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Abstract

This study investigates what four leading New Zealand historians think about the changes that have happened in historical practice in these islands over recent decades. New Zealand historians continuously debate how our shared histories should be practised and researched. However, many of these varied viewpoints are articulated individually through the written word: no one has yet asked historians themselves about their practice. This dissertation is a pilot study for a much larger project. It uses an oral history methodology to establish how New Zealand historians are thinking about their discipline and the challenges ahead. The personal testimonies of Vincent O’Malley, Ann Parsonson, Angela Wanhalla and Jock Phillips attest to the transformations which have occurred in indigenous, public, academic, educational, technological and methodological areas of history, while also offering critical reflections on their future directions. Despite their differences in generations, and in their professional and personal backgrounds, these historians share a consensus around the need to practice New Zealand history in ways that uncover its diversity, complexity and nuances, while nurturing the healing powers that understandings of the past can bring to communities.
Introduction

I think it’s actually a project that probably should have been done some time ago because... it’s not often that historians get to reflect on the work that they do ... or to see how methodologies ... have evolved over time because sometimes we don’t see ourselves as a part of that story and ... the work we’re doing is actually shaping things but it’s hard to figure out where that happens.  

Angela Wanhalla

The words of the University of Otago historian Angela Wanhalla highlight the need to reflect on historical practice in New Zealand. Today, public debates about our history are frequent. Such discussions occur in local communities, the media, schools, and the New Zealand Government.  

2019 not only commemorates, and converses about, our Pacific voyaging heritage and the 250th anniversary of Captain Cook’s landing in New Zealand through Tuia – Encounters 250, but it also

---

2 Angela Wanhalla, interviewed by Neve Duston, 6th of July, 2019, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
celebrates the compulsory inclusion of New Zealand history in the school curriculum.\(^4\) Shifts in New Zealanders’ mindsets have brought their history to the fore.

New Zealand historians have produced various scholarly manifestos about how their history should be practised.\(^5\) Keith Sinclair and W.H. Oliver, for example, legitimised New Zealand history as a subject of inquiry.\(^6\) The Māori Renaissance from the 1970s challenged historical narratives dominated by Pākehā perspectives and led to a proliferation of historical research into our race relations.\(^7\) The Waitangi Tribunal’s acquisition of retrospective powers in 1985 reshaped


\(^7\) Olssen, “Where to From Here? Reflections on the Twentieth-century Historiography of Nineteenth-century New Zealand,” 66; Jacob Pollock, “Cultural Colonization and Textual
post-colonial, trans-national, cultural colonisation, and world history approaches.\textsuperscript{13} Māori historians asserted the need for more tikanga, mātauranga and kaupapa approaches to be included in wider New Zealand history to truly reconcile with the past.\textsuperscript{14}

Although this body of writing is expanding, no one has spoken in depth with historians to establish their perspectives on the momentous changes within the discipline or in relation to its future. This dissertation addresses this notable historiographical lacuna by asking four leading New Zealand historians, kanohi ki te kanohi, to reflect about their roles, their practice and the discipline as a whole. My dissertation constitutes a pilot study for a much larger project and it signposts directions


for future research. As Angela’s words suggest, it is not often that our historians take a moment to talk about where they have been and where they might be going.

This study takes an oral history approach. Oral history is spoken history.¹⁵ Recent technological developments and a greater acceptance of this method amongst historians have resulted in oral history becoming more widely used in recent decades.¹⁶ As Paul Thompson observed, this methodology “can be used to change the focus of history itself, and open up new areas of inquiry”.¹⁷ Oral history sources are unique from written sources in the respect that they are only created when “the researcher calls [them] into existence.”¹⁸ Thus, historians have partial control over who will be interviewed and how the testimony will be shaped by the questions asked of the interviewee.¹⁹ Yet, this allows for collaborative story-telling to arise, as writers such as Nēpia Mahuika, Thompson and Alessandro Portelli have demonstrated.²⁰

An oral history methodology is not without its limitations. During an interview people can be forgetful; memories may be affected by the passing of time; interviewees may suppress memories

they do not wish to share; and the interview’s dynamics may influence what the interviewee speaks about.\(^{21}\)

Furthermore, oral history is told from many perspectives, meaning “the impartiality traditionally claimed by historians is replaced by the partiality of the narrator. ‘Partiality’ here stands for both ‘unfinishedness’ and for ‘taking sides’: oral history can never be told without taking sides, since the ‘sides’ exist inside the telling.”\(^{22}\)

The perennial question of “representativeness” also arises with oral history. The perspectives offered by the four historians interviewed for this project, for example, are not necessarily reflective of all New Zealand scholars.

Nevertheless, historians have argued oral history has creative capacities to explore Māori histories and to enrich the various shades and textures of our shared past throughout these islands.\(^{23}\) For my project, it provided the most appropriate method to answer the central questions about historical practice.\(^{24}\)

It has also opened this new avenue of inquiry through asking historians themselves about their thoughts regarding New Zealand history, how it has changed over time, and its possible future directions.

This study was conducted through the framework recommended by the National Oral History Association of New Zealand.\(^{25}\) After my project was approved by the University of Canterbury

---


\(^{24}\) See Appendix A for this study’s main research questions.

Human Ethics Committee and the Ngāi Tahu Consultation and Engagement Group, I recruited my interviewees. Through the contacts of my supervisor, Lyndon Fraser, I emailed five leading New Zealand historians to enquire if they would participate in my study. To get the broadest survey possible within the constraints of Honours, I asked five historians who spanned generations, genders, ethnicities, and public and academic New Zealand history. Four said yes. The leading historians I interviewed for this study were Dr Vincent O’Malley, Dr Ann Parsonson, Dr Jock Phillips, and Dr Angela Wanhalla. After their initial acceptance to participate, I spoke to each of them on the telephone, and met with Ann in person, to introduce myself, explain my project in more detail, answer any questions about the project, and arrange interview dates. I emailed each of these historians an interview consent form to complete before any interviews took place. The interviews were recorded using a Fostex digital recorder, and ranged between two to four hours long, with regular breaks taken during that time. The interviews were semi-structured with questions which the participants had viewed before the interview. However, new and unplanned questions arose throughout the interviews. While many of the themes discussed in the interviews were not intimately personal, I did take care to read the interviewees’ body language and tone of voice to ascertain the extent to which they wished to discuss a topic if they did not overtly express this themselves. Transcription of the interviews then took place. My interviewees were given the

---

26 Dean Sutherland, “Ref: HEC 2019/41, Neve Duston,” University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee, 20th of May, 2019; Henrietta Carroll, “RE: ‘Experiences, Perspectives and Directions: New Zealand Historians and Shifts in New Zealand Historical Practice,’” Ngāi Tahu Consultation and Engagement Group, 6th of May, 2019. Note: “Experiences, Perspectives and Directions: New Zealand Historians and Shifts in New Zealand Historical Practice” was the working title for this dissertation under which approval from the Human Ethics Committee and the Ngāi Tahu Consultation and Engagement Group was sought to conduct the oral history interviews.

27 See Appendix C.

28 See Appendix B.
transcript of their interview to approve and make changes.

Vincent has worked for iwi and the Crown Forestry Rental Trust to research Waitangi Tribunal historical claims since 1993 and has authored many books on New Zealand history. Angela is a New Zealand history lecturer at the University of Otago. Her main research interests are about intersections of gender, race, and sexuality in colonial New Zealand. Jock began his career teaching American and New Zealand history at Victoria University of Wellington (1973-1989) before moving into public history. He was Chief Historian for the Government (1989-2002), a concept leader at Te Papa Tongarewa, General, and then Senior, Editor of Te Ara: The Encyclopedia of New Zealand, and has published many books on New Zealand history.


