CLEARING THE GROUND:

HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY

AND

THE STATE IN AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Sociology at
Massey University.

EMMA KATHARINE SPEIGHT

1995

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to "clear the ground" for the socio-historical study of the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The rationale for this type of reflexive or "meta-level" study is a) that the existing substantive literature remains somewhat under-theorised, and b) that the complexity of current sociological debates is such as to perhaps raise doubts about their applicability to concrete social formations. In this work, I try to develop a critical pathway through some of these problematic theoretical areas, showing how in spite of their considerable complexity, there *are* ways of coherently and usefully managing the general issues. In that spirit of optimism, I go on to develop ideas about how my preferred theoretical perspectives might be "applied" within the context of New Zealand history.

The study has three main phases. Initially, I map the field of historical sociology, indicating my preference for a realist philosophical basis and a critical-pluralist theoretical approach. Then I tackle some of the key definitional and analytic questions around "the state" as a domain of study for the historical sociologist. Surveying the debate between society-centred and state-centred approaches, and between monocausal and pluralist explanatory frameworks, I articulate a neo-Gramscian model of analysis derived from the work of Stuart Hall and Bill Schwarz. Finally, taking elements of this model into my own field of empirical and political interest, I show, using a selection of existing analytical texts on the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand, how this preferred perspective can provide an improved overview of state formation in this country. It also, I hope, contributes to the impetus of post-colonial reflection on our political past and future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing this thesis has sometimes seemed as though it was never going to end. The fact that it has is the result of many people who have helped and encouraged me along the way. Here is a brief and heartfelt acknowledgement of some of the people who have picked me up, encouraged me, laughed with me, played with me and listened to my fishing stories (all true!).

First of all, I would like to acknowledge the assistance of my supervisor, Gregor McLennan. Your ability to pinpoint the areas that I needed to work on and your well-targeted feedback has encouraged me and improved this thesis. You have also given me the space and time to work independently, which has not always been easy, but (in the end!) definitely worthwhile.

The Sociology Department as a whole has been a supportive and interesting environment to work in. Pat Barnett, Heather Hodgetts and Barb Roberts have provided truly awesome help with my regular computer hiccups. Your friendship has also helped to keep me going through tantrums and dreary days. Paul Spoonley has helped and guided me since my first days as a sociologist, and I have always valued your support. A number of graduate students have also had a hand in this... thanks and good luck to those of you still to finish. Everyone in the Department has had time for a smile, advice and/or a chat as I have worked through this thesis. I will miss you.

Completing a post-graduate degree is often a matter of putting in the hours - but one also has to eat! I have enjoyed considerable financial assistance from Massey University. In particular, funds from the Massey Scholar 1991 Award, the Massey Masterate Scholarship for 1993 and a Graduate Research Award have eased my financial burden. Graduate Assistant work in the Department has also been invaluable in providing financial support and ongoing work skills. Credit must also go to my long-suffering bank manager - Rod - at Westpac.

Speaking of eating (and drinking), I have enjoyed the company of some truly wonderful flatmates and friends in my time as a graduate student. In Palmerston North Clare, Deej, Dave, H., Nettle, Cath A., Dave L., Cath D., Howie and Kellie have looked forward to the completion of my book. Other friends have also been amused by the length of time I've managed to stay at university - thanks. Credit must also go to James, Mo and Conrad for teaching me to fish and dragging me out of bed to go to the Tongariro. Being able to forget work while enjoying life on the side of a river is wonderful.

The final group of people that have helped this thesis on its way are my extended family. Richard and Kate Foster stimulated my interest in Aotearoa/New Zealand history over the years when I stayed with them and delved into the amazing collection of historical information at Terrace Station,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1 THE SHAPE OF THE THESIS

The general topic of this thesis is the sociological understanding of state formation in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The approach taken to this topic involves an emphasis on historical sociology. However, while the focus is on what happened in the past, the impetus for this research is a result of current concerns. In contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand, the state (as government and public service) has a huge impact on the everyday life of New Zealanders. As well as dealing with day-to-day matters such as collecting revenue and policing the streets, the state is involved with ongoing debates that (directly or indirectly) establish the limits of state jurisdiction. These limits are constantly being altered - expanding in some areas and contracting in others. Establishing why these changes occur is always open to debate. The first step in this process is, I believe, a consideration of the way that the *history* of the state may be studied.

The reason that this must begin in the present, is that it is contemporary debates that throw light on the past. In our topic, there are two particularly pertinent sociological issues of some consequence: the role of historical sociology and the respective virtues of society-centred and state-centred approaches. A second contemporary impetus for this research is more "political" the shift in the last ten years to a state structure that is tending towards a focus on the socio-ontological primacy of individuals, and which appears to be altering the areas of state jurisdiction. The third contemporary issue is equally urgent, and concerns "post-colonial" relationships and identities in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Particular issues that have been prominent recently include republicanism, the settlement of Treaty of Waitangi claims and relations between Maori and Pakeha. In this ongoing context of political and academic debate, the analytical history of state formation in Aotearoa/New Zealand is (to me at least) an area of obvious significance and interest. However, it is also worth stating at the outset that whilst the thesis is driven in part by the political questions just alluded to, the

thesis is in large part a methodological and theoretical dissertation rather than a empirical or policy-focused study.

Any sociological research involves the selection of boundaries. Without some self-regulation, this research would be in danger of aspiring to be nothing less than a *magnum opus* concerning the history and development of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state from colonisation to the present day, including a detailed assessment of all the contemporary sociological debates! A more tangible possibility was to focus on the evidence and existing material on the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and by applying a theoretical model, develop a body of work that improved our knowledge about the development of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. A slightly different option was to focus on the project of "clearing the ground" in order to establish a coherent and theoretically detailed exposition of the process involved in developing and applying a theoretical model in my chosen "domain". It is this second route that I have taken. This could, in a condensed form, perhaps be seen simply as one chapter in a study of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. However, these issues are intrinsically interesting and certainly worthy of detailed attention as at least forming one part of the developmental sociology of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

As the title indicates, then, I shall attempt to "clear the ground". This process of selecting a subject area and working through the process leading up to empirical research has been identified as significant by Lloyd (1993)[1]. Lloyd argues that:

> general concepts and general theories are parts of background frameworks or traditions of beliefs, ideas, knowledge, and assumptions that all explanations employ. These frameworks include philosophical and methodological assumptions, which are sets of ideas and beliefs about the entities and processes of the world and of how we can have knowledge of them.

---

[1]In this book Lloyd also argues for a "structurist" approach, which is not considered in this discussion.

> The framework, concepts and general theories that the advanced sciences employ pertain to what have been called "domains" of knowledge. (1993:22)

The process of identifying and outlining a domain can proceed (to a certain extent) in isolation from the consideration of specific empirical questions or hypotheses (Lloyd, 1993:30). The subject matter must, however, be identified and distinguished "from the totality of social life" (Lloyd, 1993:37). My own project, in those terms, is concerned with discussing the domain of "the state" in Aotearoa/New Zealand through a progressive articulation of three strands of analysis, namely; historical sociology, a state-centred approach to political theory and a model of conjunctural analysis developed by Stuart Hall and Bill Schwarz (1985). It does not attempt to answer questions related to how and why the state developed as it did. Rather, it looks at the theoretical arguments for utilising and articulating together the three elements that I have chosen to promote. I do examine several existing texts by local authors that focus on the period that I am concerned with. At that point, I highlight some key empirical details, and identify possible areas for further study. However, my primary emphasis remains on establishing a coherent domain of study.

The first chapter opens with a discussion of history and sociology. I contend that historical sociology can combine aspects of each discipline in a way that enhances our understanding about the past. A consideration of both philosophical and theoretical issues strengthens the case for using historical sociology as the over-arching framework for research. I later identify the period 1840 to 1907 as a key period in state development - and one in which the benefits of using historical sociology are clearly evident. This period is also characterised by marked shifts in the position of Maori relative to settlers. The process of colonialism and the issue of post-colonialism are also raised here as concepts that are central to the practise of historical sociology in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The second area in need of clarification is that of "the state". This discussion moves from a definition of the state as the governmental system and public service to considering the state in relation to civil society, the nation-state, and its international context. This process of conceptual clarification is a core part of historical sociology, and leads on to a consideration of a range of state-centred and society-centred approaches. Although the state is the focus of research, an explanatory theoretical framework can focus on the state or aspects of society as the driving force of change or stability. State-centred approaches argue that the amount of autonomy that contemporary states enjoy means that they effectively drive change or stability in society. On the other hand, society-centred approaches view society as being the key. The three society-centred approaches that I consider include liberalism, pluralism and Marxism. More recent work in this area proposes a realignment of Marxism and pluralism which retains a critical approach while allowing a degree of state autonomy. Therefore the importance of the state is acknowledged alongside the complexity of the state/society relationship.

The third chapter discusses the particular approach that I consider to be applicable to the history of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. As I have indicated, there is minimal existing research in this area. I have therefore identified the model developed by Stuart Hall and Bill Schwarz ("State and society, 1880-1930":1985) as applicable to the Aotearoa/New Zealand situation. By expanding on this model I identify the characteristics that, in principle, could provide valuable insights into the Aotearoa/New Zealand case. The Hall and Schwarz approach to Britain does not consider colonialism (or imperialism) in any depth, but it is possible, I think, to integrate colonialism within their overall approach. The widely accepted view that the Gramscian approach is impressively sensitive to the complexity of state development provides the basis for this optimism. Also, the Hall and Schwarz approach uses the concept of crisis to structure their consideration of events. While I have altered this concept to a focus on a period of potential state (re)formation, this can include, alongside political

representation, a range of other pertinent issues. Taken together, the selection of time frame and particular issues provides the basis for assessing whether there was a shift in the role of the state from an emphasis on individualism to an emphasis on collectivism (in the Hall & Schwarz discussion). The shift is also apparent in Aotearoa/New Zealand in the time frame that I have identified, and similar shifts in emphasis could be assessed throughout the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The final chapter of the thesis works upon four existing key texts to highlight the advantages of the Hall and Schwarz approach, as well as areas that Hall and Schwarz have not developed. The most obvious area is the issue of colonialism and how this shaped state development in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Theory is also a key part of the domain that I have identified, and the first part of this discussion considers the role of theory in light of the selection of historical sociology and state-centred approaches as theoretically valuable. I then go on to consider how a period of potential state (re)formation can be identified. Each of the texts that I have selected provides material that can be used to identify the potential for change in a range of areas including political representation, colonial relationships, and socio-economic structures. Hall and Schwarz focus on political representation as a key factor and I have also done this, while indicating where other factors warrant consideration. Finally, I identify the ways in which it may be possible to develop indicators for a shift in the balance between individualism and collectivism in the role played by the state. The thesis concludes with a summary of the key parts of this domain and a reiteration of major areas that could be investigated within it.

2 A PAKEHA SOCIOLOGIST

As a sociologist, there are a number of ethical issues that I need to address. The first of these is to identify where I stand. I do not consider any research (or researcher) to be "value-free". Upon completion, this thesis becomes the property of anyone who chooses to read it. Any errors within are my responsibility, and I have sought to minimise them. However, the issues and debates that I have entered into remain as ongoing areas of contention.

The Treaty of Waitangi has been characterised as a document about partnership. While many people have contributed to the development of this thesis, I have not sought the opinion of any Maori. This is a Pakeha perspective and the majority of those quoted are not from Aotearoa/New Zealand. Pakeha perspectives that address the process of colonialism are necessary - not to explain it away, but to acknowledge what has happened and to demonstrate a willingness to learn more. This research is my way of using an academic discipline to seek to understand part of the history of this country, and develop a nuanced theoretical model to approach further study. It is also a process from which I will benefit from in a number of ways. The potential for personal gain is one factor in doing this research, but it is certainly not the only one, and I hope to contribute something to the debates I have entered.

I have identified myself as Pakeha. This naming process is a very conscious one, and requires some clarification. The word Pakeha can have a number of meanings, and the one that I identify with is "New Zealander of a European background, whose cultural values and behaviour have been primarily formed from the experiences of being a member of the dominant group of New Zealand" (Spoonley, 1990:63-64). The idea of Pakeha as an ethnic group is, in turn, built on the definition of an ethnic community as "a named human population with shared ancestry myths, histories and cultures, having an association with a specific territory and a sense of solidarity" (M.

Smith, 1982:4). Whether all of these characteristics exist for Pakeha is certainly debatable. However, it is the only term to describe my own ethnicity. I also choose it because the word Pakeha can involve an explicit acknowledgement of the relationship between Maori and Pakeha in Aotearoa/New Zealand. It is not possible, I believe, to deny this relationship, and by acknowledging it here, I am also situating this research in relation to Maori/Pakeha relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

My use of the word Pakeha in my thesis has been complicated by the time-frame that I have focused on. From the definition that I have used, it is clear that initial settlers cannot be described as Pakeha. Therefore, I have referred to them as settlers. During the late 1800s the development of a national identity distinct from the settlers' original countries began to emerge in settler society. As more children were born in Aotearoa/New Zealand and grew up here, so a new ethnic identity began to form. While the term Pakeha remains contested, I have used it to refer to the majority of post-1900 New Zealanders. Prior to this time, I have described non-Maori New Zealanders as settlers or settler/Pakeha society.

3 POST-COLONIAL AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND?

As a Pakeha sociologist, I feel that it is important to acknowledge the colonial history of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In part, using the combination of Aotearoa and New Zealand explicitly presents the ongoing relationship between Maori and Pakeha in New Zealand. The naming of the society that we live in is certainly contested at present. I support the use of the word Aotearoa as the name for this country, but have used Aotearoa/New Zealand in acknowledgement of the process involved in moving beyond the colonial past. Around the world, colonialism has occurred in different societies with a range of outcomes. While Aotearoa/New Zealand does share some similarities with other colonised societies, the Treaty of Waitangi provides an

indicator of the high level of respect held for Maori, relative to other indigenous people, by their colonisers. This can also be explained by reference to some of the earlier treaties with colonised societies (Sorrenson, 1991:Ch1). Pearson (1990:27) provides an outline that highlights the complexity of the process of colonisation. Thus colonialism involves:

> the movement of populations between societies, the shape of power relations between groups in initial and subsequent contact with one another, and the continuing complexity of relations within and between established and emergent nation states. The lines of domination in colonial situations shift as one reflects on who is dominating whom, and what form the domination takes. (ibid)

In the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand, we need to consider relationships with Britain and also other important nations such as Australia and the United States. Internally, the relationships between British colonisers and Maori are of prime importance, but we also need to consider the relationships with other European and Asian settlers. This is certainly a complex task and I do not intend to tackle it here! What I will do is indicate areas in which some of these relationships can be considered.

The importance of these relationships provides one indication of the need for an emphasis on local theorising. In order to be able to study a colonial society such as Aotearoa/New Zealand, we need to be able to identify both the similarities and differences with other countries in a way that acknowledges the importance of the process of colonisation. In this study the changes in both economic and political control in Aotearoa/New Zealand are of central importance in understanding how Aotearoa/New Zealand has developed. Both structures and individuals have been important in this area, and I shall enlarge on this in the following chapters.

Post-colonialism has a range of possible meanings. The first of these is the removal of direct rule by a colonising country. In this sense Aotearoa/New Zealand can be described as post-colonial because since 1907 there has been

a system of independent government (although this system was largely modeled on the English system). However, I prefer to use the term post-colonial to refer to the *process* of continuing development[2] as a nation-state, which includes both internal and external relationships. This process cannot be divorced from events in other countries or changes in global relationships. This global inter-relatedness does provide a basis for advocating the use of a comparative methodology. However, the unique combination of the time of colonisation, the individuals who set up the initial structures, the relationship between settlers and Maori, and subsequent Aotearoa/New Zealand history all provide a basis for advocating an approach that focuses on Aotearoa/New Zealand as a unique case. I would, ideally, support an approach that is broad enough to enable some comparison with other countries, yet provides the mechanisms for evaluating the impact of conditions that are specific to Aotearoa/New Zealand. However, initially, an emphasis on Aotearoa/New Zealand as a unique case is appropriate.

The theme of colonial (and potentially post-colonial) relationships runs through this thesis. It is an important area and warrants further investigation. The model that I propose here can, I believe, help to structure further study. While this cannot proceed in isolation from the political issues that I have raised, I have focussed primarily on theoretical and methodological issues. Along the way, I have noted some of the political (and ethical) implications of research. It remains my belief that historical sociology about the Aotearoa/New Zealand state has the potential to assist in the process of developing a post-colonial society.

---

[2]Using the term "development" here may imply a type of linear or evolutionary development. I do not see these as necessarily the type of development that occurs in this situation, nor do I view this as development to a particular state. Rather, this is an ongoing process that involves experimentation, change and stability in the structures and relationships in society.

CHAPTER ONE

SHAPING THE DOMAIN:

HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY

1 INTRODUCTION

The process of shaping a domain begins with a discussion of philosophical and methodological problems. These include the issues of epistemology and ontology as well as the broader outlines of theoretical explanatory practices that can be utilised (Lloyd, 1993:29). This chapter begins with a discussion of some of the key areas of history and sociology that can be developed to form the basis for historical sociology. More generally, the rationale for this chapter is that before a coherent historical sociology of the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand can get off the ground, we need to know whether "coherent historical sociology" is a valid analytical goal, and what it might look like if it is.

Recently, there has been an upsurge in the number of people talking, writing and practising historical sociology. This wave of post 1960s popularity has developed to the stage that there is an increasing body of material that charts the development of the field, and attempts to categorise those deemed to be practitioners into typologies (eg. Abrams, 1982, Skocpol, 1984 and D Smith, 1991). I do not intend to repeat this history of historical sociology. Rather, I shall focus on some of the issues (philosophical, theoretical and methodological) that have been highlighted in different ways. It is apparent that there is no widespread agreement on these issues, and while I do not propose that there is one perfect approach, a consideration of these issues is a core condition for the practise of historical sociology.

In each part of this discussion of historical sociology, I feel it is necessary to outline some characteristics of the separate disciplines of history and sociology in order to indicate where there are significant similarities or convergences, and where there are substantial differences. Given the range of possible positions to be found in both of these disciplines, I am only able to highlight a few possibilities. However, the reason for this selectivity is to demonstrate the foundations upon which historical sociology has been

developed. This, then, provides the overarching theoretical approach that structures this domain. I then move on to consider the role that philosophical and methodological issues play in the formation of this domain.

The distinction between philosophy, methodology and theory is important in this discussion. The philosophical issues refer to ontology and epistemology, where ontology refers to the nature of the world that we live in and study. By taking a realist position, I am arguing that there are underlying structures and processes that affect changes and stability in the state structure. On the other hand, epistemology refers to the way in which we can know about the world. From a realist perspective, which will emerge as my favoured approach, we can utilise visible or recorded information to uncover the "hidden" relationships between agents (whether private individuals, groups or influential people) and social structures (such as nations, governments, educational institutions, the family). This process requires both methodologies and theories.

A methodology[1] refers to "the actual explanatory practices and structures of a particular science or discipline" (Lloyd, 1991:186). Any methodology is based on an epistemological and ontological position. In order to understand the advantages and limitations of a particular methodology, I feel that it is necessary to be clear about the philosophical assumptions that underlie it. The third key area is theory, which can be described as the "concepts, models and statements of a general kind that are directly used to explain particular events and processes" (ibid). Theories can be divided into different levels, and I shall enlarge on this later, however I view middle range theory as being most useful for my purposes, in particular the development of conceptual

---

[1]Methodology can be distinguished from particular methods or technical approaches. Most of my discussion will focus on the level of methodology, although I will touch on some particular methods where appropriate.

frameworks which can then be utilised to facilitate the description and explanation of the area of study.

This chapter charts the establishment of a domain of knowledge from an explicitly theoretical perspective. This *is* important, as this enables the researcher to consider the assumptions that underlie everything from the selection of a subject area to the presentation of a research report. While this is an important part of the formation of a domain, once the domain has been established, it is then important to move on to the development of the actual theories in a way which is consistent with the philosophical principles that have been set out. This is considered in the following chapter. Overall, this chapter charts the (admittedly complex and eclectic) process of establishing the broad framework for a domain. In this case, I have considered why historical sociology *can* provide a valuable synthesis of history and sociology, as well as the reasons for utilising a realist approach, and what needs to be considered in establishing a theoretical and methodological framework. Having set up a coherent framework, it is then possible to move on to the next step - establishing the subject of the domain.

2   AN ARGUMENT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY

The basic characteristic of historical sociology is that it is a field in which sociological theories are utilised and developed in a way that takes into account time and place. This is intended to be a very general statement and encompasses a range of individuals who may be considered to be historians or sociologists. The skills utilised by these researchers include critical theoretical knowledge as well as a familiarity with methodologies employed by both disciplines. This is not to say that the historical sociologist necessarily utilises all of these skills, but any research process necessarily involves a critically explicit theoretical approach as well as a critical approach

to both primary and secondary sources. Thus this definition encompasses survey research, historical narrative, conceptual development and theorising. It also encompasses a wide range of debates, including the specificity or generalisability of knowledge, the role of structures and agents, philosophies, theories and methods of knowledge and inquiry. Historical sociology can also highlight the political aspects of research. As Dennis Smith points out, "[h]istorical sociology can help citizens understand how opportunity structures and ways of life have been shaped and may, in some respects at least, be reshaped" (1991:184). This is an area of sociological research that cannot be neglected from an ethical perspective.

The distinction between history and sociology is often characterised (Abrams, 1982:300) as being between idiographic and nomothetic or particularising and generalising approaches (respectively). Certainly this may appear to be the case, however, within each discipline the range of approaches covers both these facets to some extent. While, historically, grand theory has probably been the prerogative of sociologists, more recent developments suggest a move to a more problem-centred approach - particularly in the area of state formation (see Skocpol, 1979). In the following discussion, I shall highlight some of the key characteristics as well as similarities and differences between history and sociology that form the basis for the praxis of historical sociology. This gap between history and sociology is characterised by Toynbee as involving three key reasons:

> The first is the failure of the universities to generate interest in the "new" social history, clinging instead to the traditional areas of scholarship, the time-honoured methods of research and the documents which have served the "old" history... On the sociological side, concern with contemporary problems and social surveys overrides the injunctions of the founding fathers... The third reason is the somewhat uncritical use of imported theoretical models to explain events or processes in New Zealand history. (1979:65)

This perspective is, I feel, somewhat dated now, but it does summarise what may be fairly common perceptions of both disciplines. In the following

discussion, I shall highlight some of the key characteristics as well as similarities and differences between history and sociology that form the basis for the praxis of historical sociology.

Sociology has been criticised by Stedman Jones (1976:301) for lacking a definite subject[2]. This fluidity does make it very difficult to specify what sociology is - or who, where, why and to what ends sociology is. Certainly, sociology is not limited to a particular sphere of society, nor a particular time span. It cannot be tied down to a particular methodology or theoretical perspective. Generally speaking, sociology is the study of society, and in particular, social structures and relationships and how these change or remain static over time. A part of this may also involve taking "snapshots" of particular subject areas and focusing on the relationships within that time and context only. In any sociological study there is an interplay between "the society" and "the individual". Banks suggests that historical sociologists differ from other sociological researchers "in their concern to understand not only what persists but also what changes over time in the attitudes and circumstances of those categories of people who are the subjects of their study" (1989:525). Put this way, I would suggest that historical sociology *is* what sociologists do, and this historical aspect of sociology is what draws together the many different philosophical, methodological and theoretical approaches in sociology. This is, of course, a very broad definition of sociology, but I am not going to make it any more specific at this stage.

History suffers from a similar problem - it is a very broad discipline. A number of writers have attempted to outline what history is (Gardiner, 1988, Stanford, 1986:Ch2). However Jenkins suggests that a more appropriate question is: "Who is history for?" (Jenkins, 1991:18). While this reflects Jenkins' rather "post-modernist" approach, it does point to the political nature of history, and indeed of sociology also. As Tosh (1991:9) points out, "history

---

[2]See also McLennan, 1984d:147.

is a political battleground" - the omission or inclusion of certain types of history or events can be a result of, or have consequences for political decisions. Both disciplines have had to grapple to some extent with issues raised, in particular, by Marxists, feminists and indigenous peoples. These issues raise questions about the "objectivity" of the findings of each discipline as well as the methods and evidence that they utilise. While history (and sociology) is shaped by contemporary debates and issues, there are dangers in bringing the present into historical research (Tosh, 1991:144), but this also enables the exposure of previously hidden history.

Starting from the obvious statement that historians study the past, it can be noted that historians use particular methods, based on assumptions as to what constitutes historical evidence and then interpret the meaning of this evidence. Tosh (1991:vi) points out that history "refers both to what actually happened in the past and to the representation of that past in the work of historians". This points to the first key similarity or convergence of sociology and history. There is a "past"[3] that can be studied, but because we cannot know that past in the same way that the individuals who experienced it (and every individual will have experienced it differently), we can only know it through representations. Thus the process through which representations are made is of central importance.

The methods employed by historians are of central importance for the development of historical sociology, and I shall expand on them shortly. Tosh (1991:15-20) outlines a number of the benefits that result from the study of history. Firstly, historical study demonstrates the achievements that have occurred in the past - and there are an incredible array of achievements to be studied. Knowledge of the different possibilities for tackling problems can provide insights for tackling contemporary problems - or suggest alternatives

---

[3]This is a realist perspective. I shall expand on both realist and idealist perspectives on history later in this chapter.

to current solutions. Also, while history does not repeat itself, knowledge of the past may help to take into account the context in which predictions of success or failure may occur (eg. Skocpol, 1979). Finally, and importantly, history is inextricably linked to political power. Versions of history are used to provide a mythical past - which we could either aim to return to or escape from. Highlighting women's history or Maori history can be used to advocate progressive or revolutionary changes, or to bolster the claim that these groups are in some way inferior. The political nature of history (and not just political history) is one of the most compelling arguments for encouraging historical sociology, in which the practise of historical research and narrative becomes more explicit about its own political implications.

What, then, does the historian do? Tilly (1981:14) suggests that there are four criteria that distinguish historians from other specialists who may also draw on the past:

1   Its members specialise in reconstructing past human behaviour
2   They use written residues of the past: texts
3   They emphasis the grouping and glossing of texts as the means of reconstructing past events
4   They consider where and, especially, when an event occurred to be an integral part of its meaning, explanation and impact.

This definition is clearly broad enough to include the work of sociologists. In particular, both historians and sociologists rely on the use of texts in constructing descriptions (and explanations) of history. The use of texts by historians or sociologists is not necessarily straightforward, and has been increasingly questioned by both historians and sociologists. As we shall see, the importance of texts is the subject of ongoing debates in the development of historical sociology.

Stedman Jones also discusses what historians do, but emphasises that the "past" is not investigated or reconstructed, rather it is "the residues of the past

which have survived into the present" (1976:296) that are studied[4] and the historian also "designates which of these residues possess historical significance, and what significance they possess" (ibid). Thus, while the consideration given to time and place is a central part of historical work, how history is conceived or interpreted can vary considerably.

In order for representations of the past to be viewed as valid and "truthful", historians utilise a range of methods. At a practical level, this involves evaluating primary sources for internal and external reliability. That is, evaluating the source to see whether it is "inaccurate, muddled, based on hearsay or intended to mislead... [or]... incomplete or tainted by prejudice or self interest" (Tosh, 1991:33&65). This involves comparison with other primary and secondary sources as well as judgements made on the basis of the researcher's knowledge.

Of particular importance to history is the study of primary sources. For more recent histories, this may involve speaking to individuals, however it more usually involves the analysis of documents and physical evidence. Thus, diaries, letters, official records, books and drawings may be used, as well as clothing, furniture, tools, weapons, houses, towns and transport. However, there is an emphasis on written sources (Tosh, 1991:30). The study of these documents and artifacts relies on a realist assumption that we can know and explain past events or practices from what has survived from that period. It is also contingent upon these remnants providing adequate representations of what is being studied. This emphasis on primary sources has parallels in some sociological research such as life histories, surveys and textual analysis. This again demonstrates the similarities between history and sociology, in that both involve the extensive use of texts. However, when analysing the more distant past in particular, sociologists often rely more heavily (although not exclusively) on secondary sources. Whatever the source, some form of

---

[4]See also Stanford, 1986:49.

critical evaluation is necessary to ascertain the limits of any conclusions that are drawn.

Tosh[5] (1991:33) points out that sources could be both primary and secondary, depending on the research context. Nevertheless, a large part of the historian's work involves evaluating these primary sources (Tosh, 1991:57ff). The first step in this process is external authentication. Following this, the document is examined for internal consistency and interpretation of its meaning. Finally the reliability of the source needs to be evaluated through the credentials of the writer (if known) and against existing knowledge. Secondary sources are also utilised and undergo a similar scrutiny. Again, this indicates considerable common ground with sociology, as sources and the way material is selected from these sources and integrated into a narrative (or discarded) is a practical concern for sociologists. Where sociologists differ from historians is in the explicitly theoretical nature of sociological work. This is not to say that theory is absent from historical work. For example, the use of narrative itself is one area of considerable debate. Narrative already exists in both primary and secondary evidence, and therefore it is not possible to avoid the different concepts and linguistic structures. The way that language is used also contributes to the way the reader is positioned and expected to respond (White, 1975:53). These issues again indicate a considerable overlap for both history and sociology in approaching the study of the past.

Another similarity of sociology and history is that the practitioners of both disciplines work in a particular age (Stanford, 1986:93) and both lay claim to professional status and organisations (ibid:95). This is an issue that is not often addressed in academic work. As individuals, all academics are situated

---

[5]It is apparent that I am focussing on a small selection of commentators on historical methods and theory. This is mainly because I did not want to caricature extremes of historical praxis, but concentrate on how history and sociology can complement one another.

in a particular context. In the wider context, it is not possible to avoid the current debates in society, and these may provide the catalyst for research projects. Therefore, living in Aotearoa/New Zealand in 1994, we cannot avoid debates about the position of women in society, the troubled processes of Treaty of Waitangi negotiations, the impact of government policy, and increasingly, debate about the role of the monarchy. To a greater or lesser extent we are also faced with international issues and debate about the role of universities in society. All of these issues impact, to some degree, on the choice and execution of research projects. Within a narrower realm, the academic environment also has an impact on the praxis of history and sociology. Individuals strive to attain certain standards of scholarship and are also under increasing pressure to provide evidence of their achievements in order to retain their position and conditions of work. These issues have certainly affected the work that I do, and I have attempted to identify some of the factors that have influenced the choices that I have made.

From this preliminary outline, it is obvious that historical sociology is a potentially enormous field. Firstly, it is not possible to define historical sociology through a particular subject area as the areas of actual and possible application are almost infinite. Secondly, historical sociology is not characterised by any particular theoretical or philosophical approach, and although it does utilise a number of methodological tools, these are also not necessarily definitive. Rather than being about the application of sociological theory to history or vice versa, I see historical sociology as being a synthesis of the two (see also Abrams, 1982:1). Abrams describes historical sociology as "the attempt to understand the relationship of personal activity and experience on the one hand and social organisation on the other as something that is continuously constructed in time" (1982:18). This sums up the core characteristics of historical sociology, although it can be expanded considerably[6].

---

[6]See for example the definition provided by Skocpol (1984:1).

What is important in these definitions is that the "historical" and the "sociological" are not divided by academic boundaries or philosophical concerns - each facet complements and enriches the other - although in any research endeavour, the emphasis may shift - depending on the aims of the project. The debate over whether it is possible to view history or sociology as science or as methods of social understanding that are essentially different to science is one that has a long history (McLennan, 1981:68). McLennan proposes that, in part, the posing of the question is the problem - the nature of "science" itself must be considered as a precondition for meaningful discussion. By discussing philosophy, theory and methodology, I intend to demonstrate that these issues that apply to both history and sociology can be fruitfully discussed in the context of historical sociology.

