access the colonial past. Rather sources that seemed to belong to the domain of culture – travel narratives, ethnographic texts, literature and art – took on a new analytical importance.³⁰ These were not understood as simply a reflection of the colonial imagination, but rather as playing a key role in constituting the asymmetrical cultural terrain of colonialism. Most importantly, this work suggested that the production of difference, especially the binary opposition between Maori and Pakeha was fundamental to the process of colonization: this 'othering' (and then the subsequent Pakeha appropriation of Maori resources and symbols) was the very basis of the colonial order.

The kind of mapping exercise that this essay has undertaken so far is useful, I believe, because it identifies a very important analytical tradition in work on colonialism in New Zealand, begins to historicize its development, and makes it possible to read this approach in a productive way in both national and international contexts. I want to use the remainder of this piece to briefly evaluate this way of viewing the past so that we can identify some ways that we might move ahead. My key concern is that we need to recalibrate our understanding of what colonialism was and its connection to writing as a practice. To pursue this line of thought I want to identify some difficulties within the existing work, offer a quick typology of key modes of writing within the cultural field of colonialism, and then end by identifying some new lines of enquiry.

I think there are various weaknesses within the work on cultural colonization that can be quickly noted. Most obviously, it has narrowly focused on the connections between writing and dominance, rather than writing and cultural transmission. This means that some very important work – here I am thinking especially of Charlotte Macdonald's examinations of the place of writing in the production of affective relationships of various

kinds and the ways in which the meaning of writing was inflected by gender, marital status and age – have been neglected within a historiographical framework that is mainly concerned with the ways in which writing enabled the dispossession of Maori. Most importantly, this occlusion means the connections between cultural transmission, the reproduction of Anglo-Celtic models of social organization and cultural practice, and the actual dynamics of constructing colonial dominance remain unclear.

The work of cultural colonization has also been moulded by a relatively weak interface with scholarship on the history of printing, reading, and the book trade in New Zealand, a significant body of work that allows us to calibrate the range and circulation of various types of texts. Important recent work on Maori newspapers and on Maori traditions of writing – here I am especially thinking of Lachy Paterson's and Bradford Haami's work – have not yet been incorporated into our broader models of colonial politics or cultural life.³¹ Print culture became a crucial forum for debate within te ao Maori and a significant cultural bridge that linked, albeit imperfectly and unevenly, the politics of the tangata whenua and colonists. I think that this kind of work really does call into question the notion that 'Maori' were produced or invented by the colonists. It would seem to me that any history of that identification would have to take relationships between hapu and iwi seriously, to be committed to exploring the long history of pan-tribalism, and to foreground the role of tangata whenua themselves in delineating what it is to be Maori, rather than see this category as primarily a colonial inscription.

But here I want to emphasize one key limitation of the work on cultural colonization: its reduction of writing to texts than can be analyzed through the lens of 'representation'. Particularly concerning here is the prioritization of representation as an analytical problematic and the ways in which representation has then been subsequently deployed. Representation is, of course, a strategy that tends to view writing in terms of its textual outputs rather than as a practice (and set of processes) embedded in social relationships and material culture. Very frequently work on nineteenth-century New Zealand offers up a quote or small slice of text to demonstrate the nature of understandings of cultural difference, racial thought, or simple racism: that text is then seen as indicative of a wider set of attitudes and assumptions. And, frequently, that text is then interpreted as doing real work – in enabling colonization, in marginalizing Maori, or securing white dominance. Rarely, however, are the mechanics of these processes actually reconstructed: in academic historiography at least we do not have many detailed treatments of how a particular idea or argument actually was deployed as an instrument of oppression or dispossession. Much more frequently, in fact, work on representation becomes merely attitudinal: texts

reveal colonial prejudice, prejudice which then becomes an explanation of colonialism *tout court*.