30 Angela Wanhabla.


identifies as a historian who works within Māori-Crown relationships.\textsuperscript{34} She was a New Zealand history lecturer at the University of Canterbury from 1978 to 2004, has been a historian for Ngāi Tahu, Ngā Iwi o Taranaki and Waikato Iwi historical Waitangi Tribunal claims, and was appointed to the Tribunal as a Historian member in 2001.\textsuperscript{35}

This dissertation draws on my interviewees’ testimonies across three chapters. Chapter One explores their reflections about, and experiences with, indigenous history and the Waitangi Tribunal. Chapter Two discusses their thoughts about the broader shifts in the practice of New Zealand history over time. Chapter Three calls on my interviewees’ vast knowledge of our past to contemplate the future directions of New Zealand history. Despite their varying emphases, the personal testimonies recorded for this project reveal a broad agreement that we should practise history to uncover and effectively communicate its tremendous diversity and complexity. Additionally, they recognise the power that understandings of the past have to heal our communities.

\textsuperscript{34} Ann Parsonson, interviewed by Neve Duston, 1\textsuperscript{st} of July, 2019, Neve’s home, Christchurch.
Chapter One: Historians’ Interactions with Te Ao Māori

In this chapter, I explore my interviewees’ experiences with indigenous histories, and the impacts of the Waitangi Tribunal on historical practice. When I asked Vincent how the relationship between Māori history and “New Zealand” history has changed, he explains it was not until the 1970s when Pākehā became aware that not all New Zealanders perceived their history as a story of harmonious race relations: “Māori have completely different understandings of the way New Zealand history unfolded and that comes as a real shock for a lot of people”.36 He thinks, now, “there is an increasing awareness of the fact that New Zealand’s history is … quite different from the rose-tinted take on it and that there were these much darker episodes. I think there is … probably just in quite recent times, a willingness to open up and engage with that history in a way that wasn’t there previously.”37 In the first section I draw on my participants’ testimonies to examine how Māori historians have transformed the ways we “do” the past. Secondly, I discuss how my interviewees’ limited Te Reo Māori language skills have affected their historical practice. Thirdly, I share these four historians’ stories of their positive experiences and challenges more broadly when working in Māori history spaces. Lastly, I investigate how the Waitangi Tribunal has reshaped New Zealand history.

36 Vincent O’Malley.
37 Ibid.
Māori Historians and Historical Perspectives

Vincent notes “‘[t]here have always been Māori historians but not necessarily … recognised within that academic framework and today there’s a very vibrant community of Māori historians who are bringing new perspectives to bear on our history.’”38 Vincent sees value “in the way that Māori perspectives on our history are … challenging the older orthodoxies.”39 Ann says “certainly there’s a much greater … feeling among historians that they can’t just write, obviously about the Pākehā past anymore and that wasn’t always the case”.40 Like Ann, Vincent says “in terms of understanding things from the Māori perspective, I think that’s obviously something that’s pretty much here to stay. I think now that you can’t simply approach any kind of historical story that has a Māori element without attempting to understand what those Māori actors were making of that themselves and ascribing a level of agency to those people in attempting to [understand] their perspectives and their takes on things in a way that Pākehā history for a long time didn’t really do or, or if it did, did quite badly.”41

Similarly, Angela sees Māori histories as increasingly nuanced, with more Māori historians “working from different approaches … so they testify to the diversity of different ways in which Māori history can be done.”42 She states it “would be fantastic” if there were more Māori historians in university history departments.43 However, she explains, “it is also a big burden being a Māori academic in an academic space … and it’s tiring, always … pushing for things to change.”44

38 Vincent O’Malley.
39 Ibid.
40 Ann Parsonson.
41 Vincent O’Malley.
42 Angela Wanhalla.
43 Ibid.
44 Ibid.
Historians and Te Reo Māori

When working with Māori history, my interviewees expressed that low Te Reo Māori proficiency challenged their engagement with Māori historical sources, such as Māori language newspapers. Angela says “we’re seeing the emergence of a lot more people who are working in that space and across that divide between Maori language and … English language materials. We’ve had so much of a dominance on English language materials in New Zealand … even to the point we might work with Te Reo material but it’s actually in English translation”. 45 Ann explains a challenge for her while engaging with Māori history has been “to overcome the fact that … your Māori Reo is not good.” 46 She speaks about the bilingual interpretation at Waitangi Tribunal claim hearings. 47 She says this was crucial when the Tribunal heard claims in the Urewera region between 2003 and 2005 because the speakers representing Ngā Tūhoe “didn’t have to speak in English about … philosophical and metaphysical matters which was very important and … for those of us who weren’t fluent in Te Reo, to … hear the translation as they spoke.” 48

Jock recalls he “grew up knowing no Te Reo and when I went to university, there was never any expectation that I would speak Māori”. 49 He discusses recently writing an article for the Royal Studies Journal about Māori during British royal visits of New Zealand. 50 Jock realised “that if I

45 Angela Wanhalla.
46 Ann Parsonson.
47 Ibid.
was going to tell the story properly, I needed to have access and to be able to read all the Māori newspapers to see from … the Māori perspective … what they thought about these tours.” 51 To do this, he “had to sit down with Paul Meredith … and go through the Māori newspapers”. 52 Vincent describes he “can read Te Reo at a reasonably basic towards intermediate level which is helpful but it would be … wonderful to have the fluency in the language”. 53 Thus, a lack of Te Reo Māori skills has challenged the effectiveness of my interviewees’ historical practice in Māori history spaces.

Experiences Engaging with Māori Histories

Ann expresses that when engaging with Māori histories, “the greatest challenge is simply to … move from a Pākehā framework … if that’s what you’ve been brought up in”. 54 In reference to Justice Eddie Durie in the Tribunal context, Ann says that “if you actually are not understanding the Māori context, mātauranga, yourself, then … you run the risk of … really only understanding … the Crown side.” 55 Similarly, Vincent explains he practises New Zealand history through trying to deconstruct “the notion of understanding everything through a Pākehā framework”. 56 By doing history “in terms of understanding Māori values and tikanga … then you begin to challenge … basic assumptions that you might’ve previously had about things.” 57

51 Jock Phillips.
52 Ibid.
53 Vincent O’Malley.
54 Ann Parsonson.
55 Ibid.
56 Vincent O’Malley.
57 Ibid.
When speaking about his experiences of engaging with Māori history, Jock admits he “had a pretty rude start.” 58 While establishing the Stout Centre, he explains he had “always assumed that that would be bicultural but I’d gone a long way down the road in setting it up before I … consulted [Māori] and that was a fundamental error.” 59 He learnt it is necessary “to involve Māori in at the ground floor.” 60 When Jock started working at Te Papa, he found “they generally had a bicultural way of operating and I engaged with the Chief Executive, Cheryl Sotheran, but I engaged just as much with Cliff Whiting who lead the Māori team.” 61 He discovered “that bicultural ways of operating can actually be very effective and very beneficial.” 62

While working at Te Ara, Jock says that “we set up a Te Ara Wānanga, a Māori committee” to discuss the Māori aspects of each encyclopaedia theme. 63 He states he “was the only Pākehā in the room but it was hugely successful because … I got all those leading Māori historians and iwi leaders right in behind us”. 64 He explains this approach led to “very accurate” entries for Te Ara “because most of the Māori who’d written those entries had then circulated them around their community and errors had been picked up.” 65 While working with Māori history, Jock learnt that “first, it requires the language; but secondly you do have to engage with the Māori way of working and you’ve got to turnover resources and power to Māori themselves and the results will absolutely justify themselves.” 66

58 Jock Phillips.
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.
62 Ibid.
63 Jock Phillips.
64 Ibid.
65 Ibid.
66 Ibid.
As someone who self-identifies both as Māori and Pākehā, Angela says this has inspired her to work in cross-cultural history spaces. She recounts “it has been largely a positive experience because … lots of other people share that … history, and are interested in it.” She explains where cross-cultural history “can be negative is because sometimes it might not be seen as Māori history.” Angela states her “view is that Māori history is a really broad space, in which you work and that might mean you might have Māori subjects and Māori methodologies but sometimes you might have Māori subjects and not necessarily Māori methodologies” depending on sources. She identifies the difficulties lie in “figuring out how you marry … those worlds together as much as possible, but to also do justice to the stories of the people that you’re writing about as best you can.”