However, there is also a need to provide a slightly narrower focus for this discussion. I have already indicated that the subject of the domain will concentrate primarily on work in the area of "states". Within this, my aim is to develop a methodology for studying the history of the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In my discussion, I have attempted to highlight the particular aspects of each discipline that can complement each other. At the same time, I do not wish to propose that history and sociology should merge to form one discipline. In part, this stems from a desire to avoid the politics of this debate. There still remains room for constructive criticism between these disciplines, as well as collaboration[7]. Stedman Jones points out (correctly I think) that the use of theory by historians and history by sociologists does not break down boundaries between the disciplines (1976:295). To do this, a novel approach is required that integrates both strands.

_____

[7]For example, Bloch (1954:18) comments on the value of interdisciplinary approaches when noting the impact of Durkheim and Vidal de la Blanche (neither of them "historians") on history.

In order to do this, I intend to approach the study of the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand from two slightly different directions. The first of these is through a discussion of historical sociology, and why this approach provides an appropriate strategy in this context. However, the implications of a colonial history and the possible "post-colonial" shift provide an alternative approach to studying this area. This involves a consideration of the impact of changing colonial relationships, the ongoing situation for indigenous people and the way in which these factors have influenced the structure of the state and the actions of individuals. There is a need for "post-colonial" approaches to these issues, and without the development of these approaches it is not possible to understand the past, nor use this understanding to help move towards the future. Historical sociology provides one way of developing a "post-colonial" approach to the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand. The following sections further develop the philosophical bases and justifications for structuring the domain in this way.

3 THE IMPORTANCE OF PHILOSOPHY AND ITS LIMITS

Dennis Smith (1991:182-183) notes that:

> The best contribution historical sociology could make in the 1990s would be the discovery and dissemination of knowledge relevant to the development of capitalist democracy, even if this meant a diversion of attention from the discussion of philosophies of history.

This approach clearly identifies one problem of research - the need to identify a particular area of study and maintain a narrow focus. In part, this is why I am attempting to establish a domain. The discussion of philosophy *is* important - as are the implications of particular philosophical positions. A consideration of capitalist democracy or, in this case, the Aotearoa/New Zealand state, cannot help but rely on a number of assumptions. This section sets out these assumptions as a part of the framework, so that the following

chapter on the subject of the domain can build on clearly articulated assumptions or presuppositions.

Raising the issue of philosophy is necessary at this stage in order to, firstly, highlight some of the possible pitfalls for the practice of historical sociology. As Stanford points out (1986:22), philosophy clearly indicates the limits of knowledge. It is with this in mind that I shall address the spectres of historicism, empiricism and positivism. The second role of philosophy is as an aid to identifying the assumptions underlying the choice of a particular perspective. As I argue for an historical realist approach, I shall indicate what I consider to be the strengths of this approach. Thus, philosophy can be used to identify the range of theoretical and methodological approaches that are appropriate to a particular topic area. Thirdly, once these issues have been addressed, it is possible to leave philosophy alone (while not abandoning its practical implications). The practice of historical sociology is primarily about studying particular problematics, using an approach that acknowledges the temporal characteristics of that problematic. Once the philosophical scene has been set the praxis of historical sociology can proceed.

Empiricism and, to a lesser degree, historicism have their basis in a positivist approach. Positivism is characterised by an emphasis on scientific method - in which social sciences conform to the same scientific criteria as the natural sciences. This approach does not allow for interpretations of the recorders of history (sources) and the practitioners of historical sociology. This attempt to emulate the methodology of the physical sciences is problematic because of the myriad of ways in which any area of social life can be interpreted, both by the people involved and by observers. As I will discuss later, I support a degree of relativism, but objectivity also is necessary in some form. Discounting particular (contradictory) sources, or using quotations out of context so that a desired outcome is obtained certainly compromises the practice of historical research. Again, a degree of "scientific" or perhaps

ethical method remains important. Positivism also stresses "the necessity of adequate evidence, of asserting the reality of the past" (Stanford, 1986:80). It *is* important to ensure that there is adequate information on which to base any discussion of past events.

The next philosophical position that I would like to distance myself from is that of historicism[8]. Clearly, historicism can mean different things in different contexts. On one side there is the position that suggests that *unconditional* laws can be utilised to both explain history and predict the future. Alternatively, historicism can encompass a broad range of approaches that aim to uncover regularities in social change without positing these as unconditional laws. A third variation that also falls under the umbrella of historicism is an interpretive approach that proposes that "each historical situation or period can only be understood in its own terms" (Jary & Jary, 1991:278). The label of historicism does encompass a diverse range of approaches, and I am concerned with avoiding the type of historicism that is described as:

> an approach to the social sciences which assumes that *historical prediction* is their principle aim, and which assumes that this aim is attainable by discovering the "rhythms" or the "patterns", the "laws" or the "trends" that underlie the evolution of history. (Popper, 1957:3)[9]

While this is a philosophical approach that has been out of vogue for some time, it often appears that this is what sociologists and historians do.

To a certain extent, sociologists do attempt to uncover trends and patterns when analysing the past, and use these to in some way hypothesise about

---

[8]Historicism can also be distinguished from historism in which the rapid changes in all aspects of social life mean that "the historian is obliged to study only concrete and singular phenomena, and to renounce all quests for structural regularities" (Boudon and Bourricaud, 1989:198).

[9]Throughout the thesis, all emphases in quotations are from the original source, unless otherwise stated.

future possibilities. Indeed, historical sociology involves this. However, this falls short of historicism if these trends or patterns are not seen as immutable and universal. It is the use of laws to help select, describe and "explain *real* complex situations, events and processes" (Lloyd, 1989:460) that contributes to understanding. By grounding these laws through reference to historical situations, historicism can be avoided. Also, by acknowledging the political consequences of the research process and the somewhat arbitrary nature of historical interpretations, historical sociologists can utilise studies of the past to suggest possibilities for the future without assuming that these are in some way predetermined laws.

Given that historical sociology is a contemporary practice and as such contributes to knowledge that may be used to develop future policies, I would suggest that an historicist approach carries two important dangers. The first of these is that historicist interpretations can be used to justify the continued subordination of groups because of some kind of "natural, historical" inferiority. Secondly, this approach is highly conservative, in that interventions to alter the status quo are ultimately useless, because they cannot alter the history on which the laws are based[10]. Historicism is a potential problem for historical sociologists. However, in dismissing historicist approaches, I do not wish to deny the use of looking for trends or patterns in history. In many situations, the practitioner of historical sociology can be seen as walking a tightrope, and historicism is the danger of leaning too far in a particular direction.

Another possible problem is empiricism, and there are a range of levels at which the problems of empiricism become apparent. Empiricism is based on the assumption that we can only obtain knowledge through direct experience,

---

[10]One possible critique of historicism has been mounted by proponents of chaos theory (Reisch, 1991), which suggests that for any laws to hold true, the initial conditions on which those laws are based must be exactly accurate. Any small discrepancy will result in wildly inaccurate outcomes.

and therefore results in an emphasis on empirical data collection at the expense of theorising and conceptual development. This preoccupation with empirical data can result in "the failure to recognise the theory-laden and the socially constructed, and reconstructible, character of concepts, and thus of 'facts'" (Jary & Jary, 1991:191). Empiricism is also characterised by an emphasis on objectivity (Jenkins, 1991:37), in which empirical data (observations) are used to generate theories by induction (Popper, 1957:131), against which unique cases can then be tested. Because of the emphasis on objectivity, bias is deemed to be a problem (Jenkins, 1991:38). Therefore the practitioner must let the facts "speak for themselves" rather than bringing pre-existing (feminist, structuralist, Marxist) biases to the selection and interpretation of facts. The political consequences of this approach essentially discount alternative or oppositional readings as biased and somehow less "true" than an approach which attempts to be "value-free". Carr critiques the idea that "there is an objective right solution and way of reaching it - the supposed assumptions of science transferred to the social sciences" (cited Davies, 1986:xix).

Empiricism is also problematic because of the "lack of empirical data - the past is irretrievably gone" (Stanford, 1986:2). We can not "experience" the past and recollecting information about the past therefore relies on utilising data collected at the time. However, this may mean relying on information that systematically excludes or misrepresents certain categories - in particular women or ethnic minorities. Unless this is acknowledged, the "facts" that we utilise can misrepresent the focus of study, and this has serious implications for the way in which this information can enhance our understanding of both contemporary and past societies.

The empiricist approach relies strongly on the existence of "facts", and the use of historical facts to explain causality (Stedman Jones, 1976:297). This reliance on directly observable phenomena can be utilised for deriving laws and inferring causality. This is contrary to a realist position that allows for the

identification of underlying mechanisms. Stanford, however, distinguishes between facts and evidence and points out that the presentation of evidence as facts is dependent on someone judging them to be facts (1986:71-3). Obviously some historical evidence, such as the official date of women's suffrage in Aotearoa/New Zealand can be regarded as "fact" in that it did occur. However, by treating this as evidence, it is also possible to see this as a part of a process. The cause of this event cannot be directly and unequivocally ascertained from a compilation of evidence. By treating "facts" as evidence, this evidence remains contestable and in the process of determining causality the evaluation and re-evaluation of the evidence remains a central concern. Jenkins (1991:48) goes further to highlight the danger of calling "traces" of history evidence because it implies that evidence leads to explanations. Attempting to ascertain causal processes is complex. However, while social phenomena *are* complex, there is also order to social phenomena. Attempting to unravel and integrate the complexities to explain order (ie. formulate generalisations) is, of course, an awesome task (Ragin, 1987:19); but again, there seems no reason in principle for thinking it impossible to make significant progress in explaining both the orderings and complexities of the socio-historical domain. Such, at any rate, is the *realist* approach to the task and possibilities or theory. Realism appears to hold distinct advantages as an explanatory framework when compared to the three philosophical approaches to history that I have outlined and criticised.

4 THE ARGUMENT FOR A REALIST APPROACH

Causality is certainly difficult to ascertain, indeed how far back is it necessary to go and how wide must the net be cast for relevant evidence? Given the complexity of any event, the search must be limited and this is where theory plays a crucial role. The aims of research are also important here - why is it that a researcher elects to attempt to explain certain events? In this research,

I support an approach to history that draws on aspects of post-modernism when described as:

> a discursive practice that enables present-minded people(s) to go to the past, there to delve around and reorganise it appropriately to their needs, then such history... may well have a radical cogency that can make visible aspects of the past that have previously been hidden or secreted away; that have previously been over-looked or sidelined, thereby producing fresh insights that can actually make emancipatory, material differences to and within the present - which is where all history starts from and returns to. (Jenkins, 1991:68)

This is closely tied to the idea of post-colonialism that I outlined earlier - studying history cannot be divorced from the present concerns which provide the impetus for studying history. This approach also relates to the way in which historical sources are *texts* and are thus always open to interpretation. By studying possible causes of past events, the researcher also contributes information that may be applied to contemporary or future decisions. This highlights the need to be specific about the presuppositions and limitations of research findings.

This approach to facts and causality could be taken to mean that all historical sociology is irrevocably relativist or idealist. Looking firstly at the issue of relativism, it could be argued that all knowledge is socially produced relative to time (and/or individuals) and that there is no objective truth. Certainly, I would adhere to a degree of relativism, firstly because we cannot avoid the use of language and the contemporary connotations of words (Carr, 1986:19). Secondly, individuals do live and learn in a particular social environment and we are in some way shaped by this environment. In the terms of a research method:

> both the notion of a point of view and the principle of selection, together with the idea of emphasis in history, may produce a certain subjectivity and relativism into the study of past happenings and in any event lead to clashes between different historical interpretations. (von Leyden, 1984:156)

This is an important aspect of a realist approach which can provide a nuanced approach to historical sociology. One consequence of the realist approach is an acceptance of a degree of philosophical pluralism[11]. McLennan (1989:192) points out that:

> realism does not deny, and in fact it positively supports, the idea that a plurality of levels operate in the social domain, and that *within* each level, a number of factors, processes and mechanisms are usually in play.

Therefore different philosophical (and theoretical) perspectives can be used to develop understanding of issues. This way, even such classical oppositions, such as societal *versus* individual explanations can be seen to complement each other (ibid).

Linked to relativism is the idealist approach which focuses on "historical agents' 'thought'" (Gilliam, 1976:237) and proposes that we can only know ideas about the past[12]. Again, our knowledge of the past *is* shaped through ideas about the past. However, the "sympathetic imagination" (Gilliam, 1976:233) of an idealist approach has limited pragmatic utility simply as ideas. By utilising a particular theoretical approach, this sympathetic imagination that presents images of the past can be used to identify particular trends in terms of both structures and agents. For if history is not perceived as real (even if viewed through a lens of ideas), how can the understanding of historical events contribute to contemporary understanding? Lloyd (1993:39) argues that:

> A policy of sociological realism presupposes that society and culture are independently real entities that are neither artifacts of the theorist's or actor's creation nor reducible to characteristics of individuals or individual behaviour.

---

[11]This should not be confused with the pluralist model of the state which I discuss in the following chapter.

[12]This contrasts with the realist assumption that "the world exists and is ordered independently of our perception" (Lloyd, 1989:464).

The imaginative past is different from the real past (von Leydon, 1984:59). Given that the theoretical approach I am developing focuses on particular historical events, there must be a link between what happened in the past and our ability to understand them in the present.

Thus, I am arguing for a realist perspective that conforms to the definition provided by McLennan (1984d:156):

> For historical (scientific) realism, history is a structured process, complex but unitary. It therefore conceives of historical reality as having an independent ontological status and as populated by structures, tendencies, and causal properties as well as by human agents. Moreover, realism posits a correspondence theory of truth in history, and therefore rejects the idea that rival theories, methods, and empirical research programmes are incommensurable. Historical realism positively emphasises the necessity of political, theoretical, and methodological debate and elaboration, since there are many ways in which "correspondence" to reality is established or rendered acceptable; and there are some respects in which it can never be achieved. Realism therefore does not reject the notion of coherence between texts as a valid criterion by which theoretical claims to truth are judged. Nor is there any necessary crudity in assuming that truth is arrived at "asymptotically".

This outline of a realist approach also conforms to the approach that I am taking by not proposing that one methodology or theoretical approach is necessarily superior. Rather, there is a need to critically evaluate the position that is taken - from a political as well as an academic perspective.

Taking a realist position does not avoid the necessity of further tightrope walking. A realist perspective could be criticised as tending "towards a scientific systematism which substituted a static abstract ordering of events for the movement and uniqueness of individual historical existence" (Gilliam, 1976:233). However:

> the real past is always a necessary, but not a sufficient condition for historical statements about it... the real past constitutes a series of lower-order actions (past events) in relation to which

historical statements constitute the performance of higher-order
actions. (von Leydon, 1984:54)

This idea of "multilayered depth" (Lloyd, 1989:457) is central to a realist
approach. Observable traces of history must be studied in such a way as to
enable unobservable relationships to be inferred. The way in which the
researcher moves from the observable level to the underlying structures and
relationships is always open to dispute[13]. In order to write about the past,
or even the present, the writer must assume that they are writing about
something that is (or was) "reality". This does not necessarily mean that what
is written is "true" - in fact it may viewed as more or less "true" when
evaluated over time (Neale, 1981:241-4). By evaluating historical evidence (or
"traces") using the methods of historians and utilising a theoretical framework
that integrates both structure and agency, the realist approach can provide
information that enhances contemporary knowledge and understanding.

Von Leydon (1984) argues the case for seeing history in terms of levels, in
which the "real" past is viewed as a "lower plane" which has temporal
priority, and historical knowledge is viewed as a higher plane and has logical
priority (1984:72). Thus, the past which we are describing or explaining exists
independently of our knowledge about it, but as knowledge develops and the
interpretation of particular events builds on previous accounts (whether
supporting or challenging them) so higher levels of historical understanding
are achieved. These higher levels of historical understanding involve the real
past, historical material about that past (and other pasts) as well as
knowledge about the practise of history (historiography) (1984:74).

Similarly, we can utilise different levels of analysis in a sociological approach.
For example, Mouzelis suggests that "third-order concepts (elsewhere called
conceptual frameworks) are validated or invalidated by constant

---

[13]However, as Lloyd points out (1989:457), the unobservable
structures of the physical sciences (eg gravity) have not
prevented scientists from reporting and analysing them.

confrontation with second-order concepts (empirical/substantive theories) and with the first-order concepts that social actors use in constructing, sustaining and transforming their social worlds" (1991:170). An important facet of the sociological approach is the use of concepts. Concepts can be described as "intellectual tools" (Neale, 1981:65) which help to provide a framework in which the meaning of key terms are less ambiguous than when they are used in everyday life. However, concepts also "come in packages of assumptions which need to be scrutinised with care" (Burke, 1992:45). An awareness of philosophical debates enables us to take a critical approach to the concepts and theories that are used so that any discussion is as unambiguous as possible.

5   THE USE OF THEORY AND A METHODOLOGICAL[14] FRAMEWORK

This section considers the way that theory may be utilised in sociology and why it should be an explicit part of the work of historians as well. The use of theory does not replace the need for ethical awareness and reflexivity. After setting out the argument for the use of theory, I then consider the methodological issues of specificity and generalisability. This concerns the way the comparisons are used - both with theory and between cases. This is considered primarily because I am seeking to reshape a model that was developed in Britain, and also because it may be possible to use this model for comparisons across time or between states at some stage.

---

[14]I am dealing with theory and methodology together because they are very closely related. Also, the next chapter will set out in more detail the actual positions that I will be taking on these issues, so the purpose of this section is to outline some of the key issues for history, sociology and historical sociology.

One important characteristic of the type of sociology that I support is the theoretical self-consciousness of its practitioners. At each step of the research process, the researcher must explicitly consider the choices that are made and how these contribute to the overall project. This begins with the researcher. A level of self-awareness is important in understanding why a particular field of study is chosen and the methodological and theoretical frameworks for that study. By this, I do not mean that all research is ultimately subjective and can therefore be automatically accepted or dismissed on the basis of the researcher's characteristics. Rather, this process can help the researcher to explicitly state their perspective. This serves two main goals. The first is to protect their research (to some degree) from charges that may be levelled at it via the researcher's beliefs. Secondly, it encourages the researcher to be explicit about choosing particular methods over others. This reflexive process is an important part of the practise of sociology.

While theory is involved in all historical sociology, the research can be "theory-centred" in that two or more states are compared with a theory, and the primary comparisons are not between the states. Rather the aim is to develop the theory itself. An alternative approach would use a theory as the basis for comparing two states in order to identify key similarities and differences[15]. These are not mutually exclusive strategies, however, I feel that it is generally simpler to focus on one strategy at a time. In this research I am interested in the theory-centred approach. By using the Aotearoa/New Zealand state in comparison with a British theory, it should be possible to develop the theory in a way that reflects the post-colonial nature of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

---

[15]Comparing different states at different times can sometimes be utilised successfully (eg Mouzelis, 1986), when this suits the research process. However it does involve additional complications, so I will not discuss it here.

It is very important that the theory on which research is based is made explicit, and then utilised to provide clear hypotheses and operationalisation processes. This applies whether an inductive or deductive approach is used (Nowak, 1989:37-39). This involves clearly defining the theoretical concepts, the relationship between them and their indicators (Nowak, 1989:50-51). Dyson (1980:205-206) also supports precise conceptual clarification. This enables "political rhetoric" to be recognised and avoided, if possible. However concepts also need to be "sufficiently loose or "open-textured" to incorporate some complexity, ambiguity and change and to be filled out in different ways" (ibid). Skocpol points out that "it needs to be stressed that comparative historical analysis is no substitute for theory... Still, comparative historical analysis does provide a valuable check, or anchor, for theoretical speculation" (Skocpol, 1979:39). I am advocating developing a model for state research that encompasses at all stages historical, theoretical and comparative strands. In order to do this I have defined the main concept (the state), as well as related concepts.

As I have discussed in the previous section, it is apparent that there are "many potential meanings and functions of a given piece or whole body of historical evidence" (von Leydon, 1984:61). In order to ensure that any research conforms to ethical requirements about how we select and utilise evidence, it is important that the researcher clearly establishes the reasons for these choices. It is also important that the researcher is able to evaluate the sources that are used. Historians are better trained than sociologists to obtain and evaluate rare or obscure source materials (Banks, 1989:540). This can result in sociologists accepting uncritically the work of historians (D. Smith, 1982:292). However, the work of historians can be viewed in a similar way to that of sociologists - as representations. In order to provide these representations, the use of a theoretical model (or models) is important.

Sociology can be characterised as a theoretically conscious discipline, in that theory plays an explicit role in virtually all sociological work. Whether one

subscribes to (or simply utilises) a realist, positivist, Marxist, structuralist, or feminist approach, or a combination of these and others, theory plays an important and clearly (or nearly) visible part. Runciman (1989:6) suggests that:

> without some wide-ranging and well constructed underlying theory, no social science, whatever the ideological disposition of its practitioners, can do more than dabble at the surface of the institutions of which human societies are composed.

An important aspect of historical sociology is the ability to link together empirical research and theoretical propositions about society in general, as well as the relevant structures and relationships. As I have pointed out, the practice of sociology can be characterised as having a range of levels and investigation can proceed at any of these levels or a combination of them. The emphasis varies, as does the success of the theorising or the application of the theory.

It is sometimes assumed that history is in some way "theory free". This may take the form of a positivistic suggestion that historians record "the facts" of history and recreate a picture of life as it was. However, from the selection of an area of study, it is clear that certain presuppositions and contemporary debates (Tosh, 1991:26) can provide a structure which is utilised to select the relevant facts from a wealth of possible sources. The proliferation of historical sources indeed requires that the historian has some method for narrowing the boundaries of what is to be studied.

It is in the conscious process of fact or source selection that the philosophy of history comes to the fore. Briefly, the historian can rely on a positivist approach - that history is a science similar to the natural sciences and that the "facts" that are recounted result in or from laws. Alternatively, there is an idealist approach - that human events are essentially different to those of natural science and history is not generalisable, but about ideas about particular events in particular contexts. However, the necessity of always

selecting facts or sources or areas for study "presupposes a hypothesis or theory however incoherent it may be" (Tosh, 1991:139). Thus a Popperian model of hypothesis testing and reformulating is possible.

Stanford (1986:1) describes history as lacking "the formal theoretical structure of most academic disciplines", however, he also points out that history does not lack structures. These structures are important for furthering knowledge for three main reasons. Firstly, for anyone to make sense of information they need to be able to structure that information into some sort of framework. Secondly, history is known through the structure and relationships of language and society. Finally, historical evidence is interpreted by "human understanding of human experience" (1986:24). Stanford goes on (ibid) to propose that:

> not only the reliability but also the importance of that evidence must be assessed. The historian should have a mental picture of the society and of how the historical agents themselves saw it, some notion of the nature and causes of the changes in that society, and, finally, some idea of the form that account will take. He or she will probably be intending to publish the results, and will try to present the account in a literary form that meets the expectations of, and is likely to please, his or her readers.

While Stanford explicitly states that these structures are not theories, they do rely on both philosophical and theoretical assumptions. It is understandable that historians do not want to simply adopt theories used by sociologists or other disciplines for these theories do not necessarily solve problems of method or evidence. However, historical sociology is valuable precisely because it does involve a conscious engagement with these issues and makes no claim to value free knowledge. There are a number of criticisms that can be made of the use of theory in historical studies. The problems of an uncritical adoption of sociological theory by historians has been raised (Eley & Nield, 1980, Knapp, 1984, Stedman Jones, 1986) and can result in a complacency and retreat from independent theoretical development. However, I feel that it is important to acknowledge that there has been a

tendency to present a caricature of the "off the peg" nature of sociological theory - which is, perhaps, outdated (see, for example, Judt, 1979).

Tilly (1981:10) points out that historians use theory for arriving at conclusions rather than investigating and narrating their finds. Both the area and context of the field of interest are theoretically informed, and the posing of questions and the search for evidence involves theoretical knowledge[16]. This stance is corroborated by Tosh who sees theory as being necessary as a problem solving tool (1991:154). Historians are faced (as are sociologists) with problems of grasping an incredibly complex world composed of a number of inter-related areas. Historians who attempt to explain historical change and the direction or meaning of that change all utilise theoretical models. Whether or not this is an explicit process, there are advantages and disadvantages in this use of theory - especially when that theory is developed outside the discourse of historians (McLennan, 1984d:147; Burke, 1992:28-33). In this case, historians run the risk of integrating the problems and contradictions of the theory as well as its benefits.

One concern is that the use of theory will simply result in the facts being chosen or interpreted so that they fit the theory (Tosh, 1991:156)[17]. This is a valid concern, however, the work of "untheoretical" historians may also unconsciously do the same thing. Surely it is better that this is a conscious and defended choice? Sociological techniques are superior to "dogmatic speculation" (Banks, 1989:539) and this is particularly important when considering the political consequences of research. A second concern that Tosh raises (1991:157) is that theory seeks to impose structures and grand themes on all of history, whereas history gives pre-eminence to the role of

---

[16]Stanford adds that models cannot be avoided in historical work, because they help to make sense of history. The most pervasive model that is utilised is language (1986:5).

[17]Although Stanford stresses the distinctions between finding a pattern in the subject area and imposing a pattern (Stanford, 1986:7).

human agents in history. Again, this does not stand up to concerted critique. While there are structuralist approaches that place less emphasis on the role of individuals, there are also theories that attempt to balance the actions of individuals and groups against the structures and institutions that they interact with. This would include the work of Anthony Giddens, Philip Abrams, Christopher Lloyd and Nicos Mouzelis - all of whom also acknowledge the importance of historical processes.

Thirdly, Banks raises a concern that too much emphasis on theoretical issues "may inculcate a blinkered state of mind in those sociologists who attempt to answer these questions through research" (1989:538). This is a valid concern, as it may be tempting to ignore contradictory or chance findings if a researcher is intent on supporting a particular theory, or the theoretical model may not be falsifiable. These raise both ethical and methodological concerns. It is important to remember that the choice of variables or "formal elements of a theory or model are not something reality imposes on the theorist, but what the theorist takes to reality" (Knapp, 1984:36). Researchers do make choices and choose to support a wide range of theoretical approaches. Providing academic freedom allows a range of perspectives to be utilised and debates over these issues continue, I do not view this as a particularly serious problem.

In terms of methodological approaches, Bonnell (1980:157) distinguishes between "the mediation of history by theory and the mediation of history by concepts", in which sociologists tend towards the former and historians to the latter. Therefore, as "most historical sociologists have sought to develop new theories capable of providing more convincing and comprehensive explanations for historical patterns and structures" (Bonnell, 1980:161), sociologists have to consciously select the general parameters of their studies. This selection process (generalisability, degree of explanation, number of cases etc) takes place with consideration of the theories and/or concepts that are being used. Bonnell also suggests (1980:166-167) that historians tend to utilise

concepts, and while the concepts are derived from theoretical approaches, the background assumptions are less important than the use of concepts for the actual research process. However, as I have pointed out earlier, it is still important to be aware of the way that we use language and formalise ideas about what is to be studied.

As Johnson, Dandeker and Ashworth state, "even to recommend simple data collection on religion (or anything else) is to theorise the social world as an aggregation of particular items of behaviour which are amenable to such forms of investigation" (1984:12). In any historical or sociological investigation it is the posing of questions that is of central importance. Indeed Runciman (1989:16) proposes that it is not methodology which distinguishes sociology from history (and anthropology), but rather the questions that are asked. While in terms of subject matter these questions are often explicit (eg. what causes suicide?), questions of a philosophical or theoretical nature may be less explicit (Lloyd, 1991:187). Is social reality represented through material phenomena (constraining conditions) or ideas (an imposed meaning on life)? Do we obtain knowledge by generalising through naming unique and conjunctural events or by using concepts to reveal a reality that we cannot directly experience? These questions are posed by Johnson et al (1984) and while they may not be directly addressed in a particular research endeavour, the position of the researcher can be ascertained by the way findings are reported. It is here that a theoretical approach can help a researcher to sidestep these philosophical issues to a certain extent. Mouzelis stresses the necessity for *preparing the ground* for empirical investigation of social structures and actors" (1991:2), and while philosophy must not be absent from sociological theory, I do agree that it is only useful up to a point.

Having addressed the use of theory and philosophy within the context of developing an argument for the use of historical sociology, I will now consider one of the key methodological issues which concerns establishing a

balance between context and generalisability. Smith (1991:166) refers to three strategies that are used in historical sociology which range from a focus on a specific historical situation, through empirical generalisations that may refer to theory, to systematic theorising. As with most typologies, these are not distinct strategies and a particular research endeavour may utilise a combination of strategies. While each of these approaches can be used to provide valuable information, the debate over comparative analysis draws attention to some of the potential dangers of generalisation.

In selecting a theoretical and methodological approach we do need to consider whether the aim of research is to provide generalisations, or to concentrate on the unique characteristics of a particular case. This becomes particularly important when studying the state and considering the impact of international factors. Comparative analysis of specific events "requires detailed examination of the actions and reactions of specific groups (and strategically located individuals) whose behaviour is intrinsic to the processes of structural change" (Smith, 1984:319). At some stage this will probably involve making (or rejecting or qualifying) generalisations. Generalisations *can* be tested by applying them to one specific case (Ragin, 1989:61). However, in order to develop generalisations a number of cases need to be compared. While I am not concerned, here, with a detailed discussion of comparative historical sociology, this area does highlight the issue of whether a researcher is primarily interested in formulating generalisations or investigating specific contexts.

Given the range of factors that need to be taken into account when making generalisations, it can seem that generalisations in themselves are too general to be any use. Perhaps we can only understand a particular situation or process on its own terms and in relation perhaps to a particular theory. I feel that generalisations *are* useful - in everyday lives we use the generalisations that experience or societies give us in order to make sense of situations and to simplify interactions with others. The experience that generalisations

capture cannot be denied, but like our everyday lives, commonsense or generalisations must not be uncritically accepted. The result of this is stereotypes, dogma and a narrowing of boundaries.

In this research I am advocating a focus on Aotearoa/New Zealand as an individual case. In part, this is to indicate how a theoretical model (Hall & Schwarz) can be utilised in the context of a coherent domain of knowledge about the state. Also, in light of the unique colonial history of Aotearoa/New Zealand, it is difficult to directly utilise generalisations derived from Britain or Europe. As Ragin points out:

> In general, attention to complexity is justified whenever it is argued that a certain historical outcome... or set of similar outcomes... is historically or culturally significant in its own right and therefore demanding of social scientific explanation. (1989:61)

Developing a domain of knowledge about the Aotearoa/New Zealand state must involve an emphasis on context and complexity. This does not mean neglecting generalisations, but being careful about the assumptions, language, concepts and theories that are used.

By treating generalisations and the theories which they rely on in a critical way, we can hope to gain the best of both worlds - the use of previous information and knowledge and the ability to branch out into new areas. The realist approach that I have taken provides a basis for taking this approach. That is, there are generalisable aspects of historical events, but there are also particular causal or structural features that may be unique to the context of that event. Therefore, with care, generalisations can be used, but this does not infer a negation of specific characteristics of that event. This negotiation of generalisations and specificity is a further way in which the perceived divide between history (particularising, idiographic) and sociology (generalising, nomothetic) can be broken down. One of the primary motivating factors for this thesis was the feeling that theories developed elsewhere do not adequately take into account the colonial nature of

Aotearoa/New Zealand's history and the way that this influences the history and future of this country. This research therefore involves an attempt to use this in refining the generalisations of an existing approach so that it is broader (it is applicable to a range of societies) and more focused (it provides a model for studying Aotearoa/New Zealand that does not neglect Aotearoa/New Zealand's colonial history).

