MĀORI CULTURE

in a

CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW

by Michael L Drake

MĀORI CULTURE in a CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW

by Michael L Drake

MĀORI CULTURE IN A CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW

© COPYRIGHT
MICHAEL L DRAKE

FEBRUARY 2005

ISBN 0-908806-15-9

All rights reserved. Not to be copied or reproduced in whole or in part by any means without permission.

Published by Wycliffe Christian Schools
43 Pilkington Road, Panmure, Auckland 1006
New Zealand

Cover Photograph
Ruakaka Beach, January 2005
© Michael L Drake

Scripture quotations taken from the HOLY BIBLE,
NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION; © Copyright 1973,1978, 1984
by International Bible Society. Used by permission.

A note about copyright:
Those who feel tempted to copy pages from this book despite the fact that to do so is illegal should prayerfully consider Romans 13:1-7, 1 Timothy 5:18 and Exodus 20:15.

MĀORI CULTURE
in a
CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW

Michael L Drake

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This booklet grew. I was asked to speak about Māori culture to a Christian worldview conference in Auckland in January 2005. Preparing for the conference, three things became rapidly apparent:

1. Any examination of a contemporary culture must be placed in its historical context to make sense. To speak of Māori culture I had to address the past as well as the present. I chose to begin in 1952 because it seems to me that the crowning of Queen Elizabeth in Parliament's 100th anniversary year was symbolic of a period when an upbeat mainstream New Zealand was largely oblivious to the great distance between itself and Māori.

2. The topic is a minefield of division and prejudice. Ever since Europeans and Māori met, they have been, in the words of ethnologist and historian Joan Metge, "talking past"[1] each other. Add to that the social and political tensions that currently exist, and the remarkable ignorance (or at best, superficial understanding) of Māori issues, a great deal needs to be said with a great deal of care. What began as a one hour paper has been expanded to what I hope is a more rounded presentation. Obviously there is still much more that needs to be said, but having tested this much with an audience it is my hope it will be helpful.

3. In general, New Zealanders have a clearly defined political position (of one sort or another) on Māori issues. This makes talking about Māori in a gospel context – surely the most important context for Christians – incredibly difficult. I suspect most New Zealand Christians find it easier to pray for the salvation and growth in grace of the pagans in darkest wherever than for their neighbours who happen to be Māori. My prayer is that this booklet can help move Christians to a more biblical response.

Although I am mainly addressing those who are not Māori and know little of Māori culture, I am conscious of many Māori who, having come to faith in Christ, have the difficult task of living at peace with relatives and friends lost in alienation from Christ. I hope that this booklet can encourage them too, firstly by helping clarify points at which their Christian faith is compromised or not compromised by Māori culture. I hope also it can encourage them to perseverance in loving those who might have every *man-centred* ground for despising the gospel and Christians. In one sense Māori believers are no different from others for whom union with Christ brings alienation to the world and even separation in families.[2] However, in the providence

[1] eg Joan Metge *The Maoris of New Zealand* Routlage, 1976 (1967). [See also Metge and Kinloch *Talking Past Each Other* Victoria UP, 1989 (1978)]
[2] Ephesians 2:19; Matthew 10:34

of God Māori believers are often placed where no other Christians can go with faithful lives and the gentle words of the gospel. As for all believers, they must take up their cross and follow Christ, denying self.[3] Those who know us well best receive our witness when our quiet lives win their respect.[4]

A few technical points need to be discussed. Māori language does not use plural forms of nouns, in addition to which the once used pluralized "Maoris" now has pejorative overtones. After trying alternatives, I have changed all instances of "Maoris" in quotations to the now conventional "Māori". I have also used the "Māori macron" to indicate long vowels where appropriate. Readers familiar with my 1988 booklet *The New Māori Myth* will notice I have used some material from it. *The New Māori Myth* however primarily addresses the issue of the place of Māori culture in the state education system, and I have not repeated that discussion here.

It needs to be stressed that this is not intended to be a handbook on Māori culture but an introduction for Christians who want to be biblical in their approach to contemporary culture, of which Māori culture is a part. The booklet is neither exhaustive nor carved with such accuracy that every variation, alternative or pedantic point is covered. It is likely that faults of omission and commission will be discovered in it. I have done my best to ensure such faults are minimal and that the content is accurate and reliable so far as is possible in a work of this sort and size.

Culture is not a sort of ether wafting through the atmosphere, but beliefs, values, practices, the way of life of *people*. If this booklet leaves you fascinated, enchanted, scandalised or whatever by the thing called Māori culture but unmoved toward people for whom this culture is personal, the booklet has failed.

If however the church can be stirred to a renewed partnership in the gospel[5] with a people for whom it was once their home and hope, God will have blessed us all in grace that is his alone to give without measure and ours to receive without merit.

[3] Matthew 16:24

[4] 1 Thessalonians 4:11. See also 1 Corinthians 7:15,16 where Paul's directions to women married to unbelievers illustrate the principles that apply.

[5] Philippians 1:5

1 MĀORI CULTURE & HISTORY

In 1952 Elizabeth Windsor was crowned Queen of New Zealand, Sir Alexander Fleming was made a Fellow of the Royal Society of New Zealand, we were at war in Korea, our Chiefs of Staff took part in the first ANZUS meeting of military heads in Hawaii, and 1.4% of the world's sightings of UFOs were in New Zealand. It was in 1952 that the woman destined to be New Zealand's first Lady Prime Minister was born, and the government was planning to close Māori schools.

For most New Zealanders Māori culture was and is something to watch but not share in. For Māori, the crowning of the new monarch was recognition not just of their sovereign, but the guarantor and protector of the Treaty of Waitangi. But when the excitement died down, having a new Queen made no difference to the place of Māori or Māori culture in New Zealand.

1952 was the hundredth anniversary of the formation of the New Zealand Parliament,[6] a parliament then elected by individual landowners who could read and write in English. Although the Treaty of Waitangi had extended British citizenship to Māori, they could not exercise that citizenship by voting in 1852 because Māori were communal landowners. Besides which, having been given a written form of their own language, they could be literate but not in English and so were excluded from voting. In 1867 Māori were given the right to elect four members to the parliament, but not by secret ballot until 1938. There was no electoral roll for the "Treaty Partners" until 1949. In 1840 as each chief signed the Treaty of Waitangi Hobson declared, "We are now one people," but in 1952 oneness in pension payments had existed for only 2 years.

The 1952 magazine *Landfall* included a wonderful piece by Bill Pearson on what it was to be a New Zealander. Reading it stirs memories of the way we were. In his comprehensive survey of New Zealand culture there is not a single mention of Māori or their culture. But Māori and Māori culture are meant to be what distinguishes us from others. By it we and others have long defined our national identity. In reality that is a myth. In 1952 being Kiwi had nothing to do with Māori or their culture. Even today, although Māori issues are politically prominent, few of us can honestly claim Māori culture is a definitive part of our way of life. At best, "Māoriness" is a fringe on the cultural rug in which we draped ourselves.

A revealing cartoon by Neville Colvin appeared in the *Evening Post* in December the following year.[7] The occasion was the new Queen's visit to New Zealand – the first ever by a reigning monarch. Māori have a deep respect for the Crown and turned out in great numbers to welcome her. But that part of our definitive culture was kept in

[6] Parliament was established by legislation in 1852 but did not meet until 1854.
[7] http://www.cartoons.org.nz/exhibitions/the_line_up/l_u_13.htm

its own corner. I was there. I remember the crowds, I remember the photos and newsreel shots of Māori cultural groups, but it was only recently I realised I had no memory of Māori cultural activity among "ordinary" New Zealanders. That's because it was not there.

In Colvin's cartoon, the Prime Minister, surrounded by cheering crowds, is rolling out the welcoming red carpet. Two Māori warriors in piupiu[8] are lending their cultural touch – but not a single Māori face is found in the crowd, not a single Māori is in conventional dress or part of the mainstream crowd. Māori were as separate as their culture.

Part of the shock New Zealand is experiencing from the new prominence of Māori culture is, I suggest, because it *is* new in a culture in which it is not supposed to be new. While Māori culture was little more than a concert item, non-Māori New Zealanders could accept it as part of our identity, yet be unaffected by it.

In 1956 the Government published a booklet entitled *The Māori of Today*. In the introduction the Minister of Māori Affairs, the Hon. E B Corbett claimed, "Two ways of life are becoming one."[9] The booklet itself claims, "Māori and Europeans today are a homogenous people united in common purpose of individual welfare and national stability … against a background of social and economic equality."[10] Both assertions belonged to the realm of myths and legends.

The booklet carefully documents a culture that is separate from mainstream New Zealand. It is prolifically illustrated, but almost all illustrations document a separate culture. Occasionally a photograph records a European in authority meeting with Māori, or a Māori teacher, nurse or sportsman making his way successfully in what it terms, "Māori progress in Pākehā civilisation."[11] The first photograph is an endearing classic from the 1952 royal tour: "a charming incident at Waitangi when little Annie Rogers of Hokianga, presented, on behalf of her people, a bouquet of roses to her Queen."[12] It is cute, but the photograph and its caption epitomise the way in which Pākehā New Zealanders viewed Māori culture. Part way through the booklet there is a less endearing photograph of "Mr and Mrs Kiwa Morgan and family enjoying an evening at their home in Johnsonville."[13] It is possible that the obviously posed photograph is not entirely contrived – but what is dramatically evident is the total absence, the complete and utter absence, of anything culturally Māori at all in the scene.

My point is not to say the policies of assimilating Māori into European civilisation were right or wrong, or that the obvious separation of mainstream Pākehā from mainstream Māori was right or wrong. I am not attempting to explain why this separation existed, or to evaluate the extent to which Māori or Pākehā contributed to or wanted the separation. My point, and it is an important one, is that the claim that Māori and Pākehā cultures were homogenously integrated was simply a deceit, albeit a self-induced one. Māori and Pākehā cultures were worlds apart, as were Māori and

[8] flax skirt
[9] *The Mäori Today* Government Printer, Wellington, 1956, p1
[10] *The Mäori Today*, p5
[11] *The Mäori Today*, p6
[12] *The Mäori Today*, p4
[13] *The Mäori Today*, p15

Pākehā people. Their occasional intersection was guarded and cautious. The modern assertion of Māori culture in our community has been traumatic, not only because of the nature of that assertion, but because it has shattered 150 years of myth.

As with any generalisation, there were exceptions. In many communities Māori and Pākehā were in relatively closer contact and enjoyed an harmonious overlapping of cultures. Māori and Pākehā came into close contact in some schools, in numerous sporting contexts, in the Armed Forces, and in many rural districts. In communities with significant or dominant Māori populations the local culture could differ notably from the mainstream. Assimilation of individuals from one culture into another happened, and there were instances where in simple friendship the cultural divide was genuinely lost rather than merely crossed. Integration of the two cultures was however rare, if it ever existed. For the most part Māori and Pākehā lived differently, and whether in the school playground or in the wider community naturally associated along ethnic affiliations. For most New Zealanders the exceptions were quaint indicators of an assumed racial harmony in which they had no real engagement.

Another force promoting greater presence and confrontation with Māori culture has been the urbanisation of Māori. What in 1964 Metge called "a new Māori migration"[14] shifted the bulk of Māori population from isolated rural communities to the cities where interaction with the now proximate mainstream New Zealand was eventually as inevitable as it has been brutal.

Through most of the 20th century Māori and their culture were kept in a virtual museum, to be paraded at convenient times. Mainstream New Zealand delighted in a Māori challenge for dignitaries, cheered the haka at football matches, took their guests to concerts where poi were twirled and "natives" would sing harmoniously to ukuleles or guitars; and smiled fraternally at "them" as they ushered traffic through Ministry of Works' roading projects where they did the work. School children learned Māori stick-games but not Te Reo[15]. Māori were seldom neighbours – or at least, not the sort of neighbours you visit casually or borrow a cup of flour from or with whom you share a culture, a way of life. Non-Māori New Zealanders "remained aloof and blissfully unaware of tikanga[16] Māori."[17]

No longer. Now we cannot build a road without appeasing the taniwha[18] in the adjacent river, locate a house without checking for urupā[19], open a new building or exhibition without karakia[20] at dawn, or visit a community facility without being confronted by grotesque and often sexually explicit gargoyles. Like an idol sprung to life, this once benign icon of Kiwiana – Māori culture – now confronts us at almost every turn, not just because Māori are more assertive than in the past, but because of "the increasing acceptability and popularity of tikanga Māori in the wider community."[21]

---

[14] Joan Metge *A New Mäori Migration* Melbourne University Press, 1964
[15] "The language" = Mäori language
[16] culture
[17] Hirini Mead, *Tikanga Mäori* Huia, Wellington, 2003, p3
[18] mythical dragon-like creature
[19] burial ground
[20] ritual prayer
[21] Mead, p23

The huge carving outside the Information Centre in the Waitakere Regional Park is typical. Massive, intricately carved in Māori convention, and, also in Māori convention, sexually assertive. We expect to see such things in public places where once they would only have been in distinctively "Māori" places, but in the contemporary context of reverence for all things indigenous, hardly a voice is raised about indecency. The Regional Authority distributed posters of this to all schools in Auckland. I lodged a complaint with the Indecent Publications Tribunal – it is my contention that a poster displaying aroused male genitals is sufficiently indecent to require at least a restriction on where it can be displayed and who should view it. That would undoubtedly apply if the figures were non-Māori. But I was informed these posters are fit for displaying in the classrooms where the morals of the young are being shaped.

Just how far the corporate and public service sectors have moved in obeisance to Māori religion was demonstrated in a January 2005 ceremony for an Auckland District Health Board hostel sponsored by the McDonalds fast-food chain. A mauri stone[22] carved by local Māori was buried to prayers said to infuse the stone with the "positive energies of the earth (papatuanuku) and the universe (pütaiao) to protect the new building. Concrete was then poured over the burial area to ensure the tapu[23] and mauri are protected, and the stone is never again seen by human eyes."[24] A spokeswoman for the Health Board said that a second carved stone, a manea stone, would be placed in the reception area to "link" with the mauri stone. People are to be encouraged to touch the manea stone to "add their own life force, which will in turn warm and protect the new building" as it links the energies of the earth and universe to the people using the building.

Not all confrontation with contemporary Māori culture is offensive. But to many New Zealanders, it often is. If not morally offensive, the aggression and apparent inequity with which Māori issues are presented and Māori rites practised can be just as offensive. For many New Zealanders the result is widespread and growing confusion, anger and even fear. And that without taking account of the biblical context of life and eternity that ought to be at the heart of a Christian interface with any culture.

Traditionally Māori elders have been reserved in public. Those who are not elders of course should be even more reticent to speak in public. The place for airing issues was the marae, not the Pākehā press. Māori did not hesitate to discuss issues forthrightly and vigorously on the marae, but seldom if ever elsewhere.

On the marae issues are debated and positions examined until agreement is reached, with discussion and agreement more important than time. The protocols surrounding such discussion were and remain well defined, with status and influence recognised according to age, knowledge, lineage, speaking ability and an intangible but instantly recognisable quality we might call bearing or charisma. The process is communal, and Māori consensus can only be achieved when consultation has involved the whole community. Certain decisions can be made by elders by virtue of their status, but ultimately all decisions, including the acceptance of the status of leaders and their

[22] Stone containing a "life force"
[23] status and power arising from spirituality
[24] *East & Bays Courier*, Auckland, January 28, 2005, p5

leadership, is subject to consensus. The marae is the locus for a commitment to, and public expression of, unity.

In the 1960s and 1970s various Māori, mostly young, and frequently under the covering of a university, teachers college, or para-Māori group such as the Auckland Māori Council, began to speak in Pākehā domains about Māori issues. In the Pākehā world they were generally seen as upstarts (which perhaps they were) creating new issues (which they definitely weren't). The issues they aired were almost always perspectives that Māori had long held to, discussed among themselves, and made the subject of regular dignified appeals to those in places of power. But the frustration these young "warriors" sensed in their elders and stirred in themselves, stimulated by a growing fluency in the Pākehā worlds of politics and academia, saw them break the bounds of tradition and speak up. Pākehā were disturbed, but probably not as much as were many marae and their elders.

Yet the young – men and women – continue to speak up, to write and publish, and to teach other Pākehā and Māori. Indeed, they are now frequently joined by elders, and as time passes are becoming elders in their own right. It seems to me that the present very public status of Māori issues, and to a large extent the remarkably successful resolution of many of these (and here I speak of "success" in an exclusively political sense) is due in no small part to this new ability of Māori to speak in the Pākehā world.[25] The very thing that confronts non-Māori New Zealanders is the conduit by which two hundred years' of hidden problems are being addressed, and may prove to be the means by which a more genuine secular national unity is advanced.