John Stenhouse's reassessment of A.K. Newman's 1882 essay 'A Study of the Causes Leading to the Extinction of the Maori' highlights some of the limits of analytical approaches that prioritize representation or simply attempt to understand colonialism through 'images' that Pakeha produced of Maori.³² Stenhouse noted that previous historians saw Newman as articulating 'widely held' beliefs, including a Social Darwinism that was seen as 'quite prevalent', and that Newman deployed medical knowledge to shore up 'European dominance'.³³ Yet Stenhouse's essay shows that Newman's arguments, which suggested that Maori were destined to die out because indigenous practices were accelerating the natural decline of the race, were in fact neither authoritative nor did they fit easily with what other settlers thought. Newman's arguments were attacked by influential figures such as Gilbert Mair, William Travers, and Sir James Hector when they were first aired at the Wellington Philosophical Institute in 1876. When Newman presented the first version of the 1882 paper he was again challenged, by Dr Morgan Grace (who predicted that the Maori population would soon begin to rebound) and, once again, by Sir James Hector. Stenhouse's reading of Newman's work underlines the importance of the institutional context of knowledge production and also foregrounds the extremely energetic nature of the colonial public sphere. Stenhouse's work points to a simple, but important methodological insight. Reconstructing debates, unpicking controversies, and tracing the dissemination and reception of arguments, offer historians far greater insights into past intellectual and cultural terrains than can be gained by simply focusing on the construction of otherness within particular texts.

So, extreme arguments may have been articulated, but the simple fact of their articulation does not allow us to gauge their cultural authority, influence or reception. What I am suggesting here, is that in analyzing colonial texts, we need to pay much, much closer attention to the spatial/social location and institutional frameworks from which the text was produced. We also need to be very aware of the broader discursive field the text entered and the patterns and pathways of print culture that shaped its circulation and reception. In other words, we need to pay attention to Peter Mandler's insistence that we should always scrutinize the 'relative throw', that is 'the weight and significance', of any text within an intellectual formation and how that relative throw shifts according to place as well as time.³⁴ This kind of strategy, I believe, allows us to connect text with context, but it also opens up the question of consequence too: how texts actually influenced and determined action. This is not only a way of salvaging causality, but it is a crucial move if we are to insist that textual analysis matters – we

must be committed to tracing the material effects of discourse in specific and concrete ways.

Let me be clear. These criticisms are not discounting the value of cultural analysis, rather I am arguing that its real power comes when we push beyond a superficial recounting of race and representation and when we reject the temptation to read the meaning of all practices or beliefs or objects as being totally determined by their implication in colonialism. Before I proceed to talk about some of the ways in which we might examine the limits of “cultural colonization”, let me reaffirm that I do think that there were extremely important connections between writing and colonization. Based on my own work on the place of knowledge in the colonization of southern New Zealand, I think it is possible to identify four modes of writing where there was a strong connection between writing and the process of colonization. Here I am resisting the temptation to identify some specific genres because genre does not necessarily dictate the problems or arguments that texts produce.

The first of these modes of writing is what I term ‘imperial potentiality’. This mode placed the colonists’ assessment of the land and resources within the framework of an imagined imperial future. An example is Edward Shortland’s vision of the transformation of the north Otago interior into an important sheep farm for the empire after spending time with the Kai Tahu chief Te Huruheru on the Waitaki river.³⁵ This tradition of writing was an important instrument for forcing these islands into the view of the British and Australian moneymen and merchants, the Colonial Office, and advocates of emigration and underscoring their potential for the empire in the long term. Given the aggressive nature of British commercial expansion and imperial ambition, it is hardly surprising that this mode of thinking and writing was durable: for the southern portions of Te Wai Pounamu, for example, we might identify key examples in the records of Cook’s voyages; the reports and published narratives of Shortland and Tuckett in coastal Otago in the 1840s; and editorials, letters to the editor and published travel narratives in the local, Australian, and British press that promoted the settlement of undeveloped regions into the 1850s (and beyond).