6 CONCLUSION

The debates involved in structuring the broad outlines of historical sociology for a domain have been set out in this chapter. Throughout, I have argued that perceived divisions between the disciplines of history and sociology *can* be overcome in the development of historical sociology. In this way the theoretical emphasis in sociology can be applied to historical evidence in a way that enhances knowledge. The contested interpretations of historical evidence are clearly acknowledged by considering the role of philosophy or "how we know" in relation to history, theory and methodology. My interpretation of these issues requires the support of a realist position that encourages consideration of underlying structures and relationships throughout history - such as the role of colonialism in the development of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. The positions that I have taken on these debates form the basis for developing a definition for the state and a society-centred theoretical basis for explaining state formation in the following chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SUBJECT OF THE DOMAIN:

THE STATE

1 INTRODUCTION

If the first part of constructing a domain is outlining a broad philosophical and theoretical framework, the second key part of constructing a domain of knowledge involves abstracting the subject matter from the social whole (Lloyd, 1993:37). In this case, the subject matter is the state. Given the range of potential meanings of the term "the state" I spend considerable time defining what is meant by "the state" and how this relates to both civil society and the international context. Historical sociology provides the basis for this research as it establishes the reasons for using a theoretically informed approach to the history of the state. By looking at the history of the role of the state and/or Colonial Office in Aotearoa/New Zealand (and Britain) we can see that there were precedents for the shape and role of the state. However, an assessment of the way that the Aotearoa/New Zealand state developed needs to include the importance of the state (especially infrastructural development) in developing the economy as well as the impact of economic developments on the possibility for extending or limiting state jurisdiction. Also relevant is the support for democratic government within the context of the nineteenth century concept of democracy.

Poulantzas advocates a focus on the state for three reasons; the role of the state in the contemporary world is considerably broader and different from past roles, until recently there has been a lag in research on the state, and it is an increasingly important theme in social science disciplines (1980:600). As I shall discuss later, state-centred approaches have become increasingly popular in recent years. Throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand history in particular, the state has been at the forefront in initiating significant changes. Firstly, the implementation of particular policies has had a major impact on Aotearoa/New Zealand society. This has been strongly influenced by particular governments, but the wider state system - Treasury and other government departments - have played important roles also. The expansion of the Waitangi Tribunal powers in 1985 has increased the number and

visibility of Maori claims. The implementation of deregulation and privatisation policies have also had a major impact on life in Aotearoa/New Zealand - although it is equally true that the previous emphasis on stability and protectionism had an equivalent, although vastly different, effect.

Secondly, the structure of the state system (and particularly government) has concentrated considerable power in the hands of the governing Cabinet. This has affected the role that the public service (and also backbenchers) play in the decision-making process. Since the development of the state system, the representation of women, Maori and other minority groups has been minimal at all levels of the system. Increasingly, however, the role of these groups is being highlighted, alongside an increasing emphasis on Aotearoa/New Zealand as a Pacific Rim nation or part of Asia. This changing outlook highlights the loosening of ties with Britain, and the increasing emphasis on Aotearoa/New Zealand as an independent "post-colonial" nation. This, in turn, involves addressing issues such as the Treaty of Waitangi and ongoing international political and economic relationships. The state system plays a central role in this process.

In considering the relationship between state and civil society I have noted that it is useful to consider the development of the state over time. This is the focus of the final two chapters. While a number of theorists have charted state development in general terms relative to capitalism and the world system, there is also a need to focus on the development of individual states. In this case, the development of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state was strongly influenced by the British system. However, the early colonial civil society was markedly different from British civil society. These differences and the Treaty of Waitangi and Maori society had an impact on state development - and continue to do so.

In recent years there has been an increased emphasis on state-centred approaches. While these approaches do highlight the neglect of the state in

some areas, I feel that the formulation that I have identified and developed in this chapter *does* "bring the state back in". The focus is on the state in this research, but this does not require that a state-centred approach be utilised. Rather, the state-centred research highlights the importance of the state and the varying levels of autonomy that the state may have. Ultimately, however, the very fact that individuals shape and reproduce state structures (in particular individuals who are state employees), while also spending a considerable part of their lives in civil society is important. Civil society cannot be entirely distinguished from the state[1], however it provides considerable impetus for the shape of the state - through periods of stability or periods of massive upheaval.

The approaches that view aspects of civil society as the driving force of societal change and stability can be described as society-centred. While the focus, in this case, *is* on the state, the impetus for state formation and reformation is found in civil society. Marxism, pluralism and liberalism are all key theoretical and methodological approaches to studying the state - and are all society-centred approaches. While each theory is outlined and assessed, I support the retention of key aspects of the Marxist approach despite the accusations of reductionism and the contested nature of the concept of relative autonomy. By utilising some aspects of *methodological* pluralism (building on the realist philosophical position), these flaws of vulgar Marxism can be overcome without losing the critical basis of the Marxist approach.

The process of establishing the subject of the domain is complex and I have endeavoured to set out the *key* themes as clearly as possible. The positions that I have taken are certainly not the only possibilities. What *is* important is the process of clarifying what the subject of the domain of knowledge is. I have built on the philosophical issues introduced in the following section

---

[1]For this reason causality can be very difficult to establish.

to justify why I define the state in the way that I do and why I use theory, and society-centred theory in particular. By working through the definition process in this way, the state is defined and other core concepts are then defined in relation to the state. This process, in turn, cannot be divorced from the selection of a theoretical framework that can be applied to the subject of the domain (the state). This chapter is concerned with both defining the state and suggesting the type of theory that can be utilised to investigate the state. The discussion of a particular theory is the aim of Chapter Three. What is important here is that these key themes form a tool kit of theoretical aims, concepts and definitions that can be built on for a specific research project.

2 DEFINING THE STATE

2.1 PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES

Studying the state is problematic for a number of reasons. First and foremost is the difficulty of defining the state. Braddick (1991:3) suggests that "it is not too much of an exaggeration to claim that there are as many definitions of "the state" as there are people who write about it"[2]. Two common approaches are to view the state as an equivalent for nation-state or country, or to define it as "state-as-government" (Denis, 1989:328-330). When one of these is what is meant by the term "state", the definition may be left out and the meaning may still be apparent. However, in this case I am utilising an alternative definition and what is meant by "the state" must be clarified. A second issue is what the state is defined in relation to - for example state-civil society or base-superstructure (ibid). Regardless of how the term is used, "the

---

[2]A selection of approaches could include Poggi 1978 (non-Marxist), Clarke 1991 (socialist) and Templeton 1979 (liberal).

state" does not exist in a vacuum, but in relation to a global environment and a society[3].

Starting from a philosophical perspective, we can note that historically "[t]he state is conceived as a product of reason, or as rational society, the only one in which human beings can lead a life which conforms to reason: that is, which conforms to their nature" (Bobbio, 1988:73). Whether the state is viewed as overthrowing "natural" social life, or regulating and perfecting social life, or epitomising one stage in historical development, we can relate this to the formation of "ideal" models of the state and attempts to describe and explain existing states.

Historically, the state has been justified by reference to two well-known, but vastly differing views of society. The first of these is Hobbes' view of "the state of nature as completely and utterly terrible and terrifying" (Tester, 1992:54). Thus the existence of the state provides the basis of a contract and also the possibility of coercion in order to ensure the operation of an "homogenous commonwealth" (1992:63). This enables the members of society to avoid and/or control their potentially disastrous natural existence. In contrast, Rousseau had an idyllic view of the state of nature, characterised by the idea of the "noble savage" (1992:64). However the inequality of existing civil society generates problems, therefore basing civil society on a social contract that is in turn built upon "the general will" (1992:68) can ensure an homogenous and "civil" society.

Both of these approaches argue that the state is important - but also see the ideal society as homogenous. While I certainly do not agree with the ideal of *homogenous* society, I do feel that the state has an important role in ensuring that a (harmonious) heterogenous society can develop and that systematic inequalities can be lessened and, ideally, overcome. The

---

[3] I will not be discussing the issue of an anarchist approach.

institutions of the state can be seen as attempting to "give unitary and unifying expression to what are in reality multifaceted and differential historical experiences of groups within society, denying their particularity" (Corrigan & Sayer, 1985:4). This can be seen in the way "the nation" is used to represent individuals as one large community, and within the nation individuals are presented as members of particular sub-groups (ibid). Of particular relevance in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, Smith (1986b:262) notes that the ideal of an homogenous national identity is unlikely to develop while conflict between ethnic groups remains. While it is difficult to discuss the role of the state without referring to these homogenising terms, I acknowledge that they do not reflect the actual diversity of individuals resident in a given territory.

The introduction of these two philosophical justifications for the state indicate the depth of assumptions that must be considered when formulating a model of the state. Both the vision of existing (or pre-existing) society and the aims for the future are important facets of definitions of the state. These "abstract models of society" provide the basis upon which the state's "historical and social relevance is established" (Dyson, 1980:139). Indeed, much of the following discussion proceeds at the level of ideal types. While these are very useful, it is important to bear in mind that it is only by applying these models to actual situations that it is possible to determine to what extent any particular case fits the model.

The use of ideal types also highlights the need to distinguish between the state as an apparatus (or institution) and the state as an idea. Ideas about the state can change without corresponding changes in the state (and vice versa). Although the relationship between the idea and the actuality may be very close, it is still possible to look at causal relationships between the two (Dyson, 1980:3). States "define in great detail, acceptable forms and images of social activity and individual and collective identity; they regulate, in empirically specifiable ways much - very much by the twentieth century - of

social life" (Corrigan & Sayer, 1985:3). This relationship will be discussed in more detail later.

2.2 INSTITUTIONAL DEFINITIONS: DEFINING THE STATE AS GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC SERVICE

The starting point for my definition of the state is provided by Held (1989a:2):

> any attempt to understand the state must consider its spatial and temporal dimensions - the horizontal stretch of the state across territory, the depth of state intervention in social and economic life and the changing form of all these things over time. Furthermore, it is important to consider the state as a cluster of agencies, departments, ties and levels, each with their own rules and resources and often with varying purposes and objectives.

From this prescription, it is clear that the state is viewed by Held as analogous to the structures, institutions and agents of the governmental system, involving the parliament and public service. More generally this could be described as infrastructure and actors. However, Held also hints at the complexity of the state and the way in which any state exists in relation to individuals, groups, technology and a larger world-system. I shall try to cover the points that Held raises in the following discussion, but the first step involves setting up a definition of the state. To do this it is necessary to determine what the key factors to be considered are. In contemporary society the state can be seen as encompassing a range of core factors which include the way "in which power is shared; rights to participate in government are legally or constitutionally defined; representation is wide; state power is fully secular and the boundaries of national sovereignty are clearly defined" (Hall, 1984a:9-10).

This definition is broad enough to allow wide ranging differences - for example in the actual right to participate in government may vary - even in a democracy. Also, while national sovereignty and territory may be clearly

defined, these may also be contested. There exists in any state system a number of "contradictory tendencies" (Rueschemeyer & Evans, 1985:46-47) and it is only by actual historical research that the shape of the state can be assessed. The state concept is also a "unifying formula capable of integrating a number of concepts (sovereignty, force, power, law, government, public interest, etc)" (Dyson, 1980:208). It is this that I refer to in my discussion of the state rather than state-as-government or nation-state[4]. This definition could be criticised as imprecise, however, it is this imprecision that enables the complexity of the state to be acknowledged, while at the same time simplifying discussion.

The definition of the state that I am using is not universally accepted. Denis (for example) defines a state as:

> *a historically specific type of society, whose institutions take the legal-constitutional discourse form which has enabled capitalism to rise* - a state is not in (or above) society, a state is a society. (1989:348)

The relationship of state and society is of central importance. However, it is not necessarily desirable or possible to equate the state with society. Certainly, in order to compare state-centred and society-centred approaches it is necessary to be able to distinguish between the two - although this does not mean that it is ever possible to present them as totally distinct entities. The close interconnections between the state and civil society are reflected in the way that "other social organisations often mould themselves in the image of the state that confronts them" (Hall, 1986:14). Laitin argues that this is especially so in states that have been colonised (1985:308), although this is difficult to assess in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context. However, it is clear that the changes to the state since 1984 have resulted in government departments and State Owned Enterprises that are required to run some, if not all, operations on a profit making basis. However there is a possible problem with this increasing interdependence as "the contradictions of civil

---

[4]See also Corrigan and Sayer, 1985:3.

society become more embedded in the state as the state more deeply penetrates civil society, potentially undermining both its coherence as a corporate actor and its autonomy" (Rueschemeyer & Evans, 1985:69). This intertwining of the state and civil society is a recurring theme in this discussion of the state.

Denis argues against using the term "the state" "as a convenient abbreviation for all manners of government agencies and other such institutions" (1989:346). Rather, we must recognise that "the state" and "civil society" are reifications. The position that I have taken is directly opposed to the first point that Denis makes. The state system as used here does not refer solely to the governing political party (or parties), but includes them along with the public service. Dyson (1980:209) also distinguishes between government as the individuals in "executive authority" or the need to rule and the state. The state is a universalistic concept that "links government into a wider institutional context as part of one collectivity" (ibid). The actual actions of individuals and groups in parliament is not of primary interest here. My discussion focuses on the *system* of government. However, as Denis points out, it is worthwhile to bear in mind the "ideal" nature of theoretical discussions about the state (and society). This involves the acknowledgement also of the role of individuals and the way in which states can be perceived as both actors and structures (Skocpol, 1985:3-43).

3 FACETS OF SUBSTANTIVE STATE THEORY

3.1 THE STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Attempting to clearly outline society or, in this case, civil society is as complex as discussing the state (Marsden, 1992:360). Civil society refers to

the structures and relationships that exist relatively independently of the state[5]. That is, private (home) life, education, work, leisure and the day-to-day existence of individuals when not actively involved in influencing the machinations of the state. Economic activity is also included in the realm of civil society, although this may at times be closely linked with, or a direct result of state policy. This is only *relatively* independent of the state because there is an inherent duality between the state and civil society, as the state "is at once distinct from civil society, is shaped by it, and is a force which shapes it" (Lefort, 1988:23). This duality means that the state cannot be simply viewed as the mechanism to give civil society autonomy and total independence from the state, nor can the state exist indefinitely as a totalitarian entity without the support of civil society. This dual relationship can also be seen in the way that "civil society has conventionally meant to distinguish the milieu of free humanity from the milieu of reification produced either by nature or the state" (Tester, 1992:11).

Poulantzas (1980:600) identifies the close relationship between the state and civil society:

> It is, of course, impossible to speak of the contemporary state without referring to the society underlying it, nor can society be divorced from the state which governs it... according to whether we choose the state or society as the focus of our research, our approach to the other term will necessarily be different.

This sentiment neatly summarises the basic approach that I take to the society-state relationship. The role of the state, as both as actor and an institution, is affected in part by the divisions and bonds that exist within civil society. But the strength of groups in society may also be affected by the structure and functions that the state performs (Stepan, 1985:340). Therefore we *can* look at the ways in which the state may enhance the position of privileged groups in society (eg. Marxism), but equally we must be able to

---

[5]The idea of *civil* society also implies "a division between a state of civilisation and a state of nature" (Tester, 1992:9). However, I will not discuss this distinction.

indicate the areas in which the state exerts considerable autonomy. However, in order to be able to explain the presence or absence of state autonomy, historical research of particular instances must (Rueschemeyer & Evans, 1985:60-70) be used because of the wide variation in potential causes and outcomes.

In order to grasp the relationship that exists between the state and civil society, it helps to consider the way in which the state has evolved over time. Corrigan and Sayer (1985:188-190) argue the case that the state as such was not formed at a particular time, but evolved through a range of institutions as well as social and economic changes. What may be viewed therefore as relics that have somehow survived in their present shapes (eg. the House of Lords in England) are instead viewed as institutions which have remained for strong reasons. Earlier institutions have provided both the impetus for the construction of new institutions and processes, and also constrained these developments (Corrigan & Sayer, 1985:190). The use of the model of an ideal capitalist state is therefore a tool that identifies certain key features, and may equally be utilised in order to highlight *apparent* inconsistencies. In Aotearoa/New Zealand the process of state formation occurred during the period 1840-1907. It was not inevitable that the state developed into the form that it did, and nor were future developments inevitable. By investigating the initial process of state formation through a focus on particular areas (eg. political representation) it is possible to chart why the state developed as it did.

Braddick (1991:4) proposes to "treat state formation as a continuous process and [assumes] that the process of state formation may be related to social change through social processes that make existing institutions more effective or more active, not simply through the creation of new institutions or constitutional relationships". Many authors have charted the development of states (see Hall, 1986:11; Rush, 1992:23-39), so I shall only touch on a few key themes. As societies have grown larger and become nation-states there has

been a formal separation of state and civil society (Lefort, 1988:5) alongside the development of democratic systems of government. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, since European settlement, these developments were relatively rapid. This can be described as "exogenous" state formation (Godelier, 1980:609), in which a conquering nation introduces a system of domination[6].

As states have developed over time, "the more the state attempted to derive its legitimacy from the *whole* of society, the more the state itself became the base from which alone *national* strategies, compromises and settlements could be devised and implemented" (Hall, 1984b:26). Thus the role of the state as a unifying set of institutions has developed over time. These developments have also been aided by the use of ideological arguments. Ideologies can be seen "as forces capable of shaping and creating a new history and contributing to the formation of a new power which will progressively emerge" (Bobbio, 1988:88). The settlement of Aotearoa/New Zealand was carried out under the influence of a range of ideological perspectives (Wakefield etc). More recently, the role of the state and even the retention of state institutions have been significantly altered in accordance with a liberal (free market) approach.

In the Aotearoa/New Zealand case, after settlement, sovereignty was viewed by settlers as residing in the Crown, and eventually the Aotearoa/New Zealand government. The establishment of sovereignty also involved the protection of external boundaries through immigration controls or defence and the control of internal threats (including the incorporation of Maori as citizens) (Pearson, 1990:149, Breuilly, 1993:369). This highlights the contested

---

[6]New Zealand settlement was loosely bound by the Treaty of Waitangi, therefore this was an agreed upon process, although it is debatable whether the particular form it eventually took was envisaged by Maori signatories. Democracy was also extended to Maori at a slower rate and subject to land holding quotas which disadvantaged the Maori system of communal ownership. The extension of the franchise to Maori was complex, and, as I shall discuss in the final chapter, this resulted in relatively low numbers of Maori participation.

nature of sovereignty in colonised nations. Hirst points out (1989:26) that sovereignty and democracy co-exist on the assumption of a homogenous population. Therefore sovereignty is extremely tenuous in a diverse (whether ethnically or economically) society. Another problem in considering sovereignty is that:

> The doctrine of sovereignty treats the state as if it were a single agent, with a single will - like an absolute monarch - whereas it is a complex amalgam of agencies and persons with different objectives and means of decision. (Hirst, 1989:25)

Therefore while sovereignty can be viewed as existing for a broadly defined (or ideal type) state, in reality the divisions of civil society may also be apparent in the state.

In order to theorise the shape of the actual relationship between the state and civil society it is necessary to turn to particular theoretical models. I shall be discussing Marxism, pluralism, liberalism and state-centred approaches in a later section. These models also structure the way in which capitalism, the nation-state and the world system are viewed. However, in order to clearly define the state as the subject of this domain, it is necessary to outline definitions and relationships that can then be further clarified if necessary.

3.2 CAPITALISM AND THE FORMATION OF NATION-STATES

Capitalism refers to a particular type of economic organisation that is based on the twin pillars of individual rights[7] and profit maximisation. While the term "capitalism" encompasses a range of possible forms, and a variety of roles for the state, the five basic characteristics include:

> (1) private ownership and control of the economic instruments of production, ie. capital; (2) the gearing of economic activity to

---

[7]This may seem contradictory, but the conception of individual rights is based on the libertarian model.

making profits; (3) a market framework that regulates this activity; (4) the appropriation of profits by the owners of capital (subject to taxation by the state); (5) the provision of labour by workers who are free agents.(Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 1988:24)

While capitalism has been the focus of a number of critiques (most notably Marxist and neo-Marxist), it also forms the basis of most Western societies, including Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The development of capitalism has evolved alongside the development of nation-states and the state. As Corrigan and Sayer point out "[c]apitalism is not just an economy, it is a regulated set of social forms of life" (1985:188). Commodity production and trade, as well as the state, evolved over a very long time, and a range of capitalist systems subsequently evolved that combined a capitalist mode of production with the modern state system (1985:188-190). Central to these developments is the process of "individualisation *and* state formation" (1985:187) in which the state enhances individual rights while simultaneously providing an ideal situation for the development of capitalism.

Breuilly argues that capitalism is intrinsic to the development of the idea of civil society. In particular, the "liberal" distinction between the role of the state (public) and the functioning of civil society (private) played an important role (1993:368ff). Similarly, international trade can be viewed as playing a key role in the formation of nation-states. Settler society in early Aotearoa/New Zealand utilised land as the basis for capitalist development, and this fits the definition provided above. In establishing the subject of the domain, it is certainly important to note that settler Aotearoa/New Zealand was a capitalist society, and the development of the state cannot be divorced from this context.

Mann proposes that the formation of nation-states can be viewed as to a large degree autonomous from the development of capitalism, rather "it resulted

from the way expansive, emergent, capitalist relations were given regulative boundaries by pre-existing states" (1988:27). However, in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context there was no pre-existing state - rather, the state developed as an extension of the British empire. Marxist and neo-Marxist analyses provide an enormous body of work on the development of states, and how this can be directly related to the capitalist mode of production. Corrigan and Sayer argue "that the national character of the nation-state is fundamental to capitalism's cultural revolution. Bourgeois classes organise their power, materially and culturally, through specifically national polities" (1985:200). Furthermore, the nation-state is a particular (historical) form of civilisation, "and in the case of capitalist economy state formation is crucial to their making and sustaining. Capitalism is not, and never has been, 'self-regulating'" (1985:203). This certainly appears to be the case in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The appropriation of Maori land was deemed by the Crown to be necessary for the development of the colony, but it was also a process that needed to be controlled and utilised to provide revenue.

Giddens summarises nation-states as involving "an apparatus of government laying claim to specific territories[8], possessing formalised codes of law, and backed by the control of military force" (1989:302). Nation-states may also be characterised by a particular education system, economy, and a particular ideology (A.D. Smith, 1986b:228). This ideology legitimises the existence of the nation-state and the authority of the state system and the individuals who exert control. This ideology often takes the form of nationalism - identification with the symbols and language of the nation-state (Giddens, 1989:303, A.D. Smith, 1986b:228).

---

[8]During internal or external conflict (wars), and also in peacetime, these boundaries may not be recognised. However, the exercise of state power generally assumes some sort of territoriality.

Defining the nation-state in this way would seem to imply a degree of homogeneity in the population. This is notably not the case - particularly in a country like Aotearoa/New Zealand with a relatively large minority indigenous population. Thus Smith (A.D., 1986b:229) argues that there is a need to distinguish between state-making and nation-building. Aotearoa/New Zealand history conforms to Smith's immigrant model in which early European settlers entered into a treaty with Maori and the used this as authority for developing the institutions and practices of the state which Pakeha continue to monopolise (Smith, 1986b:259). The development of state systems in newly recognised nation-states like New Zealand was thus strongly influenced by existing European and colonial states. Nation-building occurs alongside state-making, and in marketing terms could be described as "branding". In part this involves nationalism or identification and pride in the nation, but it also involves situating "the nation" relative to other nations.

Paralleling this awareness of the interrelated nature of nation-states has been the development of "developmentalism". This "assumes that there is a unilinear development path, similar to that of Western economies. It cannot account for the differences in Western development paths" (Laite, 1988:162). Therefore, in any comparative analysis of the history (or the future) of the state it is necessary to consider the assumptions of a Western approach to development. This involves an analysis of how development is generated by external and internal changes, and the ways in which change affects particular nation-states differently (Laite, 1988:163). Certainly, state development is affected by what has occurred previously in other states, but this is not an inevitable process.

The nation-state is a relatively recent development, and is certainly not immune from both internal and external challenges to its validity - both as a theoretical concept and as a political entity. McMichael warns that the nation-state "is a historically contingent construct, and therefore a great deal more fluid and contextualised than is allowed by the formal assumptions of

the comparative method" (1992:356). When the nation-state is uncritically adopted as the unit of analysis there is also a potential to misconstrue "observed processes as national in origins and consequence" (ibid). Certainly in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, much of this country's development has been a direct result of actions taken by individuals in the British or American states, and many of the decisions made in Aotearoa/New Zealand do not reflect the positions held by significant groups within Aotearoa/New Zealand (particularly Maori).

3.3 THE STATE IN AN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

An alternative way to look at the relationship between capitalism and the state is to utilise a world systems approach. These approaches focus on transnational relationships and trends as the basis for understanding particular states. At one end of the scale, this perspective can take a "global village" approach that lessens the importance of nation-states - given that some transnational corporations may have a higher income than some states (Giddens, 1993:185). However, what I believe is a more useful aspect of transnational approaches is the focus on relationships between nation-states and how this affects particular states. Tilly also supports world system approaches when they "reduce the reification of political-development models" and show "ways of situating states in quite different context than the individual society" (1992:335). For example, a range of approaches outline the impact that transnational trade has on the strength of individual states (Evans, 1985:193). In particular, core states that are major capital exporters will generally benefit and be strengthened from an increase in transnational markets, and peripheral or developing states will tend to be weakened. This is because the power of states in peripheral societies (nation-states) will be weakened and outside states and global structures (international banks) will have an increased potential influence on policies. Early state and nation-state

development in Aotearoa/New Zealand was closely related to trading and financial relationships with Britain.

Thus "[h]eavy reliance on trade, whatever the economic gains from trade may be, leaves a society vulnerable to the vicissitudes of economic interactions that lie outside the jurisdiction of the state and are therefore in principle beyond its capacity to control" (Evans, 1985:195). In a small country, like Aotearoa/New Zealand, that relies heavily on export markets, larger states can markedly affect the GDP. This in turn affects the way the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand will function. Of course the state can still choose what sort of policies to implement, but when this relies largely on overseas loans and investment, choices may be limited by the actions of credit rating agencies, international stock markets and other global factors (eg the Gulf War). In a cautionary tone however, Skocpol suggests that:

> we need not necessarily accept arguments that national economic developments are actually determined by the overall structure and market dynamics of a "world capitalist system". We can, however, certainly note that historically developing transnational economic relations have always strongly (and differentially) influenced national economic developments. (1979:20)

States within a capitalist world-system do not necessarily set out to focus primarily on influencing other states, but rather to ensure that internal control is maintained. Economic factors are also not the sole, nor necessarily the primary, factor in external conflict.

Held also indicates the need to be aware that some nation-states may not be equally integrated into the world economy, and therefore international influences may, in some cases, be negated by national influences (1989a:237). This relates to sovereignty in which "there is a political authority in a community which has undisputed right to determine the framework of rules and regulations in a given territory and to govern accordingly" (Held, 1989a:215). While I would not go so far as to suggest that the state system

is undisputed (in any country, including Aotearoa/New Zealand), the constitutional requirements of democracy provide a basis for assuming that sovereignty exists. This sovereignty provides individual states with some autonomy within the world system. However, if the state were to begin a program of systematic persecution of minorities (for example) there would undoubtably be pressure from other states and markets or corporations to follow a more acceptable course of action.

The logical endpoint of world-systems theory would seem to be a "world-state", and in the absence of this, it is more relevant to focus on the existence of "world powers" (Modelski, 1978:216) to explain international relationships. The key role of nation-states in this analysis is that all world powers have also been nation-states (1978:230). This has encouraged other states to develop as nation-states, both to protect themselves and to enable them to compete on a global scale. Skocpol describes the modern nation-state as "an analytically autonomous level of transnational reality - *interdependent* in its structure and dynamics with world capitalism, but not reducible to it" (1979:22). The world system focuses on states as representing the particular nation-state on the world stage. This view of nation-states can thus be seen as state-centred rather than society-centred.

The purpose of the preceding multi-faceted discussion has been to convey how it is that the state is embedded in a complex web of relationships - from civil society to global institutions, along with individuals in the state, civil society and from other nation-states. This discussion has set out my definition of the state and introduced these related concepts. However, I have limited my discussion to a general outline of areas that are relevant to a consideration of state formation from a society-centred approach. In the next section I shall investigate both society-centred and state-centred approaches to studying the role of the state. I am convinced that the state system remains a most challenging and important focus for ongoing analysis. This can only proceed if it is made very clear what is meant by the state, and

how the state fits into a range a contexts. This discussion provides the foundation on which the theoretical approach can be developed.

4 EXPLANATORY PRIORITIES IN STATE THEORY

4.1 STATE-CENTRED APPROACHES

Recently, there has been a resurgence of interest in what are broadly termed state-centred approaches. In contrast to the society-centred approaches, these approaches argue that the state does have important areas of autonomy, and meaningful analyses must include an appreciation of the role played by the state. One very practical reason for focusing on the state is the increasingly broad role of the state in contemporary society (Poulantzas, 1980:600). Even when individuals advocate the withdrawal of the state (through privatisation for example), the state is having a major effect on the economy and social life. Increasing numbers of people relying on benefits also increases the impact that the state apparatus has on individual lives. This increasing importance of the state in everyday life has been mirrored by the interest that sociologists have taken in the state. Mulgan, for example, asserts that:

> Theorists of almost every ideological bent now agree that the state is a powerful institution, or collection of institutions, with its own interests and objectives which it exerts against those of the rest of society.(Mulgan, 1994:13)

State-centred approaches theorise the state in relation to civil society, the nation-state and international contexts in a way which emphasises the potential for state autonomy. However, while these approaches do provide valuable insights, I prefer to use them as a catalyst for "bringing the state back in" to society-centred approaches.

Thus, state-centred approaches can be summarised as involving an explicit consideration of all aspects of the state, alongside this emphasis on autonomy.

An advantage of this, as Pierson points out with respect to welfare states is that statist approaches emphasise the (potential) uniqueness of state systems. This involves four areas of investigation: "the nature of state-building... the nature of the civil service and its reform... the nature of the state... [and] the relationship of the state to powers in civil society" (1991:100-101). To this could be added the role played by states in the international arena. All of these areas can be considered in relationship to the formation and reformation of the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. However, where I diverge from state-centred approaches is in considering the "driving force" of societal development. I believe that *civil society* is the driving force of stability or change - although the state may, at times, have considerable autonomy, this is perhaps not so dramatic as has often been made out in the retreat from sociological reductionism in state theory.

The importance of state autonomy[9] can be assessed in both international and national relationships. In any policy area, states "may formulate and pursue goals that are not simply reflective of the demands or interests of social groups, classes, or society" (Skocpol, 1985:9). In order to assess the autonomy of states, Skocpol suggests two complementary strategies (1985:9). The first of these involves looking at "states as actors", and assessing the goals and vested interests of individuals working within the state system, and to what extent these are realised in policy. This includes a consideration of the state itself as an actor - or how the state may appear to represent a unified decision-making actor in relation to civil society and other states. The second approach concerns "states as structures" - how the organisational structure of the state encourages certain activities and groups and discourages others. These are certainly key aspects of the way that the state functions. However, state autonomy "cannot be taken for granted; it must first be created and then, since it can be lost, maintained" (Hall, 1986:15). External challenges and

---

[9]The means (military, economic, ideological) for state autonomy are used in all social relationships and this ensures that states remain linked with societies (Mann, 1988:10).

the strength of key elites have an impact on autonomy. Thus the role of civil society in establishing state autonomy cannot be neglected.