**Historians and the Waitangi Tribunal**

Angela notes that the Waitangi Tribunal is a space where Māori histories, stories about the nineteenth century, and experiences of the effects of colonisation, which the broader public tended not to know about, were brought to the surface in new ways. She thinks this has changed “if not our historical practice, at least our historiographies of the questions, the work that’s been done in the last few decades”. She says the research to emerge from the Tribunal has been “foundational for shifting … people into different areas of work”, adding that this is one of the more significant

---

67 Angela Wanalla.  
68 Ibid.  
69 Ibid.  
70 Ibid.  
71 Ibid.  
72 Angela Wanalla.  
73 Ibid.
changes she can “think of … in my … short life in the academic world”.\textsuperscript{74} Angela thinks the Tribunal has wider value as “a space for people to … tell their histories” “which had not been in existence in colonial archives necessarily or had been there” yet were written by colonial officials.\textsuperscript{75} She says there has been “a flourishing of … work that’s really thinking about agency and power and I think that the part that the Tribunal record plays there is that it does produce a body of sources that are made available.”\textsuperscript{76} Angela uses this evidence in her research, and explains that this material “and the claim itself also means we can start asking different questions about the Māori past too that’s not just locked into a narrative of dispossession. That’s an important story and it’s actually core to the Māori experience but there’s other things that we can start thinking about, too, so by doing that kind of work, we’re actually probably expanding what we understand … colonial history to be and what Māori history could be … in the future”.\textsuperscript{77}

Similarly, Vincent says the Tribunal has been important in allowing “iwi histories to come to light and for significant resources to be devoted to those iwi histories.”\textsuperscript{78} He thinks “that’s probably been the most … exciting development in New Zealand history over the last thirty years”.\textsuperscript{79} He recognises that the Tribunal’s focus is “the history of iwi engagement with the Crown and Pākehā rather than necessarily a wider history of those iwi.”\textsuperscript{80} Jock argues this focus does a disservice to other areas of Māori history, such as creativity and cultural innovation in nineteenth-century Māori

\textsuperscript{74} Angela Wanhall.  
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{78} Vincent O’Malley.  
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid.
society. However, Vincent explains that “the research that comes through the Tribunal process is not widely known or understood because there’s been no real effort to ensure that the wider population understands that history, and so few of us learn any New Zealand history at school that … for a lot of Pākehā when they see … claims’ stuff in the news, they have no understanding of the history behind those claims, where those grievances came from”. Although Ann observes a greater appreciation of the Tribunal process now, she is often asked “[w]hen will the claims be finished? [I]t’s quite a recurrent question from Pākehā and … it’s just that feeling that … we’ve somehow, we in quotation marks have watched this going on for a very long time and isn’t it over now?”

Angela sees the Tribunal as adversarial. She says the Tribunal has resulted in “interesting debates within … the New Zealand academic world around … presentism”. Ann states the Tribunal is unique “because it operates under a statute and that immediately makes it different from other kinds of historical endeavour.” With much experience working in Tribunal spaces, however, Ann affirms that legal counsel, and not historians, have the role of advocates in the Tribunal hearing process. In response to presentist allegations, she explains the Tribunal has taken care “to look at what was practicable at any given time in New Zealand history … so that … the standards that are applied are ones that emerge from that period”. She adds there is much effort which “goes

---

81 Jock Phillips.
82 Vincent O’Malley.
83 Ann Parsonson.
84 Angela Wanhalla.
85 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
87 Ibid.
88 Ibid.
into looking at different junctures in our history as to the courses of action that governments considered at that time.”

Vincent explains when appearing in front of the Tribunal as an expert witness, “you’re not an advocate. You’re there to assist the Tribunal with its inquiries and your first duty is to the Tribunal and not to anybody regardless of … who’s hired you or commissioned you to do work.” Ann states that historians “can stand up, sometimes quite strongly to counsel cross-examining them” if they feel “they’re being asked … to draw a conclusion that they may not have drawn themselves in their report”. She expresses the Tribunal members have to examine each primary source provided by historian expert witnesses to write their reports. This “is a very normal historical process to go through …. To go back to your primary sources and to look for inconsistencies in them, to understand … what they’re saying and what they’re not saying.” Ann says the Tribunal also hears claimant community historical evidence briefs, which “makes the Tribunal reports much more Māori-centred, obviously, and we try always to convey as much as we can of what the claimants have said because often they’ve put an immense amount of work into preparing for hearings.”

Similarly, Vincent explains the reports and documents presented for Tribunal hearings are cross-examined because “often a lot of the iwi will have quite diverse takes on that history.” Thus, he

---

89 Ann Parsonson.
90 Vincent O’Malley.
91 Ann Parsonson.
92 Ibid.
93 Ibid.
94 Ibid.
95 Vincent O’Malley.
argues “the idea that you could … get away with, even if you wanted to … something that wasn’t … grounded in fact … the Tribunal would be the worst possible place to attempt that.” Jock observes that the Tribunal reports “have increased expectations about the need for historians to be absolutely accurate. [T]hat’s part of the professional equipment of a historian because the evidence is often examined … [I]f you read the reports, there’s a pretty scrupulous focus on the evidence, and I think that’s good.”

Conclusion

My interviewees’ stories about engaging with Māori histories show New Zealand historical practice can be improved by acquiring Te Reo Māori skills and understanding history through Māori cultural frameworks, such as mātauranga. While there has been progress in improving these areas of historical practice, as Angela says “there’s always more work to be done”. My participants’ testimonies reveal that the Waitangi Tribunal has been a transformative influence on New Zealand’s history. While Tribunal histories and historians operate under statute, Vincent and Ann note they still maintain strains of historical integrity found in historical practice outside Tribunal spheres. As outlined by these historians, the Tribunal has created an immense resource base for New Zealand historians to draw on to ask new questions about the colonial past. However, Vincent, Jock and Ann observe more historians need to employ these sources in their research so our wider population can understand the contemporary significance of these historical Waitangi Tribunal claims.

96 Vincent O’Malley.
97 Jock Phillips.
98 Angela Wanhalla.
99 Vincent O’Malley; Jock Phillips; Ann Parsonson.
Chapter Two: Public and Academic Historians, their Frameworks, and Digitisation

Angela notes that “the New Zealand historian of today, I think looks quite different to the New Zealand historian of probably [the] 1990s.”¹⁰⁰ She explains these generational changes happen because of the broader shifts of societal attitudes and events, and the questions these provoke, and the spaces where New Zealand history is done.¹⁰¹ I have divided this chapter into three sections. Firstly, I call on my interviewees’ testimonies to examine the relationships between our public and academic historians. Secondly, I delve into the debate about analytical frameworks for practising our history. Regarding this debate, the consensus which emerges from the testimonies is that irrespective of which framework New Zealand historians employ, their practice should enable the uncovering of, and critical engagement with, the diversity, complexity, and nuances of our histories. In the third section, I explore the impacts of digitisation on historical practice as experienced by my interviewees.

Public and Academic New Zealand Historians

The testimony from my interviewees shows there are tensions in the relationships between academic and public New Zealand historians. When talking about the latter, Jock says our public historians “live and breathe New Zealand history.”¹⁰² He contrasts this with academic historians:

---

¹⁰⁰ Angela Wanhalla.
¹⁰¹ Ibid.
¹⁰² Jock Phillips.
“within the academic community New Zealand history is still slightly the poor relation and it’s not regarded as raising serious issues that are going to change the face of the profession.”

Angela recognises that academic New Zealand historians occasionally have elitist attitudes towards public history. As an academic historian, she states that “we don’t engage in [public history] the way that maybe we ought to or we think that public history is not producing critical histories because our methods might be different.” Thus, she observes, “sometimes we talk past each other a little bit.” However, in Angela’s view, public historians make history available to the masses “in ways that sometimes academic work doesn’t, and also because they have taken up methodologies that might be much more acceptable, or supported, in a public history space compared to academia.” Despite this, she observes that where history is done and the fields of New Zealand history have diversified, partly because of the growth of public history and the increasing variation of archives and sources being used in research. Angela speaks about how public history has influenced her own practice. She says she “read a lot of public history to help me get a grip on writing for the public. I’ve learnt a lot from people who write in that public space because I think that’s, for me, the best type of history because it translates across audiences.” She comments she finds it useful to think about historians’ audiences in terms of “publics”, rather

---

103 Jock Phillips.
104 Angela Wanhalla.
105 Ibid.
106 Ibid.
107 Ibid.
108 Ibid.
109 Ibid.
than “the public”. She emphasises this helps her to effectively acknowledge the diverse and nuanced historical experiences of communities.