The second and closely related mode of writing can be termed ‘colonial promotion’. These texts extolled the virtues of the colony as it existed and stressed its ability to offer immediate returns. Within the historiography to date this type of literature has primarily been understood through the lens of ‘boosterism’.³⁶ While there is no doubt that the spirit of boosterism inflected much promotional literature, I think it is a relatively narrow reading of these texts. An important observation to make here is that dwelling exclusively on the connections between boosterism and migration occludes the importance of familial and affective networks which disseminated

information about colonies. These forms of social connection, as Angela McCarthy has shown, frequently influenced both the decision to migrate and the socio-economic context of life in the new world after migration (as new colonists found accommodation, work, and social connections through these networks).³⁷ More broadly still, stressing boosterism, or the ‘New Zealand myth’ or ‘ideal’, actually illuminates only a narrow slice of this literature. Most importantly, it fails to grapple with the empirical content of published works. This can be seen particularly clearly in the *Otago Journal*, which was used to provide information about the Otago colony to recruit potential colonists in Britain. This publication not only included a large number of migrant letters, but also furnished a host of statistics in an effort to provide both details and ostensibly objective information about the conditions of the settlement. So in the fourth issue, published in June 1849, a table provided temperatures from both attached and detached thermometers, barometric readings, and measurements of wind direction and velocity, recorded three times a day between 16 and 30 November 1848. The seventh issue of the Journal, published in May 1851, can be regarded as an exemplar of the British ‘useful knowledge’ tradition: in 14 short pages of double columns it packed in detailed descriptions and statistical measures of the colony’s geology, topography, economic base, and communications infrastructure as well as a careful description of the colony’s population assessed according to gender, marriage, religion, class, occupation and education.

Reading this literature through the lens of boosterism also underestimates the importance of the colonies when viewed from Europe. European colonists were drawn to New Zealand because it allowed them to escape the environmental constraints of a resource-poor and environmentally-depleted Europe where sustained population growth was putting tremendous pressure on a finite land base.³⁸ Thus, promotional literature was a product of both aggressive empire-building and the distinctive preoccupations of a European capitalist imagination simultaneously convinced of the improving power of agriculture, commerce and industry and anxious about the limits of Europe’s resources.³⁹ Within the political economy of the British empire, promotional literature also functioned as a vitally important instrument for the extension of British territorial reach through settlement and the incorporation of distant and lightly developed territories into the global networks of trade created by the empire. These texts were central in enabling the displacement of comparatively small tribal societies: in New Zealand’s case, as Belich has clearly demonstrated, migration was the central tool for securing white dominance as the tangata whenua were effectively swamped by waves of migration from Europe.⁴⁰

The third mode of writing where there was a strong connection between writing and the extension of colonial authority was ‘ethnographic assessment’.

The cultural work carried out by colonial ethnography has been explored by several historians, anthropologists, Maori Studies scholars, and in many dissertations. As I have already suggested, these scholars argue that ethnographic writing produced understandings of cultural difference that enabled and authorized colonialism. Work on later collectors, and especially the scholars connected to the Polynesian Society, has also explored some of the ways in which these intellectuals textualized Maori culture and used this project as an instrument of self-fashioning. In terms of this line of thought, I think we do need much more work on the role of the state in producing and harnessing these knowledges: as it stands, the connections between these texts and state action remains quite blurred. I would also like to see much more attention devoted to the distinctive regional traditions and preoccupations that structured this body of ethnographic writing. Exploring this issue would allow us to embed ethnographic texts more firmly within the institutional frameworks and real locations that framed them (as Jeff Sissons has done for Tuhoe) and would also allow us to take the question of variations between hapu and iwi much more seriously.⁴¹