In terms of assessing state autonomy, Mann (1988:Ch1) distinguishes between two types of state power - both of which need to be considered - infrastructural and despotic power. Despotic power refers to "the range of actions which the [state] elite is empowered to undertake without routine, institutionalised negotiation with civil society groups" (Mann, 1988:5). Obviously, in a dictatorship this would be very high. However Aotearoa/New Zealand history also shows evidence of times when despotic power was fairly high - as shown by the selling of state assets by the fourth Labour government. On the other hand, infrastructural power refers to "the capacity of the state to actually penetrate civil society, and to implement logistically political decisions throughout the realm" (ibid). In technologically advanced countries, where the police, Inland Revenue Department and Income Support can swap information and even obtain bank statements, infrastructural power can be very high. However, it may not extend to individuals who do not utilise these institutions.

These outlines indicate ways in which state autonomy can be theorised and assessed. While the role of the state cannot be ignored, the value of state-centred approaches for this research is in highlighting the importance of the state's organising capacities and unique resources. While state-centred approaches stress the importance of considering a range of factors, and in particular using comparative historical research (Rueschemeyer & Evans, 1985:70), focusing on the state can highlight a range of factors that are neglected in society-centred approaches. For example, Skocpol suggests that the ability of a state to achieve goals depends on a combination of factors which include a stable administration, skilled officials with financial (and other) resources, state revenues and distribution, and state authority and organisational channels (1985:16). The type of state and links between the state and social groups and organisations are also important factors (1985:20-

27). The relationship between the state and international or national groups can also affect the degree of autonomy that is possible.

Divisions amongst state managers may also reflect or shape the relationship between the state and society. State-centred approaches acknowledge (as in the pluralist models) that the state is an "arena of social conflict" (Rueschemeyer & Evans, 1985:47), and this conflict is certain to be reflected in the decision-making process. Rueschemeyer and Evans propose that state autonomy can be increased if subordinate groups (classes) gain enough power to seriously challenge the dominant groups, or if the cleavages in society become so serious that the neutrality of the state becomes of primary importance (1985:64). Also, when the state and civil society are closely intertwined, the contradictions in both areas reflect each other, weakening the potential autonomy of the state.

State-centred approaches can also provide a powerful critique of vulgar Marxism. For example, Jessop points out that one of the requirements of the capitalist state is that "the state intervenes against capital as well as the working class, especially when individual capitals or fractions of capital threaten the interests of capital in general. Such action illustrates the error of viewing the state as a simple instrument of capital" (1990:37). However, this does not mean that society-centred approaches such as Marxism must be discarded altogether. As McLennan points out:

> "Bringing the state back in" is in fact a much better formula [than statism], for this implies, as "statism" does not, that key aspects of state autonomy must be *added* to a full socio-historical account of political change. (1993c:5-6)

While I agree with this sentiment, it is also very important to consider *how* these approaches are combined and to acknowledge potential difficulties.

Skocpol is at the forefront of the move to "bring the state back in" and stresses the need to disentangle the state from abstract relationships with

economic or class relationships and view them instead as "actual organisations controlling or attempting to control territories and people" (Skocpol, 1979:31). However, without those territories and people, states would not exist. State-centred approaches may also neglect the importance of relationships within civil society. For this reason, I support the use of a society-centred approach, but - as we shall see - some society-centred approaches are also problematic.

4.2 SOCIETY-CENTRED APPROACHES

Society-centred approaches have long been recognised as effective strategies for investigating the social world. Three primary examples of society-centred approaches include Marxism, pluralism and liberalism. What characterises these as society-centred approaches is the emphasis on aspects of civil society as the driving force for the development of state structures and action. Thus "the state is seen as reflecting or at best mediating the structure and dynamics of society as a whole" (McLennan, 1993b:2). In particular, economic or social forces are viewed as "driving" society and the emphasis is then on how the state manages to fulfil the requirements of those forces.

McLennan (1993b:13) summarises three society-centred approaches as classical Marxism, conventional pluralism, and a reassessment and blurring of Marxism and pluralism (see also McLennan, 1989). I shall add liberalism to these approaches in this discussion. However, I would agree with McLennan that the most fruitful way to develop this discussion is by reassessing how Marxist and pluralist approaches can complement each other and strengthen a research program. This approach to marxism also provides a useful point for "bringing the state back in". While I feel that it is essential to focus on the role that the state has played in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, this is best done alongside a revised Marxist framework.

The first society-centred approach that I shall discuss - *liberalism* - is also the one that I am most opposed to. The early Aotearoa/New Zealand state could be described as "classical liberal" (Hall, 1984a:10). In this context, liberal refers to the libertarian approach initially developed by theorists such as Adam Smith (1952), Hayek (1960) and Friedman (1980). The ideal role of the state is primarily to provide defence, ensure justice and maintain public institutions (Smith, 1952:29ff), and, above all, to limit "the coercive powers of all government, whether democratic or not" (Hayek, 1960:103). However, the liberal approach has the ultimate effect of ensuring that those who are already economically powerful remain so, at the expense of the less fortunate.

The liberal approach is based on an "ideal" situation, in which it is possible to do away with most of the roles performed by the state, and rely instead on markets and individual self-interest. The "individual" is given ontological primacy, to the extent that systematic inequalities (for example, those experienced by women, Maori and other minority groups) can be denied. Rather it is up to each individual to bargain on the "open" market in order to secure a job or purchase consumer goods. The laws of supply and demand thus become the sole driving force for economic interactions, and social analysis can be carried out in economic terms. The residual role of the state can also be scrutinised in terms of its efficiency in ensuring the functioning of the markets. The description of the liberal approach highlights its bases of positivism and methodological individualism (Dunleavy & O'Leary, 1987:87-90), in which economic "laws" and individual "rights" provide strong ideological and philosophical justifications for an inequitable system.

One of the main reasons that I find this approach problematic, is that its proponents seem to have wielded considerable power in Aotearoa/New Zealand recently, and often assume that a transition to this type of society could be achieved relatively swiftly and easily. There is also an assumption that systematic inequalities will not exist - the position of individuals in

society is their own responsibility - therefore if they are less well off then it can only be blamed on the individual. However, in the terms of my discussion here, liberalism also reduces almost all areas of society to functioning markets. This reductionism reduces the utility of liberalism as a tool for analysing the multi-faceted relationship between state and society - in contemporary and past Aotearoa/New Zealand society as well as in other countries. Certainly, it is possible to argue that analysis could proceed (and find existing systems wanting), but I do not think that it is worth pursuing this line of theorising if we aim to provide progressive suggestions for future developments.

McLennan (1984a:81) also notes that neo-liberalism "is based on a critique of pluralist democracy. The latter is held to lead to an overloaded state, creeping socialism and a turbulent people, despite its intention to preserve both *representative* democracy and the capitalist mode of production". Certainly in recent Aotearoa/New Zealand history (Muldoon years), this critique could and has been applied. And this approach can provide the basis for analysing some of the inefficiencies of existing state systems. In particular, the liberal view of the primacy of individuals is an important cornerstone of capitalist democracies. The idea of a separate (and independent) political realm is specific to capitalism. This can be viewed as largely based on the liberal theme of free and equal individuals - the state is seen as an independent arena in which individuals can participate. While this provides the basis for democracy, it is also the basis on which exploitation occurs (Gough, 1979:40).

Along with Marxism, liberalism makes the "economistic fallacy" of assuming that the principles of the self-regulating market and economic individualism were universal, rather than a characteristic of the nineteenth century (Block & Somers, 1984:63). While liberalism does provide some pertinent (if ultimately unsatisfactory) critiques of the state, the fixation with the market as the basis of all social, economic and political interactions is both

reductionist and morally questionable. Likewise, the use of economic self-interest can provide an interesting critique of the role of individuals within the state (as well as in civil society). However, this does not mean that all individuals act on this basis all of the time. Both Marxism and pluralism present alternatives to this model of political economy.

In considering liberalism, we must however, bear in mind that liberalism is an "ideal type" that has never existed. It may, in fact, not be possible for a purely liberal state to exist. Where the liberal model comes in to this analysis is in considering changes of emphasis in the role and jurisdiction of the state. For example, while the Aotearoa/New Zealand state was initially of the "classical liberal" type, the emphasis gradually shifted to a more collectivist model. Aspects of the liberal model can be seen in the Aotearoa/New Zealand state throughout history. While I do not support the implementation of liberal ideals, assessing shifts in emphasis (towards liberalism or collectivism) is a valid research aim. The model that I develop in the following chapter is, indeed, concerned with this, but utilises a neo-Marxist framework for this analysis.

The next society-centred approach that I want to discuss is *pluralism*, an orientation that I find considerably more valuable than liberalism in understanding and explaining the state/society relationship. However, it can be acknowledged that in some ways pluralism builds upon some of the characteristics of a liberal model. McLennan, for example, suggests that pluralism accepts:

> the liberal understanding of political democracy as unconstrained institutionalised choice between competing parties... [and] develops the further claim that the essential foundation for a successful democracy is the existence of a range of citizen groups within the wider society. (1989:10)

Broadly speaking, pluralism, in this understanding, refers to any social organisation in which power is evenly distributed throughout the organisation - in particular to a range of smaller collectivities. Therefore,

every group and/or individual has the opportunity to take part in decision-making and can choose how they wish to participate. Applying a pluralist perspective to the state would then (ideally) view the state as "a political mechanism responsive to the balance of societal demands" (McLennan, 1989:18). Economic groups are not the only (nor necessarily the most important) actors in the pluralist scenario. Rather, the focus is on ensuring that the political system operates in a way that ensures representation for all groups, in order that the state may mediate between them and make decisions on the basis of submissions.

Some of the potential flaws in the traditional pluralist approach are identified by McLennan (1993b:3). For one thing, pluralism would appear to be "empiricist", in that it favours description over analysis. Pluralists have also traditionally expected political equilibrium and economic growth, and correspondingly neglected underlying (societal and state) structures affecting group interactions. However, pluralism can also be viewed as anti-statist and opposed to the extreme individualism of the liberal approach (Hirst, 1989:16). For example, "[r]espect for the autonomy of associations freely formed of citizens and the principle of functional representation both involve a limitation and not an enhancement of the scope of state power" (Hirst, 1989:2). As with liberalism, then, pluralism may not exist in any kind of "pure" shape, but the overall emphasis is firmly on civil society.

Dunleavy and O'Leary (1987) identify three different views of the state in pluralist approaches. The first of these is the state as "weathervane" or "cipher" (1987:43-44) in which the state responds directly to the (dominant) pressure groups in civil society. While this model may suit caricatures of the pluralist approach, the reality is more complex. The second model views the state as a neutral arbiter or mediator (1987:44-47), acting to develop workable compromises. Certainly, this may be how the state would ideally function, but a more critical approach identifies a more likely scenario. This is the "broker state" in which:

> [w]hatever steering capacity it possesses is a product of the strength of the dominant coalitions inside and outside the state. It is an interest group state in which elected party government is only "first among equals". (1987:47)

This approach explicitly identifies the elected government and public service employees as interest groups that play important roles in the state system. Viewing the state as a broker avoids the problem of focusing on civil society while neglecting the state (McLennan, 1989:25), and does not necessarily assume that power is evenly distributed at all levels of society.

Using this perspective, pluralism builds a critique of representative democracy on the basis that all individuals can never participate equally in a democratic state, but have to organise into groups in order to have realistic effects (McLennan, 1984a:82). Mouzelis also develops a similar argument that only macro-actors (groups or influential individuals) can participate in macro-structures such as states (1991:31-34). However:

> the "professionalised state model" argues that Western democracies remain basically pluralist in their mode of operation because of the development of internalised controls among more expert and professionalised state officials, the fragmentation of government to create interactive policy-making systems, and the growth of issue-specific forms of public participation.(Dunleavy & O'Leary, 1987:300)

The state remains a key factor in any consideration of society. Therefore, retaining a focus on the state is important. The shape of a particular state may suggest that parts of that state are the key influential lobby groups. Groups in civil society need to organise in order to impact on the state, and the importance of the state may be explained, in part, by the existence of highly developed mechanisms within the state that enable government departments to be particularly effective at participating in debates.

As with the state-centred approaches, pluralism provides the basis for a critique of Marxism. Within a pluralist approach, the impact of economic factors can be assessed. However, as Hall points out:

[t]hose forces which can be traced to economic factors determine the character of society and the state only *in, through,* and *by way of* the variety of political movements, social and ideological formations which emerge in the conjuncture. (1984b:27)

Thus while there is a powerful connection between the economy and the state this cannot alone account for the historical development of the state.

It is clear from this discussion that traditional pluralism that views the state as neutral is inadequate for a critical understanding of the role of the state. However, pluralism does introduce a range of factors into any analysis. Unlike the Marxist and liberal approaches, pluralism explicitly considers a range of interest groups, including; economic, ethnic, gender, religious, environmental and other single issue groups. These groups are all accorded ontological equality. More recently (in some theoretical approaches), the state has been added to these civil society groups. The addition of the state has gone some way to addressing the problems identified with the traditional pluralist approaches. By taking this process further, and combining aspects of Marxist and pluralist approaches, a more critical model can be developed. However, it is necessary to firstly outline both a general Marxist framework and discuss the implications of reductionism.

The final, and most important society-centred approach that I will discuss is also the most well known - Marxism. The traditional Marxist conception of historical materialism views history as a unilinear development towards the goal of a communist society. The driving force of history is economic development which is conceptualised as modes of production. Each mode of production encompasses forces and relations of production. The forces of production include the raw materials that are transformed into commodities through the productive process, the technology and equipment used, and the skills and techniques that are utilised. Relations of production refer primarily to the relationship between capitalists (owners) and labourers, ie. those who control and direct the production process and the individuals in a

subordinate position who facilitate day-to-day production. In a capitalist society, this relationship is characterised by appropriation in which commodities produced by the labourer are owned by the capitalist. The relationship between the forces and relations of production thus determine the overall mode of production (eg capitalism), but they also provide the mechanism for revolutionary change. In the Marxist model, for example, tension between the forces and relations of production should eventually lead to the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, and the establishment of a socialist society. This is a very brief sketch of Marxism, and can be viewed as an ideal type. Where it becomes of particular value here is in the tools it provides for analysing society, alongside a political profile that encourages the consideration of the political implications of research.

A Marxist approach involves a distinction between the base and superstructure in society. All superstructural phenomena (political, cultural, social) are viewed as developing as a result of their relationship with the economic mode of production; therefore, Marxism involves a materialist conception of society. The primacy of the economic in Marxism can mean that any analysis of the state ultimately relies on its relationship to economic production (essentialism) or denies the driving force of the economic and is left with an empiricist approach to analysis of the state. In Marxist analyses this is most obvious in links between economic class and the state that do not "give due consideration to the complex *organisational* and *institutional* realities which lie between classes and the state" (Mouzelis, 1986:200). This is because the base/superstructure dichotomy is aligned with a range of dichotomies including material/ideal and structural/conjunctural (ie. base = material = structural). Mouzelis[10] points out (1990:47) that the infrastructural or material aspects permeate all areas of society, not just the economy.

---

[10]Mouzelis goes on to propose the development of a plurality of "modes" similar to the mode of production (1990:47). While this is an interesting way around the spectre of reductionism or economism, I will not expand on this here.

McLennan points out (1984b:88-90) that the Marxist approach is based on three core factors; that western societies are based on capitalist economies in which power and economic resources are concentrated in the hands of a minority, the role of the state is to ensure the stability of that capitalist society, and democracy serves to "separate" political and economic spheres of society in order to defuse potential conflicts. As I pointed out earlier, this discussion of the state concerns a *capitalist* state. However, the relationship between class and the state has been a contradictory one in which "[the nineteenth century] state was necessarily both a universal, representing the interests of society against the market, and a class state, pursuing the agendas of the capitalist class, since the reproduction of capital relations was necessary to preserve society" (Block and Somers, 1984:68). This contradictory relationship is apparent in Aotearoa/New Zealand and provides the basis for a realignment of Marxism and pluralism. In order to do this I shall consider two key aspects of the Marxist approach - reductionism and relative autonomy.

Mann (1988:1) makes the point "that most general theories of the state have been false because they have been reductionist. They have reduced the state to the pre-existing structures of civil society". In particular, the Marxist, liberal and functionalist approaches have viewed the state "predominantly as a place, an *arena*, in which the struggles of classes, interest groups and individuals are expressed and institutionalised". One reason for the reluctance to challenge these approaches is that the alternative was uncomfortably close to fascism. Mann critiques this alternative as being reductionist in another way - to the state rather than civil society (1988:2). In this section I shall address the issue of reductionism and the Marxist "solution" of relative autonomy.

The relative autonomy approach grants the state considerable autonomy from any iron laws of capitalist development. However, while the state can be viewed as independent in some situations, the overall outcome tends to

favour capitalism and capitalists. So some of the reductionist tendencies remain. While each of the society-centred approaches that I have outlined can be described as reductionist, I shall discuss this in relation to Marxism as my primary example. The reason for this is that I shall use a neo-Marxist approach as the basis for "bringing the state back in" in the following chapters.

A general definition of a reductionist approach is that "it attempts to account for a range of phenomena in terms of a single determining factor" (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 1984:203). Mouzelis (1990:6) expands on this to characterise it as "methodologically illegitimate" and the consequences of this is that "possible distinctiveness and internal dynamics is ignored or under-emphasised in a prioristic fashion". The charge of economism is one of the most sustained critiques of Marxism - questioning whether all social, political, cultural and ideological aspects of life can be reduced to the economy in the last instance.

The consequence of a reductionist approach in analysing the state is that the form and actions of the state and the practical implementation of policies is always viewed as in the interests of capital (in the last instance). For example, the entire welfare state is reduced to a functional requirement of capital (functionalist reduction). An extremely reductionist viewpoint also posits the political system (and individuals) as mere mouthpieces of the bourgeoisie. These examples are the more extreme forms of reductionism, and the more "sophisticated" versions of reductionism are of more importance here.

Sophisticated reductionism is a somewhat contradictory concept, however it is an important characteristic of neo-Marxist theories. Hindess (1987:90) points out that reductionism is "endemic to the project of class analysis itself". I accept that reductionism - even in the most eclectic approach - may in fact be unavoidable in any analysis of society. Therefore, if the economic

reductionism of Marxism is viewed as problematic, what resolution is possible with sophisticated reductionism? I don't know if it is possible to resolve this, but the advantages of a sophisticated reductionism are evident in the way that Marxism has developed.

A number of theorists have provided summaries of the development of Marxism[11]. These summaries generally move through several "stages", pointing out the problems of each stage and the partial resolution by the next stages. Thus the "crude" reductionism of Marxism is gradually refined and qualified, with the result of a more complex reductionism (Jessop, 1990:37). The more complex (or sophisticated) forms of Marxism provide for the effects of political structures and individuals, ideological factors and other distinguishing factors such as gender and ethnicity. Thus, sophisticated reductionism allows us to retain the materialist base of Marxism, as well as include other factors (such as aspects of pluralism) in an analysis of contemporary society.

Democracy has an important role to play in the appearance of capitalist states because the separation between the economy and politics implies freedom and choice for individual citizens. However, this can also be viewed as serving a functional purpose for capitalism. Firstly, the state works to provide a unified impression of the capitalist class, and removes any obvious exploitative link. Secondly, because the state is working within a capitalist mode of production, it is subject to structural constraints, such as the need to fulfil the requirement of capital accumulation (Gough, 1979:42). However, while Gough defines the functions of the welfare state as the reproduction of workers and the maintenance of non-workers, he also points out that these "functions" are in fact *tendencies* (1979:51). Like any economic system, capitalism does have certain requirements, and while these need to be met for

---

[11]See Jessop (1990), Mishra (1984), Pierson (1986) for example.

the system to be in an optimal state, capitalism may still survive in a dysfunctional state.

The political relationship between the state and society is the focus of a second type of functional reductionism. This determines the political involvement of individuals. In a crude form, this approach ignores the impact of the "new social movements" (Pierson, 1991:Ch3) by reducing them to epiphenomenon of class. This functionalism denies individuals effective political action by treating all political action as class action. A more sophisticated form of reduction is reached by explaining political actions as "allowed" by the institutions and structures of capitalism. However, this effectively disables any form of political action that challenges those structures. Thus, "pragmatic" aims such as increasing the availability or level of welfare payments may be "allowed", but more serious challenges will not succeed. This form of theorising enables Marxist analyses to identify how and when the state acts in this way, and this provides the background for developing an improved democratic model of the state.

Geras (1987:44) outlines a range of reductionist tendencies that have been evident in Marxism in the debate over how this reductionism leads to a theoretical "closure". I feel that this theoretical closure is necessary, as it is not possible, nor desirable, to evaluate the impact of every aspect of every social structure in every context, as this would lead to mindless eclecticism. Hindess (1987:95) argues that economism (or economic reductionism) is "the failure to acknowledge the complexity of [the] connections" between the economy and other areas of society. Therefore it is the causal processes that relate the economy to other areas of society that need to be developed so that the focus on the economy as the determining feature in Marxist analysis can provide an insightful approach for analysing the state and civil society. It is within this context of sophisticated reductionism that relative autonomy becomes an important concept.

One of the ways that neo-Marxist analysis has attempted to deflect the negative connotations of reductionism is through the concept of relative autonomy. This was developed by Poulantzas and is based on the view that "purely economic criteria are not sufficient to determine and locate social classes" (Poulantzas, 1973:34). When applied to the state, this approach proposes that the state has a degree of autonomy from the capitalist class which explains the contradictory nature of some of its decisions. However, the role of the state is ultimately either functionally or voluntaristically linked to capitalist interests.

Poulantzas (1973) outlines the first of two important facets of relative autonomy. The first of these is that within each class there are contradictory positions and different strata. While these could serve to undermine the objective nature of class, the state provides a mechanism for uniting these different factions so that policies can be developed that have the support of a majority (1973:35). Related to this is the need for the state to have some autonomy in order to make and enforce decisions. While there are a range of influences on decisions, there are only small groups of people who can actually make decisions, and state structures provide them a degree of autonomy from class influences.

The second facet is developed by Miliband (1983) and proposes that while there is agreement that the state is constrained by forces external to it, the nature of those constraints is not specified. One proposal for the mechanism of capitalist class control stresses the changing degree of autonomy that states may enjoy. For example, when the dominant class has a near total hegemonic control, the state is subject to that control; but when the dominant class is facing challenges, that state has increased autonomy. Because of the changing nature of class control, Miliband proposes (1983:62) that we cannot focus exclusively on the Marxist model of state action, but must also include individuals within the state bureaucracy who hold power and exercise it in diverse ways.

The relative autonomy approach has been subject to critique since its inception, especially on the issue of "how relative is relative autonomy?". One point that I would like to make is that the complex nature of social relationships seems to result in all "autonomy" being relative. This is contrary to the "logical" position adopted by Laclau and Mouffe (1987:93) that either autonomy is total, or it doesn't exist. I would agree with the critique of Geras (1987:49) that the three-way conflict of economism vs relative autonomy vs pluralism does not need to be a problem for Marxism on a practical level. In my view, they all contribute to Marxism in a positive way by enabling a richer, more in depth analysis of the state in capitalist societies. Therefore proposing that the state has relative autonomy is not a problematic concept, but rather how this concept is utilised is problematic. There *are* political, cultural, ideological and historical influences on the state, and these are not simply at the individual level, but are also structural. As I have already proposed, reductionism is unavoidable and also the contradictory nature of the concept of relative autonomy is unavoidable, however the expanded analytical tools they contribute to Marxism outweigh these drawbacks, providing they are used with care.

This critique of reductionism also applies to the liberal model, although the liberal approach obviously does not view the state in the same way. However, the liberal approach is based on a market model that also excludes interest groups. Aspects of the liberal approach - such as the importance of individuals can be utilised alongside aspects of the Marxist and pluralist approaches in order to provide a society-centred approach that can be the basis for "bringing the state back in". A range of state-centred and society-centred approaches can thus provide the basis for reassessing a Marxist approach.

Marxist and neo-Marxist approaches provide an excellent basis for analysing and explaining inequalities that exist in social life. These approaches can also provide a strong critical framework that can be used to evaluate alternative

approaches. More recent developments in what could be broadly described as Marxist sociology, shows a trend to grant the state considerable autonomy from strict economic determinism. One example of this is Nicos Mouzelis who proposes a "model of domination" as a complement to "mode of production" analysis (1990). Likewise, pluralist approaches, by viewing the state as an arena, provide an "ideal type" that gives potential credence to all groups, organisations (and individuals) in civil society and the state. Thus all groups have the potential for equal participation in decision-making and resource distribution. However, collective action still needs to be closely evaluated (Melucci, 1988:248-251). How groups form and reform remains important, as does the existence of groups outside the formal political system. Liberalism, with its emphasis on the rights of individuals, can also provide an alternative approach for understanding how and why individuals act.

One basis from which a realignment of Marxism and pluralism can be made is that "marxism offers, as pluralism does not, a detailed theory of history as the necessary backdrop for its sociology of politics" (McLennan, 1989:129). Pierson (1991:101) echoes this sentiment when he notes that the:

> (partially indeterminate) development of welfare states must be understood in a comparative and historical context. Among the most important sources of this development are the actions of interest groups, nationally unique political configurations and varying patterns of state organisation.

By attempting a synthesis of aspects of pluralism with a sophisticated Marxism, it is possible to develop a critical, nuanced approach to studying the state. The state in capitalist society *can* be interpreted as both an institution and an actor that privileges the dominant socio-economic groups. However, a range of factors can be included in an analysis in order to indicate ways in which state formation and reformation is historically specific and not only shaped in response to particular (capitalist) demands. Rather, a range of interest groups (including those within the state system) affect state (re)formation. Ultimately, however, capitalism remains dominant and the inequalities of capitalist societies endure.

5 CONCLUSION

This chapter has been concerned to systematically list and explore the key issues confronting state theory today. Clearly, any one of the dimensions touched upon could readily have been elaborated, and a more detailed position on it adopted. However, it needs to be borne in mind that my general purpose is to construct a coherent and plausible "Preface" to the historical sociology of state formation in New Zealand. In this context, the primary goal is to convene together and inter-relate the full spread of central issues in theorising the state. In doing so, I believe I have also sketched the elements of a useful and authentic standpoint: a society-centred, critical pluralist, but firmly non-reductionist approach to state theory. Whilst distinctive in some ways, this stance is not however, intended to be "exclusionist" as such, though I have argued that "vulgar" versions of societal reductionism and state autonomism are unacceptable. It is to the feasibility of putting some substantive flesh on these theoretical bones that I now turn.

CHAPTER THREE

A THEORY FOR THE DOMAIN:

HALL AND SCHWARZ

1 INTRODUCTION

I want to suggest now that the approach of Stuart Hall and Bill Schwarz meets the principle criteria that I have established for my theoretical framework. In particular, their emphasis on the necessity of linking theoretical developments to historical situations is central. There are, I would argue, five important claims made by Hall and Schwarz in their analysis of the British state between 1880 and 1930. The first of these is that during this period there developed a significant "crisis of liberalism" (1985:7), a crisis of the state that signalled a major shift from the previous state system. This crisis led, in turn, to the development of "'collectivist' forms of state organisation and social regulation" (ibid). Thirdly, Hall and Schwarz stress the uniqueness of the political situation in Britain and do not presume that there already exists a single theoretical model of the state that encompasses the peculiarities of the British situation. Fourthly, the type of representative state[1] that now exists emerged during this time. And, finally, since this period there have been new crises and ongoing contradictions in the continuing process of state reformation (1985:8).

Each of these areas can usefully be considered in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context. However, while much of the Hall and Schwarz argument is directly applicable to Aotearoa/New Zealand between 1840 and 1907, I would also argue that it can be applied to more recent Aotearoa/New Zealand history. In order to discover the wider applicability of the Hall and Schwarz model, it is necessary to break it down into four core aspects, methodologically speaking. The first of these is its basis in Gramscian theory. This theoretical orientation is not apparent from the outline above, but it does provide a critical approach, as well as a number of key concepts that can facilitate an understanding of the relationship between state and civil society. The base

---

[1] In particular, the emphasis has shifted towards a collectivist system of government when compared with earlier forms.

of Gramscian theory also enables a coherent and unified approach to the other three areas. The second core area is the focus on a period of crisis. This is problematic is some respects, and I have clarified this to focus on periods of potential state (re)formation. The third area that Hall and Schwarz focus on is that of political representation. This is, of course, central to the notion of the state in democratic society, and is also a key part of the relationship between state and civil society, even if (given its necessary breadth) this is also an area which must then be divided into a range of further indicators, as I shall demonstrate. Finally, Hall and Schwarz are concerned with the overall, epochal shift from liberalism to collectivism. This is a tension that is also evident in the Aotearoa/New Zealand state system, and it has been resolved in a number of different ways throughout recent times. While Hall and Schwarz set these areas out in a general way, I try to indicate how they could be developed to form a fertile theoretical and empirical framework for studying specific areas of state formation and reformation.

As presented in these quite general terms, the Hall and Schwarz approach seems readily applicable to Aotearoa/New Zealand in the period between 1840-1907. While this implies a level of generalisability with respect to the Hall and Schwarz model, I am primarily interested here in using the model to investigate the complex characteristics specific to Aotearoa/New Zealand state development. It can also be noted, as Hall and Schwarz do (ibid), that since the state and civil society obviously continue to evolve and change, 1907 (or any other cut-off point) must be viewed in some ways as being a rather arbitrary cutoff point, and the type of analysis followed in this thesis could certainly be extended to more recent developments. The following discussion, however, restricts itself to the elaboration of the core areas of the Hall and Schwarz approach and their relevance for discussing the period between 1840 and 1907. Following this outline I shall use these four (methodological or substantive) highlighted areas to assess a selection of existing writing on this period of Aotearoa/New Zealand history.

2 KEY POINTS OF THE GRAMSCIAN APPROACH

The way in which Hall and Schwarz have developed their use of Gramsci is set out in another essay by Hall:

> We must see the state as having the specific role of creating the political and ideological conditions in which the whole society can be conformed to or brought into line with fundamental trends or tendencies in the social formation. The conditions in which this "reconstruction" can come about are, however, conditional on the effective mastery of the political and ideological, as well as the economic, terrain; also, on the formation of a social bloc, comprising sections of different classes, which forms the necessary underpinning for the state; and on the winning over to this bloc of a signification section of the popular classes. (Hall, 1984b:11)

This passage clearly highlights the complexity of the relationship between the state and civil society. However, while Gramsci *did* introduce alternatives to a traditional Marxist approach to the state/society relationship, he still retained as a theoretical assumption the primacy of the economic sphere. This development involved a reassessment of the base/superstructure relationship. Also, the introduction of the concept of hegemony provides a powerful tool for relating theory to actual situations. While Gramsci developed a number of facets of Marx's approach to studying society, the unfinished nature of his work has led to a range of interpretations of it (see Mouffe, 1979). I shall sidestep most of the issues relating to the varying interpretations to focus on the three areas of historical sociology, state definition and relationship with civil society that can be utilised in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context.

Gramsci's approach provides a strong base on which to practise historical sociology. In part this builds on Marx in which "[t]he typicality of an event, then, is not given by its intrinsic properties; rather, it is determined by both its intrinsic properties and its function within a system" (Morera, 1990;23). While particular events are historically specific, it is also possible to develop

ideas and theories about structures, tendencies and regularities which appear across history. These regularities also enable comparisons between different societies and across time (Morera, 1990:148) as they provide a basis from which comparisons can be made.