Similarly, Vincent explains that working in public spheres requires historians to exercise skills in different ways compared to academic history. He says, “engaging with the public I think for a lot of historians, means learning new ways of communicating.” He elaborates: “writing content for a website is quite different from writing a book, for example and … a number of historians have appeared in documentaries on TV and … those things required new skills.” For Vincent, when engaging with the public “[i]t should be more about … facilitating conversations about the history and the process of discovery is one that you can help people with but you’re not there to lay it all out and say this is how it was.”

Jock reveals details about the differences in the practices of academic and public New Zealand history. When beginning his New Zealand history career, he explains that writing academic books in the New Zealand setting was not viable because the academic audiences were – and are – smaller, so he had to alter his practice to make his works more accessible for wider non-historian audiences. Jock says this “probably leads you away from being too theoretical about your history because you’re no longer engaged with … group debates.” He notes that although academic

110 Angela Wanhalla.
111 Ibid.
112 Vincent O’Malley.
113 Ibid.
114 Ibid.
115 Jock Phillips.
116 Ibid.
historians are more interested in ideas and theories, rather than factual accuracy, as a public historian, “what you write is going to be up for public examination and actually you have to be much more rigorous about your evidence and your use of facts.”117 The audiences for public history and academic history are therefore considerably different.

There is varying opinion between Angela and Jock about our museums’ engagements with their wider communities. Angela talks of museums’ increased collaboration with communities to produce exhibitions: “I think we’ve seen museums being much more collaborative in that space and reflecting an understanding that communities have knowledge as well and so that development of relationships with communities has become much more of a requirement really of these institutions.”118 Jock says his “original hope with Te Papa was that it would be a … forum for debate.”119 However, he is “not convinced that’s happened.”120 In contrast to Angela, Jock states “I’m not totally convinced how seriously any of the museums want to engage with some of the major issues of New Zealand history. On the whole the museum displays about our history have been pretty thin, and not very imaginative in the kinds of things that they’ve really engaged with.”121 He explains that recently judging the Social History category of the New Zealand Museum Awards made him notice that some museums in these islands have overlooked possibilities to engage with their communities and their stories to produce exhibitions.122

117 Jock Phillips.
118 Angela Wanhalla.
119 Jock Phillips.
120 Ibid.
121 Ibid.
122 Ibid.
Furthermore, he adds not translating findings from the Waitangi Tribunal reports into exhibitions is “a great missed opportunity.”

**Analytical Frameworks**

The question of which analytical tools to employ when practicing New Zealand history remains a contentious issue within the discipline. Possible frameworks include the nation-state, post-colonialism, trans-nationalism, global history, iwi, and local, amongst many others. While Angela thinks debates about analytical frameworks are productive spaces to discuss historical practice, “sometimes that’s at such an abstract level we get nowhere.”

My interviewees’ testimonies suggest it is more constructive to engage the framework which is the most well-suited to one’s topic of historical investigation, while researching with an aim to uncover history’s diversity, nuance and complexity.

Public historians are often required to practice history through a national analysis because these histories are frequently of significant national interest and speak to broad audiences. A central critique of “the nation” as an analytical framework has been its alleged links with colonialism.

---

123 Jock Phillips.
124 Angela Wanhalla.
126 For example, Mahuika argued that while Māori history is New Zealand history, it has been explained on Pākehā terms by marginalising, romanticising and mythicising Māori history. Mahuika diagnosed New Zealand historians with “Pākehā paralysis”; engaging with New Zealand history while wearing “colonial blinkers” to avoid disturbing comfortable national narratives about New Zealand’s history by including Māori perspectives. Mahuika, “New Zealand History is Māori History: Tikanga as the Ethnical Foundation of Historical Scholarship in Aotearoa New Zealand,” 5-7. Similarly, Byrnes claimed that New Zealand history has been shaped and reinforced by the need to curate a national identity where Pākehā were the major agents of change. She argued that assumptions such as “national identity”, “biculturalism”, and “egalitarianism”, and other such remnants of colonialism, are merely ideological.
Angela, however, is a New Zealand historian who uses the nation-state framework because she thinks “the nation matters sometimes.” She explains national frameworks are “productive for thinking about intermarriage because the nation has quite a stake in what marriage looks like… And who gets to be a part of it, so it actually matters.” Moreover, she observes that “where we get into trouble is where we try to impose trans-national models, or other kinds of models on [the nation].”

Jock admits, in regards to “the nation” framework, he is “a bit of an old fashioned cultural nationalist”. He affirms that “both international and local perspectives are important; but I also think that the nation, in New Zealand’s case particularly, is actually a very good unit of analysis partly because it’s very geographically defined.” Furthermore, he explains in New Zealand, it is “very hard to do a history of almost anything that doesn’t in some way involve the state and you have to recognise obviously that historians are bound by their sources and much of the most constructions created by Pākehā rather than real truths of New Zealand history to create “feel good” and “self-congratulatory” history. Giselle Byrnes, “Preface,” in The New Oxford History of New Zealand, ed. Giselle Byrnes (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2009), x-xiv; Byrnes, “Introduction: Reframing New Zealand History,” 1-7. Gibbons stated the Pākehā construction of a national identity signalled colonisation was still ongoing, making the nation and national identity a discursive construction rather than an organic development. Consequently, he argued “New Zealand” should be dissolved as a subject of historical inquiry due to it perpetuating Pākehā colonial dominance in their use of history to find exceptionalism. Gibbons, “The Far Side of the Search for Identity: Reconsidering New Zealand History,” 39; 40; 47.
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accessible sources … are those produced by the state.”¹³² From Jock’s perspective, the nation state can “provide a window into a whole range of different kinds of social experiences.”¹³³

Vincent, who is of a younger generation than Jock, observes New Zealand history has become more fractured and decentred.¹³⁴ He explains that the “broad national swoops have … gone out of favour”.¹³⁵ He argues that historians should not abandon attempts to present history within the bigger picture because they need to explain history in ways wider audiences can relate to.¹³⁶ When asked about the place of general histories, Vincent used the example of the 2009 New Oxford History of New Zealand.¹³⁷ He states this book is “curious because it sort of said you can’t tell a national history which is … a little bit strange for a book that said it was the Oxford History of New Zealand”.¹³⁸ He feels this “signalled … we’re … abandoning this project of a national history altogether.”¹³⁹ Although Vincent observes that general histories are currently becoming disfavoured, Ann thinks productions of general histories will continue because of their appeal to public audiences.¹⁴⁰ She adds that “so long as they’re well written and well researched, there’s no reason why … that kind of history can’t continue.”¹⁴¹ Jock says the most important thing, for him, is historians being explicit “about the social groups which their research methodology throws light

¹³² Jock Phillips.
¹³³ Ibid.
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on”.

He expands: “[w]hat I don’t like is when people say they’re doing New Zealand history, a general New Zealand thing, but actually what they’re doing is literate, middle class, Pākehā history.”

In Angela’s view, in spaces where “the nation” was still forming, such as nineteenth-century New Zealand, trans-colonial or trans-local frameworks can be more useful to enable deeper understandings about colonialism. She thinks, like Vincent, it can be productive for historians to “reach beyond the nation … and place New Zealand in a larger context as well”. Vincent notes trans-nationalism has been effective for understanding our trans-Tasman history. However, he believes “the issue is when that becomes the only way of understanding history and everything else is … thrown out the window for the latest academic fad.”