Finally, the fourth mode is 'improvement writing'. Improvement was an idea ubiquitous in colonial political and institutional life and it suffused print culture. Improvement was, I think, the colonial keyword. The idea of improvement was a powerful social and political device for mobilizing action: it was used to isolate problems, identify remedies, and catalyze action. Of course, it could be directed inward: self-improvement was an abiding concern within colonial culture. But even self-improvement was commonly understood as best achieved within a context of mutuality and, as a result, mechanics institutes, literary and debating societies, and mutual improvement societies were vitally important social and intellectual spaces in the colony during the second half of the nineteenth century. While these forms of improvement were central in the transmission and localization of inherited British models of social organization, their connection to the construction of colonial authority was not nearly as clear or as direct as programmes of environmental improvement or schemes for the 'uplift' or 'civilization' of Maori. Improvement was important in these specific domains for three reasons. First, it provided a justification for the act of colonization: the colonists were improving the quality of the landscape, eliminating the practices that were holding Maori back, and, in both cases, making New Zealand modern. Second, the notion of improvement was extremely elastic and flexible: it was an idea with a long history in Britain and had become commonplace.⁴² Few colonists could object to it. Thirdly, it was a powerful idea because it promised the ability to translate belief, aspiration, and the written word into action and outcomes. James Beattie has rightly stressed that colonial improvement was often shot through with

contradictions, ambiguities and anxieties.⁴³ Nevertheless, ‘improvement’ was the most consistently powerful idea that could be mobilized to legitimize the transformations unleashed by colonial rule.

I think these four modes of writing were central in constructing, consolidating, and perpetuating colonial power. And I think it is quite possible to trace, in these traditions, concrete ways in which writing fed debates and moulded public opinion, and actually shaped action. But it is essential that we understand these four modes within the larger field of cultural production, a cultural terrain which was suffused by, but not reducible to, the written word. In simple terms, these textual traditions co-existed and inter-related with a whole host of other forms of both spoken and written expression.⁴⁴ Writers in the colony were not restricted to producing texts explicitly implicated in the colonizing project nor did they only read these kinds of texts. In other words, we not only need to follow Mandler in thinking about the ‘relative throw’ of particular texts, but we also need to think about the weight, significance, influence and durability of whole textual traditions.

We also need to pay particularly close attention to some important textual traditions whose relationship to colonization seems ambivalent or ambiguous. In the terms of Chris Hilliard’s work, these are traditions that sit at the limits of ‘cultural colonization’: they cannot be fully understood through the lens of colonization, at least colonization primarily understood as dispossession, but nor can the cultural work they carried out be apprehended without recognizing their implication in colonization.⁴⁵

One starting point for exploring such complexities is to give much greater consideration to the connections between writing and state activity. Writing was a central instrument of the state and underpinned a whole range of techniques of governance: from the drafting of reports to the Colonial Office, to the production of legislation and the *Government Gazette*; from the operation of Parliamentary Commissions to the collation of government departments’ annual reports and the analysis and interpretation of trade statistics and population data. The constant bureaucratic shuffling and shuttling of paper is something that we frequently take for granted, but it was a very particular means of directing state action and framing state power. The work of Mary Poovey, Zoë Laidlaw and others suggests that writing became firmly connected to the dynamics of governance around the 1830s, as political authority became increasingly disembodied, depersonalized, bureaucratized and routinized; paper-dependent modes of governance were the lifeblood of the colonial state as it developed here.⁴⁶

Equally pressing, the connections between culture, commerce and colonization require exploration. Of course, writing and commercial life were increasingly intertwined in the decades before the annexation of New

Zealand. Writing about commerce became a key mechanism through which basic facts of the economic systems were created and writing was central to the creation of economic expertise. Writing itself became the chief mechanism through which commercial life operated and was policed.⁴⁷ Joel Mokyr has also suggested that writing and print were key instruments in organizing knowledge in early modern Europe and that they were pivotal in the ordering and reordering of knowledge at the heart of the industrial revolution.⁴⁸