This, in effect, provides the basis on which it is possible to utilise historical information, while avoiding the pitfalls of positivism, historicism and empiricism. The Gramscian framework is also broad enough to encourage the collection of a wide range of information from which to develop and test hypotheses. Perhaps it is almost too broad - trying to cover all of the areas raised could be a very complex (and expensive) exercise. However, within the overall framework it is feasible to focus on one particular event, or even one aspect of an event. This material can then be used to develop direct comparisons with other events, or for refining the theoretical approach.

As with the definition I have outlined earlier, Gramsci's definition of the state is broad, encompassing "the entire complex of political and theoretical activity by which the ruling classes not only justify and maintain their domination but also succeed in obtaining the active consent of the governed" (1949, cited Femia, 1981:28). However, Gramsci's definition also differs somewhat in that civil society (along with political society) is included in the state (ibid). While I shall maintain a distinction between civil society and the state, the way in which civil society is defined and discussed can be retained.

My conception of the state does differ to a certain degree from that of Gramsci. As I have pointed out earlier, the distinction between civil society and the state is *analytical*, and where to draw the line remains problematic. In the terms of my analytical framework, this distinction is drawn at the level of the institutions of government and the public service. I make the distinction at the institutional level, in part, because the individuals working within those institutions necessarily bridge the gap between civil society and the state as a part of their working life. Those individuals also characterise

the contradictory nature of the state. Individuals may be a part of a process that conflicts with aspects of their lives in civil society, or indeed with other parts of the state. The state is not entirely unified, but encompasses a range of contradictions and conflicts - which may in turn reflect or shape similar differences in civil society.

The distribution of power between the state (or political society in Gramsci) and civil society is an important part of state autonomy. As I have indicated, the state, by definition, has a monopoly over the legitimate use of violence. The ability to enforce decisions is central to the ability of the state to function. While it is preferable for citizens to believe in their obligations to the state (hegemony), the state must be able to ensure that revenues are collected and public order is maintained (whether or not citizens necessarily support those measures is another matter). The state also has a huge impact on the economy. The way in which the state distributes revenue, structures the national economy and negotiates on an international level is also central to state power. State power provides the basis for a degree of state autonomy. Needless to say, international factors and economic trends may also be outside the control of the state. How state autonomy is secured and maintained is thus central to an analysis of the relationship between state and civil society.

The Gramscian basis of the Hall and Schwarz model also draws upon the importance of civil society, as I have outlined in the previous chapter. Gramsci develops the idea of civil society (alongside hegemony) in a way that differs from the traditional Marxist interpretation. Gramsci "identified civil society with the *ideological* superstructure, the institutions and technical instruments that create and diffuse modes of thought" (Femia, 1981:26). This is a contentious interpretation of Gramsci that I do not completely accept. Rather, I interpret this position as highlighting the development *within* civil society of hegemonic justifications for the role of the state in capitalist societies. Thus it is in civil society that the battle for the hearts and minds of

the general population takes place[2]. By presenting civil society in this way, Gramsci increases the importance of the superstructure. The base/superstructure relationship is not solely one-way, and as Femia points out (1981:121) the "*base determines what forms of consciousness are possible*". The analytical distinction does involve considerable overlap in practice, and in terms of causal analysis, it is not possible to clearly distinguish base and superstructure (Femia, 1981:218). However, on an analytical level, it is possible to distinguish between base and superstructure while acknowledging that in practice a straightforward division does not occur.

There is considerable debate over the relationship between structure and superstructure with respect to Gramsci (see Morera, 1990:134-160). In particular, Bobbio argues that civil society is a part of the superstructural realm in Gramsci's approach (1979:30) and that the ideological realm has primacy over the institutional (1979:36). These are direct inversions of the Marxist approach, and while I do not wish to discuss this in detail, they provide an indication of the way in which Gramsci addresses the complexity of these relationships. Gramsci acknowledges this when he comments:

> Between the premise (economic structure) and the consequence (political organisation) relations are by no means simple and direct: and it is not only by economic facts that the history of a people can be documented. It is a complex and confusing task to unravel its causes and in order to do so, a deep and widely diffused study of all spiritual and practical activities is needed. (1918, cited Bobbio, 1979:33)

I shall simplify this debate by noting that it is possible to view civil society as having aspects of *both* base and superstructure, as does the state. Therefore, while civil society could be interpreted as base and socio-economic relations (and the state as superstructure and political relations) the complexity of existing society warrants a reassessment of these divisions. By

---

[2]This can occur in a variety of ways - for example, Mouffe (1979:182) suggests that either a passive revolution ("transformism") or "expansive hegemony" involving "active, direct consensus" may be involved.

highlighting this distinction, I am aiming to avoid the problem identified by Ransome that "a problem with Marx's analysis of ideology is that it remains on the level of the economic, thus ignoring the role of the superstructure in developing individuals' perceptions of reality" (Ransome, 1992:121). The establishment of hegemony (for example, the acceptance of the structures and jurisdiction of the state in a capitalist society) involves, in part, the justification of a capitalist economy (or base), but it also relates to the way in which individuals perceive the state structures and the decisions made by state employees. While it is difficult to distinguish between the acceptance of the role of the state and economic reasons for that acceptance, Gramsci's approach allows for this possibility *in principle*.

This brings the discussion back to the issue of state-centred or society-centred approaches. The Gramscian approach is society-centred, in that ultimately, socio-economic relations have causal primacy. By using Gramsci as the theoretical background, the Marxist/pluralist realignment that was discussed in the previous chapter can be accommodated. Importantly, this retains as a core basis the critical approach to the state. This is valuable because, in the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand, it provides a way of assessing how the structure of the state (and legislation) may have advantaged particular groups. In particular, it is possible to look at how the state may have provided benefits to particular groups (eg. settler over Maori). While I have defined the state in more general terms, using this approach clearly accepts an unequal power distribution that is based, to a certain degree, upon economic position in a society based on a capitalist economy.

However, as McLennan (1989:261) points out:

> [t]he broad-scale categories of historical materialism, when applied by writers sensitive both to the problem of reductionism and to the challenge of pluralism, continue to produce an impressive array of theses and suggestions about the politico-cultural impact of developments in the modes of production.

The advantages of a Gramscian approach over a vulgar Marxist approach is that it allows political and cultural factors to be viewed as significant, so in some instances the state, for example, may have a degree of autonomy. The circular relationship between the state and civil society certainly makes causal analysis very difficult. In the complex conjuncture of events, structures and individuals that marked the emergence of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state, this "looseness" in analytical framework is important. The Gramscian approach enables other factors (alongside the economy) to be considered, and as we shall see, this enables a richer understanding of the unique circumstances that occurred as the Aotearoa/New Zealand state developed.

3   CRISIS: A PERIOD OF POTENTIAL STATE (RE)FORMATION

An important part of the Hall and Schwarz approach centres on the notion of crisis. While they note that it is possible (1985:8-9) to utilise a range of different meanings for the term, they ultimately view this as a useful focus. The definition that they use is set out by Hall (1984b:12) as:

> a period when a significant rupture, break or breakdown occurs in the processes and institutions which are fundamental to the working of a society. A crisis is a break in the social relations and institutions which bind society together; or which enable it to maintain and reproduce itself on the same basis as before.

Clearly, this corresponds closely to the idea of hegemony as developed by Gramsci. However, I would also argue that this definition must include major developments which occur alongside, before or after any "break" that constitutes a crisis.

Focusing on crises is undoubtedly interesting and provides many opportunities for new information and analyses. Given that I advocate an historical perspective, it is not possible to ignore the way in which periods of

crisis; a) have taken place over a relatively long time frame, and b) have their roots in events that may have occurred a century before. The extent of the upheaval at all levels of a society undergoing some kind of crisis provides a wealth of material to focus upon.

In the Aotearoa/New Zealand case the period 1840-1907 (as well as others) would fit this definition. Using the Hall and Schwarz model would enable comparison between Great Britain and Aotearoa/New Zealand (1880-1930 and 1840-1907 respectively), as well as between different crisis periods in Aotearoa/New Zealand history. From a slightly different perspective, periods of relative stability may indicate, in very similar ways, how that very stability and apparent consensus is attained. It is not only times of hegemonic upheaval or replacement that the mechanisms through which hegemony is maintained are apparent. Thus, focusing on a period of crisis is open to critique.

For the purpose of this research, clarifying the concept of crisis is warranted - and results in further clarification of other key aspects of the Hall and Schwarz approach. The primary alteration that I have made to the Hall and Schwarz approach is to view a period of "crisis" as a period of "potential state (re)formation". The first point to note about this alteration is that the time that is focussed on could be either a time of upheaval, or of stability. Obviously, it would be rather contradictory to refer to times of stability as periods of crisis! By reconsidering what type of time frame may be utilised, this provides the opportunity to focus on *any* time in the history of the state, as even in times of stability the state is continually being reformed through day-to-day activities. However, as with the time frame that I have identified, it is also possible to focus on times of upheaval.

The second key reason for this redefinition is that the idea of state (re)formation enables us to consider that formation of a new state (and nation-state) as well as analysing changes or reformations of existing states.

Again, in the time frame that I have identified, the Aotearoa/New Zealand state was being *formed*, while in the Hall and Schwarz example the British state was undergoing a major reformation. In the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand, the period from 1840-1907 encompasses a series of "crises" (or challenges) that occurred *alongside* the development of the state *and* civil society in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Therefore, the type of state formation must be different to the reformation of the state in Britain. However, as with Britain, "there occurred a *succession* of crises of the state, each only incompletely and partially resolved before new antagonisms arose, which in their combination amounted to a crisis of the social order itself" (Hall & Schwarz, 1985:9). The particular challenges were different, but their effect was remarkably similar. In Aotearoa/New Zealand, these challenges included the appropriation of land, the role of Maori (and the Aotearoa/New Zealand Wars), political autonomy from Britain, the extension of the franchise, economic depression, the establishment and activities of unions, and the shift from provincial to central political control.

However, while the Aotearoa/New Zealand state was being formed, the initial emphasis was on a liberal approach to the state. As the state developed, the emphasis shifted towards a more collectivist approach - as was occurring in Britain. While Aotearoa/New Zealand did not have the same tradition of liberalism as Britain (Hall & Schwarz, 1985:10-11), initially (prior to the 1890s) the state was "liberal", in that individualism characterised both the state and settler[3] civil society as they developed. This was, in part, the foundation of the myth of egalitarian society, in which any individual could work hard and improve their position in life. Even the system of political representation was based on individuals (parties were not formed until the 1890s), who would negotiate to form governments after they were elected. Thus, for settlers, liberalism could be viewed as hegemonic.

---

[3]While some Maori embraced the ideals of liberalism, I think it is fair to say that to a large extent Maori were effectively excluded from this monocultural version of liberal society.

Hall and Schwarz characterise their period of crisis as a crisis of *liberalism* - both in civil society and the state (ibid). This was also the case in New Zealand, but it was also a crisis of colonialism. And, importantly, the crisis of colonialism was not resolved. From the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, Maori rights were eroded and land was appropriated until the 1890s when the treaty was declared "a nullity" (see Pearson, 1990:146-147) and their land holdings had dwindled to around 11 million acres (Orange, 1987:186). Power had passed from Maori, to the representative of the British parliament, to the Aotearoa/New Zealand parliament. The requirement for individual land ownership prevented many Maori from voting, and they had been "granted" four Maori seats in parliament which was considerably less than a proportional amount. A number of Maori had grouped together to form the Kotahitanga, but were unable to secure political equity. This crisis of colonialism has never been resolved, but provides an example of how the selection of a fixed period of analysis can be problematic. While some issues can be viewed as resolved or having a definite outcome or direction, others can be viewed as remaining problematic.

A third aspect of altering the definition of crisis is that I wish to emphasise that there is no pre-ordained outcome to state (re)formation. Thus I am not concerned with charting a pre-ordained or inevitable shift such as the Marxist shift from feudalism to capitalism. Rather, there were a range of possible outcomes, and we can develop hypotheses as to why the state developed in the way that it did. This builds on the Gramscian basis in that the focus is not solely on the socio-economic relations as the driving force. However, the socio-economic relations can still be viewed as a central, and possibly causal, factor in combination with political and cultural factors.

The combination of challenges involved in state formation and reformation in Aotearoa/New Zealand, can still be assessed within the Hall and Schwarz framework. The developments that occurred throughout civil society and in the state are important. Economic developments, in the shape of land

settlement and development (by settlers), refrigeration, the end of the Long Depression and the increased role of the state in the economy were central and underline the links between civil society and the state. The Gramscian basis allows consideration of the effect of the changing economy, colonial issues, and the development of nationalism on the state (and vice versa). This acknowledgement of complexity is what makes the Hall and Schwarz approach particularly relevant to state reformation in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

4 POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

Reshaping the Hall and Schwarz concept of crisis also has implications for the way in which they view political representation. As I shall suggest, political representation remains a key indicator, both in terms of identifying an area that demonstrates the changes or stability that are being focussed on and in assessing how these issues were resolved (or not resolved). I have approached this discussion firstly by showing how the Aotearoa/New Zealand situation can be viewed in relation to the Hall and Schwarz approach. I then indicate ways in which this broad focus on political representation can be made more specific by viewing different aspects of political representation in isolation. Thus, what Hall and Schwarz develop as one indicator becomes the basis for a range of indicators. Research can then focus on only one indicator, or on a selection. As I shall argue in the following section, with regard to state (re)formation, these indicators can then be used to assess changes of emphasis towards individualism or collectivism in state activity.

With regard to the time span that they are considering, Hall and Schwarz note that the ideas of political representation, the nation and equality of citizenship developed and changed. This led, in turn, to increasing conflict within established political parties and systems (1985:13). A combination of changes in the capitalist class, international relationships and new social

movements also led to increasing pressures for the construction of a new type of state (1985:16). As a result of this, "[t]he relations between state and society were dramatically reconstituted. But in some senses certain features of the British crises were permanent, and in any fundamental sense, remained - and remain - unresolved" (ibid). Whichever challenge to the state is focused on, the issues of political representation must be considered, but this does not mean that any long term resolution will be achieved.

When considering this issue of political representation with respect to Aotearoa/New Zealand there are four indicators that can be developed and assessed. The first of these is British colonial control and how this shifted to the Aotearoa/New Zealand parliament. This is important because this process involved the implementation of the New Zealand Constitution, and a parliament based on the British model. Thus the Aotearoa/New Zealand state was established, and this has affected all future developments in political representation. Secondly, the formal extension of the franchise must be charted. This involves a consideration of how and why changes were made, as well as consideration of the politicians who stood for office, and those who were elected.

Thirdly, the inclusion of Maori must be considered. Initially the land ownership requirements excluded many Maori from voting. However, as the franchise was extended, Maori sought a degree of political autonomy that, although it was allowed for in Section 71 of the 1852 New Zealand Constitution, was not granted. Clearly, the emphasis remained on retaining one central decision-making body, and this would be a monocultural Westminster system parliament. Finally, the area of political representation includes those civil or public servants who worked within the state system and played an active role in policy development.

These four indicators of political representation developed from the Hall and Schwarz approach provide the basis for outlining and explaining the

development of the state as a part of a struggle for democracy. This cannot be divorced from an economic analysis, as the expansion of the state requires funding - both for state employees and in administering the increased involvement of citizens. This area of the Hall and Schwarz approach can be utilised to assess the role played by individuals and events in civil society as a part of state (re)formation. However, each of these indicators can be considered separately. Thus, we can isolate colonial state control, the franchise, Maori political incorporation and state employees as key areas for analysis[4].

The background from which these issues are approached remains Gramscian, therefore socio-economic relationships, ideological arguments and the complex relations between civil society and the state figure in all these areas. From this basis, the empirical evidence can be configured in order to chart the historical developments for each indicator. This information can then be assessed in order to ascertain the way in which a particular indicator affected state (re)formation. In particular, shifts in emphasis (on collectivism or individualism) in the state can be investigated.

If state employees were used as an example, analysis of this indicator of state (re)formation could follow a variety of paths. In the period I am considering the number of government departments and employees increased. This can be viewed as a desire or requirement of existing state employees (whether in Britain or Aotearoa/New Zealand) to develop the state as an institution (state-centred). Alternatively, a society-centred approach could view the increase as a result of an increasing population, an improving economy and/or the development of an education system to provide white-collar workers. Given that I support a society-centred explanation, this can then be

---

[4]This is a limited list - detailed consideration could also be given to the role of women in the state and the mobilisation of workers (unions).

utilised to assess whether the changes indicate (in my case) an increased emphasis on collectivism in the state system.

5 A SHIFT IN EMPHASIS - INDIVIDUALISM TO COLLECTIVISM

My example in the previous section brings this discussion to the final core area of the Hall and Schwarz approach. This relates to the way in which they identify a breakdown of individualism and a simultaneous development of collectivism. In any state there is a tension between taking a collective approach to societal issues, or devolving responsibility to individuals. Obviously, for the state to exist at all there must be an acceptance of a degree of collectivism. However, how far the collective approach is extended depends on the dominant hegemony, as well as the structure of the state and the role of particular individuals.

My reassessment of the Hall and Schwarz approach involves generalising their discussion of individualism and collectivism. My outline for the analysis of state (re)formation is thus concerned with using a range of indicators over a selected time span in order to chart stability or shifts in emphasis on state collectivism. I have termed this "shifts in emphasis" because it is not possible for a state to become the embodiment of the individualist (liberal) or collectivist ideal type. In the Aotearoa/New Zealand case there is a continual possibility for change in the emphasis on a collectivist or individualist state structure.

The period that Hall and Schwarz refer to is concerned with a shift from individualism (liberalism) to collectivism. In this case, liberalism "describes not an absence of controls, but a specific means by which market forces are politically regulated" (1985:18). I have discussed liberalism in more detail earlier, however, the key aspect is the emphasis on the individual and

individual responsibility. Thus the state has a very limited role, and civil society is viewed as being comprised of individuals. In contrast, collectivism "refers to the process by which state policy became organised around class or corporate rather than individual interests" (1985:16). Of course the same individuals (or groups) may benefit under both systems, but the emphasis has changed, along with the role of the state. Under the collectivist approach there is wider sanctioning of state intervention, and this intervention may occur in ways that have a negative impact on the capitalist class.

Hall and Schwarz outline two, slightly contradictory, mechanisms at work in the shift from individual to collectivist forms of state action. Firstly, as I have outlined in the previous section, collectivism was a part of the struggle for mass democracy. It was also a result of the alternative hegemony in which previously disadvantaged groups laid claim "to a more equal share in the social goods to which citizenship entitled them" (Hall & Schwarz, 1985:20). These "pressures from below" (ibid) resulted in demands for better representation in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the formation of political parties and contributed to the development of government policies such as the Factories Act and Old Age Pensions (OAP) Act that provided protection for workers and the destitute elderly.

However, the second interpretation of these changes can also be viewed as forms of paternalistic disciplinary regulation based on Social Darwinism (ibid). Thus, increasing revenues in a period of economic prosperity enabled the state to intervene in civil society in order to control and structure social life. For example, distinctions between deserving and undeserving poor or the establishment of structures in the state and civil society can be viewed as the imposition of state control over perceived dysfunctions (Hall & Schwarz, 1985:19) that removes control from individuals or groups in the community. The shift to collectivist forms of state activity was not necessarily always beneficial, and nor did it necessarily resolve existing problems. The Gramscian basis of the Hall and Schwarz approach encompasses

consideration of the challenges to the existing individualist hegemony and its (at least partial) replacement. However, throughout these changes, we can also assess who continued to benefit from state activity, and who formed the influential new groupings within the state.

In order to be able to chart any shift from individualism to collectivism it is necessary to consider what type of indicators are considered. There are a number of indicators that can be identified and investigated in the shift from a *laissez faire* (classical liberal) state to state intervention. One that is amenable to quantitative research is the development of institutional structures for the regulation of economic and public life (banking, taxation, police, education, a judicial system etc). From the Gramscian concern with the development and maintenance of hegemony, the assessment of ideologies around "the nation" and the "public good" can be developed. I am not concerned here with specifying how these areas should be developed in detail, but this indicates some possibilities that the revised Hall and Schwarz approach allows for.

These mechanisms highlight the utility of the Gramscian basis of Hall and Schwarz. That is, individuals in civil society can have an impact on state (re)formation *and* the state can have a degree of autonomy in the way that demands from civil society are implemented. At this point, it is important to reiterate that I do not wish to reify either civil society or the state. It is the actions of individuals or groups of individuals that I am referring to - and I am concerned with how the actions of individuals can be assessed through the institutions of the state or civil society[5]. Thus, at any point in time, the role of civil society and the state can be assessed in order to determine a benchmark of state collectivism for the chosen indicators (ie. for state employees in 1852 this could be viewed as "low"). Then, using the theoretical

---

[5]In particular, the role played by state employees (for example the development of policy) is often recorded as a final, collectively produced document.

and methodological framework that provides the initial benchmark, the empirical information can be assessed in order to identify whether a shift has occurred. At the same time the possible causes for the shift (or lack of one) can be assessed.

6 CONCLUSION

In this discussion, I have argued that, with care, it is fruitful to utilise the Hall and Schwarz approach outside the British context. Firstly, Hall and Schwarz provide a Gramscian framework for their discussion of Britain which is generalisable outside their particular place and period of concern. This model places a strong emphasis on economic dynamics, and in particular on the over-determining effect of the capitalist mode of production of Britain. As such it is manifestly a society-centred approach. However, this framework is also utilised to provide a detailed analysis of the political sphere in Britain, and I believe, allows for a considerable degree of state autonomy, in analysing the major historical transformations. As a broad framework, a Gramscian approach provides both conceptual coherence and the basis for a critical analysis. Having said that, it is true of course that this model does need considerable modification for application to the Aotearoa/New Zealand situation.

Secondly, the time frame - although differing slightly to the one I have chosen concerns similar state systems undergoing similar changes. The issues of political representation and a shift to collectivism were being addressed by both countries. There were also changes occurring in civil society in both countries. Identifying these similarities does not mean that the changes were identical in Britain and Aotearoa/New Zealand - they had different backgrounds and they were resolved (or not resolved) in different ways. Also, the changes occurring in each country were noted by the other - reports on the changes were published in newspapers and the two countries shared

a common background of literature from which to justify the courses of action that were taken.

One crucial area for us, that Hall and Schwarz address only in passing (1985:13-14), is colonialism. In the Aotearoa/New Zealand case, as I shall show, this must be developed as a central part of any adequate analytical framework. The concept of colonialism can be used to structure our understanding of the settlement of Aotearoa/New Zealand by (primarily) British settlers, the mode of production, relationships with Maori, the development of the state and the economic fortunes of the colony. Relationships between the British government, the settler colony and Maori, between the settler state and Maori, and between the Aotearoa/New Zealand state and the British state all need to be addressed in order to chart the development of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. This type of research endeavour cannot ignore the importance of Crown and settler or Pakeha relationships with Maori in this process of modernisation and state-formation. It is in this area that a study of Aotearoa/New Zealand differs markedly from that of Britain.

This issue of colonialism provides a major impetus for the redevelopment of the Hall and Schwarz approach. Given that the Gramscian theoretical basis is broad enough to encompass a range of non-economic areas this is feasible. While certainly retaining a critical basis to socio-economic relations, the possibility remains for considerable state autonomy, and the inclusion of political or cultural factors in a nuanced (if not ultimately non-reductionist) way.

In summary, with this approach analysis proceeds by selecting a time frame that encompasses the type of potential for state (re)formation that is of interest. As with Hall and Schwarz, I have selected a time of major upheaval in which similar challenges to the state occurred in both countries. By considering a range of indicators that could be combined under the heading

of political representation, it is then possible to assess whether a shift in emphasis on collectivism has occurred. As I have indicated, I do not intend to attempt an application of this model to the empirical evidence to the Aotearoa/New Zealand "case" as such. On one level, that is simply too huge a task for this study on its own. On another level, it is also too bald and naive a suggestion, to assume that by developing some concepts and identifying a theoretical framework, that the process of rediscovering the history of the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand can automatically be accomplished. The aim of this research is to provide a coherent basis for further development, rather than developing each aspect of the Hall and Schwarz model and applying them. Instead, consistent with my earlier discussion on historiography, I hold the material of history to be a matter of "sources" and their reconstruction. Accordingly, I find it more satisfactory to critically focus, in the last phase of this dissertation, on some reconstructive *commentaries* on Aotearoa/New Zealand history, rather than assume that the way is clear for me directly to supply or rediscover new empirical information.

CHAPTER FOUR

A SELECTIVE REVIEW OF

NEW ZEALAND TEXTS

1 INTRODUCTION

The approach outlined by Hall and Schwarz provides the basis for a critical historical sociology of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. However as their position is developed in a single book chapter, I have indicated that some clarification is necessary. In brief, this would involve utilising the Gramscian theoretical position to structure a society-centred, historical approach to state (re)formation. The time frame that is addressed is selected by the revised notion of crisis - a period of potential state (re)formation. This time frame can then be assessed to identify key areas that mark a change in state emphasis on collectivism. In the time frame that I am concerned with, this involves aspects of political representation (as with Hall and Schwarz), socio-economic changes and colonial relationships. Thus, we have reached the stage at which it is possible to sketch how the historical evidence can be assessed.

As I indicated in the introduction, a detailed application of theory to evidence is not possible here. In order to indicate how this clarification of Hall and Schwarz is applicable to Aotearoa/New Zealand in the period 1840-1907, I have elected to discuss four existing texts that consider the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Existing writing that deals with the history and sociology of Aotearoa/New Zealand covers a wide range of areas and approaches. This is not an attempt to provide any sort of representative overview, but rather to identify a range of approaches and assess their relevance for the implementation of the Hall and Schwarz approach. The texts that I have chosen vary in their range of focus and their disciplinary background. I have divided them into two categories for analysis. Firstly, I shall look at what I have characterised as the "history" texts - *The Oxford History of New Zealand (OHNZ)* and Claudia Orange's *The Treaty of Waitangi*. I shall then move on to sociology via Chris Wilkes' "The state as an historical subject" and David Pearson's *A Dream Deferred*.

The structure of this chapter is rather complex, as I am considering four texts in relation to the four strands of the Hall and Schwarz approach. I have therefore provided an outline of these texts in the first section. I then discuss the issue of theory. This discussion is not simply a consideration of the way in which the Hall and Schwarz approach can provide improved insights on these texts. Rather, Hall and Schwarz and these authors (as well as others) explicitly address theoretical issues to varying degrees. My discussion is concerned with the issues of historical sociology and the state as well as the Gramscian approach of Hall and Schwarz and the approaches that can be identified from these texts. Following this discussion, I consider how the period of crisis or potential for state (re)formation can be identified in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This raises a number of issues, including socio-economic changes, the development of "the nation", political representation and colonial relationships.

The next section then expands on the area of political representation. This considers the franchise, and also colonial relationships. Alongside the issues identified in the "crisis" section this indicates the areas that can be included in analysis, as well as possible indicators for collectivism or individualism as the dominant style of state formation. The final section considers how it is possible to develop a preliminary hypothesis that there *was* a shift from individualism to collectivism during the period 1840-1907. The Aotearoa/New Zealand state developed from events prior to 1840, with one key step the formation of a system of nominally independent government after the 1852 New Zealand Constitution Act. After 1852 there was a considerable time of ongoing changes to the state structure. It was by no means inevitable that there would be a continuing trend towards collectivism, but after the developments of the 1890s, the emphasis remained on a collectivist approach.

When considered in light of the approach that I have outlined, it is clear that these texts provide a wealth of information. While none of the authors take

a similar approach to the one I am advocating, they each provide valuable insights, and so I have used them to indicate how the revised Hall and Schwarz approach can build upon them in order to more completely structure this domain of study. Studying the process of state (re)formation in Aotearoa/New Zealand *is* complex, and establishing parameters for research remains difficult. These texts show how a range of authors have studied Aotearoa/New Zealand history between 1840 and 1907, and indicate the evidence that could be utilised in an application of the revised Hall and Schwarz model.

2 OUTLINE OF THE FOUR TEXTS

The two history books that I have chosen are recent texts rather than earlier writings. I have chosen these because, while they do not address issues in the way I am suggesting, they cover many of the relevant issues. My approach has been to indicate the way in which the areas that I have developed from the Hall and Schwarz model are addressed by these authors. Sociological approaches differ considerably from those of historians and the texts that I have chosen here involve two very different approaches. The first of these is Chris Wilkes' periodisation of state formation, "The state as an historical subject". The second is not concerned with the state per se, but ethnic conflict in Aotearoa/New Zealand. David Pearson's *A Dream Deferred* provides a very good example of historical sociology, as well as historical information which has relevance for an historical sociology of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. Both texts set out a framework for the analysis of their respective areas and then develop an analysis using historical examples to build a case. Regardless of the focus of the analysis, much useful information can be taken from these texts.

The Oxford History of New Zealand (OHNZ) provides 22 chapters that cover Aotearoa/New Zealand history from early Maori/Polynesian settlement to 1992. The contributing writers are not only historians, but are drawn from a range of disciplines. However, this diversity is not explicitly commented on - in the main, the contributors outline and discuss historical events, processes, individuals and groups without referring to any theoretical or empirical frameworks - although they are sometimes referenced. The presentation of *OHNZ* is also as individual chapters, and while these chapters overlap to a certain degree, there is no attempt to integrate these discussions.

The two sections of particular relevance to my research are "Part Two: Growth and Conflict" and "Part Three: A Time of Transition", which deal with the periods from 1840-1890 and 1890-1935 respectively. I have selected these periods because I feel that the time between 1840 and 1890 was the time in which, firstly, the New Zealand Constitution (1952) was enacted, enabling a nominally independent settler government. Secondly, relations between Maori and settlers/Pakeha reached possibly their lowest ebb with the Aotearoa/New Zealand Wars and widespread land confiscation or dubious "legal" sales. Thirdly, the economy also went through a major depression - although refrigeration and mechanisation developed. Finally, the social structure of the young colony developed - this included class divisions, but avoided a direct replication of the British system.

The second period, from 1890 to 1910 (1907 in my analysis) saw the development of organised political parties, increased state involvement in society, the development of unions and the extension of the public or civil service. These developments were in large part a result of the previous period. This period of state building is of primary importance for my discussion, as it relates to the idea of "crisis" developed by Hall and Schwarz. However, the period beforehand provides both the information about

previous events that were built on in the 1890s (continuity) and those areas that were markedly altered (change). By the end of these 20 years, Aotearoa/New Zealand had Dominion status (1907) however, it was not until 1941 that Aotearoa/New Zealand became a "sovereign independent state" (McIntyre, 1992:346), although this option had been possible since 1931. Thus the *OHNZ* authors do provide a range of approaches that (albeit indirectly at times) concern the development of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state system.

The Treaty of Waitangi

Another key historical text is *The Treaty of Waitangi* by Claudia Orange. This text takes the Treaty as its central focus, but continues analysis of its role up to 1897. Once again, the relationships between settlers and Maori are reviewed and Orange indicates the way Maori land was used as the basis for building the economic potential of the Aotearoa/New Zealand colony. The focus is explicitly on the national rather than international level (1987:1). She also indicates the way in which Maori were not clearly informed of the shift from colonial to settler government. Because of this, Maori were encouraged to petition the Queen, or even go to Britain in order to raise issues relating to the Treaty. However, this was a futile exercise once power had shifted to the Aotearoa/New Zealand parliament. Orange also considers Aotearoa/New Zealand to fit into a general pattern of "colonial domination of indigenous races" (1987:5) - in spite of the Treaty.