Māori culture is not static – it adapts to the world in which Māori live. In the late 1960s Metge noted "In Māori society, young people have always been expected to concentrate on active pursuits such as sport, courting, acquiring work skills … They are neither expected nor encouraged to take an interest in the more traditional, ceremonial and political concerns of their elders"[26] until they were forty or so years of age. When academics such as Hohepa and Walker took the initiative and not only spoke up but trained young Māori to do the same, they shifted Māori practice irrevocably. One formalised group, Ngā Tamatoa (Young Warriors), effectively capitalised on media exposure while holding strongly to ancestral connections. Challenged by Māori and Pākehā alike with the undeniable fact that despite their posturing they did not speak for all Māori, their effective use of the media meant that for most New Zealanders they *were* the voice of Māori opinion. More recent groupings tend to be more aligned to hapü or particular issues, but are no less effective.

It is obvious that young Māori have not given up their traditional interests of sport and courtship, but clearly they have added an acute awareness of Tikanga Māori which they are not hesitant to bring into the Pākehā world at critical points. I do not know the extent to which this has been accepted among more traditional Māori; possibly it is no more accepted there than by Pākehā. But it is now an entrenched feature of both Māori and New Zealand cultures.

[25] Compare this to the impact of the Young Mäori Party last century.
[26] Metge, *The Maoris of New Zealand*, p51

2 MĀORI CULTURE & WORLDVIEW

At the *Code Blue Christian Worldview Conference* in January 2005 I was asked to speak on the topic *The Christian Worldview and Māori Culture*. Why that title? Why not *The Christian Worldview and the Māori Worldview* or *Christian Culture and Māori Culture*?

We cannot separate cultural practice from worldview. Or to put it simply, life and faith are integrated. Of course, we can find many examples where life and faith appear to be separated. Many of us, for example, are adept at expressing a biblical worldview without living a biblical culture. But that is not a separation of life and faith, it is exposure of the actual faith to which people are committed. The culture we practice demonstrates the faith to which we hold, even if we profess something else. As James says, "Show me your faith without deeds, and I will show you my faith by what I do."[27]

Interestingly, this discussion makes no sense in a Māori context: for Māori, culture and spirituality are intimately linked. Theirs is "a thoroughly religious system of thought." Māori "believe in a spiritual reality that transcends limitations of time, space and the human senses, and at the same time pervades and operates in the world of human experience."[28] To speak of Māori culture *is* to speak of the Māori worldview. To Māori, their culture "includes not only outward visible forms but also deep inward feelings and values, which are relevant to and expressed in all they do."[29]

The title, *The Christian Worldview and Māori Culture*, however, naturally expresses the point of present tension for Christians: we commonly respond to the outward cultural expressions we meet in daily political and social contexts without placing them in a biblical context. At the same time we are getting relatively experienced in talking about a biblical worldview but remain demonstrably infantile in working that out in cultural practice.

A biblical approach to cultural issues needs to be multifaceted, but has at its core one overarching principle: "Whatever you do, do it all for the glory of God."[30] This does not mean, as so many seem to assume, "Do what you want and dedicate it to God." It means, "Find out what God wants and delight to do that." In short, shape everything you do by the Bible. This is not about limits on what we want to do, for that would be self-centred and clearly inconsistent with our Christian profession. A biblical approach to culture gives freedom to leave aside what we want and what we have

[27] James 2:18
[28] Metge, p54
[29] Metge, p45
[30] 1 Corinthians 10:31

inherited in Adam (via Rangi, or George or whoever in our whakapapa[31]), and enjoy the God-centred culture of the people of God. That may or may not include bits from the cultures of the world, but the determining factor will not be what we treasure but what God treasures.

This leads to the first of five of the Bible's cultural imperatives I want to remind you of before we look more closely at Māori culture. (I will add to this list of five later.) "If anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has gone, the new has come!"[32] In case anyone misses the cultural application of this newness, of this newness in everything, examine the cultural context of the same Apostle's declaration that "what counts is a new creation."[33] Being Māori, being English, being Arab, being Huguenot – all give place to being a new creation in Christ. As citizens of the world, we were aliens to the people of God. Our culture of the world once marked us as separated from God. But in Christ we "are no longer foreigners and aliens, but fellow citizens with God's people and members of God's household."[34] In Scottish terms, we have a new nationality, we have a new clan. In Māori terms, we have a new iwi[35], we have a new hapü[36]. What characterises our new citizenship is not our whakapapa[37], nor our skin colour nor our ethnicity; it is characterized by regarding neither ourselves nor others from the point of view of the world, by what is seen, but by what is in the heart.[38]

The second cultural imperative is the need to "have nothing to do with the fruitless deeds of darkness, but rather expose them."[39] Nothing voyeuristic is intended here, and there is no place for Christians to entertain themselves with stories of evil, for Paul goes on to say, "for it is shameful even to mention" what is to be exposed! Rather, God calls us here to identify evil for what it is by exposing it to light. As we proclaim the gospel of Christ, "light makes everything visible." That does not mean we can never clearly speak of what is sinful, for Paul repeatedly exposes specific sinfulness. But it does mean when we discuss the specifics of sin we do so for the purpose of edification,[40] not entertainment or worse, in bitterness or malice.[41] There can be no compromise with the fruitless deeds of cultures in darkness, whether they be Māori or American or European or Asian. We are to shed light into the cultures of darkness in which God has placed us.

The third imperative is the call to hold fast to a freedom from fear of idols and false gods. "We know that an idol is nothing at all in the world and that there is no God but one."[42] When the Apostle then adds, "But not everyone knows this" we have to agree – so many Christians spend so much energy in fending off evil spirits and in

---

[31] genealogy
[32] 2 Corinthians 5:17
[33] Galatians 6:13
[34] Ephesians 2:19
[35] tribe
[36] sub-tribe
[37] To emphasise this, some Christian Mäori recite, in place of a traditional whakapapa going back to ancestors and gods, a whakapapa in the form of, "I am Michael, son of Adam, child of God, co-heir with Christ of all the promises of God."
[38] 2 Corinthians 5:16 & 12
[39] Ephesians 5:11
[40] Romans 14:19
[41] Ephesians 4:21
[42] 1 Corinthians 8:4

superstitious fear of idols when in Christ we have freedom. One even finds Christians afraid their security in Christ is threatened by experiences on marae or at tangi or by Māori carvings or emblems. True, those in darkness are bound, but Christ is victor and in him we are his. Luther was right:

> And were this world all devils o'er, And watching to devour us,
> We lay it not to heart so sore; Not they can overpower us,
> And let the prince of ill, Look grim as e'er he will,
> He harms us not a whit; For why? his doom is writ;
> A word shall quickly slay him.

Of course we should not carelessly associate with paganism, and we must constrain our own liberty to guard the consciences of those who in weakness still think idols have power.[43] We are rightly saddened by the power of evil spirits and false gods in the minds and lives of pagan peoples, and we must have compassion for fellow believers who are so accustomed to idols[44] they remain snared in their minds, but we need not share their fears.

The fourth imperative is to be separate. "Do not be yoked together with unbelievers. For what do righteousness and wickedness have in common? Or what fellowship can light have with darkness? What harmony is there between Christ and Belial? What does a believer have in common with an unbeliever? What agreement is there between the temple of God and idols? For we are the temple of the living God. As God has said: 'I will live with them and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they will be my people.' 'Therefore come out from them and be separate.'"[45] We have lost the idea that separation from the world – in politics, in music, in ethics, in everything cultural – is what makes the proclamation of the gospel consistent. Instead we strive to imitate the world and wonder why the world doesn't change. Of course we do not live in a cultural vacuum, creating anew an entire way of life: in the providence of God we are used to certain conventions and art forms and technologies that may or may not have legitimacy for the people of God. But what defines that legitimacy is not our pagan heritage but the word of God. We are the living temple of God, and we bring into that temple the sacrifices of lives holy in their entire compass – and that holiness is to be shaped by what pleases God,[46] not what belongs to our past culture.

The fifth imperative is not really an imperative at all, it is a declaration of state not duty: "You are the salt of the earth. … You are the light of the world."[47] But it leads to an imperative: "Let your light shine before men."[48] Our separation from the world is not physical but cultural: neither monastic nor communal isolation is the pattern for God's people. Again the biblical image is of aliens: we are aliens and strangers looking for a heavenly country while living among the people of an earthly country.[49] In context, the light we are to shine into our surrounding darkness is not so much our proclamation as the way we live: "that they may see your good deeds …". We are

---

[43] 1 Corinthians 8:9-12
[44] 1 Corinthians 8:7
[45] 2 Corinthians 6:4-17
[46] Romans 12:1,2
[47] Matthew 5:13,14
[48] Matthew 5:16
[49] Hebrews 11:13-16

called to a public testimony of a way of life – our culture – that will cause even the pagans to "praise your Father in heaven."

To apply biblical principles we have to know what we are applying them to. We have to be clear as to what Māori culture is and who Māori are. Is what we confront in public as Māori culture really Māori? Or is it another icon from our virtual museum, trundled out to satisfy particular interest groups? Only when we are clear as to who and what we are talking about, can we identify, understand and, I pray, begin to resolve the issues.

Legally, anyone who is of Māori descent and wishes to be identified as Māori is Māori. That leads on to a definition of Māori culture that is as broad as a definition of Pākehā culture would be. And in one sense that is valid: why should we not define Māori culture as the totality of what Māori do? In that view Māori culture is the "system of symbols and meaning shared by those who identify themselves as Māori at any given time … Everything Māori do often or enjoy doing is surely part of their culture."[50] Metge rightly claims this "defines Māori culture in terms of living people instead of its imagined content at a period in the past, and provides for changes over time".[51] But we all know that is not what we are talking about! There is a set of social and political issues that relate to Māori and their traditions that we instinctively recognise as the Māori stuff. And it's different from Pākehā stuff.

In 1967 Metge drew a comparison between a Pākehā view of Māori culture and the view Māori themselves had. Pākehā saw it "as belonging to the past rather than the present, and to the private, leisure-time sector rather than the whole of life: in short as a collection of bits and pieces surviving from what was once but is no longer an integrated system." Māori saw it as "a matter of present experience, a living and lived-in reality either for themselves or for others well known to them … including everyday practices as well as ceremonial."[52]

Now, as then, we can recognise Māori culture but not define it. "Tikanga[53] at one level is conceptual and represents a set of ideas, beliefs and practices. At another level it has to do with practice."[54] It is a normative system[55] which, though rooted in tradition, is "influenced by other cultures' views and perspectives" such that "If our Tupuna[56] of over 300 years ago came back today, they would probably not understand half the Tikanga of today."[57]

Although Māori have no difficulty recognising the place of value systems in culture, they have greater difficulty in recognising those values as absolutes of right and wrong that govern behaviour. Few, if any, can actually live by the standards set. "Values could … be regarded as unreal. Yet it is true to say that people do try to

---

[50] Metge, p46
[51] bid
[52] Metge, p44f
[53] "Tikanga" is the term now most commonly used in relationship to culture. It replaces the use of "Mäoritanga" coined by Carroll and reinforced by Ngata. Mäoritanga had a broader application than tikanga which is more intensely linked to tradition and spirituality.
[54] Mead, p22
[55] Mead, p6
[56] ancestors
[57] http://www.maori.org.nz/tikanga/?d=page&pid=sp34&parent=33 29/11/04

reach towards the values and practise them to the degree that they can manage."[58] A people who have no absolute values find it very difficult to comprehend any system of absolutes, so that Māori today may have as much difficulty as Māori in the 19th century in comprehending the absolutes of Christianity.

Before we look at detailed aspects of Māori culture, I want to draw your attention to three critical things non-Māori tend to overlook, and in doing so confuse their perceptions: firstly, there is a mystical, un-objectifiable aspect to Tikanga Māori; secondly, identical words and expressions can mean different things to different groups; and thirdly, Tikanga Māori is dynamic.

The mysticism and lack of objective truths and values, is typical of pagan religions, and is a key factor in their acceptance in today's pluralism – "Do not judge different from your own as being wrong, for what they see in their past has developed their Tikanga."[59] It means that to understand Māori culture one must study its components, and in that way gain an impression of the whole. Even for Māori immersed in their culture, Tikanga can only be known through time and experience. It is existential. Not for a moment do I propose anyone attempt to experience Māori culture to understand it; we must nonetheless realise that it cannot be comprehended merely as a set of objective propositions.

Despite common experiences and shared vocabulary, Māori and Pākehā view things differently. One of my objectives in this booklet is to dig behind cultural practices to the worldview giving rise to those practices. To do that we must be cautious in assuming a common understanding in the familiar. For example, Māori may approach the resolution of grievances differently, aggressively overstating a position from which they expect to negotiate a compromise, an approach from which unnecessary offence and confusion can arise. Similarly, Pākehā and Māori may have different understandings of a common vocabulary: "Giving their own meanings to familiar words and actions without checking what the other party understands them to mean, Māori and Pākehā often talk past each other and misinterpret the message actually being sent."[60]

The dynamic in Tikanga Māori is important, for it not only demonstrates the interaction of Māori culture with its wider context, but is a key to determining the core values, the ones that don't change. This is a dynamic of relativism in which there are no absolutes, where truth for the moment is determined by a balance of power between tradition, status, knowledge, acceptance and opportunity. It is also a dynamic that is strongly influenced by academia: Tikanga Māori is being shaped as it is studied and publicised by university academics such as Salmond, Walker, King, Belich and Mead. In such a context it is inevitable that contemporary philosophies have an impact. There is more than a hint of constructivism in Mead's likening of Māori culture to a shattered Humpty Dumpty: "the pieces have been scattered – some have been destroyed, some hidden and others are just waiting to be reconstructed."[61]

[58] Mead, p27
[59] ibid
[60] Metge, p47
[61] Mead, p306

Māori culture, though still firmly anchored in its traditional past, adapts to its contemporary context. Metge includes komiti[62] and unveilings[63] in things "that have been borrowed, invented and creatively developed during nearly two hundred years of interaction with Pākehā."[64] A couple more simple examples will illustrate this dynamic:

Today we are used to the term "marae" as a reference not only to the formal meeting area, but the wider location in which Māori live and carry out a range of activities. We think of a "pā" as an ancient fortification. But until the middle of the 20th century "pā" also had another meaning: Māori lived at what was called their pā, and the marae was specifically the meeting area. Then in 1964 a small book was published for schools entitled "Washday at the Pā". It gained instant notoriety for objections from the Māori Women's Welfare League, and others, as denigrating Māori,[65] and was withdrawn from schools and burnt. Yes, burnt! But such was the impact of this incident that Māori stopped referring to their enclaves as pā and began to use what is now the universally recognised application "marae".

Even the most ill-informed New Zealander is likely to recognise the significance of the Meeting House (whare rünanga) in Māori culture. It has all the appearance of being an edifice of ancient tradition. But it is not: it is a relatively modern institution. In 1849 Governor Grey found not a single meeting house (although he did find a number of large buildings constructed specifically for Christian worship) in a journey from Auckland, through Thames and Rotorua to Taranaki.[66] Only the introduction of relative peace between tribes following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi made possible the building of permanent meeting houses as we know them. Prior to this, the marae ātea, the space in front of the Chief's house in a village, served as the place where many of the functions now associated with the whare rünanga took place.[67] The cultural context for the introduction of whare rünanga was the introduction of Christianity with its emphasis on a permanent church building for communal worship. Yet today, the meeting house on the marae "is the focal point for the spiritual, ancestral, chiefly and tribal values."[68]

Yet another example of the dynamic or evolving nature of Māori culture is the growing recognition of urban iwi. Māori culture is utterly tribal: all personal roots and cultural practice relates to the iwi or tribe. Once Treaty of Waitangi settlements began to be made, it became necessary for Māori to link with their iwi to receive benefits from the settlements. Apart from that, Māori wishing to explore or assert their Māori identity must establish their iwi affiliation. But many modern Māori have at best only tenuous links with their iwi. The development of urban Māori authorities

---

[62] ie the English word "committee" but sometimes used in a broader way to apply to a voluntary group.
[63] A year after a person is buried their tombstone is "unveiled" (having just previously been covered in traditional cloaks) in a deeply religious ceremony that Dansey relates to the ancient practice of scraping the bones clean before storing them in a burial chest. [See Harry Dansey *Mäori Custom Today* Shortland, 1978, (1972) p 62]
[64] Metge, p46
[65] Photographer and author Ans Westra had hoped to portray the care and support found in a poor family; it was seen as a distorted and derogatory portrayal of Mäori that reinforced stereotypical Päkehä attitudes.
[66] Simmons, *The Mäori Meeting House*, Reed Books, 1997, p16
[67] Simmons, p8f
[68] Simmons, p8

and the recognition by the Waitangi Tribunal and Fisheries Commission of urban iwi are clear indicators of a very significant shift in cultural practice.