Despite its cross-cultural nature, Angela points out that some consider her work is not Māori history because it is not iwi-centred. She argues, however, “that Māori history is broader than this.” Although her work mainly focuses on Ngāi Tahu whānau, Angela prefers a whānau-based approach to research histories of inter-racial families and marriages as opposed to an iwi framework. She finds attention to people and place useful to uncover more colourful and...
complex historical experiences.\textsuperscript{151} She explains she is “very wary of ever speaking for iwi or an iwi experience” because a multiplicity of experiences and perspectives can exist within one iwi, let alone the different iwi across New Zealand.\textsuperscript{152} Consequently, Angela states “[s]ome might argue that an iwi framework is just as monolithic as a state-based or nation-based framework.”\textsuperscript{153} Vincent explains the term “Māori” tends to simplify history, whereas iwi frameworks can uncover the various layers of historical experiences of iwi from different regions.\textsuperscript{154} Angela notes that while the Māori-Crown relationships which emerge from the Treaty of Waitangi can be useful to research our past, they are “a small blip” in the long timespan of New Zealand history.\textsuperscript{155} She adds that such relationships are central to our history, yet, that they are “not the only story out there”.\textsuperscript{156} Vincent and Ann highlight a challenge for historians is to transition the histories and materials from the Waitangi Tribunal iwi-Crown framework to effectively to communicate such histories to a wider audience.\textsuperscript{157} As yet, “there really haven’t been resources devoted to making sure that that happens.”\textsuperscript{158}

Thus, a common theme to emerge from my interviewees is that New Zealand historians need to practice our histories in ways which uncover their differences and intricacies, but within the wider context to tell those stories through modes which non-historians can relate to and understand.

\textsuperscript{151} Angela Wanhalla.
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Digitisation

Another key thread to emerge from my interviews was the profound influence digitisation has had on New Zealand historical practice. When talking about this impact, Vincent explains that prior to databases of digitised resources, such as Papers Past, “if you wanted to research newspapers, you would go to the National Library. You would get out the hard copy of the papers or on microfilm and you would go through and turn the paper or click over the microfilm reader and hope that you stumbled across something that was of interest to you”.159 Now, he says, historians can use databases such as Papers Past to find relevant sources through keyword searches.160 Vincent and Angela articulate that digitisation makes research faster and easier through more targeted investigations, while also expanding historians’ source bases both locally and globally.161 This access to more sources online has enabled historians to pursue new pathways of inquiry.162

Vincent acknowledges that while digitisation has made history resources available to the general public, he emphasises that historians still have important roles in digital spaces. He explains that someone without a historian’s training might organise materials in a chronological way because this is the simplest organisational structure.163 Conversely, a historian might engage with those materials thematically.164 Vincent states that historians are still needed in digital areas to “collate and curate that material, to analyse it, to critique it, to apply the usual range of skills and
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methodologies that historians are taught.”¹⁶⁵ Thus, he does not think historians will become redundant despite the rise of digitisation.¹⁶⁶

Angela says digitisation has impacted on her research and practice profoundly. For example, her book “He Reo Wāhine would not exist without the digitisation of Māori language newspapers”.¹⁶⁷ Using digitised resources reduces a “ten to fifteen year project in the past [to] a five to eight year project.”¹⁶⁸ However, she notes this digitised material is “only a small slice of what’s available to us” and that it changes “how we engage with libraries, catalogues and archives.”¹⁶⁹ Despite some people fearing the contrary, Angela asserts that the “archive isn’t lost in that story at all.”¹⁷⁰ She explains that by surveying online catalogues from their offices to discover the materials that archives have that are relevant to their research, historians can better plan their archival trips to make them more efficient.¹⁷¹

Jock also agrees the digital world has transformed history, especially in terms of sources.¹⁷² Although, when talking about the internet, he says that “as a mode of communicating and engaging people with the past, I’m afraid I don’t have the hopes that I had when I started Te Ara.”¹⁷³ Jock explains digital histories, such as the digital encyclopaedic essays on Te Ara, are useful for checking facts and that digital channels are “quite good … for publishing large bodies
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of work … like the Waitangi Tribunal reports.”  

Nevertheless, in Jock’s experience the internet “isn’t a great medium for sitting down and really capturing people’s imagination about the past or to develop an argument over three or four hours.”  

He argues that there has not been much serious investment into online New Zealand history, which he feels is “very disappointing”.  

He thinks “the web won’t replace books because people … find it hard to sit down for five hours and read something on the web.”  

Jock believes that historians should still communicate history to broader audiences through films, television, books, and radio programmes.  

His vision is that historians will create websites containing access to their research materials and spin-off articles, for example, alongside their books.  

**Conclusion**  

My interviewees’ testimonies demonstrate tensions and debates still characterise New Zealand history. As reflected by my interviewees, public and academic New Zealand historians have different audiences, styles and methodologies. Nonetheless, they both have skillsets they can share with each other to enrich their practices and community connections. My participants demonstrate that, whichever analytical tools are used, historians should practise New Zealand history critically with an aim to discover and communicate its complexity. Digitisation has enabled New Zealand historians to take steps in this direction by giving them access to underused sources.
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However, how historians can harness the internet as a method to communicate their research is a developing space.
Chapter Three: “‘Ka mua, ka muri’ – we move forward into the future by looking back into our past”¹⁸⁰

During his interview, Jock explains that “[y]ou can’t know where to go unless you know where you’ve come from.”¹⁸¹ While Angela acknowledges it can be difficult for historians to be future-orientated, Jock’s statement highlights that New Zealand historians can contribute their knowledge about the past to shape the future in more constructive ways.¹⁸² In this chapter, I report my interviewees’ reflections on the futures of New Zealand history. Firstly, I draw on my participants’ testimonies to explore the role of the New Zealand historian and the development of the skills needed to support this role going forward. Secondly, I investigate my interviewees’ perspectives about the futures of multicultural and bicultural New Zealand histories. Lastly, I explore my participants’ reflections on the potential effects of the inclusion of New Zealand history in the school curriculum and the issues to consider when creating such a curriculum.¹⁸³

¹⁸⁰ Phillips, Making History: A New Zealand Story, 5.
¹⁸¹ Jock Phillips.
¹⁸² Angela Wanhalla.
¹⁸³ At the time of conducting the oral history interviews for this project in June and July, 2019, New Zealand history was not yet a compulsory component of the New Zealand National School Curriculum. Amongst much societal debate, in June, 2019, the New Zealand History Teachers’ Association presented a petition to the New Zealand Parliament to “make compulsory the coherent teaching of our own past across appropriate year levels in our schools”. “Petition of Graeme Ball on behalf of the New Zealand History Teachers’ Association: “Give me my History!” – teaching our nation’s past in our schools,” New Zealand Parliament, published June 11th, 2019, accessed September 26th, 2019, https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/petitions/document/PET_83795/petition-of-graeme-ball-on-behalf-of-the-new-zealand-history. On the 12th of September, 2019 Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern announced the inclusion of New Zealand history into the Curriculum throughout our schools and kura. Thus, the question of the teaching of New Zealand history due to its exclusion from the Curriculum in June and July, 2019 made it pertinent to my investigations at the time of conducting my oral history interviews. Jamie Ensor and Anna Bracewell-Worrall, “New Zealand history to be taught in all Kiwi schools from 2022,” Newshub, 12th of September, 2019, accessed 14th of September, 2019, https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/politics/2019/09/new-zealand-history-to-be-taught-in-all-kiwi-schools-from-2022.html.
Our Historians’ Roles

My interviewees’ testimonies reveal New Zealand historians will need to continue to be advocates for our history. Angela thinks “anything to do with New Zealand history is urgent”. She suggests “this reflects maybe the shifts I’ve seen in New Zealand history going from starting at university when it was lots of students did it to less students doing it”. She is concerned about the view “that New Zealand history is not relevant to us as New Zealanders where actually, it’s … highly relevant. It helps explain a lot about our … current condition”. Like Jock, Angela thinks New Zealand historians have stepped into the role of public intellectuals. Thus, Angela says “being advocates for our own history” is crucial, even more so because historians are given a duty of responsibility towards history by receiving funding from taxpayers. She explains historians being visible in communities, giving public talks, and speaking to media is “something that we’ve got to … get a little bit better at, and maybe get over our modesty and our shyness around it as well”.

Vincent stresses that New Zealand historians have a significant role in facilitating and supporting dialogues about our history. Nonetheless, he emphasises these discussions need “to be bigger than … pointy head historians having conversations with one another.” He argues that “academics, historians need to get outside their comfort zone, need to have these conversations
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with the wider public around the history and also advocate for ensuring that it’s taught properly, the resources are there to support that, [and] contributing to those resources directly themselves”.  