As with the authors of *OHNZ*, Orange does not use a particular theoretical approach to structure her discussion. One striking aspect of this text is the focus on the role played by individuals. A considerable part of the book charts the actions of particular individuals (both Maori and Pakeha) and their effect on the interpretations of the treaty. This focus on individuals is at the expense of a detailed outline of the social, political and economic structures of both Maori and British settler societies. However, Orange also indicates,

as do other historical writers and biographers, the important role played by individuals in the development of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. While Orange focuses more on relationships between Maori and the government than state development per se, the key events that relate to state development are addressed and described. I have limited my discussion of *The Treaty of Waitangi* primarily to the time frame *after* the signing of the Treaty, until the turn of the century. I do not deny the importance of the *process* of the Treaty signing, however this research is concerned with interpretations of the Treaty after it was signed. *The Treaty of Waitangi* provides most detail on events prior to 1890, and it is in the 1890s when a large number of reforms altered the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. However, these changes certainly arose from events prior to 1890.

"The state as an historical subject"

Wilkes outlines and develops his "periodisation" of Aotearoa/New Zealand history in two texts, "The state as an historical subject" (1993) and *The Tragedy of the Market* (O'Brien & Wilkes, 1993). *The Tragedy of the Market* is primarily concerned with recent Aotearoa/New Zealand history. Broadly speaking, this type of analysis is developed in seven key areas - production, consumption, politics (eg. consensus vs authoritarian), employment, equity, class relations and political culture. Wilkes and O'Brien (1993:14-27) use these areas to assess the shift from Fordism to Post-Fordism in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In "The state as an historical subject", Wilkes uses two criteria in order to structure his periodisation of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. The first of these concerns "the nature of the social forces (and especially class forces) which impinge on the State", while the second concentrates on "State activities, most obviously expressed in the shape of policies which emanate from the State" (1993:192). This could be conceived as a type of pluralism (the broker state) - which does allow for a degree of state autonomy.

However, Wilkes is not concerned with evaluating his approach relative to a pluralist, Marxist or other type of approach.

I have chosen to discuss Wilkes' approach because it is directly concerned with the development of the state. This is important because a model that can provide detailed information on the development of the state in the nineteenth century, can then be applied to more recent history. Of particular concern is whether this deals adequately with colonialism, as the issues that were apparent prior to 1900 recur throughout the 1900s. This is one reason why developing a model that is applicable to New Zealand's early years is important. The Fordist/Post-Fordist analytical distinction has primarily arisen to deal with changes in more recent history - as is apparent from the derivation of its name. It does provide a different emphasis on the organisation of production within capitalist modes of production, but does not deal with colonialism as a distinct issue.

Historical sociology that focuses on the Aotearoa/New Zealand state is very limited at present, and Wilkes' approach is indicative of this. Wilkes does state (1993:207) that this model is in the early stages of development. Given that this is a relatively short chapter, it was obviously not possible to expand on some of the issues that are raised. However, Wilkes does identify a number of areas that warrant further investigation.

A Dream Deferred

In contrast, Pearson is able, in his book, to provide a more theoretically detailed and cohesive approach to historical sociology. The text *A Dream Deferred* (1990) does not deal primarily with the Aotearoa/New Zealand state, although it is covered in relation to the other material. Pearson's focus is on ethnic conflict and how it has developed in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Key factors that are defined by Pearson in this process are colonialism, labour

migration and the role of the state in shaping, encouraging or reacting to changes. While the subject of Pearson's book differs somewhat from the primary focus of the Hall and Schwarz model, I feel that its inclusion is warranted as an important example of historical sociology.

Pearson notes (1990:6) that "the origins of ethnic conflict in New Zealand are complex and are best studied through an appreciation of a multifaceted past and its vital influence on the diversity of the present". Thus the complexity of any analysis of history is acknowledged. Pearson structures his discussion by the use of a Weberian theoretical framework. This certainly provides a structure that acknowledges this complexity. However, I shall leave aside any critique of a Weberian approach relative to Hall and Schwarz to focus on the issues raised by Pearson. Each of the four Hall and Schwarz areas that I have identified is addressed in Pearson's discussion, as are the areas (to varying degrees) of colonialism, the economy and state development.

3 THE USE OF THEORY

The discussion of historical sociology in Chapter Once clearly indicates the importance that I attach to the articulation of a theoretically informed approach to the study of history. In this section I would like to reconsider the issues that were raised in Chapter One with respect to the revised Hall and Schwarz approach and the historians and sociologists that I am discussing here. The key areas to be considered include the uses of theory, methodological issues such as the definition of concepts and ethical issues. These texts cover aspects of these issues in a range of ways and these issues underlie my discussion of the potential for using the substantive dimensions of Hall and Schwarz - "crisis", political representation and the shift to collectivism.

The first area to be considered here is the use of theory in these texts. With respect to the history texts, this concerns the explicit acknowledgement within a text of historiographical issues. Overall these issues are not raised. *OHNZ* and *The Treaty of Waitangi* are not aimed solely at an academic audience, and nor are they sociology texts. However, neglecting to mention these issues effectively presents this material as "value-free". Therefore my critique is not aimed at demonstrating that they should be sociological, but rather towards highlighting areas that would be amenable to further investigation from a sociological perspective. Historiography involves the way in which the area of historical study is selected, researched and reported[1]. The history authors do have a range of backgrounds and are certainly aware of the possibilities of using theory, but this is not made explicit in these texts.

Generally speaking, these history texts fit the model of history that I outlined in contrast to sociology in Chapter One. That is, they focus on particular issues without attempting to develop generalisations, they are concerned with a wide range of subject areas, and they use a selection of primary and secondary sources in developing their discussions of history. My interpretation of the authors I have considered is that they do not support a realist approach. Philosophical issues are not explicitly considered and nor is theory. The contested nature of history and the texts that are the primary sources are not acknowledged. These areas need not be considered serious flaws in the terms of these texts - however, they certainly need to be considered in attempting to apply the Hall and Schwarz model to Aotearoa/New Zealand history.

Wilkes does not provide a detailed discussion of historiographical issues in "The state as an historical subject", aside from noting (1993:208) that historicist approaches cannot be used to predict the future. Given that Wilkes believes that "a dynamic historical account which focuses on shifts in the social

---

[1]Fairburn (1989:9-15) is an example of an historian who does acknowledge these issues and justify his position.

structure can offer a powerful account of the process of state formation in New Zealand" (ibid), these issues perhaps warrant further discussion - although this was limited by the length of the chapter.

The key difference between the historical and sociological approaches is apparent in the theory that is utilised. As this model was still being developed when Wilkes wrote "the state as an historical subject", the theoretical development is limited. With O'Brien, Wilkes does develop the Fordist model with respect to more recent Aotearoa/New Zealand history, but the analysis is not concerned with events prior to 1935. The divisions that Wilkes used are "the Minimalist State (1840-1890); the Pre-Fordist State (1890-1935); the Fordist State (1935-1984); and the Post-Fordist State (1984-1993)" (1993:192). The identification of 1890 as a key transition period parallels the importance of this time in my research.

Wilkes does not explicitly consider philosophical issues, but does suggest limits to the model he proposes, in that "a clear-cut distinction can [not] necessarily be made between each phase" (1993:192). Rather there are gradual shifts in emphasis. In terms of the theoretical approach that is utilised, Wilkes does not wish this to be interpreted as a strictly pluralist approach, citing the interests of State employees and the "inertial quality of State policies" (ibid), both of which work against social forces directly and immediately shaping the state. This approach can, however, be described as realist. Wilkes also acknowledges the complex nature of analysis in proposing "a conjunctural form of analysis which emphasises the variable and historically specific relationship between classes, class fractions, other social forces, and the State" (1993:207). The key to analysing change remains "class and social forces" (1993:208), although the state has a key role to play in the process of change.

One aspect that the Fordist model does highlight is the role of changing work practices and consumption in any analysis of societal change. In particular,

labour migrations - both internal and international - have ongoing impacts on a range of areas, not only on the labour market. This can be included in a Gramscian analysis, alongside a consideration of issues relating to the colonial economy - particularly land and economic divisions. The structuring of Wilkes' discussion and conceptual clarity does show how theory can be used to link together historical details. This can then be used to demonstrate (in contrast to other authors[2]) that historical analysis cannot rely solely on class forces as the driving mechanism for change (Wilkes, 1993:207).

The importance of using theory, in general, is raised by Pearson. When referring to existing writing on Aotearoa/New Zealand's ethnic history, he notes that "[a]ll of these studies, even the most avowedly descriptive, contain theoretical assumptions. What varies is the degree of explicitness of the theories used to explain the social world to ourselves and others" (1990:4). Pearson does not discuss the philosophical issues that I have raised but, as with Wilkes, the discussion of the Weberian theoretical model implies the acceptance of underlying philosophical assumptions. Pearson (1990:20-27) outlines Marxist and Weberian approaches to the relationship between racism, ethnicity and class, and sets out his own approach as one derived from Weber (1990:22). The state (its role and contradictions) reappears throughout Pearson's text (1990:33,52,67&145) and its importance is clearly acknowledged.

As I have outlined in Chapter One, philosophical issues are not the primary concern of historical sociology, and it is not surprising that philosophy has not been explicitly considered by these authors. In developing the Hall and Schwarz model, I have spent considerable time covering philosophical issues. This highlights the potential pitfalls of (for example) taking a positivist approach. I have also clearly specified that this is a realist approach and that a degree of relativism (or reflexivity) is desirable. However, when attempting to apply the revised Hall and Schwarz model, detailed discussion of

---

[2]For example, Bedggood 1978.

philosophical issues may not be warranted, unless a researcher wishes to debate aspects of the position set out here.

Nevertheless, a discussion of theory must not be neglected when investigating substantive issues. The theoretical basis structures the selection of subject area and time span, the operationalisation of indicators (such as political representation) and the selection and interpretation of evidence. As with my discussion of historical sociology in Chapter One and state-centred approaches in Chapter Two, the use of a theoretical approach must be made explicit. As Pearson has demonstrated, it is possible to do this while targeting both academic and general audiences. In principle, the possible advantages of using theory in this way include clarity, coherence, comparability and generalisability. I am not assuming that the use of theory is problem-free, nor will it automatically ensure brilliant research. However, theory can help to structure research, so that it limits a potentially enormous body of evidence, and also provides potential explanations for events that happened in the past. This information can be used to compare Aotearoa/New Zealand with other societies, or to possibly improve the understanding of more recent events. I have outlined earlier the advantages of the Gramscian approach advocated by Hall and Schwarz, and have not expanded on this with respect to the texts that I have discussed here. In studying the history of the state, the Hall and Schwarz approach that I have outlined can provide a clear, detailed and flexible structure for investigation.

The second aspect of theory that I shall consider is the discussion of concepts. In the terms of a sociological approach the definition of concepts cannot be divorced from the use of a theoretical framework. The way in which concepts are utilised is important, and I shall consider two primary reasons; the changing meaning of words, and the assumptions behind their use. As I have indicated, there is an inherent danger in using contemporary concepts (eg. Pakeha) to describe events of a different time. This is a problem that is

difficult to overcome, however practitioners of historical sociology need to be aware of it.

The history authors do not address the potential difficulties of using concepts. In looking at the assumptions behind the use of concepts, we come up against the thorny issue of theories such as Marxism in history. One example of the potential problems here can be seen in Chapters 10 and 12 of *OHNZ*. Graham (1992:116) and Gibbons (1992:310-312) both discuss class distinctions, but use these primarily as descriptive terms[3]. Similarly, Orange refers to "riff-raff" (1987:23) and "transients" (1987:24) but does not place this into a general context of social relationships. By not acknowledging an analytical framework, it is difficult to ascertain whether they are discussing the same things or the importance of the relationships being described. Consequently, comparisons between writers or indeed between Aotearoa/New Zealand and other countries or Aotearoa/New Zealand at a different time are difficult. A lack of theoretical grounding compounds the previous problem of conceptual clarity across time. However, these texts do raise and clarify a number of issues - for example, Graham (1992:116) and Orange (1987:223) comment on divisions within both settler and Maori societies.

As would be expected, Wilkes does discuss the concepts that he uses. Key terms are briefly outlined and clarified (state, class and social forces), and Wilkes attempts to avoid confusion in his discussion. A similar clarification of terms is provided in *The Tragedy of the Market*. Similarly, as *A Dream Deferred* is aimed at both an academic and wider audience, Pearson does not neglect the clarification of concepts. This precision (which is both academic and ethical) means that in Chapter One (1990:7-37) Pearson discusses and defines race, racism, ethnicity, colonialism, ethnic movements and the state (which is then expanded upon in the following chapter). This process enables

---

[3]Olssen (1992:Ch10), in contrast does define and discuss what is meant by the term "modernisation".

the reader to assess Pearson's position on the issues, as well as know what exactly is being discussed when these terms are used.

I have used the theoretical and philosophical positions outlined in Chapter One as the basis for defining concepts in Chapter Two. Thus an application of the revised Hall and Schwarz approach would need to reiterate the key concepts and define others in order to maintain coherence and avoid misinterpretation. This conceptual clarification is important, in order to avoid confusion about what is being discussed and how concepts may alter. Social distinctions are mentioned in each text, but it is only in the sociology texts that these are given a framework that allows comparisons to be made. This relates to the previous point - for it is by considering *how* you are going to study the past that the issue of using contemporary concepts becomes important. Similarly, the use of existing historical evidence - whether official statistics or personal diaries - requires some consideration of how these may differ from more contemporary evidence.

The final area that I shall consider is the explicit acknowledgement of the ethics of research. This is closely tied to both theory and methodology, and remains central to any research. My primary concern here is with the way that history is reinterpreted in light of events at the time of research. The idea of history as a political battleground is relevant here, as research can have an impact both on "commonsense" ideas about history and political decisions (such as government policy). The use of theory and the definition of concepts go some way towards acknowledging ethical concerns, specifying the selection of evidence and confronting the issues of historicism, empiricism and positivism. However, I am interested in how a researcher acknowledges ethical issues *in general*.

In the introduction of *OHNZ* (1992:ix) the recent increase in writing on Maori history is highlighted. This and "revisionist" histories are examples of changes in the praxis of history. These changes are important, both for the

way a different perspective is presented, and the way previously omitted areas of life are researched. Similarly, *The Treaty of Waitangi* is described as "the first comprehensive study of the treaty" (back cover), and an acknowledgement of the political implications of the book (or at least what "comprehensive" means in this context) would perhaps be pertinent. This is an important area, because *The Treaty of Waitangi* charts both Maori and Pakeha attitudes towards the Treaty - and may in turn have a role in shaping future attitudes. This book was published in 1987 - after legislative changes to enable Maori claims against the Crown relating to injustices since 1840. While I am concerned, in this research, with events that primarily occurred between 1840 and 1907, it is not possible to completely distance this analysis from current events and theoretical developments. While I have chosen to discuss *The Treaty of Waitangi*, with its emphasis on reclaiming the role of Maori in history, a similar trend has also been evident with respect to the role of women throughout history. As I have indicated, the omission of a discussion of these changes in *OHNZ* and *The Treaty of Waitangi* is not of primary importance[4]. Rather, this is an area that needs to be included in historical sociology.

The ethical issues and political implications of research are not explicitly covered in "The state as an historical subject". This is largely a result of the fact that Wilkes has set out a limited project - to chart the broad shape of four theoretically shaped periods of state history in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Therefore, Wilkes notes some implications of these shifts - such as the continuing alienation of Maori (1993:207), without consistently developing these issues. However, Wilkes clearly wishes to avoid an historicist approach to charting state formation (1993:208) and acknowledges the complexity of research in this area.

---

[4]While I feel that the issue of theory should be covered for both academic and ethical reasons, my emphasis here is not on a detailed critique of *OHNZ* and *The Treaty of Waitangi*.

As would be expected in a larger sociological analysis, Pearson does consider the ethical and political implications of research. Initially, the fragmented nature of existing information and studies on the past is acknowledged (1990:4). At the same time, Pearson positions his text as concerned with improving understanding of contemporary issues through an analysis of history. This is an explicitly political position. In the final chapter (1990:213-247), Pearson also confronts a range of topical issues that highlight both the importance of Aotearoa/New Zealand history and the way in which contemporary issues shape what is deemed to be important in the past.

Implementing a revised Hall and Schwarz approach does not imply a pre-determined ethical or political approach. However, given the lack of control that a researcher has over the interpretations of published work, I feel that it is necessary for a researcher to acknowledge the contested nature of historical evidence and the limitations of research. Each step in applying the Hall and Schwarz model (selection of time frame, indicators and interpretation) needs assessment and reassessment, as does any research model. In the period 1840-1907, the Hall and Schwarz model allows for the consideration of issues (such as the Aotearoa/New Zealand Wars) which are ongoing areas for debate. Interpreting the impact of the Aotearoa/New Zealand Wars on state formation may contribute to state reformation in Aotearoa/New Zealand today. Consideration of these possibilities should, therefore, be a part of any application of the revised Hall and Schwarz model.

To summarise; as I demonstrated in Chapter One, theory *in general* is an important part of historical sociology. The Hall and Schwarz model also emphasises theory as a key part of an historical sociology of the state. This section has provided further support for the use of theory. Firstly, a consideration of how and why the study of the past is carried out is relevant. This enables the researcher to identify what sources are used and the political implications of the research being conducted. This includes a consideration of the position of the researcher, any biases the researcher may have, the

intended audience and the aim of the research. Secondly, the theoretical model provides a coherent framework within the domain I have developed for developing a study of empirical evidence. An overarching theoretical model also enables concepts to be clearly defined. Having set out both the theoretical framework (Hall and Schwarz) and the justification for using theory in general, I shall now consider the issues involved in applying this theory to substantive historical issues.

4 SELECTION OF THE TIME FRAME FOR ANALYSIS - POTENTIAL FOR STATE (RE)FORMATION

Having established the potential advantages of using the theoretically specific revised Hall and Schwarz approach, I will now consider a range of substantive issues. The first of these is the selection of the time frame for analysis. In terms of the revised Hall and Schwarz approach this is a period of potential state (re)formation and I have selected the period 1840-1907. This is, in part, in order to remain comparable to the period that Hall and Schwarz investigated with respect to Britain. However, it also covers the period of initial Aotearoa/New Zealand state formation and the ongoing process of reformation that signalled a possible shift towards collectivism.

Given that I have selected this time frame for analysis, it is possible to utilise the Hall and Schwarz concept of crisis as one indicator of what was occurring in Aotearoa/New Zealand during this time. The combination of breaks in some areas and related new developments had a major effect on the shaping of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. However, at the same time, many things remained constant. Looking at *OHNZ* and *The Treaty of Waitangi* in general, in a number of chapters, the multitude of changes occurring are accorded special significance. Also, the way in which the chapters are divided into sections in *OHNZ* indicates that the editors (at least) considered these periods to involve significant breaks with previous and subsequent events. Similarly,

Wilkes divides two of his periods of Aotearoa/New Zealand state development around 1890. Pearson does not structure his discussion in this way, but identifies a number of events that occurred over the time frame 1840-1907 that are important in understanding the origins of ethnic conflict[5].

This discussion is not intended to be a comprehensive review of the texts that I have selected. My aim has been to identify the way in which these authors have highlighted issues which could form the basis for applying the Hall and Schwarz model. In this section, I have highlighted the way in which the events recorded by these authors fit the concept of "crisis" as a part of potential state reformation. This can be seen as a first step in considering the applicability of the Hall and Schwarz model.

The Oxford History of New Zealand

Authors in *OHNZ* provide a chronological description of these years (1840-1907) and summarise the characteristics of particular decades. While the 1870s are characterised as "a decade of consolidation" (Gardner, 1992:72), the Aotearoa/New Zealand Wars had a lasting impression as Maori realised that their authority no longer prevailed. In the 1880s, Aotearoa/New Zealand entered a "Long Depression" (1880-1895), the effect of which was compounded by Aotearoa/New Zealand's indebtedness and dependence on the (similarly depressed) British economy (Gardner, 1992:75). This "forced the colonist and colonial alike to examine the nature of New Zealand society and provided an atmosphere receptive to experiment and change" (Graham, 1992:139). While the depression lingered on, in "August 1890 New Zealand was plunged into its first crisis in the relations between labour and capital, a two-month-long strike which tied up the ports and involved some 8000 unionists" (Richardson, 1992:201). While the conditions for the strike had

---

[5]Reeves also notes the marked increase in the state involvement in society in 1890 (1969:50).

emerged from the preceding years, the following years saw the state become increasingly involved in civil society[6].

The rise of the prohibition and women's suffrage movements also mobilised large numbers of people to become involved in politics - even if only for a short time. However, Richardson also notes (1992:203) that "[t]he years following the strike were marked still by consensus rather than conflict: parties remained unstable and class peripheral". The impact of the economy cannot be neglected from these upheavals as in the mid-1890s "New Zealand entered an era of prosperity that was to last until the beginning of the 1920s" (Brooking, 1992:230)[7]. Richardson draws attention here to the way in which the upheavals prior to the 1890s occurred alongside stability and consensus. The period of state (re)formation that is covered by these authors certainly could be studied by using the revised Hall and Schwarz model. Then, rather than having a primary focus on describing history during the period 1840-1907, the theoretical model can structure a critical analysis of the process of state (re)formation.

The Treaty of Waitangi

In a similar way to the *OHNZ* authors, Orange charts what I have interpreted as a series of crises since 1840. While the book focuses on the interpretations of the Treaty and the way Maori and settlers/Pakeha shaped or reacted to those interpretations, there is a theme that runs throughout these chapters. That is, Maori have consistently been treated as though the Treaty was irrelevant, and their attempts for justice have been severely dealt with. The Aotearoa/New Zealand Wars are the most violent example of this. The Wars

---

[6]This included the 1894 BNZ takeover, taxation, the Factories Act 1894, IC&A Act 1894, OAP Act 1898.

[7]These changes (during the period 1871-1891) are also identified and summarised by Sutch (1966).

stemmed from struggles over land[8] and sovereignty, and initially involved a large number of British forces as well as settlers and some Maori. By 1868 "New Zealand's resources were being stretched to the limit; by the end of the decade there was a widespread yearning for an abiding peace" (1987:181). The last British forces pulled out in 1870.

This did not mean the end of the struggle for recognition by Maori, although this was compounded when they did not realise that by the 1860s "Britain had completely abdicated responsibility for the treaty" (1987:204). Thus by 1891 an alternative approach - the kotahitanga (Maori unity) parliaments developed as a peaceful forum for resisting further land alienation and protecting Maori taonga (1987:185). These parliaments of the 1890s were set up along the lines of the settler parliament and were designed to supplement it (1987:225). However, this movement was never able to establish any legal independence for Maori. Orange charts a range of crises that demonstrate essentially unchanging attitudes from the settlers, and a range of initiatives by Maori (ranging from individuals to pan-Maori) to attempt to counter those attitudes. The focus by Orange on the Kotahitanga provides an interesting example of the *potential* for state reformation that was *not* realised. The revised Hall and Schwarz model enables unsuccessful attempts at state reformation to be included alongside successful ones.

"The state as an historical subject"

The differentiation of distinct phases in the Hall and Schwarz model relies on the identification of times of stability and times of upheaval or transition. In this sense, Wilkes' model identifies the time around 1890 as a period of significant change in the role of the state. Wilkes also notes the continuity of

---

[8]Condliffe (1959:77) also notes that "the main drift of native land legislation has been to separate the Maoris from their lands" - especially after 1873.

development. For example, while Vogel's borrowing meant that "the national debt greatly increased, the establishment of the national infrastructure was in train" (1993:196). Thus while the control of the state and role of the state was debated and challenged, key areas continued to be developed. Wilkes also notes the importance of the abolition of provincial government in 1875 (1993:195) as a key step in the changing scope of the state. Wilkes goes on (1993:196) to summarise the changes between 1890-1935:

> The last years of the oligarchy had seen widespread economic depression, massive hardship and deprivation. A rural landed oligopoly and its client State were directly challenged by the emergence of the party system, the rise of the Liberals and their Labour allies, as well as by anticipated shifts in the structure of the economy.

Wilkes includes in his outline changes to the economy, production, political representation, alienation of Maori land and the role of the state. The Hall and Schwarz idea of crisis as a key factor in state development is clearly applicable to Wilkes' analysis. Similarly, the idea of selecting a period of potential state reformation as the focus for investigation would fit the Fordist theoretical basis of Wilkes' discussion. While Wilkes does use a sociological approach to history here, he identifies (as do the historians) events around the turning point of 1890 as important in considering the history of the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

A Dream Deferred

While Pearson does not focus directly on state (re)formation, he identifies a number of key issues that warrant investigation. He also provides a summary of the changes in Aotearoa/New Zealand that fits the idea of crisis:

> Towards the middle of the nineteenth century, New Zealand society was undergoing significant transformations as a young British colony struggling to establish a coherent state and government structure in the midst of internal and external political and economic forces.(1990:42)

Some of the areas identified by Pearson include colonial administration, the role of governor, settlers, Maori, missionaries, British events and individuals, and the Wakefield scheme. Pearson also notes the importance of the (albeit partial) economic incorporation of Maori into the capitalist system (1990:68-70). The importance of the Aotearoa/New Zealand Wars is not neglected by Pearson, and these are characterised as battles for land and value systems (1990:52). With respect to colonial relationships, the Aotearoa/New Zealand Wars "also marked the beginning of the end of imperial control over native land and native policy" (1990:53). The impact of the Wars on the Aotearoa/New Zealand state was also significant and Pearson notes that:

> After the New Zealand Wars when the sovereignty of the state seemed to be assured, any historical sense of a binding pact between coloniser and colonised, if such an interpretation was ever fully present, vanished from the minds of most Pakeha. In 1877 Judge Prendergast, in his Wi Parata judgement, declared the treaty "a simple nullity".(1990:146-147)

For ethnic relations, the period 1840-1907 was indeed a time of crisis. This was particularly so for Maori, but Pearson also includes in his analysis (1990:73-105) the treatment of Chinese and Indian immigrants (as well as others). The control of immigration was an important part of the state's jurisdiction and can be analysed in relation to labour requirements. In particular, during times of economic recession, public outcries against ethnic minorities increased (1990:94). The role of the state in controlling immigration has continued in similar forms throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand's history.

Summary

The writers that I have covered provide a wealth of material that can be considered in relation to the concept of crisis. The importance of the challenges facing the Aotearoa/New Zealand colony are also apparent. The quotes that I have used have been selected in order to highlight particular

issues - I could also have emphasised issues such as the fight for women's suffrage or the prohibition movement. By using a Gramscian approach, what could be described as arbitrarily selected chronological events, can be used to structure an analysis of the process of state formation. Instead of using a general concept of crisis, the analysis can become more specific. This would firstly include a discussion of changes in the economy and economic relations - within Aotearoa/New Zealand and internationally. A second key area could address the development of social structures and civil society alongside economic development. Thirdly, the development of the state system could be charted. The concept of crisis remains as a part of the method for selecting a time frame for analysis. The concept of crisis also remains important for discussing the following areas of political representation and individualism/collectivism.

Overall, however, using "a period of potential state (re)formation" as the basis for selecting the time frame is very similar to the Hall and Schwarz concept of crisis *in this case*. Given that I wish to allow for the possibility of a wider application of the theoretical approach, changing the terms used explicitly allows for non-crisis periods to be analysed. Each of these texts does identify the time frame that I have selected as important, and provide the basis for developing a detailed and theoretically informed justification of how this period could be considered as a period of potential state (re)formation.

5   POSSIBLE INDICATORS OF POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

The term political representation encompasses a range of areas that can be considered in a historical sociology of the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. Other areas (such as education) could also be considered separately (or alongside political representation). Given that Hall and Schwarz use political representation as their primary example I have chosen to do so also.

However, I have (in Chapter Three) pointed out that political representation in general does not provide specific indicators for assessing any relationship between the structure of the state and the representation of civil society. In the following discussion of each text I have highlighted information that could be utilised to develop some indicators of these relationships.

The Oxford History of New Zealand

Political representation covers both the relationship between Britain and Aotearoa/New Zealand, and changes within Aotearoa/New Zealand. The area of political representation is covered in passing in a number of chapters of *OHNZ*. Changes in the franchise legislation are documented, and the rise of self-government is covered. However, the ongoing colonial relationship with Britain is seldom mentioned or assessed. The colonial relationship with Britain is important as power shifted fairly rapidly from the Governor (British representative) to the nascent Aotearoa/New Zealand parliament. This had a major effect on the position of Maori, as the Treaty was consistently downplayed, while consolidating the power of the settler politicians. Similarly, the relationship of economic dependence with Britain is mentioned but the effect that this had on the developing nation-state is not expanded upon.

The chapters in *OHNZ* document the shift in colonial state control from Britain to Aotearoa/New Zealand, but this is not generally viewed as of primary importance. Parsonson (1992:173) does highlight the shift:

> Within 25 years of annexation, then, there had been great constitutional changes in New Zealand. Maori had not been consulted in this process; they had been consigned to a role as bystanders as the settlers agitated for and achieved "self-government".

As we shall see, this shift effectively removed power from Maori as they were then dealing with a settler government that had a vested interest in securing

land (and revenue) with little regard for Maori welfare. This is one indicator that could be developed further - prior to 1840, control almost exclusively rested in Britain, but by 1907, control of the state was clearly based in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The development of an internal political structure in Aotearoa/New Zealand was closely modelled on that of Britain. There were two houses - a nominated Legislative Council (which was abolished in 1950) and an elected House of Representatives. The Colonial Office retained some areas of control, in particular, native policy and foreign policy (Dalziel 1992:93, McIntyre 1992:338). Initially, the suffrage requirements involved a small amount of property and a residence requirement for males over 21 years of age. In 1867, a separate Maori roll was introduced along with four Maori seats in Parliament. If Maori individuals registered on the Maori roll, they were exempt from the property qualification. In 1879 the property qualification was abolished, although the country quota remained, and in 1893, the franchise was extended to women[9]. The political incorporation of Maori suggest another area that could be focussed on - including the refusal of settlers to allow for powersharing with Maori.

However, "the first sessions of Parliament showed that politics were a maze of competing and conflicting interests. There were no clear-cut political divisions, no sharp party lines until the late 1880s" (Dalziel, 1992:94-95). Economic conditions affected the shape of the state and representation within it. As the colonial economy consolidated, provincialism declined (Gardner, 1992:71) and national politics developed. As far as political participation was concerned, "it was not until the early 1890s that the working class and the lower middle class became aware of the power of the ballot box and began to use it" (Dalziel, 1992:97). The extension of the franchise can be considered as another possible indicator for assessing state (re)formation. The fight for

---

[9]Condliffe (1959:40) characterises the eighties as "a period of intense political agitation".

women's suffrage in particular has attracted considerable attention in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Richardson (1992:209) also notes that at the end of the century "[e]ffective power still rested with local notables in the electorates, but a model for future party structure had been created". The basic structures remained fairly constant after 1852 - it was in the areas of representation, organisation within civil society and state legislative jurisdiction that the changes occurred.

Improved economic conditions in the 1890s resulted in increased state revenue, which was able to fund the increasing legislative program. This "extension of state regulation and its concomitant, an enlarged civil service drew complaints that New Zealand was drifting towards government by bureaucracy" (Richardson, 1992:213). The role of and importance of the civil service is not expanded upon, nor is the composition of government (aside from previous references)[10]. Again, while this does not occur in *OHNZ*, the material provides the basis for developing a further indicator with regard to state employees. *OHNZ* primarily charts the constitutional and legislative changes that occurred over this time. However, it is apparent that the economy played an important role in the expansion of the state and the ability of individuals to stand for office. Shifting colonial relationships can also be liked to the economy - in funding the early development of the state. However, this development of the state did not extend to the development of a parallel or complementary pan-Maori organisation.