There are two more general points that need to be made here: Tikanga is not absolute, and it can vary from group to group within Maoridom. "Tikanga is the set of beliefs associated with practices and procedures to be followed in conducting the affairs of a group or an individual. These procedures are established by precedents through time, are held to be ritually correct, are validated by usually more than one generation and are always subject to what a group or individual is able to do."[69] "The one thing that we should realize is that each Iwi has different Tikanga, which is tika for them."[70]

[69] Mead, p12

[70] http://www.maori.org.nz/tikanga/?d=page&pid=sp34&parent=33 29/11/04

3 MĀORI CULTURE & GOD

Māori were and are religious. Even today the heritage of strong religious commitment is evident in crafts and customs. Māori religion can be summed up in three words: it is animist, spiritist and ancestral. Māori animism believes that all objects possess spirits or spiritual forces that have to be reckoned with in every day life. Spiritism is occultism by another name – communicating with and attempting to use or manipulate the spirits of the dead. The worship of ancestors is nothing less than an attempt to deify man, thereby gaining the power Adam sought in man's first rebellion.

As James Cowan wrote in 1910,

> The ancient religion of the Māori-Polynesian may be broadly said to have consisted in, first, a belief in and reverence for the personified powers of Nature, and secondly, as a propitiation of the spirits of dead ancestors. A belief in the animation of all Nature pervaded and influenced the whole life of the Māori, and equally strong was his faith in the divinity of his great *Ariki* forefathers, ancestors who had long passed to the Reinga-land, yet whose spirits still held dominion over their descendants, and were powerful to bless or ban.[71]

The Waitangi Tribunal has expressed much the same point: "For Māori the works of nature the animals, plants, rivers, mountains, and lakes are either kin, ancestors, or primeval parents according to the case, with each requiring the same respect as one would accord a fellow human being."[72]

The whole of Māori life was and is intertwined with the presence and activities of spirits. "Mauri is the life force or spirit that permeates all things in the natural world and by which all things in nature cohere."[73] This mauri is active, so that it influences events and gives people and things status and power. A person of great presence will be said to have mauri, implying that he has an impact on people because of the spirit force indwelling him. To a large extent these spirit forces are regarded as ancestral.

When Te Māori Exhibition opened in New York in 1984, much was made by presiding elder, Sonny Waru, of the spiritual nature of the artefacts on display. He explained that the carvings and relics were not mere representations of ancestors –

---

[71] James Cowan *The Maoris of New Zealand* Whitcombe and Tombs, Christchurch, 1910, p102
[72] Waitangi Tribunal *The Whanganui River Report Wai 167* (GP Publications, Wellington, 1999) 39 [The Whanganui River Report] cited by http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2001/maori_perspectives/part_1_mana.html
[73] *Taha Māori in Social Studies* Taranaki District Social Studies Committee, Department of Education, Wellington, 1985

they are "our ancestors."[74] So when entering a meeting house, the ancestors are actually present by virtue of their carved images. This is not merely access to spirits through an idol. The idol is regarded as the actual ancestral spirit.

It is sometimes imagined that Māori terms for God can be used indiscriminately with biblical names and carry the same meaning. They cannot. Although some of the ancient Māori religious terms are used in the Māori Bible, considerable caution is still required.

The most fundamental distinction that needs to be made is between the Māori concept of gods and man, and the biblical one. In the Bible God is Creator, and everyone and everything else is made by him of a different substance and nature. God and man are and always will be distinct. But in the Māori concept, men are of the gods and become gods. "There is a godlike and spiritual quality" to all humans because they are descendants of the gods.[75]

Māori believed in a pantheon of invisible spirits known as atua who had supernatural powers and could be influenced by ritual karakia. The original parents, Rangi and Papa gave rise to a host of others, many unique to particular tribes, but for all tribes the pantheon included eight chief deities, of whom Tane, the god of the forests, is perhaps best known to Pākehā. Some Christian Māori avoid using the term "atua" to apply to God because of its pre-Christian connotations, and instead only use personal names for God.[76]

Atua are invariably associated with visible objects ranging from natural phenomena and objects to living things and carved sticks and stones. Artefacts of all sorts are accorded a status that can only be understood in terms of a spiritual essence derived from previous owners.

It is difficult to differentiate between atua and the spirits of ancestors in Māori religion. Indeed, all men are ultimately descendants of the gods (or is it that the gods were all once men?). This rules out the possibility in Māori thought and practice of a God who is greater than men. The gods, the spirits, have influence but are always susceptible to manipulation by men.

As good and evil were regarded as a continuum rather than as opposites, so the atua could not be classified absolutely as good or evil. The very power of good atua implied danger to men from which evil could arise. Consequently, Māori made "little use of the … concept of wholly evil spirits"[77] and ignore the biblical concept of a personal Satan who is wholly evil.

Io (or Io-mata-ngaro), is the name given to the supreme god of Māori mythology, but I suggest even greater care is needed in identifying Io with the God of the Bible. Io is not a god of revelation, but one who is inaccessible and hidden. His name means "God of the hidden face". Out of fear not even the tohunga could normally mention his name. In ancient times, most Māori were unaware of his existence. While

[74] NZ Herald 12/9/84
[75] Meade, p42
[76] Metge, p55
[77] Metge, p55

traditionally the reason given for this is that his existence was only revealed to initiates into the secret knowledge of the tohunga[78], Meade argues strongly for the fact that he did not exist at all.[79] The Bay of Plenty genealogies to which he refers by way of example are emphatic in representing Rangi and Papa as the supreme beings (or more literally, supreme being): "There is but one ancestor of the Māori people, Rangi-nui who stands above and Papa-tua-nuku who lies below."[80]

If the name Io has validity, it is in relation to a pre-Christian deity, not to God. On the other hand, when used by Christians, or as is common in prayers in schools and workplaces, could it not be to God? Much lies in the conscience of the user, or should we say, in the consciences of all users at the time – which suggests to me we would do better to address our prayers to God not to Io.[81]

How this contrasts with the gospel of grace in Jesus Christ – a supreme God who can be approached by sinful men, not because he can be manipulated but because he brings freedom. His name can be mentioned with reverent love, because he is our loving Father. The biblical concept of "father" is of a provider, nurturer, protector as well as progenitor. As applied to God he is seen, not as ancestor but giver of life, who is to be feared because of his holiness and justice. He can be embraced in love because he embraces us in love, satisfying his holiness through the loving sacrifice of his own Son, Jesus Christ, so that his wrath never falls on those he so loves. This contrasts with concepts of fatherhood of dominance, force and, once deified through death, fear because he is likely to inflict arbitrary evil. As we trust in this one, all powerful, ever present and unchangeably gracious and righteous God, we need fear neither spirits nor death.

Māori meetings will always open with a karakia or ritual prayer to the gods that in some instances is adapted to or replaced by Christian prayer. Except in expressly Christian contexts, karakia are offered in the context of pantheism. Although "karakia" is normally translated as "prayers", "karakia" more truly corresponds to the ritual formulae of Greek and Roman gods than to the free offerings of the heart in Christian prayer. "Their efficacy was held to lie in faultless repetition, though the mana[82] and delivery of the chanter were also important."[83] There is a tendency to adapt Christian prayer to traditional ceremonies in which karakia are chanted, either by having Christian prayers following traditional karakia "to provide double protection and insurance … [or] merely to appease the Christians"[84], or by replacing karakia with Christian prayers at a traditionally auspicious time for the spirit world, such as a dawn ceremony. Neither practice honours God.

---

[78] priestly medium and guardian of secret knowledge
[79] Meade, p309
[80] Meade, p309
[81] This highlights a very important aspect of translation. There are some terms that should neither be translated nor transliterated from one language to another, particularly in the case of nouns or verbs that have no equivalent. Instead, a word that has no equivalent should be retained in its original language. For example, ordinary English has no adequate equivalent to the Mäori "marae", so it has become very common in New Zealand English where it is understood. Similarly, as there is no equivalent to the biblical concept of "God" in ancient Mäori culture, and consequently no equivalent word, it is better to use the English "God" (or for those with sensitivities to English, the words of biblical languages) than to try adapt Mäori words that are so loaded with unbiblical meaning as to make their use imprudent.
[82] prestige
[83] Metge, p22
[84] Meade, p76

Many Māori households will have a corner displaying photographs of ancestors, functioning in much the same way as carvings in a traditional whare. These "shrines" are a constant reminder to the family and visitors as they come and go that they live in the real presence of the ancestors.

The concept of a continuity between good and evil comes into focus when we examine the Māori spiritual universe. The continuity is not dissimilar to the ying yang balance of eastern mythology or the dark and light sides of *Star Wars* fame. In fact, the latter is particularly apt, for Te Rangi is said to be the realm of day, light and life, while Te Po is the realm of night, darkness and death (with the world of men as we know it lying between the two). But "the relation of Te Rangi and Te Po is not one of conflict and negation, as it is between [the Christian] Heaven and Hell, but one of complementarity. As light cannot be comprehended except in relation to darkness, as life cannot be appreciated except in relation to death, so Te Rangi and Te Po define and complete each other."[85] "Te Po was not the complete negation of light and life … [but is] a womb in which new life was generated out of death."[86] When Satan tempted our first parents with the myth that to know good it was necessary to know evil, he launched the deceit that God and Satan, good and evil, are equivalent extremes to be held in balance. In its fundamentals, Māori religion is the same as all other deceits.

Taha Māori was certainly ripe for the gospel. Any concept of the integrity of man created in the image of God was totally missing. Whatever dignity is to be found in man is not there because he is a creature made in God's image, but because all are "descended from ira Atua, the Gods."[87]

Barbaric cannibalism was such a feature that its omission or mere passing reference in so many modern histories must be regarded as the result of a policy of deliberate suppression of the truth.[88] A chief by the name of Tāreha punished a slave girl by "stringing her up by the heels, stabbing her in the neck, and gorging himself on her blood – Tāreha and his wife drinking alternately until she was dead."[89] Hongi Hika displayed his contempt for an enemy by swallowing his eyes whole before consigning him to an oven.[90] Human heads, both trophies of war and objects of mourning, were also the play things of children.[91] Marsden reported that though "the natives generally speak of [cannibalism] with horror and disgust, yet they expect that this will be their own fate in the end, as it has been with their forefathers and friends."[92]

The standing or respect a person has is called mana. Mana is a rigidly class-based social structure. People with the lowest mana have the lowest social standing. Much

---

[85] Metge, p56
[86] Metge, p56
[87] Mead, p42
[88] Cannibalism is being rehabilitated into history. Contemporary historians determine values relativistically, such that a culture that practised cannibalism cannot be judged by another culture that finds cannibalism repugnant. If it was "normal" in an "authentic" culture, then according to the latest trend in historical ethics we are meant to accept it as valid for them.
[89] Mead, p29f
[90] Richard Taylor *New Zealand and Its Inhabitants* Wertheim & MacIntosh, London, 1855, p312
[91] Ormond Wilson *From Hongi Hika to Hone Heke* McIndoe, Dunedin, 1985, p121
[92] William Williams *Christianity Among the New Zealanders* Seely Jackson and Halliday, London, 1868, p27

criticism has been levelled at what is conceived of as the working-class, employing-class society that is said to prevail in New Zealand. The Māori system however was far more rigid and structured. At the bottom of the scale were slaves, who were kept as servants and well-preserved food. "Tütüā[93] did not qualify to be treated as human beings. By becoming slaves these people lost their birthright and thus their right to be treated the same as other members of the hapü."[94] This was a caste system that locked the lower classes into servitude. It abused the weak. It abused minorities. It abused women.[95]

Women suffered a social oppression typical of all societies that reject the fatherhood of God. Infanticide minimised the problem – girls would frequently be killed at birth, the mothers pinching their noses then hypocritically mourning a death over which they claimed to have had no influence![96] (Most 19th century children of racially mixed parentage suffered the same fate.) Women were given as gifts to men, treated as spiritually contaminating, subject to polygamous marriages and even when recognised as able to make contributions to the economy and warfare, treated as chattels.

The impact of this on children indicates the abhorrent quality of fickle ancient Māori morality. Infanticide was common.[97] Mothers would kill their children when expressing grief over the loss of a husband. One Thames woman murdered seven of her children so that she could more easily run away should she be attacked![98]

Māori protected marriage, exacting muru[99] on any who broke marriage bonds. But this was not on the basis of the sanctity of marriage itself, but on the sanctify of the contract between the whānau who had made the marriage. Marriage was not seen as a union between two individuals by and before God, but a union between two families by and before them.

Into this Taha Māori the missionaries brought the gospel. Its immediate impact was to free Māori from bondage – bondage to evil spirits, bondage to sentiments of revenge, bondage to social abuse and injustice – in short, bondage to sin and fear.

[93] slaves
[94] Mead, p39
[95] *Taha Mäori in Social Studies*
[96] Wilson, p68
[97] Taylor, p165
[98] Taylor, p165
[99] judicial plunder

4 MĀORI CULTURE & THE CHURCH

Surprisingly, Christians can agree with pagan anthropologists that Christian mission defines the Bible's interface with culture: "Missionaries are in many ways our opposites: they believe in original sin."[100] Rejection of the biblical concept of sin (and necessarily therefore also of God) is a foundation stone of contemporary revisionist history and anthropology that does not hesitate to be judgemental towards Christians with statements such as: "A pall of Protestant gloom hangs over many a community in the Pacific … that once throbbed with life, laughter and song. The concept of sin must rank with smallpox among our most damaging exports."[101] With such presuppositions, historical evidence is always necessarily interpreted as "primitive means happiness, un-colonised means free." When the evidence says the opposite, such presuppositions demand the evidence be rewritten.

Yet the Bible is unequivocal: "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."[102] The problem of sin is fundamental to all mankind, and not least to 19th century Māori who had no concept of absolutes and therefore no concept of sin and righteousness. They were a people in need of the gospel and it was with great faith, boundless love and enormous personal sacrifice[103] that missionaries came to New Zealand to proclaim that gospel. Despite politically correct contemporary commentary to the contrary, the history of evangelical missionaries in New Zealand is one of effective compassionate concern for the welfare of Māori that was valued then as it ought to be valued now: it was good.

On Christmas Day 1814, in response to the invitation of a local chief, Ruatara, Samuel Marsden began the evangelisation of the Māori. Over the next half century, the message of the missionaries was to radically transform much of the Māori way of

---

[100] Walter Goldschmidt, "Anthropology and Coming Crisis: An Autoethnographic Appraisal", 79 (1979):296 in Robert J Priest "Cultural Anthropology, Sin and the Missionary" in Carson & Woodbridge (eds) *God and Culture* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1993, p87

[101] Roger Keesing, "Cultural Anthropology" Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1981, p40 in Priest, p91

[102] Romans 3:23

[103] The courage and faith of 19th century missionaries to New Zealand cannot be over estimated. Most were young, recently married, and expected to die at the hands of those they went to serve – it is remarkable, and a testimony to the respect of Mäori for the missionaries, that only one missionary was ever killed by Mäori. They bore with great dignity the most primitive of living conditions, "corresponded" with homes most would never return to in a cycle that took up to two years from writing a letter to receiving a response. They frequently endured isolation from other Europeans for months at a time. Yet the skill and perseverance they brought to their task was heroic. They learnt Mäori and gave it its written form. They walked hundreds of kilometres through the virgin bush and mountains of New Zealand to reach the lost. They translated the Bible and good books and printed them here in New Zealand. Henry Williams, for example, set himself the task of learning ship-building as he prepared to come to New Zealand, and on arrival here proceeded to build a ship of sufficient size and sea-worthiness as to be used by the mission to travel around New Zealand and across the stormy Tasman Sea to get supplies from Sydney.

life. But this was no colonial invasion – in the words of modern historian James Belich, Christianity was "an invited guest."[104] Christian missionaries were welcomed because they brought what the Māori lacked: freedom from spiritual fear, peace, education, economic reform and social justice.

Behind this missionary movement was a group of godly men who included the reformed slaver John Newton and the social reformer and parliamentarian William Wilberforce.[105] The Calvinistic Christianity of these men saw a compassion for socially and spiritually enslaved people united with a confidence in God who assured success in the proclamation of his gospel. Despite the appalling bondage and deprivation of Māori, they knew God could transform them. Their confidence was not in their abilities of persuasion but in the promise of God to save men as the gospel was proclaimed. This Calvinism compelled their vigorous missionary outreach.