The cultural frameworks of capitalism were quickly reproduced here, yet little attention has been devoted to the process of transplantation. And little consideration has been given to the operation of the cultural edifice of the colonial market economy. Maori not only had to adjust to the logics of accumulation and investment that underpinned effective action in a capitalist economy, but they had to grasp the ways in which writing articulated with economics. Most, if not all, major economic acts were undertaken within a colonial economy that was dependent on the circulation of paper currency, the authority of written contracts and mortgages, and underpinned by substantial sets of quite particular literacies and numeracies. And, of course, the circulation of the printed word in its manifold forms was an integral part of the colonial economy: the movements of texts and commodities were central in giving New Zealand real shape as a nation space.⁴⁹ This is a slightly different argument than the one forwarded most recently by Peter Gibbons. In an abrupt shift from the cultural colonization thesis, Gibbons has urged that New Zealand historians should decentre the question of national identity and instead focus on the 'world in New Zealand'. This would entail, he argues, the construction of 'macrohistories of production, trade and consumption' to highlight New Zealand's place in broader global patterns and 'microhistories' that examine the connections between consumption and the creation of collectives.⁵⁰ While I do not disagree with the outlines of this new call from Gibbons, here I am arguing that this decentring does not require us to abandon the insights of the scholarship on 'cultural colonization'. Rather, we need to embed the cultural dynamics of colonization more firmly in the domains of politics and economics and we should be much more alive to the possibilities offered by cultural analysis of colonial politics and commerce.

This kind of reconsideration is absolutely essential if we are going to remodulate our understandings of both writing and colonialism as sets of cultural practices. It will allow us to delineate much more clearly the strong connections between writing and the forms of thought and action that actually disempowered Maori. At one level, I think the prescription I have sketched here would greatly expand our vision of these connections: rather than seeing the writing-colonialism nexus operating primarily in

ethnographic texts, travel narratives, and literary output, it would refocus our attention on the culturally inflected elements of economic and political practice vital to securing real dominance. But, at the same time, it would also guard against the fuzziness that often characterizes work on colonial knowledge production and reproduction, work that frequently identifies writing or literacy (or statistical thought or map-making for that matter) as practices that automatically consolidated colonial hegemony and eroded Maori culture.

Implicit within these last two points is an important argument about the relationships between politics, economics and culture: I think that we need to firmly reconnect New Zealand scholarship on colonialism with the history of capitalism. This means not simply paying close attention to the material aspects of colonialism, but also recognizing that economics had a culture and that culture had an economics. How would our vision of the colonial past be reshaped if we understood the struggles that played out here were part of the broader tectonic shifts fashioned by those great engines of modernity: migration, empire, and capitalism? How would our understanding of cultural difference on the ground in these islands be enriched if we saw them, at least in part, as a response to the growing global uniformities arising out of the globalization of technologies of production, systems of economic activity, and increasingly common experiences of work during the long nineteenth century?⁵¹

To conclude: since the mid-1980s our understandings of what colonialism was and the extent of its legacies have been radically transformed. We have become very concerned with the cultural dynamics of colonialism and the ways in which colonial dominance was constructed through culture and representations of cultural difference. But I do think this is a moment where we need to work hard to reconnect the domain of culture in more concrete ways with the history of politics and economics. I have suggested that this process of reconnection might simultaneously enlarge our understandings of colonialism, especially by lacing it back into the history of capitalism and modernity, and refine it, producing much more precise readings of the connections between culture and colonization. I think that there is great scope for us to interrogate these linkages and to re-evaluate the colonial past, to produce new interpretations that offer a much more careful and specific reading of the connections between writing and colonization, and to be much more committed to reconstructing the role of transplanted cultural practices in processes of community-building. Hopefully these new histories will venture to prize open the domain of culture and bring it into a productive new dialogue with economics, politics and the affective relations of everyday life. I think these are important challenges if we are

to develop a richer picture of the texture and complexity of the imperial social formations that took shape on the ground in these islands.⁵²