Jock “passionately believe[s] that we do need more intelligent investigation of … the past of this country”. He asserts that “if this country doesn’t throw up historians who study the history of this place, no other country’s going to study it.” Jock explains that our historians “should be people who by throwing light on the past, raise questions about the nature of our society today … I think that historians do have that public responsibility and that puts a great emphasis on their ability to communicate in a way that’s going to be accessible and lively and interesting”. Thus, the support of New Zealand history by our historians is crucial to the future of the discipline in multiple ways.

**Development of History Skills**

My interviewees identify various skills New Zealand historians need to develop to strengthen their roles and practice. They highlight that historians should expand their Te Reo Māori skills. Angela notes there is “finally an understanding that Te Reo actually matters in the … histories we do. Finally, it’s taken a very long time.” She says “we’re certainly seeing a shift with our undergraduate students who have the language and are doing history. The more of that, the better because our histories aren’t just richer and more nuanced but our historical profession is better for it”. She articulates that “I always tell New Zealand history students they should be doing Te Reo
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Māori. It doesn’t matter what part of New Zealand history you’re studying, it should be part of … your skill set.”

Correspondingly, Vincent comments that anyone planning to focus on New Zealand history “should be learning Te Reo.”

Angela stresses that more historians working “across languages and across archives and different methodologies is also quite critical to the future of the discipline and the future of New Zealand history more broadly. You can’t just leave it to a small group of people. We’ve all got to be a part of that.” Similarly, Jock explains historians’ lack of Te Reo fluency cuts off “a huge number of sources, both oral history sources and written sources and newspaper sources, which are very important.” He further emphasises that “[t]here are not enough New Zealand historians who really draw on those Māori sources. It should become essential for a New Zealand historian.”

Angela identifies the need “to be better equipped” to understand Māori concepts to practise New Zealand history. She recognises that understanding Māori worldviews and cultural concepts can be difficult if “you’re not a part of that world but as historians who work in those spaces, it’s up to us to understand that as well, as we would do for any culture that we’re writing about.” She notes that Māori presence in history is increasing, but that more indigenous history methodologies need to be better understood and widely used in research.
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“[t]here isn’t one way of doing Māori history. It’s very, very diverse, and the more that people are exposed to that diversity, the better.” Jock argues historians need to know how to professionally conduct oral history research because “[i]t’s not only an essential tool for doing Māori history or doing Chinese history. It’s an essential tool for doing Pākehā history. For a start if you don’t do that, you don’t have access to people who are not literate”.

Vincent, Jock and Angela explore the skills needed to use the media to communicate history, and its benefits and drawbacks. Jock emphasises our historians need to continue to employ multimedia and verbal techniques to transmit history, especially to wider audiences. Vincent says when using the media, “one of the skills that you need to learn is … to summarise in one or two sentences what your latest 300-page book is about, for example. If you don’t know that, if it’s … like well it’s a complex story, that’s not really a sound bite that people are going to be able to use.” While this can be challenging for historians, Vincent notes that “if you want to have influence, if you want to be able to encourage and facilitate those discussions, you need to be able to communicate effectively and not just with other historians, but with the wider public.” Conversely, Angela sees the media as problematic for communicating history’s diversity. She explains that what “we do find sometimes is the same people getting interviewed with the media and there’s actually lots of different perspectives out there”. She observes the media’s sound bite culture “can be a
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difficult space for historians to work in when … we’re really quite attracted to the fact that there are complex answers to really simple questions.”

**Bicultural and Multicultural Histories**

A consensus to emerge amongst my interviewees is the need for future bicultural and multicultural New Zealand histories to co-exist. Jock is adamant that “Māori history is always going to be important to New Zealand history. There’s no question about that. But that doesn’t mean that it will become just a bicultural history. I think that the more we can create diversity in our history, to breakdown monolithic myths and to create a sense of the diversity of cultures that have existed in this place, that’s all to the good.” Vincent sees “Māori” and “Pākehā” as “broad catch-all terms” which can be useful to investigate the big picture. He thinks historians will seek to unpack the terms “‘Māori’ and ‘Pākehā’ to … draw it out a bit further into the different layers of that. I think that’s really important and quite exciting … in terms of the potential.” He explains that while discussing nineteenth-century New Zealand history in terms of “Māori” and “Pākehā” “is broadly correct”, using “tangata whenua” and “tangata tiriti” throughout later periods could be a more inclusive way to think about New Zealand’s multicultural history.

Ann and Vincent believe more Tribunal resources should be used by our historians in their research because they transmit iwi histories and tangata whenua perspectives. Jock thinks “there’s still a
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lot in the Waitangi Tribunal process that hasn’t translated itself into broader public history.”

Ann states that “[h]istorians who have worked in the Tribunal process … are much more likely … to be familiar with them and use them in … other work that they do … like Dr O’Malley for instance.” Encouraging historians to utilise Tribunal resources “probably requires … a greater attempt to make them accessible, not necessarily by the Tribunal which, on the whole, doesn’t have time at all to do it”. However, she acknowledges the Tribunal reports’ detailed and dense natures make this challenging. Similarly, Vincent explains the lack of circulation and understanding of Tribunal histories in New Zealand society is “one of the reasons why … I try and share the results of my own research by publishing those works in books and social media blogs … so that people can get a basic understanding of some of this … incredibly rich seam of history that is mostly really only understood by … the iwi involved and a few dozen Treaty lawyers and members of the Tribunal and staff”.

Vincent notes the Ministry for Culture and Heritage has launched a project about Treaty of Waitangi settlements. Te Tai seeks to provide a broad overview of Treaty settlements through an online platform. Vincent says he is “always a little bit wary of … Crown-driven projects … so I think … those stories need to come from iwi themselves provided they have the resources to do that properly.” He speaks about the 250th commemorations of Cook’s landing in
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Gisborne/Tūranga in 2019. He expresses that because Gisborne/Tūranga was “the first place where those interactions took place, it’s an important part of their story but it’s not one that’s really been widely understood from the perspective of the local iwi and I think … maybe there would’ve been less resistance to the 250th commemoration had iwi been properly resourced to tell their side of that story.”

Ann thinks iwi histories will become more abundant. However, Angela observes historians are now thinking about Māori history “from the perspective of the family, from whakapapa, from whānau experience. I think that’s where there’s really fantastic work is actually happening at the moment.” She says she is unsure of how to resolve concerns about multicultural history diluting the centrality of the Treaty of Waitangi and Māori histories. Even so, she thinks there will be people who will “always see Māori history … as New Zealand history, as the core of it around which we build … other things.” Angela says the Treaty-Crown and Māori-Crown relationships are central to our history and our bicultural futures. Nevertheless, she believes “there will be space, I hope for those multicultural stories, histories as well and perhaps that might be one of those future directions … for us to … think about critically as historians”.
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Vincent says he is “really hopeful by the conversations I have with young people, I think they are much more willing to have the conversations we need to have as a nation about our history”\(^\text{234}\). He perceives young New Zealanders to be “more comfortably bicultural and multicultural, and understanding and appreciative of difference, in a way that a lot of older Pākehā New Zealanders aren’t”\(^\text{235}\). In light of the Christchurch Mosque terror attacks in March, 2019, Angela thinks “that we do need more histories that tackle those diverse stories of multiculturalism” in ways which highlight these New Zealanders’ cultural complexities\(^\text{236}\). She believes historians have a role to play in “ensuring … those histories of different communities and cultures that … develop this place are preserved and remembered and also that we record that they existed. So it’s really important they’re a visible part of this place.”\(^\text{237}\) Similarly, Jock notes “that the study of ethnic minorities, immigrant minorities will remain a rich field.”\(^\text{238}\) He says more investigations could be done on the history of Pacific Islanders in New Zealand\(^\text{239}\). From my interviews, it seems there is much potential for New Zealand historians to expand our bicultural and multicultural histories to diversify our understandings and give us the tools to constructively converse about our history, and our national community, today and into the future.
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New Zealand History in Schools