Calvinism has often been caricatured by secular writers as hard and unloving. The mythology of this view is clearly displayed in the practical Christianity of these men. They pioneered the evangelisation of the South Pacific at great and frequently fatal personal sacrifice. They also established schools, provided medical help and social works whose impact is still felt today. The missionaries were never able to meet the overwhelming volume of requests by chiefs and their tribes to establish mission stations around New Zealand. Such requests arose because these compassionate men and women had something to offer that the Māori of the day recognised as invaluable.

Marsden first met Māori in Sydney,[106] and was immediately moved with their desperate darkness and need of the gospel:

> The more I examined their national character the more I felt interested in their temporal and spiritual welfare. Their minds appeared like a rich soil that had never been cultivated … they were a savage race, full of superstition, and wholly under the power and influence of the Prince of Darkness – and there was only one remedy which could effectually free them from their cruel spiritual bondage and misery, and that was the Gospel of a crucified Saviour.[107]

It was over ten years however, before he was able to see the mission to New Zealand launched. He had to be released from his duties at Sydney[108], go to England (a journey of nine months in sometimes appalling conditions) where over a period of fourteen months he eventually persuaded the CMS to begin a mission to New Zealand, and return to Sydney (only seven months this time) where because of a

---

[104] James Belich *The New Zealand Wars* Auckland UP, Auckland, 1986, p303

[105] "of all [his supporters], none was to prove more important to Marsden than that of William Wilberforce." A T Yarwood *Samuel Marsden* Reed, Wellington, 1977, p9

[106] Marsden dates his interest from his first meeting with Mäori in about 1802, 1803. See John Elder (Ed) *The Letters and Journals of Samuel Marsden* Otago University Council, 1932, p59

[107] Elder, p60

[108] Marsden has been caricatured as a hard and insensitive man, the "whipping parson" of the Sydney penal colony. Marsden found his official duties as Magistrate distasteful, never wanted to be magistrate and longed to be released from it. Nevertheless he performed his duties in a hard place in hard times with a clear conscience and he deserves to have his Sydney ministry viewed in that light. See Iain Murray *Australian Christian Life from 1788* Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, 1988, p32ff for a particularly clear defence of Marsden's integrity: "to accuse him of being personally inclined to cruelty is an entire misrepresentation of his life. … it is hard to avoid the impression that this hostility [of his contemporaries] to Marsden originated chiefly from a hatred of his spiritual convictions."

massacre of a ship's crew in Whangaroa[109] he could not get passage to New Zealand.[110] In any case he faced opposition from the government in Sydney: "For many years I had ardently wished to visit New Zealand, but I [could not] obtain permission from the Government here."[111] In the end Marsden bought his own ship (with his own funds) so that he and the three designated missionaries could go to New Zealand. All the time of course he and his wife had to live their lives and do their work.

Marsden paints a dramatic picture of the birth of their first child during their first eight month journey to Sydney. The main cargo of their ship was convicts being transported to Australia or wives of previously transported convicts. The sailors were little better than the cargo. The convict girl assigned to help Mrs Marsden betook herself to the captain's cabin for the duration of the journey, leaving the Marsdens alone to cope with the birth during a storm that flooded their cabin for days. Marsden wore his infant daughter's clothes next to his body in the hope that his body warmth would dry them enough to put on the baby![112]

The initial missionary thrust in New Zealand faltered as Marsden, convinced of the necessity of "civilizing" the Māori in preparation for his reception of the gospel, initially concentrated on social works. His schooling and agrarian reforms came to little because European culture could never survive as an appendage to Taha Māori. Some showed evidence of material success, most failed because the activities encouraged needed a more comprehensive social reform, but none produced a greater receptivity to the gospel. It was not till the arrival of Henry Williams in 1823 that Christianity began to make a real impact.[113]

Years later Marsden made clear his early policy was mistaken. In response to a Bishop claiming "savages" could not receive the gospel till they were civilised, Marsden replied, "Civilization is not necessary before Christianity … do both together if you will, but you will find civilization follow Christianity, easier than Christianity to follow civilization. Tell a poor heathen of his true God and Saviour."[114]

The value of Marsden's labours in Christ for New Zealand should not be underestimated. Despite his early "civilizing" policy, he did preach the gospel in New Zealand, he did bring gospel preachers to New Zealand, he did support, encourage and guide those gospel preachers, and he did put in place a structure that would serve the expanding mission well. All this arose from an ardent love for Christ, for the gospel and for the lost despite enormous physical difficulties and much opposition among English settlers on both sides of the Tasman Sea. Although progress was slow until Williams arrived, there was progress. He rightly recorded in 1815:

---

[109] The crew and passengers of *The Boyd* were killed and eaten in 1809.
[110] Marsden left Sydney in February 1807, reached England in November 1807, left England in August 1809 and arrived back in Sydney in February 1810. (The length of his stay in England appears partly to have been influenced by a rebellion in the Australian Colony; see Murray, p34f)
[111] Murray, p36
[112] Elder, p25
[113] Wilson, p121f. Wilson appears bemused by the willingness of Mäori to respond to the gospel: "It is less obvious how … tribes remote from Europeans, missionary or otherwise, would be attracted by these new and apparently alien ideas and religious exercises." p123
[114] Murray, p39

> I have met with hard contests in digging the foundation and laying the first stone for the Christian Church in New Zealand … I believe the work to be of God; it has gone on slowly yet, but progressively. … This island (sic) opens a large field for the exercise of Christian benevolence and missionary labours.[115]

Henry Williams must be regarded as one of the greatest servants of Christ in the history of the Church. Had he lived a couple of thousand years earlier I have no doubt he would have been named in the list in Hebrews 11! Williams had worked his way to the rank of Lieutenant in the Royal Navy when he was demobbed at the end of the Napoleonic Wars. During his service he had been a crew member on the only Royal Navy ship to capture a United States vessel in time of war[116]. In what has been suggested was a real-life parallel to an incident in the modern movie *Master and Commander*, he was one of the prize crew sailing the American ship when the captured Americans rebelled, and it was his experience then in putting down the rebellion that led him to the conviction he would never again bear arms and never again put a man to death.[117]

As a consequence, Williams never permitted the missionaries in New Zealand to be armed. That however did not prevent him from the display of amazing courage. Among many accounts is that of him standing unmoved before a naked warrior chief Tohitapu who was brandishing a spear and threatening imminent death. Williams calmly responded by rebuking Tohitapu and announcing he would not speak to him until he retreated, came through the gate "like a gentleman" instead of jumping the fence, and apologising for his rudeness.[118] It was not unknown for Williams to stand between two warring tribes, defying the threat of musket balls, and demand that in the name of Jesus Christ they stop their sinful behaviour – and at times they did. He earned such respect among Māori that at news of his death two warring tribes in the Bay of Islands immediately stopped fighting and prayed together!

Williams' wife Marianne was of equally strong faith. In her account of the incident with Tohitapu she admits that she and the children fell to their knees in earnest prayer, but as soon as the incident passed they got on with life in the most testing and primitive conditions. The danger of violent death was never far from them, yet her constant refrain was of thanks to God for allowing them to serve in such a place of blessing and of her confidence that God would preserve the family just so long as it was his purpose to do so.

The reputations of the missionaries in general, and Williams in particular, have suffered at the hands of critics for too long. Bishop Selwyn, who with ruthless determination destroyed the missionary influence in New Zealand, joined with others of his day to falsely accuse Williams and see him publicly shamed. More recently, criticism of his role in translating the Treaty of Waitangi has without justification impugned his integrity. The prejudice with which modern historians, movie makers and ethnologists shape thinking about missionaries has not helped. It is good therefore to see Caroline Fitzgerald begin what we pray will prove to be a trend

---

[115] Elder, p139
[116] In January 1815 HMS *Endymion* captured the USS *President*
[117] Caroline Fitzgerald (Ed) *Letters from the Bay of Islands* Penguin, Auckland, 2004, p80
[118] Accounts of this and many similar incidents can be found in Williams and in Fitzgerald

among historians by revealing the integrity of Williams and the unstinting respect with which he was held among Māori to the present day.[119]

The forty years following the 1823 arrival of Henry and Marianne Williams in New Zealand saw a widespread conversion of Māori to the Christian faith. Two reasons account for this: firstly, Williams spearheaded a new strategy, making preaching salvation through Ihu Karaiti (Jesus Christ) a priority. It is significant that social reform not only became possible following conversion, but was to a great extent an indigenous movement.

Secondly, the Bay of Islands became to a degree tribally cosmopolitan. The local Ngapuhi, the first tribe to arm themselves with muskets, swept through the North Island settling old scores with a vengeance. Each war party returned to the Bay with its compliment of slaves – children and adults whose flesh was to be kept for future feasts. Many of these slaves were converted, and under the changing conditions of the age were subsequently able to return to their tribes with the gospel of peace and hope. Effectively Māori were thus largely evangelised by Māori, with missionary expansion supporting and developing the work of the native evangelists.

Undeniably, missionaries offered economic, social and political advantages to 19th century Māori. Equally undeniably significant numbers of 19th century Māori became Christians and passed to their mokopuna[120] a Christian Māori heritage. When allusion is made to tension existing today "between Māori who want to follow the 'true' customs and Māori who want to follow Christian practices"[121] I bristle: our heritage of Christianity is as truly Māori as is our heritage of paganism.

In 1987, Māori Member of Parliament the Honourable Mrs Tirikatene-Sullivan, spoke of this heritage of Christian Māori culture when she described her own cultural background as essentially Christian:[122]

> I am specifically referring to the generations of Maoridom of my grandparents and parents. There was an assurance in those Christian teachings and the lifestyle that developed from that focal point … I have referred to the strength of Christian faith that has underpinned so much of Māori society over the past 150 years. Those who would strive to replace that with ideologies which are alien … are culpable of exploiting unmercifully a people ravaged economically after three decades of ineffective social policies.[123]

By the mid 1800s between 60% and 80%[124] of Māori were attending Christian worship each Sunday. How then can we account for the decline of Christianity and

---

[119] see Fitzgerald, pxiii ff
[120] descendants
[121] Mead, p82
[122] Tirikatene-Sullivan (Parliamentary Records) 24 June 1987
[123] ibid
[124] Belich offers the 60% figure: "By the 1850s, over 60 per cent of Mäori counted themselves as Christians, and I do not dispute their claim." Williams *Journal* p143 & W C Schaniel *Mäori and the Economic Frontier: An Economic History of the Mäori of New Zealand, 1769-1840* University of Tennessee PhD thesis, 1985 p353 in Belich, p219. He tends to be conservative, while CMS records which refer to 80% had every reason to be optimistic but, so far as Mäori practice of Christianity was concerned, tended to be pessimistic! "60% to 80%" is a very safe range for a quite remarkable phenomenon. Bronwyn Elsmore *Mana from Heaven* Reed, Auckland, 2004 (1989), p144 cites Thomson [*Story of New Zealand* vol 2, London, 1859, p296] as providing a figure of 64%.

resurgence of Māori paganism from 1850? Were the same reasons influential in the parallel revival of Māori paganism in the second half of last century? Can the answers to those questions help us explain and find a solution for contemporary Christian syncretism (Māori and non-Māori alike)? I think they can.

Disputes over land, and the wars that arose from those disputes, were the vector by which Māori Christianity came under pressure. On the one hand Māori viewed the "Christian" settlers and government as behaving inconsistently with the Christianity of the Bible, undermining Māori confidence in the gospel. And on the other hand the need to identify clearly as "Māori" in the face of a warring enemy encouraged a revival of the old Māori spirituality, albeit frequently cast in an amalgam of old and new. But the pressures were not the cause of the collapse of Māori Christianity. Māori Christianity ultimately collapsed because it never escaped the culture of paganism.

There can be no question that genuine conversions took place. Māori were saved. Equally there can be no question that adopting Christianity was advantageous. "When Christianity became recognised as a taonga[125], something of value in Māori terms, no group could afford to get left behind in the rush."[126] Whenever nominal Christianity gains popularity it results in both syncretism and, understandably, capitulation in the face of pressure. In the case of 19th century Māori, the pressure would come in the clash over land.

For many Māori, the need to be assertively Māori in the context of land disputes and war involved an abandonment of nominal Christianity. But in any case, as Stack wrote, "The conduct of the English [in the New Zealand wars] seemed inexplicable to the Christian Māori. How can Christians, they said, be guilty of such unchristian conduct towards those who are their brethren in Christ? No wonder the majority of Māori lost their belief in the Divine origin of the Christian religion."[127]

The initial thrust of the evangelical and biblical CMS missionaries was diluted by other missions, and particularly by aberrations of biblical Christianity. The first to exert significant influence was the Catholic missionary movement. Once Māori felt protected by the Treaty of Waitangi from French colonial aspirations Catholic missionaries began making inroads. By nature a religion of syncretism, it "was somewhat more willing to incorporate Māori tradition than its rivals. When one Methodist missionary asked a Māori why he had opted for Catholicism in 1841, the reply was: 'Why …. Their religion is good because they are not afraid of sin.'"[128] The Catholic Bishop Pompallier went so far as to claim, "Hine, the wife of the Māori god Maui, was the Virgin Mary".[129]

But Māori needed no instruction in syncretism:

> When the [CMS] missionaries came we consented to them because we thought they were a law of life to the body. When the Wesleyans came we consented

[125] Cultural treasure
[126] Philip Turner, *Politics of Neutrality: The Catholic Mission and the Mäori 1838-1870* Auckland MA thesis, 1986, p149 in Belich, p217
[127] Elsmore, p145 citing J W Stack *More Moariland Adventures* Wellington 1936, p183
[128] Turner ,p45 in Belich, p219
[129] W H Oliver and Claudia Orange (*E*ds) *The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, volume 1, 1990 (Patuone), in Belich, p219

> to them because we thought their worship was a law of life for the body. Afterwards, when the Romanists came, we consented unto them because we thought they, too, had a law of life for the body. For the same reason we now listen to the [Māori cult] Wairuarua.[130]

Syncretism was not always a matter of simple rejection of the gospel, but could as often be a genuine attempt to adapt Māori culture to the new religion (which inevitably meant the adaptation of Christian doctrine and practice to the old religion). The fear of tapu and a failure to understand the fully liberating work of Christ meant Māori looked for non-biblical solutions. For example, baptism was often adapted in various ways to become a rite to free people from spirits or tapu.

We can miss the degree to which the habits and fears of a pagan past can hang on and weigh down those who would otherwise run a good race.[131] The CMS missionary T S Grace wrote in 1856 that Taupo Māori "profess to retain their belief in Christ, but declare themselves to be double-spirited … to hold intercourse with spirits."[132] A Wesleyan report of 1857 has the same theme:

> They have sincerely abandoned their false gods and … have believed in God and in Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; … but in superstitious ignorance they have fancied that their old abandoned gods or demons or devils have still some sort of existence and some extent of power to inflict injuries of revenge upon them if opportunity should offer. They acknowledge that these false or imaginary gods have been abandoned but they have an idea that they have not been destroyed.[133]

The common response to such problems was for Māori to perform karakia, or destroy the objects that were deemed to mediate those spirits, or to engage in some other rite to destroy the spirits' powers. The Anglican liturgy was easily adapted by Māori in the pattern of karakia and rituals. There is value in a biblical structure for worship, but with fixed formulae, rites and words used repetitiously and inflexibly in the Anglican liturgy, Māori found it too easy to hope Christian ceremonial would have more power than pagan. Had they learnt forms of worship in which orderly spontaneity, thought and originality featured, there would have been less opportunity to turn liturgy from worship to magic.

Perhaps many were not truly converted, but the literature leaves me with the distinct impression that many who came to faith simply had too small a view of the power of the cross-work of Christ.

One of God's most helpful gifts to believers, the fellowship of Christians of different spiritual maturity in a local church, was not available to Māori Christians – initially because there were only new Christians in New Zealand, but later because a policy of separate Māori and English churches prevailed. The prejudice[134] of settler church-goers undoubtedly entrenched this apartheid. I am not suggesting Māori should have been assimilated into the settler churches. Rather, had English Christians, as they arrived in New Zealand joined the local churches – those in which Māori worshiped

[130] Elsmore, p129f
[131] Galatians 5:7
[132] Elsmore, p128
[133] Elsmore, p114
[134] As early as 1815 Marsden wrote of a "strong public prejudice" against Mäori; see Elder, p139

and led – the fellowship and example of fellows believers might well have filled the void left by lack of biblical teaching.