-
- 1 Talal Asad ed., *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*, London, 1973; also see David Scott, 'Appendix: the Trouble of Thinking: an Interview with Talal Asad', in David Scott and Charles Hirschkind, eds, *Powers of the Secular Modern: Talal Asad and his Interlocutors*, Stanford, 2006, pp.243-304.
 - 2 An important discussion of the 'neocolonial' assumptions that continued to govern literary studies in the late 1970s, especially in former settler colonies, is John Docker, 'Neo Colonial Assumptions in University Teaching of English', in Chris Tiffin, ed., *South Pacific Images*, Brisbane, 1978, pp.26-31.
 - 3 The Robinson and Gallagher thesis suggested that events at the edge of the empire – 'local crises' – prompted British 'expansion' in order to protect existing British interests. They suggested, therefore, that 'imperial expansion' was not the outcome of any aggressive ideology, but instead was essentially an improvised process born out of a sequence of on-the-spot decisions and *ad hoc* arrangements. Most importantly, this suggested that indigenous economic development and local politics were central to any understanding of empire-building.
 - 4 For an important discussion of this project of building a national history in Australia see Ann Curthoys, 'We've Just Started Making National Histories and You Want Us to Stop?', in Antoinette Burton, ed., *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking With and Through the Nation*, Durham, NC, 2003, pp.70-89.
 - 5 These were the four primary concerns identified by David Fieldhouse in his landmark appraisal of imperial history, 'Can Humpty-Dumpty be put together again? Imperial history in the 1980s', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* (JICH), 12 (1984), pp.9-23.
 - 6 For a discussion of the transplantation of the new social history to New Zealand see: 'The Shaping of a Field: Erik Olssen in Conversation with Brian Moloughney and Tony Ballantyne', in Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney, eds, *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand's Pasts*, Dunedin, 2006, pp.215-30.
 - 7 The impact of some of these shifts have been recently explored in Miranda Johnson, "'The Land of the Wrong White Crown": Anti-Racist Organizations and Pakeha Identity Politics in the 1970s', *New Zealand Journal of History* (NZJH), 39, 2 (2005), pp.137-57 and in the opening portions of Jacob Pollock, 'Cultural Colonization and Textual Biculturalism: James Belich and Michael King's General Histories of New Zealand', *NZJH*, 41, 2 (2007), pp.180-98.
 - 8 Ranginui Walker, *Nga Tau Tohetohe: Years of Anger*, Auckland, 1987, and *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*, Auckland, 1990.
 - 9 Note here Belich's important article: 'The Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict and the New Zealand Wars: an Approach to the Problem of One-Sided Evidence', *JICH*, 15, 2 (1987), pp.123-47.
 - 10 For example, Raymond Evans, Kay Saunders, and Kathryn Cronin, *Exclusion, Exploitation and Extermination: Race Relations in Colonial Queensland*, Sydney, 1975; Henry Reynolds, *The Other Side of the Frontier: Aboriginal Resistance to the European Invasion of Australia*, Townsville, 1981.
 - 11 See, for example, the programmatic essay: Ranajit Guha, 'On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India', in Ranajit Guha, ed., *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, New Delhi, 1981, pp.1-8.