As the state developed, representation widened as the suffrage was extended, and as more people participated in the political process. Also, the expansion of the state meant that ever more people were employed by the state and relied on it for some form of welfare. Large scale changes in political

---

[10]Le Rossignol and Stewart (1912:197) note that by 1912 the numbers employed by the state or on the OAP, plus their dependents, had reached approximately 130,000 or one eighth of the population of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

representation are thus charted in *OHNZ*. Colonial control had virtually disappeared by 1907 and the scope of the franchise was approaching its current form. However, describing these changes does not presume an analysis of why they occurred, except for noting conjunctural links between economic prosperity and the extension of the state in the 1890s. Rather, it can be interpreted as perhaps piecemeal or even inevitable that the state developed in the way that it did. This is why the development of indicators can be viewed as a central part of the operationalisation of the theoretical approach that I have presented in the previous chapter.

The Treaty of Waitangi

The Treaty of Waitangi provides only limited acknowledgement of the issues of political representation. While the actions of individuals and the perceived outcome of events is discussed, Orange does not provide a detailed discussion of state structures. Areas that are not covered include the British state system, the impetus for and justification of colonialism, the administration of colonial affairs, and the gradual establishment of settler government. Similarly, the structure of Maori society is not outlined or explained in detail. It is not clear how the pre-settlement relationships between different groups were structured, and relationships with settlers, and later the Aotearoa/New Zealand government are not discussed in relation to Maori systems. All of these areas have relevance for a discussion of the Treaty of Waitangi and subsequent Maori/settler and Maori/Pakeha relationships. The main problem with this is that it is not possible to assess changes if an initial benchmark is not provided. Once indicators have been developed they can be used to establish, firstly, whether a change has occurred in the area of interest. Then it is possible to consider possible explanations for what happened.

Orange does not assume that colonisation was inevitable. Rather, "[a]ll parties who expressed an interest in New Zealand in 1838 shared the conviction that British intervention was both necessary and desirable. Opinion differed only on the extent of that intervention and the role that Maori people should play" (1987:26). However, this does focus on the colonising parties. Orange does not discuss the initial attitude of Maori to the role of settlers, aside from noting that "Maori-European contact was mutually advantageous" (1987:7). Although later she does note that there were considerable divisions with regard to signing the Treaty (1987:46-50). However, Orange is also critical of the subtle shift in power to the Aotearoa/New Zealand government and the disempowerment of Maori (1987:4,160&184). As power shifted, there was no "neutral referee" for Maori to appeal to for resolution of conflict with settlers.

While the franchise was, in theory, extended to Maori from the implementation of the 1852 New Zealand Constitution, a combination of communal land ownership[11], exclusion from electoral districts and other factors (1987:137-142) effectively barred many Maori men (and later, women) from participating in elections[12]. The 1867 Maori Representation Act allowed for four Maori seats in the House (1987:181)[13], and abolished the land requirement for Maori (who were on the Maori roll). As the war settled, Maori were also allowed on some juries and Maori schools were introduced. However, this did not allow for proportional representation, nor for sharing

---

[11]See also Department of Justice, 1986:A14.

[12]For example, "[t]he requirement of literacy in English for the right to vote effectively excluded the Maori population from the franchise" (Dept of Justice, 1986:A9). This requirement would have had a similar effect on large numbers of the settler population as well.

[13]Also of importance "were the four statutes, passed between 1896 and 1903, relating to representation" (Dept of Justice, 1986:A45-46). These statutes determined electoral districts and boundaries, including the country quota and the number of people elected for each district.

of political power. Orange provides a detailed and essentially critical outline of these changes, but as with the authors of *OHNZ*, does not provide an explanation of these changes. Similarly, any links between the economic situation and political representation are not developed. This is particularly important for Maori, as these factors contributed to the lack of political representation for Maori.

Central to these areas is the importance of acknowledging the role of the state system, and how the processes that are a part of the state are effectively controlled by particular individuals. Implicit in *The Treaty of Waitangi* is the fact that those individuals have primarily been of British descent with the added advantage of financial independence. However, this is not developed as an indicator to highlight in a methodical way the impact that this had on Maori or settlers. While the individual and the state cannot be separated completely, the role of individuals in the establishment of a state system remains of central importance for understanding Aotearoa/New Zealand history. Developing indicators for particular areas of political representation would enable both individuals and the state to be considered in an analysis. However, as with the authors of *OHNZ*, Orange provides detailed information that can be used to develop the indicators that I have suggested.

"The state as an historical subject"

Wilkes' model does have the potential for considerable development, and this is most apparent when considering the area of political representation. While these themes are often mentioned, Wilkes is not able, in this chapter, to develop them further. From his discussion, it is apparent that the focus is on more contemporary events than I have concerned myself with. Wilkes comments on changes in the franchise, state structure and colonial relationships. The economic status of settlers is linked to their access to political power:

> The oligopolistic structure of early agriculture meant that white landholding formed the basis of early political power, and that both the membership of the ruling elite, as well as the principle influences on these rulers, could be sourced to the extensive landholdings which developed in the hands of white settlers by the 1850s.(1993:193)

The Gramscian basis of the Hall and Schwarz approach also suggests that political power cannot be divorced from socio-economic relationships. Leaving aside the consideration of existing information in the development of indicators that I have focussed on with respect to *OHNZ* and *The Treaty of Waitangi*, the development of indicators still requires a coherent theoretical approach. Thus the development of indicators for the revised Hall and Schwarz approach must not contradict the Gramscian basis. As Wilkes points out here, socio-economic relationships cannot be neglected. The development of indicators must include situating them in relation to the economic aspects of civil society and the state, as well as considering political relationships in (and between) civil society and the state.

A Dream Deferred

The issue of political representation is also covered in general terms by Pearson. In particular, the colonial relationship is given consideration as forming the basis of political structures that have, in large part, endured. As I have indicated with respect to Pearson's theoretical basis, the colonial relationship is placed into a context of capitalism and colonialism. Therefore:

> although white settler colonies clearly involve the introduction of capitalism into non-capitalistic societies, it is a distinctive brand of capitalism that reproduces dependent relations between the British "core" and the New Zealand "periphery"... However, ethnic relations *within* New Zealand also reflect core/periphery relations.(1990:32)

Pearson also notes that Maori and Pakeha were not homogenous groups and class (large landed interests versus working class) fractured the settler society

(1990:47). The exclusion of other non-white immigrants is also addressed by Pearson (1990:93). Immigration and international relationships are thus further indicators that could be developed to assess the role of the state.

Pearson takes a critical approach to the extension of the franchise, noting that "political incorporation only went so far and thus can also be seen as a placebo designed to forestall demands for real equity in power sharing" (1990:68). Similarly, the creation of four Maori seats is viewed by Pearson as institutionalising racial categorisations in voting rights and electoral candidacy (1990:152). Developing indicators does not automatically imply acceptance of what is investigated. A critical approach remains important - especially given the Gramscian framework that I am utilising.

Pearson also considers the development of the state institutions and notes that:

> [t]he Pakeha-dominated state, with its centralised set of institutions and personnel, soon spread its tentacles throughout society... The level of state influence, however, varied regionally and in some remoter districts the "state" was little more than a handful of peripatetic officials. (1990:101)

Thus the role of the state varied in different locations and in remote districts populated by Maori, there may have existed a defacto "independence". The ability to ensure that citizens comply with state decisions is a core part of capitalist democracies, and the development of institutions that fulfil this role is an important part of state development.

Summary

The four texts that I have selected cover political representation to varying degrees. However, while the history texts primarily chart the changes that occurred, the sociology texts provide more in the way of analysis. Overall, there is clearly a lack of consideration of political representation as a part of

state development. That is not necessarily the purpose of these texts. There is definitely scope here for applying both a Gramscian analysis and the Hall and Schwarz approach to the extension of democracy.

My discussion has highlighted areas that could be developed as *indicators* for assessing the changes or stability in state structures. Clearly, it would not be possible (or desirable) to consider all the potential indicators. Rather, a small selection need to be given detailed attention in light of the Gramscian framework that has been specified. While these texts are not concerned with developing indicators in order to investigate the state, they do provide ample evidence of areas that could be considered. Before developing these indicators, it is necessary to consider what the researcher intends to ascertain. In this case, I have suggested that the period 1840-1907 involved a shift in emphasis towards a collectivist state system. The following section considers the evidence that forms the basis for this tentative hypothesis.

6 THE SHIFTING EMPHASIS: INDIVIDUALISM TO COLLECTIVISM

In Chapter Three, I outlined what a shift to collectivism could entail. The importance of assessing this kind of shift is that a change in the balance of individualism and collectivism involves changes in the definition and role of the state. In this section, I consider the evidence that exists that would indicate that a shift from individualism to collectivism did occur. This involves considering whether a general shift can be identified, and also whether this can be identified in the area of political representation that I have developed from the Hall and Schwarz approach. These authors do chart such a shift, and I have indicated where the possibilities exist for further links with the revised Hall and Schwarz approach.

Interestingly, the areas of individualism and collectivism are mentioned a number of times in *OHNZ*. Particularly with regard to the government in the 1890s, there is widespread interpretation of this as involving a shift from liberalism or individualism to collectivism. Gardner (1992:70) clearly identifies this shift:

> [d]uring the late 1860s and early 1870s New Zealand was passing through a stage of transition. The pioneering phase was over and the colony had to enter a secondary phase of consolidation; the individualism of the frontier had to be supplemented by collective action on a new scale.

However, these terms are not defined - nor is, for example, the increased government spending (collectivism) viewed in relationship to the economic ties between Britain and Aotearoa/New Zealand. In contrast, when referring to the period 1890-1935, Brooking (1992:253) notes that "[a]ttitudes of mind that enshrined individualism and accepted colonial dependence limited New Zealand's capacity to cope with a rapidly changing world". This implicitly situates Aotearoa/New Zealand within a global economic system, but this link is not expanded upon.

Individualism in politics also evolved into collectivism with the emergence of political parties. As Dalziel notes (1992:111), the "old, informal, personalised style of consensus politics became outmoded in the 1890s. A more complex society demanded a different form of political organisation"[14]. While the discussion of the provincial shift provides some connection between economic issues and centralisation (especially with those provinces opposed to centralisation), these links are again minimal. Certainly, the shift to collectivism is linked to economic issues (such as the end of the long depression) and changing international relationships. Similarly, as noted by

---

[14]Along similar lines, Reeves links the fluidity of coalitions to the lack of party structures (1969:65).

Hall and Schwarz, collectivism can be viewed as related to the struggle for mass democracy.

The issue of Maori collectivism versus settler individualism is also given cursory mention, although not in these terms. Rather, the way in which Maori formed a range of associations or groups in order to fight for control over their affairs is noted (see Sorrenson, 1992:141-166 & Parsonson, 1992:167-198). Despite treating Maori as individuals as far as voting rights were concerned, they were more often viewed as a group - with particular problems that needed addressing, or as a problem that needed addressing. For example, Dalziel (1992:98-99) comments that "the two main issues in politics in the 1850s and 1860s were relations with the Maori, and the respective powers and rights of the provincial and general governments". The areas from *OHNZ* that I have raised concern the indicators of colonial state control, the franchise and Maori political incorporation and indicate that a shift to collectivism *did* occur - although this is somewhat complicated in the area of Maori political incorporation.

The Treaty of Waitangi

Orange provides in *The Treaty of Waitangi* a number of references to the steps taken by Maori to form organisations that would be able to negotiate with settlers. For example, she outlines two purposes of the runanga; that they were "to reform, consolidate or re-affirm tribal associations after the disturbances of the 1860s and, more broadly, to determine hapu and tribal relationships with the government" (1987:190). Also, the perception of powerlessness and appeals to the Queen were a "part of a groundswell of activity in the 1880s that was to lead a major sector of Maori society towards organised, united political activity" (1987:205).

These steps contributed to the development of the Kotahitanga movement around 1880 (1987:222). Orange discusses how this was viewed with trepidation by settlers:

> [s]ince Pakeha had profited by Maori divisiveness, the prospect of an extensive combination of Maori interests, a development that Pakeha had consistently believed to be an absolute impossibility, was seen as a threat. Maori land was still a hot political issue" in 1889. (1987:223)

However, while Kotahitanga "parliaments", with runanga structures operated for about 11 years after 1891, they never achieved complete Maori union (1987:225). Nor were they able to develop a complementary relationship with the settler parliament. Thus Orange provides an extra dimension to the discussion in *OHNZ* with respect to Maori collectivism. In part, this collectivism can be viewed as a response to both the individualist and collectivist phases of state development.

The focus on individuals that I have discussed, does mean that Orange does not discuss in any depth the shift to collectivism in the settler state. However, the focus on individuals rather than structures can be used to complement a more structural approach. As I have indicated, I feel that structures are an important part of any analysis. Using a Gramscian approach also emphasises the role of structures - although it does not exclude individuals. Certainly in analysing *state* development, the structures that exist in civil society and the state are an important factor. Key individuals and groups may shape these structures, and in Aotearoa/New Zealand, individuals such as George Grey played a significant role. Overall, though, the capitalist economy, British colonial traditions and the fragmented nature of Maori society had an overwhelming impact on the emergence of the state.

"The state as an historical subject"

The issue of collectivism superseding individualism in the role of the state is addressed by Wilkes. He comments on the fragmentation of all parts of the early Aotearoa/New Zealand colony (1993:193-198) - this occurred along the lines of "race", class, gender and region. However, as Vogel strived to develop the infrastructure of the colony, regional distinctions and loyalties began to diminish in favour of centralised collective government. The extension of the franchise and "assimilation" of Maori also contributed to an increasing acceptance of collectivism. The "[t]raditional Maori leadership sought to prevent further losses of land, while a newer generation sought economic advancement and the implementation of the positive aspects of Pakeha culture" (1993:197). Wilkes also notes that in the 1890s, economic developments and urbanisation meant that "the influences on the State diversified beyond recognition and, in a parallel and not unconnected fashion, its activities spread rapidly into new areas of responsibility" (1993:198). Putting it simply, as the Aotearoa/New Zealand nation-state grew, the state also grew. Economies of scale perhaps played a role in the development of the state alongside a more politically involved civil society. Once again the general hypothesis that a shift to collectivism is apparent in the areas of political representation is supported.

A Dream Deferred

Consideration of the collectivist approach that developed during the 1890s is also apparent in Pearson's discussion. The approach taken by the state is also contrasted to the approaches taken by Maori in order to protect their interests. Pearson situates the development of a centralised state in the context of white settler colonies in general, noting (1990:31) the particular importance that this had for shaping ethnic relations. The majority of settlers were also convinced of their own superiority and "quickly established a

political framework that not only created and maintained a stratified system of material rewards, but also sought to persuade or force the indigenous population to accept the dominant culture" (1990:64). Thus there was a conscious move to ensure that settlers and Maori became one homogenous group[15].

However, Pearson also identifies the fissures within both Maori and Pakeha society (1990:38,47). These fissures were never totally removed, although the collectivist state gave them limited acknowledgement. Legislation was implemented to deal with "problem" areas, but this can be interpreted as paternalistic and disciplinary as Hall and Schwarz indicate. This was a shift in *emphasis* and not a replacement of an "individualist" state by a "collectivist" state. Pearson also acknowledges that the "connection between political action and economic fluctuations underlines the importance of non-ethnic and non-racial factors in conflicts between groups which are also culturally and phenotypically dissimilar" (1990:95). Economic factors continually affect ideas about collectivism both within civil society and the state. As with the Hall and Schwarz approach, Pearson links these areas.

Summary

The shift from individualism to collectivism is charted in a variety of ways, and with emphasis on a range of different factors in the four texts that I have discussed. There is a wealth of material on the changes that were involved in this shift. While economic and colonial issues played a key role in the shift towards collectivism, this was not a total change. The capitalist system remained, and divisions within civil society and between civil society and the state remained. Similarly, key individuals remained in power. As with the

---

[15]Hamer (1988:15) interprets the liberalism of some oliticians prior to 1890 as "paternalistic not democratic" - hich fits the possible interpretation outlined earlier.

application of the Hall and Schwarz model in England, changes can be viewed as evidence both of the struggle for mass democracy and the development of a paternalistic and powerful central state system.

Ultimately, it is the shift from individualism to collectivism that Hall and Schwarz have used to structure their analysis of Britain. Here, this shift can be seen as the result of a range of challenges to the state that existed rather than one type of shift that must be assessed in terms of state development. The fact that a shift can be identified in Aotearoa/New Zealand would imply that the revised Hall and Schwarz model would bear detailed replication in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

7 CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have indicated how a selection of texts provide information that supports the possibility for applying the revised Hall and Schwarz approach to Aotearoa/New Zealand. Firstly, it is essential that any attempt to study Aotearoa/New Zealand is theoretically informed. The arguments that I have set out throughout this research have been reiterated in the consideration of whether theory was explicit in the chosen texts. Ethical requirements provide a strong basis on which to develop a theoretical framework (or domain) before attempting an assessment of the available evidence. However, given that a domain such as the one I have developed may already exist, theoretical and philosophical bases may be summarised and referenced, provided that the process of research does not contradict them.

A consideration of the chosen texts indicates that it is possible to view the period 1840-1907 as a period of potential state (re)formation, and that the political representation indicators can be developed to chart a shift towards

collectivism. Considering firstly, the selection of the time frame, it is clear that the period 1840-1907 did involve state formation and reformation. Each text identifies historical events that influenced state formation. The importance of events around 1890 in reforming state structures is also apparent. The time span that I have identified obviously covers an enormous number of changes, which makes detailed analysis difficult. However, if several (or even one) themes or indicators are selected, they can be used to assess initial benchmarks and chart changes that have occurred.

The selection of this time frame as a period of *potential* state (re)formation also provides the possibility to consider either failed attempts to alter the state, or areas in which there did not seem to be any significant challenges. The Kotahitanga can thus be studied within the bounds of this model. There are a wealth of primary and secondary sources available that focus on the time frame that I have identified. Selection, interpretation and analysis of sources within the domain that I have identified can thus be limited in part by the selection of a time frame such as the one I have indicated. The next step in applying this approach involves establishing what, in particular, is to be investigated.

Hall and Schwarz are concerned with identifying and explaining a shift from liberalism to collectivism in the state. This, then, provides the broad hypothesis from which can be developed a range of testable hypotheses to select specific areas in which state (re)formation could be identified. The texts I have discussed identify a number of areas that could be assessed in this way. Once an area has been selected possible causes for state (re)formation can also be hypothesised. A central part of this process is the selection and operationalisation of specific indicators.

I have primarily focussed on the identification of some indicators of political representation. It is clear that the operationalisation of these indicators to chart change is possible. A more difficult task is including possible causes

in order to explain changes (or stability) in particular indicators. The Gramscian basis provides a framework for considering key factors such as socio-economic relationships and colonialism. It is not possible, here, to develop these possibilities further. What a consideration of these texts *does* show is that the information is available for detailed research. The domain of knowledge that I have set out stresses the contestability of any historical evidence and the Hall and Schwarz model provides a coherent approach that can be used to select, report and critically analyse the available evidence.

CONCLUSION

In the last ten years, successive governments have acted to limit the role of the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This in no way diminishes the importance of studying the state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Indeed it may well be that the state will once again assume a massive presence in our civil society, and in any case, as Gramsci pointed out, even the "nightwatchman" state is a mode of central regulation. The framework that I have utilised here works through philosophical, theoretical and conceptual issues to suggest a possible way to study the Aotearoa/New Zealand state. By identifying some of the existing gaps in Aotearoa/New Zealand research, I have attempted to strengthen this model and indicate its applicability to Aotearoa/New Zealand. Needless to say, much research into the process of early state development in Aotearoa/New Zealand remains to be done. Attempting to do this research will indeed demonstrate whether my confidence is justified. Similarly, doing further research into more recent history could assess the changing role of the state and the changes in the relationship between civil society and the state. These issues remain important for both understanding why changes have occurred and anticipating the likelihood of future stability or change. However, the key issue that requires ongoing development is that of colonialism and the process of post-colonialism.

From philosophical to empirical information the issue of colonialism remains important for research in Aotearoa/New Zealand. As I indicated in the introduction, the Treaty of Waitangi cannot be excluded from research into Aotearoa/New Zealand. Firstly, this is because Aotearoa/New Zealand was only settled by the English (and other, primarily European, groups) on the basis of the Treaty of Waitangi. From initial settlement, the shape of the state system in Aotearoa/New Zealand has reflected a range of positions relative to the Treaty. The development of an economic infrastructure was based on the appropriation (by force if necessary) of Maori land. Studying economic, social and political developments in Aotearoa/New Zealand in the 1890s certainly requires a consideration of colonial relationships - and this is also true of Aotearoa/New Zealand in the 1990s. As a Pakeha sociologist, I

consider that I have an ethical obligation to consider the Treaty of Waitangi - both as an aspect of Aotearoa/New Zealand history and as a part of ongoing life in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Any research endeavour has the potential to encourage research in particular areas. Research is also constrained by a number of factors - not least space, time and money. We can hope that other researchers will cover those areas omitted or given scant attention in our own research. But we can also choose to highlight particular areas of importance.

These are the issues that formed a part of the impetus for this research. However, in order to address these concerns, the first step is to construct a domain of knowledge that can structure subsequent research. This has been the aim of this thesis. I have limited my discussion to the broad field of historical sociology, the state as the subject and the potential application of a revised Hall and Schwarz approach. As a domain of knowledge, the approach that I have argued for provides the tools for investigating the colonial past of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The emphasis on historical sociology is of central importance to this project. By assessing the relative merits of historical and sociological approaches, it is clear that they can be combined in a constructive way. The research skills of historians are invaluable in accessing and assessing the historical texts that form the basis for research into the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand. The theoretical basis of sociology provides the structure and justification for the way in which texts are selected, described and interpreted. Detailed historical sociology research may require ongoing collaboration by individuals from both disciplines, and this will be most successful when a dynamic exchange of ideas exists.

Within the field of historical sociology, I have suggested that a realist position forms the philosophical basis of this domain. We must look beyond the reporting of facts in order to understand or explain history. This requires the use of a theoretical framework that can propose possible reasons for historical

events or structures. The theoretical framework is also important from an ethical point of view, as the researcher must select and justify the approach taken, and, ideally, justify the selection and interpretation of evidence. Historical evidence, in itself is not neutral and should not be reported as such, but the selective reporting of evidence to fit a theory is also not desirable. The process of developing a domain is ongoing and involves the suggestion of possible approaches - as I have done here - and then testing how a particular approach may be applied.

Having charted the arguments for developing historical sociology as the broad shape of this domain, the next key area involves defining the subject. I have selected the state because of its importance as both an institution and an actor throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand's history. It is also a key area in which the issues of colonialism (and the potential shift to post-colonialism) are addressed and, importantly, recorded. "The state" is defined as government and public service and is situated in relation to civil society, the nation-state and the international context. The complex relationship between civil society and the state is of particular importance, as civil society is, potentially, the key driving force of change or stability in the state.

Explaining change or stability in the state is best structured by the use of a society-centred theoretical framework. State-centred approaches seriously assert the potential for state autonomy, however, this can be utilised as one aspect of a society-centred approach. Given that, since colonisation, Aotearoa/New Zealand has been a predominantly capitalist society, I narrow the theoretical framework by the choice of a neo-Marxist approach - on the understanding that, suitably interpreted, this stance is not far removed from that of "critical pluralism". This avoids an overt economic reductionism by allowing a wide range of factors to be included in an analysis of causality. Thus, the state is allowed a degree of autonomy, the actions of individuals are given credence and, in this case, colonial relationships, and aspects of

political representation can be considered *alongside* socio-economic relationships.

The Hall and Schwarz approach builds on the theoretical issues involved in defining the state to propose a specific model for studying the state. In particular, this involves a neo-Gramscian theoretical basis that addresses the theoretical issues I have outlined, and an emphasis on attention to historical complexity. I have enlarged considerably on this approach in order to indicate how it fits into the domain that I have developed and to demonstrate how it is applicable to Aotearoa/New Zealand. The revised Hall and Schwarz approach thus involves selecting a period of potential state (re)formation that can be studied. The aim is to assess whether, in this case, there was a shift in emphasis from individualism to collectivism in the state. In order to do this, the broad field of political representation is developed to provide four examples of what could be assessed - colonial control of the state, the franchise, Maori inclusion and state employees. These are only a small selection of potential indicators - and may not, in practice, be valid indicators of the individualism to collectivism shift. However, they provide examples that could be operationalised as a part of empirical research.

The final step taken in this thesis involved considering a small selection of New Zealand texts in light of the domain that I have established. This, in part, draws on a reflexive realist position that allows for an ongoing reassessment of historical texts. While none of the texts I have considered combine the theoretical basis and subject matter that I am concerned with, they provide evidence that it is both possible and desirable to implement the approach that I have suggested. However, this thesis has focussed primarily on establishing a coherent framework rather than the detailed application of a particular approach. Thus, this discussion is inevitably no more than an assertion of preferences, and an identification of possibilities. But there are a wealth of possibilities that can be considered in light of the domain of knowledge that I have discussed.

"Clearing the ground" has proved to be a difficult task. In the process of clarifying some issues, new areas have come to light that demand consideration - and not all can ever be given detailed assessment. Yet for all that, the importance of historical sociology is not likely to diminish, and in Aotearoa/New Zealand, history remains of central importance in the process of developing as a post-colonial society. In particular, the role of the state in the past and in the future remains vitally important, and utilising historical sociology can help to improve our understanding of the state. In closing this thesis, then, I reiterate my sense of the centrality of the topics that I have tried to weave together. My hope is that, in a small way, my themes and arguments help to clarify those domains of knowledge which pose exciting challenges as Aotearoa/New Zealand continues the process of post-colonial development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. and Turner, B.S., 1984. **The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology**. London, Penguin Books.

Abrams, P., 1982. **Historical Sociology**. New York, Cornell University Press.

Abrams, P., 1977. "Notes of the difficulty of studying the state" in **Journal of Social History, 1(1)**:58-89.

Abrams, P., Deem, R., Finch, J. and Rock, P. (Eds), 1981. **Practice and Progress: British Sociology 1950-1980**. London, George Allen & Unwin.

Adamson, W.L., 1980. **Hegemony and Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory**. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Althusser, L., 1969. **For Marx**. London, New Left Books.

Anderson, M., 1976. "Sociological history and the working class family: Smelser revisited" in **Social History, 3**:317-334.

Andrews, C.L., 1975. "Aspects of Development, 1870-1890" in I.H. Kawharu (Ed) **Conflict and Compromise: Essays on the Maori Since Colonisation**. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed:80-96.

Atkinson, J., 1992. "The state, the media and thin democracy" **Winter Lecture**. University of Auckland.

Balibar, E., 1991. "The nation form: history and ideology" in Balibar & Wallerstein **Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities**. London, Verso:86-106.

Balibar, E. and Wallerstein, I., 1991. **Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities**. London, Verso.

Banks, J.A., 1989. "From universal history to historical sociology" in **British Journal of Sociology, 40(4)**:521-543.

Barber, L., 1989. **New Zealand: A Short History**. Auckland, Century Hutchinson.

Bassett, J., 1990. "The English Island 1860-1870" in Binney et al. **The People and the Land Te Tangata me Te Whenua: An Illustrated History of New Zealand 1820-1920**. Wellington, Allen & Unwin:101-122.

Bassett, J., 1990. "Impotent Autocrats 1840-1860" in Binney et al. **The People and the Land Te Tangata me Te Whenua: An Illustrated History of New Zealand 1820-1920.** Wellington, Allen & Unwin:57-76.

Bedggood, D., 1978. "New Zealand's semi-colonial development: A Marxist view" in Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology 14(3):285-289.

Bell, K.N. and Morrell, W.P., 1968. **Select Documents on British Colonial Policy 1830-1860.** Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Bendix, R., 1980. "The mandate to rule: An introduction" in **Social Forces, 55(2):**242-256.

Bendix, R., 1970. **Embattled Reason: Essays on Social Knowledge.** New York, Oxford University Press.

Bendix, R., 1964. **Nation-Building and Citizenship: Studies of Our Changing Social Order.** Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bendix, R. and Lipset, S.M., 1966. **Class, Status, and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective.** London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Binney, J., Bassett, J., and Olssen, C., 1990. **The People and the Land Te Tangata me Te Whenua: An Illustrated History of New Zealand 1820-1920.** Wellington, Allen & Unwin.

Birnbaum, P., 1988. **States and Collective Action: The European Experience.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bloch, M., 1954. **The Historian's Craft.** Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Block, F., and Somers, M.R., 1984. "Beyond the economistic fallacy: The holistic social science of Karl Polanyi" in Skocpol, T. (Ed) **Vision and Method in Historical Sociology.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:47-84.

Bobbio, N., 1988. "Gramsci and the concept of civil society" in Keane, J. (Ed) **Civil Society and The State: New European Perspectives.** London, Verso:73-99.

Bobbio, N., 1979. "Gramsci and the conception of civil society" in Mouffe, C., (Ed) **Gramsci and Marxist Theory.** London, Routledge & Kegan Paul:21-47.

Bonnell, V.E., 1980. "The uses of theory, concepts and comparison in historical sociology" in **Comparative Studies in Society and History, 22**:156-173.

Boudon, R. and Bourricaud, F., 1989. **A Critical Dictionary of Sociology.** (trans. P. Hamilton) London, Routledge.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H., 1986. **Democracy and Capitalism: Property, Community and The Contradictions of Modern Social Thought.** London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Braddick, M., 1991. "State formation and social change in early modern England: A problem stated and approaches suggested" in **Social History, 16(1)**:1-17.

Breuilly, J., 1993. **Nationalism and The State.** Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Brookes, B., Macdonald, C., and Tennant, M. (Eds), 1992. **Women in History Two: Essays on Women in New Zealand.** Wellington, Bridget Williams Books.

Brookes, B., Macdonald, C., and Tennant, M. (Eds), 1986. **Women in History: Essays on European Women in New Zealand.** Wellington, Allen & Unwin.

Brookfield, F.M., 1989. "The New Zealand Constitution: The Search For Legitimacy" in I.H. Kawharu (Ed) **Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi.** Auckland, Auckland University Press:1-24.

Brooking, T., 1992. "Economic transformation" in Rice, G.W. (Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:230-253.

Brown, D.K., 1990. "Interpretive historical sociology: discordances of Weber, Dilthy and others" in **Journal of Historical Sociology, 3(2)**:166-191.

Buci-Glucksmann, C. (trans. D. Fernbach), 1980. **Gramsci and The State.** London, Lawrence & Wishart.

Burawoy, M., 1989. "Two methods in search of science: Skocpol versus Trotsky" in **Theory and Society, 18**:759-805.

Burke, P., 1992. **History and Social Theory.** Cambridge, Polity Press.

Butterworth, G.V., 1990. "Maori Affairs: A department and the people who made it" in Butterworth & Young **Maori Affairs/Nga Take Maori**. Wellington, Government Printer:1-67.

Butterworth, G.V. and Young, H.R., 1990. **Maori Affairs/ Nga Take Maori**. Wellington, Government Printer.

Carr, E.H., 1986. **What is History?** (2nd ed). London, MacMillan.

Chase-Dunn, C.K., Pallas, A.M. and Kentor, J., 1982. "Old and new research designs for studying the world-system: A research note" **Comparative Political Studies, 15(3):341-356**.

Chirot, D., 1984. "The social and historical landscape of Marc Bloch" in Skocpol, T. (Ed) **Vision and Method in Historical Sociology**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:22-46.