Initial enthusiasm for the gospel had in many cases been unfulfilled – there were just too few missionaries to preach to people when they were willing to hear. When Grace arrived at Taupo in 1855 he wrote

> The Gospel to them has not that freshness which is calculated to arrest their attention. They have told us that we have come 'too late!' They have long known of the Gospel, and are in a backsliding state – cold and indifferent as to their spiritual wants, but most eager about the things of time. Their belief in witchcraft, and their fear of 'Tapu', I think could never have been stronger than at present.[135]

In many instances the teaching of new Christians was in the hands of Māori teachers who had only rudimentary knowledge of the Scriptures or worse, simply filled in gaps in their knowledge with their own ideas or concepts drawn from their past. In 1856 T S Grace complained that the Māori teachers had "destroyed the faith!"[136]

Doctrinal understanding was weak without the "help" of untrained teachers: "While the Māori adhered to the Christian forms and ritual along the lines of attending services and keeping the Sabbath, their understanding of doctrines such as those of sin and repentance were coloured by traditional concepts such as tapu and utu[137]."[138]

One important trend arising from the very limited knowledge of Christian doctrine – and in a sense exacerbated by the printing and distribution of the Old Testament in Māori – was a metaphorical approach to the Bible in which Māori saw themselves as a new Jewish nation. John Gorst, Civil Commissioner for the Waikato, wrote that in the Old Testament Māori saw "a state of civilization not unlike their own."[139] Once they identified themselves with the Old Testament Jews, Māori inevitably adopted Old Testament rituals, and just as inevitably, adapted them to their own culture.

Pākehā also contributed to the decline. It was not coincidental that Darwin's *Origin of the Species*[140] was published in 1859, adding fuel to the disparaging of Māori by European settlers. Land traders and colonial settlers frequently did little to encourage godliness, while sealers, whalers, seamen and escaped or freed convicts from Australia mostly discouraged Christian living.

The supplanting of biblical evangelism with formalism and ritualistic psuedo-Christianity under the tutelage of Bishop Selwyn made possible a semblance of Christianity without conversion or holiness. Despite publicly supporting the Treaty of

---

[135] Elsmore, p127
[136] Elsmore, p129
[137] revenge
[138] Elsmore, p18
[139] Elsmore, p148 citing John Gorst *The Mäori King* London 1959, p103
[140] When Darwin visited the Bay of Islands in 1835 he regarded Mäori as savages compared with "civilized" Tahitians. Mäori and their "houses are filthily dirty and offensive: the idea of washing either their bodies or their clothes never seems to enter their heads. I saw a chief who was wearing a shirt black and matted with filth; and when asked how it came to be so dirty, he replied, with surprise, 'Do not you see it is an old one?'" [see Elsmore, pp221f] Other data is needed to determine how coloured by Darwin's anthropology these observations were – but the view he formed that Mäori "character is of a much lower order" fitted well with his evolutionary theory published 24 years later.

Waitangi, Selwyn was compromised during the wars: "Bishop Selwyn's presence at Rangiaowhia where women and children were burned in their houses, for instance, was an act which could never be justified to the Māori, and such incidents were directly responsible for a distinct decline in the Christian mission."[141]

But the overwhelming factor to which any consideration of this sort must return, is syncretism. Elsmore's comprehensive catalogue of dozens of Māori prophetic, millennial and faith movements points to a recurring theme: over and over again the biblical faith was lost as it was adapted to Māori culture. Māori, "even while they practised the forms of Christianity, still had not abandoned their traditional beliefs."

As the Wesleyan report of 1857 put it, "Though Christianity has been embraced very extensively yet many are under the bondage of fear with regard to Māori gods and Māori witchcraft and Māori tapu. Perhaps of many it might be truly said, reversing that Scripture 2 Kings 17:33[142] they served the Lord and feared their own gods."[143]

[141] Elsmore, p144
[142] 2 Kings 17:33: "They worshiped the LORD, but they also served their own gods in accordance with the customs of the nations from which they had been brought."
[143] Elsmore, p119

5 MĀORI CULTURE & PAGANISM

A miss-placed benevolence will often accommodate pagan terminology and practice. For example, contemporary Christians rightly reject Hollywood's definition of "love", but uncritically adopt "aroha" as if it is the same as biblical love. It is not uncommon to hear tangihanga[144] commended as a better way to mourn than traditional Christian practice. And, we are often challenged, does not Māori commitment to family put Pākehā to shame? The answers lie in a proper understanding of the unseen but real realm of the spiritual.

Traditional Māori views of tapu, wairua[145], and shame are part of the complex amalgam of values in a Māori worldview. We are told that Tikanga – values, traditions and customs – are founded "at the dawn of time, when events were happening, the worlds were being made, domains being decided, the balance was being put in place and English was not being spoken. … the best place to look for that is in our ancient past and within our own Wairua, for our Wairua is as old as the worlds themselves."[146] The Bible has a different view.

Tapu is perhaps the most important concept. "The concept of tapu is an important element in all tikanga. The source of tapu goes to the heart of Māori religious thought and even though a majority of Māori are members of some Christian church or sect the notion of tapu holds."[147] Tapu is commonly translated "sacred" but this is inadequate. In a Christian context, "sacred" means set aside for or belonging to God. Nothing of that sort is implied by tapu which instead refers to the presence of supernatural power (which may be good or evil or in the continuum between good and evil). Because of the presence of this power, tapu implies danger and the greater the tapu the greater the danger. Tapu is everywhere and in everything even in words and culture.

Sacredness, or tapu was perhaps the greatest moral constraint. Tapu was not an absolute value but a comparative one. Stronger tapu could overcome the weaker. Thus the tapu of, say, a canoe, that related to its owner could be overcome by someone with greater tapu. Accounts are given of chiefs taking possession of another's canoe simply by calling it by his own name. The name of the original owner gave it tapu to protect it from theft by equals, but the chief had greater tapu – by giving the canoe his name (which he could do from his position of strength) he gave it greater tapu. The original owner must quietly relinquish his claims.

---

[144] customs associated with mourning and burial
[145] spirit or soul
[146] www.maori.org.nz 2004
[147] Meade, p30

Tapu controlled people by the fear of suffering as a result of supernatural forces. It ruled many daily routines. Food was tapu and was therefore surrounded by a host of rules. The head was tapu. Touching the head of others violated this tapu; stepping over food did the same. These and many similar rules of tapu are still observed, often rigorously, today. The fear of spiritual forces governs conduct and keeps people in bondage.

A person's state of "wellness" (ahau) is directly linked to tapu. Personal tapu is inherited and is enhanced by good whakapapa and conditions – it grows as a person matures. Personal tapu is built through good works and recognition by others, but it can be diminished when it is not protected, and mental or physical sickness is deemed one result of loosing a balance in personal tapu.

"Though opposites, *tapu* and *noa*[148] are not negations of each other: they are complementary opposites, pre-supposing and completing each other, incomplete and meaningless on their own."[149]

Ancient Māori culture produced a barbaric, fear-ridden and oppressive society. To say this however, is not to assert that the imposition of any other racial culture would be better. Every culture that refuses to acknowledge God in all its ways is a culture destined for strife, division and collapse.

The Apostle Paul explains this in the first three chapters of the book of Romans in the Bible. In it he demonstrates that when men who know of God reject his pattern for life, God gives them up to their own devices, reserving them for judgement at a later date. At the same time, God is patient, waiting for men to repent or turn from their sin – because as a God of grace he is willing to turn aside his righteous judgement and enter into fellowship with those who repent.

"The wrath of God," explains God's own Spirit through the Apostle,

> is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness, since what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities – his eternal power and divine nature – have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.[150]

A few lines later he asks a critical question, "Do you show contempt for the riches of his kindness, tolerance and patience, not realising that God's kindness leads you towards repentance?"[151] Instead of sending judgement upon the people of New Zealand, God looks for the time when they will see the futility of their ways and turn to him. Here is the real hope for a stable and just society – a nation where its people despise the myths and legends of the godless cultures of its past, and rebuild its way of life on a foundation of truth.

---

[148] commonness
[149] Metge, p60
[150] Romans 1:18-20
[151] Romans 2:4

Possibly the greatest period of peace and progress in Māori history is to be found in the period of missionary ministry, when the New Zealand tribes actively took up and spread amongst themselves the faith of Jesus Christ. Their new faith opened the way for social reconstruction spontaneously commenced by believing tribes. Even a cursory look at this period demonstrates what Māori quickly saw for themselves – the Christian gospel is a means of establishing a just and peaceful society free of fear, as well as a message of hope for the future. For all New Zealanders, faith and repentance towards Jesus Christ open a way for justice, unity, peace and cultural reform.

Faith in Jesus Christ involves more than a simple assent to his existence – it involves a belief in his being the living Son of God, who died as a substitute for the sinner. It is a confession that while the sinner deserved God's judgement, Christ took that judgement and suffered God's anger in the sinner's place. It is a heart-felt acknowledgement that what the sinner deserved from God has been fully satisfied in Jesus Christ in his death so that the believer is free from guilt and the threat of punishment. Faith in Jesus Christ brings peace with God, an answer to sin and guilt, and a solution to social strife.

Repentance is part of the same exercise of faith – for a repentant person not only acknowledges sorrow for his wrong-doing but a resolve to change his ways. It is stupidity to claim to believe in Jesus Christ without attempting to live by the principles of his Word, the Bible! The repentant person grieves for his sin – not just for his deeds, but for the in-born tendency he exhibits to keep on sinning – and in dependence upon God begins to put into practice biblical principles of daily living. These principles touch on every aspect of life – from how a person should pray to how a nation should manage its affairs.

What is significant about the Christian faith is that it denies that man has the ability to solve either his own or his nation's problems. Man's sinfulness, his guilt and its practical out-working in the daily life of a nation, can only be dealt with successfully when God himself intervenes. Faith is another word for dependence upon God for what we cannot ourselves do. Only God can put away sin. Only God has the truth and lasting values we need for national harmony. Only God can come in the person of the Holy Spirit to move the conscience, enlighten the mind and empower the individual to do things God's way.

Modern Māori culture has brought from the past a behaviour known as "whākama". This is loosely translated "shame"[152], although there are a number of other implications of being whākama apart from shame. A person found to be at fault, to have done wrong, to be out of place or such like will be whākama. This can be seen in shyness, withdrawal, embarrassment, shame or anger and violence. There is a definite sorrow for being wrong and a shamefacedness involve in being whākama, but it lacks the essential elements of Christian repentance.

Whākama results from a person's perception that his mana, his standing, has been lessened in relation to others – what he has done has reduced his standing. But there is no sense in which the person regards himself as totally sinful. Christian repentance however, is the response of a person who sees himself not simply as of reduced

[152] cf Metge

standing but of no standing at all. He has offended God, broken his law and is utterly without worth. It is only when one comes to God in this state of worthlessness that unmerited forgiveness can deal with guilt. On the surface, whākama appears to be like repentance, but in reality the whākama person is still dependent upon his own merits instead of Christ's.

It is only from a position of total guilt that it becomes possible for people to forgive others and live humbly with people who can be freely acknowledged to be better than oneself. The old hatred, the utu, the violence and the fear can all be dispensed with. One of the great barriers to a negotiated peace in the past has been the pride of Māori of various strata who could not sue for peace, forgive or forget without losing standing. The Christian gospel disposes of that problem by reducing all men to the same level of plain sinner – without standing or worth apart from God!

Aroha is not a universal love that seeks the good of all. Aroha is a loyalty to the whanau[153] and hapü. Note that it is loyalty to the group not to individuals who have no standing apart from the group. Aroha is extended to individuals because they are members of the group not because they are persons in God's image. It requires a person to do all in his power to express that loyalty. If a member of the whānau has been offended, then aroha requires others take action to restore honour. Mead rightly asks "How does concern for the well-being of the individual member of the hapü compare with the warlike nature of society at large?"[154] It doesn't if aroha is linked to any biblical concept of love.

Utu, or revenge, was an appallingly destructive value that permeated the entire economic and social structure of traditional Māori society. Utu requires the repayment, with "interest", of whatever is received.[155] If what is received is good, it must at some time be repaid with a bonus. If what is received is bad, it too must be repaid with a "bonus". Of course, where good was given, the mana of the recipient depended on displaying generosity and abundant "interest" – and as this compounded backwards and forwards, there would certainly be a drain on limited resources. But of far greater impact was the need for revenge for hurt received.

When offence was given, offence had to be returned with "interest". An insult had to be returned with added insult, and injury with added injury, death with additional death. A tribe suffering a member killed by an enemy had to avenge the death by more killing. There could be no place for forgiveness, for humility, for peacemaking.[156] One had been killed: two or more had to die in response. Of course, this now compounded, for the original offenders were now in their turn offended and had to exact utu! The killing must go on, with increasing numbers being butchered for the sake of primitive pride each time.

---

[153] immediate and extended family

[154] Meade, p36

[155] McLauchlan (Ed) *NZ Encyclopaedia* Bateman, Auckland, 1984, p560

[156] Peace could sometimes be negotiated by a "peacemaker", someone of great mana in the eyes of all concerned, who could negotiate a settlement in which no one lost face. Henry Williams played such a role often, and became greatly respected for this. But without such intervention, the utu must continue. A tribe willing to loose face could offer their "Puhi", woman or women of high rank to buy peace in circumstances in which they could not sustain war.

There was nothing amusing or noble about this compounding of hatred upon hatred, butchery upon butchery, to satisfy perverted "honour". Taha Māori demands that all available resources be directed to the satisfaction of hate and capitalising of brutality. A society built on ancient Māori values is a society built on hatred and committed to perpetual violence. Captain James Cook is attributed with saying of Māori, "They are a people who will never put up with an insult if given an opportunity to resent it." The New Zealand Ministry of Justice says

> Enemies provoked utu and gained mana from insulting, misusing or abusing the tapu of those they were fighting. Enemies kept a detailed reckoning of past insults and injuries and hostile relationships were marked by escalation, similar to the exchange relationships. Exchange relationships required that feasts increase in grandeur as they developed over time; similarly, it was expected that reciprocal acts of vengeance intensify. Each utu ideally eclipsed in degree of violence the affront that provoked it, and as a feud increased it engulfed an ever-widening circle of people.[157]

Closely linked to utu is muru, sometimes inaccurately referred to as "plunder". In reality muru was a form of judicial restorative justice in which an offending whānau or tribe accepted it would be plundered by others. The offence could be deliberate or accidental, and could range from insult to adultery to death (the reason death can be an offence is difficult to explain, but relates to issues such as lack of care for the dead person or loss of the protection of someone of great mana). It essentially operated between groups, whānau and hapü, who would not go to war with each other. Biblical justice limited punishment, but not only was muru devastating, the mana of an offender was often measured in the amount of his losses to muru!

Tangihanga, the rituals surrounding death, illustrate both the spiritualistic intensity of Māori religion, and the fear and bondage that come with it. While many admire the openness of the expression of grief in the tangi, or funeral time, few realise that it is for the benefit of the dead rather than the living that weeping is so evident. The dead person is present at the tangi. He is addressed directly by the mourners because he is present. The tangi is a means of sending this spirit on to the place of spirits with respect and dignity.

Other rituals surrounding death are even less well known outside of Māoridom. On some occasion a year or so after the death a grave stone is "unveiled". The stone has previously been covered, perhaps with a flag and feather cloak, in a secretive ceremony. During the unveiling service, prayers are made and the coverings removed. Harry Dansey links this custom to the ancient custom of removing the bones from their burial site before cleaning and hiding them to prevent enemies finding them and thereby overcoming the spirit of the dead.[158]

To the observer these ceremonies are picturesque. Yet they indicate a real participation of the Māori in the realm of spirits – a participation that binds with ritual, and with fear both for the dead and of the dead.