- 12 For example, John M. MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire: the Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880-1960*, Manchester, 1984; John M. MacKenzie, ed., *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, Manchester, 1986.
- 13 Rozina Visram, *Ayahs, Lascars and Princes: Indians in Britain 1700-1947*, London, 1986; University of Birmingham: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain*, London, 1982.
- 14 The landmark works here are: Catherine Hall, *White, Male, and Middle-Class: Explorations in Feminism and History*, New York, 1992; Antoinette Burton, *Burdens of History: British Feminists, Indian Women, and Imperial Culture, 1865-1915*, Chapel Hill, 1994; Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity: the 'manly Englishman' and the 'effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century*, Manchester, 1995.
- 15 Peter Gibbons, 'Cultural Colonization and National Identity', NZJH, 36, 1 (2002), p.4. Many of these arguments were anticipated in Gibbons, 'A Note on Writing, Identity, and Colonisation in Aotearoa', *Sites*, 13 (1986), pp.32-38 and drew upon his detailed study of Johannes Andersen: "'Going Native": A Case Study of Cultural Appropriation in a Settler Society, with Particular Reference to the Activities of Johannes Andersen in New Zealand During the First Half of the Twentieth Century', Waikato University, D. Phil thesis, 1992, three vols.
- 16 Gibbons, 'Cultural Colonization and National Identity', p.6. This enlarged understanding of colonization was already hinted at by Tony Simpson, James Belich, Angela Ballara, and Judith Binney.
- 17 Gibbons, 'Non-Fiction', in Terry Sturm, ed., *The Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*, Auckland, 1991, p.28.
- 18 Ibid., pp.27-68.
- 19 Gibbons, 'Cultural Colonization and National Identity', p.9.
- 20 Ibid.
- 21 Ibid., p.13.
- 22 Ibid., p.15. In a similar vein, Gibbons elsewhere notes that there were 'many important contestatory elements within this discourse [of colonial writing]'. He identifies influential corrective traditions, including one that stressed 'the legitimacy, vitality, and persistence of the indigenous peoples; another is writing by women that seeks to revalue those experiences eliminated, denigrated, or misrepresented by male writers.' Gibbons, 'Non-fiction', pp.28-29. The place of writing by Maori, in either English or te reo, that engaged with European ideas or that exhibited an angular perspective on European culture is not clear within this formulation.
- 23 Ranajit Guha, *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*, Chicago, 1999 [1983], pp.15-17.
- 24 Eugene F. Irschick, *Dialogue and History: Constructing South India, 1795-1895*, Berkeley, 1994; C.A. Bayly, *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780-1870*, Cambridge, 1996; Norbert Peabody, 'Cents, Sense, Census: Human Inventories in Late Precolonial and Early Colonial India', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 43, 4 (2001), pp.819-50; Michael S. Dodson, *Orientalism, Empire, and National Culture: India, 1770-1880*, New York, 2007. The development of this kind of work and its influence beyond India is examined in Tony Ballantyne, 'Colonial Knowledge', in Sarah Stockwell, ed., *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives*, Oxford, 2008, pp.177-98.
- 25 Giselle Byrnes, "'A Dead Sheet Covered with Meaningless Words?'" Place Names and the Cultural Colonization of Tauranga', NZJH, 36, 1, (2002), pp.18-35; quote at p.19; see also Giselle Byrnes, *Boundary Markers: Land Surveying and the Colonisation of New Zealand*, Wellington, 2001.

- 26 For example, 'James Cowan and the Frontiers of New Zealand History', NZJH, 31, 2 (1997), pp.219-33; 'Stories of Becoming: The Centennial Surveys and the Colonization of New Zealand', NZJH, 33, 1 (1999), pp.3-20; 'Textual Museums: Collection and Writing in History and Ethnology, 1900–1950', in Bronwyn Dalley and Bronwyn Labrum, eds, *Fragments: New Zealand Social and Cultural History*, Auckland, 2000.
- 27 Chris Hilliard, 'Colonial Culture and the Province of Cultural History', NZJH, 36, 1 (2002), p.85.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Michael P.J. Reilly, 'John White: The Making of a Nineteenth-Century Writer and Collector of Maori Tradition', NZJH, 23, 2 (1989), pp.157-72; 'John White. Part II: Seeking the Elusive Mohio: White and his Maori Informants', NZJH, 24, 1 (1990), pp.45-55; 'A Book's Progress: The Story of The Ancient History of the Maori', *The Turnbull Library Record*, 24, 1 (1991), pp.31-48; 'An Ambiguous Past: Representing Maori History', NZJH, 29, 1 (1995), pp.19-39; 'Secret Writers in Foreign Lands: John White and William Wyatt Gill', NZJH, 34, 1 (2000), pp.34-45.
- 30 This shift was reinforced by the concomitant turn to questions of empire in literary studies and the strong interest of postcolonial critics in non-literary forms of textual production.
- 31 Bradford Haami, *Putea Whakairo: Maori and the Written Word*, Wellington, 2004; Lachy Paterson, *Colonial Discourses: Niupepa Māori 1855-1863*, Dunedin, 2006. This observation echoes my earlier comment about the ways in which Charlotte Macdonald's work on female traditions of writing have not forced a wider reassessment of the shape of colonial culture. Taken together, I think this suggests that one key problem with the existing historiography on colonial New Zealand is that the focused historiographies that develop around specific issues are not regularly brought into dialogue with each other and there are few attempts to undertake the kinds of broad analytical synthesis that would highlight the tensions and occlusions in the broader historiographical field.
- 32 John Stenhouse, "'A disappearing race before we came here": Doctor Alfred Kingcombe Newman, the Dying Maori and Victorian Scientific Racism', NZJH, 30, 2 (1996), pp.124-40; Alfred K. Newman, 'A Study of the Causes leading to the Extinction of the Maori', *Transactions and Proceedings of the New Zealand Institute*, 15 (1882), pp.459-77.
- 33 James Belich, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, Auckland, 1988, p.299; Malcolm Nicolson, 'Medicine and Racial Politics: Changing Images of the New Zealand Maori in the Nineteenth Century', in David Arnold ed., *Imperial Medicine and Indigenous Societies*, Manchester, 1988, p.88.
- 34 Peter Mandler, 'The Problem With Cultural History', *Cultural and Social History*, 1, 1 (2004), pp.96-97.
- 35 Edward Shortland, *The Southern Districts of New Zealand: a Journal, With Passing Notices of the Customs of the Aborigines*, London, 1851, pp.205-7.
- 36 Rebecca Durrer, 'Propagating the New Zealand Ideal', *The Social Science Journal*, 43, 1 (2006), pp.173-183; Patricia Burns, *Fatal Success: a History of the New Zealand Company*, Auckland, 1989, p.187; James Belich, *Making Peoples: a History of the New Zealanders: from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Auckland, 1996, p.281.
- 37 Angela McCarthy, 'Migration and Ethnic Identities in the Nineteenth Century', in Giselle Byrnes, ed., *The New Oxford History of New Zealand*, Melbourne, 2009, pp.180-1.
- 38 This kind of reading draws particularly from Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: Europe, China, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*, Princeton, 2000.