Vincent emphasises that learning about New Zealand history, either through school or other resources, is an important part of “genuine reconciliation and healing between Māori and Pākehā which is bigger than simply the Treaty claims’ process because the Treaty claims’ process … is iwi talking to the Crown and other New Zealanders aren’t part of that conversation. They usually have no idea of the history behind the claims because they didn’t learn about it at school so … as a nation, we need to have conversations about our history and why it matters”.240 He says such conversations should not be used to make contemporaries feel guilty about actions of past agents, but rather that they need to be grounded in appreciations of New Zealand’s history without “cherry picking out the bits of your history you’d prefer to remember, like Gallipoli.”241 Vincent tells the story of Taranaki Māori inviting the descendants of John Bryce and members of the Armed Constabulary who were involved in the invasion of Parihaka in 1881 to the Reconciliation Ceremony between Parihaka and the Crown in 2017.242 He explains that during this moment of healing, Māori and Pākehā relived this history “not in an angry way but just in a way that’s … like … this is our shared history. Some terrible stuff happened here but now we’re going to … come together to acknowledge the fact that it happened”.243

240 Vincent O’Malley.
241 Ibid.
243 Vincent O’Malley.
Vincent illuminates that dialogue aimed towards reconciliation and healing will enable us to embark on conversations about protecting our historical sites, and questioning historical symbols and place names: “we might ask ourselves … do we really need to have a Von Tempsky Street? What about Rewi Maniapoto Road …?”244 While Jock says the memorialisation of our historical sites, such as those of the Waikato Wars, has improved with the growing interest in our national history, Vincent states that we do not look after such sites well currently.245 Vincent explains “[w]e put roads through them and that’s how you find a pā site. It’s usually you drive over it, drive through the middle of it … and the road is named after a … commander of the British forces who attacked local iwi”.246 He emphasises New Zealanders, especially Pākehā, can have an honest and open belonging to these islands, rather than a complacent one, by gaining critical analysis skills through education to engage with our histories.247 Angela admits there are “plenty of sectors of New Zealand society who do not want to see New Zealand history as a diverse story … I think that complicates too many things for them and it complicates simple understandings … of our past”.248 She stresses “this is … the space where we … as historians, need to be … engaged in.”249 Thus, educating New Zealanders about their history is vital to them understanding their complex past, conversing about the meanings of this history today, and healing communities.

For Angela, the low uptake of students studying New Zealand history at university is “a real concern”.250 Ann observes New Zealanders have had “a history in the past of parents sometimes

---

244 Vincent O’Malley.
245 Jock Phillips; Vincent O’Malley.
246 Vincent O’Malley.
247 Ibid.
248 Angela Wanhalla.
249 Ibid.
250 Angela Wanhalla.
being opposed for instance to [the] teaching of [the] Treaty of Waitangi in the … classroom partly because perhaps either they associate it with their own earlier experience when they saw a lot of Māori protest” and partially “because they think the Treaty of Waitangi is a … code word for political correctness”.251 She says this is “a great pity because there’s so much of our history in the interaction between Māori and Pākehā that there’s a lot of scope for imaginative teaching”.252

New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern announced on the 12th of September, 2019 that her Government will implement changes to the “‘National Curriculum to make clear the expectation that our history is part of the local curriculum and marau ā kura in every school and kura.’”253 The new curriculum will be taught from 2022.254 While making New Zealand history compulsory in schools will likely aid in achieving an appreciation of it and reconciliation through dialogue, the historical and ethical implications of what is included and excluded from this curriculum will need to be considered. For example, Angela explains it is critical to think about how, and which, New Zealand histories are taught in schools because this “can be really dangerous [because] it re-embeds or embeds new narratives that are hard to shift too”.255 Angela thinks our educational institutions should ensure “that there’s a Māori story at the heart of” their curricula, although “that’s always going … to be a battle constantly”.256 In reference to Māori histories, she says “there are useful cultural concepts that we can also embed in the ways … we teach about the past”.257

251 Ann Parsonson.  
252 Ibid.  
254 Ibid.  
255 Angela Wanhalla.  
256 Ibid.  
257 Ibid.
Ann believes cross-cultural collaboration in researching and teaching our history is important. She states that “if we’re going to … teach … aspects of the Māori past or Māori-Pākehā shared past in mainstream schools, then … that … means … more training I think, for more teachers … so that that can be properly accomplished.”

Conclusion

My interviewees show that New Zealand historians have a significant role to play in shaping the discipline into the future. Further development of New Zealand historians’ skillsets will better support their roles and strengthen their historical practice to access new avenues of inquiry. My interviewees stress that future New Zealand historians need to practice our history with aims to expose and validate its diversity, layers, and nuances. Regardless of where the learning of our history is undertaken in the future, my participants emphasise that acquisition of this knowledge is imperative to appreciate our history, break down monolithic myths, and heal our communities. Thus, by knowing where New Zealanders have come from, the people of these islands can use this knowledge to decide how they want their communities, and nation, to be characterised and commemorated in the future.
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Conclusion

I began working on this dissertation at a particularly significant moment. 2019 marked the end of the centenary commemorations of the First World War, which were dynamically personified through the popular Te Papa exhibition, “Gallipoli: The Scale of Our War”.\textsuperscript{260} We saw the continuation of the Waitangi Tribunal claims hearing process, debates over the 250\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Captain Cook’s encounters in the Pacific, and persistent appeals – which were finally answered – for the teaching of New Zealand’s history in our schools.\textsuperscript{261} In Christchurch, we experienced terror attacks at two local mosques which called our attention to the darker aspects of our past.\textsuperscript{262} Within this atmosphere, I embarked on my inquiry into the ways leading New Zealand historians, from different generations and locations, thought about the practice and the state of their discipline.

Much more, however, awaits to be discovered. This pilot study raises further questions about matters such as the influence of identities on practice; the physical locations in which the past is “done”; the nature and impact of historians’ community relationships, cross-cultural

\textsuperscript{261} “District Inquiries,” \textit{Waitangi Tribunal/Te Rōpū Whakamana i te Tiriti o Waitangi}, last updated 1\textsuperscript{st} of October, 2019, accessed 14\textsuperscript{th} of October, 2019, \url{https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/inquiries/district-inquiries/}.
\textsuperscript{262} “The end of our innocence.”
methodologies and collaborations; and the place and practice of New Zealand history both within these islands and in the global context. Like their predecessors, the four historians at the heart of this study have needed to respond to this world’s rapidly changing societal environments. An oral history approach has illuminated the pivotal changes in their practice and those of the broader discipline. It has uncovered and given voice to the variations, intricacies, and subtleties of the very people who seek to creatively and meaningfully maintain and enrich the place of our past in the present.

In the final analysis, the personal testimonies offered by Angela, Vincent, Ann and Jock speak to their own varied experiences within New Zealand history, whether in public or academic fields, and highlight the broader changes in their discipline over the past forty years. Perhaps their views manifest the current climate of urgency and an increasing willingness to discuss the history of these islands, and its multiple perspectives, which have recently gained great momentum. My interviewees’ reflections testify to the need to honestly grapple with New Zealand history and attend to its nuances, complexities and diversities. As they suggest, a focus on these elements will enrich New Zealand historical practice in ways that are appropriate into the third decade of the twenty-first century and beyond. It is their shared hope, and mine, that this shift will empower local communities with the historical knowledge and mutual understanding which are necessary to conduct dialogue with the intention of embracing the uncomfortable to heal the wounds we carry from the past.
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Appendix A: Main Research Questions

- What are New Zealand historians’ experiences of, and perspectives about, the shifts in the practice of New Zealand history in recent decades?
  - What do they believe the role of the New Zealand historian to be?
  - What have been their experiences with digitised history?
  - What are their perspectives about frameworks for analysing our history?
  - What have been their experiences when engaging with Māori history and how did these affect their historical practice?
  - How do they think the Waitangi Tribunal claims hearing process has changed our historical practice?
  - Which directions do they think New Zealand history is going in the future?
Appendix B: Semi-Structured Oral History Interview Questions

**Background Questions**
- Where you were born? Where did you grow up?
- Did you study history at high school and university?
- How did you become interested in New Zealand history?
- What has your involvement with New Zealand history entailed?