The concept of Tangata Whenua, "people of the land", is important in determining Māori self-identity. It originally meant that people born in the land were counted as

---

[157] http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/2001/maori_perspectives/introduction.html
[158] Harry Dansey *Mäori Custom Today* Shortland, Auckland, 1978, p62

sharing rights and privileges. The lesser meaning related to tribal rights to the land.[159] This concept is one of the most significant in the arena of Māori political action today. By virtue of birth, Māori have spiritual links to the land that cannot be set aside. Occupancy and legal ownership may change, but the spiritual link to that land cannot be totally alienated. Links to the land are basically tribal rather than individual. Among other things this makes the transfer of ownership difficult – it must normally be done on a tribal basis. Yet its exclusive application to Māori is dubious. Since all people born in New Zealand can be said to be "people of the land" they can justly call themselves tangata whenua. Henry and Marianne Williams' son, also Henry, was deemed "Tangata Māori" by local Māori by virtue of his birth in New Zealand.[160]

Māori eschatology is essentially without hope of future progress, for everything goes back to the past and its ancestors. "The future is unknowable and is conceived of as being behind us. So we travel backwards into time. … The past is seen stretching out in front of you. First come your parents, then ancestors, then the culture heroes (such as Kupe), then the gods and finally earth and sky, makers of the universe."[161]

The Christian recognises the value of the past. The Bible is a record of God's past work; not in a vacuum of academic interest, but in a revelation of the work of God as he redeems for himself a people to enjoy his blessing. Such a history therefore points forward to better things to come – it gives hope and incentive to build on the past and improve, to set aside difficulty and failure because something of far greater worth is certain to be attained. The Christian sees the past as the sweep of history leading to the redemption of man and creation: a new heaven and a new earth in which God's people will enjoy all the wonder of the friendship of the living God. The value of the past is not found in returning to it, as if social and technological regression represents some wonderful new freedom – but in the help it gives in moving to something better. The Māori belief that the greatest value is in the past prevents hope and ensures that there is no value in preserving what you have today: use it and enjoy it now, because tomorrow is just another step back to the ancestors.

"The Māori view of the world can be characterised by a figure holding out his arms to encompass the past while the unknown future lies behind his back. It is perhaps summed up in the saying, 'ki mua ki muri', 'the past is in the future'."[162]

No discussion of Māori culture could be complete without reference to Māori language, Te Reo. Māori rightly see this as one of their taonga and have aggressively promoted its use. Māori is now an official language of New Zealand. Māori radio and television broadcasts are accessible to almost all New Zealanders – there is no better way to identify issues and attitudes among Māori than to hear what they say among themselves. This is not the place to evaluate the revival of Te Reo, or to consider the rights and wrongs of teaching school children in Te Reo rather than in English. As we consider Māori culture we simply need to recognise the significant and dynamic place of Māori language.

---

[159] I H Kawharu *Orakei* NZCER Wellington,1975, p15
[160] Fitzgerald, p81
[161] Rangi Walker quoted in NZ Herald 5/1/86
[162] D R Simmons *te whare rünanga: The Mäori Meeting House* Reed, Auckland, 1997, p8

There is nothing in and of itself that makes Te Reo value-laden in a way that should cause Christians to hesitate to learn or use it. While presently it is difficult to learn Te Reo without simultaneously imbibing a revived pagan culture, past Christians valued the language to such an extent they learnt it, and gave Māori its written form. I suggest we will never reach Māori for Christ if we are not willing to respect them sufficiently as to at least pronounce common Māori words correctly, if not learn a language that once carried the gospel into darkest New Zealand.

6 MĀORI CULTURE & THE TREATY

On February 6, 1840, Queen Victoria (through her agent) and a number of Māori chiefs signed the Treaty of Waitangi. It had three simple clauses, ceding sovereignty of New Zealand to the Queen, providing for protection of Māori[163] lands, forests and fisheries, and according British citizenship to Māori. Subsequently numerous chiefs around New Zealand signed copies, and eventually the Crown took possession of what had not been ceded to it.

> One of the striking things about the Treaty of Waitangi, particularly in the context of its times, is that it really does look like a treaty between equal and independent sovereigns. It bears no resemblance to the policies associated with the conquest and domination of indigenous tribes by many Western nations around that time. … And indeed the Treaty language offers a clear and powerful affirmation of Māori title.[164]

It is important to note that the Treaty properly deals with the tribes of New Zealand, "groups" in modern political jargon. In an insightful comment on proclivity for modern politics to be centred on group rights the Maxim Institute[165] correctly sees groups as "political constructs … where dignity resides in group identity rather than in our understanding of common humanity." Needs and injustice are normally best met by dealing with individuals having personal identity instead of shadowy, de-personalised groups. Treaty issues have been captured by those, including leading politicians, who want to subvert human rights theory to discriminated between individuals on the basis of group identity. The Maxim Institute's paper correctly acknowledged that there is a place for righting the injustices that undoubtedly occurred in the past. So far as the Treaty is the reference point for righting past injustice suffered by identifiable corporate bodies such as tribes (Iwi), there is no conflict. So far as individuals (or politicians) attempt to use group identity as a vehicle for resolving past injustices suffered personally however, there will be a problem. While the first two clauses of the Treaty deal with the corporate relationship of the Crown and Iwi, the third accords individuals the rights of citizenship, and it is as individual citizens that any injustice individuals have suffered must be addressed.

There can be no question that the Treaty of Waitangi is the focal point for much contemporary tension regarding Māori culture. Understanding of kawanatanga[166] and tino rangatiratanga[167] is important, but not, as is commonly propagated, in

[163] "Mäori" is used here in its modern context: in 1840 it was neither known nor used and the treaty was made with the "united tribes of New Zealand"
[164] Richard A Epstein V *The Treaty of Waitangi: A Plain Meaning Interpretation* New Zealand Business Roundtable, 1999
[165] Maxim Institute *Real Issues* No Ninety-Six 5 February 2004
[166] governorship
[167] chiefly rule

determining the meaning of the Treaty. Contemporary debate about the Treaty implications of those terms is a pragmatic device to gain leverage in the face of the failure of common sense.

Kawanatanga is the term used in the Māori version of first article of the Treaty in the place of "sovereignty" in the English version. It can be argued that kawanatanga has a meaning of governorship that falls short of the full concept of sovereignty. Tino rangatiratanga is used in the Māori version of the Treaty in the place of "possession" in the English version. It can be argued that tino rangatiratanga has a stronger concept of chiefly rule than mere possession. The debate can be sustained in the context of today only if the context of 1840 is ignored and the very clear evidence that whatever the pedantic meaning, the concepts were well understood by Pākehā and Māori in 1840 and throughout the 19th century. It follows, that whatever academic interest remains in the debate, it is not relevant to the failure of the Treaty. The Treaty failed, not because its wording was obscure (it wasn't) but because the Pākehā settler government was not only unwilling to uphold the Treaty, but determined to ride roughshod over it and the people it was meant to protect.

The history of the British Crown's approach to New Zealand and its people, leading to the Treaty, is a remarkable one. The idea that the Crown was a land-grabbing, power-seeking invader is a deceit. Rather, the Crown renounced territorial claims based on Cook's discovery in 1769 and not only recognised New Zealand's independence but obliged other national powers to do the same. It was with considerable reluctance and constraint that the British Crown ultimately extended its rule to New Zealand.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century Māori had established regular trading links with Europeans. Flax and timber as well as food were important items of trade – and preserved heads of enemy tribes also featured![168] The Royal Navy made occasional visits, mostly for timber and provisions. In 1814 the Church Missionary Society established its mission – others were to follow soon. It was estimated that in the 1839 however, there were still only 2,000 Europeans in New Zealand.[169]

At first, the British Crown attempted to stay out of New Zealand affairs. Several laws were passed attempting to control the abuse of natives by British citizens, without much effect. In 1817, and again in 1823 and 1828, the British Parliament passed Acts recognising New Zealand's independence.

American and French interests were growing. In 1838 the French established a Catholic mission with close ties to the French Government. In 1839 the United States established a consulate. While the United States were welcome, the French were seen by Māori as a threat. This became an important influence in encouraging Māori appeals to the British for protection.

In 1820 Thames Māori formally requested British protection.[170] This was the same year the northern chief Hongi met King George IV in London and exchanged

[168] Claudia Orange *The Treaty of Waitangi* Allen & Unwin, Wellington, 1987, p12
[169] Orange, p6
[170] Orange, p6

assurances of British-Māori friendliness.[171] In the hope of closer British cooperation, another northern chief, Tïtore, demonstrated that Māori spirituality was for sale – he placed a tapu on a forest to preserve its timbers for the Royal Navy in any future conflict with the French![172] Closer ties with the British were being sought to protect Māori from foreign interests; but Māori openly acknowledged that they also greatly enhanced their mana (standing) by association with the Crown.[173]

A major step was taken in 1831 when a group of northern chiefs wrote a petition to the British Crown for protection from three perceived sources of trouble: foreign powers, other tribes and British subjects.[174] It is important to note that these Māori, like many of their contemporaries, recognised they could not find peace at home or internationally without the Crown. Māori culture could do nothing to bring 1,000 years of carnage to an end. The appointment of Busby as British Resident in 1832 did little to overcome the difficulties. It did however stress the Crown's attitude of humanitarian interest while preserving Māori independence. Busby was to be an intermediary between the races.[175]

In 1834 Busby helped establish a New Zealand flag which gained international recognition of the independence of New Zealand, particularly in the field of shipping. This was not the action of a colonial power seeking dominion over independent natives![176]

A Declaration of Independence was signed by a number of chiefs under the title of 'The United Tribes of New Zealand' in 1835. The Crown had encouraged this in the hope that cooperation and lawful national government could be achieved among the warring tribes. While these tribes declared their intent to meet in a congress annually, and to frame laws binding on all, tribal animosities basic to Māori culture ensured they never met again. By 1837 fighting was so serious that Busby successfully called for a Royal Naval presence in the Bay of Islands to protect British citizens.

In the same year, influenced by those events and the aspirations of the newly formed New Zealand Company, the Colonial Office reflected on the course of future developments. Strongly influenced by Christian principles[177] a policy of humanitarian concern for the Māori was established and predominated through to the eventual signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.

---

[171] While in England Hongi studied Classical Roman military tactics at Cambridge University. He later employed these in his New Zealand military campaigns to great effect. He controlled and arranged his troops in Classical Roman formations. At Mokoia in Panmure he used Roman style siege towers to position his musketeers above the Pa's fortifications, enabling them to rain unremitting fire into the defenders. Hongi also capitalised on the generous gifts of the King and his subjects – in Sydney, on his way home, trading all his gifts except for a set of armour, for muskets. He was then able to field about 600 musketeers against forces that between them probably had fewer than a few hundred muskets in the whole of New Zealand. Hongi wore his chain-mail armour into battle, and at Mokoia it undoubtedly saved his life when he was hit by a musket ball.

[172] Orange, p6

[173] Orange, p11

[174] Orange, p12

[175] Orange, p13

[176] Orange, p21

[177] Orange, p25

The land issue was closely linked to the need for a change. Māori had freely sold off sizable portions of their land to European dealers and settlers. While it was consistent with their economic values, fears were growing that they would alienate all their land. The issue seems not to have been a matter of the spiritual value of the land, so often alluded to today, or chiefs could not have sold land in the first place. Rather, the chiefs were losing both control and mana as their land-holdings decreased. Māori became anxious to secure British control of land trading to protect their commercial and cultural interest in land.

It was against this back-ground that the Crown set out to obtain "the free and intelligent consent of the natives"[178] to a treaty establishing British sovereignty over New Zealand. Generally, those charged with explaining and negotiating the Treaty took pains to make the nature of the agreement clear. Despite this, present debate questions the extent to which Māori understood sovereignty was being transferred. While some technical ambiguity in the translation from English to Māori can be pointed to in support of this argument,[179] the Māori debate at the time clearly indicated the issue of sovereignty was widely understood.

Interestingly, the Treaty was not made with the Māori people, but with a variety of chiefs representing their tribes. Again it must be remembered there was no united Māori people with whom such an agreement could have been made. Those chiefs who did not sign, ultimately had their lands annexed to the Crown but were still accorded the benefits given the signing tribes. The vast tracts of land not under tribal control were also annexed; now, for the first time, peaceful coexistence of tribes and races was possible. But for Māori, this was not a treaty between the people of New Zealand and the Government of Britain, but a personal commitment between the chiefs and the Queen. Māori have continued to look to the reigning sovereign as personal guarantor of the Treaty.

The Treaty assigned sovereignty to the Crown, which was then in a position to apply law justly to all – European and Māori alike. Along with this, it awarded British citizenship to the Māori – something unique in British colonial history and an indication of the genuinely humanitarian concern of the Crown. The Treaty also guaranteed what the Māori had asked for: protection from foreign powers, imposition of peace on the tribes, and due legal process in land trading. In addition it guaranteed protection of Māori forests and fisheries. The Māori traded a violent cultural heritage for peaceful law and order – a small price for the British protection they had asked for!

In the light of contemporary debate, how can we be certain the meaning of the Treaty was clear, and clearly understood by all? Firstly, Māori debated the issue of sovereignty extensively in the discussions before some signed the Treaty at Waitangi.[180] It was because they feared a loss of sovereignty that many of those refusing to sign withheld their assent.

[178] Orange. p31
[179] This is the basic thesis of Orange's book
[180] Orange (in the 1987 *The Treaty of Waitangi* but not the 2004 *An Illustrated History of the Treaty of Waitangi*) and others report extensive discussions by chiefs on this point

The testimony of the Wesleyan Missionary, John Warren, who witnessed the signing is worth repeating in detail:

> I was present at the great meeting a Waitangi when the celebrated treaty was signed, and also at a meeting which took place subsequently on the same subject at Hokianga. There was a great deal of talk by the natives, principally on the subject of securing their proprietary right in the land, and their personal liberty. Everything else they were only too happy to yield to the Queen, as they said repeatedly, because they knew they could only be saved from the rule of other nations by sitting under the shadow of the Queen of England. In my hearing they frequently remarked, "Let us be one people. We had the gospel of England, let us have the law from England."
>
> My impression at the time was that the natives perfectly understood that by signing the treaty they became British subjects, and though I lived amongst them more than fifteen years after that event, and often conversed with them on the subject, I never saw the slightest reason to change my opinion. The natives were at the time in mortal fear of the French, and justly thought they had done a pretty good stroke of business when they placed the British lion between themselves and the French eagle.[181]

What followed can be summarised as a gradual perversion of an initially benevolent administration and an unrelenting exclusion of Māori from any participation in governing the new nation.

One problem that gradually unfolded was the unworkable nature of the monopoly powers of the Crown over land purchases. One of the Treaty provisions was the pre-emptive right of the Crown to purchase any Māori land offered for sale. This was intended to prevent the exploitation of Māori by the New Zealand Company in particular and Pākehā buyers in general. But what it meant was that the Crown could set its own price, then on-sell the land to Pākehā at greatly inflated prices and profit. In the first place, the Colonial government just did not have enough money to fund purchases at just rates, and in the second place the temptation to raise much needed revenue for the benefit of the colony at the expense of Māori was just too great. Māori were forced to sell at prices akin to theft, sometimes even when they didn't want to, to Government agents whose official task to protect Māori interests was corrupted.

The first three Governors, Hobson, Fitzroy and Grey each gave repeated assurances to Māori over the meaning of the Treaty: Māori understanding of the Treaty was correct and their rights were being protected.[182] One chief, Wi Tako, wrote to newspapers protesting deceitful practices of the New Zealand Company, and successfully testified before a Land Claims Commission in 1844.[183] He was supported by a government agent. But in the end, his people lost their land anyway. Hone Heke cut down the flag pole (repeatedly) at Kororareka (Russell) in protest against abusive sovereignty, and eventually waged war (initially successfully). He lost.

---

[181] Quoted in Ian Wishart *The End of the Golden Gravy Train?* Investigate December/January 2004 vol 4 issue 36, p26ff (Wishart cites, *The Treaty of Waitangi*, T I Buick, pp 281-282)
[182] Orange, p 49
[183] Orange, p52

The chief Te Wherowhero wrote to the Queen in 1847 and received a very clear assurance from her (via Downing Street) that the common understanding of the Treaty would be honoured. It wasn't. Wiremu Tamihana Te Waharoa, who established a successful Christian village near Matamata wrote to the Governor in 1861 pleading with him to reconsider the declaration of war in the Taranaki: "…it is for you to do things deliberately, as you have an example to go by. The Word of God is your compass to guide you – the laws of God. That compass is the Ten Commandments."[184] He petitioned the Queen in 1865 and the New Zealand Parliament in 1866.[185] He got nowhere. Even contemporary Pākehā settlers expressed concerns, with 400 of them signing a petition demanding the Treaty's land guarantee be respected.[186] They too got nowhere.

The Chief Justice of the Colony, William Martin joined with Bishop Selwyn in 1860 and others in a campaign to defend Treaty principles. Martin's wife wrote of a journey through the Waikato in the 1850s, "Our path lay across a wide plain…For miles we saw one great wheat field … Carts were driven to and from the mill by their native owners; the women sat under the trees sewing flour bags … and babies swarmed around … We little dreamed that in ten years the peaceful industry of the whole district would cease and the land become a desert through our unhappy war."[187] But by about 1850 Pākehā began to outnumber Māori, and the new settlers had little regard for the Treaty.