- 39 See Anthony N. Penna, *Nature's Bounty: Historical and Modern Environmental Perspectives*, Armonk, 1999, p.7.
- 40 Belich, *Making Peoples*, pp.247-56.
- 41 Jeffrey Sissons, *Te Waimana: the Spring of Mana: Tuhoë History and the Colonial Encounter*, Dunedin, 1991.
- 42 On 'improvement' see Raymond Williams, *Keywords: a Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, London, 1976, pp.132-3; Jonathan Rose, *Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes*, New Haven, 2003, pp.58-91; Richard Drayton, *Nature's Government Science, Imperial Britain and the 'Improvement' of the World*, New Haven, 2000.
- 43 James Beattie, 'Environmental Anxiety in New Zealand, 1850-1920: Settlers, Climate, Conservation, Health, Environment', PhD thesis, University of Otago, 2004.
- 44 Some of these dynamics are explored in Tony Ballantyne, *Talking, Listening, Writing, Reading: Communication and Colonisation: the 2009 Allan Martin Lecture*, Canberra, 2009.
- 45 Hilliard, 'Colonial Culture and the Province of Cultural History'.
- 46 Mary Poovey, *A History of the Modern Fact: Problems of Knowledge in the Sciences of Wealth and Society*, Chicago, 1998; Zoë Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections, 1815-45: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government*, Manchester, 2005. See also, for the New Zealand context, the early sections of Malcolm McKinnon, *Treasury: the New Zealand Treasury, 1840-2000*, Auckland, 2003.
- 47 Poovey, *A History of the Modern Fact*, p.66.
- 48 Joel Mokyr, *The Gifts of Athena: Historical Origins of the Knowledge Economy*, Princeton, 2002, pp.5-6, 40-42, 286.
- 49 Manu Goswami, *Producing India: from Colonial Economy to National Space*, Chicago, 2004, chapters 1 and 2. This is also suggested at several points in Lydia Wevers, *Country of Writing: Travel Writing and New Zealand, 1809-1900*, Auckland, 2002.
- 50 Peter Gibbons, 'The Far Side of the Search for Identity', *NZJH*, 37, 1 (2003), p.27.
- 51 C.A. Bayly, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons*, Oxford, 2004, pp.1-7, 193-8, 367-83.
- 52 The idea of imperial social formations is drawn from Mrinalini Sinha, *Specters of Mother India: the Global Restructuring of an Empire*, Durham, NC, 2006, pp.17-18, 23-26.