Chirot, D., 1976. "Introduction: Thematic controversies and new developments in the uses of historical materials by sociologists" in **Social Forces, 55(2):232-241**.

Chirot, D. (Ed), 1976. "The uses of history in sociological inquiry" in **Social Forces, 55(2):232-367**.

Clarke, S. (Ed), 1991. **The State Debate**. London, MacMillan.

Collins, S., 1987. **Rogernomics: Is There a Better Way?** New Zealand, Pitman.

Condliffe, J.B., 1959. **New Zealand in The Making: A Study of Economic and Social Development** (2nd ed). London, George Allen & Unwin.

Connolly, W.E., 1988. **Political Theory and Modernity**. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Coombes, A.E., 1992. "Inventing the "post-colonial"" in **New Formations, 18:39-52**.

Corrigan, P. and Sayer, D., 1985. **The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution**. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Dalziel, R., 1992. "The politics of settlement" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:87-111.

Davies, R.W. (Ed), 1986. "Introduction" in Carr, E.H. **What is History?** (2nd ed) London, MacMillan.

Denis, C.,1989. "The genesis of American capitalism: An historical inquiry into state theory" in **Journal of Historical Sociology, 2(4):328-356.**

Denoon, D., 1983. **Settler Capitalism: The Dynamics of Dependent Development in The Southern Hemisphere.** Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Department of Justice, 1986. "Appendix A: The electoral law of New Zealand. A brief history" in Report., **Towards a Better Democracy.** Wellington, Government Printer.

Dunleavy, P. and O'Leary, B., 1987. **Theories of The State: The Politics of Liberal Democracy.** Basingstoke, MacMillan Education.

Dye, T.R., 1994. **Politics in States and Communities.** New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Dyson, K.H.F., 1980. **The State Tradition in Western Europe: A Study of an Idea and Institution.** Oxford, Martin Robertson.

Eddy, J. and Schreuder, D., 1988. **The Rise of Colonial Nationalism: Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa First Assert Their Nationalities, 1880-1914.** Sydney, Allen & Unwin.

Eley, G. and Nield, K., 1980. "Why does social history ignore politics?" in **Social History, 5(2):249-271.**

Evans, P.B., 1985. "Transnational linkages and the economic role of the state: An analysis of developing and industrialised nations in the post-World War II period" in Evans et al (Eds), **Bringing The State Back In.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:192-226.

Evans, P.B., Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. (Eds), 1985. **Bringing The State Back In.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Fairburn, M., 1989. **The Ideal Society and Its Enemies: The Foundations of Modern New Zealand Society 1850-1900.** Auckland, Auckland University Press.

Featherstone, M., 1988. "In pursuit of the postmodern: An introduction" in **Theory, Culture and Society, 5:195-215.**

Femia, J.V., 1981. **Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and The Revolutionary Process.** Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Fieldhouse, D.K., 1983. **Colonialism 1870-1945: An Introduction.** London, MacMillan Press.

Fleras, A. and Elliot, J.L., 1992. **The Nations Within: Aboriginal-State Relations in Canada, The United States, and New Zealand.** Toronto, Oxford University Press.

Forgacs, D., 1989. "Gramsci and Marxism in Britain" in **New Left Review, 176:**70-88.

Friedman, M. and Friedman, R., 1980. **Free to Choose.** London, Penguin.

Fulbrook, M. and Skocpol, T., 1984. "Destined pathways: The historical sociology of Perry Anderson" in Skocpol, T. (Ed) **Vision and Method in Historical Sociology.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:170-210.

Gardiner, J., 1988. **What is History Today?** London, MacMillan.

Gardner, W.J., 1992. "A colonial economy" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:57-86.

Geras, N., 1988. "Ex-Marxism without substance" in **New Left Review, 169:**34-61.

Geras, N., 1987. "Post-Marxism" in **New Left Review, 163:**42-82.

Gibbons, P.J., 1992. "The climate of opinion" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:308-336.

Giddens, A., 1990. **The Consequences of Modernity.** Stanford, Polity Press.

Giddens, A., 1989. "A reply to my critics" in Held, D. and Thompson, J. (Eds) **Social Theory of Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and His Critics.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:249-301.

Giddens, A., 1985. **The Nation State and Violence: Volume II of A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism.** Cambridge, Polity Press.

Giddens, A., 1979. **Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis.** London, MacMillan.

Giddens, A., 1976. **New Rules of Sociological Method.** London, Hutchinson.

158

Gilliam, H., 1976. "The dialectics of realism and idealism in modern historiographic theory" in **History and Theory, 15:**231-256.

Godelier, M., 1980. "Origins and formation: Process of the formation, diversity and bases of the state" in **International Social Science Journal, 32(4):**609-623.

Gough, I., 1979. **The Political Economy of The Welfare State.** London, MacMillan.

Graham, J., 1992. "Settler society" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:112-140.

Griffiths, M., 1992. **Realism, Idealism and International Politics: A Reinterpretation.** London, Routledge.

Grimshaw, P., 1987. **Women's Suffrage in New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Auckland University Press.

Hall, J.A., 1989. "They do things differently here, or, the contribution of British historical sociology" in **British Journal of Sociology, 40(4):**544-564.

Hall, J.A. (Ed), 1986. **States in History.** Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Hall, J.R., 1992. "Where history and sociology meet: Forms of discourse and sociohistorical inquiry" in **Sociological Theory 10(2):**154-193.

Hall, S., 1984a. "The state in question" in McLennan et al (Eds) **The Idea of The Modern State.** Milton Keynes, Open University Press:1-28.

Hall, S., 1984b. "The rise of the representative /interventionist state 1880s-1920" in McLennan et al (Eds) **State and Society in Contemporary Britain: A Critical Introduction.** Cambridge, Polity Press:7-49.

Hall, S. and Schwarz, B., 1985. "State and society, 1880-1930" in Langan, M. and Schwarz, B. (Eds) **Crises in The British State 1880-1930.** London, Hutchinson:7-32.

Hamer, D., 1988. **The New Zealand Liberals: The Years of Power, 1891-1912.** Auckland, Auckland University Press.

Hamer, D., 1979. "Towns in nineteenth century New Zealand" in **New Zealand Journal of History, 13(1):**5-20.

Hamilton, G.G., 1984. "Configurations in history: The historical sociology of S.N. Eisenstadt" in Skocpol, T. (Ed) **Vision and Method in Historical Sociology**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:85-128.

Harrison, R.J., 1980. **Pluralism and Corporatism: The Political Evolution of Modern Democracies**. London, George Allen & Unwin.

Hayek, F.A., 1960. **The Constitution of Liberty**. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Heater, D., 1990. **Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education**. London, Longman.

Held, D., 1989a. **Political Theory and The Modern State**. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Held, D., 1989b. "Citizenship and autonomy" in Held, D. and Thompson, J. (Eds) **Social Theory of Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and His Critics**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:162-184.

Held, D., 1984. "Central perspectives on the modern state" in McLennan et al (Eds) **The Idea of The Modern State**. Milton Keynes, Open University Press:29-79.

Held, D. and Thompson, J. (Eds), 1989. **Social Theory of Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and His Critics**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hindess, B., 1987. **Politics and Class Analysis**. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Hindess, B., 1986. **Freedom, Equality and The Market: Arguments on Social Policy**. London, Tavistock.

Hirst, J.B., 1988. **The Strange Birth of Colonial Democracy**. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.

Hoffman, J., 1984. **The Gramscian Challenge: Coercion and Consent in Marxist Political Theory**. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Holt, J., 1980. "Compulsory arbitration in New Zealand, 1894-1901: The evolution of an industrial relations system" in **New Zealand Journal of History, 14(2)**:179-200.

Holub, R., 1992. **Antonio Gramsci: Beyond Marxism and Postmodernism**. London, Routledge.

Hopkins, T., 1978. "World-system analysis: Methodological issues" in Kaplan, B.H. (Ed) **Social Change in The Capitalist World Economy.** Beverley Hills, Sage:199-218.

Janowitz, M., 1980. "Observations on the sociology of citizenship: Obligations and rights" in **Social Forces, 59(1):1-24.**

Jary, D. and Jary, J., 1991. **Collins Dictionary of Sociology.** Glasgow, Harper Collins.

Jenkins, K., 1991. **Re-Thinking History.** London, Routledge.

Jessop, B., 1990. **State Theory: Putting Capitalist States in Their Place.** Cambridge, Polity.

Jessop, B., 1987. **Freedom, Equality and The Market.** London, Tavistock.

Johnson, T., Dandeker, C. and Ashworth, C., 1984. **The Structure of Social Theory.** London, MacMillan.

Joyce, P., 1995. "The end of social history?" in **Social History 20(1):73-91.**

Judt, T., 1979. "A clown in regal purple: Social history and the historians" in **History Workshop Journal 88:66-94.**

Kalberg, S., 1994. **Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology.** Cambridge, Polity Press.

Kaplan, B.H. (Ed), 1978. **Social Change in The Capitalist World Economy.** Beverley Hills, Sage.

Kawharu, I.H. (Ed), 1989. **Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi.** Auckland, Auckland University Press.

Kawharu, I.H. (Ed), 1975. **Conflict and Compromise: Essays on the Maori Since Colonisation.** Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.

Keane, J., 1991. "Democracy and the media" in **International Social Science Journal, 129:523-540.**

Keane, J., 1988. Civil Society and The State: New European Perspectives. London, Verso.

Keane, J., 1988. **Democracy and Civil Society.** London, Verso.

King, D.S., 1987. **The New Right: Politics, Markets and Citizenship.** London, MacMillan Education.

King, M., 1992. "Between two worlds" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:285-307.

Knapp, P., 1984. "Can social theory escape from history? Views of history in social science" in **History and Theory, 23**:34-52.

Kohn, M.L. (Ed), 1989. **Cross-National Research in Sociology.** California, Sage.

Kohn, M.L., 1989. "Cross-national research as an analytic strategy" in Kohn, M.L. (Ed) **Cross-National Research in Sociology.** California, Sage:77-102.

Korpi, W., 1989. "Power, politics and state autonomy in the development of social citizenship: Social rights during sickness in eighteen OECD countries since 1930" in **American Sociological Review, 54**:309-328.

Kuzmics, H., 1988. "The civilising process" in Keane, J. (Ed) **Civil Society and The State: New European Perspectives.** London, Verso.

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C., 1987. "Post-Marxism without apologies" in **New Left Review, 166**:79-106.

Laite, J., 1988. "The sociology of development" in Leeson, P.F. and Minogue, M.M. (Eds) **Perspectives on Development: Cross-Disciplinary Themes in Development.** Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Langan, M. and Schwarz, B. (Eds), 1985. **Crises in The British State 1880-1930.** London, Hutchinson.

Laslett, P., 1976. "The wrong way through the telescope: A note on literary evidence in sociology and in historical sociology" in **British Journal of Sociology, 27(3)**:319-342.

Le Rossignol, J.E. and Stewart, W.D., 1910. **State Socialism in New Zealand.** London, G.G. Harrap & Co.

Leeson, P.F. and Minogue, M.M. (Eds), 1988. **Perspectives on Development: Cross-Disciplinary Themes in Development.** Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Lefort, C., 1988. **Democracy and Political Theory** (Trans. D. Macey). Cambridge, Polity Press.

Lipset, S.M., 1994. "The social requisites of democracy revisited" in **American Sociological Review, 59(1)**:1-22.

Lipson, L., 1948. **The Politics of Equality: New Zealand's Adventures in Democracy**. Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Lloyd, C., 1993. **The Structures of History**. Oxford, Blackwell.

Lloyd, C., 1991. "The methodologies of social history: a critical survey and defense of structuralism" in **History and Theory, 30:**180-219.

Lloyd, C., 1989. "Realism, structurism and history" in **Theory and Society, 18:**451-494.

Lloyd, C. (Ed), 1983. **Social Theory and Political Practice**. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Lockwood, D., 1964. "Social integration and system integration" in Zollschan, L.D. and Hirsch, W. (Eds) **Explorations in Social Change**. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul:244-257.

Lukes, S., 1986. **Power**. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

McLintock, A., 1994. "The angel of progress: Pitfalls of the term 'post-colonialism'" in Williams, P. & Chrisman, L., **Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader**. Cambridge, Harvester Wheatsheaf:291-304.

McIntyre, W.D., 1992. "Imperialism and nationalism" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:337-347.

McIntyre, W.D. and Gardner, W.J., 1971. **Speeches and Documents on New Zealand History**. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

McLennan, G., 1993a. "Unit 9. Society-centred approach I: Marxism and the problem of reductionism" in **76.403 Political Sociology**. Palmerston North, Massey University.

McLennan, G., 1993b. "Unit 10. Society-centred approach II: Marxism and pluralism today" in **76.403 Political Sociology**. Palmerston North, Massey University.

McLennan, G., 1993c. "Unit 11. State-centred approach I: Bringing the state back in" in **76.403 Political Sociology**. Palmerston North, Massey University.

McLennan, G., 1989. **Marxism, Pluralism and Beyond**. Cambridge, Polity.

McLennan, G., 1984a. "Capitalist state or democratic polity? Recent developments in Marxist and pluralist theory" in McLennan et al (Eds) **The Idea of The Modern State**. Milton Keynes, Open University Press:80-109.

McLennan, G., 1984b. "The contours of British politics: representative democracy and social class" in McLennan et al (Eds) **State and Society in Contemporary Britain: A Critical Introduction**. Cambridge, Polity Press:241-273.

McLennan, G., 1984c. "Critical or positive theory? A comment on the status of Anthony Giddens' social theory" in **Theory, Culture and Society, 2(2):**123-129.

McLennan, G., 1984d. "History and theory: Contemporary debates and directions" in **Literature and History, 10(2):**139-164.

McLennan, G., 1981. **Marxism and The Methodologies of History**. London, Verso.

McLennan, G., Held, D. and Hall, S. (Eds), 1984. **The Idea of The Modern State**. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

McLennan, G., Hall, S and Held, D. (Eds), 1984. **State and Society in Contemporary Britain: A Critical Introduction**. Cambridge, Polity Press.

McLintock, A.H., 1958. **Crown Colony Government in New Zealand**. Wellington, Government Printer.

McMichael, P., 1992. "Rethinking comparative analysis in a post-developmentalist context" in **International Social Science Journal, 133:**351-365.

McMichael, P., 1990. "Incorporating comparison within a world-historical perspective" in **American Sociological Review, 55(3):**385-397.

McMichael, P., 1984. **Settlers and The Agrarian Question: Foundation of Capitalism in Colonial Australia**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mann, M., 1988. **States, War and Capitalism: Studies in Political Sociology**. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Mann, M., 1986. **The Sources of Social Power Vol I: A History of Power From The Beginning to A.D. 1760**. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Margolis, M., 1977. **Viable Democracy**. London, MacMillan.

Marina, W., 1979. "Egalitarianism and empire" in Templeton, K.S. (Ed) **The Politicisation of Society.** Indianapolis, Liberty Press:127-166.

Marsden, R., 1992. "'The state': A comment on Abrams, Denis and Sayer" in **Journal of Historical Sociology, 5(3):**358-377.

Marshall, T.H., 1950. **Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Melucci, A., 1988. "Social movements and the democratisation of everyday life" in Keane, J. (Ed) **Civil Society and The State: New European Perspectives.** London, Verso.

Miliband, R., 1983. "State power and class interests" in **New Left Review, 138:**57-69.

Mill, J.S., 1972. **Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government.** London, J.M. Dent.

Mills, C.W., 1959. **The Sociological Imagination.** Canada, Oxford University Press.

Mishra, R., 1984. **The Welfare State in Crisis.** London, Harvester Press.

Mishra, V. and Hodge, B., 1994. "What is post(-)colonialism?" in Williams, P. & Chrisman, L., **Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader.** Cambridge, Harvester Wheatsheaf:276-290.

Misztal, B., 1988. "Social movements of the core and periphery" in **Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 24(1):**65-82.

Modelski, G., 1978. "The long cycle of global politics and the nation-state" in **Comparative Studies in Society and History, 20:**214-235.

Morawska, E., 1989. "Social history update: Sociology and 'historical matters'" in **Journal of Social History, 23:**439-444.

Morera, E., 1990. **Gramsci's Historicism: A Realist Interpretation.** London, Routledge.

Morrell, W.P., 1966. **British Colonial Policy in The Age of Peel and Russell.** London, Frank Cass & Co.

Morrell, W.P., 1964. **The Provincial System in New Zealand 1852-76.** Christchurch, Whitcombe & Tombs.

Mouffe, C., 1979. "Introduction: Gramsci Today" in Mouffe, C. (Ed) **Gramsci and Marxist Theory**. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1992. "Social and system integration: Habermas' view" in **British Journal of Sociology, 43(2):267-288**.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1991. **Back to Sociological Theory: The Construction of Social Orders**. London, MacMillan.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1990. **Post-Marxist Alternatives: The Construction of Social Orders**. London, MacMillan.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1989a. "Political transitions in Greece and Argentina: Toward a reorientation of Marxist political theory" in **Comparative Political Studies, 21(4):443-466**.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1989b. "Restructuring structuration theory" in **Sociological Review, 37(4):613-635**.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1988. "Marxism or post-marxism?" in **New Left Review, 167:107-123**.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1986. **Politics in The Semi-Periphery: Early Parliamentarism and Late Industrialisation in The Balkans and Latin America**. London, MacMillan.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1974. "Social and system integration: some reflection on a fundamental distinction" in **British Journal of Sociology, 25(4):395-409**.

Mouzelis, N.M., 1969. **Organisation and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories**. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mulgan, R., 1994. **Politics in New Zealand**. Auckland, Auckland University Press.

Mulgan, R., 1989. **Maori, Pakeha and Democracy**. Auckland, Oxford University Press.

Neale, R.S., 1981. **Class in English History 1680-1850**. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Nielsen, K., 1993/94. "Reconceptualising civil society for now: Some somewhat Gramscian turnings" in **Arena Journal, 2:159-174**.

Nowak, S., 1989. "Comparative studies and social theory" in Kohn, M.L. (Ed) **Cross-National Research in Sociology**. California, Sage:34-56.

O'Brien, M. and Wilkes, C., 1993. **The Tragedy of The Market: A Social Experiment in New Zealand.** Palmerston North, Dunmore Press.

Offe, C., 1984. **Contradictions of The Welfare State.** London, Hutchinson Education.

Oldfield, A., 1990. **Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and The Modern World.** London, Routledge.

Olin Wright, E., 1989. "Models of historical trajectory: An assessment of Giddens' critique of Marxism" in Held, D. and Thompson, J. (Eds) **Social Theory of Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and His Critics.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:77-102.

Oliver, W.H., 1979. "Social welfare: Social justice or social efficiency?" in **New Zealand Journal of History, 13(1):25-33.**

Oliver, W.H. and Williams, B., 1981. **The Oxford History of New Zealand.** Wellington, Oxford University Press.

Olssen, E., 1992. "Towards a new society" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:254-284.

Orange, C., 1987. **The Treaty of Waitangi.** Wellington, Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.

Oyen, E., 1990. "The imperfection of comparisons" in Oyen, E. (Ed) **Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research.** London, Sage:1-18.

Oyen, E. (Ed), 1990. Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research. London, Sage.

Parry, G., 1991. "Conclusion: Paths to citizenship" in Vogel, U. & Moran, M. (Eds) **The Frontiers of Citizenship.** London, MacMillan:166-202.

Parsonson, A., 1992. "The challenge to Mana Maori" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:167-198.

Pateman, C., 1985. **The Problem of Political Obligation: A Critique of Liberal Theory.** Cambridge, Polity Press.

Pateman, C., 1970. **Participation and Democratic Theory.** London, Cambridge University Press.

Pearson, D., 1990. **A Dream Deferred: The Origins of Ethnic Conflict in New Zealand**. Wellington, Allen & Unwin.

Pierson, C., 1991. **Beyond The Welfare State?** Cambridge, Polity Press.

Poggi, G., 1978. **The Development of The Modern State: A Sociological Introduction**. London, Hutchinson.

Polaschek, R.J., 1958. **Government Administration in New Zealand**. London, Oxford University Press.

Popper, K.R., 1957. **The Poverty of Historicism**. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Poulantzas, N., 1980. "Research note on the state and society" in **International Social Science Journal, 32(4):600-608**.

Poulantzas, N., 1973. "On social class" in **New Left Review, 78:27-54**.

Przeworski, A. and Teune, H., 1970. **The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry**. New York, John Wiley & Sons.

Ragin, C., 1989. "New directions in comparative research" in Kohn, M.L. (Ed) **Cross-National Research in Sociology**. California, Sage:57-76.

Ragin, C., 1987. **The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies**. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Ragin, C. and Zaret, D., 1983. "Theory and method in comparative research: Two strategies" in **Social Forces, 61(3):731-754**.

Ransome, P., 1992. **Antonio Gramsci: A New Introduction**. London, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Reeves, W.P., 1969. **State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand - Vol I & Vol II** (first pub. 1902). Melbourne, Macmillan of Australia.

Rei, T., 1993. **Maori Women and The Vote**. Wellington, Huia Publishers.

Reisch, G.A., 1991. "Chaos, history and narrative" in **History and Theory, 30:1-36**.

Renwick, W. (Ed), 1991. **Sovereignty and Indigenous Rights: The Treaty of Waitangi in International Contexts**. Wellington, Victoria University Press.

Report of The Royal Commission on The Electoral System, 1986. **Towards a Better Democracy**. Wellington, Government Printer.

Rescher, N., 1993. **Pluralism: Against The Demand For Consensus**. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Rice, G.W. (Ed), 1992. **The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press.

Richardson, L., 1992. "Parties and political change" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:201-229.

Roche, M., 1992. **Rethinking Citizenship: Welfare , Ideology and Change in Modern Society**. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Roche, M., 1987. "Citizenship, social theory and social change" in **Theory and Society, 16:363-399**.

Rock, P., 1976. "Some problems of interpretative historiography" in **British Journal of Sociology, 27(3):353-369**.

Roper, B. and Rudd, C. (Eds), 1993. **State and Economy in New Zealand**. Auckland, Oxford University Press.

Rose, J.H., Newton, A.P. and Benians, E.A., 1933. **The Cambridge History of The British Empire Volume VII Part II: New Zealand**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Roth, G., 1976. "History and sociology in the work of Max Weber" in **British Journal of Sociology, 27(3):306-318**.

Roth, G., 1976. "Religion and revolutionary beliefs: Sociological and historical dimensions in Max Weber's work - In memory of Ivan Vallier" in **Social Forces, 55(2):257-272**.

Rubin, B., 1977. **Media, Politics and Democracy**. New York, Oxford University Press.

Rueschemeyer, D., Huber-Stephens, E. and Stephens, J., 1992. **Capitalist Development and Democracy**. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Rueschemeyer, D. and Evans, P.B., 1985. "The state and economic transformation: Toward an analysis of the conditions underlying effective intervention" in Evans et al (Eds), **Bringing the State Back In**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:44-77.

Runciman, W.G., 1989. **Confessions of a Reluctant Theorist.** London, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Rush, M., 1992. **Politics and Society: An Introduction to Political Sociology.** London, Prentice Hall.

Schopflin, G., 1993. **Politics in Eastern Europe, 1945-1992.** Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Scott, K.J, 1962. **The New Zealand Constitution.** Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Semmel, B., 1976. "H.T. Buckle: The liberal faith and the science of history" in **British Journal of Sociology, 27(3):370-386.**

Sewell, W.H., 1985. "Ideologies and social revolutions: Reflections on the French case" in **The Journal of Modern History, 57(1):57-85.**

Simon, R., 1982. **Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction.** London, Lawrence & Wishart.

Sinclair, K., 1991. **A History of New Zealand.** Auckland, Penguin.

Skocpol, T., 1985. "Bringing the state back in: Strategies of analysis in current research" in Evans et al (Eds) **Bringing The State Back In.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:3-43.

Skocpol, T. (Ed), 1984. **Vision and Method in Historical Sociology.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Skocpol, T., 1979. **States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Skocpol, T., 1976a. "France, Russia, China: A structural analysis of social revolutions" in **Comparative Studies in Society and History, 18(2):175-210.**

Skocpol, T., 1976b. "Old regime legacies and communist revolutions in Russia and China" in **Social Forces, 55(2):284-315.**

Skocpol, T., 1985. "Cultural idioms and political ideologies in the revolutionary reconstruction of state power: A rejoinder to Sewell" in **The Journal of Modern History, 57(1):86-96.**

Skocpol, T. and Somers, M., 1980. "The uses of comparative history in macrosocial inquiry" in **Comparative Study of Society and History, 22(1):174-197.**

Smart, B., 1990. "On the disorder of things: Sociology, postmodernity and the 'end of the social'" in **Sociology, 24(3):397-416.**

Smart, B., 1982. "Foucault, sociology and the problem of human agency" in **Theory and Society, 11(2):121-141.**

Smith, A.D., 1991. **National Identity.** Reno, University of Nevada Press.

Smith, A.D., 1986a. **The Ethnic Origins of Nations.** Oxford, Blackwell.

Smith, A.D., 1986b. "State-making and nation-building" in Hall, J.A. (Ed) **States in History.** Oxford, Basil Blackwell:228-263.

Smith, A.S., 1952. **The Wealth of Nations.** Chicago, Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Smith, D., 1991. **The Rise of Historical Sociology.** Cambridge, Polity Press.

Smith, D., 1984. "Discovering facts and values: The historical sociology of Barrington Moore" in Skocpol, T. (Ed) **Vision and Method in Historical Sociology.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:313-355.

Smith, D., 1982. "Social history and sociology - more than just good friends" in **The Sociological Review, 30(2):286-308.**

Sorrenson, M.K.P., 1992. "Maori and Pakeha" in Rice, G.W. **(Ed) The Oxford History of New Zealand** (2nd ed). Auckland, Oxford University Press:141-166.

Sorrenson, M.K.P., 1991. "Treaties in British colonial policy: Precedents for Waitangi" in Renwick, W. (Ed) **Sovereignty and Indigenous Rights: The Treaty of Waitangi in International Contexts.** Wellington, Victoria University Press.

Sorrenson, M.K.P., 1986. "Appendix B: A history of Maori Representation in Parliament" in Report. **Towards a Better Democracy.** Wellington, Government Printer.

Spoonley, P., 1988. **Racism and Ethnicity.** Auckland, Oxford University Press.

Stanford, M., 1986. **The Nature of Historical Knowledge.** New York, Basil Blackwell.

Stedman-Jones, G., 1976. "From historical sociology to theoretical history" in **British Journal of Sociology, 27(3):295-305.**

Stembridge, S.R., 1982. **Parliament, The Press and The Colonies, 1846-1880.** New York, Garland Publishing.

Stepan, A., 1985. "State power and the strength of civil society in the southern cone of Latin America" in Evans et al (Eds), **Bringing The State Back In.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:317-343.

Stinchcombe, A.L., 1978. **Theoretical Methods in Social History.** New York, Academic Press.

Sutch, W.B., 1969. **Poverty and Progress in New Zealand: A Reassessment.** Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.

Sutch, W.B., 1966. **Colony or Nation? Economic Crises in New Zealand From The 1860s to The 1960s.** Sydney, Sydney University Press.

Sutch, W.B., 1966. **The Quest For Security in New Zealand, 1840-1966.** Wellington, Oxford University Press.

Sztompka, P., 1993. **The Sociology of Social Change.** Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Teariki, C. and Spoonley, P, (with N. Tomoana), 1992. **Te Whakapakari Te Mana Tangata. The Politics and Process of Research For Maori.** Massey University, Department of Sociology.

Templeton, K.S. (Ed), 1979. **The Politicisation of Society.** Indianapolis, Liberty Press.

Tennant, M., 1979. "Duncan Macgregor and charitable aid administration 1886-1896" in **New Zealand Journal of History, 13(1):33-40.**

Tester, K., 1992. **Civil Society.** London, Routledge.

Teune, H., 1990. "Comparing countries: Lessons learned" in Oyen, E. (Ed) **Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research.** London, Sage:38-62.

Texier, J., 1979. "Gramsci, theoretician of the superstructures" in Mouffe, C. (Ed) **Gramsci and Marxist Theory.** London, Routledge & Kegan Paul:48-79.

Thompson, J., 1989. "The theory of structuration" in Held, D. and Thompson, J. (Eds) **Social Theory of Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and His Critics.** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press:56-76.

Tilly, C., 1992. "Prisoners of the state" in **International Social Science Journal, 133:329-334**.

Tilly, C., 1981. **As Sociology Meets History**. New York, Academic Press.

Tilly, L. and Tilly, C., 1980. "Special issue of social history" in **Theory and Society, 9(5):667-683**.

Todd, A., 1880. **Parliamentary Government in The British Colonies**. London, Longmans, Green & Co.

Toland, J.D. (Ed), 1993. **Ethnicity and The State**. New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers.

Tosh, J., 1991. **The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods and New Directions in The Study of Modern History**. London, Longman.

Toynbee, C., 1979. "Class and social structure in nineteenth century New Zealand" in **New Zealand Journal of History, 13(1):65-80**.

Turner, B.S., 1990. "Outline of a theory of citizenship" in **Sociology, 24(2):189-217**.

Turner, B.S., 1990. "Max Weber's historical sociology: a bibliographical essay" in **Journal of Historical Sociology, 3(2):192-208**.

Turner, B.S., 1988. "Religion and state formation: A commentary on recent debates" in **Journal of Historical Sociology, 1(3):322-333**.

Turner, B.S., 1986. **Citizenship and Capitalism**. London, Allen & Unwin.

Vallier, I., 1971. **Comparative Methods in Sociology: Essays on Trends and Applications**. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Von-Leydon, W., 1984. "Categories of historical understanding" in **History and Theory, 23:53-77**.

Wallerstein, I., 1978. "World-system analysis: Theoretical and interpretive issues" in Kaplan, B.H. (Ed) **Social Change in The Capitalist World Economy**. Beverley Hills, Sage:219-236.

Wallerstein, I., 1976. "A world-system perspective on the social sciences" in **British Journal of Sociology, 27(3):343-352**.

Wallerstein, I., 1976. "From feudalism to capitalism: Transition or transitions? in **Social Forces, 55(2):273-283**.

Walton, T., 1984. "Justifying the welfare state" in McLennan et al (Eds) **The Idea of The Modern State**. Milton Keynes, Open University Press:110-132.

Ward, I., 1968. **The Shadow of The Land: A Study of British Policy and Racial Conflict in New Zealand 1832-1852**. Wellington, Government Printer.

Weale, A., 1991. "Citizenship beyond borders" in Vogel, U. and Moran, M. (Eds) **The Frontiers of Citizenship**. London, MacMillan:155-165.

White, H.V., 1975. "Historicism, history and the figurative imagination" in **History and Theory 14(4):48-67**.

Wilkes, C., 1993. "The state as an historical subject: A periodisation of state formation in New Zealand" in Roper, B. & Rudd, C. (Eds), **State and Economy in New Zealand**. Auckland, Oxford University Press:192-209.

Williams, D.V., 1989. "Te Tiriti o Waitangi - Unique Relationship Between Crown and Tangata Whenua" in I.H. Kawharu (Ed) **Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi**. Auckland, Auckland University Press:64-91.

Williams, P. and Chrisman, L., 1994. **Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader**. Cambridge, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wolf, E.R., 1982. **Europe and The People Without History**. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Wolff, K.H., 1959. "Sociology and history: Theory and practice" in **American Journal of Sociology, 65(1):32-38**.

Wrong, E.M., 1926. **Charles Butler and Responsible Government**. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Zollschan, L.C. and Hirsch, W. (Eds), 1964. **Explorations in Social Change**. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.