In 1860 Governor Browne called a conference of 200 chiefs from throughout New Zealand at Kohimarama in Auckland. If there remained any doubts about the meaning of the Treaty with regard to sovereignty and protection of Māori assets, the Kohimarama Conference must be seen as dispelling them. The Governor "spelt out … that Māori rights to forests and fisheries, as well as lands, were guaranteed." For their part the chiefs pledged "to do nothing inconsistent with their declared recognition of the Queen's sovereignty, and of the union of the two races."[188] The Queen, Māori, missionaries and the British Government appeared united in their understanding and intent. So why did the New Zealand Wars break out?

According to the missionary J W Stack; the wars "forced loyal subjects of the Queen to fight against her troops in defence of their own lawful rights." [189] In detailed accounts, written to the Secretary of State and to the *Times* newspaper in London, the Otaki missionary Octavius Hadfield was unremitting in his criticism of the Government and defence of Māori. He wrote in support of a similar petition by the Bishop of Wellington. According the Hadfield, the Taranaki wars were acts of "oppression and spoliation"[190]:

> A flagrant act of injustice has been committed by the Governor …in the name of Her Majesty the Queen. … [Governor Browne] has gone out of his way to commit an act of injustice against a great chief who had always been loyal to

[184] Elsmore, p145
[185] Orange, p60
[186] Orange, p55
[187] Quoted by Orange, p62
[188] Orange, p66
[189] Elsmore, p145 citing J W Stack *More Moariland Adventures* Wellington, 1936, p183
[190] Octavius Hadfield *The Second Year of One of England's Little Wars* 1861

> Her Majesty's Government, and who had strenuously and effectively resisted the movement in favour of the Māori-king. The result of this is two-fold: loyal chiefs are disheartened, and turn their eyes towards the Māori king; the conspirators have gained more strength and adherents …[191]
>
> Any defence of Governor Browne's conduct in plunging this colony into an unjust and disastrous war, must always be a hopeless task. … Nothing, then, can be clearer than that this war has been brought about by the offended pride of Governor Browne.[192]
>
> Governor Browne blundered into war. … The Natives regard themselves as fighting in support of law and order, in opposition to the illegal conduct of Governor Browne; and there can be no doubt that they are right in this view of the subject. … The real object of the war was nothing else than the acquisition of 600 acres of land which the settlers were anxious to obtain.
>
> It is sometimes doubted whether Christianity can have had any effect on the Natives, since many professing Christianity are now in arms against the Government. I have laboured for twenty-two years among them, and I take this opportunity of saying that I never, before the war broke out, was so thoroughly convinced of the deep hold the Christian religion had taken of those under my charge as I have been since that event. I behold men deeply convinced of the injustice of the Governor's attack on W King's tribe – amazed that people born and educated in the midst of Christianity, can be guilty of such premeditated wickedness, and tempted to think that Christianity, if such be its fruits, may be a sham after all – possessing physical strength and courage not to be surpassed, and having formerly joined in wars under far less provocation, I say I believe these men paralysed, because they cannot bring themselves to believe that the Creator and Redeemer of men will allow such iniquity to prosper. They wait on Him.
>
> The only point raised by this war … [is] whether land is to be taken away from the Natives in violation of the treaty of Waitangi, and the reiterated promises of each successive governor. … Governor Browne has illegally and unjustifiably made a hostile attack upon certain peaceable and loyal natives for the purpose of forcibly wresting from them property guaranteed them by the treaty of Waitangi. They resist this hostile attack by force, being told by the Government that there is no tribunal in which they can defend their rights.[193]

Hadfield also called for an investigation into the war with compensation being paid to any survivors of those who suffered injustice. This was before the Governor added to his folly and illegal activities by seizing vast tracts of land from defeated Māori and from loyal Māori who happened to be in possession of neighbouring land settlers wanted. It was not until 1975 when the Treaty of Waitangi Act was passed that a legal structure for resolution of those and other disputes was established.

---

[191] Octavius Hadfield, *One of England's Little Wars* 1860
[192] *The Second Year …*
[193] Octavius Hadfield *A Sequel to One of England's Little Wars* 1861

The Act however, not only provided a legal forum for redressing the wrongs of the past, it also made possible the polarisation of racial tensions up to the present. The numerous settlements subsequently negotiated have been overshadowed by passionate ignorance and bigotry on all sides. Ill-informed, hot-headed posturing is sadly all too evident even among Christians. Yet it is surprisingly easy to apply biblical principles to this debate, and Christians – if only we would develop a Christian cultural practice – are uniquely placed to be salt and light and peacemakers. Two examples demonstrate this:

One of the first Waitangi tribunal claims to be settled was with the South Island tribe Ngāi Tahu.[194] Ngāi Tahu had signed the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, and over the following 24 years almost the whole of the South Island was acquired by Pākehā settlers. This process led to nine specific grievances including the failure of the Government to set aside promised reserves, failure to provide schools and hospitals for tribal use, taking of land not included in the official purchases deeds, keeping the tribe from traditional food gathering sites, forced purchases for minimal prices (the 251,500 acres purchased on Banks Peninsular for £700 in 1849 and 1856 was a better price than the £500 for over 2 million acres in North Canterbury in 1857, or the nearly 3 million acres purchased under duress in Kaikoura for £300 in 1859, or the £400 they were forced to accept for nearly 7 million acres of the West Coast in 1860!), and paying another tribe for land they owned. Note that at no stage had Ngāi Tahu been at war with the Crown or suffered judicial confiscations of land – they had just been cheated.

By 1991 when the Waitangi tribunal produced its report, the Crown had conceded it had "acted unconscionably and in repeated breach of the Treaty of Waitangi."

Getting to that point had however been difficult. In 1865 the passing of the Native Land Act had effectively disenfranchised Māori from control of their lands. It must be admitted that the administration of land sales and ownership was by then chaotic and unworkable, but there is clear documentary evidence that the Government consciously saw the Act as a means to destabilize the "natives" and forcing their assimilation into the Pākehā social and political system. Nevertheless Ngāi Tahu continued to protest they had not been dealt with justly by the Crown.

In 1869 Ngāi Tahu appealed to the courts but the Government passed a law preventing the case being heard. In 1879 a Royal Commission found Ngāi Tahu was nonetheless entitled to alienated land in Otago and Canterbury – to stop its findings being published the Government cut off the Royal Commission's funds! In 1887 another Royal Commission found in favour of Ngāi Tahu, asserting "only a 'substantial endowment' of land secured to Ngāi Tahu ownership would go some of the way to 'right so many years of neglect'" but most of its recommendations were ignored. In 1925 yet another Royal Commission came up with an offer of £354,000 to settle all claims. Despite Ngāi Tahu's determination not to accept such a paltry sum, the Government passed a new law in 1944 placing control of Ngāi Tahu affairs in the hands of a Trust Board it set up, then forcing it to accept the £354,000.

Once the Government accepted liability, all that was left was to negotiate an agreement. Ngāi Tahu leaders were adamant that no settlement could adequately

[194] See the *Appendix: The Ngäi Tahu Claim*, p56 below

compensate them for their losses, but under direction from the Prime Minister, the Right Hon Jim Bolger, and the exceptional leadership of the Minister in Charge of Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations, the Hon Douglas Graham, settlement was reached. It provided for an apology from the Crown (read by Queen Elizabeth, on her next visit to New Zealand), $170 million in economic redress, and additional funds which could only be spent on buying any publicly owned land that came up for sale, the return of Aoraki (Mt Cook) – which Ngāi Tahu regarded as an ancestor) but with Ngāi Tahu immediately entrusting it back into the Crown's care in perpetuity as a national taonga, and provision for access to food and greenstone resources.

From a Christian perspective we can see that due legal process clearly established that considerable injustices had occurred, that there was means for redress and that with the mutual good will of both parties, a balanced and moderate settlement could be achieved that satisfied tribal mana, gave token but substantial economic compensation, and was within the resources of the nation to meet. As I said before, it seems to me that the application of biblical principles in such a case is remarkably straightforward.

In the case of Taranaki tribes however, there had been war. As we have seen many Pākehā and the missionaries had at the time been of the view that the Taranaki wars were the result of unconscionable action by the Governor in support of settlers lusting for land. In 1863, on the pretext of the war now won, and at the suggestion of the Governor Sir George Grey, the Government set out to punish "the natives" by confiscating the whole of Taranaki except for inland areas too rugged to be farmed. Even tribes who had not taken part in the wars lost their land. More land was taken later, and in 1879 when Government surveyors moved onto these lands, local tribes began a campaign of peaceful resistance. Eventually in 1881, Government troops moved on the peaceful village of Parihaka, destroying it and shipping all its occupants to prison or exile. The Waitangi tribunal was to find, "The invasion and sacking of Parihaka must rank with the most heinous actions of any government, in any country, in the [19th] century. For decades, even to this day, it has had devastating effects on race relations." Allowing for judicial hyperbole, and I have no doubt it is hyperbolic, this is still a devastating indictment. Again, it seems to me that it should be relatively straight forward for Christians to acknowledge, as has our secular Government, that wrong was done and so far as is sensible and reasonable, should be put right.

None of this justifies Māori holding grudges. Nor should the opportunity for justice be perverted into covetousness: it is too easy to want what was neither lost nor earned. Māori pursuit of justice often appears to have been subverted by what has been called a "grievance industry"[195] in which reasonable claims for justice have been overwhelmed by a lust for anything that can be twisted to match desire with opportunity. Those who have been wronged are free to use lawful means to seek justice, but at the same time must have an attitude becoming of those who follow Christ.[196] Christian Māori are to give blessing not bitterness. But Christian Pākehā too are to give blessing not bitterness.

[195] See MP and *New Zealand First* Leader, The Hon. Winston Peters in *The New Zealand Herald* 30 September 2004 and numerous other sources.
[196] See 1 Peter 3:9; Hebrews 10:30; Romans 12:17,19; Philippians 2:5,14; Ephesians 4:31

The sometimes strident calls for "Māori Sovereignty" pose other difficulties. Māori culture locates the present and the future in a mythical past, thereby transforming even the present into myth. So present debate about the meaning of "sovereignty" in the Treaty of Waitangi recasts the present in a romanticised past, creating expectations of "sovereignty" that can never be realised. Whether the more extreme demands for exclusive Māori control of New Zealand are genuine or mere posturing, they are too remote from present reality to be seriously considered. But they do entrench mistrust, misunderstanding and frustration on all sides.

In ordinary English usage and legal tradition, "sovereignty" means the exercise of supreme rule. The Treaty of Waitangi transferred that rule to the Crown. Whether sovereignty was understood by all parties in 1840 as I have argued, or not, the exercise of sovereignty by the Crown since 1840 establishes the fact of Crown sovereignty from which there can be no rational retreat. "Once the Treaty had been confirmed, sovereignty, as it is commonly understood, passed from Māori to Britain."[197]

But that may not be the issue. Orange, for example, argues "the underlying issue is the desire of many Māori for recognition of Māori mana, the restoration of resources to create a sound economic base, and for recognition of Māori authority over them."[198] If that is all it means, it seems to me that is what the Treaty envisaged, and it is entirely consistent with our law. Various means, including provisions in Treaty settlements, have been used over the years to acknowledge Māori interests in particular spheres and to enable effective Māori participation in political processes. Māori seats in Parliament are an example. There is clear precedent in English law for such mechanisms – English Bishops have represented Anglicans in the House of Lords for centuries.

Māori perspectives have a special place, along with others, in this pluralistic, secular democracy. But "sovereignty" and mana that demand a pre-emptive right to be consulted or an exclusive power of veto over public policy and activity – which, despite what Orange suggests, is where the "sovereignty movement" appears to be taking New Zealand – cannot be validated by the Treaty of Waitangi. That Treaty unequivocally placed such sovereignty in the exclusive hands of the Crown. Nor does the Treaty validate the imposition of Māori spirituality on public or private life.

Biblical concepts of governance recognise that God gives to governments the authority and responsibility to rule, rewarding the good and punishing the bad.[199] All governed must submit to the rule of government, and government must consider all, governing all.

---

[197] Douglas Graham, *Māori Claims to Sovereignty Lack Credibility* 1999, reproduced on http://www.publicaccessnewzealand.org/files/treaty_articles_1999.html
[198] Orange, 268f
[199] Romans 13:1-7

7 MĀORI CULTURE & CHRISTIANS

We deny our faith when we approach these issues as just political and social tensions remote from our spiritual calling and warfare. We must move from merely interfacing with Māori culture to loving our neighbour. In contrast to Tasman's view in 1642 that Māori were "barbarian men who are nowise to be trusted" Cook was instructed in 1768 to approach Māori as "human creatures, the work of the same omnipotent Author, equally under his care with the most polished European."[200] That biblical worldview shaped British Government and missionary interaction with Māori throughout the following 70-80 years. Yet the New Zealand church, it seems to me, is in danger of either assimilating Māori culture (or assimilating itself into Māori culture) or resorting to Tasman's view and distancing itself from Māori as non-Māori New Zealanders have consistently done since the 1860s.

Earlier I identified five of the Bible's cultural imperatives: having a new culture, exposing the fruitless deeds of darkness, holding fast to the freedom we have in Christ, separation, and letting our light shine. Now I would like to add four more:

The sixth of the Bible's cultural imperatives is the necessity of maintaining a clear conscience. In his discussion of meat offered to idols[201], Paul reminds us of the freedom we have in Christ to eat such meat. We should eat without "raising questions of conscience". But some "are still so accustomed to idols"[202] and their consciences are troubled if they are emboldened by your actions to copy you. If they just don't agree with what you do, they cannot bind your conscience and you are free. But if they follow you against their own conscience, then you sin against your brother if you insist on your freedom. In such a case, for *their* sake, you should not eat. In other words, even if you are aware of the link to the idol, it does not bind your conscience – you are only inhibited if your actions provoke others to copy you, acting against their consciences. The principle is applicable in other matters of culture.

So far we have not discussed Māori arts. For Māori the arts are gifts of the gods, are surrounded with tapu, and always have a spiritual dynamic. In the arts are included carving and tattooing (body carving, unlike the pin-prick tattooing with which we are more familiar), and weaving, with girls being dedicated in ritual and karakia in infancy to the latter. Much of the artists' works are carried out in secret and before they can be seen and used, require karakia and ceremonial to release them from the tapu associated with their making. Can a Christian have such works of art, use them or go to places where they are on display? The principle of conscience applies.

---

[200] Michael King, *1000 Years of Māori History* Reed, Auckland, 1997, p23f
[201] 1 Corinthians, 8:1-12 & 10:14-33
[202] 1 Corinthians 8:7

For example, the traditional koru design, a graceful spiral resembling an unfurling fern frond, is aesthetically pleasing and is to be found in such things as corporate logos and popular jewellery. *Air New Zealand* for example has long used a stylised koru as its corporate logo, and in doing so has helped make the koru a symbol of New Zealand, rather than of the tranquillity, spirituality and birth/beginnings with which Māori religion has imbued it. Is a Christian woman free to wear a koru broach or pendant? Bearing in mind biblical constraints[203], why not wear a koru? The fact that by some who love darkness, or even by some believers who are still so accustomed to idols, it is linked to gods that don't exist, is no reason why a believer cannot exercise her freedom in Christ. But only if her own conscience is clear: keep a clear conscience.

Similarly Christians are free in Christ to visit marae, attend tangi or join in a stick game – any imagined spiritual connotations or powers that lovers of darkness may attribute to such things do not exist and need not bind the Christian. Such things in themselves take us neither closer to nor further away from God.[204] However, if the Christian is troubled in his conscience he must not take part. Or if his actions are going to embolden another believer to do something against his conscience, he must not take part[205]. We have freedom, but "Be careful, however, that the exercise of your freedom does not become a stumbling block to the weak." [206]

That leads directly to the seventh imperative: the need to strive for a united local church membership based on Christ, not on ethnic identity. The New Testament saw no place for the Christians in Colosse to be separated into Jewish and Greek congregations or communities: "Here there is no Greek or Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free, but Christ is all, and is in all."[207] It follows there can be no place for separated Māori and Pākehā churches. The separation of many New Zealand churches along racial lines in the 19th and 20th centuries[208] clearly assisted the ascendancy of syncretism in Māori Christianity. It entrenched social divisions based on race, and encouraged Māori to find identity in their ethnic roots instead of in their new creation in Christ and their new brotherhood of believers.[209] It exposed the Pākehā churches to the English cultural aberrations of nominalism and formalism that would certainly have been challenged had vibrant converts from Māori paganism been congregational partners. The local church is meant to be the place where believers from all classes and cultures nurture one another in the new culture of Christ.