**Broad changes in New Zealand historical practice**
- How do you think the practice of New Zealand history has changed since about the 1970s? (wider context of historical events, and social and cultural movements/changes)
- What have been your experiences with/perspectives about those changes?
- Have the types of historical sources used in New Zealand historical practice changed? Is there a growing acceptance of visual, statistical and oral historical sources?
- What has been the role of the New Zealand historian, and how has it changed, throughout the changes in the practice of New Zealand history?
- How has public history affected New Zealand historical practice?
- How does public New Zealand history differ from academic New Zealand history?
- How has the relationship between New Zealand historians and the wider public changed? What is the role of the New Zealand historian today?
- Do the ‘cultural cringe’ phenomenon/attitudes towards New Zealand history persist?
- How has how New Zealand history is researched and presented changed?
- How has the use of frameworks to investigate New Zealand history changed? E.g. ‘the nation’, post-colonialism, trans-nationalism, cultural colonisation, etc.
- Is New Zealand history still practiced for a search of New Zealand identity and culture, especially for Pākehā?
- How has the relationship between Māori history and wider New Zealand history changed? Has this had impacts on methodologies to research New Zealand history? i.e. How have Māori historical methodologies been used in non-Māori historical investigations/practices?
- How would you self-identify in terms of ethnicity?
- As a Māori/Pākehā historian, what have been your experiences while engaging with New Zealand history and the way it’s practiced?
- What challenges have you faced as a Māori/Pākehā New Zealand historian while engaging with encounters between Māori and non-Māori histories/perspectives and methodologies/practices?
- Have you had any positive experiences while engaging with those encounters with Māori history?
- How successfully have Pākehā New Zealand historians navigated the increasing presence of Māori history and Māori historical methodologies in “mainstream” New Zealand history?
- What is the place of the ‘general history’ of New Zealand/groups in New Zealand today? How has that changed over time?

The Waitangi Tribunal
- How has the Tribunal changed the practice of New Zealand history? How does its historical practice differ from other spheres of New Zealand history?
- To what extent has the Tribunal, and the historical reports which result from it, made New Zealand history more postcolonial in practice and deconstructed Pākehā historical narratives/myths?
- Has the Tribunal helped to forge a synthesis of Māori and non-Māori historical methodologies in its practice?
- Has the Tribunal changed the role of the New Zealand historian in New Zealand society?
- To what extent has the Tribunal brought Māori history and Māori perspectives into New Zealanders’ public consciousness and ‘mainstream’ New Zealand history?
- Does more effort need to be made to practice/engage with more Māori/New Zealand history outside the context of Māori-Crown relations?

Future directions
- Where do you think New Zealand history and historical practice will go in the future?
- What effects do you think digitisation will have on New Zealand historical practice and presentation of historical research?
- Do you have any thoughts about the future directions of the relationship between Māori history, and methodologies, and non-Māori history, and methodologies?
- What do you think the effects of multiculturalism on New Zealand historical practice and issues of investigation will be?
- How do you think globalisation will affect New Zealand historical practice and issues of historical investigation?
- What might be the potential effects on the practice of New Zealand history of Brexit and Britain re-establishing firmer ties with its former colonies?
- What do you think the role of the State in New Zealand history will be?
- Are there skills we need to be developing more in the skillsets of New Zealand history graduates to improve their historical practice?
- Will Māori historical methodologies/tikanga/kaupapa Māori approaches be used more in wider New Zealand historical practice?
- What do you think the effects of Tribunal’s historical reports on New Zealand historical practice will be once all claims have been settled?
- How might the historical findings and perspectives uncovered via the Tribunal claims hearing process be better communicated with the wider New Zealand public?
- What is your view on the inclusion of New Zealand history in the New Zealand school curriculum? If New Zealand history was included more in the New Zealand school curriculum, what effects do you think this would have on the public’s understanding of New Zealand’s past and contemporary issues?
- Will history remain an important foundation of New Zealand national identity, especially Pākehā identity?
- What are the urgent issues and problems New Zealand historians need to engage with? How does their historical practice need to change? What is the most appropriate and beneficial way/framework to engage with such issues?
- How might the historian of New Zealand history engage with the public in ways that are meaningful to them to stimulate a national/societal dialogue about New Zealand history to help resolve contemporary angst about historical issues/misunderstandings?
- Will there be generational changes in the practice and approach towards New Zealand history?
Appendix C: Dissertation Oral History Interview Consent Forms
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Consent Form for Research Interview Participants

Please indicate your consent to the following statements regarding the research by ticking the boxes and circling your answer to the ‘yes’/‘no’ statements:

I have read and understood the description of the above-named project. On this basis I agree to participate as a subject in the project.

I have been given a full explanation of this project and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

I understand what is required of me if I agree to take part in the research.

I understand that participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without penalty. Withdrawal of participation will also include the withdrawal of any information I have provided should this remain practically achievable.

263 Note: This was the working title for this dissertation. The working title was used to identify this dissertation on the consent forms for the research oral history interview participants and the file identifications of each interview recording audio file.
I consent to an audio recording being made of the interview.

I am aware that a professional transcriber will be used to transcribe the audio recording of the interview.

I am aware that the researcher will be contacting my institution(s) which are identifiable through the research.

I understand that any information or opinions I provide will be kept confidentially to the researcher, her supervisor, Associate Professor Dr Lyndon Fraser, and the professional transcriber (through a legally binding confidentiality agreement).

I understand that a dissertation is a public document and will be available through the University of Canterbury Library.

I understand that all data collected for the study will be kept in locked and secure facilities at the University of Canterbury campus and in password protected electronic form on University of Canterbury servers and laptop. I understand the data will be destroyed from these storage platforms at the University of Canterbury after the project has been completed at the end of 2019.

I understand that the data collected for the study will be offered to the Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, for archival purposes upon the completion of the research dissertation and before the destruction of the data from University of Canterbury data storage platforms.

I understand that I can place embargoes and/or restrictions on my interview data archived at the Alexander Turnbull Library.

I understand the risks associated with taking part and how they will be managed.

I understand that I am able to receive a report on the findings of the study at the conclusion of the project.

I would like a copy of the final dissertation, interview transcription and interview audio recording upon completion of the research project.
I consent to my real name being used in publications of the results of the project: **Yes / No** *(please circle your preferred option).*

I would like to remain anonymous (by using a pseudonym) in publications of results of the project: **Yes / No** *(please circle your preferred option).* If yes, please state the pseudonym you would like to use:

I consent to the interview recording and transcript to be offered for archival purposes to the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington: **Yes / No** *(please circle your preferred option).*

I would like to place an embargo on the access of the interview data: **Yes / No** *(please circle your preferred option).* If yes, I would like to place an embargo on the data for ______ years.

If you would like to place further restrictions on access to and use of the archived interview data, please state them below:

I understand that I can contact the researcher, Neve Duston, at nmd39@uclive.ac.nz and/or her supervisor, Associate Professor Dr Lyndon Fraser, at lyndon.fraser@canterbury.ac.nz for further information.

If I have any complaints, I understand that I can contact the Chair of the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch (human-ethics@canterbury.ac.nz).

By signing below, I agree to participate in this research project.

Name:_________________________ Signed:___________________________________________

Date:_________________

Email address *(for report of findings, if applicable):*
Return this completed consent form (either in scanned or hard copy form) to Neve Duston via email to nmd39@uclive.ac.nz or via post to the History Department, School of Humanities and Creative Arts, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, Christchurch 8140.
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If NO: I require that there be NO access to the recording of my interview and accompanying material without my prior written permission until:
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4. Copyright
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   4a) Any copyright I own in the interview is retained by me, the interviewee
   AND
   (Complete if required) Any copyright owned by me at my death is assigned to
   [INSERT NAME]
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   4b) Any copyright I own in the interview is assigned by me the interviewee to [INSERT NAME]

Notes:

5. Privacy Act: As interviewee I acknowledge that this agreement does not modify my
rights and responsibilities under the Privacy Act 1993

6. Additional Information:

   ........................................................................................................................................

7. Signatures:
Person Interviewed .................................................. Date: ..........................................
Interviewer: ............................................................. Date: ..........................................
For Commissioner: .................................................. Date: ..........................................

8. Alternative contact (Optional):
If I am incapable of exercising any of my rights under the Agreement please contact
[INSERT NAME].
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   restrictions on access/publication. This obligation applies to all copies of the recording
   and accompanying material, wherever they are held.
2. The terms agreed to in this Oral History Recording Agreement may be amended only
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   holders of the interview and accompanying material.
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   Act 1993.
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