A church in which people speak different languages and have different traditions certainly faces challenges. What a wonderful opportunity it presents to dump our own worldly habits and mere preferences so as to build a fellowship that nurtures all in a Christ centred way of life. That may need such practical steps as providing

---

[203] That is, not drawing attention to religious connotations (eg asking if it is idolatrous), not provoking a troubled conscience in others, and being guided by such passages as 1 Peter 3:3
[204] 1 Corinthians 8:8
[205] 1 Corinthians 8:9-13
[206] 1 Corinthians 8:9
[207] Colossians 3:11
[208] In some cases this was formalised, such as with the Anglicans in which at first Mäori and settler congregations were separated, then with the establishment of a "Mäori diocese"; in others an "accident" of location, preference, language or habit.
[209] 1 Peter 2:17

translations and translators suited to the needs of the people of God who are part of the congregation, and to using liturgies and hymnologies suited to the time and context in which God has placed us.[210]

The eighth imperative is the need to "be clothed with compassion."[211] The great Christian parliamentarian William Wilberforce, who was so influential in abolishing the slave trade and reforming working conditions and family life of English poor, exemplifies the sort of compassion we ought to have. He saw others in need, and he did what God had enabled him in his providence to do. But his example comes with a warning: while we must be compassionate towards others, while we must use all the social and political means at our disposal to help those who suffer, we ought never to assume this will bring about a Christian nation. Wilberforce himself wrote, "my only solid hopes for the well-being of my country depend, not so much on her fleets and armies, not so much on the wisdom of her rulers, or the spirit of her people, as on the persuasion that she still contains many who love and obey the gospel of Christ; that their intercessions may yet prevail; that, for the sake of these, Heaven may still look upon us with an eye of favour."[212]

With fellow evangelicals he helped found and promoted the missionary thrust into the Pacific that saw Marsden, Williams and others give their lives' labours to Māori. It was the same influence that shaped in the Home Office the biblical compassion behind the Treaty of Waitangi. Our response to contemporary Māori culture must at least recapture the dynamism of those missionaries, and their commitment to Christ, their dependence on God, their trust in the Bible, their sacrificial love for lost people.

How do *we* respond to those who are lost?

> Do we see sinners as broken and utterly helpless in the miseries of sin? I am afraid that too many, like the scribes and Pharisees, see sinners as bothersome. We are attempting to build a 'clean' society and they are in the way. They disrupt our programme and dirty the landscape. But they are torn asunder by their sins and taken captive by the wicked one at his will. Is there no loving pity for sinners? Their humanity is utterly shattered by their own sin. …
>
> Our Saviour's heart is drawn out to these scenes of lost humanity. He has an urge to be near the broken specimens known as sinners. We say we want to imitate our Lord Jesus. Surely if we begin to be more like him, we too will desire to spend time with sinners, to be fishers of men, to labour at recovering lost humanity. The Saviour's high purpose in coming to the word was 'to seek and save that which was lost'. How can we be like him and not share that purpose to some extent?[213]

Christian anthropologist Robert J Priest has written:

---

[210] That does not mean adapting Christian life and worship to contemporary local culture – such syncretism is no different from any other synthesising of Christianity and paganism whether from ethnic, national, or religious traditions. But it does mean doing things in ways that, for example, are both biblical and comprehensible to the people who are there.

[211] Colossians 3:12

[212] William Wilberforce, *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System* William Collins, Glasgow, 1841 (1797), p442

[213] Walter J Chantry *The Mutual Attraction between Jesus and Sinners* Banner of Truth #494, Edinburgh, November 2004, p29f

> Evangelicals respond to a secular culture with apologetics, philosophy, and defence of the historicity of the faith, while the culture with its discourses quietly chips away at biblical foundational assumptions of what we are as humans – giving new categories to think with and grounding its assumptions in sophisticated empirical studies. The result is that we defend, philosophically and historically, a faith that ceases to make sense of our condition, a faith that in terms of our subjective perceptions ceases to have face validity or subjective plausibility. With the demise of sin, hell becomes indefensible, grace loses its appeal, mission faces a crises of legitimacy, and the cross of Christ has no meaning.[214]

His warning is utterly pertinent to our present interface with Māori culture. 19th century Māori accommodated their old religion with their new faith, and lost the faith. We are in danger of doing the same. Whether the church piously sits in judgement over a list of pagan values and practices in contemporary Māori culture, and flees from it in superstitious denial of the cross of Christ, or synthesises Māori culture and Christian worship, the real battle is being lost as the fundamentals of the Christian faith – sin, grace and the cross of Christ – are being eroded by the pluralism that makes one man centred culture from Māori and Pākehā alike.

So long as our response to Māori and their culture, contemporary or historical, is withdrawal, we have lost the gospel. But that is also true if our response is merely social works or political action. Wilberforce again provides a wonderful example. There is probably no Christian statesman of the last three centuries who did more for the poor, the abused, the oppressed than Wilberforce. But he did not see his social and political action as contributing to the creation of a Christian state. In fact, he published his *On Christianity* while at the peak of his political career. Instead, he argued that a Christian state could only come from Christian people

> Let true Christians, then, with becoming earnestness, strive in all things to recommend their profession [faith], and to put to silence the vain scoffs of ignorant objectors – let them boldly assert the cause of Christ in an age when so many who bear the name of Christians are ashamed of Him: and let them consider as devolved on them the important duty of serving, it may be of saving, their country, not by busy interference in politics, (in which it cannot be but confessed there is much uncertainty), but rather by that sure and radical benefit of restoring the influence of religion, and of raising the standard of morality.[215]

Wilberforce was moved to social and political action by simple compassion for the plight of those he helped. So far as we are able, we can do no less. But that will not reform the nation. Only the gospel can do that. So the last imperative I want to draw your attention to is this: live and proclaim the gospel.

In the words of the first person to proclaim the gospel in New Zealand:

> The plague of sin, when it has been permitted to operate on the human mind with all its violence and poison, can never be cured, and seldom restrained by the wisest human laws and regulations. Heaven itself has provided the only

[214] Priest, p100
[215] Wilberforce, p440

> remedy for sin – the blessed balm of Gilead; to apply any other remedy is lost labour.[216]

How then should Christians respond to Māori culture? We should love our neighbour. The parable of the Good Samaritan makes clear what *that* means. We should love God. I hope I have made clear what than means in a cultural context. We should love our neighbour and love God, which means taking the gospel to our neighbours and joining with them in the new culture of the people of God.

[216] Marsden, quoted by Murray, p33

Appendix: The Ngāi Tahu Claim

Ngāi Tahu brought a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal in 1986 for redress of wrongs committed against the tribe since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. At the heart of the claim were what they called their "Nine Tall Trees", nine injustices that had significantly injured the tribe. Eight related to loss of land and one to loss of traditional food gathering rights. Over the next ten years the Waitangi Tribunal found the tribe's claims to be valid and the Government negotiated a settlement with the tribe that, in the words of Ngāi Tahu, "relegated its grievances to the past."[217]

The Waitangi Tribunal examines evidence placed before it by all interested parties and conducts its own research into claims. It reaches a finding based on evidence. Its findings are not binding on the Crown, but in the case of the Ngāi Tahu claims, not only did the Tribunal find the claims were valid, the Crown itself accepted that the claims were valid.

The Nine Tall Trees were:

1. The Ötākou (Otago) Purchase of 1844
400,000 acres were purchased by the Crown for £2,400. Almost 10,000 acres were retained by the tribe who were also promised 1/10th of the purchased land to be set aside as reserves for tribal use. The reserves were never provided.

2. The Canterbury Purchase of 1848
In 1848 Crown agent Henry Kemp purchased 13,500,000 acres in Canterbury for £2,000. Ngāi Tahu had been reluctant to sell, but were afraid that if they did not sell, the Crown would take the land. This fear arose from an earlier "deal" in which the Crown "purchased" land in Wairau by buying it from another tribe when it was known it belonged to Ngāi Tahu! Just over 6,000 acres were set aside for the tribe; more were promised along with schools and hospitals and the preservation of tribal rights to gather food from traditional areas – none of these promises was kept, and Ngāi Tahu also had taken from them large tracts of land and food resources never included in the deed of sale.

3. The Banks Peninsula Purchases of 1849 & 1856
Agent Walter Mantell was sent to Banks Peninsular to secure land the Government claimed to already have title to. Title to this land was in dispute, but the Government instructed Mantell to solve this problem by disregarding any claims the tribe made. When the tribe could not secure a reservation of 30,000 from the 251,000 being taken, they would not sign the agreement drawn up by Mantell. For years Mantell claimed that the transfer had taken place legally, but in 1856 the Government acknowledged that it had not. To "remedy" this the Crown gave Ngāi Tahu £700 and a reserve of

[217] All quotations in this Appendix are taken from *The Crown Settlement Offer* Ngäi Tahu Publications, Christchurch, 1997. See also http://www.ngaitahu.iwi.nz/Office/The%20Settlement

3,400 acres, and took the 251,000 acres. Not surprisingly, the Waitangi Tribunal has called this a "forced sale".

4. The Murihiku Purchase of 1853
Ngāi Tahu were reluctant to sell 7 million acres that agent Mantell had been ordered to purchase for £2,600 in Southland. The tribe was particularly concerned to keep enough land in reserves for its needs, but Mantell would only allow them just under 5,000 acres. Eventually they agreed, on the basis of a promise to place a school and hospital with each Ngāi Tahu village. No hospitals or schools were ever provided, and after the agreement was made, the Crown added Fiordland to the land "purchased".

5. The North Canterbury Purchase of 1857
When the Crown purchased Ngāi Tahu's Wairau block from Ngāti Toa, it also claimed to have purchased a vast tract of land north of Kaiapoi. Ngāi Tahu never accepted this, and after years of petitioning the Crown an enquiry instigated by Governor Browne found that Ngāi Tahu were right. By now almost all the land concerned was in European possession, and the Government simply gave the tribe the option of accepting £500 for just over 2,000,000 acres of land or accepting nothing! They took the money under protest.

6. The Kaiköura Purchase of 1859
In much the same way as with North Canterbury, the Crown's claim to possession of land in Kaiköura was eventually subject to negotiation. Ngāi Tahu sought £10,000 or 100,000 acres of reserve; the Crown forced the tribe to accept £300 and 5,500 acres of reserve which its agent described as "most useless and worthless" in exchange for nearly 3,000,000 acres.

7. The Arahura Purchase of 1860
By 1859 gold had been discovered on the West Coast and the Crown set out to obtain nearly 7 million acres before Ngāi Tahu realised the value of gold. Agent James Mackay was given instructions to pay no more than £150 for this land. Eventually he got Crown permission to offer £400 and set aside 10,000 acres of reserve, but Ngāi Tahu shied off this too. Eventually Ngāi Tahu agreed to sell for £300 with 16,000 acres of reserve including the whole of the Arahura River and the area on which Greymouth was eventually built. The tribe received only 2,000 acres of the promised reserve. The gold rushes of the 1860s brought settlers into the district and Ngāi Tahu owners were able to lease land they still possessed to the settlers, so in 1887 the Government took this right from them, granting perpetual leases to the leaseholders for miniscule rentals paid to Ngāi Tahu.

8. The Rakiura (Stewart Island) Purchase of 1864
A surprising £6,000 was paid for 420,000 acres, and nearly 1000 acres were set aside for reserves.

9.The Mahinga Kai
Mahinga kai are places where food and other resources had traditionally been gathered. When Ngāi Tahu lost ownership and control of mahinga kai, they lost the ability to feed and support themselves. The new land owners changed land use – mostly by instituting farming – thereby preventing Ngāi Tahu from ever again being

able to gather food and resources upon which they had depended. Such losses occurred through each of the eight land purchases.

In 1991 the Waitangi Tribunal published its findings on these nine claims:

> The Tribunal has found on the evidence before it that many of the claimant's grievances arising out of the eight Crown purchases including those relating to mahinga kai, have been established. Indeed the Crown has properly conceded that it failed to ensure Ngāi Tahu were left ample lands for their present and future needs. The tribunal cannot avoid the conclusion that in acquiring from Ngāi Tahu 34.5 million acres, more than half the land mass of New Zealand for £14,750 and leaving them with only 35,757 acres, The Crown acted unconscionably and in repeated breach of the Treaty of Waitangi.

With such an uncompromising indictment, with which all parties agreed, there was only left the matter of negotiating a settlement. The Waitangi Tribunal cannot oblige the Government to any action; all it can do is publish its findings and make recommendations. Initially the findings of the Tribunal made no progress, but a Government led by Prime Minister the Rt Hon Jim Bolger and Minister in Charge of Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations the Hon Douglas Graham[218] was committed to settlement. Ngāi Tahu leaders stressed they did not seek recompense for the real value of their losses, and both they and the Government agreed that there was no way in which privately owned land would be returned to the tribe. The final settlement had five key points:

1. An Apology

The Crown and Ngāi Tahu both placed an apology at the head of the settlement. Tikanga looks for a restoration of honour, and an apology was a key component – even for some Ngāi Tahu "the most important part of the settlement." In the apology, written into the Deed of Settlement, and read by Queen Elizabeth on her next visit to New Zealand, "the Crown expresses its profound regret and apologises unreservedly" for acting "unconscionably and in repeated breach of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi" and for its failure "to act towards Ngāi Tahu reasonably and with the utmost good faith, consistent with the honour of the Crown."

2. Aoraki /Mt Cook

New Zealand's highest mountain has always been of significance to Ngāi Tahu. In Ngāi Tahu mythology, Aoraki is a god, set there in stone because he made a mistake in reciting a karakia. But in any case the highest mountain in any country is an important symbol, and Ngāi Tahu mana has always been related to this mountain. The Crown returned Aoraki to Ngāi Tahu and agreed that it would be official named Aoraki/Mt Cook. However, recognising that Aoraki was also symbolic for the rest of New Zealand, Ngāi Tahu agreed to gift title of the mountain to the nation as "an enduring symbol of the tribe's commitment to the co-management of areas of high historical, cultural and conservation value." Apart from a consequential (and formally recognised) role for Ngāi Tahu in the management of Aoraki, nothing material really changed – but respect has been given to all parties: tikanga accords mana to both the giver and the receiver of gifts.

[218] *Sir* Douglas Graham from 1999

3. Economic Redress

A total amount of $170m million was paid in various parcels to Ngāi Tahu. Further funds were made available for Ngāi Tahu to purchase crown lands that became available, enabling the tribe to turn this part of the compensation funds into assets to be used for the future benefit of the tribe. There were a number of mechanisms and safeguards, but the total package was for compensation of $250 million, some of which could only be spent in buying available crown land at market rates. As Ngāi Tahu noted, "No package that is economically affordable by New Zealand could adequately compensate Ngāi Tahu for our full loss and thus give us 'justice'. However, the [offer] is judged … to be the best that can be achieved in the present circumstances." It was a lot, it was a lot less that was deserved, but it was affordable and reasonable.

4. Cultural Redress

This covered a number of natural resource issues, in recognition of Ngāi Tahu's "strong cultural and spiritual relationship with the natural environment." Among these:

- Remaining pounamu (greenstone) deposits were returned to Ngāi Tahu ownership. Pounamu had always been treasured by the tribe and it had never been their intention to see ownership pass out of tribal hands.
- Three high country sheep stations (then in the ownership of the Crown) were returned to the tribe, who gifted the mountains on them to the nation, and the 90% of the land that was in native bush and forest was leased in perpetuity to the nation for nominal rent. No private rights or public access were affected; in fact, although the tribe maintains a veto on commercial activities in the area, greater access than previously existed for recreational sports has been entrenched in law. Ngāi Tahu has farming rights on the 10% of land that is farmland.
- Four specific sites, with similar conditions to those applying to the three high country stations, were given into the ownership or management of the tribe.
- 88 specific place names of significance to the tribe will be changed, in most cases to dual English/Māori names. The exceptions are Aoraki/Mt Cook where the Māori name comes first, and Whareakeake which was previously distastefully named "Murderers Beach".
- 72 traditional camping and food gathering areas on public land were recognised and the tribe given seasonal camping rights to them (but subject to management and conservation controls), action mainly intended to enable tribal members to learn and experience traditional land use and food gathering.
- Significant recognition of and rights to traditional fisheries was made.

5. Non-Tribal redress

A number of claims that affected individuals but not the entire tribe were part of the Ngāi Tahu claim. Those recognised as valid were included in specific agreements for compensation.

This settlement was accepted formally by Ngāi Tahu as "a final settlement of the grievances [they] took to the Waitangi tribunal" and was passed into law by Parliament in the *Ngāi Tahu Claim Settlement Act of 1998*.

Index

ISBN 0-908806-15-9